RIGIDITY RESULTS FOR ELLIPTIC PDES WITH UNIFORM LIMITS: AN ABSTRACT FRAMEWORK WITH APPLICATIONS

ALBERTO FARINA AND ENRICO VALDINOCI

Abstract. We provide an abstract framework for a symmetry result arising in a conjecture of G. W. Gibbons and we apply it to the fractional Laplace operator, to the elliptic operators with constant coefficients, to the quasilinear operators and to the possibly nonuniformly elliptic fully nonlinear operators with possible gradient dependence.

1. Introduction

Let $u : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ be a solution of the problem

$$\begin{cases} Lu(x) = f(u(x)) \text{ for any } x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \\ \lim_{x_n \to \pm\infty} u(x', x_n) = \pm 1, \text{ uniformly in } x' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}. \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

Here, L is an operator (not necessarily linear) acting on a space $\mathbb{X}$ of smooth (say, C^r with $r \geqslant 1$) functions and commuting with the translations, i.e.,

$$L(u(x+y)) = (Lu)(x+y) \text{ for any } y \in \mathbb{R}^n, \tag{2}$$

whose precise assumptions will be listed below.
The space $\mathbb{X}$ is supposed to contain functions from $\mathbb{R}^n$ to $\mathbb{R}$ and to be translation invariant (with respect to the translations in $\mathbb{R}^n$), that is

$$\text{if } u \in \mathbb{X}, \text{ then the functions } x \mapsto u(x+y) \text{ lies in } \mathbb{X} \text{ too, for any } y \in \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{3}$$

As for the nonlinearity, we suppose that $f \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$, with

$$\inf_{r \in (-\infty, 1] \cup [1, +\infty)} f'(r) > 0. \tag{4}$$

A paradigmatic example of nonlinearity satisfying the above assumptions is the function $f(r) = r^3 - r$.
The goal of this paper is to prove that u possesses one-dimensional symmetry, that is that there exists $u_o : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$u(x', x_n) = u_o(x_n) \text{ for any } (x', x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}. \tag{5}$$

For this, the following hypotheses are taken on L:

AF: LAMFA – CNRS UMR 6140 – Université de Picardie Jules Verne – Faculté de Mathématiques et d'Informatique – 33, rue Saint-Leu – Amiens, France – alberto.farina@u-picardie.fr
EV: Università di Roma Tor Vergata – Dipartimento di Matematica – Rome, Italy – enrico.valdinoci@uniroma2.it .

H1. (Linearization): If $u \in \mathbb{X}$ satisfies $Lu = f(u)$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$, then there exists an operator $\widetilde{L}$ acting on some space of functions $\widetilde{\mathbb{X}}$, which is translation invariant in the sense of (3), such that $\partial_\omega u \in \widetilde{\mathbb{X}}$ for any $\omega \in S^{n-1}$ (where, as usual, ∂_ω denotes the directional derivative) and

$$\widetilde{L}(\partial_\omega u) = f'(u)\partial_\omega u \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^n.$$

H2. (Compactness): If $u \in \mathbb{X}$ satisfies (1), $x^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $u^{(k)}(x) := u(x + x^{(k)})$, we have that there exists a function $u^{(\infty)} \in \mathbb{X}$ such that, up to subsequence,

$$\lim_{k\to+\infty} u^{(k)}(x) = u^{(\infty)}(x), \qquad \lim_{k\to+\infty} \nabla u^{(k)}(x) = \nabla u^{(\infty)}(x)$$

$$\text{and} \qquad \lim_{k\to+\infty} Lu^{(k)} = Lu^{(\infty)} \text{ for any } x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

H3. (Maximum Principle for the linearized operator): If $w \in \widetilde{\mathbb{X}}$ satisfies $\widetilde{L}w = c(x)w$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$, with

$$w(x) \geqslant 0 \text{ if } |x_n| \leqslant M \text{ and } c(x) \geqslant \kappa \text{ if } |x_n| \geqslant M,$$

for some $\kappa > 0$ and $M > 0$, then

$$w(x) \geqslant 0 \text{ for any } x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

H4. (Strong Maximum Principle for the linearized equation): If $v \in \widetilde{\mathbb{X}}$ satisfies $\widetilde{L}v = f'(u)v$ and $v \geqslant 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with $v(0) = 0$, then v vanishes identically.

H5. (Maximum Principle for the difference operator operator): Let $\underline{L}w(x) := L(u+w)(x) - Lu(x)$. Let U be an open set contained in $\{x_n \leqslant \mu_-\} \cup \{x_n \geqslant \mu_+\}$, for some $\mu_+ > \mu_- \in \mathbb{R}$.

If $w \in \mathbb{X}$ satisfies $\underline{L}w = c(x)w$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$, with

$$w(x) \geqslant 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus U \text{ and } c(x) \geqslant \kappa \text{ if } x \in U,$$

for some $\kappa > 0$, then

$$w(x) \geqslant 0 \text{ for any } x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

H6. (Strong Maximum Principle for the difference equation): If $v \in \mathbb{X}$ satisfies $\underline{L}v = f(u+v) - f(u)$ and $v \geqslant 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with $v(0) = 0$, then v vanishes identically.

We remark that assumption H1 is almost harmless (it boils down to the standard linearization procedure if the operator L is differentiable). Similarly, H2 is a very weak condition and it does not even require, in principle, a regularity theory for (1) (for instance one can suitably choose the space $\mathbb{X}$ in order to control enough derivatives of u to obtain the required compactness). Under the above assumptions, we may state our general result as follows:

Theorem 1. *Let $u \in \mathbb{X}$ be a solution of* (1)*, with $\|u\|_{C^{1,\beta}(\mathbb{R}^n)}$ finite, for some $\beta \in (0,1)$.*
Let L satisfy H1–H6 and f satisfy (4)*.*
Then u possesses one-dimensional symmetry, that is (5) *holds.*

Theorem 1 is motivated by a famous conjecture of Gibbons when L is the Laplace operator (see [Car95, GT99]), which was motivated by the cosmological problem of detecting the shape of the interfaces which "separate" the different regions of the universe which possibly arose from the big-bang. Such conjecture was proved independently and with different methods by [Far99, BBG00, BHM00]. See [Far00, Far01] for the case of discontinuous nonlinearities. In [FV08] it is also shown that the uniform control of only one limit in (1) is enough to obtain that u is one-dimensional under the additional assumption that u is a minimal solution.

In this sense, Theorem 1 may be seen as a generalization of the results of [Far99, BBG00, BHM00] to a more general class of operators.
Such generalization is performed in order to apply Theorem 1 to concrete cases of interest. As an application, we consider the case in which L is a fractional power of the Laplacian:

Theorem 2. *Let $L = -(-\Delta)^s$, with $s \in (0,1)$. Let f satisfy (4).*
If $u \in W^{3,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is a solution of (1), then u possesses one-dimensional symmetry.

We refer to [Lan72, Ste70, Sil05] for the basics of fractional Laplacian theory.
We would like to recall that the fractional Laplacian is a very important operator, since it naturally surfaces in many different areas, such as: the thin obstacle problem [Caf79], optimization [DL76], finance [CT04], phase transitions [AB98, ABS98, CSM05, SV09b], stratified materials [SV09a], anomalous diffusion [MK00], crystal dislocation [Nab52, Tol97], soft thin films [Kur06], some models of semipermeable membranes and flame propagation [CRS09b], conservation laws [BKW01], the ultrarelativistic limit of quantum mechanics [FdlL86], quasi-geostrophic flows [MT96, Cor98], multiple scattering [DG75, CK98, GK04], minimal surfaces [CRS09a, CV09], materials science [Bat06], probability [Ito84, Ber96, BG99, JMW05, Val08] and water waves [Sto57, Zak68, Whi74, CSS92, CG94, NS94, CW95, dlLP96, CSS97, CN00, GG03, HN05, NT08, dlLV08].
When $s = 1/2$, Theorem 2 was proven, by different methods, in [CSM05] and an extension of that proof to any $s \in (0,1)$ is given in [CS10].
Also, we recall that in dimension $n = 2$ the uniform limit assumption may be dropped in (1) and Theorem 2 still holds true for monotone solutions, as proved in [SV09b, CS10].
Now, as another consequence of Theorem 1, we give a very general result on (possibly nonlinear) elliptic operators. For this, we denote by Sym^n the space of $(n \times n)$-symmetric matrices.

Theorem 3. *Let $F = F(M,p) \in C^1(\mathrm{Sym}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n)$. Assume that there exists $\lambda \in C\big(\mathrm{Sym}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n, (0,+\infty)\big)$ such that*

$$F(M+N,p) - F(M,p) \geqslant \lambda(M,p)\, \|N\| \tag{6}$$

for any nonnegative definite $(n \times n)$-symmetric matrix N.
Let $Lu = F(D^2u, \nabla u)$. Let f satisfy (4) and $\beta \in (0,1)$.
If $u \in C^{3,\beta}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is a solution of (1), then u possesses one-dimensional symmetry.

We remark that condition (6) is a very weak ellipticity assumption (compare, for instance, with Definition 2.1 on page 12 of [CC95]). Notice that (6) does not need to be uniform in M and p. Also, the application of Theorem 3 is very wide, since it comprises, for instance:

- the Laplace operator, with the choice
$$F(M,p) = \mathrm{Tr}\, M,$$
- elliptic operators with constant coefficients, take
$$F(M,p) = a_{ij}M_{ij} + b \cdot p,$$
- quasilinear operators, such as
$$F(M,p) = (a+|p|^2)^{(m-2)/2}\,\mathrm{Tr}\, M + (m-2)(a+|p|^2)^{(m-4)/2} M_{ij}p_ip_j,$$
with $a > 0$ and $m > 1$,
- the mean curvature operator
$$F(M,p) = (1+|p|^2)^{-1/2}\,\mathrm{Tr}\, M - (1+|p|^2)^{-3/2} M_{ij}p_ip_j,$$

- the (possibly nonuniformly) elliptic fully nonlinear operators.

We point out that the assumption that u is smooth in Theorem 3 is not very restrictive, since it may be obtained via elliptic regularity theory once $u \in C^{1,\beta}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

We recall that a result similar to Theorem 3 for the uniformly elliptic fully nonlinear operators of the form $F(M,p) = F(M)$ has also been recently obtained in [Sav08]. See also [CGS94, VSS06] and references therein for related results on the quasilinear case.

The proof of Theorem 1 that we give makes use of the technique of [Far99], suitably modified in order to comprise our general case.

For this, in Section 2, we give an intermediate result based on monotonicity cones. In Section 3, we complete the proof of Theorem 1, while Theorems 2 and 3 are proven in Sections 4 and 5 respectively, by showing that the operators under consideration fulfill assumptions H1–H6.

2. A first symmetry result via monotonicity cones

The proof of Theorem 1 makes use of a first provisional statement, which goes as follows:

Lemma 4. *Let $u \in \mathbb{X}$ be a bounded and uniformly Lipschitz solution of* (1)*, with L satisfying H1–H4 and f satisfying* (4)*.*
Assume also that there exists $a \in (0,1)$ such that

$$\partial_\nu u(x) > 0 \text{ for any } x \in \mathbb{R}^n \text{ and any } \nu = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n) \in \mathrm{S}^{n-1} \text{ with } \nu_n \geqslant a. \tag{7}$$

Then u possesses one-dimensional symmetry.

Of course, Lemma 4 is just Theorem 1 with the additional hypothesis on the monotonicity cone in (7): in Section 3 we will show that such additional assumption is, in fact, not needed and so we will be able to derive Theorem 1 from Lemma 4.

In order to prove Lemma 4, we show that

$$\partial_\nu u(x) > 0 \text{ for any } x \in \mathbb{R}^n \text{ and any } \nu = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n) \in \mathrm{S}^{n-1} \text{ with } \nu_n > 0. \tag{8}$$

To prove (8), we take

$$\underline{a} := \inf\{a > 0 \text{ for which (7) holds}\}. \tag{9}$$

If $\underline{a} = 0$, then (8) is proved, so we assume, by contradiction, that

$$\underline{a} > 0. \tag{10}$$

Given $S > 0$, we define

$$i_S := \inf_{\substack{x' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \\ |x_n| \leqslant S \\ \nu_n \geqslant \underline{a}}} \partial_\nu u(x', x_n).$$

By construction,

$$i_S \geqslant 0; \tag{11}$$

we claim that, in fact, that

$$i_S > 0. \tag{12}$$

To prove (12), we argue by contradiction and we suppose that there exists a sequence of $\nu^{(k)} \in S^{n-1}$ and $x^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with

$$|x_n^{(k)}| \leqslant S, \tag{13}$$

$\nu^{(k)} \geqslant \underline{a}$ and

$$\lim_{k\to+\infty} \partial_{\nu^{(k)}} u(x^{(k)}) = 0. \tag{14}$$

From (11),

$$\partial_{\nu^{(k)}} u(x) \geqslant 0 \text{ for any } x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{15}$$

We define

$$u^{(k)}(x) := u(x + x^{(k)}). \tag{16}$$

Then, (14) becomes

$$\lim_{k\to+\infty} \nabla u^{(k)}(0) \cdot \nu^{(k)} = 0. \tag{17}$$

Analogously, (15) writes

$$\nabla u^{(k)}(x) \cdot \nu^{(k)} \geqslant 0 \text{ for any } x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{18}$$

Notice also that

$$|Lu^{(k)}| = |f(u^{(k)})| \leqslant \sup_{r\in[-\|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}],\|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}]} |f(r)|,$$

where (2) has been used. Thus, from (17), (18) and H2, there exist $u^{(\infty)} \in \mathbb{X}$ and $\nu^\infty \in S^{n-1}$, with

$$\nu^{(\infty)} \geqslant \underline{a}, \tag{19}$$

such that

$$\lim_{k\to+\infty} u^{(k)}(x) = u^{(\infty)}(x) \qquad \text{for any } x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \tag{20}$$

and

$$Lu^{(\infty)} = f(u^{(\infty)}), \qquad \nabla u^{(\infty)} \cdot \nu^{(\infty)} \geqslant 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^n, \qquad \text{with } \nabla u^{(\infty)}(0) \cdot \nu^{(\infty)} = 0. \tag{21}$$

Therefore, by H1, the function $v := \partial_{\nu^{(\infty)}} u^{(\infty)} \in \widetilde{\mathbb{X}}$ satisfies

$$\widetilde{L}v = f'(u)v, \; v(x) \geqslant 0 = v(0) \text{ for any } x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

As a consequence, from H4, v vanishes identically.
Accordingly,

$$u^{(\infty)}(\nu^{(\infty)}t) - u^{(\infty)}(-\nu^{(\infty)}t) = \int_{-t}^{t} v(\nu^{(\infty)}s)\, ds = 0 \qquad \text{for any } t \geqslant 0. \tag{22}$$

Recalling the uniform limit assumption in (1), we now take $M > 0$ in such a way that

$$u(x) \geqslant 1/2 \text{ if } x_n \geqslant M \text{ and } u(x) \leqslant -1/2 \text{ if } x_n \leqslant -M.$$

Then, recalling (13) and (16),

$$u^{(k)}(x) \geqslant 1/2 \text{ if } x_n \geqslant M + S \text{ and } u^{(k)}(x) \leqslant -1/2 \text{ if } x_n \leqslant -M - S.$$

Hence, from (20),

$$u^{(\infty)}(x) \geqslant 1/2 \text{ if } x_n \geqslant M + S \text{ and } u^{(\infty)}(x) \leqslant -1/2 \text{ if } x_n \leqslant -M - S. \tag{23}$$

We recall that, from (10) and (19), $\nu_n^{(\infty)} \geqslant \underline{a} > 0$, so (23) implies that

$$u^{(\infty)}(\nu^{(\infty)}t) \geqslant 1/2 \text{ and } u^{(\infty)}(-\nu^{(\infty)}t) \leqslant -1/2 \text{ if } t \geqslant (M + S)/\underline{a}.$$

This and (22) give that

$$0 = u^{(\infty)}(\nu^{(\infty)}t) - u^{(\infty)}(-\nu^{(\infty)}t) \geqslant 1.$$

This contradiction proves (12).
Now, we use (4), to see that $f'(r) \geqslant \kappa$, for a suitable $\kappa > 0$, if $|r-1| \leqslant \eta^\star$, for a suitable $\eta^\star \in (0, 1/4)$. Also, the uniform limit assumption in (1) enable us to take $M_\star > 0$ such that $u(x) \geqslant 1 - \eta^\star$ if $x_n \geqslant M_\star$ and $u(x) \leqslant -1 + \eta^\star$ if $x_n \leqslant -M_\star$. We also define $c(x) := f'(u(x))$. Hence, $c(x) \geqslant \kappa$ when $|x_N| \geqslant M_\star$.
Let also

$$\epsilon := \frac{i_{M_\star}}{2(1 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)})}.$$

Notice that $\epsilon > 0$, thanks to (12).
Then, if $|x_n| \leqslant M_\star$ and $\nu \in \mathrm{S}^{n-1}$ with $\nu_n \in [\underline{a} - \epsilon, \underline{a}]$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\nu u(x) &= \nabla u(x) \cdot \nu \geqslant \nabla u(x) \cdot (\nu', \underline{a}) - |\nabla u(x) \cdot (0, \underline{a} - \nu_n)| \\ &\geqslant i_{M_\star} - \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \epsilon \geqslant \frac{i_{M_\star}}{2} > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by H3, $\partial_\nu u(x) \geqslant 0$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and any $\nu \in \mathrm{S}^{n-1}$ with $\nu_n \in [\underline{a} - \epsilon, \underline{a}]$.
In fact, by H4, we see that $\partial_\nu u(x) > 0$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and any $\nu \in \mathrm{S}^{n-1}$ with $\nu_n \in [\underline{a} - \epsilon, \underline{a}]$.
This is in contradiction with (9), and so it proves (8).
Then, from (8), by taking $\mu = -\nu$, we obtain that

$$\partial_\mu u(x) < 0 \text{ for any } x \in \mathbb{R}^n \text{ and any } \mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n) \in \mathrm{S}^{n-1} \text{ with } \mu_n < 0. \tag{24}$$

By taking limits of ν_n and μ_n to 0 in (8) and (24), we deduce that

$$\partial_\omega u(x) = 0 \text{ for any } x \in \mathbb{R}^n \text{ and any } \omega = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n) \in \mathrm{S}^{n-1} \text{ with } \omega_n = 0.$$

Hence, $\partial_{x_1} u(x) = \cdots = \partial_{x_{n-1}} u(x) = 0$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, which ends the proof of Lemma 4. ■

3. Proof of Theorem 1

Some of the arguments needed to proof Theorem 1 will be appropriate modifications of the ones used in the proof of Lemma 4, by taking into account the difference operator $\underline{L}$ instead of the linearized operator $\widetilde{L}$. In order to prove Theorem 1, first of all, we show that

$$\partial_n u(x) > 0 \text{ for any } x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{25}$$

To prove (25), we take $h \geqslant 0$, we let

$$\mathcal{T}_h u(x) := u(x + he_n) - u(x)$$

and we observe that

$$f(u(x + he_n)) - f(u(x)) = c_h(x) \mathcal{T}_h u(x), \tag{26}$$

where

$$c_h(x) := \int_0^1 f'\big(tu(x) + (1-t)u(x + he_n)\big)\, dt. \tag{27}$$

Now, recalling (4), we take $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$ such that

$$f' \geqslant \kappa \text{ in } (-\infty, -1 + \delta] \cup [1 - \delta, +\infty), \text{ for some } \kappa > 0. \tag{28}$$

Then, by the uniform limit assumption in (1), we take $M > 0$ such that

$$u(x) \geqslant 1 - \delta \text{ if } x_n \geqslant M \text{ and } u(x) \leqslant -1 + \delta \text{ if } x_n \leqslant -M. \tag{29}$$

Now, we observe the following useful property:

$$\text{if } x \in \{\mathcal{T}_h u < 0\} \cap \{|x_n| \geqslant M\}, \text{ then } c_h(x) \geqslant \kappa. \tag{30}$$

Indeed, on the one hand, if $x \in \{\mathcal{T}_h u < 0\} \cap \{x_n \leqslant -M\}$,

$$u(x + he_n) < u(x) \leqslant -1 + \delta$$

and therefore

$$tu(x) + (1-t)u(x + he_n) \leqslant -1 + \delta \tag{31}$$

for any $x \in \{\mathcal{T}_h u < 0\} \cap \{x_n \leqslant -M\}$ and $t \in [0, 1]$.
On the other hand, if $x \in \{\mathcal{T}_h u < 0\} \cap \{x_n \geqslant M\}$, then $u(x) > u(x + he_n) \geqslant 1 - \delta$, and therefore

$$tu(x) + (1-t)u(x + he_n) \geqslant 1 - \delta \tag{32}$$

for any $x \in \{\mathcal{T}_h u < 0\} \cap \{x_n \geqslant M\}$ and $t \in [0, 1]$.
From (27), (28), (31) and (32), we obtain that (30) holds true.
We claim that

$$\text{if } h \geqslant 2M, \text{ then } \mathcal{T}_h u(x) > 0 \text{ for any } x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{33}$$

To prove (33), fix $h \geqslant 2M$ and let $U := \{\mathcal{T}_h u < 0\}$. Then,

$$\text{if } x_n = -M, \quad \mathcal{T}_h u(x) \geqslant \inf_{x_n \geqslant M} u(x) - \sup_{x_n \leqslant -M} u(x) \geqslant (1-\delta) - (-1+\delta) > 0, \tag{34}$$

and so

$$U = U_+ \cup U_-, \tag{35}$$

where U_+ (resp., U_-) is an open set contained in the half-space $\{x_n \geqslant -M\}$ (resp.,$\{x_n \leqslant -M\}$). Then, (26), (35) and (30), together with H5, imply that: if $h \geqslant 2M$, then $\mathcal{T}_h u(x) \geqslant 0$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Hence, (33) follows from H6.
Now, we define

$$h_o := \inf \Big\{ h > 0 \text{ s.t. } \mathcal{T}_h u(x) > 0 \text{ for any } x \in \mathbb{R}^n \text{ with } |x_n| \leqslant M \Big\}.$$

Note that this definition is well-posed, due to (33).
We prove that

$$h_o = 0. \tag{36}$$

The proof of (36) is by contradiction. Suppose $h_o > 0$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} &u(x + (h_o + \epsilon)e_n) - u(x) \geqslant 0 \qquad \text{for any } x \in \{|x_n| \leqslant M\} \text{ and any } \epsilon > 0 \\ \text{and } \ &u(x^{(k)} + (h_o - \epsilon^{(k)})e_n) - u(x^{(k)}) \leqslant 0 \qquad \text{for some } x^{(k)} \in \{|x_n| \leqslant M\}, \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

where $\epsilon^{(k)} \geqslant 0$ is an infinitesimal sequence.
As a consequence,

$$\mathcal{T}_{h_o}(x) = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0^+} u(x + (h_o + \epsilon)e_n) - u(x) \geqslant 0 \qquad \text{for any } x \in \{|x_n| \leqslant M\}.$$

Therefore, recalling (30) and H5,

$$\mathcal{T}_{h_o}(x) \geqslant 0 \qquad \text{for any } x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{38}$$

Now, we define $u^{(k)}(x) := u(x + x^{(k)})$ and we deduce from H2 that, up to subsequence, $u^{(k)}$ approaches some $u^{(\infty)}$, with $\underline{L}(\mathcal{T}_{h_o} u^{(\infty)}) = f(\mathcal{T}_{h_o} u^{(\infty)} + u) - f(u)$.

By (38), we see that $\mathcal{T}_{h_o} u^{(\infty)}(x) \geqslant 0$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Also,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{h_o} u^{(\infty)}(0) &= \lim_{k\to+\infty} u(x^{(k)} + h_o e_n) - u(x^{(k)}) \\ &\leqslant \lim_{k\to+\infty} u(x^{(k)} + (h_o + \epsilon^{(k)})e_n) - u(x^{(k)}) + \epsilon^{(k)} \|u\|_{C^{1,\beta}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \\ &\leqslant 0, \end{aligned}$$

hence $\mathcal{T}_{h_o} u^{(\infty)}(0) = 0$.
Consequently, by H6, we get that $\mathcal{T}_{h_o} u^{(\infty)}$ vanishes identically. Therefore, $u^{(\infty)}(x + h_o e_n) = u^{(\infty)}(x)$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and so, by iterating,

$$u^{(\infty)}(x + j h_o e_n) = u^{(\infty)}(x) \text{ for any } x \in \mathbb{R}^n \text{ and any } j \in \mathbb{Z}. \tag{39}$$

Now, if $j \in \mathbb{N} \cap [2M/h_o, +\infty)$, we have that $jh_o + x_n^{(k)} \geqslant M$ and $-jh_o + x_n^{(k)} \leqslant -M$, so $u(jh_o e_n + x^{(k)}) \geqslant 1 - \delta$ and $u(-jh_o e_n + x^{(k)}) \leqslant -1 + \delta$.
Then, for a such j,

$$\begin{aligned} 2(1-\delta) &\geqslant \lim_{k\to+\infty} u(jh_o e_n + x^{(k)}) - u(-jh_o e_n + x^{(k)}) \\ &= u^{(\infty)}(jh_o e_n) - u^{(\infty)}(-jh_o e_n). \end{aligned}$$

Since this is in contradiction with (39), we have proved (36).
That is, $\mathcal{T}_h u(x) \geqslant 0$ for any x with $\{|x_n| \leqslant M\}$ and any $h \geqslant 0$. Consequently, by (30) and H5, we deduce that $\mathcal{T}_h u(x) \geqslant 0$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.
Accordingly, $\partial_n u(x) \geqslant 0$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and then (25) follows from H4.
Now, we show that for any $S > 0$ there exists $a(S) \in (0,1)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_\nu u(x) > 0 \text{ for any } x \in \mathbb{R}^n \cap \{|x_n| \leqslant S\} \\ &\text{and any } \nu = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n) \in \mathrm{S}^{n-1} \text{ with } \nu_n \geqslant a(S). \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

The proof of (40) is by contradiction. Suppose that, for a fixed S, there exist sequences $x^{(k)} \in \{|x_n| \leqslant S\}$ and $\nu^{(k)} \in \mathrm{S}^{n-1}$ such that $\nu_n^{(k)} \geqslant 1 - (1/k)$ and

$$\partial_{\nu^{(k)}} u(x^{(k)}) \leqslant 0. \tag{41}$$

Let $u^{(k)}(x) := u(x + x^{(k)})$. Notice that $\nu^{(k)}$ approaches e_n for large k, therefore, by H2, we obtain that, up to subsequence, $u^{(k)}$ approaches some $u^{(\infty)}$ together with its derivative, with $Lu^{(\infty)} = f(u^{(\infty)})$ and $\widetilde{L}(\partial_n u^{(\infty)}) = f'(u^{(\infty)})\partial_n u^{(\infty)}$.
We remark that, by (25),

$$\partial_n u^{(\infty)} \geqslant 0,$$

while, by (41),

$$\partial_n u^{(\infty)}(0) \leqslant 0.$$

Accordingly, H4 says that $\partial_n u^{(\infty)}$ vanishes identically.
Thus, if $t - S$ is large enough (hence $te_n - |x_n^{(k)}|$ is large enough), the uniform limit in (1) gives that

$$\frac{9}{10} \leqslant \lim_{k\to+\infty} u(te_n + x^{(k)}) = u^{(\infty)}(te_n) = u^{(\infty)}(-te_n) = \lim_{k\to+\infty} u(-te_n + x^{(k)}) \leqslant -\frac{9}{10}.$$

This contradiction proves (40).
Now, recalling the definition of M given in (28) and (29), in the notation of (40), we define

$$a := a(M).$$

Then, as a consequence of (40), H3 and (28), we have that $\partial_\nu u(x) \geqslant 0$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, if $\nu_n \geqslant a$. Then, by (40) and H4, we conclude that $\partial_\nu u(x) > 0$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, if $\nu_n \geqslant a$.
That is, condition (7) holds true. Therefore, the proof of Theorem 1 is completed thanks to Lemma 4. ■

4. Proof of Theorem 2

We will deduce Theorem 2 from Theorem 1, in which $L = \widetilde{L} = \underline{L} := -(-\Delta)^s$, $\mathbb{X} := W^{3,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\widetilde{\mathbb{X}} := W^{2,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. For this, we need to check hypotheses H1–H6.
First, we claim that, if $u \in W^{3,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, then

$$\partial_\omega\big(-(-\Delta)^s u\big) = -(-\Delta)^s(\partial_\omega u). \tag{42}$$

Indeed, (42) is obvious if u belongs to the Schwartz class of rapidly decreasing functions, since, in this case, one can represent $(-\Delta)^s$ via a Fourier transform (see, for instance, [Lan72, Ste70, Sil05, Val08]) and check (42).
If, on the other hand, $u \in W^{3,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we have that for any $h > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{u(h\omega+y)+u(h\omega-y)-2u(h\omega)}{|y|^{n+2s}} - \frac{u(y)+u(-y)-2u(0)}{|y|^{n+2s}} \\
= \; & \frac{u(h\omega+y)-u(y)+u(h\omega-y)-u(-y)-2u(h\omega)+2u(0)}{|y|^{n+2s}} \\
\leqslant \; & 5\|u\|_{W^{3,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)} h \left[|y|^{-(n+2s)}\chi_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus B_1}(y) + |y|^{2-(n+2s)}\chi_{B_1}(y)\right] \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, the Dominated Convergence Theorem gives that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \partial_\omega \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{u(x+y)+u(x-y)-2u(x)}{|y|^{n+2s}}\,dy \right)_{x=0} \\
= \; & \lim_{h\to 0^+} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{u(h\omega+y)+u(h\omega-y)-2u(h\omega)}{h|y|^{n+2s}}\,dy \\
& \qquad - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{u(y)+u(-y)-2u(0)}{h|y|^{n+2s}}\,dy \\
= \; & \lim_{h\to 0^+} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{u(h\omega+y)-u(y)+u(h\omega-y)-u(-y)-2u(h\omega)+2u(0)}{h|y|^{n+2s}}\,dy \\
= \; & \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\partial_\omega u(y)+\partial_\omega u(-y)-2\partial_\omega u(0)}{|y|^{n+2s}}\,dy.
\end{aligned}$$

This, via the integral representation of the fractional Laplacian (see [Lan72, Ste70, Sil05, Val08]), the above identity reads

$$\partial_\omega\Big(-(-\Delta)^s u(x)\Big)_{x=0} = -\Big((-\Delta)^s(\partial_\omega u)\Big)(0),$$

which proves (42) at $x = 0$ (and analogously at any point).
Then, hypothesis H1 follows from (42).
Hypothesis H2 follows from the fact that $\mathbb{X} = W^{3,\infty}$, using the Theorem of Ascoli and the integral representation of the fractional Laplacian.
We now prove H3, by arguing by contradiction. We suppose that

$$i := \inf_{\mathbb{R}^n} w < 0$$

and we take $x^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$\lim_{k \to +\infty} w(x^{(k)}) = i < 0.$$

In particular, we may suppose that $w(x^{(k)}) \leqslant i/2 < 0$, and therefore $x^{(k)} \in \{|x_n| \geqslant M\}$, and so $c(x^{(k)}) \geqslant \kappa > 0$.
Thus, if we set $w^{(k)}(x) := w(x + x^{(k)})$, we see that

$$-(-\Delta)^s w^{(k)}(x) = -(-\Delta)^s w(x + x^{(k)}) = c(x + x^{(k)}) w(x + x^{(k)}).$$

In particular,

$$C(n,s) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{w^{(k)}(y) - w^{(k)}(0)}{|y|^{n+2s}} = -(-\Delta)^s w^{(k)}(0) = c(x^{(k)}) w(x^{(k)}) \leqslant \frac{\kappa i}{2}, \tag{43}$$

for a suitable $C(n,s) > 0$.
Hence, since $w \in \widetilde{\mathbb{X}} := W^{2,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we have that $w^{(k)}$ converges locally uniformly to some $w^{(\infty)}$, up to subsequence, due to Theorem of Ascoli, and so, by taking the limit in (43), we have

$$C(n,s) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{w^{(\infty)}(y) - w^{(\infty)}(0)}{|y|^{n+2s}} \leqslant \frac{\kappa i}{2}. \tag{44}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} w^{(\infty)}(0) &= \lim_{k \to +\infty} w^{(k)}(0) \\ &= \lim_{k \to +\infty} w(x^{(k)}) = \inf_{\mathbb{R}^n} w \leqslant w(y + x^{(k)}) = w^{(k)}(y), \end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

for any $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and so

$$w^{(\infty)}(0) \leqslant w^{(\infty)}(y)$$

for any $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$.
As a consequence, (44) gives that

$$0 \leqslant C(n,s) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{w^{(\infty)}(y) - w^{(\infty)}(0)}{|y|^{n+2s}} \leqslant \frac{\kappa i}{2} < 0.$$

This contradiction proves H3.
Take now v as requested in H4: then, the integral representation of the fractional Laplacian gives that, for a suitable $C(n,s) > 0$,

$$0 = f'(u(0)) v(0) = -(-\Delta)^s v(0) = C(n,s) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{v(y) - v(0)}{|y|^{n+2s}}\, dy = C(n,s) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{v(y)}{|y|^{n+2s}}\, dy, \tag{46}$$

with the integral taken in the Cauchy principal value sense.
Since $v \geqslant 0$, (46) implies that v is identically zero, thus checking H4.
The proof of H5 (resp., H6) is analogous to the one of H3 (resp., H4): just take U instead of $\{|x_n| \geqslant M\}$ (resp. $f(u+v) - f(u)$ instead of $f'(u)v$).
The proof of Theorem 2 is thus complete. ∎

5. Proof of Theorem 3

We take $\mathbb{X} := C^{3,\beta}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\widetilde{\mathbb{X}} := C^{2,\beta}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Notice that, for any $v \in \widetilde{\mathbb{X}}$,

$$f(u+v) - f(u) = \underline{c}v, \text{ with } \underline{c}(x) := \int_0^1 f'(u(x)+tv(x))\,dt. \tag{47}$$

Also,

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{L}v &= \sum_{i,j=1}^n \widetilde{a}_{ij}\partial^2_{ij}v + \widetilde{b}\cdot\nabla v,\\
\underline{L}v &= F(D^2u + D^2v, \nabla u + \nabla v) - F(D^2u, \nabla u + \nabla v)\\
&\qquad + F(D^2u, \nabla u + \nabla v) - F(D^2u, \nabla u)\\
&= \sum_{i,j=1}^n \underline{a}_{ij}\partial^2_{ij}v + \underline{b}\cdot\nabla v,\\
\text{with}\quad & \widetilde{a}_{ij}(x) := \frac{\partial F}{\partial M_{ij}}(D^2u(x), \nabla u(x)), \qquad \widetilde{b}(x) := \frac{\partial F}{\partial p}(D^2u(x), \nabla u(x)),\\
& \underline{a}_{ij}(x) := \int_0^1 \frac{\partial F}{\partial M_{ij}}(D^2u(x) + tD^2v(x), \nabla u(x))\,dt,\\
\text{and}\quad & \underline{b}(x) := \int_0^1 \frac{\partial F}{\partial p}(D^2u(x), \nabla u(x) + t\nabla v(x))\,dt.
\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

In this way, H1 is obviously satisfied and H2 is a consequence of the Theorem of Ascoli. We observe that, by construction

$$\widetilde{a}_{ij}, \underline{a}_{ij}, \widetilde{b}, \underline{b}, \underline{c} \in C^{0,\beta}(\mathbb{R}^n) \subset L^\infty_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^n). \tag{49}$$

Moreover, from (6)

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^n \frac{\partial F}{\partial M_{ij}}(M,p)N_{ij} = \lim_{s\to 0^+} \frac{F(M+sN,p) - F(M,p)}{s} \geqslant \lambda(M,p)\,\|N\|,$$

for any nonnegative definite matrix N.
In particular, given any $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$, taking $N_{ij} := \xi_i\xi_j$,

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^n \frac{\partial F}{\partial M_{ij}}(M,p)\xi_i\xi_j \geqslant \lambda(M,p)\sqrt{\sum_{i,j=1}^n (\xi_i\xi_j)^2} \geqslant \lambda(M,p)\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (\xi_i\xi_i)^2} \geqslant \frac{\lambda(M,p)}{n^2}\|\xi\|^2.$$

Therefore, given any $R > 0$, there exists $\lambda^\star_{R,u,v} > 0$ such that

$$\inf_{\substack{x\in B_R\\ \tau,\sigma\in[0,1]}} \sum_{i,j} \frac{\partial F}{\partial M_{ij}}\big(D^2u(x) + \tau D^2v(x), \nabla u(x) + \sigma\nabla v(x)\big)\xi_i\xi_j \geqslant \lambda^\star_{R,u,v}\|\xi\|^2.$$

As a consequence, for any $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\inf_{x\in B_R} \sum_{i,j=1}^n \widetilde{a}_{ij}\xi_i\xi_j \geqslant \lambda^\star_{R,u,v}\|\xi\|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \inf_{x\in B_R} \sum_{i,j=1}^n \underline{a}_{ij}\xi_i\xi_j \geqslant \lambda^\star_{R,u,v}\|\xi\|^2. \tag{50}$$

In particular,

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \widetilde{a}_{ij}\xi_i\xi_j \geqslant 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \underline{a}_{ij}\xi_i\xi_j \geqslant 0. \tag{51}$$

Then, H4 and H6 are a consequence of (47), (48), (49), (50) and Hopf Strong Maximum Principle (see, for instance, [GT01] or Theorem 2.1.2 of [PS07]).
Therefore, in order to complete the proof of Theorem 3, it remains to prove H3 and H5 (and then invoke Theorem 1).
We prove H5 (the proof of H3 is completely analogous). Suppose, by contradiction, that the conditions on w in H5 hold, but

$$i := \inf_{\mathbb{R}^n} w < 0.$$

We take $x^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$\lim_{k\to+\infty} w(x^{(k)}) = i < 0.$$

In particular, we may suppose that $w(x^{(k)}) \leqslant i/2 < 0$, and therefore $x^{(k)} \in U$, and so $c(x^{(k)}) \geqslant \kappa > 0$.
We set $w^{(k)}(x) := w(x + x^{(k)})$ and we use the definition of $\widetilde{\mathbb{X}}$ and the Theorem of Ascoli to obtain, up to subsequence, that $w^{(k)}$ approaches some $w^{(\infty)}$ locally uniformly together with two derivatives. This also gives the convergence of the coefficients $\underline{a}_{ij} = \underline{a}_{ij}^{(k)}$ and $\underline{b} = \underline{b}^{(k)}$ obtained for $w^{(k)}$ via (48) to suitable $\underline{a}_{ij}^{(\infty)}$ and $\underline{b}^{(\infty)}$. Notice that, from (51), we have

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \underline{a}_{ij}^{(\infty)}\xi_i\xi_j \geqslant 0 \qquad \text{for any } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{52}$$

Also, 0 is a minimum for $w^{(\infty)}$ (see the computation in (45)), and so $\nabla w^{(\infty)}(0) = 0$ and $D^2 w^{(\infty)}(0)$ is nonnegative definite.
As a consequence, recalling (52)

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\kappa i}{2} &\geqslant \lim_{k\to+\infty} c(x^{(k)})w(x^{(k)}) \\
&= \lim_{k\to+\infty} \underline{L}w(x^{(k)}) \\
&= \lim_{k\to+\infty} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \underline{a}_{ij}^{(k)}\partial^2_{ij}w(x^{(k)}) + \underline{b}^{(k)}\cdot\nabla w(x^{(k)}) \\
&= \lim_{k\to+\infty} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \underline{a}_{ij}^{(k)}\partial^2_{ij}w^{(k)}(0) + \underline{b}^{(k)}\cdot\nabla w^{(k)}(0) \\
&= \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \underline{a}_{ij}^{(\infty)}\partial^2_{ij}w^{(\infty)}(0) + \underline{b}^{(\infty)}\cdot\nabla w^{(\infty)}(0) \\
&\geqslant 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $i < 0$, this is a contradiction and it proves H5.
The proof of Theorem 3 is thus completed. ∎

Acknoledgements

It is a pleasure to thank Isabeau Birindelli for very nice and instructive conversations. The work of EV has been supported by FIRB Project *Analysis and Beyond* and GNAMPA Project *Equazioni nonlineari su varietà: proprietà qualitative e classificazione delle soluzioni.*

References

[AB98] Giovanni Alberti and Giovanni Bellettini. A nonlocal anisotropic model for phase transitions. I. The optimal profile problem. *Math. Ann.*, 310(3):527–560, 1998.

[ABS98] Giovanni Alberti, Guy Bouchitté, and Pierre Seppecher. Phase transition with the line-tension effect. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 144(1):1–46, 1998.

[Bat06] Peter W. Bates. On some nonlocal evolution equations arising in materials science. In *Nonlinear dynamics and evolution equations*, volume 48 of *Fields Inst. Commun.*, pages 13–52. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2006.

[BBG00] Martin T. Barlow, Richard F. Bass, and Changfeng Gui. The Liouville property and a conjecture of De Giorgi. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 53(8):1007–1038, 2000.

[Ber96] Jean Bertoin. *Lévy processes*, volume 121 of *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996.

[BG99] Tomasz Bojdecki and Luis G. Gorostiza. Fractional Brownian motion via fractional Laplacian. *Statist. Probab. Lett.*, 44(1):107–108, 1999.

[BHM00] H. Berestycki, F. Hamel, and R. Monneau. One-dimensional symmetry of bounded entire solutions of some elliptic equations. *Duke Math. J.*, 103(3):375–396, 2000.

[BKW01] Piotr Biler, Grzegorz Karch, and Wojbor A. Woyczyński. Critical nonlinearity exponent and self-similar asymptotics for Lévy conservation laws. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 18(5):613–637, 2001.

[Caf79] L. A. Caffarelli. Further regularity for the Signorini problem. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 4(9):1067–1075, 1979.

[Car95] Gilles Carbou. Unicité et minimalité des solutions d'une équation de Ginzburg-Landau. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 12(3):305–318, 1995.

[CC95] Luis A. Caffarelli and Xavier Cabré. *Fully nonlinear elliptic equations*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1995.

[CG94] Walter Craig and Mark D. Groves. Hamiltonian long-wave approximations to the water-wave problem. *Wave Motion*, 19(4):367–389, 1994.

[CGS94] Luis Caffarelli, Nicola Garofalo, and Fausto Segàla. A gradient bound for entire solutions of quasilinear equations and its consequences. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 47(11):1457–1473, 1994.

[CK98] David Colton and Rainer Kress. *Inverse acoustic and electromagnetic scattering theory*, volume 93 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 1998.

[CN00] Walter Craig and David P. Nicholls. Travelling two and three dimensional capillary gravity water waves. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 32(2):323–359 (electronic), 2000.

[Cor98] Diego Cordoba. Nonexistence of simple hyperbolic blow-up for the quasi-geostrophic equation. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 148(3):1135–1152, 1998.

[CRS09a] Luis Caffarelli, Jean-Michel Roquejoffre, and Ovidiu Savin. Non-local minimal surfaces. *Preprint*, 2009.

[CRS09b] Luis Caffarelli, Jean-Michel Roquejoffre, and Yannick Sire. Free boundaries with fractional Laplacians. *Preprint*, 2009.

[CS10] X. Cabré and Y. Sire. Semilinear equations with fractional Laplacians. *Preprint*, 2010.

[CSM05] Xavier Cabré and Joan Solà-Morales. Layer solutions in a half-space for boundary reactions. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 58(12):1678–1732, 2005.

[CSS92] W. Craig, C. Sulem, and P.-L. Sulem. Nonlinear modulation of gravity waves: a rigorous approach. *Nonlinearity*, 5(2):497–522, 1992.

[CSS97] Walter Craig, Ulrich Schanz, and Catherine Sulem. The modulational regime of three-dimensional water waves and the Davey-Stewartson system. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 14(5):615–667, 1997.

[CT04] Rama Cont and Peter Tankov. *Financial modelling with jump processes*. Chapman & Hall/CRC Financial Mathematics Series. Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL, 2004.

[CV09] Luis Caffarelli and Enrico Valdinoci. Regularity properties of nonlocal minimal surfaces via limiting arguments. *Preprint*, 2009.

[CW95] Walter Craig and Patrick A. Worfolk. An integrable normal form for water waves in infinite depth. *Phys. D*, 84(3-4):513–531, 1995.

[DG75] J. J. Duistermaat and V. W. Guillemin. The spectrum of positive elliptic operators and periodic bicharacteristics. *Invent. Math.*, 29(1):39–79, 1975.

[DL76] G. Duvaut and J.-L. Lions. *Inequalities in mechanics and physics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1976. Translated from the French by C. W. John, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, 219.

[dlLP96] R. de la Llave and P. Panayotaros. Gravity waves on the surface of the sphere. *J. Nonlinear Sci.*, 6(2):147–167, 1996.

[dlLV08] Rafael de la Llave and Enrico Valdinoci. Symmetry for a Dirichlet-Neumann problem arising in water waves. *Preprint*, 2008.

[Far99] Alberto Farina. Symmetry for solutions of semilinear elliptic equations in $\mathbb{R}^N$ and related conjectures. *Ricerche Mat.*, 48(suppl.):129–154, 1999. Papers in memory of Ennio De Giorgi.

[Far00] Alberto Farina. Propriétés de monotonie et de symétrie unidimensionnelle pour les solutions de $\Delta u + f(u) = 0$ avec des fonctions f éventuellement discontinues. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 330(11):973–978, 2000.

[Far01] Alberto Farina. Monotonicity and one-dimensional symmetry for the solutions of $\Delta u + f(u) = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$ with possibly discontinuous nonlinearity. *Adv. Math. Sci. Appl.*, 11(2):811–834, 2001.

[FdlL86] C. Fefferman and R. de la Llave. Relativistic stability of matter. I. *Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana*, 2(1-2):119–213, 1986.

[FV08] Alberto Farina and Enrico Valdinoci. 1D symmetry for solutions of semilinear and quasilinear elliptic equations. *Preprint*, 2008.

[GG03] Günter K. Gächter and Marcus J. Grote. Dirichlet-to-Neumann map for three-dimensional elastic waves. *Wave Motion*, 37(3):293–311, 2003.

[GK04] Marcus J. Grote and Christoph Kirsch. Dirichlet-to-Neumann boundary conditions for multiple scattering problems. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 201(2):630–650, 2004.

[GT99] G. W. Gibbons and P. K. Townsend. Bogomol'nyi equation for intersecting domain walls. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 83(9):1727–1730, Aug 1999.

[GT01] David Gilbarg and Neil S. Trudinger. *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001. Reprint of the 1998 edition.

[HN05] Bei Hu and David P. Nicholls. Analyticity of Dirichlet-Neumann operators on Hölder and Lipschitz domains. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 37(1):302–320 (electronic), 2005.

[Ito84] K. Ito. *Lectures on stochastic processes*, volume 24 of *Tata Institute of Fundamental Research Lectures on Mathematics and Physics*. Distributed for the Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Bombay, second edition, 1984. Notes by K. Muralidhara Rao.

[JMW05] Benjamin Jourdain, Sylvie Méléard, and Wojbor A. Woyczynski. A probabilistic approach for nonlinear equations involving the fractional Laplacian and a singular operator. *Potential Anal.*, 23(1):55–81, 2005.

[Kur06] Matthias Kurzke. A nonlocal singular perturbation problem with periodic well potential. *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, 12(1):52–63 (electronic), 2006.

[Lan72] N. S. Landkof. *Foundations of modern potential theory*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1972. Translated from the Russian by A. P. Doohovskoy, Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 180.

[MK00] Ralf Metzler and Joseph Klafter. The random walk's guide to anomalous diffusion: a fractional dynamics approach. *Phys. Rep.*, 339(1):77, 2000.

[MT96] Andrew J. Majda and Esteban G. Tabak. A two-dimensional model for quasigeostrophic flow: comparison with the two-dimensional Euler flow. *Phys. D*, 98(2-4):515–522, 1996. Nonlinear phenomena in ocean dynamics (Los Alamos, NM, 1995).

[Nab52] F. R. N. Nabarro. The mathematical theory of stationary dislocations. *Advances in Physics*, 1:269–394 (1 plate), 1952.

[NS94] P. I. Naumkin and I. A. Shishmarëv. *Nonlinear nonlocal equations in the theory of waves*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1994. Translated from the Russian manuscript by Boris Gommerstadt.

[NT08] David P. Nicholls and Mark Taber. Joint analyticity and analytic continuation of Dirichlet-Neumann operators on doubly perturbed domains. *J. Math. Fluid Mech.*, 10(2):238–271, 2008.

[PS07] Patrizia Pucci and James Serrin. *The maximum principle*. Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications, 73. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2007.

[Sav08] Ovidiu Savin. Entire solutions to a class of fully nonlinear elliptic equations. *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5)*, 7(3):369–405, 2008.

[Sil05] Luis Silvestre. *Regularity of the obstacle problem for a fractional power of the Laplace operator*. PhD thesis, University of Texas at Austin, 2005.

[Ste70] Elias M. Stein. *Singular integrals and differentiability properties of functions*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1970. Princeton Mathematical Series, No. 30.

[Sto57] J. J. Stoker. *Water waves: The mathematical theory with applications*. Pure and Applied Mathematics, Vol. IV. Interscience Publishers, Inc., New York, 1957.

[SV09a] Ovidiu Savin and Enrico Valdinoci. Elliptic PDEs with fibered nonlinearities. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 19(2):420–432, 2009.

[SV09b] Yannick Sire and Enrico Valdinoci. Fractional Laplacian phase transitions and boundary reactions: a geometric inequality and a symmetry result. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 256(6):1842–1864, 2009.

[Tol97] J. F. Toland. The Peierls-Nabarro and Benjamin-Ono equations. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 145(1):136–150, 1997.

[Val08] Enrico Valdinoci. From the long jump random walk to the fractional Laplacian. *Preprint*, 2008.

[VSS06] Enrico Valdinoci, Berardino Sciunzi, and Vasile Ovidiu Savin. Flat level set regularity of p-Laplace phase transitions. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 182(858):vi+144, 2006.

[Whi74] G. B. Whitham. *Linear and nonlinear waves*. Wiley-Interscience [John Wiley & Sons], New York, 1974. Pure and Applied Mathematics.

[Zak68] V.E. Zakharov. Stability of periodic waves of finite amplitude on the surface of a deep fluid. *Zh. Prikl. Mekh. Tekh. Fiz.*, 9:86–94, 1968.