

Cauchy singular integral operator with parameters in Log-Hölder spaces

Yifei Pan and Yuan Zhang*

Abstract

This paper is motivated by a claim in the classical textbook of Muskhelishvili concerning the Cauchy singular integral operator S on Hölder functions with parameters. To the contrary of the claim, a counter example was constructed by Tumanov which shows that S with parameters fails to maintain the same Hölder regularity with respect to the parameters. In view of the example, the behavior of the Cauchy singular integral operator with parameters between a type of Log-Hölder spaces is investigated to obtain the sharp norm estimates. At the end of the paper, we discuss its application to the $\bar{\partial}$ problem on product domains.

1 Introductions

Let D be a bounded domain in $\mathbb{C}$, Λ be (the closure of) an open set in $\mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{C}$ and $\Omega := D \times \Lambda$. In particular, ∂D consists of a finite number of $C^{1,\alpha}$ Jordan curves possessing no points in common. Given a complex-valued function $f \in C^\alpha(\Omega)$, define the Cauchy singular integral along the slice D as follows. For any $(z, \lambda) \in \Omega$,

$$Sf(z, \lambda) := \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial D} \frac{f(\zeta, \lambda)}{\zeta - z} d\zeta. \quad (1)$$

Classical singular integral operators theory in one complex variable states that, there exists a constant C dependent only on Ω and α , such that $Sf(\cdot, \lambda) \in C^\alpha(D)$ for each $\lambda \in \Lambda$, and

$$\|Sf(\cdot, \lambda)\|_{C^\alpha(D)} \leq C\|f(\cdot, \lambda)\|_{C^\alpha(D)}.$$

*partially supported by NSF DMS-1501024

(See for instance [6][9] et al.) It is plausible to ask whether S in (1) is a bounded linear operator in $C^\alpha(\Omega)$. The question was claimed to be true by Muskhelishvili (see [6] p. 49-50). In fact, Muskhelishvili's proof only shows that given any arbitrarily small ϵ with $0 < \epsilon < \alpha$, S is bounded sending $C^\alpha(\Omega)$ into $C^{\alpha-\epsilon}(\Omega)$.

To the contrary of Muskhelishvili's claim, Tumanov [7] (p. 486) constructed a concrete example showing that S with parameters fails to maintain the same Hölder regularity with respect to the parameters. In order to study the optimal parameter dependence of S in (1) on λ , we introduce the following Log-Hölder spaces, which are considered as refined Hölder spaces and would naturally capture the boundedness of the Cauchy singular integral operator.

Definition 1.1. Let Ω be a domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{0\}$, $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ and $\nu \in \mathbb{R}$. A function $f \in C^k(\Omega)$ is said to be in $C^{k,L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)$ if

$$\|f\|_{C^{k,L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)} := \sum_{|\gamma|=0}^k \sup_{w \in \Omega} |D^\gamma f(w)| + \sum_{|\gamma|=k} \sup_{w, w+h \in \Omega, 0 < |h| \leq \frac{1}{2}} \frac{|D^\gamma f(w+h) - D^\gamma f(w)|}{|h|^\alpha |\ln |h||^\nu} < \infty.$$

Note that when $\alpha = 1$ and $\nu < 0$, $C^{k,L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)$ consists of constant functions only and thus becomes trivial. Without loss of generality, we always assume $\nu \geq 0$ if $\alpha = 1$ in the rest of the paper. It can be verified that $C^{k,L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)$ is a Banach space. Moreover, for any $\mu, \nu \in \mathbb{R}^+, k \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{0\}, 0 < \epsilon < \alpha < 1$, $C^{k,\alpha+\epsilon}(\Omega) \xrightarrow{i} C^{k,L^\alpha \text{Log}^{-\nu-\mu} L}(\Omega) \xrightarrow{i} C^{k,L^\alpha \text{Log}^{-\nu} L}(\Omega) \xrightarrow{i} C^{k,\alpha}(\Omega) \xrightarrow{i} C^{k,L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega) \xrightarrow{i} C^{k,L^\alpha \text{Log}^{\nu+\mu} L}(\Omega) \xrightarrow{i} C^{k,\alpha-\epsilon}(\Omega)$, where the inclusion map i at each level is a continuous embedding. The Log-Hölder space $C^{k,L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)$ reduces to the well-understood Log-Lipschitz space $C^{k,L^1 \text{Log} L}(\Omega)$ when $k = 0$ and $\nu = \alpha = 1$, and to Hölder space $C^{k,\alpha}(\Omega)$ when $\nu = 0$. Our main theorem stated below shows that S is a bounded operator from $C^{k,L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)$ into $C^{k,L^\alpha \text{Log}^{\nu+1} L}(\Omega)$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{0\}, 0 < \alpha \leq 1, \nu \in \mathbb{R}$.

Theorem 1.2. Let D be a bounded domain in $\mathbb{C}$ with $C^{k,\alpha}$ boundary, $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{0\}, 0 < \alpha \leq 1$, Λ be an open set in $\mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{C}$, and $\Omega := D \times \Lambda$. Then S defined in (1) sends $C^{k,L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)$ into $C^{k,L^\alpha \text{Log}^{\nu+1} L}(\Omega)$, $\nu \in \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, for any $f \in C^{k,L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)$,

$$\|Sf\|_{C^{k,L^\alpha \text{Log}^{\nu+1} L}(\Omega)} \leq C \|f\|_{C^{k,L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)},$$

where C is some constant dependent only on Ω, k, α and ν .

In view of Tumanov's example, Theorem 1.2 is optimal in the sense that the target space $C^{k,L^\alpha \text{Log}^{\nu+1} L}(\Omega)$ can not be replaced by $C^{k,L^\alpha \text{Log}^{\nu+\mu} L}(\Omega)$ for any $\mu < 1$. As an application of the theorem, we study solutions in Log-Hölder spaces to the $\bar{\partial}$ problem on product domains, improving the regularity result of [8].

Theorem 1.3. *Let $D_j \subset \mathbb{C}, j = 1, \dots, n$, be bounded domains with $C^{k+1, \alpha}$ boundary, $n \geq 2, k \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{0\}, 0 < \alpha \leq 1$, and $\Omega := D_1 \times \dots \times D_n$. Assume $\mathbf{f} = \sum_{j=1}^n f_j d\bar{z}_j \in C^{k, L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega), \nu \in \mathbb{R}$, is a $\bar{\partial}$ -closed $(0, 1)$ form on Ω (in the sense of distributions if $k = 0$). There exists a solution operator T to $\bar{\partial}u = \mathbf{f}$ such that $T\mathbf{f} \in C^{k, L^\alpha \text{Log}^{\nu+n-1} L}(\Omega), \bar{\partial}T\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{f}$ (in the sense of distributions if $k = 0$) and $\|T\mathbf{f}\|_{C^{k, L^\alpha \text{Log}^{\nu+n-1} L}(\Omega)} \leq C\|\mathbf{f}\|_{C^{k, L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)}$, where C depends only on Ω, k, α and ν .*

We would like to point out, unlike smooth domains, there is no gain of regularity phenomenon for the $\bar{\partial}$ problem on product domains, as indicated by an example of Stein and Kerzman [3] in L^∞ space (See also [8] for examples in Hölder spaces). One can similarly construct examples to show that the $\bar{\partial}$ problem on product domains does not gain regularity in Log-Hölder spaces. Yet it is not clear whether there exists a solution operator that can achieve the same regularity as that of the data space.

Example 1.4. Let $\Delta^2 = \{(z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : |z_1| < 1, |z_2| < 1\}$ be the bidisc. For each $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{0\}, 0 < \alpha < 1$ and $\nu \in \mathbb{R}$, consider $\bar{\partial}u = \mathbf{f} := \bar{\partial}((z_1 - 1)^{k+\alpha} \bar{z}_2 \log^\nu(z_1 - 1))$ on Δ^2 , $\frac{1}{2}\pi < \arg(z_1 - 1) < \frac{3}{2}\pi$. Then $\mathbf{f} = (z_1 - 1)^{k+\alpha} \log^\nu(z_1 - 1) d\bar{z}_2 \in C^{k, L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Delta^2)$ is a $\bar{\partial}$ -closed $(0, 1)$ form. However, there does not exist a solution $u \in C^{k, L^\beta \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Delta^2)$ to $\bar{\partial}u = \mathbf{f}$ for any β with $\beta > \alpha$.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, preliminaries about the function spaces and (semi-)norms are defined, as well as the classical theory about the Cauchy type integrals. The example of Tumanov is discussed in Section 3 to show that S does not send $C^\alpha(\Delta^2)$ into itself, $0 < \alpha < 1$. Section 4 is devoted to the boundedness of the Cauchy singular integral operator between Log-Hölder spaces on the complex plane. In Section 5 and Section 6, Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3 are proved respectively, along with the verification of Example 1.4.

2 Preliminaries and Notations

Throughout the rest of the paper, k, μ, ν and α are always referred to (part of) the indices of the Log-Hölder spaces. γ may represent either a positive integer or an n -tuple, determined by the context. C represents a constant that is dependent only on Ω, k, ν and α , which may be of different values in different places.

For convenience of notations, given $f \in C^{k, L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)$, denote by

$$\|f\|_{C^k(\Omega)} := \sum_{|\gamma|=0}^k \sup_{w \in \Omega} |D^\gamma f(w)|$$

and the semi-norm

$$H^\nu[f] := \sup_{w, w+h \in \Omega, 0 < |h| \leq \frac{1}{2}} \frac{|f(w+h) - f(w)|}{|h|^\alpha |\ln |h||^\nu}.$$

Here α is suppressed from the above notation due to a fixed value of α throughout the paper. When $\nu = 0$, we also suppress ν and write $H[\cdot]$ for $H^0[\cdot]$. Consequently, $\|f\|_{C^{k,L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)} = \|f\|_{C^k(\Omega)} + \sum_{|\gamma|=k} H^\nu[D^\gamma f]$.

It is worth noting that the upper bound $\frac{1}{2}$ of $|h|$ under the supreme for $H^\nu[f]$ is not essential. It can be replaced by any positive number less than 1 without changing the function space $C^{k,L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)$, and the resulting norm is equivalent by some constant dependent only on D , α , ν and the positive number itself.

In particular when $\Omega = D \times \Lambda$, the Hölder semi-norms along z and λ variables for each fixed $\lambda \in \Lambda$ and fixed $z \in D$ respectively can be defined as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} H_D^\nu[f(\cdot, \lambda)] &:= \sup_{\zeta, \zeta+h \in D, 0 < |h| \leq \frac{1}{2}} \frac{|f(\zeta+h, \lambda) - f(\zeta, \lambda)|}{|h|^\alpha |\ln |h||^\nu}, \\ H_\Lambda^\nu[f(z, \cdot)] &:= \sup_{\zeta, \zeta+h \in \Lambda, 0 < |h| \leq \frac{1}{2}} \frac{|f(z, \zeta+h) - f(z, \zeta)|}{|h|^\alpha |\ln |h||^\nu}. \end{aligned}$$

The above two expressions are clearly bounded by $H^\nu[f]$ by definition. On the other hand, the following elementary property for Log-Hölder semi-norms can be observed.

Lemma 2.1. *There exists a constant C dependent only on Ω, α and ν , such that for any function $f \in C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)$,*

$$\|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)} \leq C(\|f\|_{C(\Omega)} + \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} H_D^\nu[f(\cdot, \lambda)] + \sup_{z \in D} H_\Lambda^\nu[f(z, \cdot)]).$$

Proof. We only need to show $H^\nu[f] \leq C(\|f\|_{C(\Omega)} + \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} H_D^\nu[f(\cdot, \lambda)] + \sup_{z \in D} H_\Lambda^\nu[f(z, \cdot)])$. Indeed, for any $w = (z, \lambda) \in D \times \Lambda$, $w+h = (z+h_1, \lambda+h_2) \in D \times \Lambda$ with $|h| \leq r_0 := \min\{e^{-\frac{\nu}{\alpha}}, \frac{1}{2}\}$, then $(z+h_1, \lambda) \in D \times \Lambda$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} |f(w+h) - f(w)| &\leq |f(z+h_1, \lambda+h_2) - f(z+h_1, \lambda)| + |f(z+h_1, \lambda) - f(z, \lambda)| \\ &\leq |h_2|^\alpha |\ln |h_2||^\nu \sup_{z \in D} H_\Lambda^\nu[f(z, \cdot)] + |h_1|^\alpha |\ln |h_1||^\nu \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} H_D^\nu[f(\cdot, \lambda)] \\ &\leq |h|^\alpha |\ln |h||^\nu (\sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} H_D^\nu[f(\cdot, \lambda)] + \sup_{z \in D} H_\Lambda^\nu[f(z, \cdot)]). \end{aligned}$$

Here the last inequality is due to the non-decreasing property of the real-valued function $s^\alpha |\ln s|^\nu$ on the interval $(0, r_0)$. ■

Let D be a bounded domain in $\mathbb{C}$ with $C^{k+1,\alpha}$ boundary, $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{0\}$, $0 < \alpha \leq 1$. Given a complex valued function $f \in C(\bar{D})$, the following two operators related to the Cauchy kernel are well defined for $z \in D$.

$$\begin{aligned} Tf(z) &:= \frac{-1}{2\pi i} \int_D \frac{f(\zeta)}{\zeta - z} d\bar{\zeta} \wedge d\zeta; \\ Sf(z) &:= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial D} \frac{f(\zeta)}{\zeta - z} d\zeta. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Here the positive orientation of ∂D is such that the domain D is always to its left while traversing along the contour(s). We state some classical results concerning the Cauchy type integrals T and S on the complex plane. The reader may check for instance [9] for reference.

Theorem 2.2. *Let D be a bounded domain with $C^{k+1,\alpha}$ boundary.*

1) *If $f \in L^p(D)$, $p > 2$, then $Tf \in C^\alpha(D)$, $\alpha = \frac{p-2}{p}$. Moreover,*

$$\|Tf\|_{C^\alpha(D)} \leq C\|f\|_{L^p},$$

for some constant C dependent only on D and p .

2) *If $f \in C^{k,\alpha}(D)$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{0\}$, $0 < \alpha < 1$. Then $Tf \in C^{k+1,\alpha}(D)$ and $Sf \in C^{k,\alpha}(D)$. Moreover,*

$$\begin{aligned} \|Tf\|_{C^{k+1,\alpha}(D)} &\leq C\|f\|_{C^{k,\alpha}(D)}; \\ \|Sf\|_{C^{k,\alpha}(D)} &\leq C\|f\|_{C^{k,\alpha}(D)} \end{aligned}$$

for some constant C dependent only on D , k and α .

3 S does not sent $C^\alpha(\Delta^2)$ into itself

In this section, we verify in detail Tumanov's example in [7] (See also [5]) that S defined in (1) does not send $C^\alpha(\Delta^2)$ into itself, $0 < \alpha < 1$. Define for $\lambda \in \Delta$,

$$\tilde{f}(e^{i\theta}, \lambda) = \begin{cases} |\lambda|^\alpha, & -\pi \leq \theta \leq -|\lambda|^{\frac{1}{2}}; \\ \theta^{2\alpha}, & -|\lambda|^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \theta \leq 0; \\ \theta^\alpha, & 0 \leq \theta \leq |\lambda|; \\ |\lambda|^\alpha, & |\lambda| \leq \theta \leq \pi. \end{cases}$$

Then $\tilde{f} \in C^\alpha(\partial\Delta \times \Delta)$. Extend $\tilde{f}$ onto Δ^2 , denoted as f , such that $f \in C^\alpha(\Delta^2)$ and $\|f\|_{C^\alpha(\Delta^2)} = \|\tilde{f}\|_{C^\alpha(\partial\Delta \times \Delta)}$. (For instance, for each $w \in \Delta^2$, let $f(w) := \inf_{\eta \in \partial\Delta \times \Delta} \{\tilde{f}(\eta) + M|w - \eta|^\alpha\}$, where $M = \|\tilde{f}\|_{C^\alpha(\partial\Delta \times \Delta)}$.)

We first show that $Sf(1, \cdot) \notin C^\alpha(\Delta)$. Indeed, a direct computation gives for $\lambda \in \Delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} 2\pi i Sf(1, \lambda) &= \int_{\partial\Delta} \frac{\tilde{f}(\zeta, \lambda)}{\zeta - 1} d\zeta \\ &= i \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{\tilde{f}(e^{i\theta}, \lambda) e^{i\theta}}{e^{i\theta} - 1} d\theta \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{\tilde{f}(e^{i\theta}, \lambda) e^{\frac{i\theta}{2}}}{\sin \frac{\theta}{2}} d\theta \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \tilde{f}(e^{i\theta}, \lambda) \cot \frac{\theta}{2} d\theta + \frac{i}{2} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \tilde{f}(e^{i\theta}, \lambda) d\theta =: I + II. \end{aligned}$$

Here the third equality uses the identity that $e^{i\theta} - 1 = \cos \theta - 1 + i \sin \theta = 2i \sin \frac{\theta}{2} e^{\frac{i\theta}{2}}$. Since $\tilde{f} \in C^\alpha(\partial\Delta \times \Delta)$, we have $II \in C^\alpha(\Delta)$.

On the other hand, write

$$I = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \tilde{f}(e^{i\theta}, \lambda) \left(\cot \frac{\theta}{2} - \frac{2}{\theta} \right) d\theta + \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{\tilde{f}(e^{i\theta}, \lambda)}{\theta} d\theta.$$

Notice that $\cot \frac{\theta}{2} - \frac{2}{\theta}$ extends as a continuous function on $[-\pi, \pi]$. Hence $\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \tilde{f}(e^{i\theta}, \lambda) \left(\cot \frac{\theta}{2} - \frac{2}{\theta} \right) d\theta \in C^\alpha(\Delta)$ as a function of $\lambda \in \Delta$. For the second term in I , from construction of $\tilde{f}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{\tilde{f}(e^{i\theta}, \lambda)}{\theta} d\theta &= \int_{-|\lambda|^{\frac{1}{2}}}^0 \frac{\theta^{2\alpha}}{\theta} d\theta + \int_0^{|\lambda|} \frac{\theta^\alpha}{\theta} d\theta + \int_{|\lambda|}^{|\lambda|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{|\lambda|^\alpha}{\theta} d\theta \\ &= \frac{|\lambda|^\alpha}{2\alpha} + \frac{1}{2} |\lambda|^\alpha \ln |\lambda|. \end{aligned}$$

We thus obtain $I \notin C^\alpha(\Delta)$ and hence $Sf(1, \cdot) \notin C^\alpha(\Delta)$.

Suppose by contradiction that $Sf \in C^\alpha(\Delta^2)$. Then the non-tangential limit of Sf on $\partial\Delta \times \Delta$, denoted by Φf , is in C^α as well. In particular, $\Phi f(1, \cdot) \in C^\alpha(\Delta)$. On the other hand, by Sokhotski-Plemelj formula, $\Phi f(1, \cdot) = Sf(1, \cdot) + \frac{1}{2}f(1, \cdot)$. This contradicts with the fact that $Sf(1, \cdot) \notin C^\alpha(\Delta)$.

Remark 3.1. For f constructed above, $Sf \notin C^{L^\alpha \log^\mu L}(\Delta^2)$ for any $\mu < 1$.

4 Cauchy singular integral in Log-Hölder spaces in $\mathbb{C}$

Let D be a bounded domain in $\mathbb{C}$ with $C^{1,\alpha}$ boundary, $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{0\}$, $0 < \alpha \leq 1$. In this section, we shall prove that S defined in (2) is a bounded linear operator from $C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)$ into itself if $0 < \alpha < 1$, and into $C^{L^1 \text{Log}^{\nu+1} L}(D)$ if $\alpha = 1$ (and $\nu \geq 0$). Since $C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)$ is a subspace of $C^\epsilon(D)$ for $0 < \epsilon < \alpha$, Sf is well defined for $f \in C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)$ by the classical theory of S in Hölder spaces.

Write $\partial D = \cup_{j=1}^N \Gamma_j$, where each Jordan curve Γ_j is connected and positively oriented with respect to D , and of total arclength s_j . Since ∂D is Lipschitz in particular, ∂D satisfies the so-called *chord-arc* condition. In other words, for any $t, t' \in \Gamma_j$, $j = 1, \dots, N$, let $|t, t'|$ be the smaller length of the two arcs of Γ_j with t and t' as the two end points. There exists a constant $c_0 \geq 1$ dependent only on ∂D such that

$$|t - t'| \leq |t, t'| \leq c_0 |t - t'|. \quad (3)$$

The following calculus lemma is elementary but will be frequently used in this section.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ and $\nu \in \mathbb{R}$. There exists a constant C dependent only on α and ν , such that for all $0 < h \leq h_0 := \min\{e^{-\frac{2\nu}{\alpha}}, e^{\frac{2\nu}{1-\alpha}}, \frac{1}{2}\}$,*

- 1) $\int_0^h s^{\alpha-1} |\ln s|^\nu ds \leq Ch^\alpha |\ln h|^\nu$ when $0 < \alpha \leq 1$.
- 2) $\int_h^{h_0} s^{\alpha-2} |\ln s|^\nu ds \leq \begin{cases} Ch^{\alpha-1} |\ln h|^\nu, & 0 < \alpha < 1; \\ C |\ln h|^{\nu+1}, & \alpha = 1. \end{cases}$

Proof. 1) Using integration by part directly,

$$\int_0^h s^{\alpha-1} |\ln s|^\nu ds = \frac{1}{\alpha} \int_0^h |\ln s|^\nu ds^\alpha = \frac{1}{\alpha} h^\alpha |\ln h|^\nu + \frac{\nu}{\alpha} \int_0^h s^{\alpha-1} |\ln s|^{\nu-1} ds.$$

If $\nu \leq 0$, the lemma follows directly from the above identity by dropping off the last negative term. If $\nu > 0$, since $s \leq h_0 \leq e^{-\frac{2\nu}{\alpha}}$, $1 - \frac{\nu}{\alpha |\ln s|} \geq \frac{1}{2}$, which implies $\int_0^h s^{\alpha-1} |\ln s|^\nu ds - \frac{\nu}{\alpha} \int_0^h s^{\alpha-1} |\ln s|^{\nu-1} ds = \int_0^h s^{\alpha-1} |\ln s|^\nu (1 - \frac{\nu}{\alpha |\ln s|}) ds \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_0^h s^{\alpha-1} |\ln s|^\nu ds$. Hence

$$\int_0^h s^{\alpha-1} |\ln s|^\nu ds \leq \frac{2}{\alpha} h^\alpha |\ln h|^\nu.$$

2) When $0 < \alpha < 1$,

$$\int_h^{h_0} s^{\alpha-2} |\ln s|^\nu ds = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} (h^{\alpha-1} |\ln h|^\nu - h_0^{\alpha-1} |\ln h_0|^\nu) - \frac{\nu}{1-\alpha} \int_h^{h_0} s^{\alpha-2} |\ln s|^{\nu-1} ds.$$

So we have

$$\int_h^{h_0} s^{\alpha-2} |\ln s|^\nu ds \leq \frac{1}{1-\alpha} h^{\alpha-1} |\ln h|^\nu - \frac{\nu}{1-\alpha} \int_h^{h_0} s^{\alpha-2} |\ln s|^{\nu-1} ds.$$

If $\nu \geq 0$, the lemma is proved as in 1). If $\nu < 0$, notice $1 + \frac{\nu}{(1-\alpha)|\ln s|} \geq \frac{1}{2}$ when $s \leq h_0 \leq e^{\frac{2\nu}{1-\alpha}}$, we have $\int_h^{h_0} s^{\alpha-2} |\ln s|^\nu ds + \frac{\nu}{1-\alpha} \int_h^{h_0} s^{\alpha-2} |\ln s|^{\nu-1} ds = \int_h^{h_0} s^{\alpha-2} |\ln s|^\nu (1 + \frac{\nu}{(1-\alpha)|\ln s|}) ds \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_h^{h_0} s^{\alpha-2} |\ln s|^\nu ds$. Hence $\int_h^{h_0} s^{\alpha-2} |\ln s|^\nu ds \leq \frac{2}{1-\alpha} h^{\alpha-1} |\ln h|^\nu$.

When $\alpha = 1$ and $\nu \geq 0$,

$$\int_h^{h_0} \frac{|\ln s|^\nu}{s} ds = \frac{1}{\nu+1} (|\ln h|^{\nu+1} - |\ln h_0|^{\nu+1}) \leq \frac{1}{\nu+1} |\ln h|^{\nu+1}.$$

Both desired inequalities are proved. ■

We first consider points on ∂D . When $t \in \partial D$, by Sokhotski-Plemelj Formula (see [6] for instance), the nontangential limit of Sf at $t \in \partial D$ is

$$\Phi f(t) := Sf(t) + \frac{1}{2}f(t) := \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial D} \frac{f(\zeta)}{\zeta - t} d\zeta + \frac{1}{2}f(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial D} \frac{f(\zeta) - f(t)}{\zeta - t} d\zeta + f(t).$$

Here $Sf(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial D} \frac{f(\zeta)}{\zeta - t} d\zeta$ is interpreted as the Principal Value when $t \in \partial D$ and is well defined if f is in Hölder spaces. In particular, $\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial D} \frac{1}{\zeta - t} d\zeta = \frac{1}{2}$ when $t \in \partial D$. Let h_0 and c_0 be defined as in Lemma 4.1 and (3) respectively, $s_0 := \min_{1 \leq j \leq N} \{s_j\} > 0$ and $\delta_0 := \inf_{1 \leq j \neq m \leq N} \{|t - t'| : t \in \Gamma_j, t' \in \Gamma_m\} > 0$.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $0 < \alpha \leq 1$. If $f \in C^{L^\alpha \log^\nu L}(D)$, then for $t, t+h \in \partial D$ with $|h| \leq \min\{\frac{h_0}{3c_0}, \frac{s_0}{6c_0}, \frac{\delta_0}{2}\}$,*

$$|\Phi f(t+h) - \Phi f(t)| \leq \begin{cases} C\|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \log^\nu L}(D)} |h|^\alpha |\ln |h||^\nu, & 0 < \alpha < 1; \\ C\|f\|_{C^{L^1 \log^\nu L}(D)} |\ln |h||^{\nu+1}, & \alpha = 1 \end{cases}$$

for a constant C dependent only on D, α and ν .

Proof. Assume $t \in \Gamma_1$ without loss of generality. Since $|t+h-t| = |h| \leq \frac{\delta_0}{2}$, $t+h \in \Gamma_1$ as well. By Sokhotski-Plemelj Formula,

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi f(t+h) - \Phi f(t) &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial D} \frac{f(\zeta) - f(t+h)}{\zeta - t-h} d\zeta - \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial D} \frac{f(\zeta) - f(t)}{\zeta - t} d\zeta + (f(t+h) - f(t)) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \left(\int_{\cup_{j=1}^N \Gamma_j} \frac{f(\zeta) - f(t+h)}{\zeta - t-h} d\zeta - \int_{\cup_{j=1}^N \Gamma_j} \frac{f(\zeta) - f(t)}{\zeta - t} d\zeta \right) + (f(t+h) - f(t)). \end{aligned}$$

Because $\cup_{j=2}^N \Gamma_j$ does not intersect with Γ_1 and $t, t+h \in \Gamma_1$, we have $|\zeta - t| \geq C$ and $|\zeta - t - h| \geq C$ on $\cup_{j=2}^N \Gamma_j$ for some positive C dependent only on ∂D . It immediately follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \int_{\cup_{j=2}^N \Gamma_j} \frac{f(\zeta) - f(t+h)}{\zeta - t - h} d\zeta - \int_{\cup_{j=2}^N \Gamma_j} \frac{f(\zeta) - f(t)}{\zeta - t} d\zeta \right| \\
&= \left| \int_{\cup_{j=2}^N \Gamma_j} \frac{(f(\zeta) - f(t))h + (f(t) - f(t+h))(\zeta - t)}{(\zeta - t - h)(\zeta - t)} d\zeta \right| \\
&\leq \int_{\cup_{j=2}^N \Gamma_j} C \|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)} |h|^\alpha |\ln |h||^\nu |d\zeta| \\
&\leq C \|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)} |h|^\alpha |\ln |h||^\nu.
\end{aligned}$$

It thus suffices to show, in view of the chord-arc condition, for $t, t+h \in \Gamma_1$ with $\tilde{h} := |t+h, t| \leq \min\{\frac{h_0}{3}, \frac{s_0}{6}\}$,

$$\left| \int_{\Gamma_1} \frac{f(\zeta) - f(t+h)}{\zeta - t - h} d\zeta - \int_{\Gamma_1} \frac{f(\zeta) - f(t)}{\zeta - t} d\zeta \right| \leq \begin{cases} C \|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)} \tilde{h}^\alpha |\ln \tilde{h}|^\nu, & 0 < \alpha < 1; \\ C \|f\|_{C^{L^1 \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)} \tilde{h} |\ln \tilde{h}|^{\nu+1}, & \alpha = 1. \end{cases}$$

Due to the $C^{1,\alpha}$ boundary of Γ_1 , $|d\zeta| \approx |ds|$. Denote by s the arclength parameter of Γ_1 with $\zeta|_{s=0} = t$, and by l the arc on Γ_1 centered at t of total arclength $4\tilde{h}$. Recall that s_1 is the total arclength of Γ_1 . The chord-arc condition implies $|\zeta - t| \approx |\zeta, t| = \min\{s, s_1 - s\}$ on Γ_1 .

On l , notice that

$$|\zeta - t - h| \geq C |\zeta, t+h| \geq C ||\zeta, t| - |t+h, t|| = \begin{cases} C |s - \tilde{h}|, & s \leq \frac{s_1}{2}; \\ C |s_1 - s - \tilde{h}|, & s \geq \frac{s_1}{2}. \end{cases}$$

Together with the fact that $|f(\zeta) - f(t+h)| \leq \|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)} |\zeta - t - h|^\alpha |\ln |\zeta - t - h||^\nu$ and

$|f(\zeta) - f(t)| \leq \|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)} |\zeta - t|^\alpha |\ln |\zeta - t||^\nu$ on l , one obtains from Lemma 4.1,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \int_l \frac{f(\zeta) - f(t+h)}{\zeta - t - h} d\zeta - \int_l \frac{f(\zeta) - f(t)}{\zeta - t} d\zeta \right| \\
& \leq C \|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)} \left(\int_l |\zeta - t - h|^{\alpha-1} |\ln |\zeta - t - h||^\nu |d\zeta| + \int_l |\zeta - t|^{\alpha-1} |\ln |\zeta - t||^\nu |d\zeta| \right) \\
& \leq C \|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)} \left(\int_0^{2\tilde{h}} |s - \tilde{h}|^{\alpha-1} |\ln |s - \tilde{h}||^\nu ds + \int_0^{2\tilde{h}} |s|^{\alpha-1} |\ln |s||^\nu ds \right) \\
& \leq C \|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)} \left(\int_0^{3\tilde{h}} s^{\alpha-1} |\ln |s||^\nu ds + \int_0^{2\tilde{h}} |s|^{\alpha-1} |\ln |s||^\nu ds \right) \\
& \leq C \|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)} \tilde{h}^\alpha |\ln \tilde{h}|^\nu.
\end{aligned}$$

Next we estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \int_{\Gamma_1 \setminus l} \frac{f(\zeta) - f(t+h)}{\zeta - t - h} d\zeta - \int_{\Gamma_1 \setminus l} \frac{f(\zeta) - f(t)}{\zeta - t} d\zeta \right| \\
& \leq \left| \int_{\Gamma_1 \setminus l} (f(\zeta) - f(t+h)) \left(\frac{1}{\zeta - t - h} - \frac{1}{\zeta - t} \right) d\zeta \right| + \left| \int_{\Gamma_1 \setminus l} \frac{f(t+h) - f(t)}{\zeta - t} d\zeta \right| =: I + II.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $II = |f(t+h) - f(t)| \left| \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_1 \setminus l} \frac{1}{\zeta - t} d\zeta \right| \leq C |f(t+h) - f(t)|$, II is bounded by $C \|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)} \tilde{h}^\alpha |\ln \tilde{h}|^\nu$. Now we treat $I = \left| \frac{h}{2\pi} \int_{\Gamma_1 \setminus l} \frac{f(\zeta) - f(t+h)}{(\zeta - t - h)(\zeta - t)} d\zeta \right|$. Due to the chord-arc condition, $|\zeta, t+h| \geq |\zeta, t| - |t, t+h| = \min\{s - \tilde{h}, s_1 - s - \tilde{h}\} \geq \tilde{h}$ on $\Gamma_1 \setminus l$. Hence

$$|\zeta - t| \leq |\zeta, t| \leq |\zeta, t+h| + |t+h, t| = |\zeta, t+h| + \tilde{h} \leq 2|\zeta, t+h| \leq C|\zeta - t - h|,$$

or equivalently,

$$|\zeta - t - h| > C|\zeta - t| \approx \min\{s, s_1 - s\}$$

on $\Gamma_1 \setminus l$. Let l' be the arc on Γ_1 centered at t with total arclength $\min\{2h_0, s_1\}$ so $l \subset l' \subset \Gamma_1$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
I & \leq C \|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)} \tilde{h} \int_{l' \setminus l} \frac{|\zeta - t - h|^{\alpha-1} |\ln |\zeta - t - h||^\nu}{|\zeta - t|} |d\zeta| + \\
& \quad + C \|f\|_{C(D)} \tilde{h} \int_{\Gamma_1 \setminus l'} \frac{1}{|\zeta - t - h| |\zeta - t|} |d\zeta| \\
& \leq C \|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)} \tilde{h} \int_{2\tilde{h}}^{\min\{h_0, \frac{s_1}{2}\}} s^{\alpha-2} |\ln |s||^\nu ds + C \|f\|_{C(D)} \tilde{h} \int_{\min\{h_0, \frac{s_1}{2}\}}^{\frac{s_1}{2}} \frac{1}{s^2} ds \\
& \leq C \|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)} \tilde{h} \left(\int_{2\tilde{h}}^{h_0} s^{\alpha-2} |\ln |s||^\nu ds + 1 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

It follows immediately from Lemma 4.1,

$$I \leq \begin{cases} C\|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)} \tilde{h}^\alpha |\ln \tilde{h}|^\nu, & 0 < \alpha < 1; \\ C\|f\|_{C^{L^1 \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)} \tilde{h} |\ln \tilde{h}|^{\nu+1}, & \alpha = 1. \end{cases}$$

■

For Hölder semi-norm of S at interior points of the domain, classical singular integral operators theory utilizes a generalized version of the Maximum Modulus Theorem of holomorphic functions to a branch of $\frac{Sf(z)-Sf(z')}{(z-z')^\alpha}$ to achieve the boundedness. We adopt here a different approach introduced in [4].

Given $t \in \partial D$, define $\mathcal{N}(t)$, a nontangential approach region (cf. [2] [4]) as follows.

$$\mathcal{N}(t) = \{z \in D : |z - t| \leq \min\{4\text{dist}(z, \partial D), \frac{\delta_0}{4}\}\}.$$

If $z \in \mathcal{N}(t)$, then $|\zeta - z| \geq \text{dist}(z, \partial D) \geq \frac{1}{4}|z - t|$ for all $\zeta \in \partial D$. Hence $|\zeta - z| \geq \frac{1}{4}(|\zeta - t| - |\zeta - z|)$, implying $|\zeta - z| \geq \frac{1}{5}|\zeta - t|$ on ∂D . Altogether, for $z \in \mathcal{N}(t)$ and $\zeta \in \partial D$,

$$|\zeta - z| \geq \max\{\frac{1}{4}|z - t|, \frac{1}{5}|\zeta - t|\}. \quad (4)$$

Lemma 4.3. *Let $0 < \alpha \leq 1$. If $f \in C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)$ and $t \in \partial D$, then for $z \in \mathcal{N}(t)$ with $|z - t| \leq \min\{h_0, \frac{s_0}{2}\}$,*

$$|Sf(z) - \Phi f(t)| \leq \begin{cases} C\|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)} |z - t|^\alpha |\ln |z - t||^\nu, & 0 < \alpha < 1; \\ C\|f\|_{C^{L^1 \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)} |z - t| |\ln |z - t||^{\nu+1}, & \alpha = 1 \end{cases}$$

for a constant C dependent only on D, α and ν .

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume $t \in \Gamma_1$. By Cauchy's integral formula, $\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial D} \frac{1}{\zeta - z} d\zeta = 1$ when $z \in D$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} Sf(z) - \Phi f(t) &= \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial D} \frac{f(\zeta) - f(t)}{\zeta - z} d\zeta + f(t) \right) - \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial D} \frac{f(\zeta) - f(t)}{\zeta - t} d\zeta + f(t) \right) \\ &= \frac{z - t}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial D} \frac{f(\zeta) - f(t)}{(\zeta - z)(\zeta - t)} d\zeta \\ &= \frac{z - t}{2\pi i} \int_I \frac{f(\zeta) - f(t)}{(\zeta - z)(\zeta - t)} d\zeta + \frac{z - t}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_1 \setminus I} \frac{f(\zeta) - f(t)}{(\zeta - z)(\zeta - t)} d\zeta + \\ &\quad + \frac{z - t}{2\pi i} \int_{\cup_{j=2}^N \Gamma_j} \frac{f(\zeta) - f(t)}{(\zeta - z)(\zeta - t)} d\zeta \\ &=: I + II + III \end{aligned}$$

Here l is the arc on Γ_1 centered at t of total arclength $2|z - t| =: 2|h|$. For III , when $\zeta \in \cup_{j=2}^N \Gamma_j$, $|\zeta - t| \geq \delta_0$, and $|\zeta - z| \geq |\zeta - t| - |t - z| \geq \delta_0 - \frac{\delta_0}{4} = \frac{3\delta_0}{4}$. We thus deduce

$$|III| \leq C|h|\|f\|_{C(D)} \leq C\|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)}|h|^\alpha |\ln |h||^\nu.$$

Next we estimate I and II . It follows from (4) and Lemma 4.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} |I| &\leq C|h|\|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)} \int_l \frac{|\zeta - t|^{\alpha-1} |\ln |\zeta - t||^\nu}{|\zeta - z|} |d\zeta| \\ &\leq C|h|\|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)} \int_l \frac{|\zeta - t|^{\alpha-1} |\ln |\zeta - t||^\nu}{|z - t|} |d\zeta| \\ &\leq C\|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)} \int_0^{|h|} s^{\alpha-1} |\ln s|^\nu ds \\ &\leq C\|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)} |h|^\alpha |\ln |h||^\nu. \end{aligned}$$

For II , let l' be the arc on Γ_1 centered at t of arclength $\min\{2h_0, s_1\}$ as in the previous lemma.

$$\begin{aligned} |II| &\leq C|h|\|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)} \int_{l' \setminus l} \frac{|\zeta - t|^\alpha |\ln |\zeta - t||^\nu}{|\zeta - t|^2} |d\zeta| + C|h|\|f\|_{C(D)} \int_{\Gamma_1 \setminus l'} \frac{1}{|\zeta - t|^2} |d\zeta| \\ &\leq C|h|\|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)} \left(\int_{|h|}^{h_0} s^{\alpha-2} |\ln s|^\nu ds + \int_{\min\{h_0, \frac{s_1}{2}\}}^{\frac{s_1}{2}} \frac{1}{s^2} ds \right) \\ &\leq \begin{cases} C\|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)} |h|^\alpha |\ln |h||^\nu, & 0 < \alpha < 1; \\ C\|f\|_{C^{L^1 \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)} |h| |\ln |h||^{\nu+1}, & \alpha = 1. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

■

Lemma 4.4. *Let $0 < \alpha \leq 1$. If $f \in C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)$ and $t \in \partial D$, then for $z, z + h \in \mathcal{N}(t)$ with $|h| \leq \min\{h_0, \frac{\delta_0}{4}, \frac{s_0}{2}\}$,*

$$|Sf(z + h) - Sf(z)| \leq \begin{cases} C\|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)} |h|^\alpha |\ln |h||^\nu, & 0 < \alpha < 1; \\ C\|f\|_{C^{L^1 \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)} |h| |\ln |h||^{\nu+1}, & \alpha = 1 \end{cases}$$

for a constant C dependent only on D, α and ν .

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume $t \in \Gamma_1$. Since $z, z + h \in D$, by Cauchy integral

formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
Sf(z+h) - Sf(z) &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial D} \frac{f(\zeta) - f(t)}{\zeta - z - h} - \frac{f(\zeta) - f(t)}{\zeta - z} d\zeta + \\
&\quad + \frac{f(t)}{2\pi i} \left(\int_{\partial D} \frac{1}{\zeta - z - h} d\zeta - \int_{\partial D} \frac{1}{\zeta - z} d\zeta \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial D} \frac{f(\zeta) - f(t)}{\zeta - z - h} - \frac{f(\zeta) - f(t)}{\zeta - z} d\zeta \\
&= \frac{h}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial D} \frac{f(\zeta) - f(t)}{(\zeta - z - h)(\zeta - z)} d\zeta \\
&= \frac{h}{2\pi i} \int_l \frac{f(\zeta) - f(t)}{(\zeta - z - h)(\zeta - z)} d\zeta + \frac{h}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_1 \setminus l} \frac{f(\zeta) - f(t)}{(\zeta - z - h)(\zeta - z)} d\zeta + \\
&\quad + \frac{h}{2\pi i} \int_{\cup_{j=2}^N \Gamma_j} \frac{f(\zeta) - f(t)}{(\zeta - z - h)(\zeta - z)} d\zeta \\
&=: I + II + III.
\end{aligned}$$

Here l is the arc on Γ_1 centered at t of total arclength $2|h|$. Note when $\zeta \in \cup_{j=2}^N \Gamma_j$, $|\zeta - z| \geq |\zeta - t| - |t - z| \geq \frac{3\delta_0}{4}$ and $|\zeta - z - h| \geq |\zeta - t| - |t - z| - |h| \geq \frac{\delta_0}{2}$. As in the proof of Lemma 4.3, we immediately obtain

$$|III| \leq C|h| \|f\|_{C(D)} \leq C \|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)} |h|^\alpha \ln |h|^\nu.$$

For the remaining two terms I and II , without loss of generality assume $|z-t| \geq |z+h-t|$. Then

$$|z-t| \geq \frac{1}{2}(|z-t| + |z+h-t|) \geq \frac{|h|}{2}.$$

Together with (4), we have

$$|\zeta - z| \geq \max\{C|z-t|, C|\zeta-t|\} \geq \max\{C|h|, C|\zeta-t|\}. \quad (5)$$

Recalling

$$|\zeta - z - h| \geq \max\{C|z+h-t|, C|\zeta-t|\} \geq C|\zeta-t|,$$

and combining it with (5) and Lemma 4.1, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}
|I| &\leq C \|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)} \int_l |\zeta - t|^{\alpha-1} |\ln |\zeta - t||^\nu |d\zeta| \\
&\leq C \|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)} \int_0^{|h|} s^{\alpha-1} |\ln s|^\nu ds \\
&\leq C \|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)} |h|^\alpha \ln |h|^\nu.
\end{aligned}$$

Denote by l' the arc on Γ_1 centered at t of total arclength $\min\{2h_0, s_1\}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
|II| &\leq C|h|\|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)} \int_{l' \setminus l} \frac{|\zeta - t|^\alpha |\ln |\zeta - t||^\nu}{|\zeta - t|^2} |d\zeta| + C|h|\|f\|_{C(D)} \int_{\Gamma_1 \setminus l'} \frac{1}{|\zeta - t|^2} |d\zeta| \\
&\leq C|h|\|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)} \left(\int_{|h|}^{h_0} s^{\alpha-2} |\ln s|^\nu ds + \int_{\min\{h_0, \frac{s_1}{2}\}}^{\frac{s_1}{2}} \frac{1}{s^2} ds \right) \\
&\leq \begin{cases} C\|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)} |h|^\alpha |\ln |h||^\nu, & 0 < \alpha < 1; \\ C\|f\|_{C^{L^1 \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)} |h| |\ln |h||^{\nu+1}, & \alpha = 1. \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

■

We now are in a position to estimate the Log-Hölder semi-norm of Sf in D .

Proposition 4.5. *Let $0 < \alpha \leq 1$. If $f \in C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)$, then for $z, z+h \in D$ with $|h| \leq \min\{\frac{h_0}{9c_0}, \frac{s_0}{18c_0}, \frac{\delta_0}{16}, \frac{e^{-\nu-1}}{3}\}$,*

$$|Sf(z+h) - Sf(z)| \leq \begin{cases} C\|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)} |h|^\alpha |\ln |h||^\nu, & 0 < \alpha < 1; \\ C\|f\|_{C^{L^1 \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)} |h| |\ln |h||^{\nu+1}, & \alpha = 1 \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

for a constant C dependent only on D, α and ν .

Proof. Let $t, t' \in \partial D$ such that $|z - t| = \text{dist}(z, \partial D)$ and $|z + h - t'| = \text{dist}(z + h, \partial D)$. Without loss of generality, assume $t \in \Gamma_1$. If both $|z - t|$ and $|z + h - t'|$ are greater than $\frac{\delta_0}{16}$, then $|\zeta - z| \geq |z - t| \geq \frac{\delta_0}{16}$ and $|\zeta - z - h| \geq |t' - z - h| \geq \frac{\delta_0}{16}$ on $\zeta \in \partial D$. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}
|Sf(z+h) - Sf(z)| &= \left| \frac{h}{2\pi} \int_{\partial D} \frac{f(\zeta) - f(t)}{(\zeta - z - h)(\zeta - z)} d\zeta \right| \\
&\leq C|h|\|f\|_{C(D)} \\
&\leq C\|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)} |h|^\alpha |\ln |h||^\nu.
\end{aligned}$$

Otherwise, suppose one of $|z - t|$ and $|z + h - t'|$ is less than $\frac{\delta_0}{16}$. Say $|z - t| \leq \frac{\delta_0}{16}$, implying $|z + h - t'| \leq |z + h - t| \leq |z - t| + |h| \leq \frac{\delta_0}{8}$. The other case is done similarly. Hence $z \in \mathcal{N}(t)$ and $z + h \in \mathcal{N}(t')$ by definition. Thus if in addition either $z + h \in \mathcal{N}(t)$ or $z \in \mathcal{N}(t')$, (6) follows directly from Lemma 4.4.

We are only left with the case when both $z + h \in D \setminus \mathcal{N}(t)$ and $z \in D \setminus \mathcal{N}(t')$. Noticing that $|z + h - t| \leq |z - t| + |h| < \frac{\delta_0}{4}$ and $|z - t'| \leq |z - (z + h)| + |z + h - t'| < \frac{\delta_0}{4}$, it implies by definition of $\mathcal{N}(t)$ and $\mathcal{N}(t')$ that $|z + h - t| \geq 4|z + h - t'|$ and $|z - t'| \geq 4|z - t|$, or equivalently,

$$|z + h - t'| \leq \frac{1}{4}|z + h - t| \quad \text{and} \quad |z - t| \leq \frac{1}{4}|z - t'|.$$

We claim that

$$|z + h - t'| \leq |h|, |z - t| \leq |h|, \text{ and } |t - t'| \leq 3|h|. \quad (7)$$

Indeed, since $|z + h - t'| \leq \frac{1}{4}|z + h - t| \leq \frac{1}{4}(|z + h - t'| + |t' - t|)$, we have

$$|z + h - t'| \leq \frac{1}{3}|t' - t|.$$

Similarly,

$$|z - t| \leq \frac{1}{3}|t' - t|.$$

On the other hand, since $|t' - t| \leq |t' - z - h| + |z + h - z| + |z - t| \leq \frac{2}{3}|t' - t| + |h|$, one infers

$$|t' - t| \leq 3|h|.$$

Hence

$$|z + h - t'| \leq |h|, \quad |z - t| \leq |h|.$$

The claim is proved.

Now we estimate

$$|Sf(z + h) - Sf(z)| \leq |Sf(z + h) - \Phi f(t')| + |Sf(z) - \Phi f(t)| + |\Phi f(t) - \Phi f(t')|$$

for $z, z + h, t$ and t' as previously. Because $z + h \in \mathcal{N}(t')$ and $|z + h - t'| \leq |h| \leq \min\{h_0, \frac{s_0}{2}, e^{-\nu-1}\}$ by (7), we deduce from Lemma 4.3,

$$\begin{aligned} |Sf(z + h) - \Phi f(t')| &\leq \begin{cases} C\|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)}|z + h - t'|^\alpha |\ln |z + h - t'||^\nu, 0 < \alpha < 1 \\ C\|f\|_{C^{L^1 \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)}|z + h - t'| |\ln |z + h - t'||^{\nu+1}, \alpha = 1 \end{cases} \\ &\leq \begin{cases} C\|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)}|h|^\alpha |\ln |h||^\nu, 0 < \alpha < 1; \\ C\|f\|_{C^{L^1 \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)}|h| |\ln |h||^{\nu+1}, \alpha = 1. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Here we have used the non-decreasing property of the real-valued functions $s^\alpha |\ln s|^\nu$ and $s |\ln s|^{\nu+1}$ when s is less than $\min\{h_0, e^{-\nu-1}\}$. Similarly,

$$|Sf(z) - \Phi f(t)| \leq \begin{cases} C\|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)}|h|^\alpha |\ln |h||^\nu, 0 < \alpha < 1; \\ C\|f\|_{C^{L^1 \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)}|h| |\ln |h||^{\nu+1}, \alpha = 1. \end{cases}$$

Lastly, since $|t' - t| \leq 3|h| \leq \min\{\frac{h_0}{3c_0}, \frac{s_0}{6c_0}, \frac{\delta_0}{2}, e^{-\nu-1}\}$, by Lemma 4.2,

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi f(t) - \Phi f(t')| &\leq \begin{cases} C\|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)}|t - t'|^\alpha |\ln |t - t'||^\nu, 0 < \alpha < 1 \\ C\|f\|_{C^{L^1 \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)}|t - t'| |\ln |t - t'||^{\nu+1}, \alpha = 1 \end{cases} \\ &\leq \begin{cases} C\|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)}|h|^\alpha |\ln |h||^\nu, 0 < \alpha < 1; \\ C\|f\|_{C^{L^1 \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)}|h| |\ln |h||^{\nu+1}, \alpha = 1. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

The proof of the proposition is complete. ■

Theorem 4.6. *Let D be a bounded domain in $\mathbb{C}$ with $C^{1,\alpha}$ boundary, $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{0\}$, $0 < \alpha \leq 1$. Then S defined in (2) sends $C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)$ into itself when $0 < \alpha < 1$, and into $C^{L^1 \text{Log}^{\nu+1} L}(D)$ if $\alpha = 1$. Moreover, there exists a constant C dependent only on D, α and ν , such that for any $f \in C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)$,*

$$\|Sf\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)} \leq C\|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)}$$

if $0 < \alpha < 1$, and

$$\|Sf\|_{C^{L^1 \text{Log}^{\nu+1} L}(D)} \leq C\|f\|_{C^{L^1 \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)}$$

if $\alpha = 1$.

Proof. Choose ϵ such that $0 < \epsilon < \alpha \leq 1$. We have $\|f\|_{C^\epsilon(D)} \leq C\|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)}$ with C dependent only on ν, α, ϵ and D . Hence

$$\|Sf\|_{C(D)} \leq \|Sf\|_{C^\epsilon(D)} \leq C\|f\|_{C^\epsilon(D)} \leq C\|f\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D)}.$$

The rest of the theorem follows directly from Proposition 4.5. ■

5 Proof of Theorem 1.2

We are now in a position to prove Theorem 1.2. Let $\Omega = D \times \Lambda \subset \mathbb{C}^2$, where $D \subset \mathbb{C}$ is a bounded domain with $C^{k+1,\alpha}$ boundary, and Λ is an open set in $\mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{C}$. Let S be defined in (1). For $0 < \epsilon < \alpha \leq 1$, there exists a constant C dependent only on ν, α, ϵ and Ω , such that for all $f \in C^{k, L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)$,

$$\|Sf\|_{C^k(\Omega)} \leq C\|Sf\|_{C^{k,\epsilon}(\Omega)} \leq C\|f\|_{C^{k,\epsilon}(\Omega)} \leq C\|f\|_{C^{k, L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)}.$$

We shall further prove for $|\gamma| = k$, $H^{\nu+1}[D^\gamma Sf] \leq C\|f\|_{C^{k, L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)}$. Noticing that Sf is holomorphic with respect to $z \in D$, we assume $D^\gamma = \partial_z^{\gamma_1} D_\lambda^{\gamma_2}$. Making use of integration by part, we obtain for any $(z, \lambda) \in \Omega$,

$$\begin{aligned} D^\gamma Sf(z, \lambda) &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \partial_z^{\gamma_1} S D_\lambda^{\gamma_2} f(z, \lambda) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \partial_z^{\gamma_1-1} \int_{\partial D} \partial_z \frac{D_\lambda^{\gamma_2} f(\zeta, \lambda)}{\zeta - z} d\zeta \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \partial_z^{\gamma_1-1} \int_{\partial D} \frac{\partial_\zeta D_\lambda^{\gamma_2} f(\zeta, \lambda)}{\zeta - z} d\zeta \\ &\quad \dots \\ &= : \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial D} \frac{\tilde{f}(\zeta, \lambda)}{\zeta - z} d\zeta = S\tilde{f}(z, \lambda) \end{aligned}$$

with $\tilde{f} := \partial_z^{\gamma_1} D_\lambda^{\gamma_2} f \in C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)$ and $\|\tilde{f}\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)} \leq \|f\|_{C^{k, L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)}$. (See [8] Proposition 3.3, or [9] p. 21-22 for more details.) Therefore, it will suffice to show $H^{\nu+1}[S\tilde{f}] \leq C\|\tilde{f}\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)}$. By (the proof of) Proposition 4.5, it is already clear that for each $\lambda \in \Lambda$, $S\tilde{f}(\zeta, \lambda)$ as a function of $\zeta \in D$ satisfies

$$H_D^{\nu+1}[S\tilde{f}(\cdot, \lambda)] \leq C\|\tilde{f}\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)}$$

for a constant C independent of $\tilde{f}$ and λ . In view of Lemma 2.1, we only need to show for each $z \in D$, $S\tilde{f}(z, \zeta)$ as a function of $\zeta \in \Lambda$ satisfies

$$H_\Lambda^{\nu+1}[S\tilde{f}(z, \cdot)] \leq C\|\tilde{f}\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)} \quad (8)$$

for a constant C independent of $\tilde{f}$ and z .

To do so we shall apply the Maximum Modulus Principle of holomorphic functions. First consider $z = t \in \partial D$. Without loss of generality, assume $t \in \Gamma_1$. By Sokhotski–Plemelj Formula, the non-tangential limit of $S\tilde{f}$ at $(t, \lambda) \in \partial D \times \Lambda$ is

$$\Phi\tilde{f}(t, \lambda) := \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial D} \frac{\tilde{f}(\zeta, \lambda)}{\zeta - t} d\zeta + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{f}(t, \lambda).$$

Here the first term is interpreted as the Principal Value. We shall prove that for $\lambda, \lambda + h \in \Lambda$ with $0 < |h| \leq \min\{h_0, \frac{s_1}{2}\}$,

$$\left| \int_{\partial D} \frac{\tilde{f}(\zeta, \lambda + h)}{\zeta - t} d\zeta - \int_{\partial D} \frac{\tilde{f}(\zeta, \lambda)}{\zeta - t} d\zeta \right| \leq C|h|^\alpha |\ln |h||^{\nu+1} \|\tilde{f}\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)} \quad (9)$$

for a constant C independent of $\tilde{f}, t, \lambda$ and h .

Indeed, write

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial D} \frac{\tilde{f}(\zeta, \lambda + h) - \tilde{f}(\zeta, \lambda)}{\zeta - t} d\zeta &= \int_{\partial D} \frac{\tilde{f}(\zeta, \lambda + h) - \tilde{f}(t, \lambda + h) - \tilde{f}(\zeta, \lambda) + \tilde{f}(t, \lambda)}{\zeta - t} d\zeta \\ &\quad + (\tilde{f}(t, \lambda + h) - \tilde{f}(t, \lambda)) \int_{\partial D} \frac{1}{\zeta - t} d\zeta \\ &=: I + II. \end{aligned}$$

Since $|\int_{\partial D} \frac{1}{\zeta - t} d\zeta|$ is bounded in terms of the Principal Value,

$$|II| \leq C|h|^\alpha |\ln |h||^{\nu+1} \|\tilde{f}\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)}$$

for a constant C independent of $\tilde{f}, t, \lambda$ and h .

For I , let l be the arc on ∂D that is centered at t with total arclength $2|h|$ and s be an arclength parameter of ∂D such that $\zeta|_{s=0} = t$. In particular, $l \subset \Gamma_1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \int_l \frac{\tilde{f}(\zeta, \lambda + h) - \tilde{f}(t, \lambda + h) - \tilde{f}(\zeta, \lambda) + \tilde{f}(t, \lambda)}{\zeta - t} d\zeta + \\ &\quad + \int_{\Gamma_1 \setminus l} \frac{(\tilde{f}(\zeta, \lambda + h) - \tilde{f}(t, \lambda + h)) - (\tilde{f}(\zeta, \lambda) - \tilde{f}(t, \lambda))}{\zeta - t} d\zeta + \\ &\quad + \int_{\cup_{j=2}^N \Gamma_j} \frac{(\tilde{f}(\zeta, \lambda + h) - \tilde{f}(\zeta, \lambda)) - (\tilde{f}(t, \lambda + h) - \tilde{f}(t, \lambda))}{\zeta - t} d\zeta \\ &=: I_1 + I_2 + I_3. \end{aligned}$$

Because $|\zeta - t| \geq \delta_0$ for $\zeta \in \cup_{j=2}^N \Gamma_j$ and $|\tilde{f}(\zeta, \lambda + h) - \tilde{f}(\zeta, \lambda) - (\tilde{f}(t, \lambda + h) - \tilde{f}(t, \lambda))| \leq |h|^\alpha |\ln |h||^\nu \|\tilde{f}\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)}$, one has

$$|I_3| \leq C|h|^\alpha |\ln |h||^\nu \|\tilde{f}\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)}$$

for a constant C independent of $\tilde{f}, t, \lambda$ and h .

Recall by the chord-arc condition, $|\zeta - t| \approx |\zeta, t| = \min\{s, s_1 - s\}$ on Γ_1 . Moreover, the numerator of I_1 is less than $C|\zeta - t|^\alpha |\ln |\zeta - t||^\nu \|\tilde{f}\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)}$. It follows from Lemma 4.1

$$|I_1| \leq C \int_0^{|h|} s^{\alpha-1} |\ln s|^\nu ds \leq C|h|^\alpha |\ln |h||^\nu \|\tilde{f}\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)}$$

for a constant C independent of $\tilde{f}, t, \lambda$ and h .

Rearrange I_2 and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |I_2| &\leq \left| \int_{\Gamma_1 \setminus l} \frac{\tilde{f}(\zeta, \lambda + h) - \tilde{f}(\zeta, \lambda)}{\zeta - t} d\zeta \right| + \left| (\tilde{f}(t, \lambda + h) - \tilde{f}(t, \lambda)) \int_{\Gamma_1 \setminus l} \frac{1}{\zeta - t} d\zeta \right| \\ &\leq C|h|^\alpha |\ln |h||^\nu \|\tilde{f}\|_{C^\alpha(\Omega)} \int_{|h|}^{\frac{s_1}{2}} \frac{1}{s} ds + C|h|^\alpha |\ln |h||^\nu \|\tilde{f}\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C|h|^\alpha |\ln |h||^{\nu+1} \|\tilde{f}\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

We have thus shown (9) holds, and hence there exists a constant C such that for each $z = t \in \partial D$, $H_\Lambda^{\nu+1}[\Phi \tilde{f}(t, \cdot)] \leq C \|\tilde{f}\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^{\nu+1} L}(\Omega)}$ with C independent of $\tilde{f}$ and t . Notice that for each fixed $\zeta \in \Lambda$, $S\tilde{f}(z, \zeta)$ is holomorphic as a function of $z \in D$ and by Plemelj–Privalov Theorem, continuous up to the boundary with boundary value $\Phi \tilde{f}(z, \zeta)$. Applying

the Maximum Modulus Theorem to the holomorphic function $\frac{S\tilde{f}(z, \lambda+h) - S\tilde{f}(z, \lambda)}{|h|^\alpha \ln |h|^{\nu+1}}$ of $z \in D$ for each fixed λ and $\lambda + h$ with $0 < |h| \leq \min\{h_0, \frac{s_0}{2}\}$, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{z \in D} \frac{|S\tilde{f}(z, \lambda+h) - S\tilde{f}(z, \lambda)|}{|h|^\alpha \ln |h|^{\nu+1}} &\leq \sup_{t \in \partial D} \frac{|\Phi\tilde{f}(t, \lambda+h) - \Phi\tilde{f}(t, \lambda)|}{|h|^\alpha \ln |h|^{\nu+1}} \\ &= \sup_{t \in \partial D} H_\Lambda^{\nu+1}[\Phi\tilde{f}(t, \cdot)] \\ &\leq C \|\tilde{f}\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)}, \end{aligned}$$

with C independent of $\tilde{f}$, z_1 , z_2 and z'_2 . (8) is thus verified and the proof of Theorem 1.2 is complete.

We conclude the section by pointing out that the proof of Tumanov's example in Section 3 indicates that for any $\mu < 1$, S does not send $C^\alpha(\Delta^2)$ into $C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\mu L}(\Delta^2)$, $0 < \alpha < 1$. Theorem 1.2 thus is sharp in view of the example.

6 Proof of Theorem 1.3

Let $D_j \subset \mathbb{C}$, $j = 1, \dots, n$, be bounded domains with $C^{k+1, \alpha}$ boundary, $n \geq 2$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{0\}$, $0 < \alpha \leq 1$, and $\Omega := D_1 \times \dots \times D_n$. Given a function $f \in C^{k, L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)$, since $C^{k, L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega) \xrightarrow{i} C^{k, \epsilon}(\Omega)$ for $0 < \epsilon < \alpha$, the following two operators are well defined for $z \in \Omega$,

$$\begin{aligned} T_j f(z) &:= -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{D_j} \frac{f(z_1, \dots, z_{j-1}, \zeta_j, z_{j+1}, \dots, z_n)}{\zeta_j - z_j} d\bar{\zeta}_j \wedge \zeta_j; \\ S_j f(z) &:= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial D_j} \frac{f(z_1, \dots, z_{j-1}, \zeta_j, z_{j+1}, \dots, z_n)}{\zeta_j - z_j} d\zeta_j. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

By Theorem 1.2, S_j is a bounded operator sending $C^{k, L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)$ into $C^{k, L^\alpha \text{Log}^{\nu+1} L}(\Omega)$. It was proved in [8] that the operator T_j is bounded between $C^{k, \alpha}(\Omega)$. In the following, we generalize this result and show T_j is bounded sending $C^{k, L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)$ into itself.

Proposition 6.1. *For each $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, T_j is a bounded operator sending $C^{k, L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)$ into $C^{k, L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{0\}$, $0 < \alpha \leq 1$, $\nu \in \mathbb{R}$. Namely, there exists a constant C dependent only on Ω, k, α and ν , such that for $f \in C^{k, L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)$,*

$$\|T_j f\|_{C^{k, L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)} \leq C \|f\|_{C^{k, L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)}.$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume $n = 2$ and $j = 1$. As in [8], $\|T_1 f\|_{C^k(\Omega)} \leq C\|f\|_{C^k(\Omega)}$ for a constant C independent of f . We only need to show

$$H^\nu[D^\gamma T_1 f] \leq C\|f\|_{C^k, L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L(\Omega)}$$

for some constant independent of f for all $|\gamma| = k$.

Write $D^\gamma = D_1^{\gamma_1} D_2^{\gamma_2}$. Then $D^\gamma T_1 f = D_1^{\gamma_1} T_1(D_2^{\gamma_2} f)$. If $\alpha < 1$, choose a positive number $0 < \epsilon < 1 - \alpha$. So $\alpha + \epsilon < 1$ and for each $z_2 \in D_2$, $\|D^\gamma T_1 f(\cdot, z_2)\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D_1)} \leq C\|D_1^{\gamma_1} T_1(D_2^{\gamma_2} f)(\cdot, z_2)\|_{C^{\alpha+\epsilon}(D_1)}$ for some constant C independent of f and z_2 . We shall show for each $z_2 \in D_2$, $\|D_1^{\gamma_1} T_1(D_2^{\gamma_2} f)(\cdot, z_2)\|_{C^{\alpha+\epsilon}(D_1)} \leq C\|f\|_{C^{|\gamma|}(\Omega)}$. Indeed, by making use of Theorem 2.2, if $\gamma_1 = 0$,

$$\|D_1^{\gamma_1} T_1(D_2^{\gamma_2} f)(\cdot, z_2)\|_{C^{\alpha+\epsilon}(D_1)} = \|T_1(D_2^{\gamma_2} f)(\cdot, z_2)\|_{C^{\alpha+\epsilon}(D_1)} \leq C\|D_2^{\gamma_2} f\|_{C(\Omega)} \leq C\|f\|_{C^{\gamma_2}(\Omega)};$$

If $\gamma_1 \geq 1$, then

$$\|D_1^{\gamma_1} T_1(D_2^{\gamma_2} f)(\cdot, z_2)\|_{C^{\alpha+\epsilon}(D_1)} \leq C\|D_2^{\gamma_2} f\|_{C^{\gamma_1-1, \alpha+\epsilon}(\Omega)} \leq C\|f\|_{C^{\gamma_1+\gamma_2}(\Omega)}$$

for some constant C independent of f and z_2 . Altogether, $D^\gamma T_1 f(\zeta, z_2)$ as a function of $\zeta \in D_1$ satisfies

$$\|D^\gamma T_1 f(\cdot, z_2)\|_{C^{L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(D_1)} \leq C\|D_1^{\gamma_1} T_1(D_2^{\gamma_2} f)(\cdot, z_2)\|_{C^{\alpha+\epsilon}(D_1)} \leq C\|f\|_{C^{|\gamma|}(\Omega)} \leq C\|f\|_{C^k, L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L(\Omega)}$$

for some constant C independent of f and z_2 . If $\alpha = 1$ (so $\nu \geq 0$), choose $\epsilon < 1$. Then $\|D^\gamma T_1 f(\cdot, z_2)\|_{C^{L^1 \text{Log}^\nu L}(D_1)} \leq C\|D_1^{\gamma_1} T_1(D_2^{\gamma_2} f)(\cdot, z_2)\|_{C^1(D_1)} \leq C\|T_1(D_2^{\gamma_2} f(\cdot, z_2))\|_{C^{\gamma_1+1, \epsilon}(D_1)}$ and hence by Theorem 2.2,

$$\|D^\gamma T_1 f(\cdot, z_2)\|_{C^{L^1 \text{Log}^\nu L}(D_1)} \leq C\|D_2^{\gamma_2} f\|_{C^{\gamma_1, \epsilon}(\Omega)} \leq C\|f\|_{C^{|\gamma|, \epsilon}(\Omega)} \leq C\|f\|_{C^k, L^1 \text{Log}^\nu L(\Omega)}$$

for some C independent of f and z_2 .

Let $z'_2 (\neq z_2) \in D_2$ with $|z_2 - z'_2| \leq h_0$ and consider $F_{z_2, z'_2}(\zeta) := \frac{D_2^{\gamma_2} f(\zeta, z_2) - D_2^{\gamma_2} f(\zeta, z'_2)}{|z_2 - z'_2|^\alpha |\ln |z_2 - z'_2||^\nu}$ on D_1 . Since $f \in C^k, L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L(\Omega)$, $F_{z_2, z'_2} \in C^{\gamma_1}(D_1)$ and $\|F_{z_2, z'_2}\|_{C^{\gamma_1}(D_1)} \leq \|f\|_{C^k, L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L(\Omega)}$. If $\gamma_1 = 0$,

$$\|D_1^{\gamma_1} T_1 F_{z_2, z'_2}\|_{C(D_1)} = \|T_1 F_{z_2, z'_2}\|_{C(D_1)} \leq C\|F_{z_2, z'_2}\|_{C(D_1)} \leq C\|f\|_{C^k, L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L(\Omega)}$$

for some constant C independent of f , z_2 and z'_2 . For $\gamma_1 \geq 1$, choosing $\epsilon < \alpha$, we have from Theorem 2.2,

$$\|D_1^{\gamma_1} T_1 F_{z_2, z'_2}\|_{C(D_1)} \leq C\|F_{z_2, z'_2}\|_{C^{\gamma_1-1, \epsilon}(D_1)} \leq C\|F_{z_2, z'_2}\|_{C^{\gamma_1}(D_1)} \leq C\|f\|_{C^k, L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L(\Omega)}$$

for some constant C independent of f , z_2 and z'_2 . Hence for each $z_1 \in D_1$,

$$\frac{|D^\gamma T_1 f(z_1, z_2) - D^\gamma T_1 f(z_1, z'_2)|}{|z_2 - z'_2|^\alpha |\ln |z_2 - z'_2||^\nu} = |D_1^\gamma T_1 F_{z_2, z'_2}(z_1)| \leq \|D_1^\gamma T_1 F_{z_2, z'_2}\|_{C(D_1)} \leq C \|f\|_{C^{k, L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)},$$

where C is independent of f , z_1 , z_2 and z'_2 . The proof of the proposition is complete in view of Lemma 2.1. $\blacksquare$

Theorem 6.2. *Let $\mathbf{f} = \sum_{j=1}^n f_j d\bar{z}_j \in C^{k, L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{0\}$, $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ and $\nu \in \mathbb{R}$. Then*

$$T\mathbf{f} := \sum_{j=1}^n \prod_{l=1}^{j-1} T_j S_l f_j = T_1 f_1 + T_2 S_1 f_2 + \cdots + T_n S_1 \cdots S_{n-1} f_n \quad (11)$$

is in $C^{k, L^\alpha \text{Log}^{\nu+n-1} L}(\Omega)$ with $\|T\mathbf{f}\|_{C^{k, L^\alpha \text{Log}^{\nu+n-1} L}(\Omega)} \leq C \|\mathbf{f}\|_{C^{k, L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)}$ for some constant C dependent only on Ω, k, α and ν .

Proof. The operator T in (11) is well defined on $C^{k, L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)$ due to Theorem 4.6 and Proposition 6.1. Moreover, for each $1 \leq j \leq n$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \prod_{l=1}^{j-1} T_j S_l f_j \right\|_{C^{k, L^\alpha \text{Log}^{\nu+n-1} L}(\Omega)} &\leq C \left\| \prod_{l=1}^{j-1} S_l f_j \right\|_{C^{k, L^\alpha \text{Log}^{\nu+n-1} L}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C \left\| \prod_{l=1}^{j-2} S_l f_j \right\|_{C^{k, L^\alpha \text{Log}^{\nu+n-2} L}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \cdots \\ &\leq C \|f_j\|_{C^{k, L^\alpha \text{Log}^{\nu+n-j} L}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C \|f_j\|_{C^{k, L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\|T\mathbf{f}\|_{C^{k, L^\alpha \text{Log}^{\nu+n-1} L}(\Omega)} \leq C \|\mathbf{f}\|_{C^{k, L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Omega)}$. $\blacksquare$

Proof of Theorem 1.3. When $\mathbf{f}$ is $\bar{\partial}$ -closed, $T\mathbf{f}$ defined by (11) satisfies $\bar{\partial} T\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{f}$ (in the sense of distributions if $k = 0$) by [8]. The rest of the theorem follows from Theorem 6.2. $\blacksquare$

Proof of Example 1.4. $\mathbf{f}$ is well defined in Δ^2 and $\mathbf{f} = (z_1 - 1)^{k+\alpha} \log^\nu(z_1 - 1) d\bar{z}_2 \in C^{k, L^\alpha \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Delta^2)$. Assuming $u \in C^{k, L^\beta \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Delta^2)$ solves $\bar{\partial} u = \mathbf{f}$ in Δ^2 for some $\beta > \alpha$, then there exists a holomorphic function h in Δ^2 such that $u = h + (z_1 - 1)^{k+\alpha} \log^\nu(z_1 - 1) \bar{z}_2$.

Now consider $w(\xi) := \int_{|z_2|=\frac{1}{2}} u(\xi, z_2) dz_2$ on $\xi \in \Delta = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < 1\}$. Since $u \in C^{k, L^\beta \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Delta^2)$, $w \in C^{k, L^\beta \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Delta)$ as well. On the other hand, a direct computation gives

$$\begin{aligned} w(\xi) &= \int_{|z_2|=\frac{1}{2}} (\xi - 1)^{k+\alpha} \log^\nu(\xi - 1) \bar{z}_2 dz_2 \\ &= (\xi - 1)^{k+\alpha} \log^\nu(\xi - 1) \int_{|z_2|=\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{4z_2} dz_2 \\ &= \frac{\pi i (\xi - 1)^{k+\alpha} \log^\nu(\xi - 1)}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

This contradicts with the fact that $(\xi - 1)^{k+\alpha} \log^\nu(\xi - 1) \notin C^{k, L^\beta \text{Log}^\nu L}(\Delta)$ for any $\beta > \alpha$. ■

References

- [1] GILBARG, D.; TRUDINGER, N. S.: *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001. xiv+517 pp.
- [2] KENIG, C. E.: *Recent progress on boundary value problems on Lipschitz domains*. Proc. Sympos. Pure Math. **43** (1985), 175–205.
- [3] KERZMAN, N.: *Hölder and L^p estimates for solutions of $\bar{\partial}u = f$ in strongly pseudoconvex domains*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **24**(1971) 301–379.
- [4] MCLEAN, W.: *Hölder estimates for the Cauchy integral on a Lipschitz contour*. J. Integral Equations Appl. **1** (1988), no. 3, 435–451.
- [5] MERKER, J.; PORTEN, E.: *Holomorphic extension of CR functions, envelopes of holomorphy, and removable singularities*. IMRS Int. Math. Res. Surv. 2006, Art. ID 28925, 287 pp.
- [6] MUSKHELISHVILI, N. I.: *Singular integral equations. Boundary problems of function theory and their application to mathematical physics*. Dover Publications, Inc., New York, 1992. 447 pp.
- [7] TUMANOV, A.: *On the propagation of extendibility of CR functions*. Complex analysis and geometry (Trento, 1993), 479–498, Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math., 173, Dekker, New York, 1996.
- [8] PAN, Y.; ZHANG, Y.: *$C^{k,\alpha}$ estimates of the $\bar{\partial}$ equation on product domains*. Preprint.

[9] VEKUA, I. N.: *Generalized analytic functions*, vol. 29, Pergamon Press Oxford, 1962.

Yifei Pan, pan@pfw.edu, Department of Mathematical Sciences, Purdue University Fort Wayne, Fort Wayne, IN 46805-1499, USA

Yuan Zhang, zhangyu@pfw.edu, Department of Mathematical Sciences, Purdue University Fort Wayne, Fort Wayne, IN 46805-1499, USA