

Qualitative properties of free boundaries for the exterior Bernoulli problem for the half Laplacian.

Sven Jarohs*, Tadeusz Kulczycki†, Paolo Salani‡

Abstract

In this work, we study the asymptotic behavior of the free boundary of the solution to the exterior Bernoulli problem for the half Laplacian when the Bernoulli's gradient parameter tends to 0^+ and to $+\infty$. Moreover, we show that, under suitable conditions, the perpendicular rays of the free boundary always meets the convex envelope of the fixed boundary.

Keywords: free boundary problems, fractional Laplacian, moving planes method, starshapedness.

AMS Subject Classification 2020: 35R35, 35S99.

1 Introduction

The exterior Bernoulli free boundary problem for the half Laplacian is formulated as follows.

Problem 1.1. *Given $d \in \mathbb{N}$, a bounded domain $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and a constant $\lambda > 0$, we look for a continuous function $u : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, 1]$ and a domain $\Omega \supset \overline{K}$ of class C^1 satisfying*

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)^{1/2}u(x) = 0 & \text{for } x \in \Omega \setminus \overline{K}, \\ u(x) = 1 & \text{for } x \in \overline{K}, \\ u(x) = 0 & \text{for } x \in \Omega^c, \\ D_\Omega^{1/2}u(x) = \lambda & \text{for } x \in \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Here, $(-\Delta)^{1/2}$ denotes the half Laplacian given by

$$(-\Delta)^{1/2}f(x) = \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{d+1}{2}\right)}{2\pi^{\frac{d+1}{2}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{2f(x) - f(x+z) - f(x-z)}{|z|^{d+1}} dz$$

and $D_\Omega^{1/2}$ denotes the generalized normal derivative given by

$$D_\Omega^{1/2}u(x) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{u(x + tn(x)) - u(x)}{t^{1/2}} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{u(x + tn(x))}{t^{1/2}},$$

where $x \in \partial\Omega$ and $n(x)$ is the inward unit normal vector to Ω at x . As usual, by a domain we understand a nonempty, connected open set; by a domain of class C^k for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we

*Goethe-Universität Frankfurt, Germany, jarohs@math.uni-frankfurt.de.

†Wrocław University of Science and Technology, Poland, tadeusz.kulczycki@pwr.edu.pl

‡DiMaI, Università di Firenze, Italy, paolo.salani@unifi.it

understand a domain whose boundary is locally a graph of a C^k function. Given $r > 0$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we denote by $B_r(\xi)$ the open ball of radius r centered at ξ . Since we will widely use the notion of starshapedness, although it is quite standard, let us recall it now: we say that a domain A is *starshaped with respect to a point* $\xi \in A$ if $\mu(A - \xi) + \xi \subseteq A$ for every $\mu \in [0, 1]$ (i.e., if for every $x \in A$ the whole segment joining ξ to x is contained in A). Furthermore, we say that A is starshaped with respect to the set $B \subseteq A$ if it is starshaped with respect to every point $\xi \in B$.

The study of classical Bernoulli free boundary problems has a long history, which started with the pioneering work by [5]. The fractional version has been introduced in [7], where the authors studied the regularity of the free boundary. Since then, the study of the regularity of the free boundary in the nonlocal case has attracted great attention, see e.g. [1, 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 21, 22, 23, 24, 28]. By assuming further geometric properties of the fixed boundary ∂K in Problem 1.1, these properties carry over to the solution (u, Ω) . In [20] (see Theorem 1.6 and Proposition 2.11) the following result is proven.

Theorem 1.2 (Theorem 1.6 and Proposition 2.11 in [20]). *Assume that the bounded domain $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ has a C^2 boundary and it is starshaped with respect to a ball $B_r(x_0)$ for some $r > 0$ and $x_0 \in K$. Then for any $\lambda > 0$ there exists a unique solution $u_\lambda, \Omega_\lambda$ of Problem 1.1. Moreover, Ω_λ is bounded, starshaped with respect to $B_r(x_0)$ and it is of class C^∞ .*

The aim of this paper is to study geometric properties of the family of sets $\{\Omega_\lambda\}_{\lambda > 0}$. For any $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 > 0$, we define

$$\Delta_{x_0}(\Omega_{\lambda_1}, \Omega_{\lambda_2}) = \inf\{|\ln \mu| : \mu \leq 1, \mu(\Omega_{\lambda_1} - x_0) \subseteq \Omega_{\lambda_2} - x_0 \text{ and } \mu(\Omega_{\lambda_2} - x_0) \subseteq \Omega_{\lambda_1} - x_0\}.$$

We simply write Δ instead of Δ_{x_0} when $x_0 = 0$, as we can usually assume up to a translation.

We say that a domain $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ *satisfies the uniform interior ball condition* (with radius $r > 0$) if for any point $x \in \partial A$ there exists a ball $B_r(\xi) \subseteq A$ such that $x \in \partial B_r(\xi) \cap \partial A$. We denote by $r_A > 0$ the supremum of all $r > 0$ such that A satisfies the uniform interior ball condition with radius $r > 0$ (note that the supremum is in fact the maximum). It is clear that if a bounded domain $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ has a C^2 boundary then it satisfies the uniform interior ball condition. We show the following results.

Theorem 1.3. *Assume that a bounded domain $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ has a C^2 boundary and it is starshaped with respect to a ball $B_\rho(x_0) \subset K$ for some $\rho > 0$. Then the following properties hold.*

(i) $0 < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2$ implies

$$\Omega_{\lambda_1} \supset \Omega_{\lambda_2}.$$

(ii) For any $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 > 0$ we have

$$\Delta_{x_0}(\Omega_{\lambda_1}, \Omega_{\lambda_2}) \leq 2|\ln \lambda_2 - \ln \lambda_1|.$$

(iii)

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow +\infty} \text{dist}(\partial \Omega_\lambda, \partial K) = 0, \quad \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0^+} \text{dist}(\partial \Omega_\lambda, \partial K) = +\infty.$$

(iv) There is a strictly decreasing function g_{d,r_K} , depending only on r_K and on the dimension d , such that for every $\lambda > 0$ it holds

$$g_{d,r_K}(\lambda) \leq \text{dist}(\partial \Omega_\lambda, \partial K) \leq \frac{1}{\lambda^2}.$$

The function g_{d,r_K} satisfies $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0^+} g_{d,r_K}(\lambda) = +\infty$. We have

$$g_{1,r_K}(\lambda) = \sqrt{\frac{4Cr_K}{\lambda^2} + r_K^2} - r_K,$$

and

$$g_{d,r_K}(\lambda) \geq \frac{C}{\lambda^2 (\min \{A(\lambda), A(\lambda)^{1/2d}\} + 1)^{2d-1}} \quad \text{for } d \geq 2, \quad (1)$$

where $C \in (0, 1]$ is a constant only depending on the dimension d and

$$A(\lambda) = \frac{C}{r_K \lambda^2}.$$

Remark 1.1. We remark that if K is convex with boundary of class C^2 , then

$$r_K = \frac{1}{\kappa}, \quad \text{where } \kappa = \max\{\kappa_i(x) : i = 1, \dots, d-1, x \in \partial K\}$$

and $\kappa_1(x), \dots, \kappa_{d-1}(x)$ are the principal curvatures of ∂K at x . This is true more in general, indeed for many regular domains, even not convex; on the other hand, without the convexity assumption it is easy to find smooth domains such that $r_K < 1/\kappa$, for instance, this is the case for a dumbbell with a sufficiently tiny rod.

Remark 1.2. By Theorem 1.3 (iv), we can see that there is a constant $D > 0$, depending only on the dimension d , such that for every $\lambda > 0$ it holds

$$\frac{Dr_K^\beta}{\lambda^{2\alpha}} \leq \text{dist}(\partial\Omega_\lambda, \partial K) \leq \frac{1}{\lambda^2}, \quad (2)$$

where the exponents α and β are as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \alpha = 1, \beta = 0 & \text{for } \lambda \text{ large enough,} \\ \alpha = 1/2d, \beta = (2d-1)/2d & \text{for } \lambda \text{ small enough.} \end{cases}$$

Essentially, notice that if λ is large then $\text{dist}(\partial\Omega_\lambda, \partial K)$ behaves like $1/\lambda^2$, which is different from the classical case for which it behaves like $1/\lambda$, see [18, Theorem 15].

Theorem 1.4. *In the same assumptions about K as in Theorem 1.2, for any $x \in \partial\Omega_\lambda$ the inward normal ray to $\partial\Omega_\lambda$ meets the convex envelope of \bar{K} .*

Remark 1.3. In fact, the assumptions on K in Theorem 1.4 (i.e., C^2 regularity and starshapedness with respect to a ball) only serve to assure the existence of a suitably regular solution $(\Omega_\lambda, u_\lambda)$, via Theorem 1.2. So, as soon as we have such a solution, the conclusion of the theorem still holds, even without such assumptions. Moreover, we remark that in the planar case, $d = 2$, meeting the convex envelope of K and meeting K are equivalent, hence the thesis can be written, more intriguingly, as follows: *for any $x \in \partial\Omega_\lambda$, the inward normal ray to $\partial\Omega_\lambda$ meets K .*

We notice that Theorem 1.4 gives interesting information about the shape of Ω_λ , which, from a purely qualitative point of view, in particular says that, when $\lambda \rightarrow 0^+$, Ω_λ tends to look like a ball with center in K . Information about the shape of Ω_λ can be obtained also from [19] and [16, 26]. For instance, when K is convex, [19] tells that Ω_λ must be starshaped with




Figure 1: Ω_{λ_i} for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ with $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \lambda_3 < \lambda_4$ and the corresponding normal rays intersecting K .

respect to every point of K , while [16, 26] informs that, if K is symmetric with respect to a hyperplane, the same happens for Ω_λ – hence if K is a ball, then Ω_λ is a ball as well.

For the classical exterior Bernoulli free boundary problem properties of parametrized families of free boundaries have been studied in [2, 3, 18, 27, 29]. In particular, in the classical case estimates of the type (2) have been proved in [18, Theorem 15] and properties similar to the ones presented in Theorem 1.3 (i), (ii) have been proved in [3, Theorem 3.9 (ii), (iii)]. In [27] it was proved that the normal to the free boundary always hits the convex hull of the fixed boundary (this was earlier shown for dimension $d = 2$ in [29] by different methods).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Sections 2, we give some preliminaries and prove some technical lemmas. In Section 3, we prove the main results, that are Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4.

2 Preliminaries

Given a fixed open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, we let $\delta(x)$ denote the distance of x to $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Omega$. We use the following notation for halfspaces and reflections across the boundary of halfspaces. Given a halfspace $H \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, that is, $H = H_{\lambda, e} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x \cdot e > \lambda\}$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and $e \in \partial B_1(0)$, let $Q := Q_{\lambda, e} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be the reflection across ∂H , that is

$$\bar{x} := Q(x) = x - 2(x \cdot e)e + 2\lambda e \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Moreover, for a function $u : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ let $\bar{u} := u \circ Q$. By rotation, we may usually simply consider $e = e_1 := (1, 0, \dots, 0)$.

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be an open, bounded set. We say that $u \in H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfies (in weak sense)

$$(-\Delta)^{1/2}u \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

if for all nonnegative $v \in H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\text{supp } v \subset \Omega$ it holds

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{(u(x) - u(y))(v(x) - v(y))}{|x - y|^d + 1} dx dy \geq 0.$$

Here, as usual, $H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ denotes the (fractional) Sobolev space of order $\frac{1}{2}$. We emphasize that the solution given by Theorem 1.2 belongs to $H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by construction.

Proposition 2.1 (Fractional Hopf lemma). *Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be an open bounded set and let $u \in H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap C^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfy*

$$(-\Delta)^{1/2}u \geq 0 \quad \text{in } U; \quad u \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus U.$$

Then either $u \equiv 0$ in \mathbb{R}^d or $u > 0$ in U .

Moreover, if $u > 0$ in U and, in addition, there is $x_0 \in \partial U$ such that $u(x_0) = 0$ and there is a ball $B \subset U$ with $\partial B \cap \partial U = \{x_0\}$, then

$$D_U^{1/2}u(x_0) > 0.$$

Proof. This statement follows from [16], in particular combining Proposition 3.3, Remark 3.5 and Proposition 3.1 therein. \square

Proposition 2.2 (Fractional Hopf lemma – a variant for antisymmetric functions). *Let $H \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a halfspace and let $Q : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be the reflection at ∂H . Let $W \subset H$ open and let $v \in H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap C^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $v(Q(x)) = -v(x)$ for all $x \in H$. If*

$$(-\Delta)^{1/2}v \geq 0 \quad \text{in } W; \quad v \geq 0 \quad \text{in } H \setminus W.$$

Then either $v \equiv 0$ in \mathbb{R}^d or $v > 0$ in W .

Moreover, if $v > 0$ in W and, in addition, there is $x_0 \in \partial W \setminus \partial H$ such that $v(x_0) = 0$ and there is a ball $B \subset W$ with $\partial B \cap \partial W = \{x_0\}$, then

$$D_W^{1/2}v(x_0) > 0.$$

Proof. This is a direct consequence of Proposition 3.1 and Proposition 3.3 in [16]. \square

Lemma 2.3 (A fractional corner point lemma, Lemma 4.4, [16]). *Let $H = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_1 > 0\}$ and let $Q : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be the reflection at ∂H . Let $W \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be an open set, which is symmetric in x_1 , that is $Q(W) = W$, and such that $0 \in \partial W$. Assume further that the interior normal of W at 0 is given by $e_2 = (0, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$. Let $U := W \cap H$ (c.f. Figure 2). Let $v \in H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap C^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $v(Q(x)) = -v(x)$ for all $x \in H$ and*

$$(-\Delta)^{1/2}v \geq 0 \quad \text{in } U; \quad v \geq 0 \quad \text{in } H \setminus U, \quad v > 0 \quad \text{in } U.$$

Let $\eta = (1, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$. Then there is $C, t_0 > 0$ depending only on W and d such that

$$v(t\eta) \geq Ct^{\frac{3}{2}} \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, t_0).$$

Lemma 2.4. *Let $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded domain, which has C^2 boundary and it is starshaped with respect to a ball $B_r(x_0)$ for some $r > 0$ and $x_0 \in K$. Let $\lambda > 0$ and let $(u_\lambda, \Omega_\lambda)$ be the unique solution of Problem 1.1 given by [20, Theorem 1.6]. For $t > 0$ let $v : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be given by $v(x) = u_\lambda(x/t)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then v is the unique solution of*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} (-\Delta)^{1/2}v(x) = 0 & \text{for } x \in t\Omega_\lambda \setminus t\overline{K}, \\ v(x) = 1 & \text{for } x \in t\overline{K}, \\ v(x) = 0 & \text{for } x \in (t\Omega_\lambda)^c, \\ D_{t\Omega_\lambda}^{1/2}v(x) = t^{-\frac{1}{2}}\lambda & \text{for } x \in \partial(t\Omega_\lambda). \end{array} \right.$$

That is, v is the unique solution of Problem 1.1 with the respective scaled quantities.




Figure 2: Exemplification of Lemma 2.3 with $U = W \cap H$ and respectively of Lemma 3.2 with $U = \Omega_+$ (but without K), and $e_1 = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$ and $e_2 = (0, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$.

Proof. This follows immediately by the uniqueness statement in [20, Theorem 1.6] with the scaling properties of $(-\Delta)^{1/2}$. \square

Lemma 2.5. *Let $0 < r < R$, $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and let $b \in C^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be the solution to*

$$(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}}b = 0 \quad \text{in } W, \quad b = 1 \quad \text{in } \overline{B_r(x_0)}, \quad \text{and} \quad b = 0 \quad \text{in } B_R^c(x_0),$$

where $W = B_R(x_0) \setminus \overline{B_r(x_0)}$. Then b is radially symmetric, strictly decreasing in the radial direction away from x_0 , and there is a constant $C_d \in (0, 1)$ depending only on d such that

$$\frac{C_d}{\sqrt{R-r}} \left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^{d-\frac{1}{2}} \leq D_W^{1/2} b(\theta) < \frac{1}{\sqrt{R-r}} \quad \text{for any } \theta \in \partial B_R(x_0).$$

Proof. First note that the symmetry and monotonicity properties of b follow immediately from [26, Theorem 1.2]. In the following, we can assume $x_0 = 0$, without loss of generality, and consider only the normal derivative in the direction $e_1 = (1, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^d$. That is, we set $\theta = Re_1$. For the upper bound, we consider the half space $H = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_1 < R\}$. We abbreviate $B_R(0)$ to B_R and $B_r(0)$ to B_r . Note that $B_R \subset H$ and $\partial H \cap \partial B_R = \{Re_1\}$. Moreover, recall the function

$$v : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad v(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus H; \\ (R - x_1)^{\frac{1}{2}}, & x \in H \end{cases}$$

which satisfies

$$(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}}v = 0 \quad \text{in } H, \quad v = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus H.$$

A simple observation gives

$$\inf_{\substack{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \\ x \cdot e_1 < r}} v(x) = v(re_1) = (R - r)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Thus the function $\tilde{v} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\tilde{v}(x) = (R - r)^{-\frac{1}{2}}v(x)$ satisfies

$$(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}}\tilde{v} = 0 \quad \text{in } W, \quad \tilde{v} \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_R, \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{v} \geq 1 \quad \text{in } B_r.$$




Figure 3: Definition of $B_\rho(y_0)$ with $x_0 = 0$.

The fractional Hopf Lemma applied to $\tilde{v} - b$ implies $D_W^{1/2}(\tilde{v} - b)(Re_1) > 0$ and thus

$$D_W^{1/2}b(Re_1) < D_W^{1/2}\tilde{v}(Re_1) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{R-r}} \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{(R - ((R-t))^{\frac{1}{2}})}{\sqrt{t}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{R-r}}.$$

Next, let $y_0 = \frac{R+r}{2}e_1$ and let $\rho = \frac{R-r}{2}$, so that $B_\rho(y_0) \subset B_R \setminus B_r$ and $\partial B_\rho(y_0) \cap \partial B_R = \{Re_1\}$, c.f. Figure 3. Recall that the Poisson kernel of $(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ in $B_\rho(y_0)$ is given by

$$P(x, y) = c \frac{(\rho^2 - |x - y_0|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(|y - y_0|^2 - \rho^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} |x - y|^{-d}, \quad x \in B_\rho(y_0), \quad y \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{B_\rho(y_0)}$$

with $c = \Gamma(\frac{d}{2})\pi^{-1-\frac{d}{2}}$. Thus we have for $x \in B_\rho(y_0)$

$$b(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_\rho(y_0)} P(x, y)b(y) dy$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} D_W^{1/2}b(Re_1) &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{b((R-t)e_1)}{\sqrt{t}} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} t^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_\rho(y_0)} P((R-t)e_1, y)b(y) dy \\ &= c \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_\rho(y_0)} \frac{(\rho^2 - |(R-t)e_1 - y_0|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\sqrt{t}(|y - y_0|^2 - \rho^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{b(y)}{|(R-t)e_1 - y|^d} dy \\ &> c \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{B_r} \frac{(\rho^2 - (\rho-t)^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\sqrt{t}(|y - y_0|^2 - \rho^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{1}{|(R-t)e_1 - y|^d} dy \\ &= c \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{B_r((R-t)e_1)} \frac{(2\rho-t)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(|(\rho-t)e_1 - z|^2 - \rho^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{1}{|z|^d} dz \\ &= c \int_{B_r(Re_1)} \frac{(2\rho)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(|z|^2 - 2\rho z_1)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{1}{|z|^d} dz. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

If $d = 1$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
D_W^{1/2}b(Re_1) &> c \int_{R-r}^{R+r} \frac{(2\rho)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(z^2 - 2\rho z)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{1}{z} dz = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\frac{R-r}{2\rho}}^{\frac{R+r}{2\rho}} \frac{(2\rho)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(4\rho^2\tau^2 - 4\rho^2\tau)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{2\rho}{2\rho\tau} d\tau \\
&= \frac{1}{\pi\sqrt{2\rho}} \int_1^{\frac{R+r}{R-r}} \frac{1}{\tau(\tau^2 - \tau)^{\frac{1}{2}}} d\tau = \frac{1}{\pi\sqrt{2\rho}} \frac{2\sqrt{\tau-1}}{\sqrt{\tau}} \Big|_1^{\frac{R+r}{R-r}} \\
&= \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi\sqrt{\rho}} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{R+r-(R-r)}}{\sqrt{R+r}} = \frac{2}{\pi\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{r}}{\sqrt{R+r}} \geq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi\sqrt{\rho}} \sqrt{\frac{r}{R}}
\end{aligned}$$

and the claim follows for $d = 1$. If $d \geq 2$, first note that

$$(x_1 - R)^2 + |x'|^2 \leq r^2 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad |x'|^2 \leq r^2 - (x_1 - R)^2 = (x_1 - 2\rho)(r + R - x_1).$$

Since, for $x_1 \in [0, R]$ we have

$$(x_1 - 2\rho) \leq r + R - x_1,$$

using $(d-1)$ dimensional spherical coordinates, from (3) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
D_W^{1/2}b(Re_1) &> c \int_{B_r(Re_1)} \frac{(2\rho)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(z_1^2 - 2\rho z_1 + |z'|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{1}{(z_1^2 + |z'|^2)^{\frac{d}{2}}} dz \\
&\geq c \int_{2\rho}^R \int_{B_{\sqrt{(\tau-2\rho)(r+R-\tau)}}} \frac{(2\rho)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(\tau^2 - 2\rho\tau + |z'|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{1}{(\tau^2 + |z'|^2)^{\frac{d}{2}}} dz' d\tau \\
&\geq c \int_{2\rho}^R \int_{B_{\tau-2\rho}} \frac{(2\rho)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(\tau^2 - 2\rho\tau + |z'|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{1}{(\tau^2 + |z'|^2)^{\frac{d}{2}}} dz' d\tau \\
&= \frac{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2})2\pi^{\frac{d-1}{2}}}{\Gamma(\frac{d-1}{2})\pi^{1+\frac{d}{2}}} \int_{2\rho}^R \int_0^{\tau-2\rho} \frac{(2\rho)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(\tau^2 - 2\rho\tau + t^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{t^{d-2}}{(\tau^2 + t^2)^{\frac{d}{2}}} dt d\tau =: A
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting $t = \tau x$ and then $\tau = 2\rho y$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}
A &= \frac{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2})2(2\rho)^{-\frac{1}{2}}}{\Gamma(\frac{d-1}{2})\pi^{\frac{3}{2}}} \int_1^{\frac{R}{2\rho}} \int_0^{1-\frac{1}{y}} \frac{1}{y(y^2(1+x^2) - y)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{x^{d-2}}{(1+x^2)^{\frac{d}{2}}} dx dy \\
&\geq \frac{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2})2(2\rho)^{-\frac{1}{2}}}{\Gamma(\frac{d-1}{2})\pi^{\frac{3}{2}}} \int_1^{\frac{R}{2\rho}} \frac{1}{y(y^2(1+(1-\frac{1}{y})^2) - y)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \int_0^{1-\frac{1}{y}} \frac{x^{d-2}}{(1+x^2)^{\frac{d}{2}}} dx dy \\
&\geq \frac{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2})2(2\rho)^{-\frac{1}{2}}}{2^{\frac{d+1}{2}}\Gamma(\frac{d-1}{2})\pi^{\frac{3}{2}}} \int_1^{\frac{R}{2\rho}} \frac{1}{y^{\frac{3}{2}}\sqrt{y-1}} \int_0^{\frac{y-1}{y}} x^{d-2} dx dy \\
&= \frac{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2})(2\rho)^{-\frac{1}{2}}}{2^{\frac{d+1}{2}}\Gamma(\frac{d+1}{2})\pi^{\frac{3}{2}}} \int_1^{\frac{R}{2\rho}} (y-1)^{d-\frac{3}{2}} y^{-\frac{1}{2}-d} dy = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2})(2\rho)^{-\frac{1}{2}}}{2^{\frac{d+1}{2}}\Gamma(\frac{d+1}{2})\pi^{\frac{3}{2}}} \left(\frac{2}{2d-1} \left(\frac{y}{y-1} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}-d} \right) \Big|_1^{\frac{R}{2\rho}} \\
&= \frac{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2})}{2^{\frac{d-1}{2}}(2d-1)\Gamma(\frac{d+1}{2})\pi^{\frac{3}{2}}\sqrt{R-r}} \left(\frac{r}{R} \right)^{d-\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

The claim thus also holds for $d \geq 2$. □

Remark 2.1. From the proof it follows that in the case of $d = 1$ (and with $x_0 = 0$), the upper bound can easily be improved. With the notation in the proof it holds for $d = 1$:

$$\begin{aligned}
D_W^{1/2}b(Re_1) &= D_W^{1/2}b(R) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{b((R-t))}{\sqrt{t}} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} t^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus (y_0 - \rho, y_0 + \rho)} P((R-t)e_1, y) b(y) dy \\
&= \frac{1}{\pi} \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{-R}^{\frac{R+r}{2} - \rho} \frac{(\rho^2 - ((R-t) - \frac{R+r}{2})^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\sqrt{t}((y - \frac{R+r}{2})^2 - \rho^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} |(R-t) - y|} b(y) dy \\
&= \frac{\sqrt{2\rho}}{\pi} \int_{\rho - \frac{R+r}{2} + R}^{2R} \frac{b(R-y)}{|y|((\frac{R+r}{2} - R + y)^2 - \rho^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} dy \\
&= \frac{\sqrt{2\rho}}{\pi} \int_{2\rho}^{2R} \frac{b(R-y)}{|y|(y - \rho)^2 - \rho^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} dy = \frac{\sqrt{2\rho}}{\pi} \int_{2\rho}^{2R} \frac{b(R-y)}{y(y^2 - 2\rho y)^{\frac{1}{2}}} dy \\
&= \frac{\sqrt{2\rho}}{\pi} \int_1^{R/\rho} \frac{b(R-2\rho t)2\rho}{2\rho t(4\rho^2 t^2 - 4\rho^2 t)^{\frac{1}{2}}} dt = \frac{1}{\pi\sqrt{2\rho}} \int_1^{R/\rho} \frac{b(R-2\rho t)}{t(t^2 - t)^{\frac{1}{2}}} dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $b \leq 1$ we get

$$D_W^{1/2}b(Re_1) \leq \frac{1}{\pi\sqrt{2\rho}} \int_1^{\frac{R}{\rho}} \frac{1}{t^{\frac{3}{2}}(t-1)^{\frac{1}{2}}} dt = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi\sqrt{\rho}} \frac{\sqrt{t-1}}{\sqrt{t}} \Big|_1^{\frac{R}{\rho}} = \frac{\sqrt{2R-2\rho}}{\pi\sqrt{\rho R}} = \frac{\sqrt{R+r}}{\pi\sqrt{\rho R}}.$$

Thus, for $d = 1$ it holds

$$\frac{2}{\pi\sqrt{R-r}} \sqrt{\frac{r}{R}} \leq D_W^{1/2}b(\pm R) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{b(\pm R \mp t)}{\sqrt{t}} \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi\sqrt{R-r}} \sqrt{1 + \frac{r}{R}}. \quad (4)$$

Lemma 2.6. Any solution u_λ given by Theorem 1.2 satisfies $u_\lambda \in C^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Proof. Fix $\lambda > 0$ and abbreviate u_λ to u and Ω_λ to Ω . Let $v \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be such that $v \equiv 1$ on \overline{K} , $\text{supp}(v) \subset \Omega$. Put $w = u - v$. Note that $(-\Delta)^{1/2}v$ is bounded, denote $f = (-\Delta)^{1/2}v$. Then w satisfies

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)^{1/2}w(x) = -f(x), & \text{for } x \in \Omega \setminus \overline{K}, \\ w(x) = 0, & \text{for } x \in \overline{K} \cup \Omega^c. \end{cases}$$

Note that $\Omega \setminus \overline{K}$ is a bounded domain with C^2 boundary. Hence, by Proposition 1.1 in [22] we obtain $w \in C^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Clearly, $v \in C^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Hence, $u \in C^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. \square

3 Proofs of the main results

Proof of Theorem 1.3. We assume, without loss of generality, that $x_0 = 0$. Let $u_i := u_{\lambda_i}$ and that, for $i = 1, 2$, $\Omega_i := \Omega_{\lambda_i}$ be the solution to Problem 1.1 with $\lambda = \lambda_i$ in K . In the following, for $\tau > 0$ let $v_\tau, w_\tau : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be given by $v_\tau(x) = u_2(x/\tau)$ and $w_\tau(x) = u_1(x/\tau)$.

(i): Let $t > 0$ be the largest number such that $(t\Omega_2) \subset \Omega_1$. Notice for that for this t we can find some $\theta \in \partial(t\Omega_2) \cap \partial\Omega_1$. Assume, $t < 1$. Then by the regularity of the free boundary Ω_1 and Ω_2 respectively, we can find a ball B contained in $t\Omega_2 \setminus \overline{K}$ such that $\partial B \cap \partial(t\Omega_2) = \{\theta\}$. Since $tK \subset K$, by the fractional Hopf Lemma, Proposition 2.1, applied to $u_1 - v_t$ in $t\Omega_2 \setminus \overline{K}$ it follows that either we have $u_1 - v_t \equiv 0$ or $D_{\Omega_2}^{1/2}(u_1 - v_t)(\theta) = \lambda_1 - t^{-\frac{1}{2}}\lambda_2 > 0$. Notice that since $t \in (0, 1)$ by assumption and $\lambda_2 > \lambda_1$, we must have $u_1 \equiv v_t$. But by the maximum principle we also have $v_t < 1 = u_1$ in $K \setminus (t\overline{K})$. A contradiction. Thus we must have $t \geq 1$ and (i) follows.

(ii): Assume, without loss, $\lambda_2 > \lambda_1$ and let s be the largest number such that $s\Omega_1 \subset \Omega_2$ and let $\theta \in \partial(s\Omega_1) \cap \partial\Omega_2$. By (i) we have $s \in (0, 1]$ and thus $\Delta(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) = |\ln s|$. To estimate s , note that analogously to the proof of (i) we have by the fractional Hopf Lemma, applied to $u_2 - w_s$ in $s\Omega_1 \setminus \overline{K}$, that either $u_2 - w_s \equiv 0$ or $D_{s\Omega_1}^{1/2}(u_2 - w_s)(\theta) = \lambda_2 - s^{-\frac{1}{2}}\lambda_1 > 0$. Since $u_2 \equiv w_s$ is not possible, because $s < 1$ and thus $sK \subsetneq K$, it holds $s^{\frac{1}{2}}\lambda_2 > \lambda_1$, hence, in particular,

$$0 \geq \ln(s) \geq \ln(\lambda_1^2/\lambda_2^2) = 2\left(\ln(\lambda_1) - \ln(\lambda_2)\right),$$

that is,

$$\Delta(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) \leq 2|\ln(\lambda_1) - \ln(\lambda_2)|$$

as claimed in (ii).

(iii): Next, let $\xi_0 \in \partial K$ and $\theta \in \partial\Omega_\lambda$ such that $\text{dist}(\xi_0, \theta) = \text{dist}(\partial\Omega_\lambda, \partial K)$. By the interior ball property, there exists a ball $B_{r_K}(x_0)$ of radius r_K (we denote its center as x_0) such that $B_{r_K}(x_0) \subset K$ and $\xi_0 \in \partial B_{r_K}(x_0) \cap \partial K$. Let $B_R(x_0)$ be the ball with center x_0 and radius $R = r_K + \text{dist}(\partial\Omega_\lambda, \partial K)$. Notice that $B_R(x_0) \subset \Omega_\lambda$ and $\theta \in \partial\Omega_\lambda \cap \partial B_R(x_0)$. Let $b = b_\lambda$ be the solution to

$$(-\Delta)^{1/2}b = 0 \quad \text{in } W, \quad b = 1 \quad \text{in } \overline{B_{r_K}(x_0)}, \quad \text{and} \quad b = 0 \quad \text{in } B_R^c(x_0)$$

where $W = B_R(x_0) \setminus \overline{B_{r_K}(x_0)}$. Then the comparison principle yields $b \leq u_\lambda$ in \mathbb{R}^d . Since $b(\theta) = u_\lambda(\theta) = 0$, we have

$$D_W^{1/2}b(\theta) \leq D_{\Omega_\lambda}^{1/2}u_\lambda(\theta) = \lambda.$$

Moreover, Lemma 2.5 guarantees the existence of some constant $C > 0$ depending on d such that

$$\frac{C}{\sqrt{\text{dist}(\partial\Omega_\lambda, \partial K)}} \left(\frac{r_K}{R}\right)^{d-\frac{1}{2}} \leq D_W^{1/2}b(\theta).$$

Similarly, let $m := \inf\{\rho > 0 : K \subset B_\rho(x_0)\}$, $M := \inf\{\sigma > 0 : \Omega_\lambda \subset B_\sigma(x_0)\}$, and $\beta = \beta_\lambda$ the unique solution to

$$(-\Delta)^{1/2}\beta = 0 \quad \text{in } U, \quad b = 1 \quad \text{in } \overline{B_m(x_0)}, \quad \text{and} \quad b = 0 \quad \text{in } B_M^c(x_0).$$

where $U = B_M(x_0) \setminus \overline{B_m(x_0)}$. Then the comparison principle yields $\beta \geq u_\lambda$ in \mathbb{R}^d , whence, if $\phi \in \partial B_M(x_0) \cap \partial\Omega_\lambda$, we get

$$D_U^{1/2}\beta(\phi) \geq D_{\Omega_\lambda}^{1/2}u_\lambda(\phi) = \lambda.$$

Using again Lemma 2.5, we also obtain

$$D_U^{1/2}\beta(\phi) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{M-m}}.$$

Since $M - m \geq R - r_K = \text{dist}(\partial\Omega_\lambda, \partial K)$, putting together the last four inequalities, we obtain

$$\frac{C}{\sqrt{\text{dist}(\partial\Omega_\lambda, \partial K)}} \left(\frac{r_K}{r_K + \text{dist}(\partial\Omega_\lambda, \partial K)}\right)^{d-\frac{1}{2}} \leq D_W^{1/2}b(\theta) \leq \lambda \leq D_U^{1/2}\beta(\phi) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\text{dist}(\partial\Omega_\lambda, \partial K)}}.$$

Thus

$$C^2 \left(\frac{r_K}{r_K + \text{dist}(\partial\Omega_\lambda, \partial K)}\right)^{2d-1} \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \leq \text{dist}(\partial\Omega_\lambda, \partial K) \leq \frac{1}{\lambda^2}. \quad (5)$$

The right inequality in (iv) is proved. Moreover, we note that sending $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$, this implies $\text{dist}(\partial\Omega_\lambda, \partial K) \rightarrow 0$, so also the first assertion in (iii) is proved.

Next, note that the first inequality on (5) gives

$$\text{dist}(\partial\Omega_\lambda, \partial K)^{1/(2d-1)} (r_K + \text{dist}(\partial\Omega_\lambda, \partial K)) \geq \frac{C^{2/(2d-1)} r_K}{\lambda^{2/(2d-1)}}. \quad (6)$$

This shows the second assertion of (iii).

(iv): Now, set

$$t = \frac{\text{dist}(\partial\Omega_\lambda, \partial K)^{1/(2d-1)}}{r_K^{1/(2d-1)}},$$

then (6) reads

$$h(t) := t^{2d} + t - A \geq 0, \quad (7)$$

where

$$A = \left(\frac{C^2}{r_K \lambda^2} \right)^{1/(2d-1)}.$$

Notice that h is $C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, $h(0) < 0$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} h(t) = +\infty$. Since h is strictly increasing for $t \geq 0$, we have that there exists exactly one $t(A) > 0$ such that $h(t(A)) = 0$ and (7) is equivalent to $t \geq t(A)$. Put

$$g_{d,r_K}(\lambda) = r_K t(A)^{2d-1}. \quad (8)$$

To obtain estimate (1), observe that

$$h(A) = A^{2d} > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad h(A^{1/2d}) = A^{1/2d} > 0,$$

hence

$$t(A) < \min\{A, A^{1/2d}\},$$

and there exists $\epsilon < 1$ such that

$$t(A) = \epsilon \min\{A, A^{1/2d}\}.$$

Let's look for an estimate from below of ϵ and calculate

$$\begin{aligned} h(\epsilon \min\{A, A^{1/2d}\}) &= \epsilon^{2d} \min\{A, A^{1/2d}\}^{2d} + \epsilon \min\{A, A^{1/2d}\} - A \\ &< \epsilon(\min\{A, A^{1/2d}\}^{2d} + \min\{A, A^{1/2d}\}) - A, \end{aligned}$$

and we see that, choosing

$$\epsilon = \frac{A}{\min\{A, A^{1/2d}\}(\min\{A, A^{1/2d}\}^{2d-1} + 1)},$$

we have $h(\epsilon \min\{A, A^{1/2d}\}) < 0$, which yields

$$t(A) > \frac{A}{\min\{A, A^{1/2d}\}^{2d-1} + 1}.$$

The estimate (1) follows from the latter coupled with (8). \square

Now our aim is to show Theorem 1.4. We will use some ideas from [25] and [27]. First we need some auxiliary lemmas.

Lemma 3.1. *Assume $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is an open set with C^2 boundary and let $H = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_1 > 0\}$. Assume $0 \in \partial\Omega$ is such that $e_2 = (0, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$ is the interior normal of Ω at 0 . Let $\delta(x) = \text{dist}(x, \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Omega)$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and u be a function belonging to $C^s(B_\varepsilon(0))$ for some $s \in (0, 1)$ and satisfying*

$$(i) \quad u(x) = 0 \text{ for } x \in B_\varepsilon(0) \setminus \Omega,$$

$$(ii) \quad u(x) = \delta^s(x)\psi(x) \text{ for } x \in \overline{\Omega} \cap B_\varepsilon(0), \text{ where } \psi \in C^1(\overline{\Omega} \cap \overline{B_\varepsilon(0)})$$

$$(iii) \quad \psi \equiv c \text{ on } \partial\Omega \cap B_\varepsilon(0).$$

Let $\eta = (1, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$. Then $v := \bar{u} - u = u \circ Q_{0, e_1} - u$ satisfies

$$v(t\eta) = o(t^{1+s}) \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow 0^+. \quad (9)$$

Proof. First of all, notice that $\nabla\delta(0) = e_2$. We assume t is sufficiently small such that $t\eta$ and $t\bar{\eta}$ belong to Ω . Notice next that we have

$$\begin{aligned} v(t\eta) &= u(t\bar{\eta}) - u(t\eta) \\ &= \delta^s(t\bar{\eta})\psi(t\bar{\eta}) - \delta^s(t\eta)\psi(t\eta) \\ &= (\delta^s(t\bar{\eta}) - \delta^s(t\eta))\psi(t\bar{\eta}) + \delta^s(t\eta)(\psi(t\bar{\eta}) - \psi(t\eta)) \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

We begin with the first summand. It holds by a Taylor expansion for $t \rightarrow 0^+$

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(t\eta) &= \delta(0) + \nabla\delta(0)t\eta + \frac{1}{2}\nabla^2\delta(0)t\eta + o(t^2) \\ &= t + \frac{t^2}{2} \left(\nabla^2\delta(0)e_1 + 2\nabla^2\delta(0)[e_1](e_2) + \nabla^2\delta(0)e_2 \right) + o(t^2), \end{aligned}$$

where, since $\nabla\delta(0) \cdot e_1 = e_2 \cdot e_1 = 0$,

$$|\nabla^2\delta(0)[e_1](e_2)| = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{|\nabla\delta(te_2) \cdot e_1|}{t} \leq \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \max_{\tau \in [0, t]} |\nabla^2\delta(\tau e_2)[e_1]| = 0$$

using $\delta \in C^2(\overline{\Omega})$. Thus

$$\delta(t\eta) = t + \frac{t^2}{2} \left(\nabla^2\delta(0)e_1 + \nabla^2\delta(0)e_2 \right) + o(t^2)$$

and similarly,

$$\delta(t\bar{\eta}) = t + \frac{t^2}{2} \left(\nabla^2\delta(0)e_1 + \nabla^2\delta(0)e_2 \right) + o(t^2).$$

Thus, for $t > 0$, there is $\tau \in [0, 1]$ such that with $x_t = \eta + \tau(\bar{\eta} - \eta) = (1 - 2\tau)e_1 + e_2$ it holds for $t \rightarrow 0^+$

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^s(t\bar{\eta}) - \delta^s(t\eta) &= s\delta^{s-1}(tx_t) \left(\delta(t\bar{\eta}) - \delta(t\eta) \right) \\ &= s\delta^{s-1}(tx_t) o(t^2) \\ &= o(t^{1+s}), \end{aligned}$$

noting that $tx_t \rightarrow 0$ for $t \rightarrow 0$ and that $\delta(tx_t)$ is comparable to t . Since $\psi(t\bar{\eta}) = c + o(1)$ as $t \rightarrow 0^+$ by assumption, we have

$$(\delta^s(t\bar{\eta}) - \delta^s(t\eta))\psi(t\bar{\eta}) = o(t^{1+s}) \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow 0^+$$

which shows that the first summand in (10) behaves as claimed.

For the second summand in (10), note first that there is $C > 0$ such that

$$C^{-1}t^s \leq \delta^s(t\eta) \leq Ct^s \quad \text{for } t \geq 0 \text{ small enough.}$$

It thus remains to show that

$$\psi(t\bar{\eta}) - \psi(t\eta) = o(t) \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow 0^+. \quad (11)$$

Similarly as above, there is, for every $t > 0$ some $\tau \in [0, 1]$ such that with $x_t = \eta + \tau(\bar{\eta} - \eta) = (1 - 2\tau)e_1 + e_2$ it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(t\bar{\eta}) - \psi(t\eta) &= t\nabla\psi(tx_t) \cdot (\bar{\eta} - \eta) \\ &= -2t\partial_1\psi(tx_t). \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

In the following, let $\tilde{\psi} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function in $C^1(B_\varepsilon(0))$ such that $\tilde{\psi} = \psi$ and $\nabla\tilde{\psi} = \nabla\psi$ in $\bar{\Omega} \cap B_\varepsilon(0)$ —this is possible by Whitney's theorem, see [30, Theorem] or [6, Section 2.5], using that $\partial\Omega$ is of class C^2 . For $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and $f : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where $U \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is an arbitrary set, we write

$$L_r(f) := \{x \in U : f(x) = r\}.$$

Note that since $\psi \equiv c$ on $\partial\Omega \cap B_\varepsilon(0)$ we have $0 \in \partial\Omega \subset L_c(\psi) \subset L_c(\tilde{\psi})$. Since $\tilde{\psi}$ is a C^1 function, it holds $\nabla\psi(0) = \nabla\tilde{\psi}(0) = 0$ or $\nabla\tilde{\psi} = \nabla\psi$ is orthogonal to the tangent plane at 0. In the first case, we immediately have $\partial_1\psi(0) = 0$ and in the second case, we note that e_1 is contained in the tangent plane and thus, again, $\partial_1\psi(0) = \nabla\psi(0)e_1 = 0$. Thus, it follows

$$\partial_1\psi(tx_t) = o(1) \quad \text{for } t \rightarrow 0^+,$$

and (11) follows with (12) □

For any halfspace $H \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we denote by

$$\hat{x}^{\partial H}$$

the reflection of x with respect to ∂H .

Remark 3.1. Lemma 3.1 is very similar to [16, Lemma 4.3]. However, in [16, Lemma 4.3] the missing assumption that

$$u/\delta^s : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \quad \text{has a } C^1 \text{ extension to a function defined on } \bar{\Omega} \quad (13)$$

is necessary to conclude the result. In particular, the main results, Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 in [16] need the additional assumption (13). We emphasize that even in the classical overdetermined problem by Serrin [25], that is the case $s = 1$, the solution is assumed to be in $C^2(\bar{\Omega})$. Note that the assumption (13) and a similar remark appear also in [12]. A slightly adjusted assumption (13) is also needed in subsequent results to [16], for instance, in [26].

Lemma 3.2. *Let $H = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_1 > 0\}$ and $\hat{H} = \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \bar{H} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_1 < 0\}$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be an open, nonempty, connected, bounded set, which has a $C^{2,1/2}$ boundary, $K \subset \Omega \cap \hat{H}$ be an open, nonempty, and bounded set such that $\text{dist}(K, \partial(\Omega \cap \hat{H})) > 0$. Put $\Omega_- = \Omega \cap \hat{H}$, $\Omega_+ = \Omega \cap H$. We assume that $Q_{0,e_1}(\Omega_+) \subset \Omega_-$ and that there exists $z \in \partial\Omega \cap \partial H$ such that $\partial\Omega$ and ∂H are perpendicular at z (see Figure 4). Assume that $u : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, 1]$, $u \in C^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $u = 1$ on \bar{K} , $u = 0$ on Ω^c , $(-\Delta)^{1/2}u = 0$ on $\Omega \setminus \bar{K}$. Then $D_\Omega^{1/2}u$ is not constant on $\partial\Omega$.*




Figure 4: Picture for Lemma 3.2.

Proof. We may assume that $z = 0$. By contradiction, assume that $D_\Omega^{1/2}u$ is constant on $\partial\Omega$, i.e. $D_\Omega^{1/2}u(x) = c$ for all $x \in \partial\Omega$ for some $c > 0$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be such that $\text{dist}(B_\varepsilon(0), K) > 0$. Then u clearly satisfies

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)^{1/2}u(x) = 0 & \text{for } x \in \Omega \cap B_\varepsilon(0), \\ u(x) = 0 & \text{for } x \in B_\varepsilon(0) \setminus \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Let $\delta(x) = \text{dist}(x, \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Omega)$. By [1, Theorem 1.4] for $x \in \bar{\Omega} \cap B_\varepsilon(0)$ we have the representation $u(x) = \delta^{1/2}(x)\psi(x)$, where $\psi \in C^{1,1/2}(\bar{\Omega} \cap B_\varepsilon(0))$. By our assumption that for all $x \in \partial\Omega$ we have $D_\Omega^{1/2}u(x) = c$ we obtain that for all $x \in \partial\Omega \cap B_\varepsilon(0)$ we have $\psi(x) = c$. Put $\eta = e_1 + e_2 = (1, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$ and $\bar{\eta} = -e_1 + e_2 = (-1, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$. By Lemma 3.1 we have

$$u(t\bar{\eta}) - u(t\eta) = o(t^{3/2}) \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow 0^+. \quad (14)$$

For $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ let $\bar{x} = Q_{0,e_1}(x)$ and put

$$v(x) = u(\bar{x}) - u(x).$$

Note that $(-\Delta)^{1/2}u(x) = 0$ for $x \in \Omega \setminus \bar{K}$ so $(-\Delta)^{1/2}v(x) = 0$ for $x \in \Omega_+ \setminus \hat{K}$, where $\hat{K} := Q_{0,e_1}(\bar{K})$. Since $\hat{K} \subset H$ we have $v(x) > 0$ for $x \in \hat{K}$. We also have $v(x) \geq 0$ for $x \in H \setminus \Omega_+$. Hence, by Proposition 2.2 for $W = \Omega_+ \setminus \hat{K}$, we have $v(x) > 0$ for $x \in \Omega_+ \setminus \hat{K}$. It is easy to show that there exists an open set $U \subset \Omega \setminus \bar{K}$ such that $0 \in \partial U$ with C^2 boundary which is symmetric across ∂H . We may assume that $\text{dist}(U, \bar{K}) > 0$. By Lemma 2.3 there exist positive constants c_0 and t_0 such that for all $t \in (0, t_0)$ we have

$$v(t\bar{\eta}) = u(t\bar{\eta}) - u(t\eta) \geq c_0 t^{3/2}.$$

This contradicts (14), so ending the proof of the lemma. \square

Lemma 3.3. *Assume that a bounded domain $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ has a C^2 boundary and it is starshaped with respect to some open ball contained in K and let $u = u_\lambda$, $\Omega = \Omega_\lambda$ be the solution of Problem 1.1 given by Theorem 1.2 for some $\lambda > 0$. Let $e \in \partial B_1(0)$ and, for $t \in \mathbb{R}$ let*

$$v_t := u \circ Q_{t,e} - u,$$

using the notation as in the beginning of Section 2. Define $\Omega_t = \Omega \cap H_{t,e}$, $K_t = K \cap H_{t,e}$, and

$$t_1 := t_1(e) := \sup\{t \in \mathbb{R} : H_{t,e} \cap \Omega \neq \emptyset\} \quad \text{and}$$

$$t_0 := t_0(e) := \inf\{t \in \mathbb{R} : Q_{\mu,e_1}(\Omega_\mu) \subset \Omega \text{ and } Q_{\mu,e_1}(K_\mu) \subset K \text{ for all } \mu \in (t, t_1)\}$$

Then the following are true.

(i) It holds $t_0 < t_1 < \infty$ and for any $t \in (t_0, t_1)$ we have

- $v_t \in C^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap C^\infty(\Omega_t \setminus \overline{M_t})$, where $M_t := Q_{t,e}(K \setminus \overline{H_{t,e}})$,
- $(-\Delta)^{1/2}v_t = 0$ in $\Omega_t \setminus \overline{M_t}$, $v_t \geq 0$ in $H_{t,e} \setminus (\Omega_t \setminus \overline{M_t})$, and $v_t \circ Q_{t,e_1} = -v_t$ in \mathbb{R}^d .

(ii) $v_t > 0$ in $\Omega_t \setminus \overline{M_t}$ for any $t \in (t_0, t_1)$ and

$$\text{either } v_{t_0} \equiv 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^d \quad \text{or} \quad v_{t_0} > 0 \text{ in } \Omega_{t_0} \setminus \overline{M_{t_0}}.$$

Proof. Recall that u belongs to the energy space $H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ as mentioned above. Note that by regularity theory, it follows that $u = u_\lambda \in C^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, see e.g. [1, Theorem 1.4] for the regularity at $\partial\Omega$ and the regularity at ∂K follows since this boundary is of class C^2 and by considering the problem solved by $1 - u$ (in a localized sense).

We show the claim with the moving plane method. For this, let $e \in \partial B_1(0)$ and consider, for $t \in \mathbb{R}$ the hyperplane $H_t = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x \cdot e > t\}$. By rotation we may assume that $e = e_1 = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$. We emphasize the following four situations that may occur for some t :

1. The boundary of $Q_{t,e_1}(\Omega_t)$ touches the boundary of Ω in $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_1 < t\}$ at some point z ;
2. ∂H_t is perpendicular to $\partial\Omega$ at some point $z \in \partial\Omega$;
3. The boundary of $Q_{t,e_1}(K_t)$ touches the boundary of K in $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_1 < t\}$ at some point z ;
4. ∂H_t is perpendicular to ∂K at some point $z \in \partial K$.

For (i), first note that $t_0 < t_1 < \infty$ follows immediately by Theorem 1.2. Next note that at t_0 at least one of the above cases 1.–4. is true. Notice that $K_t \subset M_t$ for $t \geq t_0$ so that $v_t \geq 0$ in $\overline{M_t}$. Moreover, $v_t \geq 0$ in $H_t \setminus \Omega_t$ since $u \geq 0$ in \mathbb{R}^d . Finally, notice that $v_t \in C^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap C^\infty(\Omega_t \setminus \overline{M_t})$ and this function satisfies

$$(-\Delta)^{1/2}v_t = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega_t \setminus \overline{M_t}, \quad v_t \geq 0 \quad \text{in } H_t \setminus (\Omega_t \setminus \overline{M_t}), \quad \text{and} \quad v_t \circ Q_{t,e_1} = -v_t \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d$$

for any $t \in [t_0, t_1)$. This shows (i).

For (ii), we stress that $v_t \equiv 0$ is not possible for any $t > t_0$, since $u > 0$ in Ω and $u = 1$ in K . Proposition 2.2 thus entails that for all $t \in (t_0, t_1)$ we have $v_t > 0$ in $\Omega_t \setminus \overline{M_t}$ and we have either

$$v_{t_0} \equiv 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \quad \text{or} \quad v_{t_0} > 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega_{t_0} \setminus \overline{M_{t_0}}. \quad (15)$$

This finishes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Fix $\lambda > 0$ and abbreviate $\Omega = \Omega_\lambda$ and $u = u_\lambda$. Recall that u belongs to the energy space $H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap C^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ as mentioned in the proof of Lemma 3.3.

By contradiction, assume that there is $x^* \in \partial\Omega$ such that the inward normal ray to $\partial\Omega$ at x^* does not meet $\text{conv}(\overline{K})$ (see Figure 5).




Figure 5: What happens when the inward normal ray to $\partial\Omega$ at x_0 does not meet \overline{K} .

Then, there exists a $(d - 1)$ -dimensional hyperplane T^* containing this inward normal ray such that $\text{conv}(\overline{K}) \cap T^* = \emptyset$. Clearly, T^* is orthogonal to $\partial\Omega$ at x^* .

By translation and rotation, we can assume $x^* = 0$, $T^* = \{x = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_1 = 0\}$, and for all $x \in \text{conv}(\overline{K})$ it holds $x_1 < 0$.

Next, for $t \in \mathbb{R}$ let $H_t = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_1 > t\}$ and let $v_t = u \circ Q_{t, e_1} - u$. Moreover, let t_0, t_1 be as stated in Lemma 3.3 and let t^* be the first t such that one of the cases 1.–4. in the proof of Lemma 3.3 happens. Then, $t^* \geq 0$ by our assumption and $t^* \geq t_0$ by definition. If $t^* > t_0$, then $v_{t^*} > 0$ in $\Omega_{t^*} \setminus \overline{M_{t^*}}$ by (ii) of Lemma 3.3. If $t^* = t_0$, then (15) holds. But $v_{t^*} \equiv 0$ is not possible, since $K \subset (H_{t^*})^c$ and $u = 1$ in K , while $u < 1$ in $(\overline{K})^c$. This implies again $v_{t^*} > 0$ in $\Omega_{t^*} \setminus \overline{M_{t^*}}$.

Now, notice that our assumption implies $t^* \geq 0$ and that one of the cases 1. or 2. is happening at t^* .

If we are in case 1: Then there is an internal ball $B \subset \Omega_{t^*} \setminus \overline{M_{t^*}}$ such that $\overline{B} \cap \partial\Omega = \{z\}$. Proposition 2.2 applied to v_{t^*} in $W = \Omega_{t^*} \setminus \overline{M_{t^*}}$ implies

$$0 < D_{\Omega_{t^*}}^{1/2} v_{t^*}(z) = D_{Q_{t^*, e_1}(\Omega_{t^*})}^{1/2} u(Q_{t^*, e_1}(z)) - D_{\Omega_{t^*}}^{1/2} u(z) = \lambda - \lambda = 0,$$

a contradiction!

If we are in case 2: Then, by translation if necessary, we may assume $t^* = 0$ and apply Lemma 3.2 to u . But this leads again to a contradiction, since $D_{\Omega}^{1/2} u$ is constant on $\partial\Omega$.

This finishes the proof. \square

Acknowledgements The second author was supported by the National Science Centre, Poland, grant no. 2019/33/B/ST1/02494. The third author was supported in part by INdAM through a GNAMPA Project and by the project "Geometric-Analytic Methods for PDEs and Applications (GAMPA)", funded by European Union –Next Generation EU within the PRIN 2022 program (D.D. 104 - 02/02/2022 Ministero dell'Università e della Ricerca).

References

- [1] N. Abatangelo, X. Ros-Oton, *Obstacle problems for integro-differential operators: higher regularity of free boundaries*, Adv. Math. 360 (2020), 106931, 61 pp.
- [2] A. Acker, *On the qualitative theory of parametrized families of free boundaries*, J. Reine Angew. Math. 393 (1989), 134-167.

- [3] A. Acker, R. Meyer, *A Free Boundary Problem for the p -Laplacian: Uniqueness, Convexity, and Successive Approximation of Solutions*, Electron. J. Differ. Equ. No. 08 (1995), 1-20.
- [4] M Allen, A Petrosyan, *A two-phase problem with a lower-dimensional free boundary*, Interfaces and Free Boundaries 14 (2012), 307-342.
- [5] A. Beurling, *On free boundary problems for the laplace equation*, Seminars on analytic functions I, Institute Advanced Studies Seminars, Princeton (1957), 248-263.
- [6] A. Brudnyi, Y. Brudnyi, *Methods of geometric analysis in extension and trace problems. Volume 1*, Monographs in Mathematics, 102, Birkhäuser/Springer Basel AG, Basel, 2012.
- [7] L. A. Caffarelli, J.-M. Roquejoffre, Y. Sire, *Variational problems with free boundaries for the fractional Laplacian* J. Eur. Math. Soc. 12, No. 5 (2010), 1151-1179.
- [8] D. De Silva, J. M. Roquejoffre, *Regularity in a one-phase free boundary problem for the fractional Laplacian*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire 29, No. 3 (2012), 335-367.
- [9] D. De Silva, O. Savin, *Regularity of Lipschitz free boundaries for the thin one-phase problem*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) 17, No. 6 (2015), 1293-1326.
- [10] D. De Silva, O. Savin, *C^∞ regularity of certain thin free boundaries*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 64, No. 5 (2015), 1575-1608.
- [11] D. De Silva, O. Savin, Y. Sire, *A one-phase problem for the fractional Laplacian: regularity of flat free boundaries*, Bull. Inst. Math. Acad. Sin. (N.S.) 9, No. 1 (2014), 111-145.
- [12] S. Dipierro, G. Poggesi, J. Thompson, E. Valdinoci, *Quantitative stability for the nonlocal overdetermined Serrin problem*, preprint available on arXiv, 2023, arXiv:2309.17119v1.
- [13] S Dipierro, O Savin, E Valdinoci, *A nonlocal free boundary problem*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. 47(6), (2015) 4559-4605.
- [14] M Engelstein, X Fernández-Real, H Yu, *Graphical solutions to one-phase free boundary problems*, J. Reine Angew. Math. vol. 2023, no. 804, (2023) 155-195.
- [15] M. Engelstein, A. Kauranen, M. Prats, G. Sakellaris, Y. Sire, *Minimizers for the thin one-phase free boundary problem*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 74 (2021), no. 9, 1971-2022.
- [16] M. M. Fall, S. Jarohs, *Overdetermined problems with fractional Laplacian*, ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var. 21.4 (2015), 924-938.
- [17] X. Fernández-Real, X. Ros-Oton *Stable cones in the thin one-phase problem*, Amer. J. Math. 146(3) (2024), 631-685.
- [18] M. Flucher, M. Rumpf, *Bernoulli's free-boundary problem, qualitative theory and numerical approximation*, J. Reine Angew. Math. 486 (1997), 165-204.
- [19] S. Jarohs, T. Kulczycki, P. Salani, *Starshapedness of the superlevel sets of solutions to equations involving the fractional Laplacian in starshaped rings*, Math. Nach. 292(5) (2019), pp. 1008-1021.
- [20] S. Jarohs, T. Kulczycki, P. Salani, *On the Bernoulli free boundary problems for the half Laplacian and for the spectral half Laplacian*, Nonlinear Anal. 222 (2022), Paper No. 112956, 39 pp.
- [21] T. Kulczycki, J. Wszola, *On the interior Bernoulli free boundary problem for the fractional Laplacian on an interval*, Collect. Math. (2023).
- [22] X. Ros-Oton, J. Serra, *The Dirichlet problem for the fractional Laplacian: Regularity up to the boundary*, Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées 101(3) (2014), 275-302.
- [23] X Ros-Oton, M Weidner, *Improvement of flatness for nonlocal free boundary problems*, preprint available on arXiv, 2024, arXiv:2404.15975.
- [24] X Ros-Oton, M Weidner, *Optimal regularity for nonlocal elliptic equations and free boundary problems*, preprint available on arXiv, 2024, arXiv:2403.07793.
- [25] J. Serrin, *A symmetry problem in potential theory*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. 43 (1971), 304-318.
- [26] N. Soave, E. Valdinoci, *Overdetermined problems for the fractional Laplacian in exterior and annular sets*, J. Anal. Math. 137.1 (2019), 101-134.

- [27] H. Shahgholian, *Quadrature surfaces as free boundaries*, Ark. Mat. 32 (1994), no. 2, 475-492.
- [28] S. Snelson, E. V. Teixeira, *Regularity and nondegeneracy for nonlocal Bernoulli problems with variable kernels*, preprint available on arXiv, 2024, arXiv:2403.11937
- [29] D. E. Tepper, *On a free boundary problem, the starlike case*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. 6 (1975), 503-505.
- [30] H. Whitney, *Functions differentiable on the boundaries of regions*, Ann. of Math. (2) 35 (1934), no. 3, 482-485.