

THE SPATIALLY VARIANT FRACTIONAL LAPLACIAN *

HARBIR ANTIL[†], ANDREA N. CERETANI[‡], AND CARLOS N. RAUTENBERG[†]

Abstract. We introduce a definition of the fractional Laplacian $(-\Delta)^{s(\cdot)}$ with spatially variable order $s : \Omega \rightarrow [0, 1]$ and study the solvability of the associated Poisson problem on a bounded domain Ω . The initial motivation arises from the extension results of Caffarelli and Silvestre, and Stinga and Torrea; however the analytical tools and approaches developed here are new. For instance, in some cases we allow the variable order $s(\cdot)$ to attain the values 0 and 1 leading to a framework on weighted Sobolev spaces with non-Muckenhoupt weights. Initially, and under minimal assumptions, the operator $(-\Delta)^{s(\cdot)}$ is identified as the Lagrange multiplier corresponding to an optimization problem; and its domain is determined as a quotient space of weighted Sobolev spaces. The well-posedness of the associated Poisson problem is then obtained for data in the dual of this quotient space. Subsequently, two trace regularity results are established, allowing to partially characterize functions in the aforementioned quotient space whenever a Poincaré type inequality is available. Precise examples are provided where such inequality holds, and in this case the domain of the operator $(-\Delta)^{s(\cdot)}$ is identified with a subset of a weighted Sobolev space with spatially variant smoothness $s(\cdot)$. The latter further allows to prove the well-posedness of the Poisson problem assuming functional regularity of the data.

Key words. fractional order Sobolev space, spatially varying exponent, trace theorem, fractional Laplacian with variable exponent, Hardy-type inequalities

AMS subject classifications. 35S15, 26A33, 65R20

1. Introduction. The goal of this work is twofold: (i) introduce the spectral fractional Laplacian $(-\Delta)^{s(\cdot)}$ associated with a homogeneous Dirichlet condition on a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, $N \geq 1$, in the case the fractional order $s(\cdot)$ is spatially variable and possibly attains the values 0 and 1; (ii) study the well-posedness of the equation

$$(1) \quad \begin{aligned} (-\Delta)^{s(\cdot)} v &= h && \text{in } \Omega, \\ v &= 0 && \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{aligned}$$

for some classes of data h , and where $v = 0$ is understood in an appropriate sense.

Motivated by the extension approach in $\mathbb{R}^N$ by Caffarelli and Silvestre [5], or in bounded domains by Stinga and Torrea [17], we define $(-\Delta)^{s(\cdot)}$ to be the Lagrange multiplier associated to a suitable variational problem defined in an extended domain, for measurable functions $s(\cdot)$ with range contained in the interval $[0, 1]$. For a general class of functions $s(\cdot)$, the domain of $(-\Delta)^{s(\cdot)}$ can be identified with a quotient space

* HA and CNR were partially supported by NSF grants DMS-1913004, DMS-1818772, and 2012391. In addition, HA and ANC were partially supported by Air Force Office of Scientific Research under Award NO: FA9550-19-1-0036. ANC was also partially supported by CONICET under grant PIP 0032CO and by ANPCyT under grant PICT 2016-1022. Finally, CNR was also been supported via the framework of MATHEON by the Einstein Foundation Berlin within the ECMath project SE15/SE19 and of the Excellence Cluster Math+ Berlin within project AA4-3 and the transition project OT6, and acknowledges the support of the DFG through the DFG-SPP 1962: Priority Programme “Non-smooth and Complementarity-based Distributed Parameter Systems: Simulation and Hierarchical Optimization” within Project 11.

[†]Department of Mathematical Sciences and Center for Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence (CMAI), George Mason University, Fairfax, VA 22030, USA. hantil@gmu.edu, crautenb@gmu.edu

[‡]Department of Mathematics of the Faculty of Exact and Natural Sciences, University of Buenos Aires, and Mathematics Research Institute “Luis A. Santaló” (IMAS), CONICET, Argentina. aceretani@dm.uba.ar

$\mathcal{X}(\Omega, w)$ involving weighted Sobolev spaces,

$$(2) \quad \mathcal{X}(\Omega, w) := \mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w) / \mathcal{L}_0^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w),$$

where $\mathcal{C} = \Omega \times (0, +\infty)$ is the open semi-infinite cylinder (the extended domain) with base Ω , and w is a specific weight function. Roughly speaking, the spaces $\mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ and $\mathcal{L}_0^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ are composed of functions that vanish on the lateral boundary of $\mathcal{C}$, and on the whole boundary (including the base Ω), respectively. Equation (1) is then solvable for every h in the dual space of $\mathcal{X}(\Omega, w)$. For a smaller class of $s(\cdot)$, the domain can be identified as a subset of a weighted Lebesgue space $L^2(\Omega, \tilde{w})$ for some function $\tilde{w}$, and the equation (1) is solvable when the right hand side is in $L^2(\Omega, \tilde{w})$. For an even smaller class of functions $s(\cdot)$, this result is further improved since the domain of $(-\Delta)^{s(\cdot)}$ is identified with a subset of a weighted Sobolev space of functions with spatially variable smoothness, related to $s(\cdot)$.

The main application that has motivated this work, in addition to the natural theoretical interest, is the recent paper by the authors [2]. There, initial results on an extension approach in Hilbert spaces on an open cylinder with base Ω are given. However, the authors stopped short of defining $(-\Delta)^{s(\cdot)}$ due to the lack of a proper functional framework. The current paper aims to fill this gap. It is worth mentioning that none of the existing results in the literature are applicable to our case and new PDE and variational analysis tools are needed to study the current situation. For example, the extension approaches in [5, 17] assume $s \in (0, 1)$ to be a constant and avoid the extreme cases of 0 and 1. In this setting, the nonlocal problem $(-\Delta)^s v = h$ in Ω , where $(-\Delta)^s$ is the s -power of the realization of $-\Delta$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ with zero Dirichlet boundary conditions, can be equivalently formulated as a local one on a Sobolev space with a Muckenhoupt weight. On the other hand, our $s(\cdot)$ is a function which is allowed to touch the extreme cases 0 and 1 and therefore, the associated weights do not fulfill the Muckenhoupt property [2, Proposition 1]. In particular, fundamental results of type “ $H = W$ ” or Poincaré inequalities are not known in our case, leading to a more complex functional analytic framework.

The literature concerning possible definitions of $(-\Delta)^{s(\cdot)}$ with non-constant s is restricted to the stochastic processes and stochastic calculus approaches and considers always the unbounded case $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$; see the monograph [3] and the references therein. By means of the Lévy-Khintchine representation formula, and the Fourier transform, the operator is determined to be of Lévy type. However, strong additional assumptions on $s(\cdot)$ are required to show that the operator is associated to a Feller or a Markov process. To name a few, these include assuming that $s(\cdot)$ is Lipschitz continuous and satisfies $\varepsilon \leq s(\cdot) \leq 1 - \varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$; see [3, Example 3.5.9]. Neither of these restrictions are present in this work.

The paper is further motivated by several applications. The extension approach with spatially varying $s(\cdot)$ has shown remarkable potential in image denoising: A rough choice of $s(\cdot)$ performs better than an optimal selected regularization parameter in total variation approaches; see [2]. This is indeed a game changer, especially the variable $s(\cdot)$ approach can enable one to replace the nonlinear (and degenerate) Euler-Lagrange equations in case of total variation by a linear one in the case of the variable fractional Laplacian. Another application of variable $s(\cdot)$ is in geophysics. Recently, in [20] it was shown that the behavior of fractional Helmholtz equation matches qualitatively well with data from the USArray Magnetotelluric station located in NW of Kansas City, KS, USA. Even though so far only the constant $s(\cdot)$ case has been considered, this is a perfect place for spatially varying $s(\cdot)$ to further

obtain quantitative match. Indeed, if $s(\cdot)$ is interpreted to represent via non-locality some degree of long-range correlation of underlying material properties (e.g. electrical conductivity), then it is relevant to consider how spatial variability in this correlation is accommodated in the architecture of fractional calculus paradigm.

Outline. The notation and main assumptions we make, specially those for the variable exponent $s(\cdot)$, are specified in [Section 2](#). In [Section 3](#) we provide a succinct idea of the approach that we follow to study the fractional Laplacian with spatially variable order, $(-\Delta)^{s(\cdot)}$, which is motivated by well-known results for the usual spectral fractional Laplacian.

Our main results begin from [Section 4](#), where we introduce a definition of $(-\Delta)^{s(\cdot)}$ on the quotient space $\mathcal{X}(\Omega, w)$. Also in this section we prove the existence and uniqueness of a solution $v \in \mathcal{X}(\Omega, w)$ to the associated Poisson problem (1) for every h in the dual space of $\mathcal{X}(\Omega, h)$. It is worth mentioning that the results in [Section 4](#) require minimal conditions on the function $s(\cdot)$, the weight w , and the domain Ω . The results given in [Section 4](#), however, do not provide conditions for solvability of the Poisson problem when the right hand side of the elliptic equation is a (regular) real valued function defined only on Ω .

In a second approach, we are able to better identify the domain of $(-\Delta)^{s(\cdot)}$ as a quotient space also, now on a Sobolev space $\mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ that consist of functions in $W^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ that formally vanish on the lateral boundary of $\mathcal{C}$. Differently from the construction given in [Section 4](#), this second approach requires some extra conditions on both, $s(\cdot)$ and Ω . These conditions are intimately related with the existence of Ω -trace results for functions in $\mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$, as well as with the existence of a Poincaré inequality in $\mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$; thus, we postpone the second construction until [Section 7](#).

In [Section 5](#), we first study the Ω -traces of functions in $\mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, w)$, for $2 \leq p < \infty$. In particular, we are able to characterize $s(\cdot)$ -dependent integrability and differential regularity of restrictions of functions in $\mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ to Ω . Subsequently, we are able to prove the existence of a Poincaré inequality for $\mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ in [Section 6](#), for a special class of non-constant $s(\cdot)$ functions.

Our results finish in [Section 7](#), where the details on the second definition of $(-\Delta)^{s(\cdot)}$ are given. Here, we identify the domain of $(-\Delta)^{s(\cdot)}$ with a subset of a weighted Lebesgue space $L^2(\Omega, \tilde{w})$ for some weight $\tilde{w}$, provided $s(\cdot)$ vanishes only on a set of zero measure and a Poincaré inequality holds for functions in $\mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$. Further, we improve this result for the case when Ω is the N -dimensional unit square and $s(\cdot)$ satisfies some extra conditions. In this latter case we identify the domain of $(-\Delta)^{s(\cdot)}$ with a subset of a Sobolev space of functions with variable smoothness on Ω . The paper closes with [Section 8](#) that includes, in addition to conclusions, a number of open questions and future research directions.

As a closing remark for this introduction, it should be noted that the approach followed in this paper can be extended to problems of the type

$$(-\operatorname{div} A \nabla)^{s(\cdot)} v = h,$$

that is, involving general spatially variable fractional elliptic operators, under natural changes on the presented framework.

2. Notation and main assumptions. We assume that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, $N \geq 1$, is a non-empty bounded open set with a Lipschitz boundary $\partial\Omega$ (except in [Section 4](#), where no condition is imposed on the Ω boundary). We denote by $\mathcal{C}$ the open semi-infinite cylinder with base Ω , by $\partial_L \mathcal{C}$ the lateral boundary of $\mathcal{C}$, and by $\mathcal{C}_\Omega$ the cylinder

$\mathcal{C}$ with the base Ω , that is,

$$\mathcal{C} = \Omega \times (0, \infty), \quad \partial_L \mathcal{C} = \partial\Omega \times [0, \infty), \quad \mathcal{C}_\Omega = \mathcal{C} \cup (\Omega \times \{0\}).$$

A generic point X in $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ is denoted by (x, y) , where $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}$.

A function ρ is said to be a weight if ρ is positive and finite almost everywhere. For an open set U , and a weight ρ , we denote by $L^p(U, \rho)$ the space of measurable functions $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such

$$\|u\|_{L^p(U, \rho)} := \left(\int_{\Omega} |u(x)|^p \rho(x) \, dx \right)^{1/p} < +\infty.$$

The space $L^p(U, \rho)$ endowed with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{L^p(U, \rho)}$ is a Banach space. Further, given $p \in [2, +\infty)$ we say that a weight ρ satisfies the B_p condition, and write $\rho \in B_p$, if $\rho^{-1/(p-1)}$ is locally integrable, that is,

$$\rho \in B_p \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \rho^{-1/(p-1)} \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(U).$$

For a weight $\rho \in B_p$, we define the weighted Sobolev space $W^{1,p}(U, \rho)$ as the subset of $L^p(U, \rho)$ of functions u with weak gradients ∇u such that $|\nabla u| \in L^p(U, \rho)$. Endowed with the norm

$$\|u\|_{W^{1,p}(U, \rho)} := \left(\int_{\Omega} |u(x)|^p \rho(x) \, dx + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u(x)|^p \rho(x) \, dx \right)^{1/p} < +\infty,$$

$W^{1,p}(U, \rho)$ is a Banach space; see [12]. Notice that B_p is a larger class of weights than the Muckenhoupt A_p . The latter is also used to define weighted Sobolev spaces; see [19]. Throughout the paper we assume $p \in [2, \infty)$ and denote the (Hölder) conjugate exponent of p by p' .

The measurable function $s(\cdot) : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, which will characterize the spatially variable order of the fractional Laplacian, is assumed to satisfy:

$$(H1) \quad s(x) \in [0, 1] \text{ for almost all } x \in \Omega.$$

We use the notation $s(\cdot)$ to emphasize the dependence of the function $s : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ on the spatial variable $x \in \Omega$, and use s to denote a constant in the interval $(0, 1)$.

Throughout the paper we consider the function $w : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$w(x, y) = G_s(x) y^{1-2s(x)},$$

and such that for a given $s(\cdot)$, and p , the function $G_s : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies that

$$(H2) \quad G_s \in B_p, \text{ and if } s(\cdot) = s \in (0, 1) \text{ constant, then}$$

$$G_s(x) = \frac{2^{2s-1} \Gamma(s)}{\Gamma(1-s)}$$

for all $x \in \Omega$. Here Γ is the standard Euler-Gamma function.

Assumptions (H1) and (H2) imply that $w \in B_p$. However, it is known that (in general) w is not expected to be of Muckenhoupt type, see [2, Proposition 1].

Given $\tau > 0$, we denote by $\mathcal{C}^\tau$ the truncated cylinder $\mathcal{C}$ of height τ , that is,

$$\mathcal{C}^\tau = \Omega \times (0, \tau),$$

and define the sets $\partial_L \mathcal{C}^\tau$ and $\mathcal{C}_\Omega^\tau$ accordingly. The restriction of the weight w to $\mathcal{C}^\tau$ is also denoted by w .

EXAMPLE 2.1. A possible choice for the function $s(\cdot)$ is given by

$$s(x) = \sigma \min(\text{dist}(x, \mathcal{B}), \varepsilon),$$

where $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, $\mathcal{B} \subset \Omega$ is a closed subset with zero-measure of $\mathbb{R}^N$ and $\text{dist}(x, \mathcal{B}) = \inf\{|x-y| : y \in \mathcal{B}\}$ and $\sigma \in (0, 1)$. This type of functions are useful in image processing where the set $\mathcal{B}$ is the approximated set of edges/discontinuities of a certain image that one tries to recover; see [2].

The two examples for G_s that are of relevance to us are defined by

$$(3) \quad G_s^{(1)}(x) = 2^{2\bar{s}-1} \frac{\Gamma(\bar{s})}{\Gamma(1-\bar{s})} \quad \text{and} \quad G_s^{(2)}(x) = 2^{2s(x)-1} \frac{\Gamma(s(x))}{\Gamma(1-s(x))},$$

where $\bar{s} = \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_\Omega s(x) dx$. It follows that (H2) is satisfied given that $\sigma \in (0, 1)$.

3. The extended domain approach. This section is devoted to briefly review the well-known extension domain approach to define the spectral fractional Laplacian, see for instance [5, 8, 17]. Throughout this section, we assume that $s \in (0, 1)$ is constant.

We denote by $\{\lambda_n\}$ the sequence of eigenvalues of the Laplace operator supplemented with a Dirichlet boundary condition, and consider an orthonormal basis $\{\varphi_n\}$ of $L^2(\Omega)$ of associated eigenfunctions. The spectral fractional Laplacian is defined by

$$(4) \quad (-\Delta)^s v = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_n^s b_n \varphi_n \quad \text{where} \quad b_n = \int_\Omega v \varphi_n dx,$$

on the space

$$H = \left\{ v = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n \varphi_n \in L^2(\Omega) : \|v\|_H^2 = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_n^s b_n^2 < \infty \right\}.$$

For extensions of (4) to non-homogeneous boundary conditions, we refer to [1]. It is worth mentioning that $H = \mathbb{H}_0^s(\Omega)$ if $s \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ or $s \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ and $H = \mathbb{H}_{00}^s(\Omega)$ for $s = \frac{1}{2}$. Here, $\mathbb{H}_0^s(\Omega)$ is the closure in $\mathbb{H}^s(\Omega)$ of the space of infinitely continuous differentiable functions with compact support in Ω , and $\mathbb{H}_{00}^s(\Omega)$ is the Lions-magenes space [18]. Moreover, $\mathbb{H}^s(\Omega)$ is the fractional Sobolev space of order s ,

$$\mathbb{H}^s(\Omega) = \left\{ v \in L^2(\Omega) : \int_\Omega \int_\Omega \frac{|v(x) - v(y)|^2}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} dx dy < \infty \right\},$$

endowed with the norm

$$\|v\|_{\mathbb{H}^s(\Omega)} = \left(\int_\Omega |v|^2 dx + \int_\Omega \int_\Omega \frac{|v(x) - v(y)|^2}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} dx dy \right)^{1/2}.$$

The extension approach introduced by Caffarelli and Silvestre [6], see [7, 17] for the case of bounded domains, establishes that if $h \in H'$ (dual space of H) then the unique solution to the elliptic equation

$$\begin{aligned} (-\Delta)^s v &= h & \text{in } \Omega, \\ v &= 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{aligned}$$

is given by $v = \text{tr}_\Omega u$, where $u \in H_{0,L}^1(\mathcal{C}, y^{1-2s})$ satisfies

$$(5) \quad \langle h, \text{tr}_\Omega \psi \rangle_{H',H} = \frac{2^{2s-1}\Gamma(s)}{\Gamma(1-s)} \int_{\mathcal{C}} y^{1-2s} \nabla u \cdot \nabla \psi \, dX \quad \forall \psi \in H_{0,L}^1(\mathcal{C}, y^{1-2s}),$$

see [7, Lemma 2.2]. Here, $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H',H}$ denotes the dual pairing between H' and H . Moreover, tr_Ω is the Ω -trace operator for functions in the space

$$H_{0,L}^1(\mathcal{C}, y^{1-2s}) = \{u \in H^1(\mathcal{C}, y^{1-2s}) : u = 0 \text{ on } \partial_L \mathcal{C} \text{ in the trace sense}\}.$$

More precisely,

$$\text{tr}_\Omega : H_{0,L}^1(\mathcal{C}, y^{1-2s}) \rightarrow \mathbb{H}_0^s(\Omega),$$

is the unique bounded linear operator that satisfies $\text{tr}_\Omega u = u(\cdot, 0)$ for every $u \in C^\infty(\bar{\mathcal{C}})$ that vanishes on $\partial_L \mathcal{C}$; which is also onto over H , that is

$$(6) \quad \text{tr}_\Omega H_{0,L}^1(\mathcal{C}, w) = H,$$

see [7, Proposition 2.1].

Additionally, since the minimization problem

$$(7) \quad \begin{aligned} &\text{minimize} \quad \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{C}} y^{1-2s} |\nabla u|^2 \, dX \quad \text{over} \quad H_{0,L}^1(\mathcal{C}, y^{1-2s}), \\ &\text{subject to} \quad \text{tr}_\Omega u = v, \end{aligned}$$

admits a unique solution $u \in H_{0,L}^1(\mathcal{C}, y^{1-2s})$ for any $v \in \text{tr}_\Omega H_{0,L}^1(\mathcal{C}, w)$, the harmonic extension operator

$$\mathcal{S} : \text{tr}_\Omega H_{0,L}^1(\mathcal{C}, y^{1-2s}) \rightarrow H_{0,L}^1(\mathcal{C}, y^{1-2s}), \quad v \mapsto \mathcal{S}(v) = u,$$

where u is the solution to problem (7), is well-defined, linear, and bounded. Then one finds that the spectral fractional Laplacian given by (4) satisfies

$$(8) \quad \langle (-\Delta)^s v, \text{tr}_\Omega \psi \rangle_{H',H} = \frac{2^{2s-1}\Gamma(s)}{\Gamma(1-s)} \int_{\mathcal{C}} y^{1-2s} \nabla \mathcal{S}(v) \cdot \nabla \psi \, dX \quad \forall \psi \in H_{0,L}^1(\mathcal{C}, y^{1-2s}),$$

for all $v \in H$, which provides an equivalent definition for $(-\Delta)^s$. This second approach is our starting point to study the fractional Laplacian with spatially variable order: We identify a space of traces on which we can define the fractional Laplacian $(-\Delta)^{s(\cdot)}$ by a formula analogous to (8).

4. Abstract definition and solution to $(-\Delta)^{s(\cdot)}v = h$. We consider in this section an abstract derivation of the spatially variable fractional Laplacian $(-\Delta)^{s(\cdot)}$. The advantage of this initial approach is that it requires minimal assumptions, namely

(H1) and (H2), which are primarily sufficient conditions to have $w \in B_p$; this leads to an appropriate definition of the associated weighted Sobolev spaces. Also, it is worth noticing that the arguments in this section do not require any assumption on the regularity of the Ω boundary $\partial\Omega$. This path starts with the proper derivation of the trace space for the weighted Sobolev spaces in study. For this matter, we consider the space

$$L^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w) = \{u : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ measurable} : \nabla u \in L^2(\mathcal{C}, w)\},$$

and endow it with the semi-norm

$$\|u\|_{L^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)} := \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{C}, w)}.$$

Note that $u \mapsto \|u\|_{L^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)}$ is a norm on the subset of C^1 functions in $L^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ that vanish at $\partial\mathcal{C}$ or $\partial_L\mathcal{C}$. Subsequently, we define $\mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ and $\mathcal{L}_0^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ as the completion in $L^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ of the infinitely differentiable functions in $L^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ with compact support in $\mathcal{C}_\Omega$ and $\mathcal{C}$, respectively, that is:

$$\mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w) := \text{completion of } C_c^\infty(\mathcal{C}_\Omega) \cap L^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w) \text{ for } \|\cdot\|_{L^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)},$$

$$\mathcal{L}_0^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w) := \text{completion of } C_c^\infty(\mathcal{C}) \cap L^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w) \text{ for } \|\cdot\|_{L^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)},$$

where

$$(9) \quad C_c^\infty(\mathcal{C}_\Omega) = \{u \in C^\infty(\bar{\mathcal{C}}) : \text{supp}(u) \cap \partial_L\mathcal{C} = \emptyset\}.$$

The only portion of the boundary where functions in $C_c^\infty(\mathcal{C}_\Omega)$ do not necessarily vanish is the Ω cap. A few words are in order concerning $\mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ and $\mathcal{L}_0^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$. Note that $C_c^\infty(\mathcal{C}_\Omega) \cap L^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ and $C_c^\infty(\mathcal{C}) \cap L^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ are both pre-Hilbert spaces when endowed with the inner product

$$(u_1, u_2)_{L^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)} = \int_{\mathcal{C}} w \nabla u_1 \cdot \nabla u_2 \, dX.$$

It follows then that their completion, $\mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ and $\mathcal{L}_0^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$, are Hilbert spaces; in particular for $z_1, z_2 \in \mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ there exist Cauchy sequences $\{z_1^n\}$ and $\{z_2^n\}$ in $C_c^\infty(\mathcal{C}_\Omega) \cap L^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ such that

$$(z_1, z_2)_{\mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)} := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{C}} w \nabla z_1^n \cdot \nabla z_2^n \, dX.$$

If there is no risk of confusion, and in order to simplify notation, occasionally we simply write

$$(z_1, z_2)_{\mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)} = \int_{\mathcal{C}} w \nabla z_1 \cdot \nabla z_2 \, dX,$$

and analogously we treat $\mathcal{L}_0^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$.

Given that $C_c^\infty(\mathcal{C}) \cap L^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w) \subset C_c^\infty(\mathcal{C}_\Omega) \cap L^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$, then we observe that $\mathcal{L}_0^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ is a closed subspace of $\mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$. Thus, we can define an abstract space of traces on Ω of functions in $\mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ as the quotient space

$$\mathcal{X}(\Omega, w) := \mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w) / \mathcal{L}_0^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w).$$

We then define

$$\mathrm{Tr}_\Omega u := [u],$$

i.e., the abstract trace on Ω of a function $u \in \mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ is identified with the equivalence class $[u]$ that contains u . The space $\mathcal{X}(\Omega, w)$ is then endowed with the usual norm

$$\|\mathrm{Tr}_\Omega u\|_{\mathcal{X}(\Omega, w)} = \|[u]\|_{\mathcal{X}(\Omega, w)} := \inf\{\|u - z\|_{\mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)} : z \in \mathcal{L}_0^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)\}.$$

Note that

$$(10) \quad \mathrm{Tr}_\Omega : \mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w) \rightarrow \mathcal{X}(\Omega, w),$$

is a linear and bounded operator, and that $\mathcal{X}(\Omega, w)$ is a Hilbert space, given that $\mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ and $\mathcal{L}_0^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ are also Hilbert spaces. We denote its inner product as $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\mathcal{X}}$. Further notice that, by definition, $\mathrm{Tr}_\Omega \mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w) = \mathcal{X}(\Omega, w)$. Unless it is not clear from the context, we denote the class $[v] \in \mathcal{X}(\Omega, w)$ simply by v . The following result establishes the existence of the harmonic extension operator.

THEOREM 1. *Let $v \in \mathcal{X}(\Omega, w)$ and $\mu > 0$. The minimization problem:*

$$(\mathbb{P}_{\mu, v}) \quad \text{minimize } J_\mu(u, v) \quad \text{over } \mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w),$$

for

$$J_\mu(u, v) := \frac{1}{2}\|u\|_{\mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)}^2 + \frac{\mu}{2}\|\mathrm{Tr}_\Omega u - v\|_{\mathcal{X}(\Omega, w)}^2,$$

admits a unique solution $u_\mu \in \mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ that, as $\mu \rightarrow \infty$, converges strongly to the unique solution to

$$(\mathbb{P}_v) \quad \begin{aligned} &\text{minimize } J(u) \quad \text{over } \mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w), \\ &\text{subject to } \mathrm{Tr}_\Omega u = v, \end{aligned}$$

for

$$J(u) := \frac{1}{2}\|u\|_{\mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)}^2$$

Proof. The existence of a solution $\{u_\mu\}$ to $(\mathbb{P}_{\mu, v})$ follows from arguments of the direct methods for calculus of variations: The functional $u \mapsto J_\mu(u, v)$ is non-negative, coercive, and weakly lower semicontinuous; for the latter part note that $\mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w) \ni w \mapsto \|\mathrm{Tr}_\Omega w\|_{\mathcal{X}(\Omega, w)}$ is also weakly lower semicontinuous. Uniqueness follows from the strict convexity of $u \mapsto J_\mu(u, v)$.

Since $v \in \mathcal{X}(\Omega, w)$, there exists $\tilde{u} \in \mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ such that $v = [\tilde{u}] = \mathrm{Tr}_\Omega \tilde{u}$. Thus, given that u_μ is a minimizer of $J_\mu(\cdot, v)$,

$$(11) \quad J_\mu(u_\mu, v) \leq J_\mu(\tilde{u}, v) = J(\tilde{u}),$$

for every $\mu > 0$. Then, by basic theory for penalty functions (see [13, Lemma 1 in Chapter 10]) we have that

$$(12) \quad \lim_{\mu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mu}{2} \|\mathrm{Tr}_\Omega u_\mu - v\|_{\mathcal{X}(\Omega, w)}^2 = 0.$$

Thus, by (11) we have that the sequence $\{u_\mu\}$ is bounded in $\mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$, so it admits a weakly convergent subsequence, say

$$(13) \quad u_{\mu'} \rightharpoonup u \quad \text{in } \mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w).$$

Further, by (12) we observe that $\text{Tr}_\Omega u = v$. Next we show that $J(u_\mu) \rightarrow J(u)$ with u being the minimizer to $(\mathbb{P}_v)$. By weak lower semicontinuity of J and (12), we observe:

$$J(u) \leq \liminf_{\mu' \rightarrow \infty} J(u_{\mu'}) \leq \overline{\lim}_{\mu' \rightarrow \infty} J(u_{\mu'}) = \overline{\lim}_{\mu' \rightarrow \infty} J_{\mu'}(u_{\mu'}, v) \leq \overline{\lim}_{\mu' \rightarrow \infty} J_{\mu'}(u, v) = J(u),$$

that is $J(u_{\mu'}) \rightarrow J(u)$. The fact that u is a minimizer to $(\mathbb{P}_v)$ follows by selecting an arbitrary $\tilde{u}$ such that $\text{Tr}_\Omega \tilde{u} = v$, then the previous to last inequality above yield

$$J(u) \leq \overline{\lim}_{\mu' \rightarrow \infty} J_{\mu'}(\tilde{u}, v) = J(\tilde{u}),$$

i.e., u is a minimizer. Further, by strict convexity, minimizers to $(\mathbb{P}_v)$ are unique, so that the entire sequence $\{u_\mu\}$ satisfies

$$(14) \quad u_\mu \rightharpoonup u \quad \text{in } \mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w),$$

and also $J(u_\mu) \rightarrow J(u)$. Using (12), this limit is equivalent to

$$\lim_{\mu \rightarrow \infty} \|u_\mu\|_{\mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)} = \|u\|_{\mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)},$$

which together with (14) implies that

$$(15) \quad u_\mu \rightarrow u \quad \text{in } \mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w);$$

see [4, Proposition 3.32]. □

Theorem 1 ensures the existence of the abstract weighted harmonic extension operator

$$S : \text{Tr}_\Omega \mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w), \quad v \mapsto S(v) = u.$$

where u is the solution to $(\mathbb{P}_v)$. In addition, the map S is linear and bounded: Linearity follows directly from the examination of the first order conditions. For boundedness, consider (11) with $u - z$ instead of $\tilde{u}$, where u solves $(\mathbb{P}_v)$ and $z \in \mathcal{L}_0^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$, to obtain $J_\mu(u_\mu, v) \leq J(u - z)$. Then, by taking the limit as $\mu \rightarrow \infty$ we observe

$$\|S(v)\|_{\mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)} = \|u\|_{\mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)} \leq \|u - z\|_{\mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)}.$$

Then, by considering the infimum over all $z \in \mathcal{L}_0^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$, we obtain

$$\|S(v)\|_{\mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)} \leq \|v\|_{\mathcal{X}(\Omega, w)}.$$

The well-posedness of the map S allows us to establish a definition for the fractional Laplacian with spatially variable order.

DEFINITION 2. Let $\mathcal{X}(\Omega, w)'$ be the dual space of $\mathcal{X}(\Omega, w)$. The operator

$$(-\Delta)^{s(\cdot)} : \mathcal{X}(\Omega, w) \rightarrow \mathcal{X}(\Omega, w)'$$

is determined as follows: for $v \in \mathcal{X}(\Omega, w)$, then $(-\Delta)^{s(\cdot)}v \in \mathcal{X}(\Omega, w)'$ is defined by

$$(16) \quad \langle (-\Delta)^{s(\cdot)}v, \text{Tr}_\Omega \psi \rangle_{\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{X}} = (S(v), \psi)_{\mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)}, \quad \forall \psi \in \mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w).$$

REMARK 1. The relation of the above definition with the classical spectral fractional Laplacian (8) is straightforward in light of the abuse of notation disclosed at the beginning of the chapter; in which case we can write

$$\langle (-\Delta)^{s(\cdot)}v, \text{Tr}_\Omega \psi \rangle_{\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{X}} = \int_{\mathcal{C}} w \nabla S(v) \cdot \nabla \psi \, dX, \quad \forall \psi \in \mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w).$$

Furthermore, by a formal integration-by-parts formula and using the fact that $S(v)$ is weighted harmonic, we obtain that $(-\Delta)^{s(\cdot)}$ is equal to the generalized Neumann trace of $S(v)$ when restricted to $\Omega \times \{0\}$. In other words, similarly to the classical case where $s(\cdot)$ is a constant, the variable order fractional Laplacian can also be interpreted as the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map.

REMARK 2. In view of Theorem 1, the expression in (16) is equivalent to

$$\langle (-\Delta)^{s(\cdot)}v, \text{Tr}_\Omega \psi \rangle_{\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{X}} = \lim_{\mu \rightarrow \infty} \mu (\text{Tr}_\Omega u_\mu - v, \text{Tr}_\Omega \psi)_{\mathcal{X}}, \quad \forall \psi \in \mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w),$$

where u_μ is the unique solution to $(\mathbb{P}_{\mu, v})$.

The operator $(-\Delta)^{s(\cdot)} : \mathcal{X}(\Omega, w) \rightarrow \mathcal{X}(\Omega, w)'$ is well-defined as we see next, and it can be seen as the Lagrange multiplier associated to the harmonic extension problem.

PROPOSITION 3. For each $v \in \mathcal{X}(\Omega, w)$, there exists a unique $\lambda = \lambda(v) \in \mathcal{X}(\Omega, w)'$ such that

$$\langle \lambda, \text{Tr}_\Omega \psi \rangle_{\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{X}} = (S(v), \psi)_{\mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)} \quad \forall \psi \in \mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w).$$

Proof. Initially, note that $S(v)$ is the solution to $(\mathbb{P}_v)$. For convenience, we write the constraint in $(\mathbb{P}_v)$ as $G(u) = 0$, where $G : \mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w) \rightarrow \mathcal{X}(\Omega, w)$ is defined by $G(u) = \text{Tr}_\Omega u - v$. Since the operator Tr_Ω is linear and bounded, also it is G , and hence $G'(u)h = \text{Tr}_\Omega h$. Thus, $G'(u) : \mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w) \rightarrow \mathcal{X}(\Omega, w)$ is linear, bounded, and surjective. Therefore, there exists a unique Lagrange multiplier $\lambda \in \mathcal{X}(\Omega, w)'$ such that

$$J'(S(v))\psi = \lambda \circ G'(S(v))\psi, \quad \forall \psi \in \mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$$

which proves the statement. $\square$

In view of Remark 1, we can also interpret λ as the Neumann trace of the extension onto $\Omega \times \{0\}$.

REMARK 3. It follows that $(-\Delta)^{s(\cdot)} : \mathcal{X}(\Omega, w) \rightarrow \mathcal{X}(\Omega, w)'$ is a bounded linear operator given that S is linear and bounded.

We are now able to determine existence of solutions to the Poisson problem with spatially variant Laplacian.

THEOREM 4. Let $h \in \mathcal{X}(\Omega, w)'$. The equation

$$(17) \quad (-\Delta)^{s(\cdot)} v = h,$$

admits a unique solution in $\mathcal{X}(\Omega, w)$ that is given by $v = \text{Tr}_\Omega u$, where u solves

$$(18) \quad \text{minimize } \mathcal{J}(u) \quad \text{over } \mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w),$$

for

$$\mathcal{J}(u) := \frac{1}{2} \|u\|_{\mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)}^2 - \langle h, \text{Tr}_\Omega u \rangle_{\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{X}}.$$

Proof. Since Tr_Ω is linear and bounded, we have that

$$u \mapsto \langle h, \text{Tr}_\Omega u \rangle_{\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{X}},$$

is a linear functional over $\mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$. Then, there exists a solution to the problem (18) and the solution is unique due to strict convexity of $\mathcal{J}$.

Note that via necessary and sufficient conditions of optimality for (18), the unique solution u satisfies:

$$(19) \quad (u, \psi)_{\mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)} = \langle h, \text{Tr}_\Omega \psi \rangle_{\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{X}} \quad \forall \psi \in \mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w),$$

and then u is identical to its harmonic extension, i.e., $u = S(\text{Tr}_\Omega u)$. To see the latter, we consider $\psi \in C_c^\infty(\mathcal{C}) \cap \mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ in (19) and observe that by density

$$(20) \quad (u, \psi)_{\mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)} = 0 \quad \forall \psi \in \mathcal{L}_0^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w),$$

where we have used the fact that the functions in $C_c^\infty(\mathcal{C})$ vanish on $\Omega \times \{0\}$. Moreover, we also (trivially) have $\text{Tr}_\Omega S(\text{Tr}_\Omega u) = \text{Tr}_\Omega u$ so that u satisfies first order optimality conditions for $(\mathbb{P}_v)$ for $v = \text{Tr}_\Omega u$. Hence, by convexity (uniqueness) $u = S(\text{Tr}_\Omega u)$. Also, by definition of the operator $(-\Delta)^{s(\cdot)}$ and (19), we have

$$(21) \quad \langle (-\Delta)^{s(\cdot)} \text{Tr}_\Omega u, \text{Tr}_\Omega \psi \rangle_{\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{X}} = (S(\text{Tr}_\Omega u), \psi)_{\mathcal{L}_0^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)} = \langle h, \text{Tr}_\Omega \psi \rangle_{\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{X}},$$

for all $\psi \in \mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ and hence $\text{Tr}_\Omega u$ solves (17).

To prove uniqueness, consider a solution v to (17) with $h = 0$ and notice that

$$(S(v), \psi)_{\mathcal{L}_0^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)} = 0 \quad \forall \psi \in \mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w).$$

Then, $S(v)$ satisfies first order optimality conditions for

$$\text{minimize } \frac{1}{2} \|u\|_{\mathcal{L}_0^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)}^2 \quad \text{over } \mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w),$$

whose unique minimizer is the zero function. Then, by convexity, $S(v) = 0$, so that $v = \text{Tr}_\Omega S(v)$ and hence $v = 0$. $\square$

REMARK 4 (Truncated cylinder $\mathcal{C}^\tau$). It is worth mentioning that exactly the same construction with $\mathcal{C}$ replaced by the truncated cylinder $\mathcal{C}^\tau$, $\tau > 0$, leads to a definition of $(-\Delta)^{s(\cdot)}$ by means of an extension problem on $\mathcal{C}^\tau$, as well as to the existence and uniqueness of solution to the associated Poisson problem. We care about $\mathcal{C}^\tau$ because it makes the problem tractable from an implementation point of view [2, 15].

A few words are in order concerning [Theorem 4](#); although it provides a solvability result for the elliptic problem, it does not establish existence of solutions based on maps defined on Ω . That is, we would like to address the question: Under what conditions on $h : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, does the equation $(-\Delta)^{s(\cdot)}v = h$ admit a solution? This question is answered in [Section 7](#) and it is intimately related to the following trace results.

5. Trace theorems. In this section we identify a trace operator that properly relates values of maps on a Sobolev space in $\mathcal{C}$ to their values at Ω . For this matter, in addition to [\(H1\)](#) and [\(H2\)](#), we assume that the measurable function $s(\cdot)$ satisfies:

(H3) The set of points on which $s(\cdot)$ is zero has measure zero, i.e., $|A_0| = 0$ where

$$A_0 := \{x \in \Omega : s(x) = 0\}.$$

We define $\mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ to be the closure in $W^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ of the infinitely differentiable functions in $W^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ with compact support in $\mathcal{C}_\Omega$, that is,

$$\mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, w) = \overline{C_c^\infty(\mathcal{C}_\Omega) \cap W^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, w)}^{W^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, w)},$$

where $C_c^\infty(\mathcal{C}_\Omega)$ is given in [\(9\)](#). Then, formally speaking, $\mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ is the set of functions in $W^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ that vanish on $\partial_L \mathcal{C}$. We now prove the regularity of restrictions of functions in $\mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ on the Ω boundary.

THEOREM 5 (TRACE THEOREM). *Provided that [\(H1\)](#), [\(H2\)](#), and [\(H3\)](#) hold true, there exists a unique bounded linear operator*

$$\text{tr}_\Omega : \mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, w) \rightarrow L^p(\Omega, \tilde{w}),$$

that satisfies $\text{tr}_\Omega u = u(\cdot, 0)$ for all $u \in \mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, w) \cap C_c^\infty(\mathcal{C}_\Omega)$, where the weight $\tilde{w} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$\tilde{w}(x) = G_s(x)(p - 2 - 2s(x))^p.$$

The same statement is true if we replace $\mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ by the space $\mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}^\tau, w)$, for every $\tau > 0$.

Proof. For the sake of brevity, we define $\delta(\cdot) := 1 - 2s(\cdot)$ so that

$$\tilde{w}(x) = G_s(x)(p - 1 - \delta(x))^p.$$

Let $u \in \mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, w) \cap C_c^\infty(\mathcal{C}_\Omega)$ and $(x, y) \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}$ be such that $s(x) \neq 0$ and $G_s(x) \neq 0$. Initially, we write

$$(22) \quad u(x, 0) = u(x, y) - \int_0^1 y D_{N+1} u(x, ty) \, dt,$$

where $D_{N+1}u$ is the partial derivative of u with respect to the $(N + 1)$ coordinate.

Let $\sigma \in (0, 1)$. Multiplying [\(22\)](#) by $w(x, y)^{1/p}$ and then integrating from 0 to σ with respect to y , we find:

$$|u(x, 0)| \int_0^\sigma w(x, y)^{1/p} dy \leq I_1 + I_2,$$

where:

$$I_1 := \int_0^\sigma |u(x, y)| w(x, y)^{1/p} dy,$$

$$I_2 := \int_0^1 \int_0^\sigma y |D_{N+1} u(x, ty)| w(x, y)^{1/p} dy dt.$$

Now, we notice that $\int_0^\sigma w(x, y)^{1/p} dy = G_s(x) \int_0^\sigma y^{\delta(x)/p} dy$ and that

$$\int_0^\sigma y^{\delta(x)/p} dy \geq \int_0^\sigma y^{1/p} dy = \frac{p}{1+p} \sigma^{\frac{1+p}{p}} > 0,$$

since $\sigma \in (0, 1)$ and $\delta(x) \leq 1$. Thus,

$$|u(x, 0)| G_s(x)^{1/p} \leq \frac{p+1}{p \sigma^{(1+p)/p}} (I_1 + I_2).$$

Multiplying the last expression by $(p-1-\delta(x))$, we obtain:

$$(23) \quad |u(x, 0)| \tilde{w}(x)^{1/p} \leq \frac{p+1}{p \sigma^{(1+p)/p}} (p-1-\delta(x)) (I_1 + I_2).$$

Next, we shall estimate I_1 and I_2 . A direct use of the Hölder's inequality yields:

$$I_1 \leq \sigma^{1/p'} \left(\int_0^\sigma |u(x, y)|^p w(x, y) dy \right)^{1/p}.$$

We now estimate I_2 in several steps. With the change of variables $y = zt^{-1}$ in the inner integral of I_2 , we obtain:

$$(24) \quad I_2 \leq \sigma \int_0^1 \int_0^{t\sigma} |D_{N+1} u(x, z)| w(x, z)^{1/p} t^{-1-\delta(x)/p} dz dt.$$

By adding and subtracting $(1+\delta(x))/pp'$ in the exponent of t , we rewrite the r.h.s. of (24) as

$$\sigma \int_0^1 t^{-\frac{1+\delta(x)}{pp'}} \int_0^{t\sigma} F(x, z) t^{\frac{1-pp'+(1-p')\delta(x)}{pp'}} dz dt,$$

where $F(x, z) = D_{N+1} u(x, z) w(x, z)^{1/p}$. Then, by the Hölder's inequality, we find:

$$I_2 \leq \sigma \left(\int_0^1 t^{-\frac{1+\delta(x)}{p}} dt \right)^{1/p'} \left(\int_0^1 \left(\int_0^{t\sigma} F(x, z) t^{\frac{1-pp'+(1-p')\delta(x)}{pp'}} dz \right)^p dt \right)^{1/p}$$

$$= \sigma \left(\frac{p}{p-1-\delta(x)} \right)^{1/p'} \left(\int_0^1 \left(\int_0^{t\sigma} F(x, z) t^{\frac{1-pp'+(1-p')\delta(x)}{pp'}} dz \right)^p dt \right)^{1/p}.$$

Applying the Hölder's inequality on the integral with respect to z , we obtain:

$$I_2 \leq \sigma \left(\frac{p}{p-1-\delta(x)} \right)^{1/p'} \left(\int_0^1 (\sigma t)^{p/p'} \int_0^{\sigma t} F(x, z)^p t^{\frac{1-pp'+(1-p')\delta(x)}{p'}} dz dt \right)^{1/p}$$

$$\leq \sigma \left(\frac{p}{p-1-\delta(x)} \right)^{1/p'} \left(\int_0^1 (\sigma t)^{p/p'} \int_0^\sigma F(x, z)^p t^{\frac{1-pp'+(1-p')\delta(x)}{p'}} dz dt \right)^{1/p}$$

$$= \sigma^{1+p/p'} \left(\frac{p}{p-1-\delta(x)} \right)^{1/p'} \left(\int_0^1 t^{-\frac{1+\delta(x)}{p}} dt \right)^{1/p} \left(\int_0^\sigma F(x, z)^p dz \right)^{1/p}.$$

Finally, we have:

$$I_2 \leq \frac{p\sigma^{1+p/p'}}{p-1-\delta(x)} \left(\int_0^\sigma |D_{N+1}u(x,z)|^p w(x,z) dz \right)^{1/p}.$$

Using the above estimations for I_1 and I_2 in (23), and observing that $p-1-\delta(x) \leq p$, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} |u(x,0)|\tilde{w}(x)^{1/p} &\leq (p+1)\sigma^{-2/p} \left(\int_0^\sigma |u(x,y)|^p w(x,y) dy \right)^{1/p} \\ &\quad + (p+1)\sigma^{p-1-1/p} \left(\int_0^\sigma |D_{N+1}u(x,z)|^p w(x,z) dz \right)^{1/p}, \end{aligned}$$

from which we have:

(25)

$$|u(x,0)|\tilde{w}(x)^{1/p} \leq (p+1)\sigma^{-2/p'} \left(\int_0^\sigma (|u(x,y)|^p + |D_{N+1}u(x,y)|^p) w(x,y) dy \right)^{1/p},$$

since $\sigma^{p-1-1/p} \leq \sigma^{-2/p}$.

Raising inequality (25) to the p power and then integrating over Ω , we find:

$$\int_\Omega |u(x,0)|^p \tilde{w}(x) dx \leq (p+1)^p \sigma^{-2p/p'} \left(\|u\|_{L^p(\mathcal{C},w)}^p + \|\nabla u\|_{L^p(\mathcal{C},w)}^p \right).$$

Therefore, $u(\cdot, 0) \in L^p(\Omega, \tilde{w})$ and

$$\|u(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^p(\Omega, \tilde{w})} \leq C(p, \sigma) \|u\|_{W^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, w)},$$

where $C(p, \sigma) = (p+1)\sigma^{-2/p'}$. Notice that σ is an arbitrary, but fixed, number in $(0, 1)$, so that in this case we can fix $C(p, \sigma)$ to depend only on p . The operator tr_Ω is the unique bounded linear extension of the mapping $u(x, y) \mapsto u(x, 0)$ to $\mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, w)$.

Let us finally see that the same trace result holds true when we replace $\mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ by $\mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}^\tau, w^\tau)$, where $\tau > 0$. If $\tau \geq 1$, it follows from (25) that

$$|u(x,0)|\tilde{w}(x)^{1/p} \leq (p+1)\sigma^{-2/p'} \left(\int_0^\tau (|u(x,y)|^p + |D_{N+1}u(x,y)|^p) w(x,y) dy \right)^{1/p},$$

from which, exactly as before, we find

$$(26) \quad \|u(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^p(\Omega, \tilde{w})} \leq C(p, \sigma) \|u\|_{W^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}^\tau, w^\tau)}.$$

If, on the contrary, $0 < \tau < 1$, then we select $\sigma = \tau$ in (25) and obtain (26) in the same way. The trace operator is now obtained as before. $\square$

REMARK 5. If $s(\cdot) = s \in (0, 1)$ is constant, then both $\tilde{w}$ and G_s are also constants. Hence, $L^p(\Omega, \tilde{w}) = L^p(\Omega)$ and $\mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, w) = \mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, y^{1-2s})$, so it follows from Theorem 5 that

$$\text{tr}_\Omega : \mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, y^{1-2s}) \rightarrow L^p(\Omega).$$

This is in accordance to the classical case, see [14, Theorem 3.2]. If, additionally, $p = 2$, then we observe that tr_Ω and the trace operator given in [7] (see also Section 3) coincide for functions in $C_c^\infty(\mathcal{C}_\Omega)$. From this, we find that tr_Ω is just given by the restriction to $\mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, y^{1-2s}) \subset H_{0,L}^1(\mathcal{C}, y^{1-2s})$ of the map in [7]. However, a deeper result is true; see Theorem 15.

In [Theorem 5](#), we have characterized the integrability of functions in the trace space of $\mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, w)$. We aim now to identify the “smoothness” of functions in this trace space. This is a more complicated task since we aim at determining a space with a spatially variable smoothness associated to the function $s(\cdot)$.

For simplicity, from now on we assume that Ω is the N -dimensional unit square $\mathbb{Q}_N = (0, 1)^N$. The forthcoming analysis requires one final assumption on the functions $s(\cdot)$ and G_s :

(H4) For almost every $x_j, z \in (0, 1)$, $j \neq i$, and $i = 1, \dots, N$, it holds true that

$$\int_0^1 \left(G_s(x) |x_i - z|^{1-2s(x)} \right)^{1-p'} dx_i < \infty,$$

where $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$.

Assumption (H4) enables us to use a Hardy-type inequality (see [Lemma 9](#) below) for two specially chosen weights, which is a key ingredient to prove the subsequent improvement of the trace result in [Theorem 10](#).

EXAMPLE 5.1. Let $\Omega = \mathbb{Q}_1$, $p = 2$, and $G_s = G_s^{(1)}$ constant; see (3) in [Example 2.1](#). Suppose that $s(\cdot)$ satisfies:

$$(27) \quad s(x) \geq m|x - x_0|^q \quad \text{if} \quad |x - x_0| > R, \quad s(x) > \mu > 0 \quad \text{if} \quad |x - x_0| < R,$$

for some $q, R \in (0, 1)$, $m, \mu > 0$, and $x_0 \in (R, 1 - R)$. Notice that the only point where s is allowed to be zero is x_0 . For this particular setting, although $w \notin A_p(\mathcal{C})$, i.e., w is not a Muckenhoupt weight (see [2]), we find that (H4) holds true as we see next.

To simplify the notation below, we write $\delta(\cdot) := 1 - 2s(\cdot)$. Since $\delta(x)(1 - p') = -\delta(x) > -1$ for all $x \neq x_0$, we have:

$$\int_0^1 |x - z|^{-\delta(x)} dz = \frac{x^{2s(x)} + (1 - x)^{2s(x)}}{2s(x)} \quad \forall x \neq x_0.$$

Then,

$$\int_0^1 \left(\int_0^1 |x - z|^{-\delta(x)} dz \right) dx \leq \int_0^1 \frac{1}{s(x)} dx.$$

We now observe that, by (27), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 \frac{1}{s(x)} dx &= \int_0^{x_0-R} \frac{dx}{s(x)} + \int_{x_0-R}^{x_0+R} \frac{dx}{s(x)} + \int_{x_0+R}^1 \frac{dx}{s(x)} \\ &\leq \frac{2}{\mu}(1 - 2R) + \frac{1}{m} \int_{x_0-R}^{x_0+R} |x - x_0|^{-q} dx < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\int_0^1 \left(\int_0^1 |x - z|^{-\delta(x)} dz \right) dx < \infty.$$

Therefore, by Tonelli's Theorem, we have that $(x, z) \mapsto |x - z|^{-\delta(x)}$ belongs to $L^1(\mathbb{Q}_2)$, which in turn implies that

$$\int_0^1 |x - z|^{-\delta(x)} dx < \infty,$$

for almost all $z \in (0, 1)$, by Fubini's Theorem.

Minor changes in the above arguments yield the same conclusion for functions s with a finite number of zeros and a local behavior as (27) around each of them.

Next, in Definition 6 we present a Sobolev space of functions where smoothness is spatially dependent and related to $s(\cdot)$. First, we introduce the required notation.

For $i = 1, \dots, N$, let $\varphi_i, \psi_i : \mathbb{Q}_{N+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be given by

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_i(x, \tau) &= \Phi_i(x, \tau)^{1-p'} \left(\int_{\min\{x_i, \tau\}}^{\max\{x_i, \tau\}} \Phi_i(x_{t'}, \tau)^{1-p'} dt' \right)^{-p}, \\ \psi_i(x, \tau) &= \Phi_i(x, \tau)^{1-p'} \left(\int_{\min\{x_i, \tau\}}^{\max\{x_i, \tau\}} \Phi_i(x, \tau')^{1-p'} d\tau' \right)^{-p},\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Phi_i(x, \tau) = G_s(x) |x_i - \tau|^{1-2s(x)}$$

and the notation x_a^i for $a \in (0, 1)$ means that the i th-coordinate of $x = (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathbb{Q}_N$ is replaced by a , that is:

$$x_a^i = (x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, a, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_N).$$

DEFINITION 6. The space $\mathbb{W}^{s(\cdot), p}(\mathbb{Q}_N, \tilde{w}, w_1, \dots, w_N)$ is defined by

$$(28) \quad \mathbb{W}^{s(\cdot), p}(\mathbb{Q}_N, \tilde{w}, w_1, \dots, w_N) = \{v \in L^p(\mathbb{Q}_N, \tilde{w}) : A_i(v) < \infty \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, N\},$$

with the norm

$$(29) \quad \|v\|_{\mathbb{W}^{s(\cdot), p}(\mathbb{Q}_N, \tilde{w}, w_1, \dots, w_N)} = \left(\|v\|_{L^p(\mathbb{Q}_N, \tilde{w})}^p + \sum_{i=1}^N A_i(v) \right)^{1/p},$$

where

$$A_i(v) = \underbrace{\int_0^1 \dots \int_0^1}_{(N-1)\text{-fold}} \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^1 w_i(x_t^i, \tau) |v(x_t^i) - v(x_\tau^i)|^p d\tau dt \right) dx_1 \dots dx_{i-1} dx_{i+1} \dots dx_N,$$

and

$$w_i = \min\{\varphi_i, \psi_i\} \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, N.$$

In order to address that $s(\cdot)$ controls locally the differential regularity of elements in $\mathbb{W}^{s(\cdot), p}(\mathbb{Q}_N, \tilde{w}, w_1, \dots, w_N)$, consider the following. For $s \in (0, 1)$, let $W^{s, p}(Q_N)$ be the fractional Sobolev space of order s , that is,

$$W^{s, p}(Q_N) = \left\{ v \in L^2(Q_N) : \int_{Q_N} \int_{Q_N} \frac{|v(x) - v(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{N+ps}} dx dy < \infty \right\},$$

equipped with the norm

$$\|v\|_{W^{s, p}(Q_N)} = \left(\|v\|_{L^p(Q_N)}^p + \int_{Q_N} \int_{Q_N} \frac{|v(x) - v(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{N+ps}} dx dy \right)^{1/p}.$$

If $p = 2$, we have $\mathbb{H}^s(Q_N) = W^{1,2}(Q_N)$. Then, note the following lemma that can be found in [14] (see also [11]).

LEMMA 7. *Let $-1 < \varepsilon < p - 1$. There exists a positive constant c such that*

$$\|v\|_{W^{1-\frac{1+\varepsilon}{p},p}(Q_N)} \leq c \left(\|v\|_{L^p(Q_N)}^p + \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{A}_i(v) \right),$$

for every $v \in L^p(Q_N)$ that satisfies $\mathcal{A}_i(v) < \infty$ for all $i = 1, \dots, N$, where

$$\mathcal{A}_i(v) := \underbrace{\int_0^1 \dots \int_0^1}_{(N-1)\text{-fold}} \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^1 \frac{|v(x_t^i) - v(x_\tau^i)|^p}{|t - \tau|^{p-\varepsilon}} d\tau dt \right) dx_1 \dots dx_{i-1} dx_{i+1} \dots dx_N.$$

We now can show the relation between $\mathbb{W}^{s(\cdot),p}(Q_N, \tilde{w}, w_1, \dots, w_N)$ and the classical Sobolev spaces.

THEOREM 8. *If $s(\cdot) = s \in (0, 1)$ constant, then*

$$\mathbb{W}^{s(\cdot),p}(Q_N, \tilde{w}, w_1, \dots, w_N) \hookrightarrow W^{1-\frac{2(1-s)}{p},p}(Q_N).$$

Proof. Let $\delta := 1 - 2s$ and consider $t, \tau \in (0, 1)$. Since $\delta(1 - p') > -1$, we have:

$$\int_{\min\{t,\tau\}}^{\max\{t,\tau\}} |t - \tau|^{\delta(1-p')} dt' = \int_{\min\{t,\tau\}}^{\max\{t,\tau\}} |t - \tau'|^{\delta(1-p')} d\tau' = \frac{|t - \tau|^{1+\delta(1-p')}}{1 + \delta(1 - p')}.$$

Then, a direct calculation yields:

$$\varphi_i(x, \tau) = \psi_i(x, \tau) = \frac{G_s(1 + \delta(1 - p'))^p}{|x_i - \tau|^{p-\delta}},$$

for all $(x, \tau) \in Q_{N+1}$ since G_s is constant by assumption (H2). Therefore,

$$A_i(v) = C(p, s) \underbrace{\int_0^1 \dots \int_0^1}_{(N-1)\text{-fold}} \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^1 \frac{|v(x_t^i) - v(x_\tau^i)|^p}{|t - \tau|^{p-\delta}} d\tau dt \right) dx_1 \dots dx_{i-1} dx_{i+1} \dots dx_N,$$

where $C(p, s) = G_s(1 + \delta(1 - p'))^p$. In addition, we notice that $L^1(Q_N, \tilde{w}) = L^1(Q_N)$ since $\tilde{w}$ is constant. Now the conclusion follows from Lemma 7 with $\varepsilon = \delta$. $\square$

REMARK 6. *In light of the previous result, it seems that a more appropriate notation for $\mathbb{W}^{s(\cdot),p}(Q_N, \tilde{w}, w_1, \dots, w_N)$ would be $\mathbb{W}^{1-\frac{2(1-s(\cdot))}{p},p}(Q_N, \tilde{w}, w_1, \dots, w_N)$. We avoid this for the sake of brevity.*

The following lemma is a key tool for the improvement of the result in Theorem 5. The proof can be found in [16, Sect. 2.6].

LEMMA 9 (WEIGHTED HARDY-TYPE INEQUALITY). *Let ρ be a weight function defined in the interval (a, b) . If*

$$\int_a^b \rho(t)^{1-p'} dt < \infty,$$

then

$$(30) \quad \int_a^b \hat{\rho}(t) |f(t)|^p dt \leq C_H(p) \int_a^b \rho(t) |f'(t)|^p dt \quad \forall x \in (a, b),$$

for all absolutely continuous functions f in (a, b) that satisfy $\lim_{t \rightarrow a^+} f(t) = 0$, where

$$\hat{\rho}(t) = \rho(t)^{1-p'} \left(\int_a^t \rho(\xi)^{1-p'} d\xi \right)^{-p},$$

and $C_H(p) = p^p / (p-1)^{p-1}$.

Now we are in shape to prove the improvement of [Theorem 5](#).

THEOREM 10 (IMPROVED TRACE THEOREM). *Provided that (H1) to (H4) hold true, there exists a unique bounded linear operator*

$$\mathrm{tr}_{Q_N} : \mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, w) \rightarrow \mathbb{W}^{s(\cdot),p}(Q_N, \tilde{w}, w_1, \dots, w_N),$$

that satisfies $\mathrm{tr}_{Q_N} u = u(\cdot, 0)$ for all $u \in \mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, w) \cap C_c^\infty(\mathcal{C}_{Q_N})$.

The same statement is true if we replace $\mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ by the space $\mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}^\tau, w)$, for every $\tau \geq 1$.

Proof. For the sake of simplicity, we give the proof only for $N = 1$; with the natural changes, the proof adapts straightforward to the case $N \geq 2$.

Let $u \in \mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, w) \cap C_c^\infty(\mathcal{C}_{Q_1})$. Initially, we write:

$$(31) \quad A_1(u(\cdot, 0)) = I_1 + I_2,$$

where:

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &:= \int_0^1 \int_0^t w_1(t, \tau) |u(t, 0) - u(\tau, 0)|^p d\tau dt, \\ I_2 &:= \int_0^1 \int_t^1 w_1(t, \tau) |u(t, 0) - u(\tau, 0)|^p d\tau dt, \end{aligned}$$

where $w_1 = \min\{\varphi_1, \psi_1\}$ as in [Definition 6](#). Next, we shall estimate I_1 and I_2 separately. For this, we introduce the auxiliary function $v : Q_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$v(t, \tau) = u(t, \max\{t, \tau\} - \min\{t, \tau\}).$$

We have:

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \int_0^1 \int_0^t w_1(t, \tau) |v(t, t) - v(\tau, \tau)|^p d\tau dt \\ &= \int_0^1 \int_0^t w_1(t, \tau) \left| \int_\tau^t D_1 v(t', \tau) dt' + \int_\tau^t D_2 v(t, \tau') d\tau' \right|^p d\tau dt \\ &\leq 2^{p-1} \int_0^1 \int_0^t w_1(t, \tau) \left| \int_\tau^t D_1 v(t', \tau) dt' \right|^p d\tau dt \\ &\quad + 2^{p-1} \int_0^1 \int_0^t w_1(t, \tau) \left| \int_\tau^t D_2 v(t, \tau') d\tau' \right|^p d\tau dt, \end{aligned}$$

where $D_1 v$ and $D_2 v$ denote the partial derivative of v with respect to the first and second coordinates, respectively.

Interchanging the order of integration in the first term of the right hand side of the above inequality, and introducing the change of variable $\tilde{\tau} = -\tau$ in the second

one, we find:

$$(32) \quad I_1 \leq 2^{p-1} \int_0^1 \int_\tau^1 w_1(t, \tau) |f_1(t, \tau)|^p dt d\tau + 2^{p-1} \int_0^1 \int_{-t}^0 w_1(t, -\tilde{\tau}) |f_2(t, \tilde{\tau})|^p d\tilde{\tau} dt,$$

where:

$$f_1(t, \tau) = \int_\tau^t D_1 v(t', \tau) dt', \quad \text{and} \quad f_2(t, \tilde{\tau}) = \int_t^{-\tilde{\tau}} D_2 v(t, \tau') d\tau'.$$

The function $f_1(\cdot, \tau)$ is absolutely continuous in $(\tau, 1)$ and satisfies $\lim_{t \rightarrow \tau+} f_1(t, \tau) = 0$ for almost all $\tau \in (0, 1)$. Additionally, by definition we observe that

$$\varphi_1(t, \tau) = \Phi_1(t, \tau)^{1-p'} \left(\int_\tau^t \Phi_1(t', \tau)^{1-p'} dt' \right)^{-p} \quad \forall t \geq \tau,$$

for almost all $\tau \in (0, 1)$. Then, by [Lemma 9](#), we have:

$$(33) \quad \int_\tau^1 \varphi_1(t, \tau) |f_1(t, \tau)|^p dt \leq C_H(p) \int_\tau^1 \Phi_1(t, \tau) |D_1 v(t, \tau)|^p dt,$$

for almost all $\tau \in (0, 1)$.

Similarly, the function $f_2(t, \cdot)$ is absolutely continuous in $(-t, 0)$ and satisfies $\lim_{\tilde{\tau} \rightarrow -t+} f_2(t, \tilde{\tau}) = 0$ for almost all $t \in (0, 1)$. Since

$$\psi_1(t, -\tilde{\tau}) = \Phi_1(t, -\tilde{\tau})^{1-p'} \left(\int_{-t}^{\tilde{\tau}} \Phi_1(t, -\tilde{\tau}')^{1-p'} d\tilde{\tau}' \right)^{-p} \quad \forall \tilde{\tau} \geq -t,$$

for almost all $t \in (0, 1)$, it follows by [Lemma 9](#) that

$$(34) \quad \int_{-t}^0 \psi_1(t, -\tilde{\tau}) |f_2(t, \tilde{\tau})|^p d\tilde{\tau} \leq C_H(p) \int_{-t}^0 \Phi_1(t, -\tilde{\tau}) |D_2 v(t, -\tilde{\tau})|^p d\tilde{\tau},$$

for almost all $t \in (0, 1)$.

Then, since $w_1 = \min\{\varphi_1, \psi_1\}$, the estimation [\(32\)](#) in conjunction with [\(33\)](#) and [\(34\)](#) yields:

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &\leq C_H(p) 2^{p-1} \int_0^1 \int_\tau^1 \Phi_1(t, \tau) |D_1 v(t, \tau)|^p dt d\tau \\ &\quad + C_H(p) 2^{p-1} \int_0^1 \int_{-t}^0 \Phi_1(t, -\tilde{\tau}) |D_2 v(t, -\tilde{\tau})|^p d\tilde{\tau} dt. \end{aligned}$$

Interchanging the order of integration in the first term of the r.h.s., and making the change of variable $\tau = -\tilde{\tau}$ in the second one, we obtain:

$$(35) \quad I_1 \leq C_H(p) 2^{p-1} \int_0^1 \int_0^t \Phi_1(t, \tau) (|D_1 v(t, \tau)|^p + |D_2 v(t, \tau)|^p) d\tau dt.$$

Since the function v is given by $v(t, \tau) = u(t, t - \tau)$ for $t > \tau$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} D_1 v(t, \tau) &= D_1 u(t, t - \tau) + D_2 u(t, t - \tau), \\ D_2 v(t, \tau) &= -D_2 u(t, t - \tau). \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
|D_1 v(t, \tau)|^p + |D_2 v(t, \tau)|^p &\leq (|D_1 u(t, t - \tau)| + |D_2 u(t, t - \tau)|)^p + |D_2 u(t, t - \tau)|^p \\
&\leq (2^{p-1} + 1) (|D_1 u(t, t - \tau)|^p + |D_2 u(t, t - \tau)|^p) \\
&\leq 2^{p/2} (2^{p-1} + 1) |\nabla u(t, t - \tau)|^p.
\end{aligned}$$

Using this estimation in (35) and then making the change of variable $y = t - \tau$ in the inner integral, we find:

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &\leq C_H(p) 2^{p-1} 2^{p/2} (2^{p-1} + 1) \int_0^1 \int_0^t \Phi_1(t, \tau) |\nabla u(t, t - \tau)|^p d\tau dt \\
&= C_H(p) 2^{p-1} 2^{p/2} (2^{p-1} + 1) \int_0^1 \int_0^t \Phi_1(t, t - y) |\nabla u(t, y)|^p dy dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$(36) \quad I_1 \leq C_H(p) 2^{p-1} 2^{p/2} (2^{p-1} + 1) \int_0^1 \int_0^1 w(t, y) |\nabla u(t, y)|^p dy dt.$$

To estimate I_2 , we first write:

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 &= \int_0^1 \int_t^1 w_1(t, \tau) |v(t, t) - v(\tau, \tau)|^p d\tau dt \\
&= \int_0^1 \int_0^\tau w_1(t, \tau) |v(t, t) - v(\tau, \tau)|^p dt d\tau.
\end{aligned}$$

and notice that, in general, $I_2 \neq I_1$ since $w_1(t, \tau) \neq w_1(\tau, t)$ for $s(\cdot)$ not constant. However, similarly as we obtained (36), we identify the same bound for I_2 :

$$(37) \quad I_2 \leq C_H(p) 2^{p-1} 2^{p/2} (2^{p-1} + 1) \int_0^1 \int_0^1 w(t, y) |\nabla u(t, y)|^p dy dt,$$

Using (36) and (37) in (31), we obtain:

$$A_1(u(\cdot, 0)) \leq C_H(p) 2^p 2^{p/2} (2^{p-1} + 1) \|\nabla u\|_{L^p(\mathcal{C}, w)}^p,$$

hence,

$$A_1(u(\cdot, 0)) \leq C_H(p) 2^p 2^{p/2} (2^{p-1} + 1) \|u\|_{W^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, w)}^p.$$

In addition, we know by the Theorem 5 that:

$$\|u(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^p(Q_1, \tilde{w})}^p \leq (1 + p)^p \sigma^{-2p/p'} \|u\|_{W^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, w)}^p,$$

where σ is some arbitrary, but fixed, number in $(0, 1)$.

Therefore, $u(\cdot, 0) \in \mathbb{W}^{s(\cdot), p}(Q_1, \tilde{w}, w_1)$ and

$$\|u(\cdot, 0)\|_{\mathbb{W}^{s(\cdot), p}(Q_1, \tilde{w}, w_1)} \leq C(p, \sigma) \|u\|_{W^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, w)},$$

where $C(p, \sigma) = (C_H(p) 2^p 2^{p/2} (2^{p-1} + 1) + (1 + p)^p \sigma^{-2p/p'})^{1/p}$.

The operator tr_{Q_1} is the unique bounded linear extension of the map $u \mapsto u(\cdot, 0)$ to $\mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, w)$.

The proof when $\mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ is replaced by $\mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}^\tau, w)$ where $\tau \geq 1$ is identical. $\square$

REMARK 7 (Surjectivity of trace operator). *Although the previous result represents an improvement on the Ω -trace characterization for functions in $\mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, w)$, nothing can be said about the surjectivity of the trace operator $\text{tr}_\Omega : \mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, w) \rightarrow \mathbb{W}^{s(\cdot),p}(\mathcal{Q}_N, w, w_1, \dots, w_N)$ for $s(\cdot)$ non-constant.*

REMARK 8. *If $s(\cdot) = s \in (0, 1)$ is constant, then it follows by Theorem 8 that $\mathbb{W}^{s,2}(\mathcal{Q}_N, \tilde{w}, w_1, \dots, w_N) \hookrightarrow W^{1-\frac{2(1-s)}{p},p}(\mathcal{Q}_N)$. Hence, the trace result in Theorem 5 is again in accordance to the classical case, see [14, Theorem 2.8] (see also Remark 5). Moreover, if $p = 2$ and $s \in (0, 1/2)$, we observe that*

$$(38) \quad \mathbb{W}^{s,2}(\mathcal{Q}_N, \tilde{w}, w_1, \dots, w_N) \hookrightarrow H,$$

since $\mathbb{H}^s(\mathcal{Q}_N) = \mathbb{H}_0^s(\mathcal{Q}_N) = H$, so in this case we further partially recover the trace result in [7, Lemma 2.2] given that $\mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, y^{1-2s}) \subset H_{0,L}^1(\mathcal{C}, y^{1-2s})$.

6. Cases where the Poincaré inequality holds. We address now in this section cases and conditions on $s(\cdot)$ not constant that are sufficient for the Poincaré inequality to hold true. Two results are given, one in the entire cylinder and one in the truncated cylinder; see Theorem 11 and Theorem 13 respectively. From now on until the end of the section, we assume that $G_s = G_s^{(1)}$ constant, see (3) in Example 2.1; and $s(\cdot)$ is given by

$$(39) \quad s(\cdot) = \sum_{i=1}^M s_i \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_i}(\cdot),$$

where $s_i \in (0, 1)$ for $i = 1, \dots, M$ and $\{\Omega_i : i = 1, \dots, M\}$ is a finite collection of non-empty open subsets of Ω that satisfies $\bigcup_{i=1}^M \bar{\Omega}_i = \bar{\Omega}$. In other words, we assume that $s(\cdot)$ is a step function in Ω with range contained in the interval $(0, 1)$. Our first example is given by the next theorem which basically states that the Poincaré inequality holds provided that all pieces Ω_i of the partition of Ω touch the boundary $\partial\Omega$.

THEOREM 11. *Assume that $G_s = G_s^{(1)}$ constant and $s(\cdot)$ is given by (39). If*

$$(40) \quad |\partial\Omega_i \cap \partial\Omega| > 0 \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, M,$$

then there exists a positive constant $C_P(p, \Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_M)$ that satisfies

$$(41) \quad \|u\|_{L^p(\mathcal{C}, w)} \leq C_P(p, \Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_M) \|\nabla u\|_{L^p(\mathcal{C}, w)} \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, w).$$

Proof. The proof is quite direct, thanks to the existence of a Poincaré inequality for functions in $C^\infty(\Omega_i)$ that vanish on a subset of non-zero measure of $\partial\Omega_i$: Let $u \in C_c^\infty(\mathcal{C}_\Omega) \cap W^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, M\}$. For every $y > 0$, the function $u(\cdot, y)$ belongs to $C^\infty(\Omega_i)$ and vanishes on a portion with non-zero measure of $\partial\Omega_i$, by (40). Then, by the Poincaré inequality, we have

$$(42) \quad \int_{\Omega_i} |u(x, y)|^p dx \leq c_i \int_{\Omega_i} |\nabla_x u(x, y)|^p dx,$$

where c_i is a positive constant that depends only on Ω_i and p , and $\nabla_x u$ is the gradient of u with respect to the first N coordinates. Multiplying (42) by y^{1-2s_i} , then integrating for $y \in (0, \infty)$, and finally adding up for $i = 1, \dots, M$, we obtain

$$\int_{\mathcal{C}} y^{1-2s(x)} |u(x, y)|^p dX \leq c \int_{\mathcal{C}} y^{1-2s(x)} |\nabla_x u(x, y)|^p dX,$$

where $c = c_1 + \dots + c_M$. Since $|\nabla_x u|^p \leq |\nabla u|^p$ in $\mathcal{C}$ and G_s is constant, we get

$$\int_{\mathcal{C}} w(x, y) |u(x, y)|^p dX \leq c \int_{\mathcal{C}} w(x, y) |\nabla u(x, y)|^p dX \quad \forall u \in C_c^\infty(\mathcal{C}_\Omega) \cap W^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, w).$$

Now (41) follows by density. $\square$

Next we prove that the truncated domain allows a much more amenable result than the one in the complete cylinder $\mathcal{C}$. In particular, we prove that (39) is a sufficient condition for the Poincaré inequality to hold; the result is given in next [Theorem 13](#). The proof requires the following auxiliary lemma, see [10, Theorem 5.2] for its proof.

LEMMA 12 (CLASSICAL HARDY INEQUALITY). *Let $\varepsilon > p - 1$ and let f be a differentiable function almost everywhere in $(0, \infty)$ that satisfies $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} f(t) = 0$. If*

$$\int_0^\infty t^\varepsilon |f'(t)|^p dt < \infty,$$

then

$$\int_0^\infty t^{\varepsilon-p} |f(t)|^p dt \leq C_H(p, \varepsilon) \int_0^\infty t^\varepsilon |f'(t)|^p dt < \infty,$$

where $C_H(p, \varepsilon) = p^p / (\varepsilon - p + 1)^p$.

We are now in a position to present the final result in this section.

THEOREM 13. *Assume that $G_s = G_s^{(1)}$ constant and $s(\cdot)$ is given by (39). For every $\tau > 0$ there exists a positive constant $C_P(\tau, p, \Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_M)$ that satisfies*

$$(43) \quad \|u\|_{L^p(\mathcal{C}^\tau, w)} \leq C_P(\tau, p, \Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_M) \|\nabla u\|_{L^p(\mathcal{C}^\tau, w)} \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}^\tau, w).$$

Proof. Let $\tau > 0$ and $u \in C_c^\infty(\mathcal{C}_\Omega^\tau) \cap W^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}^\tau, w)$. Initially, we write:

$$(44) \quad \int_{\mathcal{C}^\tau} y^{1-2s(x)} |u(x, y)|^p dX = \sum_{i=1}^M I_i,$$

where

$$I_i := \int_0^\tau y^{1-2s_i} \int_{\Omega_i} |u(x, y)|^p dx dy.$$

We denote by c a positive constant that may depend only on p and the partition $\{\Omega_i : i = 1, \dots, M\}$, whose numerical value may be different from one line to another.

Let $i \in \{1, \dots, M\}$. We define

$$\bar{u}_i(y) = \frac{1}{|\Omega_i|} \int_{\Omega_i} u(x, y) dx,$$

and observe that

$$(45) \quad I_i \leq c (I_{i1} + I_{i2}),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_{i1} &:= \int_0^\tau y^{1-2s_i} \int_{\Omega_i} |u(x, y) - \bar{u}_i(y)|^p dx dy, \\ I_{i2} &:= \int_0^\tau y^{1-2s_i} \int_{\Omega_i} |\bar{u}_i(y)|^p dx dy = |\Omega_i| \int_0^\tau y^{1-2s_i} |\bar{u}_i(y)|^p dy. \end{aligned}$$

For each fixed $y \in (0, \tau)$, the function $u(\cdot, y)$ belongs to $C^\infty(\Omega_i)$. Thus, by the Poincaré-Wirtinger's inequality, we obtain:

$$\int_{\Omega_i} |u(x, y) - \bar{u}_i(y)|^p dx \leq c \int_{\Omega_i} |\nabla_x u(x, y)|^p dx.$$

From this, similarly as in the proof of [Theorem 11](#), we find:

$$(46) \quad I_{i1} \leq c \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega_i} y^{1-2s_i} |\nabla u(x, y)|^p dx dy$$

Let $\bar{u}_{ext}$ be the extension by zero of $\bar{u}$ to $[0, \infty)$. Notice that $\bar{u}_{ext}$ is differentiable almost everywhere in $(0, \infty)$ since $u(x, \cdot) \in C^\infty([0, \tau])$ for all $x \in \Omega_i$, and, trivially, $\bar{u}_{ext}$ satisfies $\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} \bar{u}_{ext}(y) = 0$. Also, observe that

$$\int_0^\infty y^{1+p-2s_i} |\bar{u}'_{ext}(y)|^p dy = \int_0^\tau y^{1+p-2s_i} |\bar{u}'(y)|^p dy \leq c \int_0^\tau y^{1+p-2s_i} dy < \infty,$$

since $1 + p - 2s_i > -1$ and $\bar{u}'$ is bounded in $[0, \tau]$.

Then, by the classical Hardy inequality in [Lemma 12](#) with $\varepsilon = 1 + p - 2s_i$, we have:

$$(47) \quad I_{i2} = |\Omega_i| \int_0^\infty y^{\varepsilon-p} |\bar{u}_{ext}(y)|^p dy \leq c |\Omega_i| \int_0^\infty y^\varepsilon |\bar{u}'_{ext}(y)|^p dy.$$

We now observe that:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty y^\varepsilon |\bar{u}'_{ext}(y)|^p dy &= \frac{1}{|\Omega_i|^p} \int_0^\tau y^\varepsilon \left| \int_{\Omega_i} D_{N+1} u(x, y) dx \right|^p dy \\ &\leq \frac{1}{|\Omega_i|^p} \int_0^\tau y^\varepsilon \left(\int_{\Omega_i} |\nabla u(x, y)| dx \right)^p dy, \end{aligned}$$

where $D_{N+1}u$ is the partial derivative of u with respect to the $(N+1)$ coordinate. Then, by the Hölder's inequality on the inner integral, we have:

$$\int_0^\infty y^\varepsilon |\bar{u}'_{ext}(y)|^p dy \leq \frac{1}{|\Omega_i|} \int_0^\tau y^\varepsilon \int_{\Omega_i} |\nabla v(x, y)|^p dx dy.$$

With this estimation in [\(47\)](#), we find:

$$(48) \quad I_{i2} \leq c \tau^p \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega_i} y^{1-2s_i} |\nabla u(x, y)|^p dx dy.$$

Finally, using [\(46\)](#) and [\(48\)](#) in [\(45\)](#), we obtain:

$$I_i \leq c \tau^p \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega_i} y^{1-2s_i} |\nabla u(x, y)|^p dx dy,$$

and hence, by [\(44\)](#) and since G_s is constant, we have:

$$\int_{\mathcal{C}^\tau} w(x, y) |u(x, y)|^p dX \leq c \tau^p \int_{\mathcal{C}^\tau} w(x, y) |\nabla u(x, y)|^p dX \quad \forall u \in C_c^\infty(\mathcal{C}_\Omega^\tau) \cap W^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}^\tau, w).$$

Then we obtain [\(43\)](#) by density. $\square$

7. Second definition and solution to $(-\Delta)^{s(\cdot)}v = h$. We are now in a position to give a new definition for the operator $(-\Delta)^{s(\cdot)}$, and to solve the associated Poisson problem for right hand sides defined on Ω . The arguments below are very similar to those developed in [Section 4](#) but now we assume some extra conditions on the function $s(\cdot)$ and the domain Ω , which enable a better characterization of the domain of $(-\Delta)^{s(\cdot)}$. We present the ideas for the semi-infinite cylinder $\mathcal{C}$, but the same arguments are valid for a truncated one $\mathcal{C}^\tau$.

From now on, we assume that the functions $s(\cdot)$ and G_s satisfy hypotheses [\(H1\)](#), [\(H2\)](#), and [\(H3\)](#). Further, we assume that the Poincaré inequality holds true, that is there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\|u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{C}, w)} \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{C}, w)} \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, w).$$

For example, this is satisfied under the assumptions of [Theorem 11](#) (see [Theorem 13](#) for the case of a truncated cylinder). In particular, this implies that

$$\mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w) = \mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w),$$

algebraically and topologically. We endow $\mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ with the norm $\|v\|_{\mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, w)} := \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\mathcal{C}, w)}$. Under the hypotheses assumed, we have established in [Theorem 5](#) an Ω -trace operator

$$(49) \quad \text{tr}_\Omega : \mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega, \tilde{w}),$$

and proved it is bounded, linear, and such that $\text{tr}_\Omega u = u(\cdot, 0)$ for all $u \in W^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}, w) \cap C_c^\infty(\mathcal{C}_\Omega)$. Note that this operator is not, however, surjective. Subsequently, consider

$$\mathcal{W}_0^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w) := \{u \in \mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w) : \text{tr}_\Omega u = 0\},$$

which is a closed subspace of $\mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$. Hence, a space of abstract traces on Ω of functions in $\mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ can be defined as the quotient space

$$\mathcal{Y}(\Omega, w) := \mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w) / \mathcal{W}_0^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w).$$

REMARK 9. *Due to the absence of density results of the type “ $H = W$ ” for non-Muckenhoupt weights, we are not in a position to assure that the spaces $\mathcal{X}(\Omega, w)$ and $\mathcal{Y}(\Omega, w)$ are actually the same.*

Immediately from here, via the isomorphism theorems, we can argue that there is an isomorphism

$$(50) \quad \varphi : \mathcal{Y}(\Omega, w) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{tr}_\Omega \mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w).$$

Moreover, one can simply consider φ to be given by $[u] \mapsto \text{tr}_\Omega u$. However, in order to identify $\mathcal{Y}(\Omega, w)$ with a subset of functions defined on Ω , we need further information related with the structure of the function space $\text{tr}_\Omega \mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$.

Analogously as in [Section 4](#), we define

$$(51) \quad \text{TR}_\Omega : \mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w) \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}(\Omega, w)$$

as $\text{TR}_\Omega u := [u]$, and observe that Tr_Ω is surjective by definition. In this setting we identify the abstract Ω -trace of $u \in \mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ with the equivalence class $[u]$ that contains u . The space $\mathcal{Y}(\Omega, w)$ is then endowed with the usual quotient norm

$$\|\text{TR}_\Omega u\|_{\mathcal{Y}(\Omega, w)} = \|[u]\|_{\mathcal{Y}(\Omega, w)} := \inf\{\|u - z\|_{\mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)} : z \in \mathcal{H}_0^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)\}.$$

As before, we have $\text{TR}_\Omega \mathcal{L}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w) = \mathcal{Y}(\Omega, w)$. Note that $\mathcal{Y}(\Omega, w)$ is a Hilbert space, given that $\mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ and $\mathcal{H}_0^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ are also Hilbert spaces.

Identically as in [Theorem 1](#), we argue the existence of the weighted harmonic extension operator

$$S : \text{TR}_\Omega \mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w), \quad v \mapsto S(v) = u.$$

where u is the solution to

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize } J(u) \quad \text{over } \mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w), \\ & \text{subject to } \text{TR}_\Omega u = v, \end{aligned}$$

for

$$J(u) := \frac{1}{2} \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)}^2 = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{C}} w |\nabla u|^2 \, dX.$$

The well-posedness of the map S allows us to establish a definition for the fractional Laplacian with spatially variable order.

DEFINITION 14. *Let $\mathcal{Y}(\Omega, w)'$ be the dual space of $\mathcal{Y}(\Omega, w)$. The operator*

$$(-\Delta)^{s(\cdot)} : \mathcal{Y}(\Omega, w) \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}(\Omega, w)'$$

is determined as follows: for $v \in \mathcal{Y}(\Omega, w)$, then $(-\Delta)^{s(\cdot)} v \in \mathcal{Y}(\Omega, w)'$ is defined by

$$\langle (-\Delta)^{s(\cdot)} v, \text{TR}_\Omega \psi \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}', \mathcal{Y}} = \int_{\mathcal{C}} w \nabla S(v) \cdot \nabla \psi \, dX, \quad \psi \in \mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w).$$

Since [Proposition 3](#) holds true with the usual changes, the operator is then well-defined and [Theorem 4](#) is also proven mutatis mutandis: For a $h \in \mathcal{Y}(\Omega, w)'$, the equation

$$(52) \quad (-\Delta)^{s(\cdot)} v = h \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

admits a unique solution $v \in \mathcal{Y}(\Omega, w)$ that is given by $v = \text{TR}_\Omega u$, where u solves

$$(53) \quad \text{minimize } \mathcal{J}(u) \quad \text{over } \mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w),$$

for

$$\mathcal{J}(u) := \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{C}} w |\nabla u|^2 \, dX - \langle h, \text{TR}_\Omega u \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}', \mathcal{Y}}.$$

Although this approach seems equivalent to the one in [Section 4](#), in this setting we have a more detailed representation of the elements $\mathcal{Y}(\Omega, w)$. In fact, within this approach, there exists an injection

$$I : \mathcal{Y}(\Omega, w) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega, \tilde{w}), \quad u \mapsto I([u]) = \text{tr}_\Omega u,$$

which is linear and bounded. Linearity follows directly, and boundedness follows given that for arbitrary $z \in \mathcal{W}_0^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$,

$$\|I([u])\|_{L^2(\Omega, \tilde{w})} = \|\text{tr}_\Omega u\|_{L^2(\Omega, \tilde{w})} = \|\text{tr}_\Omega (u - z)\|_{L^2(\Omega, \tilde{w})} \leq C \|u - z\|_{\mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)},$$

where we have used the linearity of tr_Ω and that $\text{tr}_\Omega z = 0$, and then

$$\|I([u])\|_{L^2(\Omega, \tilde{w})} \leq C \inf_{y \in \mathcal{W}_0^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)} \|u - y\|_{\mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)} = C \|u\|_{\mathcal{Y}(\Omega, w)}.$$

In order to see that I is an injection, suppose that $I([u]) = 0$, then $\text{tr}_\Omega u = 0$ so that $u \in \mathcal{W}_0^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$, and the class $\mathcal{W}_0^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ is the zero element of $\mathcal{Y}(\Omega, w)$. This identification allows us to consider I to be the identity, and identify the continuous embedding

$$\mathcal{Y}(\Omega, w) \hookrightarrow L^2(\Omega, \tilde{w}).$$

For a schematic relationship between the trace operators tr_Ω , Tr_Ω , the isomorphism φ and the embedding I , see Figure 1. An amenable consequence of this identification is given in Theorem 16, however in first place we address the reduction to case where $s(\cdot) = s \in (0, 1)$, a constant, where we obtain that H is recovered as the domain of $(-\Delta)^s$.




FIG. 1. Diagram relating the operators tr_Ω , Tr_Ω , the isomorphism φ , and the operator I .

THEOREM 15. *Let $s(\cdot) = s \in (0, 1)$ be constant and suppose that functions in $\mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ satisfy a Poincaré inequality, then*

$$\text{tr}_\Omega \mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w) = H,$$

and therefore,

$$\mathcal{Y}(\Omega, w) \simeq H.$$

Proof. Given that $s(\cdot) = s \in (0, 1)$ is constant, we have that G is constant, and hence $\mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w) = \mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, y^{1-2s})$. Additionally, by Remark 5, we have that $\text{tr}_\Omega \mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, y^{1-2s}) \subset H$. Then, there is only left to prove that for each $v \in H$ there exists a sequence $\{u_n\}$ in $C_c^\infty(\mathcal{C}_\Omega) \cap W^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, y^{1-2s})$ convergent in the sense of $W^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, y^{1-2s})$ to a $u \in \mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, y^{1-2s})$, and such that $\text{tr}_\Omega u = v$. We divide the proof into steps for the sake of clarity.

Step 1: Let $v \in H$ be arbitrary. Since $H = \mathbb{H}_0^s(\Omega)$ for $s \in (0, 1/2)$ or $s \in (1/2, 1)$, and $H = \mathbb{H}_{00}^s(\Omega)$ for $s = 1/2$, it follows that $C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ is dense in H . Then, there exists a sequence $\{v_k\}$ in $C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ such that

$$v_k \rightarrow v \quad \text{in } H,$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$. We denote $v = \sum_{n=1}^\infty b_n \varphi_n$ and $v_k = \sum_{n=1}^\infty b_n^k \varphi_n$ to their spectral decomposition where $b_n^k \rightarrow b_n$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Further, define $u, u_k : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$u(x, y) = \sum_{n=1}^\infty b_n \varphi_n(x) g_n(y) \quad \text{and} \quad u_k(x, y) = \sum_{n=1}^\infty b_n^k \varphi_n(x) g_n(y),$$

where each g_n satisfies the Bessel equation:

$$\begin{aligned} g_n'' + \frac{1-2s}{y} g_n' - \lambda_k g_n &= 0 \quad \text{in } (0, +\infty), \\ g_n(0) &= 1, \\ g_n(+\infty) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since the Poincaré inequality is valid for functions in $W^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, y^{1-2s})$, by the construction of the proof in [7, Proposition 2.1], we have that $u, u_n \in W^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, y^{1-2s})$, and

$$\int_0^\infty \int_\Omega y^{1-2s} |\nabla u(x, y) - \nabla u_k(x, y)|^2 dx dy = c_{N,s} \sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} (b_n - b_n^k)^2 \mu_n^s = c_{N,s} \|v - v_k\|_H^2,$$

and thus

$$(54) \quad u_k \rightarrow u \quad \text{in } W^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, y^{1-2s}),$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Note that since v_k has compact support, the support of u_k is uniformly away from $\partial_L \mathcal{C}$.

Step 2: For $\tau \geq 1$ and $0 < \sigma < 1$, we consider a smooth non-increasing function $\eta_\tau : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that:

$$\eta_\tau(y) = 1 \quad \text{if } 0 < y < \tau - \sigma, \quad \eta_\tau(y) = 0 \quad \text{if } y > \tau,$$

and notice that the function $u_{k,\tau}(x, y) := \eta_\tau(y) u_k(x, y)$ belongs to $W^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, y^{1-2s})$. By direct calculation we have that

$$(55) \quad u_{k,\tau} \rightarrow u_n \quad \text{in } W^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, y^{1-2s}),$$

as $\tau \rightarrow \infty$.

Step 3: For $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ and $\tau' > \tau + \varepsilon$, we consider the shifted cylinder

$$\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon^{\tau'} := \{(x, y - \varepsilon) : (x, y) \in \mathcal{C}^{\tau'}\},$$

and the weighted space $W^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon^{\tau'}, \rho)$, where

$$\rho(x, y) = \begin{cases} y^{1-2s} & \text{if } 0 < y < \tau' - \varepsilon, \\ (-y)^{1-2s} & \text{if } -\varepsilon < y < 0. \end{cases}$$

Further, let $\hat{u}_{k,\tau} \in W^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon^{\tau'}, \rho)$ defined by reflection as

$$\hat{u}_{k,\tau}(x, y) = \begin{cases} u_{k,\tau}(x, y) & \text{if } 0 < y < \tau' - \varepsilon, \\ u_{k,\tau}(x, -y) & \text{if } -\varepsilon < y \leq 0, \end{cases}$$

and note that $\rho \in A_2(\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon^{\tau'})$, i.e.,

$$\sup_{B \subset \mathcal{C}_\varepsilon^{\tau'}} \left(\frac{1}{|B|} \int_B \rho \, dX \right) \left(\frac{1}{|B|} \int_B \rho^{-1} \, dX \right) < +\infty,$$

for all squares $B \subset \mathcal{C}_\varepsilon^{\tau'}$.

Let L_r be the usual mollifier operator, i.e.,

$$(L_r f)(x) = \frac{1}{r^{N+1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N+1}} \omega\left(\frac{x-z}{r}\right) f(z) \, dz,$$

where $\omega : \mathbb{R}^{N+1} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ belongs to $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{N+1})$, $\text{supp } \omega \subset \overline{B(0, 1)}$, and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N+1}} \omega = 1$. Since $\rho \in A_2(\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon^{\tau'})$ and since $\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon^{\tau'}$ is bounded and with Lipschitz boundary, it follows that for $f \in W^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon^{\tau'}, \rho)$,

$$L_r f \rightarrow f \quad \text{in } W^{1,2}(D, y^{1-2s}),$$

for any $D \subset \subset \mathcal{C}_\varepsilon^{\tau'}$; see [9]. Given that the support of $u_{k,\tau}$ is uniformly away from $\partial_L \mathcal{C}$, and that $u_{k,\tau} = 0$ if $\tau < y$, it follows that

$$(56) \quad L_r \hat{u}_{k,\tau} \rightarrow u_{k,\tau} \quad \text{in } W^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, y^{1-2s}),$$

as $r \rightarrow \infty$. Note in addition, that for sufficiently large $r > 0$, we have

$$L_r \hat{u}_{k,\tau} \in C_c^\infty(\mathcal{C}_\Omega) \subset \mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, y^{1-2s}).$$

Step 4: In view of (54), (55), and (56), by appropriately selecting a sequence $\{(r_i, k_i, \tau_i)\}_{i=1}^\infty$, we observe

$$\tilde{u}_i := L_{r_i} \hat{u}_{k_i, \tau_i} \rightarrow u \quad \text{in } W^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, y^{1-2s}),$$

as $i \rightarrow \infty$, so that $u \in \mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, y^{1-2s})$. In particular,

$$\text{tr}_\Omega \tilde{u}_i \rightarrow v \quad \text{in } L^2(\Omega),$$

and $v = \text{tr}_\Omega u$; the result is then proven. $\square$

Next we can establish the well-posedness of the elliptic equation of interest.

THEOREM 16. *Assume that (H1), (H2), and (H3) holds true, and functions in $\mathcal{H}_{0,L}^{1,2}(\mathcal{C}, w)$ satisfy a Poincaré inequality. For every $h \in L^2(\Omega, \tilde{w})$, the equation*

$$(57) \quad (-\Delta)^{s(\cdot)} v = h,$$

admits a unique solution $v \in \mathcal{Y}(\Omega, w) \subset L^2(\Omega, \tilde{w})$.

Proof. The conclusion follows from the existence and uniqueness of solution to the same problem with right hand side in $\mathcal{Y}(\Omega, w)$ since we identify $L^2(\Omega, \tilde{w})' \simeq L^2(\Omega, \tilde{w})$, so that $L^2(\Omega, \tilde{w}) \subset \mathcal{Y}(\Omega, w)$ by means of $I' : L^2(\Omega, \tilde{w}) \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}(\Omega, w)'$. $\square$

The result above can be refined in terms of regularity if in addition we observe (H4), and consider $\Omega = Q_N$. In this case, the injection I is given as

$$I : \mathcal{Y}(Q_N, w) \rightarrow \mathbb{W}^{s(\cdot), 2}(Q_N, \tilde{w}, w_1, \dots, w_N),$$

leading to our last theorem, whose proof is obtained as for Theorem 16.

THEOREM 17. *In addition to the hypotheses of Theorem 16, consider $\Omega = Q_N$ and assume that (H4) holds true. Then, for every $h \in \mathbb{W}^{s(\cdot), 2}(Q_N, \tilde{w}, w_1, \dots, w_N)'$, the equation (57) admits a unique solution $v \in \mathcal{Y}(\Omega, w) \subset \mathbb{W}^{s, 2}(Q_N, \tilde{w}, w_1, \dots, w_N)$.*

The problem in the truncated cylinder $\mathcal{C}^\tau$ is treated identically, and Theorem 16 and Theorem 17 still hold true under the obvious changes.

8. Conclusions and open questions. This paper continues the program initiated by the authors in [2] and provides a rigorous definition of the variable order fractional Laplacian. The proposed theoretical framework enables solutions to Poisson equation on bounded Lipschitz domains Ω . The techniques introduced in the paper are completely new and none of the existing works applies to our setting. However, the existing setting, where $s(\cdot)$ is a constant, can be recovered from our proofs as a special case.

The following are open questions and topics for future research:

- The study of $-\Delta^{s(\cdot)}$ as regularizer in optimization problem, i.e.,

$$\min_u J(u) + \gamma R(u) \quad \text{with} \quad R(u) = \langle (-\Delta)^{s(\cdot)} u, u \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}', \mathcal{Y}},$$

and the optimal selection of $s(\cdot)$ in a bilevel framework.

- The extension to more general settings of the Poincaré inequality type result presented in Section 6.
- The surjectivity of the new trace operator is still open (cf. Remark 7).
- We have introduced Sobolev spaces with $s(\cdot)$ -dependent weights for the extension problem and $s(\cdot)$ -dependent differentiability for the space on Ω . New approaches need to be established to prove additional regularity of solutions to $(-\Delta)^{s(\cdot)} u = h$ in these Sobolev spaces.
- Extensions to parabolic, semilinear and obstacle type problems are of interest.
- The authors in [2] proposed a numerical method for the truncated problem. But the numerical analysis of this problem is completely open. Also, convergence of the truncated solution to the full solution is of interest as well.
- Optimal control problems with variable order PDEs as constraints.

REFERENCES

- [1] Harbir Antil, Johannes Pfefferer, and Sergejs Rogovs. Fractional operators with inhomogeneous boundary conditions: Analysis, control, and discretization. *Commun. Math. Sci.*, 16(5):1395–1426, 2018.
- [2] Harbir Antil and Carlos N. Rautenberg. Sobolev spaces with non-Muckenhoupt weights, fractional elliptic operators, and applications. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 51(3):2479–2503, 2019.
- [3] David Applebaum. Lévy processes and stochastic calculus. 2009.
- [4] Haim Brezis. *Functional Analysis, Sobolev Spaces and Partial Differential Equations*. Springer New York, 2011.
- [5] Luis Caffarelli and Luis Silvestre. An extension problem related to the fractional Laplacian. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 32(7-9):1245–1260, 2007.
- [6] Luis A. Caffarelli, Sandro Salsa, and Luis Silvestre. Regularity estimates for the solution

- and the free boundary of the obstacle problem for the fractional Laplacian. *Inventiones Mathematicae*, 171(2):425–461, 2007.
- [7] Antonio Capella, Juan Dávila, Louis Dupaigne, and Yannick Sire. Regularity of radial extremal solutions for some non-local semilinear equations. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 36(8):1353–1384, 2011.
 - [8] Eleonora Di Nezza, Giampiero Palatucci, and Enrico Valdinoci. Hitchhiker’s guide to the fractional Sobolev spaces. *Bull. Sci. Math.*, 136(5):521–573, 2012.
 - [9] Vladimir Gol’dshstein and Alexander Ukhlov. Weighted sobolev spaces and embedding theorems. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 361(7):3829–3850, 2009.
 - [10] Alois Kufner. *Weighted Sobolev Spaces*. Teubner-Texte zur, 1980.
 - [11] Alois Kufner, Oldřich John, and Svatopluk Fučík. *Function spaces*. Academia, 1977.
 - [12] Alois Kufner and Bohumír Opic. How to define reasonably weighted sobolev spaces. *Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae*, 25(3):537–554, 1984.
 - [13] David G. Luenberger. *Optimization by Vector Space Methods*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, NY, USA, 1st edition, 1997.
 - [14] Aleš Nekvinda. Characterization of traces of the weighted Sobolev space $W^{1,p}(\omega, d_M^\epsilon)$ on M . *Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal*, 43(4):695–711, 1993.
 - [15] R.H. Nochetto, E. Otárola, and A.J. Salgado. A PDE approach to fractional diffusion in general domains: A priori error analysis. *Found. Comput. Math.*, 15(3):733–791, 2015.
 - [16] Bohumír Opic and Alois Kufner. *Hardy-type inequalities*, volume 219. Longman Scientific and Technical, 1990.
 - [17] Pablo Raúl Stinga and José Luis Torrea. Extension problem and Harnack’s inequality for some fractional operators. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 35(11):2092–2122, 2010.
 - [18] Luc Tartar. *An introduction to Sobolev spaces and interpolation spaces*, volume 3 of *Lecture Notes of the Unione Matematica Italiana*. Springer, Berlin; UMI, Bologna, 2007.
 - [19] Bengt O Turesson. *Nonlinear potential theory and weighted Sobolev spaces*, volume 1736. Springer Science & Business Media, 2000.
 - [20] Chester Weiss, Bart van Bloemen Waanders, and Harbir Antil. Fractional operators applied to geophysical electromagnetics. *Geophysical Journal International*, 220(2):1242–1259, 2020.