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$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Abstract. We study a Rayleigh-Faber-Krahn inequality for regional fractional } \\
& \text { Laplacian operators. In particular, we show that there exists a compactly sup- } \\
& \text { ported nonnegative Sobolev function } u_{0} \text { that attains the infimum (which will be } \\
& \text { a positive real number) of the set } \\
& \qquad\left\{\iint_{\{u>0\} \times\{u>0\}} \frac{|u(x)-u(y)|^{2}}{|x-y|^{n+2 \sigma}} \mathrm{~d} x \mathrm{~d} y: u \in \dot{H}^{\sigma}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right), \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n}} u^{2}=1, \quad|\{u>0\}| \leq 1\right\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Unlike the corresponding problem for the usual fractional Laplacian, where the domain of the integration is $\mathbb{R}^{n} \times \mathbb{R}^{n}$, symmetrization techniques may not apply here. Our approach is instead based on the direct method and new a priori diameter estimates. We also present several remaining open questions concerning the regularity and shape of the minimizers, and the form of the Euler-Lagrange equations.
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## 1 Introduction

Let $n \geq 1, \sigma \in(0,1)$ (with the additional assumption that $\sigma<1 / 2$ if $n=1$ ), and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{n}$ be an open set. There are two natural fractional Sobolev norms which may be defined for $u \in C_{c}^{\infty}(\Omega)$ :

$$
I_{n, \sigma, \mathbb{R}^{n}}[u]:=\iint_{\mathbb{R}^{n} \times \mathbb{R}^{n}} \frac{(u(x)-u(y))^{2}}{|x-y|^{n+2 \sigma}} \mathrm{~d} x \mathrm{~d} y
$$

and

$$
I_{n, \sigma, \Omega}[u]:=\iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(u(x)-u(y))^{2}}{|x-y|^{n+2 \sigma}} \mathrm{~d} x \mathrm{~d} y .
$$

Depending on the choices of $n, \sigma$ and $\Omega$, these two norms may or may not be equivalent. Even when they are equivalent (see Lemma 2.1), there are still subtle differences in how they depend on the domain $\Omega$.

One significant difference is the behavior of their corresponding best Sobolev constants:

$$
S_{n, \sigma}(\Omega):=\inf \left\{I_{n, \sigma, \Omega}[u]: u \in C_{c}^{\infty}(\Omega), \quad \int_{\Omega}|u|^{\frac{2 n}{n-2 \sigma}} \mathrm{~d} x=1\right\}
$$

and

$$
\widetilde{S}_{n, \sigma}(\Omega):=\inf \left\{I_{n, \sigma, \mathbb{R}^{n}}[u]: u \in C_{c}^{\infty}(\Omega), \quad \int_{\Omega}|u|^{\frac{2 n}{n-2 \sigma}} \mathrm{~d} x=1\right\} .
$$

Clearly, $\widetilde{S}_{n, \sigma}(\Omega) \geq \widetilde{S}_{n, \sigma}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ and, in fact, using the dilation or translation invariance of $\widetilde{S}_{n, \sigma}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$, it is not difficult to see that

$$
\widetilde{S}_{n, \sigma}(\Omega)=\widetilde{S}_{n, \sigma}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)=S_{n, \sigma}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right) .
$$

Moreover, a result of Lieb [15], classifies all minimizers for $\widetilde{S}_{n, \sigma}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ and shows that they do not vanish anywhere on $\mathbb{R}^{n}$. Therefore, the infimum $\widetilde{S}_{n, \sigma}(\Omega)$ is not attained unless $\Omega=\mathbb{R}^{n}$.

However, in [10], two of the authors with R. Frank discovered that the minimization problem for $S_{n, \sigma}(\Omega)$ behaves differently from $\widetilde{S}_{n, \sigma}(\Omega)$. Let us first recall some qualitative results about whether the constant $S_{n, \sigma}(\Omega)$ is positive or zero:

- For $n \geq 2$ and $\sigma>1 / 2$, one has $S_{n, \sigma}(\Omega)>0$ for any open set $\Omega$. This follows from Dyda-Frank [8], which even shows that $\underline{S}_{n, \sigma}:=\inf _{\Omega} S_{n, \sigma}(\Omega)>0$.
- When $n \geq 1$ and $\sigma<1 / 2$, one has $S_{n, \sigma}(\Omega)=0$ for any open set $\Omega$ of finite measure with sufficiently regular boundary; see Lemma 16 in [10].
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