

ASC Report No. 25/2018

***H*-matrix approximability of inverses of
discretizations of the fractional Laplacian**

M. Karkulik, J.M. Melenk

Most recent ASC Reports

- 24/2018 *M. Bernkopf and J.M. Melenk*
Analysis of the hp -version of a first order system least squares method for the Helmholtz equation
- 23/2018 *T. Jawecki, W. Auzinger, O. Koch*
Computable strict upper bounds for Krylov approximations to a class of matrix exponentials and ϕ -functions
- 22/2018 *A. Jüngel, and O. Leingang*
Convergence of an implicit Euler Galerkin scheme for Poisson-Maxwell-Stefan systems
- 21/2018 *J. Kraus, C.-M. Pfeiler, D. Praetorius, M. Ruggeri, and B. Stiftner*
Iterative solution and preconditioning for the tangent plane scheme in computational micromagnetics
- 20/2018 *T. Führer, G. Gantner, D. Praetorius, and S. Schimanko*
Optimal additive Schwarz preconditioning for adaptive 2D IGA boundary element methods
- 19/2018 *A. Arnold, C. Klein, and B. Ujvari*
WKB-method for the 1D Schrödinger equation in the semi-classical limit: enhanced phase treatment
- 18/2018 *A. Bespalov, T. Betcke, A. Haberl, and D. Praetorius*
Adaptive BEM with optimal convergence rates for the Helmholtz equation
- 17/2018 *C. Erath and D. Praetorius*
Optimal adaptivity for the SUPG finite element method
- 16/2018 *M. Fallahpour, S. McKee, and E.B. Weinmüller*
Numerical simulation of flow in smectic liquid crystals
- 15/2018 *A. Bespalov, D. Praetorius, L. Rocchi, and M. Ruggeri*
Goal-oriented error estimation and adaptivity for elliptic PDEs with parametric or uncertain inputs

Institute for Analysis and Scientific Computing
Vienna University of Technology
Wiedner Hauptstraße 8–10
1040 Wien, Austria

E-Mail: admin@asc.tuwien.ac.at
WWW: <http://www.asc.tuwien.ac.at>
FAX: +43-1-58801-10196

ISBN 978-3-902627-00-1

© Alle Rechte vorbehalten. Nachdruck nur mit Genehmigung des Autors.



\mathcal{H} -matrix approximability of inverses of discretizations of the fractional Laplacian *

Michael Karkulik[†]

Jens Markus Melenk[‡]

Abstract

The integral version of the fractional Laplacian on a bounded domain is discretized by a Galerkin approximation based on piecewise linear functions on a quasi-uniform mesh. We show that the inverse of the associated stiffness matrix can be approximated by blockwise low-rank matrices at an exponential rate in the block rank.

Key words: Hierarchical Matrices, Fractional Laplacian

AMS Subject Classification: 65N30, 65F05, 65F30, 65F50

1 Introduction

Fractional differential operators are non-local operators with many applications in science and technology and interesting mathematical properties; a discussion of some of their features can be found, e.g., in [15]. The nonlocal nature of such operators implies for numerical discretizations that the resulting system matrices are fully populated. Efficient matrix compression techniques are therefore necessary. Various data-sparse representations of (discretizations) of classical integral operators have been proposed in the past. We mention techniques based on multipole expansions, panel clustering, wavelet compression techniques, the mosaic-skeleton method, the adaptive cross approximation (ACA) method, and the hybrid cross approximation (HCA); we refer to [18] for a more detailed literature review in the context of classical boundary element methods (BEM). In fact, many of these data-sparse methods may be understood as specific incarnations of \mathcal{H} -matrices, which were introduced in [29, 25, 23, 30] as blockwise low-rank matrices. Although many of the above mentioned techniques were originally developed for applications in BEM the underlying reason for their success is the so-called “asymptotic smoothness” of the kernel function, which is given for a much broader class of problems. We refer to [16] and references therein, where the question of approximability is discussed for pseudodifferential operators.

*MK was supported by Conicyt Chile through project FONDECYT 1170672, JMM was supported by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) project F 65.

[†]Departamento de Matemática, Universidad Técnica Federico Santa María, Avenida España 1680, Valparaíso, Chile, mkarkulik.mat.utfsm.cl, email: michael.karkulik@usm.cl

[‡]Institut für Analysis und Scientific Computing, Technische Universität Wien, Wiedner Hauptstrasse 8-10, Wien, Austria, email: melenk@tuwien.ac.at

Discretizations of integral versions of the fractional Laplacian such as the one considered in the present paper, (1.6), are therefore amenable to data-sparse representations with $O(N \log^\beta N)$ complexity, where N is the matrix size and $\beta \geq 0$. This compressibility has recently been observed in [52] and in [4], where an analysis and implementation of a panel clustering type matrix-vector multiplication for the stiffness matrix is presented. It is the purpose of the present paper to show that also the inverse of the stiffness matrix of a discretization of the integral version of the fractional Laplacian can be represented in the \mathcal{H} -matrix format, using the same underlying block structure as employed to compress the stiffness matrix.

One reason for studying the compressibility of the inverses (or the closely related question of compressibility of the LU -factors) are recent developments in fast (approximate) arithmetic for data-sparse matrix formats. For example, \mathcal{H} -matrices come with an (approximate) arithmetic with log-linear complexity, which includes, in particular, the (approximate) inversion and factorization of matrices. These (approximate) inverses/factors could either be used as direct solvers or as preconditioners, as advocated, for example, in a BEM context in [5, 24, 26, 39, 27] and in [40] in the context of fractional differential equations. We point out that the class of \mathcal{H} -matrices is not the only one for which inversion and factorizations algorithms have been devised. Related to \mathcal{H} -matrices and its arithmetic are “hierarchically semiseparable matrices”, [50, 51, 41] and the idea of “recursive skeletonization”, [34, 28, 35]; for discretizations of PDEs, we mention [35, 21, 47, 43], and particular applications to boundary integral equations are [44, 13, 36].

The underlying structure of our proof is similar to that in [18, 19] for the classical single layer and hypersingular operators of BEM. There, it is exploited that these operators are traces of potentials, i.e., they are related to functions that solve an elliptic PDE. The connection of [18, 19] with the present article is given by the works of [10, 49, 11], which show that fractional powers of certain elliptic operators posed in \mathbb{R}^d can be realized as the Dirichlet-to-Neumann maps for (degenerate) PDEs posed in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} .

1.1 The fractional Laplacian and the Caffarelli-Silvestre extension

In this section, we briefly introduce the fractional Laplacian; the discussion will remain somewhat formal as the pertinent function spaces (e.g., $H_0^s(\mathbb{R}^d; \Omega)$) and lifting operators (e.g., \mathcal{L}) will be defined in subsequent sections.

For $s \in (0, 1)$, the fractional Laplacian in full space \mathbb{R}^d is classically defined through the Fourier transform, $(-\Delta u)^s := \mathcal{F}^{-1}(|\xi|^{2s} \mathcal{F}(u))$. As discussed in the survey [38], several equivalent definitions are available. For example, for suitable u , a pointwise characterization is given in terms of a principal value integral:

$$(-\Delta u)^s(x) = C(d, s) \text{P.V.} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{u(x) - u(y)}{|x - y|^{d+2s}} dy, \quad C(d, s) := 2^{2s} s \frac{\Gamma(s + d/2)}{\pi^{d/2} \Gamma(1 - s)}.$$

Caffarelli and Silvestre [10] characterized this operator as the Dirichlet-to-Neumann operator of a (degenerate) elliptic PDE. That is, they proved

$$C(d, s)(-\Delta u)^s(x) = - \lim_{x_{d+1} \rightarrow 0^+} x_{d+1}^{1-2s} \partial_{x_{d+1}}(\mathcal{L}u)(x, x_{d+1}), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (1.1)$$

where the *extension* $\mathcal{L}u$ is a function on the half-space $\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1} := \{(x, x_{d+1}) \mid x \in \mathbb{R}^d, x_{d+1} > 0\}$ and solves

$$\operatorname{div}(x_{d+1}^{1-2s} \nabla \mathcal{L}u) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}, \quad \operatorname{tr} \mathcal{L}u = u. \quad (1.2)$$

In weak form, the combination of (1.1) and (1.2) therefore yields

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}} x_{d+1}^{1-2s} \nabla \mathcal{L}u \cdot \nabla \mathcal{L}v = C(d, s) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (-\Delta u)^s v \quad \forall v \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}). \quad (1.3)$$

For suitable u, v , we also have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}} x_{d+1}^{1-2s} \nabla \mathcal{L}u \cdot \nabla \mathcal{L}v = C(d, s) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (-\Delta u)^s v \quad (1.4)$$

$$= \frac{C(d, s)}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{(u(x) - u(y))(v(x) - v(y))}{|x - y|^{d+2s}} dx dy, \quad (1.5)$$

which is a form that is amenable to Galerkin discretizations.

The fractional Laplacian on a *bounded* domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ can be defined in one of several *non-equivalent* ways. We consider the *integral fractional Laplacian* with the exterior “boundary” condition $u \equiv 0$ in Ω^c , which reads, cf., e.g., the discussions in [2, 42]

$$(-\Delta u)_I^s(x) = C(d, s) \operatorname{P.V.} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{u(x) - u(y)}{|x - y|^{d+2s}} dy, \quad x \in \Omega \quad (1.6)$$

and the understanding that $u = 0$ on Ω^c . Important for the further developments is that this version of the fractional Laplacian still admits the interpretation (1.1) as a Dirichlet-to-Neumann map for arguments $u \in H_0^s(\mathbb{R}^d; \Omega)$ (see (1.7) ahead). In particular, for $u, v \in H_0^s(\mathbb{R}^d; \Omega)$ the representations (1.4) and (1.5) are both valid.

1.2 Notation

Let $\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1} = \mathbb{R}^d \times (0, \infty)$ be the upper half-space. We will identify its boundary $\mathbb{R}^d \times \{0\}$ with \mathbb{R}^d . More generally, if necessary, we will identify subsets $\omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\omega \times \{0\} \subset \mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}$. For measurable subset M of \mathbb{R}^d , we will use standard Lebesgue and Sobolev spaces $L^2(M)$ and $H^1(M)$. Sobolev spaces of non-integer order $s \in (0, 1)$ are defined via the Sobolev-Slobodecki norms

$$\|u\|_{H^s(M)}^2 = \|u\|_{L^2(M)}^2 + |u|_{H^s(M)}^2 = \|u\|_{L^2(M)}^2 + \int_M \int_M \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^2}{|x - y|^{d+2s}} dx dy.$$

We will work in particular with the Hilbert space

$$H_0^s(\mathbb{R}^d; \Omega) := \left\{ u \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^d) \mid u \equiv 0 \text{ on } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{\Omega} \right\}. \quad (1.7)$$

2 Main results

2.1 Model problem and discretization

For a polyhedral Lipschitz domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and $s \in (0, 1)$, we are interested in calculating the trace u on $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ of a function \mathbf{u} defined on \mathbb{R}_+^{d+1} , where \mathbf{u} solves

$$\begin{aligned} -\operatorname{div} (x_{d+1}^{1-2s} \nabla \mathbf{u}) &= 0 && \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}, \\ -\lim_{x_{d+1} \rightarrow 0^+} x_{d+1}^{1-2s} \partial_{x_{d+1}} \mathbf{u} &= f && \text{on } \Omega, \\ \mathbf{u} &= 0 && \text{on } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Omega. \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

Our variational formulation of (2.8) is based on the spaces $H_0^s(\mathbb{R}^d; \Omega)$: Find $u \in H_0^s(\mathbb{R}^d; \Omega)$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}} x_{d+1}^{1-2s} \nabla \mathcal{L}u \cdot \nabla \mathcal{L}v \, dx = \int_{\Omega} f v \, dx \quad \text{for all } v \in H_0^s(\mathbb{R}^d; \Omega). \quad (2.9)$$

Here, \mathcal{L} is the *harmonic extension* operator associated with the PDE given in (2.8). It has already appeared in (1.2) and is formally defined in (3.18). We will show in Section 3 ahead that the left-hand side of the above equation introduces a bounded and elliptic bilinear form. Hence, the Lax-Milgram Lemma proves that the variational formulation (2.9) is well-posed. Given a quasiuniform mesh \mathcal{T}_h on Ω with mesh width h , we discretize problem (2.9) using the conforming finite element space

$$\mathcal{S}_0^1(\mathcal{T}_h) := \left\{ u \in C(\mathbb{R}^d) \mid \operatorname{supp} u \subset \bar{\Omega} \text{ and } u|_K \in \mathcal{P}_1 \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h \right\} \subset H_0^s(\mathbb{R}^d; \Omega),$$

where \mathcal{P}_1 denote the space of polynomials of degree 1. We emphasize that $\mathcal{S}_0^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$ is the “standard” space of piecewise linear functions on Ω that are extended by zero outside Ω . Obviously, there is a unique solution $u_h \in \mathcal{S}_0^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$ of the linear system

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}} x_{d+1}^{1-2s} \nabla \mathcal{L}u_h \cdot \nabla \mathcal{L}v_h \, dx = \int_{\Omega} f v_h \, dx \quad \text{for all } v_h \in \mathcal{S}_0^1(\mathcal{T}_h). \quad (2.10)$$

If we consider the nodal basis $(\psi_j)_{j=1}^N$ of $\mathcal{S}_0^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$, we can write equation (2.10) as

$$\mathbf{A} \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}.$$

Our goal is to derive an \mathcal{H} -matrix representation of the inverse \mathbf{A}^{-1} .

Remark 2.1. Computationally, the bilinear form (2.10) is not easily accessible. One possibility is to employ (1.5). For this representation of the bilinear form, the entries of the stiffness matrix \mathbf{A} can be computed, [1, 4]. ■

2.2 Blockwise low-rank approximation

Let us introduce the necessary notation. Let $\mathcal{I} = \{1, \dots, N\}$ be the set of indices of the nodal basis $(\psi_j)_{j=1}^N$ of $\mathcal{S}_0^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$. A *cluster* τ is a subset of \mathcal{I} . For a cluster τ , we say that $B_{R_\tau}^0 \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a *bounding box* if

- (i) $B_{R_\tau}^0$ is a hyper cube with side length R_τ ,
- (ii) $\text{supp}(\psi_j) \subset B_{R_\tau}^0$ for all $j \in \tau$.

For an *admissibility parameter* $\eta > 0$, a pair of cluster (τ, σ) is called η -admissible, if there exist bounding boxes $B_{R_\tau}^0$ of τ and $B_{R_\sigma}^0$ of σ such that

$$\max \{ \text{diam}(B_{R_\tau}^0), \text{diam}(B_{R_\sigma}^0) \} \leq \eta \text{dist}(B_{R_\tau}^0, B_{R_\sigma}^0). \quad (2.11)$$

The next theorem is the first main result of this work. For two admissible clusters, the associated matrix block of the inverse \mathbf{A}^{-1} of the matrix associated to the linear system of problem (2.8) can be approximated by low-rank matrices with an error that is exponentially small in the rank.

Theorem 2.2. *Let $\eta > 0$ be a fixed admissibility parameter and $q \in (0, 1)$. Let (τ, σ) be a cluster pair with η -admissible bounding boxes. Then, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exist matrices $\mathbf{X}_{\tau\sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau| \times r}$ and $\mathbf{Y}_{\tau\sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times |\sigma|}$ with rank $r \leq C_{\text{dim}}(2 + \eta)^{d+1} q^{-(d+1)} k^{d+2}$ such that*

$$\|\mathbf{A}^{-1}|_{\tau \times \sigma} - \mathbf{X}_{\tau\sigma} \mathbf{Y}_{\tau\sigma}^\top\|_2 \leq C_{\text{apx}} N^{\frac{1+d}{d}} q^k. \quad (2.12)$$

The constants C_{dim} and C_{apx} depend only on d , Ω , the shape-regularity of \mathcal{T}_h , and on s .

Theorem 2.2 shows that individual blocks of \mathbf{A}^{-1} can be approximated by low-rank matrices. \mathcal{H} -matrices are blockwise low-rank matrices where the blocks are organized in a tree structure, which affords the fast arithmetic of \mathcal{H} -matrices. The block cluster tree is based on a tree structure for the index set \mathcal{I} , which we described next.

Definition 2.3 (cluster tree). A *cluster tree* with leaf size $n_{\text{leaf}} \in \mathbb{N}$ is a binary tree $\mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{I}}$ with root \mathcal{I} such that for each cluster $\tau \in \mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{I}}$ the following dichotomy holds: either τ is a leaf of the tree and $|\tau| \leq n_{\text{leaf}}$, or there exist so called sons $\tau', \tau'' \in \mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{I}}$, which are disjoint subsets of τ with $\tau = \tau' \cup \tau''$. The *level function* $\text{level} : \mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{I}} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$ is inductively defined by $\text{level}(\mathcal{I}) = 0$ and $\text{level}(\tau') := \text{level}(\tau) + 1$ for τ' a son of τ . The *depth* of a cluster tree is $\text{depth}(\mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{I}}) := \max_{\tau \in \mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{I}}} \text{level}(\tau)$.

Definition 2.4 (far field, near field, and sparsity constant). A partition P of $\mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{I}$ is said to be based on the cluster tree $\mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{I}}$, if $P \subset \mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{I}} \times \mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{I}}$. For such a partition P and fixed admissibility parameter $\eta > 0$, we define the *far field* and the *near field* as

$$P_{\text{far}} := \{(\tau, \sigma) \in P : (\tau, \sigma) \text{ is } \eta\text{-admissible}\}, \quad P_{\text{near}} := P \setminus P_{\text{far}}. \quad (2.13)$$

The *sparsity constant* C_{sp} , introduced in [32, 33, 23], of such a partition is defined by

$$C_{\text{sp}} := \max \left\{ \max_{\tau \in \mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{I}}} |\{\sigma \in \mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{I}} : \tau \times \sigma \in P_{\text{far}}\}|, \max_{\sigma \in \mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{I}}} |\{\tau \in \mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{I}} : \tau \times \sigma \in P_{\text{far}}\}| \right\}. \quad (2.14)$$

The following Theorem 2.5 shows that the matrix \mathbf{A}^{-1} can be approximated by blockwise rank- r matrices at an exponential rate in the block rank r :

Theorem 2.5. *Fix the admissibility parameter $\eta > 0$. Let a partition P of $\mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{I}$ be based on a cluster tree $\mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{I}}$. Then, there is a blockwise rank- r matrix $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$ such that*

$$\|\mathbf{A}^{-1} - \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}}\|_2 \leq C_{\text{apx}} C_{\text{sp}} N^{(d+1)/d} \text{depth}(\mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{I}}) e^{-br^{1/(d+2)}}. \quad (2.15)$$

The constant C_{apx} depends only on Ω , d , the shape regularity of the quasiuniform triangulation \mathcal{T}_h , and on s , while the constant $b > 0$ additionally depends on η .

Proof. As it is shown in [23], [30, Lemma 6.32], norm bounds for a block matrix that is based on a cluster tree can be inferred from norm bounds for the blocks. This allows one to prove Theorem 2.5 based on the results of Theorem 2.2 (see, e.g., the proof of [17, Thm. 2] for details). \square

Remark 2.6. For quasiuniform meshes with $\mathcal{O}(N)$ elements, typical clustering strategies such as the “geometric clustering” described in [30] lead to fairly balanced cluster trees $\mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{I}}$ with $\text{depth } \mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{I}} = \mathcal{O}(\log N)$ and a sparsity constant C_{sp} that is bounded uniformly in N . We refer to [32, 33, 23, 30] for the fact that the memory requirement to store $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is $\mathcal{O}((r + n_{\text{leaf}})N \log N)$. \blacksquare

3 The Beppo-Levi space $\mathcal{B}_{\alpha}^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})$

In the present section, we formulate a functional framework for the lifting operator \mathcal{L} of (1.2). We will work in the Beppo-Levi space

$$\mathcal{B}_{\alpha}^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}) := \left\{ \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}) \mid \nabla \mathbf{u} \in L_{\alpha}^2(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}) \right\}$$

of all distributions $\mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})$ having all first order partial derivatives in $L_{\alpha}^2(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})$ for

$$\alpha = 1 - 2s \in (-1, 1), \quad (3.16)$$

where this last space is defined as the set of measurable functions \mathbf{u} such that

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_{L_{\alpha}^2(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})}^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}} x_{d+1}^{\alpha} |\mathbf{u}(x)|^2 dx < \infty.$$

We denote by $L_{\alpha, \text{bdd}}^2(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})$ the set of functions that are in L_{α}^2 on every bounded subset of \mathbb{R}_+^{d+1} . By $\text{tr} : C^{\infty}(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}}) \rightarrow C^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we denote the trace operator $(\text{tr } \mathbf{u})(x_1, \dots, x_d) := \mathbf{u}(x_1, \dots, x_d, 0)$. The following result, which is an extension to weighted spaces of the well-known result [14, Cor. 2.1], shows that the distributions in $\mathcal{B}_{\alpha}^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})$ are actually functions. Its proof will be given below in Section 3.1.

Lemma 3.1. For $\alpha \in (-1, 1)$ there holds $\mathcal{B}_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}) \subset L_{\alpha, \text{bdd}}^2(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})$. Furthermore, for $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ one has $\mathbf{u} \in L_{0, \text{bdd}}^2(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})$.

We additionally define the space

$$\mathcal{B}^s(\mathbb{R}^d) := \left\{ u \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \mid |u|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)} < \infty \right\}.$$

From now on, we fix a hypercube $K := K' \times (0, b_{d+1})$, $K' = \prod_{j=1}^d (a_j, b_j)$. Then, using Lemma 3.1, one can show that $\mathcal{B}_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})$ and $\mathcal{B}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ are Hilbert spaces when endowed with the norms

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathcal{B}_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})}^2 := \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L_\alpha^2(K)}^2 + \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L_\alpha^2(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})}^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|u\|_{\mathcal{B}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 := \|u\|_{L^2(K')}^2 + |u|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2. \quad (3.17)$$

There holds the following density result, which can be found for bounded domains in [37, Thm. 11.11] even for higher Sobolev regularity. In the present case of first order regularity and unbounded domains, we give a short proof below in Section 3.1.

Lemma 3.2. For $\alpha \in (-1, 1)$ the set $C^\infty(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}}) \cap \mathcal{B}_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})$ is dense in $\mathcal{B}_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})$.

The trace operator can be extended to the spaces $\mathcal{B}_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})$ as will also be shown below in Section 3.1. Analogous trace theorems in Sobolev spaces on smooth and bounded domains are given for $s = 1/2$ in [9, Prop. 1.8], and for $s \in (0, 1) \setminus \frac{1}{2}$ in [12, Prop. 2.1].

Lemma 3.3. For $\alpha \in (-1, 1)$, the trace operator is a bounded linear operator $\text{tr} : \mathcal{B}_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$, where s is given by (3.16).

We define the Hilbert space $\mathcal{B}_{\alpha, 0}^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}) := \ker(\text{tr})$. The following Poincaré inequality holds on this space. The proof will be given below in Section 3.1.

Corollary 3.4. For all $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{B}_{\alpha, 0}^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})$, there holds

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathcal{B}_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})} \lesssim \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L_\alpha^2(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})}.$$

For a function $u \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we define the *minimum norm extension* or *harmonic extension* $\mathcal{L}u \in \mathcal{B}_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})$ as

$$\mathcal{L}u = \underset{\substack{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{B}_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}) \\ \text{tr } \mathbf{u} = u}}{\text{arg min}} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L_\alpha^2(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})}. \quad (3.18)$$

We can characterize $\mathcal{L}u$ by

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}} x_{d+1}^{1-2s} \nabla \mathcal{L}u \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v} \, dx = 0 \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{B}_{\alpha, 0}^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}), \quad (3.19)$$

$$\text{tr } \mathcal{L}u = u.$$

In view of the previous developments the minimum norm extension exists uniquely and satisfies

$$\|\mathcal{L}u\|_{\mathcal{B}_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})} \lesssim \|u\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)}. \quad (3.20)$$

Indeed, the minimum norm extension can be written $\mathcal{L}u = \mathcal{E}u + \mathbf{u}$, where $\mathcal{E}u$ is the operator from Lemma 3.9, and $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{B}_{\alpha,0}^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})$ is given by

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}} x_{d+1}^{1-2s} \nabla \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v} \, dx = - \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}} x_{d+1}^{1-2s} \nabla \mathcal{E}u \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v} \, dx \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{B}_{\alpha,0}^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}).$$

This equation is uniquely solvable due to the Lax-Milgram theorem and Corollary 3.4, and this also implies the stability (3.20). Due to (3.19), we see that a variational form of our original problem (2.8) is actually given by (2.9). Next, we show that problem (2.9) is well-posed. We mention that ellipticity has already been shown in [10, eq. (3.7)] using Fourier methods.

Lemma 3.5. *Problem (2.9) has a unique solution $u \in H_0^s(\mathbb{R}^d; \Omega)$, and*

$$\|u\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim \|f\|_{H^{-s}(\Omega)},$$

where $H^{-s}(\Omega)$ is the dual space of $H_0^s(\mathbb{R}^d; \Omega)$.

Proof. Due to [2, Prop. 2.4], there holds the Poincaré inequality $\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim |u|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)}$ for all $u \in H_0^s(\mathbb{R}^d; \Omega)$. We conclude that $\|u\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim |u|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)}$ for all $u \in H_0^s(\mathbb{R}^d; \Omega)$. Combining this Poincaré inequality with the trace estimate (3.28), we obtain the ellipticity of the bilinear form on the left-hand side of (2.9). The continuity of this bilinear form follows from (3.20). \square

3.1 Technical details and proofs

Define the Sobolev space $H_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})$ as the space of functions \mathbf{u} such that

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_{L_\alpha^2(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})}^2 + \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L_\alpha^2(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})}^2 < \infty.$$

We start with a density result, whose proof is based on ideas from [37, Thm. 11.11].

Lemma 3.6. *For $\alpha \in (-1, 1)$, the space $C^\infty(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}}) \cap H_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})$ is dense in $H_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})$.*

Proof. By [22, Thm. 1] the space $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}) \cap H_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})$ is dense in $H_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})$. Hence, without loss of generality, we may assume that $\mathbf{u} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}) \cap H_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})$. For $h > 0$, define the function \mathbf{u}_h by

$$\mathbf{u}_h(x_1, \dots, x_{d+1}) := \begin{cases} \mathbf{u}(x_1, \dots, x_{d+1}) & \text{if } h < x_{d+1} \\ \mathbf{u}(x_1, \dots, h) & \text{if } x_{d+1} \leq h. \end{cases}$$

By construction, $\mathbf{u}_h \in C(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}}) \cap H_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h\|_{H_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})}^2 &= \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h\|_{H_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}^d \times (0, h))}^2 = \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h\|_{L_\alpha^2(\mathbb{R}^d \times (0, h))}^2 + \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L_\alpha^2(\mathbb{R}^d \times (0, h))}^2 \\ &\lesssim \|\mathbf{u}\|_{H_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}^d \times (0, h))}^2 + \|\mathbf{u}_h\|_{L_\alpha^2(\mathbb{R}^d \times (0, h))}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

By Lebesgue Dominated Convergence, we have $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{H_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}^d \times (0, h))} = 0$. Hence, we focus on showing $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \|\mathbf{u}_h\|_{L_\alpha^2(\mathbb{R}^d \times (0, h))} = 0$. To that end, we use a 1D trace inequality: For $v \in C^1(0, \infty)$ we have $v(h) = v(y) - \int_h^y v'(t) dt$ so that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{y=h}^{h+1} y^\alpha v^2(h) dy &\leq 2 \int_{y=h}^{h+1} y^\alpha v^2(y) dy + 2 \int_{y=h}^{h+1} y^\alpha \left| \int_{t=h}^y |v'(t)| dt \right|^2 dy \\ &\lesssim \|v\|_{L_\alpha^2(h, h+1)}^2 + \int_{y=h}^{h+1} y^\alpha y^{1-\alpha} \int_{t=h}^{h+1} t^\alpha |v'(t)|^2 dt dy \lesssim \|v\|_{L_\alpha^2(h, h+1)}^2 + \|v'\|_{L_\alpha^2(h, h+1)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since there exists $C > 0$ such that for $h \in (0, 1]$, we have $C^{-1} \leq \int_h^{h+1} t^\alpha dt \leq C$, we can conclude

$$|v(h)|^2 \leq C_{\text{trace}}^2 \left[\|v\|_{L_\alpha^2(h, h+1)}^2 + \|v'\|_{L_\alpha^2(h, h+1)}^2 \right]. \quad (3.22)$$

With this, we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{u}_h\|_{L_\alpha^2(\mathbb{R}^d \times (0, h))}^2 &= \int_0^h x_{d+1}^\alpha \int_{y \in \mathbb{R}^d} \mathbf{u}_h(y, h)^2 dy dx_{d+1} = h^{\alpha+1} \int_{y \in \mathbb{R}^d} \mathbf{u}(y, h)^2 dy \\ &\stackrel{(3.22)}{\leq} C_{\text{trace}}^2 h^{\alpha+1} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{H_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}^d \times (h, h+1))}^2 \leq C_{\text{trace}}^2 h^{\alpha+1} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{H_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})}^2. \end{aligned}$$

As $\alpha + 1 > 0$ we conclude that $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \|\mathbf{u}_h\|_{L_\alpha^2(\mathbb{R}^d \times (0, h))} = 0$. Since \mathbf{u}_h is only piecewise smooth, we perform, as a last step, a mollification step. The above shows that, given $\varepsilon > 0$, we can fix h such that

$$\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h\|_{H_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})} \leq \varepsilon. \quad (3.23)$$

Next, for $0 < \delta < h/4$ define the function

$$\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_\delta := \begin{cases} \rho_\delta \star \mathbf{u}_h & h/2 < x_{d+1} \\ \mathbf{u}_h & x_{d+1} \leq h/2. \end{cases}$$

Then, $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_\delta \in C^\infty(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}}) \cap H_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})$, cf. [22], and

$$\|\mathbf{u}_h - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_\delta\|_{H_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})} = \|\mathbf{u}_h - \rho_\delta \star \mathbf{u}_h\|_{H_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}^d \times (h/2, \infty))}. \quad (3.24)$$

Note that h is already fixed. Standard results about mollification, cf., e.g., [22], show that the term $\|\mathbf{u}_h - \rho_\delta \star \mathbf{u}_h\|_{H_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}^d \times (h/2, \infty))}$ converges to zero for $\delta \rightarrow 0$. Hence, choosing δ small enough, we obtain from (3.23) and (3.24) that $\|\mathbf{u} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_\delta\|_{H_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})} \leq 2\varepsilon$, which proves the result. \square

Next, we show that the trace operator tr extends continuously to weighted Sobolev spaces.

Lemma 3.7. *Let $\alpha \in (-1, 1)$. The trace operator tr has a unique extension as linear and bounded operator $H_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and there holds the trace inequality*

$$\|\text{tr } \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C_{\text{tr}} \left(\|\mathbf{u}\|_{L_\alpha^2(\Omega_+)} + \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L_\alpha^2(\Omega_+)}^{(1-\alpha)/2} \cdot \|\partial_{d+1} \mathbf{u}\|_{L_\alpha^2(\Omega_+)}^{(1+\alpha)/2} \right). \quad (3.25)$$

for all measurable subsets $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, where $\Omega_+ := \Omega \times (0, \infty)$. The constant C_{tr} does not depend on Ω . If the support of \mathbf{u} is contained in a strip $\mathbb{R}^d \times [0, b_{d+1}]$ with $b_{d+1} > 1$, then there holds the multiplicative trace inequality

$$\|\text{tr } \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C_{\text{tr}} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L_\alpha^2(\Omega_+)}^{(1-\alpha)/2} \cdot \|\partial_{d+1} \mathbf{u}\|_{L_\alpha^2(\Omega_+)}^{(1+\alpha)/2}. \quad (3.26)$$

Proof. In order to prove all statements of the lemma, we note that due to Lemma 3.6, it is sufficient to show the multiplicative estimate (3.26) for smooth functions $\mathbf{u} \in C^\infty(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}}) \cap H_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})$. The estimate (3.25) then follows by multiplication with an appropriate cut-off function. Using the abbreviation $v(x) = \mathbf{u}(x_1, \dots, x_d, x)$, we note that due to Hölder's inequality

$$|v(0)| \leq |v(y)| + \left| \int_0^y v'(t) dt \right| \lesssim |v(y)| + y^{(1-\alpha)/2} \|v'\|_{L_\alpha^2(\mathbb{R}_+)}.$$

A one-dimensional trace inequality and a scaling argument show for $y > 0$

$$|v(y)|^2 \lesssim y^{-1} \int_y^{2y} |v(t)|^2 dt + y \int_y^{2y} |v'(t)|^2 dt.$$

For $t \in (y, 2y)$ we have $1 \leq y^{-\alpha} t^\alpha$ if $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ and $1 \leq 2^{-\alpha} y^{-\alpha} t^\alpha$ if $\alpha \in (-1, 0)$, and we conclude

$$|v(y)|^2 \lesssim y^{-1-\alpha} \|v\|_{L_\alpha^2(\mathbb{R}_+)}^2 + y^{1-\alpha} \|v'\|_{L_\alpha^2(\mathbb{R}_+)}^2.$$

If $\|v'\|_{L_\alpha^2(\mathbb{R}_+)} \neq 0$, we set $y = \|v\|_{L_\alpha^2(\mathbb{R}_+)} \cdot \|v'\|_{L_\alpha^2(\mathbb{R}_+)}^{-1}$ and get

$$|v(0)|^2 \lesssim \|v\|_{L_\alpha^2(\mathbb{R}_+)}^{1-\alpha} \cdot \|v'\|_{L_\alpha^2(\mathbb{R}_+)}^{1+\alpha}. \quad (3.27)$$

We note that (3.27) is also valid if $\|v'\|_{L_\alpha^2(\mathbb{R}_+)} = 0$ since our assumption $\text{supp } \mathbf{u} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, b_{d+1}]$ implies in this degenerate case $v \equiv 0$. Integrating $\mathbf{u}(\cdot, 0)$ over Ω and using (3.27) shows (3.26). \square

Lemma 3.8. *Let $\alpha \in (-1, 1)$ and s be given by (3.16). The trace operator tr is bounded as $\text{tr} : H_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}) \rightarrow H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and*

$$\|\text{tr } \mathbf{u}\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L_\alpha^2(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})}. \quad (3.28)$$

Proof. Due to Lemma 3.6, it suffices to show (3.28) for $\mathbf{u} \in C^\infty(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}}) \cap H_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})$. Combining (3.28) with Lemma 3.7 then proves that $\text{tr} : H_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}) \rightarrow H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is bounded. Upon writing $y = x + r\phi$ with polar coordinates $r > 0$, $\phi \in S^{d-1} := \partial B_1(0) \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, we obtain with the triangle inequality and symmetry arguments

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{tr } \mathbf{u}|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|\mathbf{u}(x, 0) - \mathbf{u}(y, 0)|^2}{|x - y|^{d+2s}} dy dx \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|\mathbf{u}(\frac{x+y}{2}, \frac{|x-y|}{2}) - \mathbf{u}(x, 0)|^2}{|x - y|^{d+2s}} dy dx \\ &\sim \int_x \int_{\phi \in S^{d-1}} \int_{r=0}^\infty \frac{|\mathbf{u}(x + \frac{r}{2}\phi, \frac{r}{2}) - \mathbf{u}(x, 0)|^2}{r^{1+2s}} dr d\phi dx. \end{aligned}$$

The fundamental theorem of calculus gives

$$\mathbf{u}(x + \frac{r}{2}\phi, \frac{r}{2}) - \mathbf{u}(x, 0) = \int_0^r \nabla_x \mathbf{u}(x + \frac{y}{2}\phi, \frac{y}{2}) \cdot \phi + \partial_{d+1} \mathbf{u}(x + \frac{y}{2}\phi, \frac{y}{2}) dy,$$

and the weighted Hardy inequality from [53, I, Thm. 9.16], cf. also [45, (1.1)], then implies

$$\int_{r=0}^\infty \frac{|\mathbf{u}(x + \frac{r}{2}\phi, \frac{r}{2}) - \mathbf{u}(x, 0)|^2}{r^{1+2s}} dr \lesssim \int_{r=0}^\infty r^{1-2s} |\nabla_x \mathbf{u}(x + \frac{r}{2}\phi, \frac{r}{2}) \cdot \phi + \partial_{d+1} \mathbf{u}(x + \frac{r}{2}\phi, \frac{r}{2})|^2 dr.$$

Hence,

$$|\text{tr } \mathbf{u}|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 \lesssim \int_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\phi \in S^{d-1}} \int_{r=0}^\infty r^{1-2s} |\nabla \mathbf{u}(x + \frac{r}{2}\phi, \frac{r}{2})|^2 dr d\phi dx \lesssim \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L_\alpha^2(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})}^2,$$

which proves (3.28). \square

Next, we will show that the trace operator $\text{tr} : H_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}) \rightarrow H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is actually onto. To that end, we generalize ideas from [20].

Lemma 3.9. *Let $\alpha \in (-1, 1)$ and s be given by (3.16). There exists a bounded linear operator $\mathcal{E} : H^s(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow H_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})$ that is a right-inverse of the trace operator tr . Furthermore, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $h > 0$ it holds*

$$\|\mathcal{E}u\|_{L_\alpha^2(\mathbb{R}^d \times (0, h))} \leq Ch^{1-s} \|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

Proof. Let $\rho \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\eta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ with $\text{supp } \eta \subset (-1, 1)$ and $\eta \equiv 1$ in $(-1/2, 1/2)$. We denote a point in \mathbb{R}_+^{d+1} by (x, t) with $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Define the extension operator as the mollification $\mathcal{E}u(x, t) := \eta(t)\rho_t \star u(x)$, where $\rho_t(y) := t^{-d}\rho(y/t)$. Since $\|\rho_t \star u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim \|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}$ uniformly in $t > 0$ (cf., e.g., [3, Thm. 2.29]), we immediately obtain the postulated estimate

$$\|\mathcal{E}u\|_{L_\alpha^2(\mathbb{R}^d \times (0, h))}^2 \leq \|\eta\|_{L^\infty}^2 \int_0^h t^\alpha \|\rho_t \star u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 dt \lesssim h^{2(1-s)} \|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2.$$

Since η is compactly supported, this also shows $\|\mathcal{E}u\|_{L^2_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})} \lesssim \|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}$. For the desired statement that $\mathcal{E} : H^s(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow H^1_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ is bounded it is sufficient to prove

$$\|\nabla_x(\rho_t \star u)\|_{L^2_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})}^2 + \|\partial_t(\rho_t \star u)\|_{L^2_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})}^2 \lesssim |u|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2.$$

To that end, we calculate

$$\partial_t(\rho_t \star u)(x) = -dt^{-d-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u(y) \rho\left(\frac{x-y}{t}\right) dy - t^{-d-2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u(y) \nabla \rho\left(\frac{x-y}{t}\right) \cdot (x-y) dy.$$

Integration by parts shows $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla \rho(z) \cdot z dz = -d$, which yields

$$-dt^{-d-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho\left(\frac{x-y}{t}\right) dy = -dt^{-1} = t^{-d-2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla \rho\left(\frac{x-y}{t}\right) \cdot (x-y) dy.$$

Hence, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t(\rho_t \star u)(x) &= -dt^{-d-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} [u(y) - u(x)] \rho\left(\frac{x-y}{t}\right) dy \\ &\quad - t^{-d-2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} [u(y) - u(x)] \nabla \rho\left(\frac{x-y}{t}\right) \cdot (x-y) dy. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we calculate for $1 \leq j \leq d$

$$\partial_{x_j}(\rho_t \star u)(x) = t^{-d-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u(y) (\partial_{x_j} \rho)\left(\frac{x-y}{t}\right) dy.$$

Integration by parts also shows that $\int (\partial_{x_j} \rho)(z) dz = 0$, which yields

$$\partial_{x_j}(\rho_t \star u)(x) = t^{-d-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} [u(y) - u(x)] (\partial_{x_j} \rho)\left(\frac{x-y}{t}\right) dy.$$

Due to the support properties of ρ , we conclude

$$|\partial_t(\rho_t \star u)(x)| + |\nabla_x(\rho_t \star u)(x)| \lesssim t^{-d-1} \int_{B_t(x)} |u(x) - u(y)| dy,$$

where $B_r(x) \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ denotes the ball of radius t centered at x . Using polar coordinates and Hardy's inequality gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^\infty t^\alpha (|\partial_t(\rho_t \star u)(x)|^2 + |\nabla_x(\rho_t \star u)(x)|^2) dt \lesssim \int_0^\infty t^\alpha \left(t^{-d-1} \int_{B_t(x)} |u(y) - u(x)| dy \right)^2 dt \\ &\leq \int_0^\infty \left(t^{-1} \int_{B_t(x)} \frac{|u(y) - u(x)|}{|x-y|^{d-\alpha/2}} dy \right)^2 dt = \int_0^\infty \left(t^{-1} \int_{B_t(0)} \frac{|u(x) - u(x-z)|}{|z|^{d-\alpha/2}} dz \right)^2 dt \\ &= \int_0^\infty \left(t^{-1} \int_{r=0}^t \int_{\phi \in S^{s-1}} \frac{|u(x) - u(x-r\phi)|}{r^{1-\alpha/2}} d\phi dr \right)^2 dt \\ &\lesssim \int_{t=0}^\infty \left(\int_{\phi \in S^{d-1}} \frac{|u(x) - u(x-t\phi)|}{t^{1-\alpha/2}} d\phi \right)^2 dt \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^2}{|x-y|^{d+2s}} dy. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating this estimate over $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ concludes the proof. \square

We are in position to prove Lemma 3.1.

Proof of Lemma 3.1. The proof follows a standard procedure. Since it involves functions in a half-space, we present some details.

Step 1: Let $\rho \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ be a symmetric, non-negative function with $\text{supp } \rho \subset B_1(0)$ and set $\rho_\varepsilon(x) := \varepsilon^{-d} \rho(x/\varepsilon)$. Introduce the translation operator τ_h by $\tau_h \varphi(x) := \varphi(x - h e_{d+1})$ with $e_{d+1} = (0, 0, \dots, 0, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$. Define for $\varepsilon > 0$ the smoothing operator \mathcal{A}_ε by $\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon \varphi = \rho_\varepsilon \star (\tau_{2\varepsilon} \varphi)$ and the regularized distribution \mathbf{u}_ε by

$$\langle \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon, \varphi \rangle := \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon \varphi \rangle = \langle \mathbf{u}, \rho_\varepsilon \star (\tau_{2\varepsilon} \varphi) \rangle,$$

where we view $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})$ as an element of $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ in the canonical way. Note that $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})$ by standard arguments and $\text{supp } \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \subset \mathbb{R}^d \times (\varepsilon, \infty)$. We also note that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \langle \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon, \varphi \rangle = \langle \mathbf{u}, \varphi \rangle \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}). \quad (3.29)$$

Step 2: For $\alpha \in [0, 1)$, we claim

$$\|x_{d+1}^{-\alpha/2} \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon(x_{d+1}^{\alpha/2} \varphi)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})} \leq \|\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})} \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}). \quad (3.30)$$

To see this, we start by noting

$$\sup_{\substack{(x,z) \\ x > \varepsilon, -\varepsilon < z < \varepsilon, x - 2\varepsilon - z > 0}} x^{-\alpha/2} (x - 2\varepsilon - z)^{\alpha/2} \leq 1. \quad (3.31)$$

We observe $x_{d+1}^{\alpha/2} \varphi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})$ and $\text{supp } \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon(x_{d+1}^{\alpha/2} \varphi) \subset \mathbb{R}^d \times (\varepsilon, \infty)$ and write

$$x_{d+1}^{-\alpha/2} \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon(x_{d+1}^{\alpha/2} \varphi)(x) = x_{d+1}^{-\alpha/2} \int_{z \in B_\varepsilon(0)} \rho_\varepsilon(z) (x_{d+1} - 2\varepsilon - z_{d+1})^{\alpha/2} \varphi(x - 2\varepsilon e_{d+1} - z) dz.$$

From (3.31) and $\rho_\varepsilon \geq 0$ we get

$$\|x_{d+1}^{-\alpha/2} \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon(x_{d+1}^{\alpha/2} \varphi)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})} \leq \|\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon \varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})} \leq \|\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})}.$$

Step 3: For $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ we have for every $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\|\nabla \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|_{L_\alpha^2(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})} \leq C \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L_\alpha^2(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})}. \quad (3.32)$$

To see (3.32), fix a bounded open $\omega \subset \mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}$. We compute for $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(\omega)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, noting that $x_{d+1}^{\alpha/2} \varphi \in \mathcal{D}(\omega)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \langle x_{d+1}^{\alpha/2} \nabla \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon, \varphi \rangle \right| &= \left| \langle \nabla \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon, x_{d+1}^{\alpha/2} \varphi \rangle \right| = \left| -\langle \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon, \nabla(x_{d+1}^{\alpha/2} \varphi) \rangle \right| \\ &= \left| -\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon \nabla(x_{d+1}^{\alpha/2} \varphi) \rangle \right| = \left| -\langle \mathbf{u}, \nabla(\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon(x_{d+1}^{\alpha/2} \varphi)) \rangle \right| = \left| \langle \nabla \mathbf{u}, \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon(x_{d+1}^{\alpha/2} \varphi) \rangle \right| \\ &\leq \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L_\alpha^2(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})} \|x_{d+1}^{-\alpha/2} \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon(x_{d+1}^{\alpha/2} \varphi)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})} \stackrel{\text{Step 2}}{\leq} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L_\alpha^2(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})} \|\varphi\|_{L^2(\omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with the observation

$$\|x_{d+1}^{\alpha/2} \nabla \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\omega)} = \sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(\omega)} \frac{\langle x_{d+1}^{\alpha/2} \nabla \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon, \varphi \rangle}{\|\varphi\|_{L^2(\omega)}} \quad (3.33)$$

gives us $\|\nabla \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|_{L_\alpha^2(\omega)} \leq \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L_\alpha^2(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})}$. The claim (3.32) now follows since ω is arbitrary.

Step 4: For $\alpha \in (-1, 0]$ we have for every bounded open $\omega \subset \mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}$ the existence of $C_\omega > 0$ such that for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$

$$\|\nabla \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\omega)} \leq C_\omega \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L_\alpha^2(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})}.$$

The proof follows by inspecting the procedure of Step 2 and essentially using Step 2 with $\alpha = 0$ there.

Step 5: Steps 3 and 4 show that $\mathbf{u} \in H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})$: Fix a bounded, open and connected $\omega \subset \mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}$. Fix a $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(\omega)$ with $(\varphi, 1)_{L^2(\omega)} \neq 0$. Exploiting the norm equivalence

$$\|v\|_{H^1(\omega)} \sim \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\omega)} + |(\varphi, v)_{L^2(\omega)}| \quad \forall v \in H^1(\omega)$$

we infer from Steps 3, 4, and the observation $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} (\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon, \varphi)_{L^2(\omega)} = \langle \mathbf{u}, \varphi \rangle$ that $(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon \in (0, 1]}$ is uniformly bounded in $H^1(\omega)$. Thus, a subsequence converges weakly in $H^1(\omega)$ and strongly in $L^2(\omega)$ to a limit, which is the representation of the distribution \mathbf{u} on ω .

Step 6: Claim: For any bounded open $\omega \subset \mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}$ we have $\mathbf{u} \in L_\alpha^2(\omega)$. It suffices to show norm bounds for bounded open sets of the form $\omega = \omega^0 \times (0, 1)$ with $\omega^0 \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. For that, consider again the regularized functions \mathbf{u}_ε and assume, additionally (with the aid of a cut-off function), that $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon(x, x_{d+1}) = 0$ for $x_{d+1} \geq 1$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then for $x_{d+1} \in (0, 1)$ we have

$$\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon(x, x_{d+1}) = - \int_{x_{d+1}}^1 \partial_{d+1} \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon(x, t) dt. \quad (3.34)$$

For $\alpha \in (-1, 0]$, we square, multiply by x_{d+1}^α , and integrate to get

$$\|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|_{L_\alpha^2(\omega)}^2 \leq C \|\partial_{d+1} \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\omega)}^2.$$

Since $\|\partial_{d+1} \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\omega)}$ can be controlled uniformly in $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ by Steps 4, 5 the proof is complete for $\alpha \in (-1, 0]$. For $\alpha \in [0, 1)$, we square (3.34), use a Cauchy-Schwarz inequality on the right-hand side and integrate to get

$$\|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\omega)}^2 \leq C_\alpha \|\partial_{d+1} \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\omega)}^2.$$

Again, Steps 3, 5 allows us to control the right-hand side uniformly in ε . \square

Proof of Lemma 3.2. We choose an open cover $(U_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ of \mathbb{R}_+^{d+1} by bounded sets and a partition of unity $(\psi_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ subordinate to this cover. For $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{B}_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})$ we have $\mathbf{u}\psi_j \in H_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})$, and according to Lemma 3.6, $\mathbf{u}\psi_j$ can be approximated to arbitrary accuracy by a function $\varphi_j \in C^\infty(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}}) \cap H_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})$ in the norm of $H_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})$ and hence also in the norm of $\mathcal{B}_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})$. By construction, only a finite number of φ_j overlap, and hence $\sum_{j=0}^\infty \varphi_j \in C^\infty(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}}) \cap \mathcal{B}_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1})$. \square

Proof of Lemma 3.3. Using an appropriate cut-off function, this is a simple consequence of Lemmas 3.2, 3.7, and 3.8. \square

Proof of Corollary 3.4. Due to the density result of Lemma 3.2 and the definition of the trace operator, it suffices to show

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^2_\alpha(K)} \lesssim \|\operatorname{tr} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(K')} + \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2_\alpha(K)}$$

for all $\mathbf{u} \in C^\infty(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}})$. Using the abbreviation $v(x) = \mathbf{u}(x_1, \dots, x_d, x)$, we note that due to Hölder's inequality,

$$|v(x)|^2 \lesssim |v(0)|^2 + \left| \int_0^x v'(t) dt \right|^2 \lesssim |v(0)|^2 + x^{1-\alpha} \|v'\|_{L^2_\alpha(0, b_{d+1})}^2.$$

Multiplying the last equation by x^α and integrating over K finishes the proof. \square

4 \mathcal{H} -matrix approximability

For any subset $D \subset \mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}$ define the space

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_h(D) := \{ & \mathbf{u} \in H_\alpha^1(D) \mid \exists \tilde{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathcal{B}_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}), \operatorname{tr} \tilde{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathcal{S}_0^1(\mathcal{T}_h) \subset H_0^s(\mathbb{R}^d; \Omega) \text{ such that } \mathbf{u}|_D = \tilde{\mathbf{u}}|_D, \\ & a(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}, \mathbf{v}) = 0 \text{ for all } \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{B}_{\alpha,0}^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}) \} \end{aligned}$$

and the space with additional orthogonality

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{h,0}(D) := \{ & \mathbf{u} \in H_\alpha^1(D) \mid \exists \tilde{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathcal{B}_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}), \tilde{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathcal{S}_0^1(\mathcal{T}_h) \subset H_0^s(\mathbb{R}^d; \Omega) \text{ such that } \mathbf{u}|_D = \tilde{\mathbf{u}}|_D, \\ & a(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}, \mathbf{v}) = 0 \text{ for all } \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{B}_{\alpha,0}^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}) \\ & \text{and all } \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{B}_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}) \text{ with } \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{S}_0^1(\mathcal{T}_h) \subset H_0^s(\mathbb{R}^d; \Omega) \text{ and } \operatorname{supp}(\operatorname{tr} \mathbf{v}) \subset \overline{D} \cap \mathbb{R}^d \}. \end{aligned}$$

Define the cubes with side length R (henceforth called ‘‘box’’) by

$$B_R := B_R^0 \times (0, R) \subset \mathbb{R}^{d+1}. \quad (4.35)$$

We say that two boxes B_{R_1} and B_{R_2} are concentric if their projections on \mathbb{R}^d , i.e., the corresponding cubes $B_{R_1}^0$ and $B_{R_2}^0$, share the same barycenter and are concentric. For $h > 0$, we define on $H_\alpha^1(B_R)$ the norm

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_{h,R}^2 := \left(\frac{h}{R} \right)^2 \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L_\alpha^2(B_R)}^2 + \frac{1}{R^2} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L_\alpha^2(B_R)}^2.$$

We have the following Caccioppoli-type inequality.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a Lipschitz domain. Let $R \in (0, 8 \operatorname{diam}(\Omega))$, $\delta \in (0, 1)$, and $h > 0$ be such that $16h \leq \delta R$. Let B_R and $B_{(1+\delta)R}$ be two concentric boxes. Then, there exists a constant $C > 0$ depending only on Ω , d , and the γ -shape regularity of \mathcal{T}_h , such that for all $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{H}_{h,0}(B_{(1+\delta)R})$ it holds*

$$\|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L_\alpha^2(B_R)} \leq C \frac{1+\delta}{\delta} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{h,(1+\delta)R}. \quad (4.36)$$

Proof. In the proof, various boxes will appear. They will always be assumed to be concentric to B_R . Choose a function $\eta \in W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ with $(\operatorname{tr} \eta)|_\Omega \in \mathcal{S}_0^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$, $\eta \equiv 1$ on B_R , $\operatorname{supp}(\eta) \subset B_{(1+\delta/4)R}$, $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$, and $\|\nabla \eta\|_\infty \lesssim (\delta R)^{-1}$. We calculate

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L_\alpha^2(B_R)}^2 &\leq \|\nabla(\eta \mathbf{u})\|_{L_\alpha^2(B_{(1+\delta)R})}^2 = \int_{B_{(1+\delta)R}} x_{d+1}^\alpha \nabla(\eta \mathbf{u}) \cdot \nabla(\eta \mathbf{u}) \, dx \\ &= \int_{B_{(1+\delta)R}} x_{d+1}^\alpha \mathbf{u}^2 (\nabla \eta)^2 \, dx + \int_{B_{(1+\delta)R}} x_{d+1}^\alpha \nabla \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla(\eta^2 \mathbf{u}) \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

We first deal with the last integral on the right-hand side. Due to the support properties of η and the orthogonality properties of space $\mathcal{H}_{h,0}(B_{(1+\delta)R})$, we see

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{(1+\delta)R}} x_{d+1}^\alpha \nabla \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla(\eta^2 \mathbf{u}) \, dx &= \int_{(1+\delta)R} x_{d+1}^\alpha \nabla \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla (\tilde{\eta} \mathcal{E}(\operatorname{tr}(\eta^2 \mathbf{u})) - I_h \operatorname{tr}(\eta^2 \mathbf{u})) \, dx \\ &\leq \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L_\alpha^2(B_{(1+\delta)R})} \cdot \|\nabla (\tilde{\eta} \mathcal{E}(\operatorname{tr}(\eta^2 \mathbf{u})) - I_h \operatorname{tr}(\eta^2 \mathbf{u}))\|_{L_\alpha^2(B_{(1+\delta)R})} \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\eta}$ is a cut-off function with support contained $B_{(1+3\delta/4)R}^0 \times (0, 3\delta R/4)$ and $\tilde{\eta} \equiv 1$ on $B_{(1+\delta/2)R}^0 \times (0, \delta R/2)$, such that $\|\nabla \tilde{\eta}\|_\infty \lesssim (\delta R)^{-1}$. Furthermore, $I_h : C(\bar{\Omega}) \cap H_0^1(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_0^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$ is the usual nodal interpolation operator (extended by zero outside Ω). Then, using Lemma 3.9, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\nabla (\tilde{\eta} \mathcal{E}(\operatorname{tr}(\eta^2 \mathbf{u})) - I_h \operatorname{tr}(\eta^2 \mathbf{u}))\|_{L_\alpha^2(B_{(1+\delta)R})} \\ &\leq \|\nabla (\mathcal{E}(\operatorname{tr}(\eta^2 \mathbf{u})) - I_h \operatorname{tr}(\eta^2 \mathbf{u}))\|_{L_\alpha^2(B_{(1+\delta)R})} + (\delta R)^{-1} \|\mathcal{E}(\operatorname{tr}(\eta^2 \mathbf{u})) - I_h \operatorname{tr}(\eta^2 \mathbf{u})\|_{L_\alpha^2(B_{(1+3\delta/4)R})} \\ &\lesssim \|\operatorname{tr}(\eta^2 \mathbf{u}) - I_h \operatorname{tr}(\eta^2 \mathbf{u})\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)} + (\delta R)^{-s} \|\operatorname{tr}(\eta^2 \mathbf{u}) - I_h \operatorname{tr}(\eta^2 \mathbf{u})\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}. \end{aligned}$$

For $r \in [0, 1]$ it holds

$$\|\operatorname{tr}(\eta^2 \mathbf{u}) - I_h \operatorname{tr}(\eta^2 \mathbf{u})\|_{H^r(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 \lesssim h^{4-2r} \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} |\operatorname{tr}(\eta^2 \mathbf{u})|_{H^2(K)}^2, \quad (4.37)$$

and a short calculation, cf. [17], and an inverse estimate show that

$$\begin{aligned} |\operatorname{tr}(\eta^2 \mathbf{u})|_{H^2(K)}^2 &\lesssim \frac{1}{(\delta R)^2} \|\nabla \operatorname{tr}(\eta \mathbf{u})\|_{L^2(K)}^2 + \frac{1}{(\delta R)^4} \|\operatorname{tr} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(K)}^2 \\ &\lesssim \frac{h^{2s-2}}{(\delta R)^2} \|\operatorname{tr}(\eta \mathbf{u})\|_{H^s(K)}^2 + \frac{1}{(\delta R)^4} \|\operatorname{tr} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(K)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

By the support properties of η , the sum in (4.37) extends over elements $K \cap B_{(1+\delta/4)R} \neq \emptyset$. As $h \leq (\delta R)/16$, it holds $\bigcup_{K \cap B_{(1+\delta/4)R} \neq \emptyset} K \subset B_{(1+\delta/2)R}^0$. Then, using $h/(\delta R) \leq 1$, we conclude that

$$\|\nabla(\tilde{\eta}\mathcal{E}(\text{tr}(\eta^2\mathbf{u}) - I_h \text{tr}(\eta^2\mathbf{u})))\|_{L_\alpha^2(B_{(1+\delta)R})} \lesssim \frac{h}{(\delta R)} \|\text{tr}(\eta\mathbf{u})\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)} + \frac{h^{2-s}}{(\delta R)^2} \|\text{tr} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(B_{(1+\delta/2)R}^0)}.$$

Choosing a cut-off function η_2 with $\eta_2 \equiv 1$ on $B_{(1+\delta/2)R}$ and support contained in $B_{(1+3\delta/4)R}$ and employing the multiplicative trace inequality from Lemma 3.7 we see

$$\begin{aligned} \|\text{tr} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(B_{(1+\delta/2)R}^0)} &\leq \|\text{tr}(\eta_2\mathbf{u})\|_{L^2(B_{(1+3\delta/4)R}^0)} \leq C_{\text{tr}} \|\eta_2\mathbf{u}\|_{L_\alpha^2(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})} \|\nabla(\eta_2\mathbf{u})\|_{L_\alpha^2(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})}^{1-s} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{(\delta R)^{1-s}} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L_\alpha^2(B_{(1+\delta)R})} + \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L_\alpha^2(B_{(1+\delta)R})}^s \|\nabla\mathbf{u}\|_{L_\alpha^2(B_{(1+\delta)R})}^{1-s}. \end{aligned}$$

Together with the boundedness of the trace operator asserted in Lemma 3.8, i.e., $\|\text{tr}(\eta\mathbf{u})\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L_\alpha^2(B_{(1+\delta)R})} + \|\nabla(\eta\mathbf{u})\|_{L_\alpha^2(B_{(1+\delta)R})}$, this implies

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{(1+\delta)R}} x_{d+1}^\alpha \nabla\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla(\eta^2\mathbf{u}) \, dx &\lesssim \|\nabla\mathbf{u}\|_{L_\alpha^2(B_{(1+\delta)R})} \cdot \left(\frac{h}{\delta R} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L_\alpha^2(B_{(1+\delta)R})} + \frac{h}{\delta R} \|\nabla(\eta\mathbf{u})\|_{L_\alpha^2(B_{(1+\delta)R})} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{h^{2-s}}{(\delta R)^{2+(1-s)}} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L_\alpha^2(B_{(1+\delta)R})} + \frac{h^{2-s}}{(\delta R)^2} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L_\alpha^2(B_{(1+\delta)R})}^s \|\nabla\mathbf{u}\|_{L_\alpha^2(B_{(1+\delta)R})}^{1-s} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The four products on the right-hand side are estimated with Young's inequality: the first three ones using the form $ab \leq \varepsilon a^2 + \frac{1}{4\varepsilon} b^2$, and the last one with exponents $\frac{2}{2-s}$ and $\frac{2}{s}$. We conclude that there are positive constants C_1 and C_2 such that

$$\|\nabla(\eta\mathbf{u})\|_{L_\alpha^2(B_{(1+\delta)R})}^2 \leq C_1 \frac{1}{(\delta R)^2} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L_\alpha^2(B_{(1+\delta)R})}^2 + C_2 \frac{h^2}{(\delta R)^2} \|\nabla\mathbf{u}\|_{L_\alpha^2(B_{(1+\delta)R})}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla(\eta\mathbf{u})\|_{L_\alpha^2(B_{(1+\delta)R})}^2.$$

Subtracting the last term from the left-hand side finishes the proof. \square

Denote by $\Pi_{h,R} : (H_\alpha^1(B_R), \|\cdot\|_{h,R}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{H}_{h,0}(B_R), \|\cdot\|_{h,R})$ the orthogonal projection. For \mathcal{K}_H a shape-regular triangulation of \mathbb{R}_+^{d+1} of mesh width H , denote by $\Pi_H : H_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}^1(\mathcal{K}_H)$ the operator from [46].

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and $R \in (0, 4 \text{diam}(\Omega))$ be such that $16h \leq \delta R$. Let B_R , $B_{(1+\delta)R}$, and $B_{(1+2\delta)R}$ be three concentric boxes. Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{H}_{h,0}(B_{(1+2\delta)R})$ and suppose that $16H \leq \delta R$. Let $\eta \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ with $\text{supp}(\eta) \subset B_{(1+\delta)R}$ and $\eta = 1$ on B_R . Then it holds*

- (i) $(\mathbf{u} - \Pi_{h,R}\Pi_H(\eta\mathbf{u}))|_{B_R} \in \mathcal{H}_{h,0}(B_R)$;
- (ii) $\|\|\mathbf{u} - \Pi_{h,R}\Pi_H(\eta\mathbf{u})\|\|_{h,R} \leq C_{\text{app}} \frac{1+2\delta}{\delta} \left(\frac{h}{R} + \frac{H}{R}\right) \|\|u\|\|_{h,(1+2\delta)R}$;
- (iii) $\dim W \leq C_{\text{app}} \left(\frac{(1+2\delta)R}{H}\right)^{d+1}$, where $W := \Pi_{h,R}\Pi_H\eta\mathcal{H}_{h,0}(B_{(1+2\delta)R})$.

Proof. To see (i), note that if $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{H}_{h,0}(B_{(1+2\delta)R})$, then $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{H}_{h,0}(B_R)$, and $\Pi_{h,R}$ maps into $\mathcal{H}_{h,0}(B_R)$. To see (ii), first note that due to the support properties of η and the fact that $\Pi_{h,R}$ is the orthogonal projection, it holds

$$\|\|\mathbf{u} - \Pi_{h,R}\Pi_H(\eta\mathbf{u})\|\|_{h,R}^2 = \|\|\Pi_{h,R}(\eta\mathbf{u} - \Pi_H(\eta\mathbf{u}))\|\|_{h,R}^2 \leq \|\|\eta\mathbf{u} - \Pi_H(\eta\mathbf{u})\|\|_{h,R}^2.$$

Furthermore, due to the approximation properties of Π_H given in [46, Thm. 5.4], we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\|\eta\mathbf{u} - \Pi_H(\eta\mathbf{u})\|\|_{h,R}^2 &= \frac{h^2}{R^2} \|\|\nabla(\eta\mathbf{u} - \Pi_H(\eta\mathbf{u}))\|\|_{L_\alpha^2(B_R)}^2 + \frac{1}{R^2} \|\|\eta\mathbf{u} - \Pi_H(\eta\mathbf{u})\|\|_{L_\alpha^2(B_R)}^2 \\ &\lesssim \left(\frac{h^2}{R^2} + \frac{H^2}{R^2} \right) \|\|\nabla(\eta\mathbf{u})\|\|_{L_\alpha^2(B_{(1+\delta)R})}^2 \\ &\lesssim \left(\frac{h^2}{R^2} + \frac{H^2}{R^2} \right) \left(\frac{1}{\delta^2 R^2} \|\|\mathbf{u}\|\|_{L_\alpha^2(B_{(1+\delta)R})}^2 + \|\|\nabla\mathbf{u}\|\|_{L_\alpha^2(B_{(1+\delta)R})}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 4.1 with $\tilde{\delta} = \delta/(1+\delta)$ and $\tilde{R} = (1+\delta)R$, i.e., $(1+\tilde{\delta})\tilde{R} = (1+2\delta)R$, shows

$$\|\|\nabla\mathbf{u}\|\|_{L_\alpha^2(B_{(1+\delta)R})}^2 \lesssim \frac{(1+2\delta)^2}{\delta^2} \|\|\mathbf{u}\|\|_{h,(1+2\delta)R}^2.$$

Together with the trivial estimate $\|\|\mathbf{u}\|\|_{L_\alpha^2(B_{(1+\delta)R})} \leq (1+2\delta)R\|\|\mathbf{u}\|\|_{h,(1+2\delta)R}$ we conclude (ii). Statement (iii) follows from the local definition of the operator Π_H . \square

Lemma 4.3. *Let $q, \kappa \in (0, 1)$, $R \in (0, 2 \operatorname{diam}(\Omega))$, and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Assume*

$$h \leq \frac{\kappa q R}{64k \max\{1, C_{\text{app}}\}}, \quad (4.38)$$

where C_{app} is the constant from Lemma 4.2. Then, there exists a finite dimensional subspace \widehat{W}_k of $\mathcal{H}_h(B_{(1+\kappa)R})$ with dimension $\dim \widehat{W}_k \leq C_{\dim} \left(\frac{1+\kappa^{-1}}{q} \right)^{d+1} k^{d+2}$ such that for every $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{H}_{h,0}(B_{(1+\kappa)R})$ it holds

$$\min_{\mathbf{v} \in \widehat{W}_k} \|\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}\|\|_{h,R} \leq q^k \|\|\mathbf{u}\|\|_{h,(1+\kappa)R}.$$

Proof. Define $H := \frac{\kappa q R}{64k \max\{1, C_{\text{app}}\}}$, then $h \leq H$. Define $\delta_j := \kappa \frac{k-j}{k}$ for $j = 0, \dots, k$. This yields $\kappa = \delta_0 > \delta_1 \geq \dots \geq \delta_k = 0$. Now we will repeatedly apply Lemma 4.2 k times, with $\tilde{R}_j = (1+\delta_j)R$ and $\tilde{\delta}_j = \frac{1}{2k(1+\delta_j)}$. This can be done, as $\tilde{R}_j \leq 4 \operatorname{diam}(\Omega)$, $\tilde{\delta}_j < 1/2$, and

$$16H \leq \frac{R}{4k \max\{1, C_{\text{app}}\}} \leq \frac{R}{2k(1+\delta_j)} = \tilde{\delta}_j R \leq \tilde{\delta}_j \tilde{R}_j.$$

Note that $(1+2\tilde{\delta}_j)\tilde{R}_j = (1+\delta_{j-1})R$. The first application of Lemma 4.2 yields a function \mathbf{w}_1 in a subspace \widehat{W}_1 of $\mathcal{H}_h(B_{(1+\delta_1)R})$ with $\dim W_1 \leq C_{\text{app}} \left(\frac{(1+\kappa)R}{H} \right)^{d+1}$ such that

$$\|\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{w}_1\|\|_{h,(1+\delta_1)R} \leq 2C_{\text{app}} \frac{1+2\tilde{\delta}_1}{\tilde{\delta}_1} \frac{H}{\tilde{R}_1} \|\|\mathbf{u}\|\|_{h,(1+2\tilde{\delta}_1)\tilde{R}_1} = 8C_{\text{app}} \frac{kH}{R} \|\|\mathbf{u}\|\|_{h,(1+\delta_0)R} \leq q \|\|\mathbf{u}\|\|_{h,(1+\delta_0)R}.$$

As $\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{w}_1 \in \mathcal{H}_h(B_{(1+\delta_1)R})$, a second application of Lemma 4.2 yields a function \mathbf{w}_2 in a subspace W_2 of $\mathcal{H}_h(B_{(1+\delta_2)R})$ such that

$$\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{w}_1 - \mathbf{w}_2\|_{h,(1+\delta_2)R} \leq q \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{w}_1\|_{h,(1+\delta_1)R} \leq q^2 \|\mathbf{u}\|_{h,(1+\delta_0)R}.$$

Applying k times Lemma 4.2, we obtain a function $\mathbf{v} = \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbf{w}_j$ that is an element of the subspace $V_k := \sum_{j=1}^k W_j$ of $\mathcal{H}_h(B_R)$ and fulfills $\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}\|_{h,R} \leq q^k \|\mathbf{u}\|_{h,(1+\kappa)R}$. \square

Proposition 4.4. *Let $\eta > 0$ be a fixed admissibility parameter and $q \in (0, 1)$. Let (τ, σ) be a cluster pair with admissible bounding boxes $B_{R_\tau}^0$ and $B_{R_\sigma}^0$, that is, $\eta \operatorname{dist}(B_{R_\tau}^0, B_{R_\sigma}^0) \geq \operatorname{diam}(B_{R_\tau}^0)$. Then, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a space $V_k \subset \mathcal{S}_0^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$ with $\dim V_k \leq C_{\dim}(2 + \eta)^{d+1} q^{-(d+1)} k^{d+2}$ such that if $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ with $\operatorname{supp}(f) \subset B_{R_\sigma}^0 \cap \Omega$, the solution u_h of (2.10) satisfies*

$$\min_{v \in V_k} \|u_h - v\|_{L^2(B_{R_\tau}^0)} \leq C_{\text{box}} h^{-1} q^k \|f\|_{L^2(B_{R_\sigma}^0)}. \quad (4.39)$$

Proof. Set $\kappa := (1 + \eta)^{-1}$. We distinguish two cases.

1. **Condition (4.38) is satisfied with $R = R_\tau$:** As $\operatorname{dist}(B_{R_\tau}, B_{R_\sigma}) \geq \eta^{-1} \operatorname{diam}(B_{R_\tau}) = \eta^{-1} \sqrt{d} R_\tau$, we conclude

$$\operatorname{dist}(B_{(1+\kappa)R_\tau}, B_{R_\sigma}) \geq \operatorname{dist}(B_{R_\tau}, B_{R_\sigma}) - \kappa R_\tau \sqrt{d} = \sqrt{d} R_\tau \frac{1}{\eta(1+\eta)} > 0,$$

hence $\mathcal{L}u_h \in \mathcal{H}_{h,0}(B_{(1+\kappa)R_\tau})$. Lemma 4.3 implies that there is a space \widehat{W}_k with

$$\min_{\mathbf{v} \in \widehat{W}_k} \|\mathcal{L}u_h - \mathbf{v}\|_{h,R_\tau} \leq q^k \|\mathcal{L}u_h\|_{h,(1+\kappa)R_\tau}.$$

Now

$$\|\mathcal{L}u_h\|_{h,(1+\kappa)R_\tau} \lesssim \left(1 + \frac{1}{R_\tau}\right) \|\mathcal{L}u_h\|_{\mathcal{B}_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})} \lesssim \left(1 + \frac{1}{R_\tau}\right) \|\Pi f\|_{L_2(\Omega)},$$

where the last estimate follows from (3.20) and Lemma 3.5. On the other hand, employing an appropriate cut-off function and the multiplicative trace estimate of Lemma 3.7 shows

$$\|u_h - \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(B_{R_\tau}^0)} \lesssim \frac{1}{R_\tau} \|\mathcal{L}u_h - \mathbf{v}\|_{L_\alpha^2(B_{R_\tau})} + \|\nabla(\mathcal{L}u_h - \mathbf{v})\|_{L_\alpha^2(B_{R_\tau})} \lesssim \frac{R_\tau}{h} \|\mathcal{L}u_h - \mathbf{v}\|_{h,R_\tau}.$$

Combining the last three chains of estimates, we get the desired result if we set $V_k := \operatorname{tr} \widehat{W}_k$.

2. **Condition (4.38) is not satisfied with $R = R_\tau$:** We select $V_k := \{v|_{B_{R_\tau}^0} \mid v \in \mathcal{S}_0^1(\mathcal{T}_h)\}$. The minimum in (4.39) is then zero and

$$\dim V_k \lesssim \left(\frac{R_\tau}{h}\right)^d \leq \left(\frac{64k \max\{1, C_{\text{app}}\}}{\kappa q}\right)^d \lesssim k^d (1 + \eta)^d q^{-d}.$$

□

Proof of Theorem 2.2. Suppose first that $C_{\dim}(2+\eta)^{d+1}q^{-(d+1)}k^{d+2} \geq \min\{|\tau|, |\sigma|\}$. In the case $\min\{|\tau|, |\sigma|\} = |\tau|$ we set $\mathbf{X}_{\tau\sigma} = \mathbf{I} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau| \times |\tau|}$ and $\mathbf{Y}_{\tau\sigma} = \mathbf{A}^{-1}|_{\tau \times \sigma}^\top$. If $\min\{|\tau|, |\sigma|\} = |\sigma|$, we set $\mathbf{X}_{\tau\sigma} = \mathbf{A}^{-1}|_{\tau \times \sigma}$ and $\mathbf{Y}_{\tau\sigma} = \mathbf{I} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\sigma| \times |\sigma|}$. Now suppose that $C_{\dim}(2+\eta)^{d+1}q^{-(d+1)}k^{d+2} < \min\{|\tau|, |\sigma|\}$. For a cluster $\tau \subset \mathcal{I}$ we define $\mathbb{R}^\tau := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N \mid \mathbf{x}_j = 0 \forall j \notin \tau\}$. According to [48], there exist linear functionals λ_i such that $\lambda_i(\psi_j) = \delta_{ij}$, and

$$\|\lambda_i(w)\psi_i\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \lesssim \|w\|_{L_2(\text{supp}(\psi_i))}, \quad (4.40)$$

where the hidden constant depends only on the shape-regularity of \mathcal{T}_h . Define

$$\Phi_\tau : \begin{cases} \mathbb{R}^\tau \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_0^1(\mathcal{T}_h) \\ \mathbf{x} \mapsto \sum_{j \in \tau} \mathbf{x}_j \psi_j \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda_\tau : \begin{cases} L_2(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\tau \\ w \mapsto \mathbf{w} \end{cases},$$

where $\mathbf{w}_j = \lambda_j(w)$ for $j \in \tau$ and $\mathbf{w}_j = 0$ else. Note that $h^{d/2}\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 \sim \|\Phi_\tau(\mathbf{x})\|_{L_2(\Omega)}$ for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^\tau$, and that $\Phi_\tau \circ \Lambda_\tau$ is bounded in $L_2(\Omega)$. For $\Lambda_\mathcal{I}^*$ the adjoint of $\Lambda_\mathcal{I}$, this implies $\|\Lambda_\mathcal{I}^*\|_{\mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow L_2(\Omega)} \lesssim h^{-d/2}$. Let V_k be the space of Proposition 4.4. We define the columns of $\mathbf{X}_{\tau\sigma}$ to be a orthogonal basis of the space $\{\Lambda_\tau w \mid w \in V_k\}$ and $\mathbf{Y}_{\tau\sigma} := \mathbf{A}^{-1}|_{\tau \times \sigma}^\top \mathbf{X}_{\tau\sigma}$. The ranks of $\mathbf{X}_{\tau\sigma}$ and $\mathbf{Y}_{\tau\sigma}$ are then bounded by $C_{\dim}(2+\eta)^{d+1}q^{-(d+1)}k^{d+2}$. Now, for $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^\sigma$, set $f := \Lambda_\tau^*(\mathbf{b})$. This yields $b_i = (f, \psi_i)_\Omega$ and $\text{supp}(f) \subset \overline{B_{R_\sigma}} \cap \Omega$. According to Proposition 4.4, there exists an element $v \in V_k$ such that $\|u_h - v\|_{L_2(B_{R_\tau}^0 \cap \Omega)} \lesssim h^{-1}q^k \|f\|_{L_2(B_{R_\sigma}^0)}$. This implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Lambda_\tau u_h - \Lambda_\tau v\|_2 &\lesssim h^{-d/2} \|\Phi_\tau \circ \Lambda_\tau(u_h - v)\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \lesssim h^{-d/2} \|u_h - v\|_{L_2(B_{R_\tau}^0 \cap \Omega)} \\ &\lesssim h^{-1-d/2} q^k \|f\|_{L_2(B_{R_\sigma}^0)} \lesssim h^{-1-d} q^k \|\mathbf{b}\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

For $\mathbf{z} := \mathbf{X}_{\tau\sigma} \mathbf{X}_{\tau\sigma}^\top \Lambda_\tau u_h$ it holds

$$\|\Lambda_\tau u_h - \mathbf{z}\|_2 \leq \|\Lambda_\tau u_h - \Lambda_\tau v\|_2 \lesssim h^{-1-d} q^k \|\mathbf{b}\|_2.$$

As $\Lambda_\tau u_h = \mathbf{A}^{-1}|_{\tau \times \sigma} \mathbf{b}|_\sigma$, we obtain

$$\|(\mathbf{A}^{-1}|_{\tau \times \sigma} - \mathbf{X}_{\tau\sigma} \mathbf{Y}_{\tau\sigma}^\top) \mathbf{b}|_\sigma\|_2 \lesssim N^{\frac{1+d}{d}} q^k \|\mathbf{b}\|_2.$$

As $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^\sigma$ was arbitrary, the result follows. □

5 Numerical experiments

We provide numerical experiments in two space dimensions, i.e., $d = 2$, that confirm our theoretical findings. The indices \mathcal{I} of the standard basis of the space $\mathcal{S}_0^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$ based on a quasiuniform triangulation of Ω , are organized in a cluster tree $\mathbb{T}_\mathcal{I}$ that is obtained by a geometric clustering, i.e., bounding boxes are split in half perpendicular to their longest edge until the corresponding

clusters are smaller than $n_{\text{leaf}} = 20$. The block cluster tree is based on that cluster tree using the admissibility parameter $\eta = 2$. In order to calculate a blockwise rank- r approximation $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}}^r$ of \mathbf{A}^{-1} , we compute the densely populated system matrix \mathbf{A} using the MATLAB code presented in [1]. On admissible cluster pairs, we compute a rank- r approximation of the corresponding matrix block by singular value decomposition. We carried out experiments for $s \in \{0.25, 0.5, 0.75\}$ on a square and an L-shaped domain. On the square, we use a coarse mesh of 2674 elements, resulting in 358 admissible and 591 non-admissible blocks, and a fine mesh of 17130 elements, resulting in 5234 admissible and 5486 non-admissible blocks. On the L-shaped domain, we use a mesh of 6560 elements, resulting in 640 admissible and 1332 non-admissible blocks. Note that for a fixed mesh and cluster tree, Theorem 2.5 predicts $\|\mathbf{A}^{-1} - \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}}^r\|_2 \lesssim e^{-br^{1/4}}$. However, in our experiments we observe that the error behaves like $\|\mathbf{A}^{-1} - \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}}^r\|_2 \sim e^{-10r^{1/3}}$. Hence, we will plot the error logarithmically over the third root of the block rank r , and include the reference curve $e^{-10r^{1/3}}$.




Figure 1: Square domain, $s = 0.25$, 2674 elements.




Figure 2: Square domain, $s = 0.25$, 17130 elements.

6 Conclusions and extensions

We have shown that the inverse \mathbf{A}^{-1} of the stiffness matrix \mathbf{A} of a Galerkin discretization of the fractional Laplacian can be approximated at an exponential rate in the block rank by \mathcal{H} -matrices, using the standard admissibility criterion (2.11). The following extensions are possible:

- We restricted our analysis to the discretization by piecewise linears. However, the analysis generalizes to approximation by piecewise polynomials of fixed degree p .
- We focussed on the approximability of \mathbf{A}^{-1} in the \mathcal{H} -format. Computationally attractive are also factorizations such as \mathcal{H} -LU or \mathcal{H} -Cholesky factorizations. The ability to find an approximate $\mathbf{A} \approx L_{\mathcal{H}}U_{\mathcal{H}}$ has been shown for (classical) FEM discretizations in [6, 17] and for non-local BEM matrices in [18, 19] with techniques that generalize to the present case of the fractional Laplacian.
- Related to \mathcal{H} -matrices is the format of \mathcal{H}^2 -matrices discussed in [31, 8, 30, 7]. Using the techniques employed in [7, 17, 18, 19], one may also show that \mathbf{A}^{-1} can be approximated




Figure 3: Square domain, $s = 0.5$, 2674 elements.

by \mathcal{H}^2 -matrices at an exponential rate in the block rank.

References

- [1] G. Acosta, F. M. Bersetche, and J. P. Borthagaray. A short FE implementation for a 2d homogeneous Dirichlet problem of a fractional Laplacian. *Comput. Math. Appl.*, 74(4):784–816, 2017.
- [2] G. Acosta and J. P. Borthagaray. A fractional Laplace equation: regularity of solutions and finite element approximations. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 55(2):472–495, 2017.
- [3] R. A. Adams and J. J. F. Fournier. *Sobolev spaces*, volume 140 of *Pure and Applied Mathematics (Amsterdam)*. Elsevier/Academic Press, Amsterdam, second edition, 2003.




Figure 4: Square domain, $s = 0.5$, 17130 elements.

- [4] M. Ainsworth and C. Glusa. Aspects of an adaptive finite element method for the fractional Laplacian: a priori and a posteriori error estimates, efficient implementation and multigrid solver. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 327:4–35, 2017.
- [5] M. Bebendorf. Hierarchical LU decomposition-based preconditioners for BEM. *Computing*, 74(3):225–247, 2005.
- [6] M. Bebendorf. Why finite element discretizations can be factored by triangular hierarchical matrices. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 45(4):1472–1494, 2007.
- [7] S. Börm. Approximation of solution operators of elliptic partial differential equations by \mathcal{H} - and \mathcal{H}^2 -matrices. *Numer. Math.*, 115(2):165–193, 2010.
- [8] S. Börm. *Efficient numerical methods for non-local operators*, volume 14 of *EMS Tracts in Mathematics*. European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, 2010.
- [9] X. Cabré and J. Tan. Positive solutions of nonlinear problems involving the square root of the Laplacian. *Adv. Math.*, 224(5):2052–2093, 2010.




Figure 5: Square domain, $s = 0.75$, 2674 elements.

- [10] L. Caffarelli and L. Silvestre. An extension problem related to the fractional Laplacian. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 32(7-9):1245–1260, 2007.
- [11] L. Caffarelli and P. Stinga. Fractional elliptic equations, Caccioppoli estimates and regularity. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 33(3):767–807, 2016.
- [12] A. Capella, J. Dávila, L. Dupaigne, and Y. Sire. Regularity of radial extremal solutions for some non-local semilinear equations. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 36(8):1353–1384, 2011.
- [13] E. Corona, P.-G. Martinsson, and D. Zorin. An $O(N)$ direct solver for integral equations on the plane. *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.*, 38(2):284–317, 2015.
- [14] J. Deny and J. L. Lions. Les espaces du type de Beppo Levi. *Ann. Inst. Fourier, Grenoble*, 5:305–370 (1955), 1953–54.
- [15] E. Di Nezza, G. Palatucci, and E. Valdinoci. Hitchhiker’s guide to the fractional Sobolev spaces. *Bull. Sci. Math.*, 136(5):521–573, 2012.




Figure 6: Square domain, $s = 0.75$, 17130 elements.

- [16] J. Dölz, H. Harbrecht, and C. Schwab. Covariance regularity and \mathcal{H} -matrix approximation for rough random fields. *Numer. Math.*, 135(4):1045–1071, 2017.
- [17] M. Faustmann, J. M. Melenk, and D. Praetorius. \mathcal{H} -matrix approximability of the inverses of FEM matrices. *Numer. Math.*, 131(4):615–642, 2015.
- [18] M. Faustmann, J. M. Melenk, and D. Praetorius. Existence of \mathcal{H} -matrix approximants to the inverses of BEM matrices: The simple-layer operator. *Math. Comp.*, 85(297):119–152, 2016.
- [19] M. Faustmann, J. M. Melenk, and D. Praetorius. Existence of \mathcal{H} -matrix approximants to the inverse of BEM matrices: the hyper-singular integral operator. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 37(3):1211–1244, 2017.
- [20] E. Gagliardo. Caratterizzazioni delle tracce sulla frontiera relative ad alcune classi di funzioni in n variabili. *Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Padova*, 27:284–305, 1957.




Figure 7: L-shaped domain, $s = 0.25$, 6560 elements.

- [21] A. Gillman and P. G. Martinsson. A direct solver with $O(N)$ complexity for variable coefficient elliptic PDEs discretized via a high-order composite spectral collocation method. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 36(4):A2023–A2046, 2014.
- [22] V. Gol’dshstein and A. Ukhlov. Weighted Sobolev spaces and embedding theorems. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 361(7):3829–3850, 2009.
- [23] L. Grasedyck. *Theorie und Anwendungen Hierarchischer Matrizen*. doctoral thesis, Kiel, 2001.
- [24] L. Grasedyck. Adaptive recompression of \mathcal{H} -matrices for BEM. *Computing*, 74(3):205–223, 2005.
- [25] L. Grasedyck and W. Hackbusch. Construction and arithmetics of \mathcal{H} -matrices. *Computing*, 70(4):295–334, 2003.
- [26] L. Grasedyck, W. Hackbusch, and R. Kriemann. Performance of \mathcal{H} -LU preconditioning for sparse matrices. *Comput. Methods Appl. Math.*, 8(4):336–349, 2008.




Figure 8: L-shaped domain, $s = 0.5$, 6560 elements.

- [27] L. Grasedyck, R. Kriemann, and S. Le Borne. Parallel black box \mathcal{H} -LU preconditioning for elliptic boundary value problems. *Comput. Vis. Sci.*, 11(4-6):273–291, 2008.
- [28] L. Greengard, D. Gueyffier, P. Martinsson, and V. Rokhlin. Fast direct solvers for integral equations in complex three-dimensional domains. *Acta Numer.*, 18:243–275, 2009.
- [29] W. Hackbusch. A sparse matrix arithmetic based on \mathcal{H} -matrices. Introduction to \mathcal{H} -matrices. *Computing*, 62(2):89–108, 1999.
- [30] W. Hackbusch. *Hierarchical matrices: algorithms and analysis*, volume 49 of *Springer Series in Computational Mathematics*. Springer, Heidelberg, 2015.
- [31] W. Hackbusch, B. Khoromskij, and S. Sauter. On \mathcal{H}^2 -matrices. *Lectures on Applied Mathematics*, pages 9–29, 2000.
- [32] W. Hackbusch and B. N. Khoromskij. A sparse \mathcal{H} -matrix arithmetic: general complexity estimates. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 125(1-2):479–501, 2000.




Figure 9: L-shaped domain, $s = 0.75$, 6560 elements.

- [33] W. Hackbusch and B. N. Khoromskij. A sparse \mathcal{H} -matrix arithmetic. II. Application to multi-dimensional problems. *Computing*, 64(1):21–47, 2000.
- [34] K. Ho and L. Greengard. A fast direct solver for structured linear systems by recursive skeletonization. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 34(5):A2507–A2532, 2012.
- [35] K. L. Ho and L. Ying. Hierarchical interpolative factorization for elliptic operators: differential equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 69(8):1415–1451, 2016.
- [36] K. L. Ho and L. Ying. Hierarchical interpolative factorization for elliptic operators: integral equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 69(7):1314–1353, 2016.
- [37] A. Kufner. *Weighted Sobolev spaces*. A Wiley-Interscience Publication. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1985. Translated from the Czech.
- [38] M. Kwaśnicki. Ten equivalent definitions of the fractional Laplace operator. *Fract. Calc. Appl. Anal.*, 20(1):7–51, 2017.

- [39] S. Le Borne and L. Grasedyck. \mathcal{H} -matrix preconditioners in convection-dominated problems. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 27(4):1172–1183 (electronic), 2006.
- [40] I. Li, Z. Mao, F. Song, H. Wang, and G. Karniadakis. a fast solver for spectral element approximation applied to fractional differential equations using hierarchical matrix approximation. Technical report, arxiv, 2018. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1808.02937.pdf>.
- [41] S. Li, M. Gu, C. Wu, and J. Xia. New efficient and robust HSS Cholesky factorization of SPD matrices. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 33(3):886–904, 2012.
- [42] A. Lischke, G. Pang, M. Gulian, F. Song, C. Glusa, X. Zheng, Z. Mao, W. Cai, M. Meerschaert, M. Ainsworth, and G. Karniadakis. What is the fractional laplacian? Technical report, arxiv, 01 2018. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1801.09767>.
- [43] P. Martinsson. A fast direct solver for a class of elliptic partial differential equations. *J. Sci. Comput.*, 38(3):316–330, 2009.
- [44] P. Martinsson and V. Rokhlin. A fast direct solver for boundary integral equations in two dimensions. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 205(1):1–23, 2005.
- [45] B. Muckenhoupt. Hardy’s inequality with weights. *Studia Math.*, 44:31–38, 1972. Collection of articles honoring the completion by Antoni Zygmund of 50 years of scientific activity, I.
- [46] R. H. Nochetto, E. Otárola, and A. J. Salgado. Piecewise polynomial interpolation in Muckenhoupt weighted Sobolev spaces and applications. *Numer. Math.*, 132(1):85–130, 2016.
- [47] P. Schmitz and L. Ying. A fast direct solver for elliptic problems on general meshes in 2D. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 231(4):1314–1338, 2012.
- [48] L. R. Scott and S. Zhang. Finite element interpolation of nonsmooth functions satisfying boundary conditions. *Math. Comp.*, 54(190):483–493, 1990.
- [49] P. Stinga and J. Torrea. Extension problem and Harnack’s inequality for some fractional operators. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 35(11):2092–2122, 2010.
- [50] J. Xia. Efficient structured multifrontal factorization for general large sparse matrices. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 35(2):A832–A860, 2013.
- [51] J. Xia, S. Chandrasekaran, M. Gu, and X. Li. Superfast multifrontal method for large structured linear systems of equations. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 31(3):1382–1411, 2009.
- [52] X. Zhao, X. Hu, W. Cai, and G. E. Karniadakis. Adaptive finite element method for fractional differential equations using hierarchical matrices. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 325:56–76, 2017.
- [53] A. Zygmund. *Trigonometric series. Vol. I, II*. Cambridge Mathematical Library. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, third edition, 2002. With a foreword by Robert A. Fefferman.