Rend. Lincei Mat. Appl. 35 (2024), 643–680
DOI 10.4171/RLM/1055

© 2025 Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei
Published by EMS Press
This work licensed under a CC BY 4.0 license

Partial Differential Equations. – *The Kinetic Fokker–Planck equation in a domain: Ultracontractivity, hypocoercivity, and long-time asymptotic behavior*, by Kleber Carrapatoso and Stéphane Mischler, communicated on 9 May 2025.

Abstract. – We consider the Kinetic Fokker–Planck (FKP) equation in a domain with Maxwell reflection condition on the boundary. We establish the ultracontractivity of the associated semigroup and the hypocoercivity of the associated operator. We deduce the convergence with the constructive rate of the solution to the KFP equation towards the stationary state with the same mass as the initial datum.

Keywords. – Kinetic Fokker–Planck equation, ultracontractivity, hypocoercivity, long-time asymptotic behavior.

Mathematics Subject Classification 2020. – 35Q84 (primary); 35B40, 47D06 (secondary).

1. Introduction

In this paper, we consider the Kinetic Fokker–Planck (KFP) equation, also called the degenerated Kolmogorov or the ultraparabolic equation,

$$\partial_t f + v \cdot \nabla_x f - \Delta_v f - \mathrm{div}_v(vf) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{U} \tag{1.1}$$

on the function $f := f_t = f(t,\cdot) = f(t,x,v)$, with $(t,x,v) \in \mathcal{U} := (0,T) \times \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d$, $T \in (0,+\infty]$, $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ a suitably smooth domain, $d \geq 3$, complemented with the Maxwell reflection condition on the boundary

$$\gamma_- f = \mathcal{R}\gamma_+ f = (1-\iota)\mathcal{S}\gamma_+ f + \iota\mathcal{D}\gamma_+ f \quad \text{on } \Gamma_-, \tag{1.2}$$

and associated with an initial condition

$$f(0,x,v) = f_0(x,v) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{O} := \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{1.3}$$

Here, Γ_- denotes the incoming part of the boundary, $\mathcal{S}$ denotes the specular reflection operator, $\mathcal{D}$ denotes the diffusive reflection operator (see precise definitions below), and $\iota : \partial\Omega \to [0,1]$ denotes a (possibly space-dependent) accommodation coefficient. More precisely, we assume that $\Omega := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d;\ \delta(x) > 0\}$ for a $W^{2,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ function δ such that $|\delta(x)| := \mathrm{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)$ on a neighborhood of the boundary set $\partial\Omega$ and thus

$n_x = n(x) := -\nabla\delta(x)$ coincides with the unit normal outward vector field on $\partial\Omega$. We next define $\Sigma^x_\pm := \{v \in \mathbb{R}^d;\ \pm v \cdot n_x > 0\}$ the sets of outgoing (Σ^x_+) and incoming (Σ^x_-) velocities at point $x \in \partial\Omega$, then the sets

$$\Sigma_\pm := \big\{(x, v);\ x \in \partial\Omega,\ v \in \Sigma^x_\pm\big\}, \quad \Gamma_\pm := (0, T) \times \Sigma_\pm,$$

and finally the outgoing and incoming trace functions $\gamma_\pm f := \mathbf{1}_{\Gamma_\pm}\gamma f$. The specular reflection operator $\mathcal{S}$ is defined by

$$(\mathcal{S}g)(x, v) := g(x, \mathcal{V}_x v), \quad \mathcal{V}_x v := v - 2n_x(n_x \cdot v), \tag{1.4}$$

and the diffusive operator $\mathcal{D}$ is defined by

$$(\mathcal{D}g)(x, v) := \mathcal{M}(v)\tilde{g}(x), \quad \tilde{g}(x) := \int_{\Sigma^x_+} g(x, w)\,(n_x \cdot w)\,dw, \tag{1.5}$$

where $\mathcal{M}$ stands for the (conveniently normalized) Maxwellian function

$$\mathcal{M}(v) := (2\pi)^{-(d-1)/2} \exp\big(-|v|^2/2\big), \tag{1.6}$$

which is positive on $\mathbb{R}^d$ and verifies $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}} = 1$. We assume that the accommodation coefficient satisfies $\iota \in W^{1,\infty}(\partial\Omega)$. For further references, we also define the (differently normalized) Maxwellian function

$$f_\infty(x, v) = \frac{1}{|\Omega|}\,\mu(v) := \frac{1}{|\Omega|(2\pi)^{d/2}} \exp\big(-|v|^2/2\big), \tag{1.7}$$

which is positive on $\mathcal{O}$ and verifies $\|f_\infty\|_{L^1(\mathcal{O})} = 1$. The elementary (and well-known at least at a formal level) properties of the Kinetic Fokker–Planck equation are that it is mass conservative, namely,

$$\langle\!\langle f_t \rangle\!\rangle = \langle\!\langle f_0 \rangle\!\rangle,\ \forall t \geq 0, \quad \text{with } \langle\!\langle h \rangle\!\rangle := \int_{\mathcal{O}} h\,dx\,dv, \tag{1.8}$$

it is positivity preserving, namely, $f_t \geq 0$ if $f_0 \geq 0$, and f_∞ is a stationary solution.

The aim of this paper is twofold:

(1) On the one hand, we prove the ultracontractivity of the semigroup associated with the evolution problem (1.1)–(1.2)–(1.3) by establishing some immediate gain of Lebesgue integrability and even immediate uniform bound estimate.

(2) On the other hand, we prove the convergence of the solution to the associated stationary state, namely, $f_t \to \langle\!\langle f_0 \rangle\!\rangle f_\infty$ as $t \to \infty$, with constructive exponential rate in many weighted Lebesgue spaces.

These results extend some previous similar results known for other geometries or less general reflection conditions. For both problems, we adapt or modify some

recent or forthcoming results established in [7, 12] for the Landau equation for the same geometry as considered here. In that sense, the techniques are not really new and the present contribution may rather be seen as a pedagogical illustration on one of the simplest models of the kinetic theory of some tools we develop in other papers for more elaborated kinetic models. We also refer to [10, 11, 22] for further developments of these techniques for related kinetic equations set in a domain with reflection conditions on the boundary.

For a weight function $\omega : \mathbb{R}^d \to (0, \infty)$ and an exponent $p \in [1, \infty]$, we define the associated weighted Lebesgue space

$$L^p_\omega := \{f \in L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d);\ \|f\|_{L^p_\omega} := \|f\omega\|_{L^p} < \infty\}.$$

Our first main result is an ultracontractivity property.

THEOREM 1.1. *There exist two weight functions $\omega = \exp(\zeta|v|^2)$, $\omega' = \exp(\zeta'|v|^2)$, with $0 < \zeta' < \zeta < 1/2$, and some constants $\nu > 0$, $C_1 \geq 1$, $C_2 \geq 0$ such that for any exponents $p, q \in [1, \infty]$, $q > p$, and any initial datum $f_0 \in L^p_\omega(\mathcal{O})$, the associated solution f with the Kinetic Fokker–Planck (KFP) equation* (1.1)–(1.2)–(1.3) *satisfies*

$$\|f(t)\|_{L^q_{\omega'}} \leq C_1 \frac{e^{C_2 t}}{t^{\nu(1/p-1/q)}} \|f_0\|_{L^p_\omega}, \quad \forall t > 0. \tag{1.9}$$

We refer to Section 3.5 for a possible definition of the set $\mathfrak{W}_1$ of weight functions ω for which the above ultracontractivity property holds true. In the whole space $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^d$, such a kind of ultracontractivity property is a direct consequence of the representation of the solution thanks to the Kolmogorov kernel; see [33], as well as [8, 31] for related regularity estimates. Some local uniform estimate of a similar kind for a larger class of KFP equations in the whole space has been established [2, 13, 47] by using Moser iterative scheme introduced in [43, 44], from what some Gaussian upper bound on the fundamental solution may be derived; see [4, 34, 46]. In [23], the same local uniform estimates (as well as the Harnack inequality and the Holder regularity) has been shown for a still larger class of KFP equations in the whole space by using De Giorgi iterative scheme as introduced in [15]. We also refer to [1] for a general survey about these issues and to [3, 32, 35, 50, 51] for additional results on the KFP equations in the whole space. In [29], a gain of regularity estimate has been established by adapting Nash argument introduced in [45]; see also [24, 39, 49] for further developments of the same technique.

In [19], an ultracontractivity result similar to ours is obtained for the KFP equation in a domain with specular reflection at the boundary by an extension argument to the whole space (used first in [26]) and then reduces the problem to the application of [23, 47]. In [52], some kind of regularity up to the boundary is proved for the KFP

equation with inflow or specular reflection at the boundary using the extension argument of [19] and some appropriate change of coordinates. See also [48], where some similar results are established for the KFP equation with zero inflow. We finally refer to [10] where the same kind of ultracontractivity result is established with $\omega' = \omega$ for a large class of weight functions ω.

We are next concerned with the longtime behavior estimate. We start by establishing a hypocoercivity result. For that purpose, we define the operator

$$\mathcal{L} f := -v \cdot \nabla_x f + \Delta_v f + \mathrm{div}_v(vf) \tag{1.10}$$

and we denote by $\mathrm{Dom}(\mathcal{L})$ its domain in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} := L^2(\mu^{-1} dx\, dv)$ endowed with the norm $\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}} = \|\mu^{-1/2} f\|_{L^2}$.

THEOREM 1.2. *There exists a scalar product $((\cdot,\cdot))$ on the space $\mathcal{H}$ so that the associated norm $|||\cdot|||$ is equivalent to the usual norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}}$, and for which the linear operator $\mathcal{L}$ satisfies the following coercivity estimate: there is a positive constant $\lambda \in (0,1)$ such that*

$$((-\mathcal{L} f, f)) \geq \lambda |||f|||^2 \tag{1.11}$$

for any $f \in \mathrm{Dom}(\mathcal{L})$ satisfying the boundary condition (1.2) and the mass condition $\langle\langle f \rangle\rangle = 0$.

The result and the proof is a mere adaptation and simplification of the same hypocoercivity estimate established in [7]. This last one is inspired by, generalizes, and simplifies some previous results established in [9, 25]; see also [16, 18, 20, 27, 28, 30, 49] and the references therein for more material about the hypocoercivity theory.

We deduce from the two previous results the announced exponential convergence result.

THEOREM 1.3. *There exists a class of weight functions $\mathfrak{W}_2$ such that for any weight function $\omega \in \mathfrak{W}_2$, any exponent $p \in [1,\infty]$, and any initial datum $f_0 \in L^p_\omega(\mathcal{O})$, the associated solution f with the KFP equation (1.1)–(1.2)–(1.3) satisfies*

$$\left\| f(t) - \langle\langle f_0 \rangle\rangle f_\infty \right\|_{L^p_\omega} \leq C e^{-\lambda t} \left\| f_0 - \langle\langle f_0 \rangle\rangle f_\infty \right\|_{L^p_\omega}, \quad \forall t \geq 0, \tag{1.12}$$

for the same constant $\lambda \in (0,1)$ as in Theorem 1.2 and for some constant $C = C(\omega)$.

It is worth emphasizing that the set $\mathfrak{W}_2$ contains some exponential functions and some polynomial (increasing fast enough) functions. The case $p = 2$ and $\omega = \mu^{-1/2}$ is an immediate consequence of Theorem 1.2. The general case is then deduced from this particular one thanks to Theorem 1.1 and some enlargement and shrinking techniques introduced and developed in [24, 39, 40].

Let us end the introduction by describing the organization of the paper which is mainly dedicated to the proof of the above results.

In Section 2, we establish some growth estimates in many weighted Lebesgue spaces on the semigroup associated with the KFP equation (1.1)–(1.2)–(1.3). We do not discuss the existence and uniqueness issues about solutions to the KFP equation and the construction of the associated positive semigroup which will be discussed in detail in the companion paper [10]. We however emphasize that solutions to the KFP equation must be understood in the renormalized sense as defined in [17, 38] so that the associated trace functions are well defined; see [10, 12, 38] and the references therein. We thus rather focus on the (a priori) estimates by exhibiting suitable twisted weight estimates for the solutions to the KFP equation (1.1)–(1.2)–(1.3) and its dual counterpart.

Section 3 is dedicated to the proof of Theorem 1.1. The strategy mixes Moser's gain of integrability argument of [44] and Nash's duality and interpolation arguments of [45]. It is also based on a twisted weight argument which is somehow slightly more elaborated than the one used in the previous sections. In Section 4, we prove Theorem 1.2, and Section 5 is dedicated to the proof of Theorem 1.3.

2. Weighted L^p growth estimates

This section is devoted to the proof of a first and somehow rough set of growth estimates in some convenient weighted L^p spaces for solutions to the KFP equation (1.1)–(1.2)–(1.3) and the associated semigroup that we denote by the same letter $S_{\mathcal{L}}$ whatever is the space in which it is considered. It is classical that we may work at the level of the evolution equation and the associated generator or at the level of the associated semigroup. We will do the job at both levels.

As announced, we will not bother with too much rigorous justification but rather establish a priori weighted Lebesgue norm estimates from which we may very classically deduce the well-posedness of the Cauchy problem (1.1)–(1.2)–(1.3) and also deduce the existence of the associated semigroup. The solutions of the KFP equations would have to be understood in an appropriate renormalized sense, but again we will not bother about this important but technical point and we will freely make the computations as if the considered functions are smooth and fast enough decaying at infinity. Because the KFP equation conserves the positivity, the associate semigroup is positive and we may thus only handle it with nonnegative functions. All these issues are discussed in the companion papers [10, 12, 21] for more general classes of KFP equations, and we thus refer to these works for more details.

We now introduce the class of weight function we deal with. We denote by $\mathcal{C}$ the operator

$$\mathcal{C} f := \Delta_v f + \mathrm{div}_v(v f), \tag{2.1}$$

which is nothing but the collision part of the Kinetic Fokker–Planck operator involved in (1.1). We observe that for $f, \omega : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}_+$ and $p \in [1, \infty)$, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\mathcal{C} f) f^{p-1} \omega^p \, dv = -\frac{4(p-1)}{p^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla_v (f\omega)^{p/2}|^2 + \int |f|^p \omega^p \varpi, \tag{2.2}$$

with

$$\varpi = \varpi_{\omega,p}(v) := 2\left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \frac{|\nabla_v \omega|^2}{\omega^2} + \left(\frac{2}{p} - 1\right) \frac{\Delta_v \omega}{\omega} + \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) d - v \cdot \frac{\nabla_v \omega}{\omega}; \tag{2.3}$$

see for instance [21, Lemma 7.7] and the references therein. We define $\mathfrak{W}$ as the set of radially symmetric nondecreasing weight functions $\omega : \mathbb{R}^d \to (0, \infty)$ such that

$$\kappa = \kappa_\omega := \max_{p=1,\infty} \sup_{v \in \mathbb{R}^d} \varpi_{\omega,p} < \infty.$$

It is worth noticing that $\omega := \langle v \rangle^k e^{\zeta \langle v \rangle^s}$, with $k \in \mathbb{R}$ and $s, \zeta \geq 0$, satisfies

$$\varpi(v) \underset{|v| \to \infty}{\sim} (s\zeta)^2 |v|^{2s-2} - s\zeta |v|^s \quad \text{if } s > 0,$$

$$\varpi(v) \underset{|v| \to \infty}{\sim} \frac{d}{p'} - k \quad \text{if } s = 0,$$

so that $\omega \in \mathfrak{W}$ when

$$s \in (0, 2), \quad \text{or} \quad s = 2 \text{ and } \zeta < 1/2, \quad \text{or} \quad s = 0. \tag{2.4}$$

On the other hand, we may check

$$\varpi_{\mathcal{M}^{-1+1/q},p}(v) = -\frac{1}{q}\left(1 - \frac{1}{q}\right)|v|^2 + \left(\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} - \frac{2}{pq}\right) d, \tag{2.5}$$

so that for the limit case $\omega = \mathcal{M}^{-1} \in \mathfrak{W}$, since then $\varpi_{\mathcal{M}^{-1},p} \equiv 2d/p$. We finally define

$$\mathfrak{W}_0 := \left\{\omega \in \mathfrak{W};\ 1 \lesssim \omega \lesssim \mathcal{M}^{-1},\ \omega^{-1}|v|,\ \omega \mathcal{M}|v| \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)\right\}. \tag{2.6}$$

PROPOSITION 2.1. *For any weight function $\omega \in \mathfrak{W}_0$, there exist $\kappa \geq 0$ and $C \geq 1$ such that for any exponent $p \in [1, \infty]$ and any solution f to the KFP equation* (1.1)–(1.2)–(1.3)*, there holds*

$$\|f_t\|_{L^p_\omega} \leq C e^{\kappa t} \|f_0\|_{L^p_\omega}, \quad \forall t \geq 0, \tag{2.7}$$

and we write equivalently

$$S_{\mathcal{L}}(t) : L^p_\omega \to L^p_\omega, \text{ with growth rate } \mathcal{O}(e^{\kappa t}), \quad \forall t \geq 0. \tag{2.8}$$

We start recalling the following classical estimate based on very specific choices of the weight functions, so that Darrozès–Guiraud type inequality [14] may be used.

LEMMA 2.2. *For any $p \in [1,\infty]$, the semigroup $S_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a contraction on $L^p_{\mathcal{M}^{-1+1/p}}$.*

PROOF OF LEMMA 2.2. We fix $p \in [1,\infty)$, $0 \le f_0 \in L^p_{\mathcal{M}^{-1+1/p}}$, and we denote by $f = f(t,x,v) \ge 0$ the solution to the Cauchy problem associated with (1.1)–(1.2)–(1.3). We compute

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{p}\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\mathcal{O}} f^p\mathcal{M}^{1-p} &= \int_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathcal{C}f)f^{p-1}\mathcal{M}^{1-p} - \frac{1}{p}\int_{\Sigma}(\gamma f)^p\mathcal{M}^{1-p}\,n_x\cdot v\\ &\le \int_{\mathcal{O}}\varpi_{\mathcal{M}^{-1+1/p},p}f^p\mathcal{M}^{1-p} - \frac{1}{p}\int_{\Sigma_+}(\gamma_+ f)^p\mathcal{M}^{1-p}|n_x\cdot v|\\ &\quad + \frac{1}{p}\int_{\Sigma_-}\big\{(1-\iota)\mathcal{S}\gamma_+ f + \iota\mathcal{D}\gamma_+ f\big\}^p\mathcal{M}^{1-p}|n_x\cdot v|,\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the Green-Ostrogradski formula in the first line, we have thrown away the first term coming from (2.2) in the second line, we have split the boundary term into two pieces, and we have used the boundary condition on its incoming part in the second and third lines. For the last term we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\Sigma_-}\big\{(1-\iota)\mathcal{S}\gamma_+ f + \iota\mathcal{D}\gamma_+ f\big\}^p\mathcal{M}^{1-p}|n_x\cdot v|\\ &\quad\le \int_{\Sigma_-}(1-\iota)(\mathcal{S}\gamma_+ f)^p\mathcal{M}^{1-p}|n_x\cdot v| + \int_{\Sigma_-}\iota(\widetilde{\gamma_+ f})^p\mathcal{M}|n_x\cdot v|\\ &\quad\le \int_{\Sigma_+}(1-\iota)(\gamma_+ f)^p\mathcal{M}^{1-p}|n_x\cdot v| + \int_{\partial\Omega}\iota(\widetilde{\gamma_+ f})^p,\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the convexity of the function $s \mapsto s^p$ in the second line and we have used both the change of variables $v \mapsto \mathcal{V}_x v$ in the last integral (which transforms Σ_- into Σ_+ with unit Jacobian) and the normalization condition on $\mathcal{M}$ (see (1.6)) in the third line. Observing next that

$$(\widetilde{\gamma_+ f})^p = \left(\int_{\Sigma_+^x}(\gamma_+ f/\mathcal{M})\,\mathcal{M}|n_x\cdot v|\,dv\right)^p \le \int_{\Sigma_+^x}(\gamma_+ f/\mathcal{M})^p\,\mathcal{M}|n_x\cdot v|\,dv,$$

thanks to the Jensen inequality (also called Darrozès–Guiraud's inequality in this context!), which is true because of the normalization condition on $\mathcal{M}$, we have thus established

$$\int_{\Sigma_-}\big\{(1-\iota)\mathcal{S}\gamma_+ f + \iota\mathcal{D}\gamma_+ f\big\}^p\mathcal{M}^{1-p}|n_x\cdot v| \le \int_{\Sigma_+}(\gamma_+ f)^p\mathcal{M}^{1-p}|n_x\cdot v|,$$

from which we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\mathcal{O}} f^p \mathcal{M}^{1-p} \le p \int_{\mathcal{O}} \varpi_{\mathcal{M}^{-1+1/p},p} f^p \mathcal{M}^{1-p}.$$

Coming back to (2.5), we observe that

$$\varpi_{\mathcal{M}^{-1+1/p},p}(v) = -\frac{1}{p}\left(1-\frac{1}{p}\right)|v|^2 + \frac{2}{p}\left(1-\frac{1}{p}\right)d \le 0,$$

from which we immediately deduce that $S_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a contraction on $L^p_{\mathcal{M}^{-1+1/p}}$ when $p \in [1,\infty)$. We get the same conclusion in $L^\infty_{\mathcal{M}^{-1}}$ by letting $p \to \infty$. ∎

We extend the decay estimate to a general weight function in an L^1 framework by using an appropriate modification of the initial weight. That kind of moment estimate is reminiscent of L^1 hypodissipativity techniques; see e.g. [6,24,41]. Our multiplicator is inspired from the usual multiplicator used in order to control the diffusive operator in previous works on the Boltzmann equation; see e.g. [5,6,37,38]. For further references, we define the formal adjoints

$$\mathcal{L}^* := v\cdot\nabla_x + \mathcal{C}^*, \quad \mathcal{C}^* g := \Delta_v g - v\cdot\nabla_v g. \tag{2.9}$$

LEMMA 2.3. *Let $\omega : \mathbb{R}^d \to (0,\infty)$ be a radially symmetric nondecreasing weight function such that $\omega \in \mathfrak{W}$ and $\mathcal{M}\omega|v| \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$. There exists $\kappa \ge 0$ such that we have*

$$S_{\mathcal{L}}(t) : L^1(\omega) \to L^1(\omega), \quad \forall t \ge 0,$$

with growth estimate $\mathcal{O}(e^{\kappa t})$.

It is worth emphasizing that with a very similar proof we may establish the same growth rate in L^p_ω for $p \in (1,\infty)$, but we were not able to reach the limit exponent $p = \infty$ because our estimates blow up as $p \to \infty$.

PROOF OF LEMMA 2.3. Without loss of generality, we may suppose that $\omega \ge 1$. We split the proof into two steps.

STEP 1. For $0 \le f_0 \in L^1(\omega)$, we denote by $f = f(t,x,v) \ge 0$ the solution to the Cauchy problem (1.1)–(1.2)–(1.3), so that $f(t) = S_{\mathcal{L}}(t) f_0$.

We introduce the weight functions

$$\omega_A(v) := \chi_A(v) + \big(1-\chi_A(v)\big)\omega(v),$$

with $\chi_A(v) := \chi(|v|/A)$, $A \ge 1$ to be chosen later and $\chi \in C^2(\mathbb{R}_+)$, $\mathbf{1}_{[0,1]} \le \chi \le \mathbf{1}_{[0,2]}$, and next

$$\widetilde{\omega}(x,v) := \omega_A(v) + \frac{1}{2} n_x \cdot \tilde{v},$$

with $\hat{v} := v/\langle v\rangle$ and $\tilde{v} := \hat{v}/\langle v\rangle$. It is worth emphasizing that

$$1 \le \omega_A \le \omega \quad \text{and} \quad c_A^{-1}\omega \le \tfrac{1}{2}\omega_A \le \widetilde{\omega} \le \tfrac{3}{2}\omega_A, \tag{2.10}$$

with $c_A \in (0,\infty)$. We write

$$\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\mathcal{O}} f\,\widetilde{\omega} = \int_{\mathcal{O}} f\,\mathcal{L}^*\widetilde{\omega} - \int_{\Sigma} \gamma f\,\widetilde{\omega}\,n_x\cdot v. \tag{2.11}$$

We first compute separately each contribution of the boundary term

$$B := -\int_{\Sigma} \gamma f\,\widetilde{\omega}\,n_x\cdot v = B_1 + B_2,$$

with

$$B_1 := -\int_{\Sigma_+} \gamma_+ f\omega_A|n_x\cdot v| + \int_{\Sigma_-} \big\{(1-\iota)\mathcal{S}\gamma_+ f + \iota\mathcal{D}\gamma_+ f\big\}\omega_A|n_x\cdot v|,$$
$$B_2 := -\frac{1}{2}\int_{\Sigma} \gamma f\,(n_x\cdot\hat{v})^2.$$

Making the change of variables $v \mapsto \mathcal{V}_x v$ in the last integral involved in B_1, we get

$$B_1 = -\int_{\Sigma_+} \iota\gamma_+ f\,\omega_A\,|n_x\cdot v| + \int_{\Sigma_+} \iota\mathcal{D}\gamma_+ f\,\omega_A\,|n_x\cdot v|.$$

We then define

$$K_1(\omega_A) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{M}\,\omega_A\,(n_x\cdot v)_+\,dv, \tag{2.12}$$

which is finite by the assumption on ω, so that

$$\int_{\Sigma_+} \iota\mathcal{D}\gamma_+ f\,\omega_A\,|n_x\cdot v| = \int_{\partial\Omega} \iota K_1(\omega_A)\widetilde{\gamma_+ f}.$$

Since $\omega_A \ge 1$, we then obtain

$$B_1 \le \int_{\partial\Omega} \iota(K_1(\omega_A)-1)\widetilde{\gamma_+ f}.$$

On the other hand, denoting

$$K_0 := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{M}(n_x\cdot\hat{v})_+^2\,dv \in (0,\infty), \tag{2.13}$$

which we observe is independent of x, we have

$$-\int_{\Sigma} \gamma f(n_x\cdot\hat{v})^2 \le -\int_{\Sigma_+} \iota\mathcal{D}\gamma_+ f(n_x\cdot\hat{v})^2 = -K_0\int_{\partial\Omega} \iota\widetilde{\gamma_+ f}.$$

Recalling (2.10) and observing that $\omega_A \to 1$ a.e. when $A \to \infty$, we get $K_1(\omega_A) \to K_1(1) = 1$ as $A \to \infty$ thanks to the dominated convergence Theorem of Lebesgue and the normalization condition on $\mathcal{M}$. We may thus fix $A \geq 1$ large enough in such a way that

$$K_1(\omega_A) - 1 - \frac{1}{2} K_0 \leq 0,$$

and the contribution of the boundary is nonpositive.

Step 2. For the contribution of the volume integral, we write

$$\mathcal{L}^* \widetilde{\omega} = \mathcal{C}^* \omega + \mathcal{C}^* \big[\chi_A (1 - \omega)\big] + \mathcal{C}^* [n_x \cdot \tilde{v}] + v \cdot \nabla_x (n_x \cdot \tilde{v}),$$

where we recall that the adjoint Fokker–Planck operator $\mathcal{C}^*$ is defined in (2.9). Because $\omega \in \mathfrak{W}$, we have

$$\mathcal{C}^* \omega \leq \varpi_{\omega,1}\, \omega \leq \kappa_1 \omega,$$

for some $\kappa_1 \in \mathbb{R}$. On the other hand, because χ_A has compact support and because of the regularity assumption of Ω, we have

$$\mathcal{C}^* \big[\chi_A (1 - \omega)\big] + \mathcal{C}^* [n_x \cdot \tilde{v}] + v \cdot \nabla_x (n_x \cdot \tilde{v}) \leq \kappa_2,$$

for some $\kappa_2 \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Coming back to (2.11), we deduce that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{O}} f\, \widetilde{\omega} \leq \kappa \int_{\mathcal{O}} f\, \widetilde{\omega},$$

with $\kappa := 2\kappa_1 + c_A \kappa_2$. We immediately conclude thanks to Grönwall's lemma and the comparison (2.10) between ω and $\widetilde{\omega}$. ∎

We establish now a similar exponential growth estimate in a general weighted L^1 framework for the dual backward problem associated with (1.1)–(1.2)–(1.3), namely,

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t g = v \cdot \nabla_x g + \mathcal{C}^* g & \text{in } (0,T) \times \mathcal{O}, \\ \gamma_+ g = \mathcal{R}^* \gamma_- g & \text{on } (0,T) \times \Sigma_+, \\ g(T) = g_T & \text{in } \mathcal{O}, \end{cases} \tag{2.14}$$

for any $T \in (0, \infty)$ and any final datum g_T. The adjoint Fokker–Planck operator $\mathcal{C}^*$ is defined in (2.9), and the adjoint reflection operator $\mathcal{R}^*$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{R}^* g(x,v) = (1 - \iota) \mathcal{S} g(x,v) + \iota \mathcal{D}^* g(x),$$

with

$$\mathcal{D}^* g(x) = \widetilde{\mathcal{M} g}(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g(x,w) \mathcal{M}(w) (n_x \cdot w)_-\, dw.$$

Again, we do not discuss the very classical issue about well-posedness in Lebesgue spaces for these problems nor the possibility to approximate the solutions by *smooth enough solutions*, which is useful in the following argument. Consider f a solution to the forward Cauchy problem (1.1)–(1.2)–(1.3) and g a solution to the above dual problem (2.14). We compute (at least formally)

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathcal{O}} f(T)g_T &= \int_{\mathcal{O}} f_0 g(0) + \int_0^T \int_{\mathcal{O}} (\partial_t f g + f \partial_t g)\, ds \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{O}} f_0 g(0) - \int_0^T \int_{\mathcal{O}} (v \cdot \nabla_x f g + f v \cdot \nabla_x g)\, ds \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{O}} f_0 g(0) - \int_0^T \int_{\Sigma} (v \cdot n) \gamma f \gamma g\, ds \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{O}} f_0 g(0) - \int_0^T \int_{\Sigma_+} (v \cdot n)(\gamma_+ f)(\mathcal{R}^* \gamma_- g)\, ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^T \int_{\Sigma_-} |v \cdot n| (\mathcal{R}\gamma_+ f)(\gamma_- g)\, ds,\end{aligned}$$

by using the Green-Ostrogradski formula and the reflection conditions at the boundary. From the very definition of $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{R}^*$, we then deduce the usual identity

$$\int_{\mathcal{O}} f(T) g_T = \int_{\mathcal{O}} f_0 g(0), \tag{2.15}$$

or equivalently that $g(t) = S^*_{\mathcal{L}}(T-t) g_T$. We observe now that for a weight function ω, we have

$$\mathcal{C}\omega^{-1} = \omega^{-1} \varpi_{\omega,\infty}. \tag{2.16}$$

We then define $\mathfrak{N}$ the class of weight functions $m : \mathbb{R}^d \to (0,\infty)$ such that $\omega = m^{-1} \in \mathfrak{W}$. In particular, because of (2.16) and the definition of $\mathfrak{W}$, there exists $\kappa' \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\mathcal{C} m \le \kappa' m. \tag{2.17}$$

We also define

$$\mathfrak{N}_0 := \{ m \in \mathfrak{N};\ \mathcal{M} \lesssim m,\ mv \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \}. \tag{2.18}$$

For further discussion, we emphasize that $\omega \in \mathfrak{W}_0$ clearly implies $\omega^{-1} \in \mathfrak{N}_0$.

LEMMA 2.4. *For any weight function $m \in \mathfrak{N}_0$, there exists $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$S^*_{\mathcal{L}}(t) : L^1_m \to L^1_m, \quad \mathcal{O}(e^{\kappa t}).$$

More precisely, there exists $C \geq 1$ such that for any $T > 0$ and any $g_T \in L^1_m$, the associated solution g with the backward dual problem (2.14) satisfies

$$\|g(0)\|_{L^1_m} \leq C e^{\kappa T} \|g_T\|_{L^1_m}. \tag{2.19}$$

Proof of Lemma 2.4. Without loss of generality, we may suppose that $m \geq \mathcal{M}$. For $T \in (0, \infty)$ and $0 \leq g_T \in L^1_m$, we denote by $g = g(t, x, v)$ the solution to the backward dual Cauchy problem (2.14). We introduce the weight functions

$$m_A := \chi_A \mathcal{M} + (1 - \chi_A) m, \quad \widetilde{m} := m_A - \frac{1}{2}(n_x \cdot \tilde{v})\, \mathcal{M}, \tag{2.20}$$

with the notations of Lemma 2.3. It is worth emphasizing that

$$\mathcal{M} \leq m_A \leq m \quad \text{and} \quad c_A^{-1} m \leq \tfrac{1}{2} m_A \leq \widetilde{m} \leq \tfrac{3}{2} m_A, \tag{2.21}$$

with $c_A \in (0, \infty)$. Similarly as in the proof of Lemma 2.3, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{O}} g\, m_A &= \int_{\mathcal{O}} g\, (\mathcal{C} m_A) + \int_{\Sigma} \gamma g\, m_A\, n_x \cdot v \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{O}} g\, (\mathcal{C} m_A) + \int_{\Sigma_+} \big[(1 - \iota) \mathcal{S} \gamma_- g + \iota \widetilde{\gamma_- g \mathcal{M}}\big]\, m_A\, |n_x \cdot v| \\ &\quad - \int_{\Sigma_-} \gamma_- g\, m_A\, |n_x \cdot v|, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used again the Green-Ostrogradski formula in the first line and the reflection condition at the boundary in the second line. We deduce

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{O}} g\, m_A &= \int_{\mathcal{O}} g\, (\mathcal{C} m_A) - \int_{\Sigma_-} \iota \gamma_- g\, m_A\, |n_x \cdot v| \\ &\quad + \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} m_A (n_x \cdot v)_+\, dv \right) \int_{\Sigma_-} \iota \mathcal{M} \gamma_- g\, |n_x \cdot v|, \end{aligned}$$

by making the change of variables $v \mapsto \mathcal{V}_x v$ on the *outgoing part* Σ_+ of the boundary (which is in fact the *incoming part* of the boundary for the backward dual problem). Since $m_A \geq \mathcal{M}$, we have established a first estimate

$$-\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{O}} g\, m_A \leq \int_{\mathcal{O}} g\, (\mathcal{C} m_A) + \int_{\Sigma_-} \iota \big(K_1(m_A) - 1\big) \mathcal{M} \gamma_- g\, |n_x \cdot v|,$$

with now

$$K_1(m_A) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} m_A\, (n_x \cdot v)_+\, dv \to 1, \quad \text{as } A \to \infty.$$

On the other hand, with the same notations as in the proof of Lemma 2.3, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{O}} g \mathcal{M}\, (n_x \cdot \tilde{v}) = \int_{\mathcal{O}} g \mathcal{C}\big(\mathcal{M}\, (n_x \cdot \tilde{v})\big) - \int_{\mathcal{O}} g\, \mathcal{M}\, \hat{v} \cdot D_x n_x \hat{v} - \int_{\Sigma} \gamma g\, \mathcal{M}\, (n_x \cdot \hat{v})^2.$$

For the last term, there holds

$$\int_\Sigma \gamma g \mathcal{M}\,(n_x\cdot\hat{v})^2 \geq \int_{\Sigma_+} \iota(\mathcal{D}^*\gamma_- g)(n_x\cdot\hat{v})^2\,\mathcal{M}$$
$$\geq \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{M}(n_x\cdot\hat{v})_+^2\right)\int_{\Sigma_-} \iota\mathcal{M}\gamma_- g|n_x\cdot v|,$$

which implies a second estimate

$$\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\mathcal{O}} g\mathcal{M}\,(n_x\cdot\tilde{v})$$
$$\leq \int_{\mathcal{O}} g\mathcal{C}\big(\mathcal{M}\,(n_x\cdot\tilde{v})\big) - \int_{\mathcal{O}} g\,\mathcal{M}\,\hat{v}\cdot D_x n_x\hat{v} - K_0\int_{\Sigma_-}\iota\mathcal{M}\gamma_- g|n_x\cdot v|,$$

with now

$$K_0 := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{M}\,(n_x\cdot\hat{v})_+^2\,dv \in (0,\infty). \tag{2.22}$$

Choosing $A>0$ large enough such that $K_1(m_A)-1-\frac{1}{2}K_0\leq 0$, the contribution of the boundary is nonpositive and we obtain

$$-\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\mathcal{O}} g\,\tilde{m} \leq \int_{\mathcal{O}} g\left[\mathcal{C}m + \mathcal{C}\big[\chi_A(\mathcal{M}-m)\big] + \mathcal{C}[n_x\cdot\tilde{v}\mathcal{M}] - v\cdot\nabla_x(n_x\cdot\tilde{v}\mathcal{M})\right]$$
$$\leq \kappa\int_{\mathcal{O}} g\tilde{m},$$

for some $\kappa\in\mathbb{R}$, by arguing similarly as during the proof of Lemma 2.3 and in particular using (2.17). By Grönwall's lemma, we then deduce

$$\big\|g(0)\big\|_{L^1(\tilde{m})} \leq e^{\kappa T}\|g_T\|_{L^1(\tilde{m})}, \tag{2.23}$$

from which we immediately conclude to (2.19). ∎

We may now come to the proof of the main result of this section.

Proof of Proposition 2.1. For $f_0\in L^\infty_\omega$, let us define $f(t):=S_{\mathcal{L}}(t)f_0$ the associated flow. Because of the duality identity (2.15), for any $g_t\in L^1_{\omega^{-1}}$, we have

$$\int_{\mathcal{O}} f(t)g_t = \int_{\mathcal{O}} f_0 g(0) \leq \|f_0\|_{L^\infty_\omega}\big\|g(0)\big\|_{L^1_{\omega^{-1}}}.$$

Together with (2.19), we deduce

$$\int_{\mathcal{O}} f(t)g_t \leq \|f_0\|_{L^\infty_\omega} Ce^{\kappa t}\|g_t\|_{L^1_{\omega^{-1}}}.$$

Taking the supremum on g_t over the unit ball of $L^1(\omega^{-1})$, we thus conclude that

$$\big\|f(t)\big\|_{L^\infty_\omega} \leq Ce^{\kappa t}\|f_0\|_{L^\infty_\omega},$$

for any f_0, which is the desired estimate (2.8) when $p = \infty$. The estimate (2.8) for $p = 1$ has been established in Lemma 2.4. We then conclude to the estimate (2.8) for any $p \in [1, \infty]$ by using a standard interpolation argument. ∎

REMARK 2.5. The conditions on the weight function ω in the statement of Proposition 2.1 are not optimal but they are more than enough for our purpose. As a matter of fact, we may observe that

- Lemma 2.2 gives an estimate on $S_{\mathcal{L}}$ in L^1 and in $L^\infty_{\mathcal{M}^{-1}}$;
- Lemma 2.3 gives an estimate on $S_{\mathcal{L}}$ in L^1_ω from $\omega = 1$ and up to $\omega = \mathcal{M}^{-1}\langle v\rangle^{-d-1-\varepsilon}$, $\varepsilon > 0$;
- Lemma 2.4 gives an estimate on $S^*_{\mathcal{L}}$ in L^1_m from $m = \langle v\rangle^{-d-1-\varepsilon}$, $\varepsilon > 0$, and up to $m = \mathcal{M}$, and thus an estimate on $S_{\mathcal{L}}$ in L^∞_ω from $\omega = \langle v\rangle^{d+1+\varepsilon}$, $\varepsilon > 0$, and up to $\omega = \mathcal{M}^{-1}$.

We may straightforwardly check that $\omega := \langle v\rangle^k e^{\zeta\langle v\rangle^s} \in \mathfrak{W}_0$ when

$$s \in (0, 2), \quad \text{or} \quad s = 2 \text{ and } \zeta < 1/2, \quad \text{or} \quad s = 0 \text{ and } k > d + 1. \tag{2.24}$$

3. ULTRACONTRACTIVITY: PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

3.1. *An improved weighted L^2 estimate at the boundary*

The De Giorgi–Nash–Moser theory tells us that for parabolic equations some gain of integrability estimates can be obtained by elementary manipulations when evaluating the evolution of functions f^q for $q \neq 1$. That kind of regularity effect is also called ultracontractivity. More recently, a similar theory has been developed for the Kolmogorov equation in the whole space; see in particular [23, 47]. Our purpose is to generalize these techniques to a bounded domain framework. In the present framework and in order to be able to deduce next (by interpolation) the same kind of regularity effect in the border L^1_ω space, we first consider $q < 1$. Let us observe that for $q \neq 0$ and f a positive solution to the KFP equation (1.1), we may compute

$$\partial_t f^q + v \cdot \nabla_x f^q - v \cdot \nabla_v f^q - q d f^q - \Delta_v f^q - 4\frac{(1-q)}{q}|\nabla_v f^{q/2}|^2 = 0.$$

Multiplying the equation by $\Phi^q := \varphi^q m^q$ with $q \in (0, 1)$, $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}((0, T))$, and integrating in all the variables, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{q}\int_\Gamma (\gamma f)^q \Phi^q n_x \cdot v + \frac{1}{q}\int_{\mathcal{U}} f^q \mathcal{T}^* \Phi^q \\ = 4\frac{(1-q)}{q^2}\int_{\mathcal{U}} |\nabla_v (f\Phi)^{q/2}|^2 + \int_{\mathcal{U}} f^q \Phi^q \varpi, \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

with $\varpi := \varpi_{m,q}$ defined in (2.3) and

$$\mathcal{T}^*\Psi := -\partial_t \Psi - v \cdot \nabla_x \Psi. \tag{3.2}$$

Alternatively, defining

$$\mathcal{T} := \partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x \tag{3.3}$$

and recalling that $\mathcal{C}$ has been defined in (2.1), we may write

$$\mathcal{T}\frac{f^q}{q} = f^{q-1}\mathcal{T} f = f^{q-1}\mathcal{C} f,$$

so that

$$\frac{1}{q}\int_\Gamma (\gamma f)^q \Phi^q n_x \cdot v + \frac{1}{q}\int_{\mathcal{U}} f^q \mathcal{T}^*\Phi^q = \int_{\mathcal{U}} f^{q-1}(\mathcal{C} f)\Phi^q,$$

from which we deduce (3.1) with the help of (2.2)–(2.3).

We now establish a key new moment estimate on the KFP equation (1.1)–(1.2)–(1.3) which makes it possible to control a solution near the boundary. The proof is based on the introduction of an appropriate weight function which combines the twisting term used in the previous section and the twisting term used in [21, Section 11], that last one being in the spirit of moment arguments used in [36, 42].

PROPOSITION 3.1. *Let $q \in (0,1)$ and let $m : \mathbb{R}^d \to (0,\infty)$ be a radially symmetric decreasing weight function such that $m^{\frac{q}{1-q}}|v| \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$. There exists $C = C(q, m, \Omega) > 0$ such that for any nonnegative solution f to the KFP equation (1.1)–(1.2)–(1.3) and any test function $0 \le \varphi \in \mathcal{D}((0,T))$, there holds*

$$\int_{\mathcal{U}} f^q \tilde{m}^q \frac{(n_x \cdot \hat{v})^2}{\delta^{1/2}}\varphi^q + \int_{\mathcal{U}} |\nabla_v (f^{q/2}\tilde{m}^{q/2})|^2 \varphi^q \le C \int_{\mathcal{U}} f^q m^q [|\partial_t \varphi^q| + \langle \varpi_- \rangle \varphi^q],$$

where $\tilde{m}$ is a modified weight function such that $m \lesssim \tilde{m} \lesssim m$ and $\varpi := \varpi_{\tilde{m},q}$ is defined in (2.3).

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.1. We fix $q \in (0,1)$ and we introduce the modified weight functions

$$m_A^q := \chi_A \mathcal{M}^{1-q} + (1-\chi_A) m^q, \tag{3.4}$$

for $A \ge 1$ and with the notations of Lemma 2.3. We next introduce the function

$$\Phi^q := \varphi^q \tilde{m}^q, \quad \tilde{m}^q := m_A^q - \frac{m_A^q}{4} n_x \cdot \tilde{v} + \frac{m_A^q}{4D^{1/2}}\delta(x)^{1/2} n_x \cdot \tilde{v},$$

where $D = \sup \delta$ is half the diameter of Ω, so that in particular an estimate similar to

(2.21) holds. From (3.1), we have

$$4\frac{(1-q)}{q}\int_{\mathcal{U}}|\nabla_v(f\Phi)^{q/2}|^2-\int_{\Gamma}(\gamma f)^q\Phi^q n_x\cdot v-\int_{\mathcal{U}}f^q\mathcal{T}_2^*\Psi_3 \tag{3.5}$$
$$=\int_{\mathcal{U}}f^q\mathcal{T}_2^*\Psi_{12}-q\int_{\mathcal{U}}f^q\Phi^q\varpi+\int_{\mathcal{U}}f^q\mathcal{T}_1^*\Phi^q,$$

where $\mathcal{T}_1^*=-\partial_t$, $\mathcal{T}_2^*=-v\cdot\nabla_x$, $\varpi=\varpi_{\tilde{m},q}$, and

$$\Psi_{12}:=\varphi^q m_A^q\left(1-\frac{1}{4}n_x\cdot\tilde{v}\right),\quad \Psi_3:=\varphi^q\,\frac{m_A^q}{4D^{1/2}}\delta(x)^{1/2}n_x\cdot\tilde{v}.$$

We now compute each term separately.

Step 1. For the second term at the left-hand side of (3.5), we observe that

$$-\int_{\Sigma}(\gamma f)^q m_A^q n_x\cdot v=-\int_{\Sigma_+}(\gamma_+ f)^q m_A^q|n_x\cdot v|+\int_{\Sigma_-}(\gamma_- f)^q m_A^q|n_x\cdot v|$$

and, using the boundary condition together with the fact that the map $s\mapsto s^q$ is concave, we get

$$\int_{\Sigma_-}\left\{(1-\iota)\mathcal{S}\gamma_+ f+\iota\mathcal{D}\gamma_+ f\right\}^q m_A^q|n_x\cdot v|$$
$$\geq\int_{\Sigma_-}(1-\iota)(\mathcal{S}\gamma_+ f)^q m_A^q|n_x\cdot v|+\int_{\Sigma_-}\iota(\widetilde{\gamma_+ f})^q\mathcal{M}^q m_A^q|n_x\cdot v|.$$

Removing the contribution of the specular reflection thanks to the change of variables $v\mapsto\mathcal{V}_x v$ as in the proof of Lemmas 2.3 and 2.4 and using the Hölder inequality in order to manage the term involving K_2, we therefore obtain

$$-\int_{\Sigma}(\gamma f)^q m_A^q n_x\cdot v\geq\int_{\Sigma_-}\iota(\widetilde{\gamma_+ f})^q\mathcal{M}^q m_A^q(n_x\cdot v)_--\int_{\Sigma_+}\iota(\gamma_+ f)^q m_A^q(n_x\cdot v)_+$$
$$\geq\left(K_1(m_A)-K_2(m_A)^{1-q}\right)\int_{\partial\Omega}\iota(\widetilde{\gamma_+ f})^q,$$

with

$$K_1(m_A):=\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\mathcal{M}^q m_A^q(n_x\cdot v)_-dv<+\infty,$$
$$K_2(m_A):=\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}m_A^{\frac{q}{1-q}}(n_x\cdot v)_+dv<+\infty.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\int_{\Sigma}(\gamma f)^q m_A^q\frac{(n_x\cdot\hat{v})^2}{4}\geq K_0(m_A)\int_{\partial\Omega}\iota(\widetilde{\gamma_+ f})^q$$

with

$$K_0(m_A) := \frac{1}{4}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{M}^q m_A^q (n_x\cdot\hat{v})_-^2\, dv.$$

Both together, we obtain

$$-\int_\Sigma (\gamma f)^q \widetilde{m}^q n_x\cdot v \geq \left[K_0(m_A)+K_1(m_A)-K_2(m_A)^{1-q}\right]\int_{\partial\Omega} \iota(\widetilde{\gamma_+ f})^q.$$

Observing that $m_A \to \mathcal{M}^{\frac{1}{q}-1}$ when $A\to\infty$, we deduce that $K_1(m_A)\to K_1(\mathcal{M}^{\frac{1}{q}-1})=1$, $K_2(m_A)\to K_2(\mathcal{M}^{\frac{1}{q}-1})=1$, and $K_0(m_A)\to K_0(\mathcal{M}^{\frac{1}{q}-1})>0$ as $A\to\infty$, thanks to the integrability condition made on m and the dominated convergence theorem of Lebesgue. We may thus choose $A>0$ large enough in such a way that

$$K_0(m_A)+K_1(m_A)-K_2(m_A)^{1-q}\geq 0. \tag{3.6}$$

STEP 2. In order to deal with the third term at the left-hand side of (3.5), we define $\psi := \delta(x)^{1/2} n_x\cdot\tilde{v}$. Observing that $\langle v\rangle\psi\in L^\infty(\mathcal{O})$, $\nabla_v\psi\in L^\infty(\mathcal{O})$, and

$$v\cdot\nabla_x\psi = \frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{\delta(x)^{1/2}}(\hat{v}\cdot n_x)^2+\delta(x)^{1/2}\hat{v}\cdot D_x n_x\hat{v},$$

we compute

$$-\int_{\mathcal{U}} f^q \mathcal{T}_2^*\Psi_3 = \frac{1}{4D^{1/2}}\int_{\mathcal{U}} f^q\varphi^q m_A^q\left\{\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{\delta(x)^{1/2}}(\hat{v}\cdot n_x)^2+\delta(x)^{1/2}\hat{v}\cdot D_x n_x\hat{v}\right\}.$$

We may now conclude. Because of (3.6), we may get rid of the boundary term, and together with the last inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&4\frac{1-q}{q}\int_{\mathcal{U}}|\nabla_v(f\widetilde{m})^{q/2}|^2\varphi^q+\frac{1}{8D^{1/2}}\int_{\mathcal{U}} f^q\varphi^q m_A^q\frac{1}{\delta(x)^{1/2}}(n_x\cdot\hat{v})^2\\
&\quad\leq \frac{1}{4}\int_{\mathcal{U}} f^q m_A^q\varphi^q\, v\cdot\nabla_x(n_x\cdot\tilde{v})-q\int_{\mathcal{U}} f^q\varphi^q\widetilde{m}^q\varpi-\int_{\mathcal{U}} f^q\widetilde{m}^q\partial_t\varphi^q\\
&\qquad-\frac{1}{4D^{1/2}}\int_{\mathcal{U}} f^q\varphi^q m_A^q\delta(x)^{1/2}\hat{v}\cdot D_x n_x\hat{v}\\
&\quad\leq C_{\Omega,A}\int_{\mathcal{U}} f^q m^q\langle\varpi_-\rangle\varphi^q+C_A\int_{\mathcal{U}} f^q m^q|\partial_t\varphi^q|,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $\delta\in W^{2,\infty}(\Omega)$ and Ω is bounded. ∎

Using an interpolation argument, we may write our previous weighted L^q estimate in a more convenient way where the penalization of a neighborhood of the boundary is made clearer. In order to do this, we use the following interpolation estimate.

LEMMA 3.2. *We set $\beta := (2(d+1))^{-1}$. For any function $g:\mathcal{O}\to\mathbb{R}$, there holds*

$$\int_{\mathcal{O}}\frac{g^2}{\delta^\beta}\lesssim\int_{\mathcal{O}}\left(g\langle v\rangle\right)^2\frac{(n_x\cdot\hat{v})^2}{\delta^{1/2}}+\int_{\mathcal{O}}\left|\nabla_v\left(g\langle v\rangle\right)\right|^2. \tag{3.7}$$

PROOF OF LEMMA 3.2. For $\eta, \varsigma > 0$, we start by writing

$$\int_{\mathcal{O}} g^2 \delta^{-2\eta} = \int_{\mathcal{O}} \frac{g^2}{\delta^{2\eta}} \mathbf{1}_{(n_x \cdot v)^2 > \delta^{2\varsigma}} + \int_{\mathcal{O}} \frac{g^2}{\delta^{2\eta}} \mathbf{1}_{|n_x \cdot v| \le \delta^{\varsigma}} =: T_1 + T_2.$$

For the first term, we have

$$T_1 \le \int_{\mathcal{O}} g^2 \mathbf{1}_{(n_x \cdot v)^2 > \delta^{2\varsigma}} \frac{(n_x \cdot v)^2}{\delta^{2\varsigma + 2\eta}} \le \int_{\mathcal{O}} g^2 \frac{(n_x \cdot v)^2}{\delta^{1/2}},$$

by choosing $2\varsigma + 2\eta = 1/2$. For the second term, we define $2^* := 2d/(d-2)$ the Sobolev exponent in dimension $d \ge 3$, and we compute

$$\begin{aligned} T_2 &\le \int_{\Omega} \delta^{-2\eta} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \big(\langle v \rangle g\big)^{2^*} \right)^{2/2^*} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle v \rangle^{-d} \mathbf{1}_{|n_x \cdot v| \le \delta^{\varsigma}} \right)^{2/d} \\ &\lesssim \int_{\Omega} \delta^{-2\eta + 2\varsigma/d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \big|\nabla_v \big(\langle v \rangle g\big)\big|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the Hölder inequality in the first line and the Sobolev inequality in the second line together with the observation that $\langle v \rangle^{-d} \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}; L^1(\mathbb{R}^{d-1}))$. Choosing $2\varsigma/d = 2\eta$, we get $\eta = (4(d+1))^{-1}$ and we conclude to (3.7). ∎

Gathering the estimates of Proposition 3.1 and Lemma 3.2, we immediately obtain the following result.

PROPOSITION 3.3. *Let $q \in (0,1)$ and let $m : \mathbb{R}^d \to (0, \infty)$ be a radially symmetric decreasing weight function such that $m^{\frac{q}{1-q}} |v| \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$. There exists $C = C(q, m, \Omega) > 0$ such that for any nonnegative solution f to the KFP equation (1.1)–(1.2)–(1.3) and any test function $0 \le \varphi \in \mathcal{D}((0,T))$, there holds*

$$\int_{\mathcal{U}} \frac{f^q}{\delta^\beta} \frac{m^q}{\langle v \rangle^2} \varphi^q \le C \int_{\mathcal{U}} f^q m^q \big[|\partial_t \varphi^q| + \langle \varpi_- \rangle \varphi^q \big],$$

where $\beta := (2(d+1))^{-1}$ and $\varpi := \varpi_{m^{-1},q}$ is defined in (2.3).

By particularizing the choice of m, we obtain a first boundary penalizing weighted $L^1 - L^q$ estimate which will be convenient for our purpose in the next steps.

PROPOSITION 3.4. *For any $q \in ((d+1)/(d+2), 1)$, for any nonnegative solution f to the KFP equation (1.1)–(1.2)–(1.3) and any test function $0 \le \varphi \in \mathcal{D}((0,T))$, there holds*

$$\int_{\mathcal{U}} \frac{f^q}{\delta^\beta} \frac{\varphi^q}{\langle v \rangle^{2 + (d+2)q(1-q)}} \le C T^{1-q} \|\varphi^q\|_{W^{1,\infty}(0,T)} \|f\|^q_{L^1(\mathcal{U})},$$

with $C = C(q, d, \Omega) > 0$ and $\beta = (2(d+1))^{-1}$ defined just above.

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.4. We choose $m := \langle v\rangle^{-(d+2)(1-q)}$ and we observe that $m^{\frac{q}{1-q}}\langle v\rangle \in L^1$ and $\varpi_{m^{-1},q} \in L^\infty$. From Proposition 3.3, we thus get

$$\int_{\mathcal{U}} \frac{f^q}{\delta^\beta}\frac{\varphi^q}{\langle v\rangle^{2+(d+2)q(1-q)}} \le C\|\varphi^q\|_{W^{1,\infty}(0,T)}\int_{\mathcal{U}} f^q\langle v\rangle^{-(d+2)(1-q)q}.$$

On the other hand, using the Hölder inequality, we have

$$\int_{\mathcal{U}} f^q\langle v\rangle^{-(d+2)(1-q)q} \le \left(\int_{\mathcal{U}} f\right)^q \big(T|\Omega|\big)^{1-q}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\langle v\rangle^{-(d+2)q}\right)^{1-q},$$

and the last integral is finite because $(d+2)q > d$. We conclude by just gathering the two estimates. ∎

3.2. *A weak weighted $L^1 - L^p$ estimate*

Taking advantage of a known $L^1 - L^p$ estimate available for the KFP equation set in the whole space and thus in the interior of the domain, we deduce a downgrade weighted $L^1 - L^p$ estimate. We define

$$\mathfrak{W}_3 := \big\{\omega : \mathbb{R}^d \to (0,\infty);\ \omega_0 := \omega/\langle v\rangle \in \mathfrak{W},\ |\nabla\omega_0|\omega_0^{-1}\langle v\rangle^{-1} \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)\big\}. \tag{3.8}$$

We may notice that $\omega := \langle v\rangle^k e^{\zeta\langle v\rangle^s} \in \mathfrak{W}_3$ under the condition (2.4).

PROPOSITION 3.5. *Assume that $p \in (1, 1+1/(2d))$, $\alpha > p$, and $\omega \in \mathfrak{W}_3$. There exists some constant $C = C(\Omega, p, \alpha, \omega) \in (0,\infty)$ such that any solution f to the KFP equation (1.1)–(1.2)–(1.3) satisfies*

$$\left\| f\varphi\frac{\omega}{\langle v\rangle}\delta^{\alpha/p}\right\|_{L^p(\mathcal{U})} \le CT^{1/p+2d(1-1/p)}\|\varphi\|_{W^{1,\infty}(0,T)}\|f\omega\|_{L^1(\mathcal{U})}, \tag{3.9}$$

for any $0 \le \varphi \in \mathcal{D}((0,T))$ and any $T > 0$.

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.5. We split the proof into two steps.

STEP 1. For $\chi \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega)$ such that $0 \le \chi \le 1$, we define $0 \le \bar f := f\varphi\chi\omega_0$, which is a solution to the equation

$$\partial_t \bar f + v\cdot\nabla_x \bar f - \Delta_v \bar f - \left(v + 2\frac{\nabla_v\omega_0}{\omega_0}\right)\cdot\nabla_v \bar f = F$$

set on $(0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d$, with

$$F := f\omega_0(\varphi'\chi + \varphi v\cdot\nabla_x\chi) + \bar f\left(d - v\cdot\frac{\nabla_v\omega_0}{\omega_0} + 2\frac{|\nabla_v\omega_0|^2}{\omega_0^2} - \frac{\Delta_v\omega_0}{\omega_0}\right).$$

Because $\omega_0 \in \mathfrak{W}$, we have

$$F_+ \le f\omega_0\langle v\rangle\big(|\varphi'|\chi + \varphi|\nabla_x\chi|\big) + f\varphi\chi\omega_0\kappa_{\omega_0}.$$

From [4, Theorem 1.5] for instance and because $|\nabla\omega_0|\omega_0^{-1} \lesssim \langle v\rangle$, we know that

$$\bar f \le \int_0^t K_{t-s} \star F_{+s}\, ds,$$

where $\star = \star_{x,v}$ stands for a convenient convolution operation and K_τ is the Kolmogorov kernel defined by

$$K_\tau(x,v) := \frac{C_1}{\tau^{2d}} \exp\Big(-\frac{3C_2}{\tau^3}|x-\frac{\tau}{2}v|^2 - \frac{C_2}{4\tau}|v|^2\Big), \quad C_i > 0.$$

We next compute

$$\begin{aligned}\|\bar f\|^p_{L^p([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{2d})} &\le \int_0^T \Big\| \int_0^t K_{t-s}\star F_{+s}\Big\|^p_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^{2d})} dt \\ &\le \|K\|^p_{L^p([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{2d})} \|F_+\|^p_{L^1([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{2d})},\end{aligned}$$

and because $1 \le p < 1 + 1/(2d)$, we find

$$\|K\|^p_{L^p([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{2d})} = C_{K,p} T^{1-2d(p-1)}.$$

As a consequence, we have

$$\|f\varphi\omega_0\chi\|_{L^p(\mathcal{U})} \lesssim C_T \|\varphi\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \|\chi\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \|f\omega\|_{L^1(\mathcal{U})}, \tag{3.10}$$

with $C_T := T^{1/p+2d(1-1/p)}$.

Step 2. We define $\Omega_k := \{x \in \Omega \mid \delta(x) > 2^{-k}\}$ and we choose $\chi_k \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega)$ such that $\mathbf{1}_{\Omega_{k+1}} \le \chi_k \le \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k}$ and $2^{-k}\|\chi_k\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \lesssim 1$ uniformly in $k \ge 1$. We also denote $\mathcal{U}_k := (0,T)\times\Omega_k\times\mathbb{R}^d$. We deduce from (3.10) that

$$\|f\varphi\omega_0\|_{L^p(\mathcal{U}_{k+1})} \lesssim 2^k C_T \|\varphi\|_{W^{1,\infty}(0,T)} \|f\omega\|_{L^1(\mathcal{U})}, \quad \forall k \ge 1.$$

Summing up, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathcal{U}} \delta^\alpha (\varphi f\omega_0)^p &= \sum_k \int_{\mathcal{U}_{k+1}\setminus\mathcal{U}_k} \delta^\alpha(\varphi f\omega_0)^p \\ &\lesssim \sum_k 2^{-k\alpha} \int_{\mathcal{U}_{k+1}} (\varphi f\omega_0)^p \\ &\lesssim \sum_k 2^{k(p-\alpha)} C_T^p \|\varphi\|^p_{W^{1,\infty}} \|f\omega\|^p_{L^1(\mathcal{U})} \\ &\lesssim C_T^p \|\varphi\|^p_{W^{1,\infty}(0,T)} \|f\omega\|^p_{L^1(\mathcal{U})},\end{aligned}$$

because $\alpha > p$, which is nothing but (3.9). ∎

3.3. *The $L^1 - L^r$ estimate up to the boundary*

We start with a classical interpolation result.

LEMMA 3.6. *For any weight functions $\sigma_i : \mathcal{U} \to (0,\infty)$ and any exponents $0 < r_0 < r_1 < \infty$, $0 < \theta < 1$, there holds*

$$\|g\|_{L^r_\sigma} \le \|g\|^{1-\theta}_{L^{r_0}_{\sigma_0}} \|g\|^{\theta}_{L^{r_1}_{\sigma_1}},$$

with $1/r := (1-\theta)/r_0 + \theta/r_1$ and $\sigma := \sigma_0^{1-\theta}\sigma_1^{\theta}$.

We include the very classical proof because the statement is usually written assuming rather $1 \le r_0 < r_1 < \infty$, but that last restriction is not needed.

PROOF OF LEMMA 3.6. We write

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\int f^r\sigma^r\right)^{1/r} &= \left(\int (f\sigma_0)^{r(1-\theta)}(f\sigma_1)^{r\theta}\right)^{1/r}\\ &\le \left(\int (f\sigma_0)^{a'r(1-\theta)}\right)^{1/a'r}\left(\int (f\sigma_1)^{ar\theta}\right)^{1/ar}\end{aligned}$$

thanks to the Hölder inequality with $\frac{1}{a} := \frac{\theta r}{r_1} = 1 - (1-\theta)\frac{r}{r_0} < 1$, from which we immediately deduce $r_1 = ar\theta$ and $r_0 = a'r(1-\theta)$, and thus conclude. ∎

We are now in position of stating our weighted $L^1 - L^r$ estimate up to the boundary which is the well-known cornerstone step in the proof of De Giorgi–Nash–Moser gain of integrability estimate.

PROPOSITION 3.7. *There exist an exponent $r > 1$ and some constants $\eta > 0$, $\theta, q \in (0,1)$ such that any solution f to the KFP equation (1.1)–(1.2) satisfies*

$$\|\varphi f\omega^\sharp\|_{L^r(\mathcal{U})} \le CT^\eta \|\varphi^q\|^{1/q}_{W^{1,\infty}(0,T)} \|f\omega\|_{L^1(\mathcal{U})}, \tag{3.11}$$

for any weight function $\omega \in \mathfrak{W}_3$ and any test function $0 \le \varphi \in \mathcal{D}((0,T))$, with $\omega^\sharp := \omega^\theta \langle v\rangle^{-4}$ and $C = C(d,\Omega,\omega)$. A possible choice is $\theta = \theta_1 := (2d+3)^{-1}$.

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.7. From Proposition 3.4, we have

$$\left\| f\varphi \frac{1}{\delta^{\beta/q}} \frac{1}{\langle v\rangle^{2/q+(d+2)(1-q)}} \right\|_{L^q(\mathcal{U})} \le CT^{1/q-1}\|\varphi^q\|^{1/q}_{W^{1,\infty}(0,T)}\|f\omega\|_{L^1(\mathcal{U})},$$

for some exponent $q \in ((d+1)/(d+2), 1)$ and with $\beta := (2(d+1))^{-1}$. Together with Proposition 3.5 and Lemma 3.6, we deduce that

$$\|f\varphi\sigma\|_{L^r} \le CT^\eta \|\varphi^q\|^{1/q}_{W^{1,\infty}} \|f\omega\|_{L^1(\mathcal{U})},$$

for any $\theta \in (0,1)$ with

$$\frac{1}{r} = \frac{1-\theta}{q} + \frac{\theta}{p}, \quad \sigma := \frac{\delta^{\alpha\theta/p}}{\delta^{(1-\theta)\beta/q}} \frac{\omega^\theta}{\langle v\rangle^{\theta+\big(2/q+(d+2)(1-q)\big)(1-\theta)}},$$

and

$$\eta := (1-\theta)(1/q-1) + \theta\big(1/p + 2d(1-1/p)\big),$$

where we recall here that $p \in (1, 1+1/(2d))$ and $\alpha > p$ are arbitrary. We first choose

$$\theta := \frac{\beta/q}{\beta/q + \alpha/p} = \frac{1}{1+2(d+1)q\alpha/p},$$

in such a way that $\delta^{\alpha\theta/p-(1-\theta)\beta/q} \equiv 1$. In order to track the dependency in both the exponent and the weight function, we choose $\alpha := p/q$, so that $\theta = \theta_1 := (1+2(d+1))^{-1}$, and because $r = r_q \to r_*$ as $q \to 1$ with

$$\frac{1}{r_*} = 1 - \theta_1 + \frac{\theta_1}{p} < 1,$$

we may choose $q \in ((d+1)/(d+2), 1)$ large enough in such a way that $r > 1$. We finally observe that $2/q + (d+2)(1-q) \le 4$ so that $\sigma \gtrsim \omega^\sharp$. ∎

3.4. The $L^1 - L^p$ estimate on the dual problem

We consider the dual backward problem (2.14) for which we establish the same kind of estimate as for the forward KFP problem (1.1)-(1.2). In all this section, we denote by $q \in (0,1)$ the exponent chosen during the proof of Proposition 3.7 and we define

$$\mathfrak{N}_1 := \big\{m := e^{-\zeta|v|^2},\ \zeta \in (0,1/2)\big\}. \tag{3.12}$$

Proposition 3.8. *There exist some exponent $r > 1$ and some constants $\eta > 0$ such that for any weight function $m \in \mathfrak{N}_1$ and any solution g to the dual backward problem* (2.14)*, there holds*

$$\|\varphi g m'\|_{L^r(\mathcal{U})} \lesssim T^{\eta_1} \|\varphi^q\|^{1/q}_{W^{1,\infty}(0,T)} \|g m\|_{L^1(\mathcal{U})}, \tag{3.13}$$

for any test function $0 \le \varphi \in \mathcal{D}((0,T))$ and some exponential weight function $m' := \exp(-\zeta'|v|^2)$, with $\zeta' \in (\zeta, 1/2]$.

We emphasize that the exponent $r > 1$ can be taken identically as in Proposition 3.7, and for the sake of simplicity, it is what we will do in the sequel.

Proof of Proposition 3.8. The proof follows the same steps as for the proof of Proposition 3.7 and we thus repeat it without too much details.

STEP 1. BOUNDARY PENALIZING $L^1 - L^q$ ESTIMATE. From [21, Lemma 7.7] or a direct computation, we have

$$\int (\mathcal{C}^* g)\, g^{q-1} m^q = -\frac{4(q-1)}{q^2} \int \left|\nabla_v (g m)^{q/2}\right|^2 + \int g^q m^q \wp_{m,q}, \tag{3.14}$$

with $\mathcal{C}^*$ defined in (2.9) and

$$\wp_{m,q} := 2\left(1 - \frac{1}{q}\right) \frac{|\nabla_v m|^2}{m^2} + \left(\frac{2}{q} - 1\right) \frac{\Delta_v m}{m} + \frac{d}{q} + v \cdot \frac{\nabla_v m}{m}. \tag{3.15}$$

Considering a solution g to the dual backward problem (2.14) and $q \neq 1$, we may write

$$\mathcal{T}^* \frac{g^q}{q} = g^{q-1} \mathcal{T}^* g = g^{q-1} \mathcal{C}^* g, \tag{3.16}$$

with $\mathcal{T}^*$ defined in (3.2). We define the modified weight function $\mathfrak{M}$ by

$$\mathfrak{M} := \mathcal{M}\Big(1 - \frac{1}{4D^{1/2}} \delta(x)^{1/2} n_x \cdot \tilde{v}\Big).$$

Multiplying the equation (3.16) by $\Phi^q := \varphi^q \mathfrak{M}$ with $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(0, T)$, and integrating in all the variables, we obtain

$$-\frac{1}{q} \int_\Gamma (\gamma g)^q \Phi^q n_x \cdot v + \frac{1}{q} \int_{\mathcal{U}} g^q \mathcal{T} \Phi^q = \int_{\mathcal{U}} g^{q-1} (\mathcal{C}^* g) \Phi^q,$$

with $\mathcal{T}$ defined in (3.3). Together with (3.14), we thus deduce

$$4 \frac{1-q}{q^2} \int_{\mathcal{U}} \left|\nabla_v (g\Phi)^{q/2}\right|^2 + \frac{1}{q} \int_\Gamma (\gamma g)^q \Phi^q n_x \cdot v = \frac{1}{q} \int_{\mathcal{U}} g^q \mathcal{T} \Phi^q - \int g^q \Phi^q \wp, \tag{3.17}$$

with $\wp = \wp_{\mathfrak{M}^{1/q},q}$. For the boundary term at the left-hand side, we argue similarly as during the proof of Lemma 2.2. We observe that

$$\int_\Sigma (\gamma g)^q \mathcal{M} n_x \cdot v \geq \int_{\Sigma_+} \iota(\widetilde{\gamma_- g \mathcal{M}})^q \mathcal{M}(n_x \cdot v)_+ - \int_{\Sigma_-} \iota(\gamma_- g)^q \mathcal{M}(n_x \cdot v)_- \geq 0,$$

where we have used the concavity of the function $G \mapsto G^q$ and removed the contribution of the specular reflection in the first inequality, and we have used Hölder's inequality

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \gamma_- g^q \mathcal{M}(n_x \cdot v)_- \leq (\widetilde{\gamma_- g \mathcal{M}})^q \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{M}(n_x \cdot v)_-\right)^{1-q}$$

and the normalization condition (1.6) in the second inequality. We may then proceed exactly as in the proof of Proposition 3.1, and we obtain

$$\int g^q \mathfrak{M} \frac{(n_x \cdot \hat{v})^2}{\delta^{1/2}} \varphi^q + \int \left|\nabla_v (g^{q/2} \mathfrak{M}^{1/2})\right|^2 \varphi^q \leq \frac{C_\Omega}{1-q} \int g^q \mathfrak{M} \big[|\partial_t \varphi^q| + \varphi^q \langle \wp_- \rangle\big].$$

As in Proposition 3.3 and with the help of the interpolation Lemma 3.2, we deduce

$$\int \frac{g^q}{\delta^\beta}\frac{\mathfrak{M}}{\langle v\rangle^2}\varphi^q \le \frac{C_\Omega}{1-q}\int g^q\mathfrak{M}\big[|\partial_t\varphi^q| + \varphi^q\langle\wp_-\rangle\big], \tag{3.18}$$

for the same $\beta := (2(d+1))^{-1}$. Finally, using that $\langle\wp_-\rangle \lesssim \langle v\rangle^2$ and arguing similarly as in the proof of Proposition 3.4 with the help of a last Holder inequality for handling the RHS term, we get

$$\int \frac{g^q}{\delta^\beta}\frac{\mathfrak{M}}{\langle v\rangle^2}\varphi^q \le CT^{1-q}\|\varphi^q\|_{W^{1,\infty}}\big\|g\mathfrak{M}^{1/q}\langle v\rangle^{2/q}\langle v\rangle^{(1-q)(d+1)/q}\big\|^q_{L^1(\mathcal{U})}, \tag{3.19}$$

for some constant $C = C(q,\Omega) > 0$.

Step 2. Weak weighted $L^1 - L^p$ estimate, $p > 1$. Consider a solution g of the dual problem (2.14), $0 \le \varphi \in \mathcal{D}((0,T))$, $0 \le \chi \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega)$, and a weight function $m \in \mathfrak{N}_1$, so that $m_0 := m\langle v\rangle^{-2}$ satisfies

$$\frac{|\nabla m_0|^2}{m_0^2} + \frac{|\Delta m_0|}{m_0} \lesssim \langle v\rangle^2.$$

We set $\bar g := g\varphi\chi m_0$ and we easily compute

$$-\partial_t\bar g - v\cdot\nabla_x\bar g - \Delta_v\bar g + \left(2\frac{\nabla_v m_0}{m_0} - v\right)\cdot\nabla_v\bar g = G,$$

with

$$G := \bar g\left[2\frac{|\nabla_v m_0|^2}{m_0^2} - \frac{\Delta_v m_0}{m_0} + v\cdot\frac{\nabla_v m_0}{m_0}\right] - gm_0(\partial_t + v\cdot\nabla_x)(\varphi\chi).$$

Proceeding as in the proof of Proposition 3.5, we get first

$$\|\bar g\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^{2d+1})} \le CT^{\eta_2}\|\varphi\|_{W^{1,\infty}}\|\chi\|_{W^{1,\infty}}\|gm\|_{L^1(\mathcal{U})},$$

for any $p \in (1, 1+1/(2d))$ and with $\eta_2 := 1/p + 2d(1-1/p)$. By interpolation, we then conclude

$$\|g\varphi\frac{m}{\langle v\rangle^2}\delta^{\alpha/p}\|_{L^p(\mathcal{U})} \le CT^{\eta_2}\|\varphi\|_{W^{1,\infty}}\|gm\|_{L^1(\mathcal{U})}, \tag{3.20}$$

for any $\alpha > p$ and some constant $C = C(\alpha,\Omega,m) > 0$.

Step 3. Weighted $L^1 - L^r$ estimate, $r > 1$. We consider again a weight function $m \in \mathfrak{N}_1$, and we observe that $m \ge \mathfrak{M}^{1/q}\langle v\rangle^{2/q}\langle v\rangle^{(1-q)(d+1)/q}$. From Step 1, we thus find

$$\left\|\frac{g}{\delta^{\beta/q}}\frac{\mathcal{M}}{\langle v\rangle^{2/q}}\varphi\right\|_{L^q(\mathcal{U})} \le CT^{\eta_1}\|\varphi^q\|^{1/q}_{W^{1,\infty}}\|gm\|_{L^1(\mathcal{U})},$$

with $\eta_1 := 1/q - 1$. Since m satisfies the requirement of Step 2, we may thus use the above estimate together with (3.20) and the interpolation Lemma 3.6 as during the proof of Proposition 3.4. We get

$$\|g\varphi\sigma\|_{L^r(\mathcal{U})} \le C T^\eta \|\varphi^q\|_{W^{1,\infty}}^{1/q} \|gm\|_{L^1(\mathcal{U})},$$

with

$$\frac{1}{r} = \frac{1-\theta_1}{q} + \frac{\theta_1}{p}, \quad \sigma := \frac{m^{\theta_1}\mathcal{M}^{1-\theta_1}}{\langle v\rangle^{2\theta_1+(2/q)(1-\theta_1)}},$$

and

$$\eta := (1-\theta_1)(1/q-1) + \theta_1\big(1/p + 2d(1-1/p)\big),$$

where we have fixed

$$p \in \big(1, 1+1/(2d)\big), \quad \alpha := p/q, \quad \theta_1 := (2d+3)^{-1}.$$

Because of the choice of q (large enough), we have $r > 1$. On the other hand, we clearly have $\sigma \gtrsim m' := \exp(-\zeta'|v|^2)$, for any $\zeta' \in (\theta_1\zeta + (1-\theta_1)/2, 1/2)$, in particular $\zeta' > \zeta$. ∎

3.5. *Conclusion of the proof*

We now conclude the proof of Theorem 1.1 in several elementary and classical (after Nash's work) steps.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. We split the proof into four steps. We denote by $r > 1$ the (same) exponent defined in Propositions 3.7 and 3.8. We define

$$\mathfrak{W}_1 := \big\{\exp\big(\zeta'|v|^2\big);\ \zeta' \in \big((1-\theta_1)/2, 1/2\big)\big\}$$

and we fix $\omega \in \mathfrak{W}_1$.

Step 1. Take $\omega_1 := \omega$, so that $\omega_1 \in \mathfrak{W}_0 \cap \mathfrak{W}_3$ and $\omega_r := \omega^\sharp = \omega^\theta\langle v\rangle^{-4} \in \mathfrak{W}_0$, where $\theta \in (0,1)$ is defined in the statement of Proposition 3.7. We claim that there exist $\nu_1, \kappa_1 > 0$ such that

$$T^{\nu_1}\big\|S_{\mathcal{L}}(T)f_0\big\|_{L^r_{\omega_r}(\mathcal{O})} \lesssim e^{\kappa_1 T}\|f_0\|_{L^1_{\omega_1}(\mathcal{O})}, \quad \forall T > 0,\ \forall f_0 \in L^1_{\omega_1}(\mathcal{O}). \tag{3.21}$$

We set $f_t := S_{\mathcal{L}}(t)f_0$. On the one hand, from Proposition 2.1 with $p = r$, we have

$$\frac{T}{2}\|f_T\|^r_{L^r_{\omega_r}} \lesssim \int_{T/2}^T e^{r\kappa(T-t)}\|f_t\|^r_{L^r_{\omega_r}}\,dt \lesssim e^{r\kappa T}\int_0^T \big\|f_t\varphi_0(t/T)\big\|^r_{L^r_{\omega_r}}\,dt,$$

with $\varphi_0 \in C_c^1((0,2))$, $\mathbf{1}_{[1/2,1]} \le \varphi_0 \le 1$, $\varphi_0^q \in W^{1,\infty}$, $q \in ((d+1)/(d+2), 1)$. On the other hand, thanks to Proposition 3.7 applied with $\varphi(t) := \varphi_0(t/T)$ and next to Proposition 2.1 with $p = 1$, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{T}{2}\|f_T\|^r_{L^r_{\omega_r}} &\lesssim e^{r\kappa T} T^{r\eta}\left(1+\frac{1}{T}\right)^{r/q}\left(\int_0^T \|f_t\|_{L^1_{\omega_1}}\,dt\right)^r\\ &\lesssim e^{r\kappa T} T^{r\eta}\left(1+\frac{1}{T}\right)^{r/q}\left(\int_0^T e^{\kappa t}\,dt\right)^r \|f_0\|^r_{L^1_{\omega_1}},\end{aligned}$$

from which (3.21) follows with $\nu_1 := 1/r - \eta - 1/q$ and any $\kappa_1 \ge 3\kappa$.

Step 2. Take $m_1 := \exp(-\zeta|v|^2)$, $\zeta \in (0,1/2)$, and $m_r := \exp(-\zeta'|v|^2)$, $\zeta' \in (\theta_1\zeta + (1-\theta_1)/2, 1/2)$ as in the statement of Proposition 3.8. We emphasize that $m_r^{-1} \in \mathfrak{M}_0$ as defined in (2.6) and $m_1 \in \mathfrak{N}_0$ as defined in (2.18). We now claim that there exist $\nu_2, \kappa_2 > 0$ such that

$$T^{\nu_2}\left\|S^*_{\mathcal{L}}(T)g_0\right\|_{L^r_{m_r}(\mathcal{O})} \lesssim e^{\kappa_2 T}\|g_0\|_{L^1_{m_1}(\mathcal{O})}, \quad \forall T>0,\ \forall g_0 \in L^1_{m_1}(\mathcal{O}). \tag{3.22}$$

We repeat the argument presented in Step 1. We set $g_t := S^*_{\mathcal{L}}(t)g_0$. On the one hand, from the dual counterpart of Proposition 2.1 with $p = r'$ and next from Proposition 3.8, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{T}{2}\|g_T\|^r_{L^r_{m_r}} &\lesssim e^{r\kappa T}\int_0^T \left\|g_t\varphi_0(t/T)\right\|^r_{L^r_{m_r}}\,dt,\\ &\le e^{r\kappa T} T^{r\eta}\left(1+\frac{1}{T}\right)^{r/q}\left(\int_0^T \|g_t\|_{L^1_{m_1}}\,dt\right)^r,\end{aligned}$$

where φ_0 is the same function as above. We conclude to (3.22) thanks to Lemma 2.4.

Step 3. Observing that for $\omega := \exp(\zeta'|v|^2)$, $\zeta' \in ((1-\theta_1)/2, 1/2)$, there exists $\zeta \in (0,1/2)$ such that $\zeta' \in (\theta_1\zeta + (1-\theta_1)/2, 1/2)$, the dual counterpart of (3.22) writes

$$T^{\nu_2}\left\|S_{\mathcal{L}}(T)f_0\right\|_{L^\infty_{\omega_\infty}(\mathcal{O})} \lesssim e^{\kappa_2 T}\|f_0\|_{L^s_\omega(\mathcal{O})}, \quad \forall T>0,\ \forall f_0 \in L^s_\omega(\mathcal{O}), \tag{3.23}$$

with $\omega_\infty := m_1^{-1} = \exp(\zeta|v|^2)$ and $s := r' \in (1,\infty)$. Interpolating (3.21) and (3.23), for any $1 \le p < q \le \infty$, we obtain

$$\left\|S_{\mathcal{L}}(T)f_0\right\|_{L^q_{\omega_q}} \le C_1\frac{e^{C_2 T}}{t^{\nu(1/p-1/q)}}\|f_0\|_{L^p_\omega}, \quad \forall T>0,\ \forall f_0 \in L^p_\omega(\mathcal{O}),$$

with $\nu := \max(\nu_1,\nu_2)(1-1/r)^{-1}$, $C_2 := \max(\kappa_1,\kappa_2)$, and the appropriate interpolated weight function ω_q, in particular $\omega_q \ge \omega' := \exp(\zeta''|v|^2)$, with $\zeta'' := \min(\theta_1\zeta', \zeta)$. ∎

4. Hypocoercivity: Proof of Theorem 1.2

We adapt the proof of [7, Theorem 1.1]. We start introducing some notations and recalling some classical results about the Poisson equation. For any convenient function or distribution $\xi : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, we define $u := (-\Delta_x)^{-1}\xi : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ as the associated solution to the Poisson equation with Neumann condition. More precisely, for any $\eta_i \in L^2(\Omega)$, $\langle \eta_1 \rangle = 0$, we define $u \in H$, with $H := \{u \in H^1(\Omega),\ \langle u \rangle = 0\}$, as the solution of the variational problem

$$\int_\Omega \nabla_x u \cdot \nabla_x w = \int_\Omega \{w\eta_1 - \nabla_x w \cdot \eta_2\}, \quad \forall w \in H, \tag{4.1}$$

which is indeed a variational solution to the Poisson equation with Neumann condition

$$-\Delta_x u = \eta_1 + \mathrm{div}_x\, \eta_2 \text{ in } \Omega, \quad n_x \cdot (\nabla_x u - \eta_2) = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega. \tag{4.2}$$

It is well known that the above variational problem has a unique solution thanks to the Poincaré–Wirtinger inequality and the Lax–Milgram theorem, that

$$\|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \lesssim \sum_{i=1}^{2} \|\eta_i\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \tag{4.3}$$

holds true, and that the additional regularity estimate

$$\|u\|_{H^1(\partial\Omega)} \lesssim \|u\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\eta_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \tag{4.4}$$

holds when $\eta_2 = 0$. We define

$$\mathcal{H} := L^2(\mu^{-1} dv\, dx), \quad \mathcal{H}_0 := \big\{f \in \mathcal{H};\ \langle\!\langle f \rangle\!\rangle = 0\big\},$$

where μ is defined in (1.7) and $\langle\!\langle \cdot \rangle\!\rangle$ in (1.8). We next define the new (twisted) scalar product $((\cdot,\cdot))$ on $\mathcal{H}_0$ by

$$((f,g)) := (f,g)_{\mathcal{H}} + \varepsilon\big(\nabla_x(-\Delta_x)^{-1}\varrho_f, j_g\big)_{L^2} + \varepsilon\big(\nabla_x(-\Delta_x)^{-1}\varrho_g, j_f\big)_{L^2},$$

with $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough to be fixed later, $L^2 := L^2_x(\Omega)$, and where the mass ϱ_f and the momentum j_f are defined respectively by

$$\varrho_h(x) = \varrho[h](x) := \langle h \rangle, \quad j_h(x) = j[h](x) := \langle hv \rangle, \quad \langle H \rangle := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} H(x,v)\, dv.$$

For any $f \in \mathcal{H}_0$, we next decompose

$$f = \pi f + f^\perp, \tag{4.5}$$

with the macroscopic part πf given by

$$\pi f(x,v) = \varrho_f(x)\mu(v),$$

and we remark that

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 = \|f^\perp\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + \|\pi f\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2, \quad \|\pi f\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 = \|\varrho_f\|_{L^2}^2 \tag{4.6}$$

as well as

$$\|\varrho_f\|_{L^2} \le \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad \|j_f\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|f^\perp\|_{\mathcal{H}} \le \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}}. \tag{4.7}$$

It is worth emphasizing that

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\left(\nabla_x(-\Delta_x)^{-1}\varrho_f, j_f\right)_{L^2}\right| &\le \left\|\nabla_x(-\Delta_x)^{-1}\varrho_f\right\|_{L^2}\|j_f\|_{L^2}\\ &\lesssim \|\varrho_f\|_{L^2}\|f^\perp\|_{\mathcal{H}} \lesssim \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2,\end{aligned}$$

from the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, (4.4), and (4.7). Denoting by $|||\cdot|||$ the norm associated with the scalar product $((\cdot,\cdot))$, we in particular deduce that

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}} \lesssim |||f||| \lesssim \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{H}_0. \tag{4.8}$$

We finally define the Dirichlet form associated with the operator $\mathcal{L}$ defined in (1.10) for the twisted scalar product

$$D[f] := ((-\mathcal{L}f, f)), \quad f \in \mathcal{H}_0.$$

More explicitly, we have

$$D[f] = D_1[f] + D_2[f] + D_3[f],$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}D_1[f] &:= (-\mathcal{L}f, f)_{\mathcal{H}},\\ D_2[f] &:= \varepsilon\left(\nabla_x\Delta_x^{-1}\varrho_f, j[\mathcal{L}f]\right)_{L^2},\\ D_3[f] &:= \varepsilon\left(\nabla_x\Delta_x^{-1}\varrho[\mathcal{L}f], j_f\right)_{L^2},\end{aligned}$$

and we estimate each term separately. For simplicity, we introduce the notations $\mathcal{D}^\perp := \mathrm{Id} - \mathcal{D}$, where we recall that $\mathcal{D}$ is given by (1.5) and

$$\partial\mathcal{H}_+ := L^2\left(\Sigma_+; \mu^{-1}(v)n_x \cdot v\,dv\,d\sigma_x\right).$$

It is worth emphasizing that because $f \in \mathrm{Dom}(\mathcal{L})$, the trace functions $\gamma_\pm f$ are well defined. We refer the interested reader to [12, 21, 38] and the references therein for a suitable definition of the trace function for solutions to the KFP equation.

We estimate the first term involved in the Dirichlet form D.

LEMMA 4.1. *For any $f \in \mathcal{H}$, there holds*

$$(-\mathcal{L} f, f)_{\mathcal{H}} \geq \|f^{\perp}\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + \frac{1}{2}\left\|\sqrt{\iota(2-\iota)}\mathcal{D}^{\perp}\gamma_+ f\right\|_{\partial\mathcal{H}_+}^2.$$

PROOF OF LEMMA 4.1. Recalling (1.10) and (2.1), we write

$$(-\mathcal{L} f, f)_{\mathcal{H}} = (-\mathcal{C} f, f)_{\mathcal{H}} + (v \cdot \nabla_x f, f)_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

On the one hand, we recall the classical Poincaré inequality

$$\left\|h - \langle h\mu\rangle\right\|_{L^2(\mu)} \leq \|\nabla_v h\|_{L^2(\mu)}, \quad \forall h \in L^2(\mu dv\, dx),$$

from which we classically deduce

$$\begin{aligned}(-\mathcal{C} f, f)_{\mathcal{H}} &= -\int_{\mathcal{O}} \operatorname{div}_v\left(\mu\nabla_v(f/\mu)\right) f/\mu\, dv\, dx \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{O}} \left|\nabla_v(f/\mu)\right|^2 \mu\, dv\, dx \\ &\geq \int_{\mathcal{O}} \left|f/\mu - \langle f\rangle\right|^2 \mu\, dv\, dx = \|f^{\perp}\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2.\end{aligned}$$

The second part of the estimate has been proved during the proof of [7, Lemma 3.1]. ■

We recall the identity established in [7, Lemma 3.2].

LEMMA 4.2. *Let $\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$. For any $x \in \partial\Omega$, there holds*

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \phi(v)\gamma f(x,v)\, n_x \cdot v\, dv &= \int_{\Sigma_+^x} \phi(v)\iota(x)\mathcal{D}^{\perp}\gamma_+ f\, n_x \cdot v\, dv \\ &\quad + \int_{\Sigma_+^x} \left\{\phi(v) - \phi(\mathcal{V}_x v)\right\}\left(1-\iota(x)\right)\mathcal{D}^{\perp}\gamma_+ f\, n_x \cdot v\, dv \\ &\quad + \int_{\Sigma_+^x} \left\{\phi(v) - \phi(\mathcal{V}_x v)\right\}\mathcal{D}\gamma_+ f\, n_x \cdot v\, dv.\end{aligned}$$

We estimate the second term involved in the Dirichlet form D.

LEMMA 4.3. *There is a constant $C_2 > 0$, such that*

$$\left(\nabla_x \Delta_x^{-1}\varrho_f, j[\mathcal{L} f]\right)_{L^2} \geq \frac{1}{2}\|\varrho_f\|_{L^2}^2 - C_2\|f^{\perp}\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 - C_2\|\iota\mathcal{D}^{\perp}\gamma_+ f\|_{\partial\mathcal{H}_+}^2, \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{H}.$$

PROOF OF LEMMA 4.3. We repeat the proof of [7, Lemma 3.8]. Writing

$$j[\mathcal{L} f] = j[-v \cdot \nabla_x f] - j[f^{\perp}]$$

where we have observed that $\mathcal{C}\pi f = 0$ and $j[\mathcal{C}g] = j[g]$, and denoting $u := (-\Delta_x)^{-1}\varrho_f$, we have

$$\big(-\nabla_x u, j[\mathcal{L} f]\big)_{L^2} = \left(\partial_{x_i} u, \partial_{x_j} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v_i v_j f\, dv\right)_{L^2} + \big(\nabla_x u, j[f^\perp]\big)_{L^2}.$$

On the one hand, using the Green formula, we may write

$$\left(\partial_{x_i} u, \partial_{x_j} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v_i v_j f\, dv\right)_{L^2} = A + B,$$

with

$$A := -\left(\partial_{x_j}\partial_{x_i} u, \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v_i v_j f\, dv\right)_{L^2}, \quad B := \int_{\partial\Omega} \partial_{x_i} u\, n_j(x) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v_i v_j \gamma f\, dv\right) d\sigma_x.$$

Thanks to the decomposition (4.5), we get

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v_i v_j f\, dv = \delta_{ij}\varrho_f + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v_i v_j f^\perp\, dv,$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} A &= (-\Delta_x u, \varrho_f)_{L^2} - \left(\partial_{x_j}\partial_{x_i} u, \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v_i v_j f^\perp\, dv\right)_{L^2} \\ &= \|\varrho\|_{L^2}^2 - \left(\partial_{x_j}\partial_{x_i} u, \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v_i v_j f^\perp\, dv\right)_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

since $-\Delta_x u = \varrho$ by definition of u. Using (4.4), we have

$$\left|\left(\partial_{x_j}\partial_{x_i} u, \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v_i v_j f^\perp\, dv\right)_{L^2}\right| \lesssim \|D_x^2 u\|_{L^2}\|f^\perp\|_{\mathcal{H}} \lesssim \|\varrho_f\|_{L^2}\|f^\perp\|_{\mathcal{H}},$$

from which it follows, thanks to Young's inequality, that

$$A \geq \frac{3}{4}\|\varrho_f\|_{L^2}^2 - C\|f^\perp\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2.$$

We now investigate the boundary term B. Thanks to Lemma 4.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} B &= \int_\Sigma \nabla_x u \cdot v\, \gamma f\, n_x \cdot v\, dv\, d\sigma_x \\ &= \int_{\Sigma_+} \nabla_x u \cdot v \iota(x) \mathcal{D}^\perp \gamma_+ f\, n_x \cdot v\, dv\, d\sigma_x \\ &\quad + \int_{\Sigma_+} \nabla_x u \cdot [v - \mathcal{V}_x v]\big(1 - \iota(x)\big)\mathcal{D}^\perp \gamma_+ f\, n_x \cdot v\, dv\, d\sigma_x \\ &\quad + \int_{\Sigma_+} \nabla_x u \cdot [v - \mathcal{V}_x v] D\gamma_+ f\, n_x \cdot v\, dv\, d\sigma_x \\ &=: B_1 + B_2 + B_3, \end{aligned}$$

and we remark that

$$v - \mathcal{V}_x v = 2n_x(n_x \cdot v),$$

so that

$$\nabla_x u \cdot [v - \mathcal{V}_x v] = 2\nabla_x u \cdot n_x\,(n_x \cdot v).$$

We therefore obtain $B_2 = B_3 = 0$ thanks to the boundary condition satisfied by u in (4.2). On the other hand, the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and (4.4) yield

$$|B_1| \le \|\nabla_x u\|_{L^2_x(\partial\Omega)} \|v\mu\|_{L^1}^{1/2} \|\iota\mathcal{D}^\perp \gamma_+ f\|_{\partial\mathcal{H}_+} \lesssim \|\varrho_f\|_{L^2} \|\iota\mathcal{D}^\perp \gamma_+ f\|_{\partial\mathcal{H}_+}.$$

Similarly as for the term A, we lastly have

$$\left|\left(\nabla_x u, j[f^\perp]\right)_{L^2}\right| \le \|\nabla_x u\|_{L^2} \left\|j[f^\perp]\right\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\varrho_f\|_{L^2} \|f^\perp\|_{\mathcal{H}},$$

where we have used the estimate (4.4) and twice the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality. The proof is then complete by gathering all the previous estimates and by using Young's inequality. ∎

We finally estimate the third term involved in the Dirichlet form D.

LEMMA 4.4. *There is a constant $C_3 > 0$ such that*

$$\left(\nabla_x \Delta_x^{-1} \varrho[\mathcal{L} f], j_f\right)_{L^2} \ge -C_3 \|f^\perp\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2.$$

PROOF OF LEMMA 4.4. From (1.10), (2.1), and $\varrho[\mathcal{C} f] = 0$, one has

$$\varrho[\mathcal{L} f] = \varrho[-v \cdot \nabla_x f] = -\operatorname{div}_x \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v f\, dv = -\operatorname{div}_x j_f.$$

On the other hand, we also classically observe

$$\begin{aligned} j_f \cdot n_x &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \gamma f\, v \cdot n_x dv \\ &= \iota \left\{ \int_{\Sigma_+^x} \gamma_+ f\, v \cdot n_x dv - \int_{\Sigma_-^x} \mathcal{M}(v) \widetilde{\gamma_+ f}\, |v \cdot n_x| dv \right\} \\ &\quad + (1-\iota) \left\{ \int_{\Sigma_+^x} \gamma_+ f\, v \cdot n_x dv - \int_{\Sigma_-^x} \gamma_+ f \circ \mathcal{V}_x\, |v \cdot n_x| dv \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

and using the very definition of $\widetilde{\gamma_+ f}$ and $\mathcal{M}$ in (1.5) and (1.6) in the second integral and the change of variables $v \mapsto \mathcal{V}_x v$ in the last integral, we see that both contributions vanish and we thus obtain the zero flux condition

$$j_f \cdot n_x = 0. \tag{4.9}$$

Now let us define

$$u := (-\Delta_x)^{-1}\varrho[\mathcal{L}f] = (-\Delta_x)^{-1}(-\operatorname{div}_x j_f)$$

the unique variational solution to (4.2) with Neumann boundary condition associated with the source term

$$\xi = \varrho[\mathcal{L}f] = \operatorname{div}\eta_2, \quad \eta_2 := -j_f.$$

From the variational formulation (4.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla_x u\|_{L^2}^2 &= -\int_\Omega (\nabla_x \cdot j_f)\, u\, dx \\ &= \int_\Omega j_f \cdot \nabla_x u\, dx - \int_{\partial\Omega} j_f \cdot n_x\, u\, d\sigma_x \\ &= \int_\Omega j_f \cdot \nabla_x u\, dx,\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the Green formula and finally (4.9) in order to obtain the last equality. We deduce

$$\|\nabla_x u\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|j_f\|_{L^2}$$

thanks to the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, and thus

$$\left|(-\nabla_x u, j_f)_{L^2}\right| \lesssim \|\nabla_x u\|_{L^2}\|j_f\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|j_f\|_{L^2}^2.$$

We conclude thanks to (4.7). ∎

We are now able to conclude the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let f satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 1.2. Observing that $\sqrt{\iota(2-\iota)} \geq \iota$ since ι takes values in $[0,1]$, and gathering Lemmas 4.1, 4.3, and 4.4, one has

$$\begin{aligned}((-\mathcal{L}f, f)) \geq \|f^\perp\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + \frac{1}{2}\left\|\sqrt{\iota(2-\iota)}\mathcal{D}^\perp\gamma_+ f\right\|_{\partial\mathcal{H}_+}^2 \\ + \varepsilon\left(\frac{1}{2}\|\varrho_f\|_{L^2}^2 - (C_2+C_3)\|f^\perp\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 - C_2\left\|\sqrt{\iota(2-\iota)}\mathcal{D}^\perp\gamma_+ f\right\|_{\partial\mathcal{H}_+}^2\right).\end{aligned}$$

Choosing $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ small enough, we get

$$((-\mathcal{L}f, f)) \geq \kappa\big(\|f^\perp\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + \|\varrho_f\|_{L^2}^2\big) + \kappa'\left\|\sqrt{\iota(2-\iota)}\mathcal{D}^\perp\gamma_+ f\right\|_{\partial\mathcal{H}_+}^2$$

for some constants $\kappa, \kappa' > 0$. We thus obtain (1.11) by using the identity (4.6) and the equivalence (4.8) of the norms $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $|||\cdot|||$. ∎

5. Asymptotic behavior: Proof of Theorem 1.3

We repeat the proof of [24, Theorem 3.1] and [39, Theorem 1.4], so that we just sketch the arguments.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. We introduce the splitting

$$\mathcal{A} f := M\chi_R(v) f, \quad \mathcal{B} := \mathcal{L} - \mathcal{A},$$

with $\chi_R(v) := \chi(v/R)$, $\chi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\mathbf{1}_{B_1} \le \chi \le \mathbf{1}_{B_2}$, and some constants $M, R > 0$ to be fixed below. We denote by $S_{\mathcal{B}}$ the semigroup associated with the modified KFP equation associated with the partial differential operator $\mathcal{B}$ and the same reflection condition (1.2). We define

$$\mathfrak{W}_2 := \Big\{\omega \in \mathfrak{W}_0;\ \sup_{p\in[1,\infty]} \limsup_{|v|\to\infty} \varpi_{\omega,p} =: \kappa^* < -1\Big\}, \tag{5.1}$$

where we recall that $\varpi_{\omega,p}$ is defined in (2.3). In particular, $\omega := \langle v\rangle^k e^{\zeta|v|^s} \in \mathfrak{W}_2$ if $s = 2$ and $\zeta \in (0, 1/2)$, or if $s \in [0, 2)$, or if $s = 0$ and $k > d + 1$. By repeating the proof of Proposition 2.1, for any $\kappa > \kappa^*$, we may find $M, R > 0$ large enough such that for any $\omega \in \mathfrak{W}_2$, we have

$$\sup_{p\in[1,\infty]} \sup_{v\in\mathbb{R}^d} \big(\varpi_{\omega,p}(v) - M\chi_R(v)\big) \le (\kappa^* + \kappa)/2,$$

and thus there exists a constant $C = C(\omega) > 0$ such that

$$\big\| S_{\mathcal{B}}(t) f_0 \big\|_{L^p_\omega} \le C e^{\kappa t} \| f_0 \|_{L^p_\omega}, \quad \forall t \ge 0, \tag{5.2}$$

for any $f_0 \in L^p_\omega$, $1 \le p \le \infty$.

We now fix two weight functions $\omega_0 = e^{\zeta|v|^2}$ and $\omega_0' = e^{\zeta'|v|^2}$ with $0 < \zeta' < \zeta < 1/2$ satisfying the conditions of Theorem 1.1. By repeating the proof of Theorem 1.1, we also have

$$\big\| S_{\mathcal{B}}(t) f_0 \big\|_{L^\infty_{\omega_0'}} \le C \frac{e^{\kappa t}}{t^\nu} \| f_0 \|_{L^p_{\omega_0}}, \quad \forall t > 0. \tag{5.3}$$

Recalling the definition of total mass $\langle\!\langle \cdot \rangle\!\rangle$ in (1.8), we define

$$\Pi g := g - \langle\!\langle g \rangle\!\rangle \mu$$

and

$$\bar{S}_{\mathcal{L}} := \Pi S_{\mathcal{L}} = S_{\mathcal{L}} \Pi = \Pi S_{\mathcal{L}} \Pi.$$

Iterating the Duhamel formulas

$$S_{\mathcal{L}} = S_{\mathcal{B}} + S_{\mathcal{B}} \mathcal{A} * S_{\mathcal{L}}, \quad S_{\mathcal{L}} = S_{\mathcal{B}} + S_{\mathcal{L}} * \mathcal{A} S_{\mathcal{B}},$$

where $*$ stands for the time convolution between operator defined on $\mathbb{R}$ with support on $\mathbb{R}_+$, we deduce that

$$\bar{S}_{\mathcal{L}} = V_1 \Pi + W_1 * \bar{S}_{\mathcal{L}}, \tag{5.4}$$

$$\bar{S}_{\mathcal{L}} = \Pi V_1 + \bar{S}_{\mathcal{L}} * W_2, \tag{5.5}$$

with

$$V_1 := \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (S_{\mathcal{B}} \mathcal{A})^{*j} * S_{\mathcal{B}}, \quad W_1 := (S_{\mathcal{B}} \mathcal{A})^{*n}, \quad W_2 := (\mathcal{A} S_{\mathcal{B}})^{*n},$$

where we use the shorthand $U^{*0} := \mathrm{Id}$, $U^{*(j+1)} := U * U^{*j}$. Taking both estimates (5.4) and (5.5) together, we obtain

$$\bar{S}_{\mathcal{L}} = V_2 + W_1 * \bar{S}_{\mathcal{L}} * W_2, \tag{5.6}$$

with

$$V_2 := V_1 \Pi + W_1 * \Pi V_1.$$

For any $\kappa > \kappa^*$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we deduce from (5.2) that

$$\left\| V_2(t) f_0 \right\|_{L^p_\omega} \leq C e^{\kappa t} \| f_0 \|_{L^p_\omega}, \quad \forall t \geq 0. \tag{5.7}$$

For any $\kappa > \kappa^*$, we deduce from (5.2) and (5.3) (see [24, 39] as well as [40, Proposition 2.5]) that we may find $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ such that

$$\left\| W_1(t) f_0 \right\|_{L^p_\omega} \leq C e^{\kappa t} \| f_0 \|_{L^2(\mu)}, \quad \forall t \geq 0, \tag{5.8}$$

$$\left\| W_2(t) f_0 \right\|_{L^2_{\mu^{-1/2}}} \leq C e^{\kappa t} \| f_0 \|_{L^p_\omega}, \quad \forall t \geq 0. \tag{5.9}$$

We also recall that from Theorem 1.2, we have

$$\| \bar{S}_{\mathcal{L}} f_0 \|_{L^2_{\mu^{-1/2}}} \leq C e^{-\lambda t} \| f_0 \|_{L^2_{\mu^{-1/2}}}, \quad \forall t \geq 0. \tag{5.10}$$

We conclude to (1.12) by just writing the representation formula (5.6) and using the estimates (5.7), (5.8), (5.9), and (5.10). ∎

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS. – The authors warmly thank Clément Mouhot for his PhD course *De Giorgi–Nash–Moser theory for kinetic equations* taught at Université Paris Dauphine-PSL during Spring 2023, which has been a source of inspiration for the present work, and also the enlightening discussions in many occasions about the same subject.

FUNDING. – K. Carrapatoso was partially supported by the Project CONVIVIALITY ANR-23-CE40-0003 of the French National Research Agency.

References

[1] F. Anceschi – S. Polidoro, A survey on the classical theory for Kolmogorov equation. *Matematiche (Catania)* **75** (2020), no. 1, 221–258. Zbl 1435.35130 MR 4069607

[2] F. Anceschi – S. Polidoro – M. A. Ragusa, Moser's estimates for degenerate Kolmogorov equations with non-negative divergence lower order coefficients. *Nonlinear Anal.* **189** (2019), article no. 111568. Zbl 1425.35011 MR 3981630

[3] F. Anceschi – A. Rebucci, A note on the weak regularity theory for degenerate Kolmogorov equations. *J. Differential Equations* **341** (2022), 538–588. Zbl 1505.35061 MR 4491355

[4] F. Anceschi – A. Rebucci, On the fundamental solution for degenerate Kolmogorov equations with rough coefficients. *J. Elliptic Parabol. Equ.* **9** (2023), no. 1, 63–92. Zbl 1517.35128

[5] L. Arkeryd – N. Maslova, On diffuse reflection at the boundary for the Boltzmann equation and related equations. *J. Statist. Phys.* **77** (1994), no. 5–6, 1051–1077. Zbl 0839.76073 MR 1301931

[6] A. Bernou, A semigroup approach to the convergence rate of a collisionless gas. *Kinet. Relat. Models* **13** (2020), no. 6, 1071–1106. Zbl 1464.35277 MR 4179249

[7] A. Bernou – K. Carrapatoso – S. Mischler – I. Tristani, Hypocoercivity for kinetic linear equations in bounded domains with general Maxwell boundary condition. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré C Anal. Non Linéaire* **40** (2023), 287–338. Zbl 1521.35132 MR 4581432

[8] F. Bouchut, Hypoelliptic regularity in kinetic equations. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)* **81** (2002), no. 11, 1135–1159. Zbl 1045.35093 MR 1949176

[9] M. Briant – Y. Guo, Asymptotic stability of the Boltzmann equation with Maxwell boundary conditions. *J. Differential Equations* **261** (2016), no. 12, 7000–7079. Zbl 1352.35088 MR 3562318

[10] K. Carrapatoso – P. Gabriel – R. Medina – S. Mischler, Constructive Krein-Rutman result for Kinetic Fokker-Planck equations in a domain. 2024, arXiv:2407.10530v2.

[11] K. Carrapatoso – S. Mischler, The Boltzmann equation in a domain. In preparation.

[12] K. Carrapatoso – S. Mischler, The Landau equation in a domain. 2024, arXiv:2407.09031.

[13] C. Cinti – A. Pascucci – S. Polidoro, Pointwise estimates for a class of non-homogeneous Kolmogorov equations. *Math. Ann.* **340** (2008), no. 2, 237–264. Zbl 1162.35015 MR 2368979

[14] J. S. Darrozès – J. P. Guiraud, Généralisation formelle du Théorème H en présence de parois. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris* **262** (1966), 368–371.

[15] E. De Giorgi, Sulla differenziabilità e l'analiticità delle estremali degli integrali multipli regolari. *Mem. Accad. Sci. Torino. Cl. Sci. Fis. Mat. Nat. (3)* **3** (1957), 25–43. Zbl 0084.31901 MR 0093649

[16] L. Desvillettes – C. Villani, On the trend to global equilibrium in spatially inhomogeneous entropy-dissipating systems: the linear Fokker-Planck equation. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **54** (2001), no. 1, 1–42. Zbl 1029.82032 MR 1787105

[17] R. J. DiPerna – P.-L. Lions, On the Fokker–Planck–Boltzmann equation. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **120** (1988), no. 1, 1–23. Zbl 0671.35068 MR 0972541

[18] J. Dolbeault – C. Mouhot – C. Schmeiser, Hypocoercivity for linear kinetic equations conserving mass. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **367** (2015), no. 6, 3807–3828. Zbl 1342.82115 MR 3324910

[19] H. Dong – Y. Guo – T. Yastrzhembskiy, Kinetic Fokker-Planck and Landau equations with specular reflection boundary condition. *Kinet. Relat. Models* **15** (2022), no. 3, 467–516. Zbl 1498.35542 MR 4414615

[20] J.-P. Eckmann – M. Hairer, Spectral properties of hypoelliptic operators. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **235** (2003), no. 2, 233–253. Zbl 1040.35016 MR 1969727

[21] C. Fonte Sanchez – P. Gabriel – S. Mischler, On the Krein-Rutman theorem and beyond. [v1] 2023, [v3] 2024, arXiv:2305.06652v3.

[22] C. Fonte Sanchez – S. Mischler, On the Voltage-Conductance kinetic equation. 2024, arXiv:2408.02471v1.

[23] F. Golse – C. Imbert – C. Mouhot – A. F. Vasseur, Harnack inequality for kinetic Fokker-Planck equations with rough coefficients and application to the Landau equation. *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5)* **19** (2019), no. 1, 253–295. Zbl 1431.35016 MR 3923847

[24] M. P. Gualdani – S. Mischler – C. Mouhot, Factorization of non-symmetric operators and exponential H-theorem. *Mém. Soc. Math. Fr. (N.S.)* **153** (2017), 137. Zbl 1470.47066 MR 3779780

[25] Y. Guo, Decay and continuity of the Boltzmann equation in bounded domains. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **197** (2010), no. 3, 713–809. Zbl 1291.76276 MR 2679358

[26] Y. Guo – H. J. Hwang – J. W. Jang – Z. Ouyang, The Landau equation with the specular reflection boundary condition. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **236** (2020), no. 3, 1389–1454. Zbl 1437.35161 MR 4076068

[27] B. Helffer – F. Nier, *Hypoelliptic estimates and spectral theory for Fokker-Planck operators and Witten Laplacians*. Lecture Notes in Math. 1862, Springer, Berlin, 2005. Zbl 1072.35006 MR 2130405

[28] F. Hérau, Hypocoercivity and exponential time decay for the linear inhomogeneous relaxation Boltzmann equation. *Asymptot. Anal.* **46** (2006), no. 3-4, 349–359. Zbl 1096.35019 MR 2215889

[29] F. Hérau, Short and long time behavior of the Fokker–Planck equation in a confining potential and applications. *J. Funct. Anal.* **244** (2007), no. 1, 95–118. Zbl 1120.35016 MR 2294477

[30] F. Hérau – F. Nier, Isotropic hypoellipticity and trend to equilibrium for the Fokker-Planck equation with a high-degree potential. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **171** (2004), no. 2, 151–218. Zbl 1139.82323 MR 2034753

[31] L. Hörmander, Hypoelliptic second order differential equations. *Acta Math.* **119** (1967), 147–171. Zbl 0156.10701 MR 0222474

[32] E. Ipocoana – A. Rebucci, Pointwise estimates for degenerate Kolmogorov equations with L^p-source term. *J. Evol. Equ.* **22** (2022), no. 1, 1–25. Zbl 1487.35134 MR 4386001

[33] A. Kolmogoroff, Zufällige Bewegungen (zur Theorie der Brownschen Bewegung). *Ann. of Math. (2)* **35** (1934), no. 1, 116–117. Zbl 0008.39906 MR 1503147

[34] A. Lanconelli – A. Pascucci, Nash estimates and upper bounds for non-homogeneous Kolmogorov equations. *Potential Anal.* **47** (2017), no. 4, 461–483. Zbl 1383.35105 MR 3717350

[35] A. Lanconelli – A. Pascucci – S. Polidoro, Gaussian lower bounds for non-homogeneous Kolmogorov equations with measurable coefficients. *J. Evol. Equ.* **20** (2020), no. 4, 1399–1417. Zbl 1462.35116 MR 4181953

[36] P.-L. Lions – B. Perthame, Lemmes de moments, de moyenne et de dispersion. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.* **314** (1992), no. 11, 801–806. Zbl 0761.35085 MR 1166050

[37] S. Mischler, On the initial boundary value problem for the Vlasov–Poisson–Boltzmann system. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **210** (2000), no. 2, 447–466. Zbl 0983.45007 MR 1776840

[38] S. Mischler, Kinetic equations with Maxwell boundary conditions. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)* **43** (2010), no. 5, 719–760. Zbl 1228.35249 MR 2721875

[39] S. Mischler – C. Mouhot, Exponential stability of slowly decaying solutions to the kinetic-Fokker-Planck equation. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **221** (2016), no. 2, 677–723. Zbl 1338.35430 MR 3488535

[40] S. Mischler – C. Quiñinao – J. Touboul, On a kinetic Fitzhugh–Nagumo model of neuronal network. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **342** (2016), no. 3, 1001–1042. Zbl 1338.35001 MR 3465438

[41] S. Mischler – J. Scher, Spectral analysis of semigroups and growth-fragmentation equations. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré C Anal. Non Linéaire* **33** (2016), no. 3, 849–898. Zbl 1357.47044 MR 3489637

[42] S. Mischler – Q. Weng, On a linear runs and tumbles equation. *Kinet. Relat. Models* **10** (2017), no. 3, 799–822. Zbl 1357.35048 MR 3591133

[43] J. Moser, A new proof of De Giorgi's theorem concerning the regularity problem for elliptic differential equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **13** (1960), 457–468. Zbl 0111.09301 MR 0170091

[44] J. Moser, A Harnack inequality for parabolic differential equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **17** (1964), 101–134. Zbl 0149.06902 MR 0159139

[45] J. Nash, Continuity of solutions of parabolic and elliptic equations. *Amer. J. Math.* **80** (1958), 931–954. Zbl 0096.06902 MR 0100158

[46] A. Pascucci – S. Polidoro, A Gaussian upper bound for the fundamental solutions of a class of ultraparabolic equations. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **282** (2003), no. 1, 396–409. Zbl 1026.35056 MR 2000352

[47] A. Pascucci – S. Polidoro, The Moser's iterative method for a class of ultraparabolic equations. *Commun. Contemp. Math.* **6** (2004), no. 3, 395–417. Zbl 1096.35080 MR 2068847

[48] L. Silvestre, Hölder estimates for kinetic Fokker-Planck equations up to the boundary. *Ars Inven. Anal.* **2022** (2022), article no. 6. MR 4527757

[49] C. Villani, Hypocoercivity. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* **202** (2009), no. 950, iv+141. Zbl 1197.35004 MR 2562709

[50] W. Wang – L. Zhang, The C^α regularity of a class of non-homogeneous ultraparabolic equations. *Sci. China Ser. A* **52** (2009), no. 8, 1589–1606. Zbl 1181.35139 MR 2530175

[51] W. Wang – L. Zhang, The C^α regularity of weak solutions of ultraparabolic equations. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* **29** (2011), no. 3, 1261–1275. Zbl 1209.35072 MR 2773175

[52] Y. Zhu, Regularity of kinetic Fokker–Planck equations in bounded domains. *Ann. H. Lebesgue* **7** (2024), 1323–1366. Zbl 08012975 MR 4883871

Received 19 August 2024,
and in revised form 2 May 2025

Kleber Carrapatoso
Centre de Mathématiques Laurent Schwartz, École Polytechnique, Institut Polytechnique de Paris
91128 Palaiseau Cedex, France
kleber.carrapatoso@polytechnique.edu

Stéphane Mischler
Centre de Recherche en Mathématiques de la Décision, Université Paris Dauphine-PSL
Place du Maréchal de Lattre de Tassigny, 75775 Paris Cedex 16
Institut Universitaire de France
103 Boulevard Saint-Michel, 75005 Paris, France
mischler@ceremade.dauphine.fr