arXiv:2001.06874v2 [math.AP] 29 May 2020

Suboptimal Error Estimates for Linear Elasticity Systems on Perforated Domains

Li Wang, Qiang Xu, Peihao Zhao

February 18, 2022

Abstract

In the present work, we established almost-sharp error estimates for linear elasticity systems in periodically perforated domains. The first result was $L^{\frac{2d}{d-1-\tau}}$-error estimates $O\big(\varepsilon^{1-\frac{\tau}{2}}\big)$ with $0<\tau<1$ for a bounded smooth domain. It followed from weighted Hardy-Sobolev's inequalities and a suboptimal error estimate for the square function of the first-order approximating corrector (which was earliest investigated by C. Kenig, F. Lin, Z. Shen [28] under additional regularity assumption on coefficients). The new approach relied on the weighted quenched Calderón-Zygmund estimate (initially appeared in A. Gloria, S. Neukamm, F. Otto's work [22] for a quantitative stochastic homogenization theory). The second effort was L^2-error estimates $O\big(\varepsilon^{\frac{5}{6}}\ln^{\frac{2}{3}}(1/\varepsilon)\big)$ for a Lipschitz domain, followed from a new duality scheme coupled with interpolation inequalities. Also, we developed a new weighted extension theorem for perforated domains, and a real method imposed by Z. Shen [40] played a fundamental role in the whole project.

Key words. Homogenization; perforated domains; elasticity systems; error estimates.

Contents

1 Introduction **2**
- 1.1 Hypothesises and Main Results . . . 2
- 1.2 Related to Previous Works on Error Estimates . . . 7
- 1.3 Outline of the Ingredients for (1.9) . . . 8
- 1.4 Tricks on the Estimate (1.10) . . . 9
- 1.5 Organization of the Paper . . . 9
- 1.6 Notation . . . 10

2 Preliminaries **12**
- 2.1 Periodic Cancellations . . . 13
- 2.2 Extension Theories . . . 14

3 Convergence Rates in H^1-norm **17**

4 Convergence Rates in H^{-s}-norm **21**

5 Estimates for Weak Formulation from Duality **26**

6 Weighted Quenched Calderón-Zygmund Estimates **30**

7 Boundary Estimates at Large-scales **37**

8 Appendix **40**

1 Introduction

1.1 Hypothesises and Main Results

In this paper, we are aimed to establish sharp convergence rates for linear elasticity systems in periodically perforated domains. Consider the operator

$$\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon := -\nabla \cdot A_\varepsilon(x)\nabla = -\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}\left\{a_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}\big(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\big)\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}\right\}, \quad x \in \varepsilon\omega,\ \varepsilon > 0, \tag{1.1}$$

where $A_\varepsilon(x) := A(x/\varepsilon)$ and $A(y) = \{a_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}(y)\}_{1\le i,j,\alpha,\beta\le d}$ for $y \in \omega$ with $d \ge 2$, and $\omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is an unbounded Lipschitz domain with 1-periodic structure. We denote the ε-homothetic set $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x/\varepsilon \in \omega\}$ by $\varepsilon\omega$. For a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, we study the following mixed boundary value problem:

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) = F & \text{in } \ \Omega_\epsilon, \\ \sigma_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) = 0 & \text{on } \ S_\epsilon, \\ u_\varepsilon = g & \text{on } \ \Gamma_\varepsilon, \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

in which $\sigma_\varepsilon := n \cdot A(\cdot/\varepsilon)\nabla$ and n denotes the outward unit normal to Ω_ε, and $\Omega_\varepsilon := \Omega \cap \varepsilon\omega$; $S_\varepsilon := \partial\Omega_\varepsilon \cap \Omega$; $\Gamma_\varepsilon := \partial\Omega_\varepsilon \cap \partial\Omega$. Throughout the paper, we have the following hypothesises.

(H1). **The structure assumptions on the coefficient.**

(a) A is real, measurable, and 1-periodic, i.e.,

$$A(y+z) = A(z) \quad \text{for } y \in \omega \text{ and } z \in \mathbb{Z}^d. \tag{1.3}$$

(b) The tensor A satisfies elasticity condition:

$$\begin{cases} a_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}(y) = a_{ji}^{\beta\alpha}(y) = a_{\alpha j}^{i\beta}(y); \\ \mu_0|\xi|^2 \le a_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}(y)\xi_i^\alpha\xi_j^\beta \le \mu_1|\xi|^2 \end{cases} \tag{1.4}$$

for $y \in \omega$ and any symmetric matrix $\xi = \{\xi_i^\alpha\}_{1\le i,\alpha\le d}$, where $\mu_0, \mu_1 > 0$.

(H2). **The geometry assumptions on the reference domain** ω.

(a) ω is supposed to be connected.

(b) $\omega \cap Y$ is a Lipschitz domain, where $Y := [-1/2, 1/2)^d$ is the unit cube.

(c) $\mathbb{R}^d\backslash\omega$ represents the set of "holes", and any two of them is kept a positive distance. Specifically, let $\mathbb{R}^d\backslash\omega = \bigcup_{k=1}^\infty H_k$ in which H_k is connected and bounded for each k, while there exists a constant $\mathfrak{g}^\omega$ such that

$$0 < \mathfrak{g}^\omega \le \inf_{i\ne j} \operatorname{dist}(H_i, H_j). \tag{1.5}$$

Then, the following qualitative homogenization result was well known (see for example [14, 15, 49], and we presented it in the way of V. Zhikov and M. Rychago [49, Theorem 1.1]). Let $F \in L^2(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^d)$, and u_ε be the weak solution to (1.2) (see Definition 2.1). It is concluded that $l_\varepsilon^+ u_\varepsilon \to u_0$ strongly in $L^2(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^d)$, and $l_\varepsilon^+ A(x/\varepsilon)\nabla u_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup \widehat{A}\nabla u_0$ weakly in $L^2(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{d\times d})$, as ε goes to zero, where $l_\varepsilon^+ := l^+(\cdot/\varepsilon)$ with l^+ being the indicator function of ω, and u_0 satisfies the effective (homogenized) equation:

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_0(u_0) := -\nabla\cdot\widehat{A}\nabla u_0 = F & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_0 = g & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \tag{1.6}$$

Here, the homogenized coefficient $\widehat{A} = \{\widehat{a}_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}\}_{1\le i,j,\alpha,\beta\le d}$ is defined by

$$\widehat{a}_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} = \theta^{-1}\int_{Y\cap\omega} a_{ik}^{\alpha\gamma}(y)\frac{\partial \mathbb{X}_j^{\gamma\beta}}{\partial y_k}dy \quad \text{and} \quad \theta := |Y\cap\omega|, \tag{1.7}$$

where $\mathbb{X}_j^\beta = \{\mathbb{X}_j^{\gamma\beta}\}_{1\le\gamma\le d}$ is the weak solution to the following cell problem:

$$\begin{cases} \nabla\cdot A\nabla\mathbb{X}_j^\beta = 0 & \text{in } Y\cap\omega, \\ n\cdot A\nabla\mathbb{X}_j^\beta = 0 & \text{on } Y\cap\partial\omega, \\ \mathbb{X}_j^\beta - y_j e^\beta := \chi_j^\beta \in H^1_{\text{per}}(\omega;\mathbb{R}^d), & \displaystyle\int_{Y\cap\omega}\chi_j^\beta dy = 0. \end{cases} \tag{1.8}$$

(The definition of the space $H^1_{\text{per}}(\omega;\mathbb{R}^d)$ will be found in Subsection 1.6.)

Now, we turn to quantitative estimates, and state the main results of the paper as follows.

Theorem 1.1 (suboptimal error estimates). *Let $0<\varepsilon\ll 1$, $0<\tau<1$ and $p=\frac{2d}{d-1-\tau}$. Suppose that $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon$ and ω satisfy the hypothesises* (H1) *and* (H2). *Assume that $u_\varepsilon \in H^1(\Omega_\varepsilon;\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $u_0\in H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^d)$ are weak solutions to (1.2) and (1.6), respectively. Let Ω_0 be an extended region such that $\bar{\Omega}\subset\Omega_0$ with $\operatorname{dist}(x,\Omega)\sim 10\varepsilon$ for every $x\in\partial\Omega_0$, and $F\in H^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega_0;\mathbb{R}^d)\cap L^2(\Omega_0;\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfies a finite square function condition, i.e., $\big(\int_{\Omega_0}|\nabla F|^2\delta dx\big)^{1/2}<\infty$, where $\delta(x)=\operatorname{dist}(x,\partial\Omega_0)$.*

- *If Ω is a $C^{1,\eta}$ domain with $\eta\in(0,1]$, and $g\in W^{1,q}(\partial\Omega;\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $q=p-p/d$. Then one may derive that*

$$\|u_\varepsilon-u_0\|_{L^p(\Omega_\varepsilon)} \lesssim \varepsilon^{1-\frac{\tau}{2}}\ln^{\frac12}(1/\varepsilon)\left\{\Big(\int_{\Omega_0}|\nabla F|^2\delta dx\Big)^{\frac12} + \|F\|_{L^2(\Omega_0)} + \|g\|_{W^{1,q}(\partial\Omega)}\right\}. \tag{1.9}$$

- *If Ω is a Lipschitz domain and $g\in H^1(\partial\Omega;\mathbb{R}^d)$, then there holds*

$$\|u_\varepsilon-u_0\|_{L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon)} \lesssim \varepsilon^{\frac56}\ln^{\frac23}(1/\varepsilon)\left\{\Big(\int_{\Omega}|\nabla F|^2\delta^2 dx\Big)^{\frac12} + \|F\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|g\|_{H^1(\partial\Omega)}\right\}. \tag{1.10}$$

Here, $\lesssim$ means $\le$ up to a multiplicative constant which depend on $\mu_0,\mu_1,d,\mathfrak{g}^\omega,\eta,\tau,r_0$ and the characters of Ω and ω, but never on ε.

We refer the reader to Subsection 1.6 for the definition of the notation like "r_0","$\sim$","$\ll$".

Although the following theorem is not particularly new (probably well known by experts), it still deserves to be presented in a more prominent position because it is not only the first step towards Theorem 1.1 but also a proper perspective to realize the hurdles of Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 1.2 (H^1-error estimates). *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded Lipschitz domain. Given $F \in H^{1-s}(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $0 \le s \le 1$ and $g \in H^1(\partial\Omega;\mathbb{R}^d)$, let the weak solutions u_ε and u_0 be associated with the given data by (1.2) and (1.6), respectively. Suppose that $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon$ and ω satisfy the hypothesises* (H1) *and* (H2). *Consider the first-order approximating corrector*

$$w_\varepsilon := u_\varepsilon - u_0 + \varepsilon\chi(\cdot/\varepsilon)S_\varepsilon(\psi_\varepsilon\nabla u_0), \tag{1.11}$$

in which S_ε is a smoothing operator (see Definition 2.5), and ψ_ε is a cut-off function defined in (1.26). Then one may derive that

$$\|\nabla w_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon)} \lesssim \varepsilon^{1-s}\|F\|_{H^{1-s}(\mathbb{R}^d)} + \varepsilon^{1/2}\Big\{\|F\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|g\|_{H^1(\partial\Omega)}\Big\}. \tag{1.12}$$

Moreover, if $F = 0$, then there holds

$$\|u_\varepsilon - u_0\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-1}}(\Omega_\varepsilon)} \lesssim \varepsilon^{1/2}\|g\|_{H^1(\partial\Omega)}, \tag{1.13}$$

where the up to constant depends on μ_0, μ_1, d, r_0 and the characters of ω and Ω.

Compared to the case of unperforated domains, the new phenomenon arising from the source term F will be observed from (1.12). On the one hand, square-integrable F as given data is too rough to offer a convergence rate. On the other hand, a sharp error estimate would be delivered by $H^{-\frac{1}{2}}$-norms (see Corollary 4.3).

Since the boundary of Ω_ε may be quite irregular, some fundamental analysis tools such as Poincaré's inequalities and trace theorems can not be employed anymore. Instead, people first manage to extend functions to a larger and more regular region and then operate them as usual. In this regard, O. Oleinik, A. Shamaev, and G. Yosifian [35, pp.50, Theorem 4.3] successfully constructed a bounded linear extension operator from $H^1(\Omega_\varepsilon,\Gamma_\varepsilon;\mathbb{R}^d)$ to $H_0^1(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}^d)$, in which $H^1(\Omega_\varepsilon,\Gamma_\varepsilon;\mathbb{R}^d)$ denotes the closure in $H^1(\Omega_\varepsilon;\mathbb{R}^d)$ of smooth vector-valued functions vanishing on Γ_ε (see Subsection 1.6). Here, to fulfill the new scheme on Theorem 1.1, their consequences have received further development in the following.

Theorem 1.3 (weighted extension property). *Let Ω and Ω_0 be bounded Lipschitz domains with $\bar{\Omega} \subset \Omega_0$ and $\operatorname{dist}(x,\Omega) \sim 10\varepsilon$ for $x \in \partial\Omega_0$. Suppose that ω satisfies the hypothesis* (H1) *with $\Omega_\varepsilon = \Omega \cap (\varepsilon\omega)$. Let $\delta(x) = \operatorname{dist}(x,\partial\Omega_0)$ be a weight. Then there exists an extension operator $\Lambda_\varepsilon : H^1(\Omega_\varepsilon,\Gamma_\varepsilon;\mathbb{R}^d) \to H_0^1(\Omega_0;\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\Lambda_\varepsilon(w) = w$ a.e. on Ω_ε with the trace of $\Lambda_\varepsilon(w)$ vanishing on $\partial\Omega_0$. Moreover, there holds the following weighted estimate*

$$\int_{\Omega_0} |\nabla\Lambda_\varepsilon(w)|^2\delta^\beta dx \lesssim \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} |\nabla w|^2\delta^\beta dx \tag{1.14}$$

for $-1 < \beta < 1$, where the up to constant depends on d, $\mathfrak{g}^\omega$ and the characters of Ω and ω, but independent of ε and r_0.

Concerned with the above theorem, we want to emphasize two points: (i). Note that $\delta^\beta \in A_2$ (see for example [19, Theorem 3.1]), which guaranteed that we could rightfully employ some extension theorems in weighted Sobolev spaces (see [13, Theorem 1.2]), where the notation A_p with $1 \le p \le \infty$ is known as a Muckenhoupt's weight class (see for example [17, Chapter 7]). (ii). The stated estimates (1.14) is rooted in weighted $W^{1,p}$ estimates for an auxiliary equation with mixed boundary conditions (see (2.11) and Theorem 8.2).

Although the equation (2.11) was constructed with constant coefficients, its proof shared the same strategy (repeating Shen's real methods twice) with the following theorem. As we have mentioned in Abstract, these estimates below were first known by A. Gloria, S. Neukamm, F. Otto [22] in a random setting.

Theorem 1.4 (weighted quenched Calderón-Zygmund estimates). *Let $0<\varepsilon\ll 1$ and Ω be a bounded $C^{1,\eta}$ domain with $0<\eta\le 1$. Suppose that $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon$ and ω satisfy the hypothesises* (H1) *and* (H2). *Let $1<p<\infty$, and $\rho\in A_p$ be a weight. For any $f\in L^p(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{d\times d})$, assume that u_ε is the weak solution to $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon)=\nabla\cdot f$ in Ω_ε with $\sigma_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon)=-n\cdot f$ on S_ε and $u_\varepsilon=0$ on Γ_ε. Then there holds*

$$\left(\int_\Omega\left(\fint_{B_\varepsilon(x)\cap\Omega_\varepsilon}|\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2\right)^{\frac{p}{2}}\rho dx\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}\lesssim\left(\int_\Omega\left(\fint_{B_\varepsilon(x)\cap\Omega_\varepsilon}|f|^2\right)^{\frac{p}{2}}\rho dx\right)^{\frac{1}{p}},\tag{1.15}$$

where $B_\varepsilon(x)$ is the ball centered at x with radius ε, and the average integral $\fint$ is defined in (1.25). *Moreover, if $\rho\in A_1$, then we have*

$$\left(\int_\Omega\left(\fint_{B_\varepsilon(x)\cap\Omega_\varepsilon}|\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2\right)^{\frac{p}{2}}\rho dx\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}\lesssim\left(\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon}|f|^p\rho dx\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.\tag{1.16}$$

Here the up to constant depends on $\mu_0,\mu_1,d,\mathfrak{g}^\omega,\eta$, p and the characters of Ω and ω.

Up to now, the idea of Theorem 1.4 is more or less standard in harmonic analysis. One may reduce it to a good-λ inequality measured by weights (see (6.25)), which essentially parallels to the classical counterparts developed for singular integrals (see [17, Theorem 7.11]). The main difference is that a pointwise estimate of the composition of sharp maximal operators with singular integrals is displaced by Shen's real arguments [37, 40]. Recently, Z. Shen [39] developed his kernel-free scheme in weighted spaces. Nevertheless, the important fact is that weighted estimates are usually based upon non-weighted ones. Whereupon, it is very natural to consider the next theorem.

Theorem 1.5 (quenched Calderón-Zygmund estimate). *Assume the same conditions as in Theorem 1.4. For any $f\in L^p(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{d\times d})$, let u_ε be associated with f by the equation $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon)=\nabla\cdot f$ in Ω_ε with $\sigma_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon)=-n\cdot f$ on S_ε and $u_\varepsilon=0$ on Γ_ε. Then, for $1<p<\infty$, we obtain*

$$\left(\int_\Omega\left(\fint_{B_\varepsilon(x)\cap\Omega_\varepsilon}|\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2\right)^{\frac{p}{2}}dx\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}\lesssim\left(\int_\Omega\left(\fint_{B_\varepsilon(x)\cap\Omega}|f|^2\right)^{\frac{p}{2}}dx\right)^{\frac{1}{p}},\tag{1.17}$$

where the up to constant relies on $\mu_0,\mu_1,d,\mathfrak{g}^\omega,\eta$, p and the characters of Ω and ω.

The terminology "quenched" probably came from some mathematical physicists, which was likely used to underline some structural assumption on A at macroscopic scales. Regarding of this paper, it refers to the 1-periodicity condition (1.3). In other words, some higher regularity estimates (beyond energy estimates) can still be expected, if the coefficient A is ruled by some "law" such as periodicity, quasi-periodicity, almost-periodicity, and stationarity coupled with quantitative ergodicity. In the absence of smoothness of coefficients, it is reasonable to replace classical pointwise quantity with a specific average. Also, we strongly refer the reader to [27] for its tight relationship with a quantitative stochastic homogenization theory.

Recently, the estimate (1.17) as an intermediate step was developed for elliptic systems with stationary random coefficients of integrable correlations by M. Duerinckx and F. Otto [18]. In their plot, there were two notable ingredients. One was Shen's lemma (see Lemma 6.1), inspired by L.

Caffarelli and I. Peral's work [15]. The other was the large-scale Lipschitz regularity, as developed in [4, 5, 22]. In terms of a quasi-linear model, a similar quenched $W^{1,p}$ estimate with $p > 2$ was received by S. Armstrong, J.-P. Daniel [3], and their approach was closer to S. Byun and L. Wang's framework [11], which also enlightened by the literature [15]. In short, although their methods have their characteristics, the common point is the dependence on the large-scale Lipschitz estimates.

Theorem 1.6 (boundary Lipschitz estimates at large-scales)**.** *Let $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ and Ω be a bounded $C^{1,\eta}$ domain with $0 < \eta \le 1$. Suppose that $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon$ and ω satisfy the hypothesises* (H1) *and* (H2)*. Let $u_\varepsilon \in H^1(D_1^\varepsilon; \mathbb{R}^d)$ be a weak solution to*

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) = 0 & \text{in } D_1^\varepsilon, \\ \sigma_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) = 0 & \text{on } D_1 \cap \partial(\varepsilon\omega), \\ u_\varepsilon = 0 & \text{on } \Delta_1 \cap \varepsilon\omega, \end{cases} \tag{1.18}$$

in which the notation D_1^ε, D_1 and Δ_1 are referred to Subsection 1.6. Then there holds

$$\left(\fint_{D_r^\varepsilon} |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 \right)^{1/2} \lesssim \left(\fint_{D_{1/2}^\varepsilon} |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 \right)^{1/2} \tag{1.19}$$

for any $\varepsilon \le r \le (1/2)$, where the up to constant depends on $\mu_0, \mu_1, d, \mathfrak{g}^\omega, \eta$ and the characters of Ω and ω.

The large-scale (uniform) Lipschitz regularity was first obtained by M. Avellaneda, F. Lin [7] via a three-step compactness method. Recently, S. Armstrong, T. Kuusi, J.-C. Mourrat, Z. Shen [4, 5, 6] created a new approach towards (1.19) in aperiodic settings. (In this respect, a fair statement should not ignore A. Gloria, S. Neukamm, F. Otto's work [22], although theirs has not been formally published yet.) Roughly speaking, it includes two steps. The first one is devoted to approximating u_ε by a "good" function in a quantitative way, which is finally reduced to find a convergence rate like the estimate (1.13). The second one is to carry out the so-called Campanato's iteration, which is similar to a classical program of Schauder's estimates.

In the matter of the iteration, we prefer the version given by Z. Shen [38, Lemma 8.5], so it is free to use in this step. Consequently, to complete the whole argument for (1.19), we need to review Theorem 1.2, which also works as the first step in the proof of large-scale regularities.

Remark 1.7. The authors pointed out that the scheme for (1.9) would be valid to a Lipschitz domain since we merely employ Theorem 1.4 in the case of $p = 2$. Thus, it is reasonable to believe that Theorem 1.4 would be right for $|p - 2| \ll 1$ if Ω were merely a Lipschitz domain, and it would be linked up to the new progress in [39]. On the other hand, it is not optimal for assuming $\partial\Omega \in C^{1,\eta}$ in Theorems 1.4, and 1.5. The potential substitutions might be a C^1 region or some non-smooth domain with small Lipschitz constants (such as Reifenberg flat domains in [11]). It is obviously a separate interest.

Remark 1.8. As mentioned in Abstract, one of the new contributions should be suboptimal error estimates for the square function of the first-order approximating corrector w_ε, which was shown in Corollary 5.2. Compared to arguments developed by C. Kenig, F. Lin, Z. Shen [28], ours seems to be much easier to be generalized in other models.

Remark 1.9. In terms of given data F in Theorem 1.1, its regularities shown in (1.9) and (1.10) seem to be a minimum requirement, although it is still stronger than the $H^{1/2}$-norm. At least, the hypothesis of $H^{1/2}$-smoothness of F is deemed to be necessary for the error estimate $O(\varepsilon^{1/2})$ in Theorem 1.2.

1.2 Related to Previous Works on Error Estimates

Pioneering studies on the present model (1.2). Homogenization in the perforated domain has been considered for decades, and most of the papers studied qualitative results, for example, [2, 14, 15, 35, 49]. There were also some quantitative outcomes. O. Oleinik, A. Shamaev, and G. Yosifian [35, pp.124, Theorem 1.2] obtained the error estimate:

$$\|u_\varepsilon - u_0 - \varepsilon\chi_\varepsilon \nabla u_0\|_{H^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)} \lesssim \varepsilon^{1/2}\Big\{\|g\|_{H^{5/2}(\partial\Omega)} + \|F\|_{H^1(\Omega)}\Big\}, \tag{1.20}$$

under additional regularity assumptions on the coefficient A and $\omega \cap Y$. Recently, B. Russell [36, Theorem 1.4] improved the result (1.20) by receiving

$$\|u_\varepsilon - u_0 - \varepsilon\chi_\varepsilon S_\varepsilon^2(\psi_\varepsilon \nabla u_0)\|_{H^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)} \lesssim \varepsilon^{1/2}\|g\|_{H^1(\partial\Omega)}$$

in the case that $F = 0$, and A merely satisfies (1.3), (1.4). Meanwhile, an interior large-scale Lipschitz regularity (see [36, Theorem 1.1]) was established, i.e.,

$$\Big(\fint_{B(0,r)\cap\varepsilon\omega} |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2\Big)^{1/2} \lesssim \Big(\fint_{B(0,1)\cap\varepsilon\omega} |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2\Big)^{1/2} \tag{1.21}$$

for $\varepsilon \le r \le (1/4)$, provided u_ε satisfies $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) = 0$ in $B(0,1)\cap\varepsilon\omega$ and $\sigma_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) = 0$ on $B(0,1)\cap\partial(\varepsilon\omega)$. From our point of view, their notable contributions are summarized below.

- The literature [35] developed some extension theorems on perforated domains, and their central ideas stimulated the creation of Theorem 1.3.
- The so-called flux corrector was introduced by [35, 36] in a different format, and the later one first extended the corrector χ from $\omega \cap Y$ to Y and then defined flux correctors on Y (see Lemma 2.4).
- Concerning the estimate (1.21), the literature [36] developed some techniques to make the scheme on large-scale regularities in [38] valid for perforated domains, such as [36, Lemma 4.4]. This provided us with a blueprint to Theorem 1.6, while our work focused on overcoming the difficulties caused by boundaries.

Earlier works on duality arguments for sharp error estimates. In this part of the presentation, we limited ourselves in the case of $\omega = \mathbb{R}^d$. To our best knowledge, T. Suslina [44, 45] was the first to use a duality approach to acquire an optimal convergence rate in L^2-norm for elliptic homogenization problems with Dirichlet or Neumann boundary conditions. However, her literature was a little biased towards operator algebra fields. Later on, Z. Shen [38, Theorem 1.3] described her ideas from PDEs and originally obtained a sharp error estimate measured by $L^{\frac{2d}{d-1}}$-norm. It is important to note that their results were independent of the smoothness of the coefficients.

Regarding Lipschitz domains, under additional smoothness assumption on coefficients, C. Kenig, F. Lin, Z. Shen [28] obtained almost-sharp error estimates in L^2-norm. Most importantly, their results included an error estimate of the first-order approximating corrector in the sense of the "square function", i.e.,

$$\left(\int_\Omega |\nabla v_\varepsilon|^2 \mathrm{dist}(x,\partial\Omega)dx\right)^{1/2} = O(\varepsilon), \tag{1.22}$$

where $v_\varepsilon = u_\varepsilon - u_0 - \varepsilon\chi(\cdot/\varepsilon)\nabla u_0$ in Ω. Considering nontangential maximal function estimates had been established by C. Kenig, Z. Shen [30], it was possible to apply a duality scheme to some quantity

on boundaries, in which the so-called Rellich estimates were instrumental. On the other hand, the nontangential maximal function and the square function are comparable if the solution satisfies a homogeneous elliptic equation (i.e., its right-hand side equals zero). Also, some crucial analysis tools and observations were introduced.

- Weighted estimates for potentials.
- For any $\mathcal{L}_1$-harmonic function, its non-tangential maximal function must be equivalent to its radial maximal function.

Recently, without smoothness assumption on coefficients, the second author [47] obtained the same result as in [28] regarding the almost-sharp error estimates in L^2-norm. Roughly speaking, his project combined the duality arguments in [38, 44, 45] and ideas on weighted estimates in [28]. The individual contribution in [47] was some weighted-type estimates for the smoothing operator at ε-scales, i.e., Lemmas 2.8 and 2.9, which still played a vital role in this literature. Also, we mention that the approach developed in [47] can be flexibly extended to other models, such as Stokes systems, parabolic systems, and higher-order elliptic systems. However, it was failed to establish the estimate (1.22) in [47], while this was precisely a concealed interest of the current work. In this regard, we will grasp more about it in Subsection 1.3.

Also, we refer the reader to [24, 25, 42] for a recent development on quantitative estimates of elasticity systems in periodic mediums.

1.3 Outline of the Ingredients for (1.9)

As mentioned previously, the extension idea is conventional in the study of homogenization problems on perforated domains. However, we remind the reader that the extended region Ω_0 is only slightly larger than the original one Ω, whose difference in radial size can be measured by ε-scales. The primary purpose is to generate a boundary layer (see, for example handling the term T_3 of (1.24)). At the same time, the inverse of the distance function δ has no singularity around the boundary of Ω, which benefits the computations near to $\partial\Omega$ (see, for example, Remark 5.3).

Recalling the weight $\rho = \delta^\beta$ with $-1 < \beta < 1$, as well as, w_ε defined in (1.11), we now describe the main ingredients for the estimate (1.9) in the following (it is fine to assume that $\partial\Omega$ and g are sufficiently smooth).

1. Estimate for a weak formulation (a duality argument):

$$\Big| \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \nabla w_\varepsilon \cdot f dx \Big| \lesssim \varepsilon^{\frac{1+\beta}{2}} \bigg(\int_\Omega \fint_{B_\varepsilon(x)\cap\Omega_\varepsilon} |\nabla \phi_\varepsilon|^2 dy \rho^{-1} dx \bigg)^{\frac{1}{2}} \times \Big\{ \text{given data} \Big\}, \tag{1.23}$$

   where ϕ_ε is associated with f by the adjoint equation (5.4) (see Theorem 5.1).

2. Weighted quenched Calderón-Zygmund estimates "+" (1.23) imply the square function estimates

$$\bigg(\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} |\nabla w_\varepsilon|^2 \delta(x) dx \bigg)^{\frac{1}{2}} = O\big(\varepsilon^{\frac{1+\beta}{2}}\big)$$

   (see Corollary 5.2). Although this result is suboptimal compared to (1.22), it does not rely on any smoothness assumption on the coefficients.

3. The weighted extension theorem "+" weighted Hardy-Sobolev inequalities ([32, Theorem 2.1]) leads to

$$\Big(\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon}|\nabla w_\varepsilon|^2\delta^\beta dx\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}\gtrsim\Big(\int_{\Omega_0}|\nabla\Lambda_\varepsilon(w_\varepsilon)|^2\delta^\beta dx\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}\gtrsim\Big(\int_{\Omega_0}|\Lambda_\varepsilon(w_\varepsilon)|^{\frac{2d}{d-2+\beta}}dx\Big)^{\frac{d-2+\beta}{2d}},$$

in which $0<\beta<1$, and we mention that the critical case $\beta=1$ is invalid above, while the case $\beta=0$ is valid for $d>2$.

1.4 Tricks on the Estimate (1.10)

For the interpolation inequality between the Hilbert spaces H^1 and H^{-s} (with $s\geq 0$) was well known on the whole space $\mathbb{R}^d$ (see for example [8, Proposition 1.52]), we consider the extension of w_ε, denoted by $\tilde{w}_\varepsilon$, in the way of Lemma 2.10 (whose previous version was [35, pp.50, Theorem 4.3]). Here the improved effects guarantee that $\mathrm{supp}(\tilde{w}_\varepsilon)\subseteq\Omega_0$ with $\Omega_0\supseteq\bar{\Omega}$ being such that $\mathrm{dist}(x,\partial\Omega)\sim 10\varepsilon$ for $x\in\partial\Omega_0$. Let $\Phi\in H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $(1/2)\leq\sigma\leq 1$ be any test function, and then it is natural to analyze the following quantity

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\theta\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\Phi dx,$$

which one may formulate into

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\theta\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\Phi dx&=\int_\Omega\theta\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\Phi dx+\int_{\mathbb{R}^d\setminus\Omega}\theta\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\Phi dx\\&=\int_\Omega l_\varepsilon^+\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\Phi dx+\int_\Omega(\theta-l_\varepsilon^+)\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\Phi dx+\int_{\Omega_0\setminus\Omega}\theta\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\Phi dx\\&=\underbrace{\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon}A_{ij}(x/\varepsilon)\nabla_{x_j}w_\varepsilon\nabla_{x_i}\phi_\varepsilon dx}_{T_1}+\underbrace{\int_\Omega(\theta-l_\varepsilon^+)\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\Phi dx}_{T_2}+\underbrace{\int_{\Omega_0\setminus\Omega}\theta\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\Phi dx}_{T_3}.\end{aligned}\tag{1.24}$$

Here ϕ_ε is associated with Φ by the adjoint equation (4.1), and we also use the observation that $\int_\Omega l_\varepsilon^+\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\Phi dx=\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon}w_\varepsilon\Phi dx$ in the last equality. It is a suitable weak formulation for (1.10). Now, there are some small tricks for every term in the bottom line of (1.24).

1. The quantity ϕ_ε in T_1 will be substituted with two-scale expansions (first-order) of ϕ_ε (see the formula (4.5)), and this idea was originally shown in [44, 45].

2. Appeal to auxiliary equation (3.7) to engage with the oscillating factor $(\theta-l_\varepsilon^+)$ in T_2.

3. As $\Omega_0\setminus\Omega$ is a boundary layer part of Ω_0, it is reduced to apply Lemma 2.14 to T_3.

1.5 Organization of the Paper

In Section 2, we first introduced some properties of homogenized coefficients and flux correctors. A basic and essential fact is that the effective operator $\mathcal{L}_0$ and $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon$ belong to the same type class of operators (see Lemma 2.2), which is crucial to the idea of "borrowing" good regularities from effective equations in all scales. In terms of the antisymmetry (see Lemma 2.4), the flux corrector played a central role purely in the algebraical level, which finally leads to an informative weak formulation for the first-order approximating corrector (see (3.1)). Then, the so-called periodic cancellations measured by different norms were presented in Subsection 2.1, in which Lemma 2.6 seems to be

newly imposed. Subsection 2.2 was devoted to some extension theories. The first notable consequence was stated in Lemma 2.10, which served as a technical starting point in the scheme to (1.10), and therefore played a fundamental role in Sections 3 and 4. Then Lemmas 2.13, 2.14 as preparations were used to show a proof for Theorem 1.3, which was assigned at the end of this section.

In Section 3, the most important result was a proper weak formulation for w_ε defined in (1.11), which was shown in Lemma 3.1. The reason why we call it weak formulation instead of bilinear form was that the formula (3.1) was weaker than the bilinear form given in Definition 2.1. In other words, our computations in Sections 3, 4, 5 were based upon the weak formulation instead of the bilinear form as usual. The proof of Theorem 1.2 was reached in this section. In Section 4, we proved the estimate (1.10) (see Corollary 4.3). However, the most exciting result around (1.24) was summarized in Theorem 4.1. Technically, it together with Lemma 4.4 was most highly consistent with [47, Lemma 3.5] throughout the paper.

In Section 5, the main innovation of this work would be reflected in Theorem 5.1, which was, in fact, parallel to Theorem 4.1 from the duality. Another impressive result was the suboptimal error estimates for the square function of the first-order approximating corrector, which was presented in Corollary 5.2. However, arguments in this section relied on quenched regularities that we would discuss later on, which might bring the reader some uncomfortable feeling. So, we recommended that the reader would skip this section for a moment if he or she were not familiar with quenched regularity theories.

In Section 6, Shen's real methods were presented in Lemma 6.1. Other useful results were related to primary geometry on integrals (see Lemma 6.3). Then, we provided the proofs of Theorems 1.5 and 1.4, respectively, based upon the large-scale Lipschitz estimate (1.19). In Section 7, we completed the main plot for Theorem 1.6. Compared with the case on unperforated domains, people had first to investigate an equivalence of two quantities defined in (7.8) at large-scales (see Lemma 7.3). Also, a quenched boundary L^2-error estimate (see Lemma 7.2) involved more techniques than those engaged in interior cases. The rest parts were standard nowadays, and we preferred to omit them.

In Section 8, there were two significant results. One was weighted $W^{1,p}$ estimates for a mixed boundary problem on Lipschitz domains and stated in Theorem 8.2. The other was layer and co-layer type estimates for effective equations, which we summarized in Theorem 8.3. They should be known by experts most likely, but there were no precise references for Theorem 8.2 and we merely outlined some necessary steps and computations for the reader's convenience.

1.6 Notation

1. Notation for estimates.

   (a) $\lesssim$ and $\gtrsim$ stand for $\leq$ and $\geq$ up to a multiplicative constant, which may depend on some given parameters imposed in the paper, but never on ε.

   (b) We use $\gg$ instead of $\gtrsim$ to indicate that the multiplicative constant is much larger than 1 (but still finite).

   (c) We write $\sim$ when both $\lesssim$ and $\gtrsim$ hold.

2. Notation for derivatives.

   (a) $\nabla v = (\nabla_1 v, \cdots, \nabla_d v)$ is the gradient of v, where $\nabla_i v = \partial v/\partial x_i$ denotes the i^{th} derivative of v. $\nabla^2 v = (\nabla^2_{ij} v)_{d\times d}$ denotes the Hessian matrix of v, where $\nabla^2_{ij} v = \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}$.

(b) $\nabla \cdot v = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \nabla_i v_i$ denotes the divergence of v, where $v = (v_1, \cdots, v_d)$ is a vector-valued function.

(c) $\nabla_y v$ indicates the gradient of v with respective to the variable y, while $\Delta_x v$ denotes the Laplace operator with respective to the variable x, where $\Delta := \nabla \cdot \nabla$.

(d) $(\nabla v)^T$ represents the transpose of ∇v, and $e(v) := \frac{1}{2}\big[\nabla v + (\nabla v)^T\big]$.

3. Geometric notation.

(a) $d \geq 2$ is the dimension.

(b) Let $B := B(x, r) = B_r(x)$, and $nB = B(x, nr)$ denote the concentric balls as $n > 0$ varies.

(c) The layer set of Ω is denoted by $O_{n\varepsilon} := \{x \in \Omega : \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) < n\varepsilon\}$. The co-layer set is defined by $\Sigma_{n\varepsilon} := \Omega \setminus O_{n\varepsilon}$.

(d) r_0 represents the diameter of Ω.

(e) Ω_0 is the extended region such that $\Omega_0 \supseteq \bar{\Omega}$ and $\text{dist}(x, \Omega) \sim 10\varepsilon$ for every $x \in \partial\Omega_0$.

(f) $\delta(x) := \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega_0)$ represents the distance function to $\partial\Omega_0$.

(g) Let $\vartheta : \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a Lipschitz function (or $C^{1,\eta}$ function) such that $\vartheta(0) = 0$ and $\|\nabla\vartheta\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})} \leq M_0$ (or $\|\nabla\vartheta\|_{C^{0,\eta}(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})} \leq M_0$). For any $r > 0$, let

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_r &= \big\{(x', \vartheta(x')) \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x'| < r\big\}; \\ D_r &= \big\{(x', t) \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x'| < r \text{ and } \vartheta(x') < t < \vartheta(x') + 10(M_0 + 1)r\big\}. \end{aligned}$$

One may roughly write $D_r = B(0, r) \cap \Omega$, and $\Delta_r = B(0, r) \cap \partial\Omega$.

(h) $D_r^\varepsilon := D_r \cap \varepsilon\omega$ (half-ball with holes); $\Delta_r^\varepsilon := \partial D_r \cap \partial\Omega \cap \varepsilon\omega$ (lower bottom of half-ball).

4. Notation for spaces and functions.

(a) $H^1(\Omega_\varepsilon, \Gamma_\varepsilon; \mathbb{R}^d)$ denotes the closure in $H^1(\Omega_\varepsilon; \mathbb{R}^d)$ of smooth vector-valued functions vanishing on Γ_ε (see [35, pp.3]).

(b) $H^1_{\text{per}}(\omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ denotes the closure in $H^1(Y \cap \omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ of the set of 1-periodic $C^\infty(\bar{\omega}; \mathbb{R}^d)$ functions (see [35, pp.5]).

(c) The average integral is defined as

$$\fint_U f := \frac{1}{|U|} \int_U f(x)dx. \tag{1.25}$$

(d) Let $\psi'_\varepsilon, \psi_\varepsilon \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ be cut-off functions, satisfying

$$\begin{cases} 0 \leq \psi_\varepsilon, \psi'_\varepsilon \leq 1 \quad \text{for} \quad x \in \Omega, \\ \text{supp}(\psi_\varepsilon) \subset \Omega \backslash O_{3\varepsilon}, \quad \text{supp}(\psi'_\varepsilon) \subset \Omega \backslash O_{7\varepsilon}, \\ \psi_\varepsilon = 1 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega \backslash O_{4\varepsilon}, \quad \psi'_\varepsilon = 1 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega \backslash O_{8\varepsilon}, \\ \max\{|\nabla\psi_\varepsilon|, |\nabla\psi'_\varepsilon|\} \leq C\varepsilon^{-1}. \end{cases} \tag{1.26}$$

(By the above definition, it's known that $(1 - \psi_\varepsilon)\psi'_\varepsilon = 0$ in Ω.)

(e) The radial maximal operator is defined as

$$\mathrm{M_r}(\phi)(Q)=\sup_{t\in(0,c_0)}\big|\phi(Q-tn(Q))\big| \qquad \text{for a.e. } Q\in\partial\Omega, \tag{1.27}$$

in which c_0 is a very small number but $c_0\gg\varepsilon$.

(f) The non-tangential maximal function of u is defined by

$$(\phi)^*(Q)=\sup\big\{|\phi(x)|:x\in\Gamma_{N_0}(Q)\big\} \qquad \text{for a.e. } Q\in\partial\Omega, \tag{1.28}$$

where $\Gamma_{N_0}(Q)=\{x\in\Omega:|x-Q|\le N_0\mathrm{dist}(x,\partial\Omega)\}$ is the cone with vertex Q and aperture N_0, and $N_0>1$ depends on the character of Ω.

Finally, we mention that: (1) when we say that the multiplicative constant depends on the character of the domain, it means that the constant relies on M_0; (2) we shall make a little effort to distinguish vector-valued functions or function spaces from their real-valued counterparts, and they will be clear from the context; (3) the Einstein's summation convention for repeated indices is used throughout.

2 Preliminaries

Definition 2.1. *We call u_ε the weak solution to the equation (1.2), if there holds*

$$\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon}A(x/\varepsilon)\nabla u_\varepsilon\nabla\phi dx=\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon}F\phi dx$$

for any $\phi\in H^1(\Omega_\varepsilon,\Gamma_\varepsilon;\mathbb{R}^d)$, and $u_\varepsilon-\tilde{g}\in H^1(\Omega_\varepsilon,\Gamma_\varepsilon;\mathbb{R}^d)$, where $\tilde{g}$ is the H^1-extension function of g, satisfying $\tilde{g}=g$ on $\partial\Omega$ in the sense of the trace.

Lemma 2.2. *Suppose that A satisfies (1.3) and (1.4), then the effective matrix $\widehat{A}=(\widehat{a}_{ij}^{\alpha\beta})$ defined in (1.7) satisfies*

$$\begin{cases}\widehat{a}_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}=\widehat{a}_{ji}^{\beta\alpha}=\widehat{a}_{\alpha j}^{i\beta};\\ \widehat{\mu}_0|\xi|^2\le\widehat{a}_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}\xi_i^\alpha\xi_j^\beta\le\widehat{\mu}_1|\xi|^2\end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

for any symmetric matrix $\xi=\{\xi_i^\alpha\}_{1\le i,\alpha\le d}$, where $\widehat{\mu}_0,\widehat{\mu}_1>0$ depend on μ_0 and μ_1.

Proof. See either [26] or [35]. □

Remark 2.3. *The estimate (2.1) is significant both in qualitative and quantitative homogenization theories, especially for some nonlinear models, and we refer the reader to a recent work [46], as well as [1, 49], for this attention.*

Lemma 2.4 (flux corrector)**.** *Suppose $B=\{b_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}\}_{1\le i,j,\alpha,\beta\le d}$ is 1-periodic and satisfies $b_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}\in L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with*

$$\text{(i)}\quad \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i}b_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}=0, \qquad\qquad \text{(ii)}\quad \int_Y b_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}=0.$$

Then there exists $E=\{E_{kij}^{\alpha\beta}\}_{1\le i,j,k,\alpha,\beta\le d}$ with $E_{kij}^{\alpha\beta}\in H^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, which is 1-periodic and satisfies

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y_k}E_{kij}^{\alpha\beta}=b_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} \quad \text{and} \quad E_{kij}^{\alpha\beta}=-E_{ikj}^{\alpha\beta}.$$

Proof. See [26] and also [28, Lemma 3.1]. □

2.1 Periodic Cancellations

Definition 2.5. *Fix a nonnegative function $\zeta \in C_0^\infty(B(0,1/2))$, and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\zeta(x)dx = 1$. Define the smoothing operator for $f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $1 \le p < \infty$ as*

$$S_\varepsilon(f)(x) := f * \zeta_\varepsilon(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x-y)\zeta_\varepsilon(y)dy,$$

where $\zeta_\varepsilon(y) = \varepsilon^{-d}\zeta(y/\varepsilon)$.

Lemma 2.6. *Let $f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $0 \le s \le 1$. Then, for any $\varpi \in W^{1,\infty}_{\rm per}(Y)$, there holds*

$$\big\|\varpi(\cdot/\varepsilon)f\big\|_{H^{-s}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \le C\varepsilon^{-s}\big\|\varpi\big\|_{W^{1,\infty}(Y)}\big\|f\big\|_{H^{-s}(\mathbb{R}^d)}, \tag{2.2}$$

where the constant C depends only on d.

Proof. The idea relies on complex interpolation inequalities and a duality argument. First of all, we define $T_\varepsilon(f) := \varpi(\cdot/\varepsilon)f$ on $\mathbb{R}^d$. Then it is not hard to derive that

$$\begin{aligned}&\|T_\varepsilon(f)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} \le \|\varphi\|_{L^\infty(Y)}\|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)};\\ &\|T_\varepsilon(f)\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} \le C\varepsilon^{-1}\|\varphi\|_{W^{1,\infty}(Y)}\|f\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)}.\end{aligned}$$

This implies the operator norms: $\|T_\varepsilon\|_{L^2\to L^2} \le M_1$ and $\|T_\varepsilon\|_{H^1\to H^1} \le M_2/\varepsilon$, where $\max\{M_1, M_2\} \lesssim \|\varphi\|_{W^{1,\infty}(Y)}$. By the complex interpolation inequality (see for example [33, Theorem 2.6]), there holds

$$\|T_\varepsilon\|_{H^s\to H^s} \le \varepsilon^{-s}M_1^{1-s}M_2^s \le C\varepsilon^{-s}\|\varpi\|_{W^{1,\infty}(Y)},$$

where we use the fact that $H^s(\mathbb{R}^d) := \big[L^2(\mathbb{R}^d), H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)\big]_s$ (see [33, pp.57]). For any $\zeta \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ one may obtain

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\varphi(\cdot/\varepsilon)f\zeta dx \le \|f\|_{H^{-s}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\|\varphi(\cdot/\varepsilon)\zeta\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)} \le C\varepsilon^{-s}\|\varpi\|_{W^{1,\infty}(Y)}\|f\|_{H^{-s}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\|\zeta\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)},$$

and this gives the stated estimate (2.2). We have completed the proof. □

Lemma 2.7. *Let $f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $1 \le p < \infty$ and $\varpi \in L^p_{\rm per}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then there holds*

$$\big\|\varpi(\cdot/\varepsilon)S_\varepsilon(f)\big\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \le C\big\|\varpi\big\|_{L^p(Y)}\big\|f\big\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}, \tag{2.3}$$

where C depends on d. Moreover, if $f \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for some $1 < p < \infty$, then we have

$$\big\|S_\varepsilon(f) - f\big\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \le C\varepsilon\big\|\nabla f\big\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}, \tag{2.4}$$

where the constant C depends only on d.

Proof. See [38, Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2]. □

Recall the notation δ and $\Sigma_{2\varepsilon}$ defined in Subsection 1.6.

Lemma 2.8. *Let $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ be supported in $\Sigma_{2\varepsilon}$, and $\varpi \in L^2_{\rm per}(Y)$. Then we obtain*

$$\bigg(\int_{\Sigma_{2\varepsilon}}|\varpi(x/\varepsilon)S_\varepsilon(f)|^2\delta^{\pm1}dx\bigg)^{1/2} \le C\|\varpi\|_{L^2(Y)}\bigg(\int_{\Sigma_{2\varepsilon}}|f|^2\delta^{\pm1}dx\bigg)^{1/2}, \tag{2.5}$$

in which the constant C depends only on d.

Proof. See [47, Lemma 3.2]. □

Lemma 2.9. *Let $f \in H^1(\Omega)$ be supported in Σ_ε. Then one may acquire that*

$$\left(\int_{\Sigma_{2\varepsilon}} |f - S_\varepsilon(f)|^2 \delta dx \right)^{1/2} \leq C\varepsilon \left(\int_{\Sigma_\varepsilon} |\nabla f|^2 \delta dx \right)^{1/2}, \tag{2.6}$$

where the constant C depends only on d.

Proof. See [47, Lemma 3.3]. □

2.2 Extension Theories

Our next goal is to extend function in $H^1(\Omega_\varepsilon, \Gamma_\varepsilon; \mathbb{R}^d)$ (see Subsection 1.6) to become functions in Sobolev space $H_0^1(\Omega_0; \mathbb{R}^d)$. Later on, we generalize it with a homogenous weight.

Lemma 2.10 (improved extension property)**.** *Let $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. Suppose that Ω and Ω_0 are bounded Lipschitz domains satisfying $\bar{\Omega} \subset \Omega_0$ and $\operatorname{dist}(x, \Omega) \sim 10\varepsilon$ for $x \in \partial\Omega_0$. Then there exists a linear extension operator $P_\varepsilon : H^1(\Omega_\varepsilon, \Gamma_\varepsilon; \mathbb{R}^d) \to H_0^1(\Omega_0; \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} &\|P_\varepsilon w\|_{H_0^1(\Omega_0)} \leq C_1 \|w\|_{H^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)}; \\ &\|\nabla P_\varepsilon w\|_{L^2(\Omega_0)} \leq C_2 \|\nabla w\|_{L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon)}; \\ &\|e(P_\varepsilon w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_0)} \leq C_3 \|e(w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon)} \end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

hold for some constants C_1, C_2, C_3 depending only on the characters of Ω and ω, where $e(w)$ denotes the symmetric part of ∇w, defined in Subsection 1.6.

Proof. Compared to [35, pp.50, Theorem 4.3], the only modification is the condition "$\operatorname{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) \sim 10\varepsilon$ for $x \in \partial\Omega_0$". We denote the corresponding notation in [35, Theorem 4.3] by $\tilde{P}_\varepsilon$, $\tilde{\Omega}_0$, where $\tilde{\Omega}_0 \supseteq \Omega$ with $\operatorname{dist}(\partial\tilde{\Omega}_0, \Omega) > 1$. To achieve our goal, define

$$P_\varepsilon(w) := \psi_\varepsilon \tilde{P}_\varepsilon(w) \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega_0^{2\varepsilon} := \{x \in \tilde{\Omega}_0 : \operatorname{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) < 2\varepsilon\} \cup \Omega,$$

where $\psi_\varepsilon \in C_0^1(\Omega_0)$ be a cut-off function, satisfying $\psi_\varepsilon = 1$ on Ω, $\psi_\varepsilon = 0$ outside $\Omega_0^{2\varepsilon}$ and $|\nabla\psi_\varepsilon| \lesssim 1/\varepsilon$. Then we have $P_\varepsilon(w) \in H_0^1(\Omega_0)$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla P_\varepsilon(w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_0)} &\lesssim \varepsilon^{-1} \|\tilde{P}_\varepsilon(w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_0^{2\varepsilon} \setminus \Omega)} + \|\nabla \tilde{P}_\varepsilon(w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_0)} \\ &\lesssim \|\nabla \tilde{P}_\varepsilon(w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_0^{2\varepsilon} \setminus \Omega)} + \|\nabla \tilde{P}_\varepsilon(w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_0)} \lesssim \|\nabla w\|_{L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon)}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

where we employ Poincaré's inequality (noting that $w = 0$ on Γ_ε and using the same argument as in Lemma 2.12) in the second step, and [35, Theorem 4.3] in the last one. This proved the second inequality of (2.7). The third one of (2.7) follows from the same approach given for (2.8), in which Poincaré's inequality is replaced by Korn's inequality. We have completed the proof. □

Lemma 2.11. *There exists a constant C, independent of ε, such that*

$$\|w\|_{H^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)} \leq C \|e(w)\|_{L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon)}$$

for any $w \in H^1(\Omega_\varepsilon, \Gamma_\varepsilon; \mathbb{R}^d)$.

Proof. See [35, pp.53, Theorem 4.5]. □

Lemma 2.12. *For $w \in H^1(\Omega_\varepsilon, \Gamma_\varepsilon; \mathbb{R}^d)$, let $\tilde{w}$ be the extension of w in the way of Lemma 2.10. Then there holds*

$$\|\tilde{w}\|_{L^2(O_{4\varepsilon})} \leq C\varepsilon \|\nabla \tilde{w}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \tag{2.9}$$

where C depends on d, r_0 and the characters of Ω and ω.

Proof. See [36, Lemma 3.4]. □

For the ease of the statement, we impose the following notation in this subsection. Let ρ be a weight, and the L^2-weighted norm is defined by $\|\cdot\|_{L^2_\rho(\Omega)} := (\int_\Omega |\cdot|^2 \rho dx)^{1/2}$. Then we denote the homogenous weighted space by $H^1_\rho(\Omega) := \{f \in H^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega) : \|\nabla f\|_{L^2_\rho(\Omega)} < \infty\}$.

Lemma 2.13. *Let $G \subset D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and let each of the sets G, D and $D \setminus \bar{G}$ be a non-empty bounded Lipschitz domain. Suppose that $\partial G \cap D$ is non-empty. Let $\rho \in A_2$. Then for vector-valued functions in $H^1_\rho(D \setminus \bar{G})$ there is a linear extension operator $\Lambda : H^1_\rho(D \setminus \bar{G}) \to H^1_\rho(D)$ such that*

$$\|\nabla \Lambda(w)\|_{L^2_\rho(D)} \lesssim \|\nabla w\|_{L^2_\rho(D\setminus\bar{G})}, \tag{2.10}$$

where the up to constant depends on d and the characters of $D \setminus \bar{G}$ and D.

Proof. The main idea in the proof is paralleled to [35, Lemma 4.1], while we impose some weighted estimates here, and we provide a proof for the reader's convenience. To do so, we construct an auxiliary equation

$$\begin{cases} \nabla \cdot \bar{a} \nabla W = 0 & \text{in } G, \\ n \cdot \bar{a} \nabla W = 0 & \text{on } \partial G \cap \partial D, \\ W = \tilde{w} & \text{on } \partial G \cap D, \end{cases} \tag{2.11}$$

where $\tilde{w}$ is an weighted H^1_ρ-extension of w such that $\tilde{w} = w$ on $D \setminus \bar{G}$ and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla \tilde{w}|^2 \rho dx \lesssim \int_{D\setminus G} |\nabla w|^2 \rho dx, \tag{2.12}$$

in which the up to constant is independent of radius of $D \setminus G$ (see [13, Theorem 1.2]). Then we construct the extension map as

$$\Lambda(w)(x) = \begin{cases} w(x) & \text{if } x \in D \setminus \bar{G}; \\ W(x) & \text{if } x \in \bar{G}. \end{cases} \tag{2.13}$$

It is known that $W \in H^1(G)$, and one may further derive the weighted estimate

$$\int_G |\nabla \Lambda(w)|^2 \rho dx \lesssim \int_G |\nabla \tilde{w}|^2 \rho dx \tag{2.14}$$

for any $\rho \in A_2$. Admitting the estimate (2.14) for a while and this together with the estimate (2.12) gives the desired estimate (2.10). In fact, the estimate (2.14) is included in Theorem 8.2, and we have completed the proof. □

The terminology of "perforated domains of type II" is taken from [35, pp.43-44].

Lemma 2.14 (extension of functions in perforated domains of type II)**.** *Let Ω_ε be a perforated domain of type II. Let $\delta_{\partial\Omega}(x) = \mathrm{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)$ be a distance function and $\rho = \delta^\beta_{\partial\Omega}$ with $-1 < \beta < 1$. Then there exits a linear extension operator $\Lambda_\varepsilon : H^1_\rho(\Omega_\varepsilon) \to H^1_\rho(\Omega)$ such that*

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla \Lambda_\varepsilon(w)|^2 \rho dx \lesssim \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} |\nabla w|^2 \rho dx, \tag{2.15}$$

where the up to constant is independent of ε, β and w.

Proof. The main idea is similar to that in [35, Lemma 4.2]. Let $\Lambda_\varepsilon(w)(x) = \Lambda_1(\tilde{w})(x/\varepsilon)$, where $\tilde{w}(y) = w(\varepsilon y) = w(x)$ and $y \in \Omega/\varepsilon$ and $x \in \Omega$. Let $\tilde{\rho}(y) = \big[\mathrm{dist}(y, \partial\Omega/\varepsilon)\big]^\beta$. Due to the homogeneity of the Euclidean distance, we have $\tilde{\rho}(y) = \varepsilon^{-\beta}\rho(x)$, and therefore there still holds $\tilde{\rho} \in A_2$. Hence, if the holes have no intersection with ∂Q, then it follows from Lemma 2.13 that

$$\int_{Q+z} |\nabla_y \Lambda_1(\tilde{w})(y)|^2 \tilde{\rho}(y) dy \lesssim \int_{(Q+z)\cap\omega} |\nabla_y \tilde{w}(y)|^2 \tilde{\rho}(y) dy,$$

where the up to constant is independent of z. By changing variable $y = x/\varepsilon$, we obtain

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla \Lambda_\varepsilon(w)|^2 \rho(x) dx \lesssim \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} |\nabla w|^2 \rho(x) dx, \tag{2.16}$$

in which we employ the fact that $\tilde{\rho}(y) = \varepsilon^{-\beta}\rho(x)$. This proved the estimate (2.15) in such the case.

Now, we turn to the case that the hole $\bar{Q} \setminus \omega$ has a non-empty intersection with ∂Q. It is known that $\Lambda_1(\tilde{w})$ may not belong to $H^1(\Omega/\varepsilon)$, since its traces on the adjacent faces of the cubes (taking limitation from different sides) may not be equal. However, we can mimic the idea in the proof of [35, Lemma 4.2] to overcome the same difficulty, and we provide a proof for the sake of the completeness. Let $\gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_N$ be these holes which has non-empty intersection with ∂Q, where $l = 0, 1$, and N goes to infinity as $\varepsilon \to 0$. Moreover, for any $m = 1, \cdots, N$, the notation γ^l_m with $l = 0, 1$ represents one of two parts of γ_m, which is divided by ∂Q. It is fine to assume that we first extend the function from γ^1_m parts to the related boundary $\gamma^1_m \cap \partial Q$, and then setting $\gamma_0 = \cup_{m=1}^N \gamma^0_m$ one may extend the function from the region $\Omega' := (\Omega/\varepsilon) \setminus \gamma_0$ to the whole domain Ω/ε. Although N tends to infinity as ε goes to zero, the family of γ^0_m comes from the shifts of a finite number of bounded Lipschiz domains. So, the up to constant in the later computations is independent of N.

According to the previous step and the result of Lemma 2.13, one may construct the extension function of $\Lambda_1(\tilde{w})(y)$ such that $\Lambda_1(\tilde{w})$ belongs to $H^1(\Omega')$, and

$$\int_{\Omega'} |\nabla_y \Lambda_1(\tilde{w})(y)|^2 \tilde{\rho}(y) dy \lesssim \int_{U\cap\omega} |\nabla_y \tilde{w}(y)|^2 \tilde{\rho}(y) dy, \tag{2.17}$$

where we use the notation $\bar{U} := \cup_{z\in T_\varepsilon}(z + \bar{Q})$, and T_ε is the subset of $\mathbb{Z}^n$ consisting of all z such that $\varepsilon(z + Q) \subset \Omega$ and $\mathrm{dist}(\varepsilon(z + Q), \partial\Omega) \geq \varepsilon$. Then for some $m = 1, \cdots, N$, we may choose the neighbourhood of γ^0_m, denoted by $\tilde{\gamma}^0_m$, such that $\tilde{\gamma}^0_m \supset \gamma^0_m$, and it follows from Lemma 2.13 that

$$\int_{\gamma^0_m} |\nabla_y \Lambda\Lambda_1(\tilde{w})(y)|^2 \tilde{\rho}(y) dy \lesssim \int_{\tilde{\gamma}^0_m \setminus \gamma^0_m} |\nabla_y \Lambda_1(\tilde{w})(y)|^2 \tilde{\rho}(y) dy.$$

On account of the periodicity, the above estimate implies

$$\int_{\gamma_0} |\nabla_y \Lambda\Lambda_1(\tilde{w})(y)|^2 \tilde{\rho}(y) dy \lesssim \int_{\Omega'} |\nabla_y \Lambda_1(\tilde{w})(y)|^2 \tilde{\rho}(y) dy$$

and this together with (2.17) and $\Lambda\Lambda_1(\tilde{w}) = \Lambda_1(\tilde{w})$ on Ω' gives

$$\int_{\Omega/\varepsilon} |\nabla_y \Lambda\Lambda_1(\tilde{w})(y)|^2 \tilde{\rho}(y)dy \lesssim \int_{U\cap\omega} |\nabla_y \tilde{w}(y)|^2 \tilde{\rho}(y)dy.$$

In such the case, set $\Lambda_\varepsilon(w)(x) := \Lambda\Lambda_1(\tilde{w})(x/\varepsilon)$ and this completes the whole argument. □

The proof of Theorem 1.3. The main idea comes from [35, Theorem 4.3], and we still take the notation imposed in Lemmas 2.13 and 2.14. For any $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $\varepsilon(z + Q \cap \omega) \cap \Omega \neq \emptyset$, collect such z to be the index set T_ε. Then recalling the interior of $\cup_{z\in T_\varepsilon}(z + \bar{Q})$ written by U, we denote the interior of $\cup_{z\in T_\varepsilon}\varepsilon(z + \overline{Q \cap \omega})$ by U_ε. For any $w \in H^1(\Omega_\varepsilon, \Gamma_\varepsilon; \mathbb{R}^d)$, we impose the following zero-extension:

$$\bar{w}(x) = \begin{cases} w(x), & x \in \Omega_\varepsilon; \\ 0, & x \in U_\varepsilon \setminus \Omega; \\ 0, & x \in \Omega_0 \setminus (\varepsilon U), \end{cases}$$

and $\bar{w} \in H^1(U_\varepsilon; \mathbb{R}^d)$. Hence, the problem has been reduced to the perforated domain of type II, and $\bar{w}$ may be further extended to the whole region Ω_0 via Lemma 2.14, denoted by $\Lambda_\varepsilon(\bar{w})$. Setting $\bar{\Lambda}_\varepsilon(w) := \Lambda_\varepsilon(\bar{w})$, it is clear to see $\bar{\Lambda}_\varepsilon(w) = 0$ on $\partial\Omega_0$. Moreover, we have

$$\int_{\Omega_0} |\nabla \bar{\Lambda}_\varepsilon(w)|^2 \delta^\beta dx \lesssim^{(2.15)} \int_{U_\varepsilon} |\nabla \bar{w}|^2 \delta^\beta dx \lesssim \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} |\nabla w|^2 \delta^\beta dx.$$

This yields the desired estimate (1.14). Abusing notation to rewrite $\bar{\Lambda}_\varepsilon$ as Λ_ε, we have completed the whole proof. □

3 Convergence Rates in H^1-norm

Lemma 3.1 (weak formulation)**.** *Assume the same conditions as in Theorem 1.2. Let w_ε be given in (1.11), and $E = (E_{kij})$ be the flux corrector defined in Lemma 2.4, and θ defined in (1.7). Then, for any $\phi \in H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} A(x/\varepsilon)\nabla w_\varepsilon \nabla\phi dx = &\int_\Omega (l_\varepsilon^+ - \theta) F\phi dx \\ &+ \int_\Omega (\theta\widehat{A} - l_\varepsilon^+ A^\varepsilon)(\nabla u_0 - \varphi)\nabla\phi dx - \varepsilon \int_\Omega \varpi(x/\varepsilon)\nabla\varphi\nabla\phi dx, \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

where the notation $\varpi := E + l^+ A\tilde{\chi}$ belongs to $L^2_{\mathrm{per}}(Y)$, and $\tilde{\chi}$ is an extension of χ satisfying $\tilde{\chi} = \chi$ in ω and $\tilde{\chi} = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^d\setminus\omega$.

Proof. In terms the definition of the weak solution to (1.2) and (1.6), respectively, there hold

$$\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} A(x/\varepsilon)\nabla u_\varepsilon \nabla\phi dx = \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} F\phi dx = \int_\Omega l_\varepsilon^+ F\phi dx \tag{3.2}$$

(see Definition 2.1) and

$$\int_\Omega \widehat{A}\nabla u_0 \nabla\phi dx = \int_\Omega F\phi dx \tag{3.3}$$

for any $\phi \in H_0^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^d)$, where we mention that $\phi \in H^1(\Omega_\varepsilon,\Gamma_\varepsilon;\mathbb{R}^d)$ in (3.2). Recalling $w_\varepsilon = u_\varepsilon - v_\varepsilon$ with $v_\varepsilon = u_0 + \varepsilon\chi_\varepsilon\varphi$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} A_\varepsilon \nabla w_\varepsilon \nabla\phi dx \\
&= \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} A_\varepsilon \nabla u_\varepsilon \nabla\phi dx - \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} A_\varepsilon \nabla v_\varepsilon \nabla\phi dx \\
&= \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} A_\varepsilon \nabla u_\varepsilon \nabla\phi dx - \int_{\Omega} \theta\widehat{A}\nabla u_0 \nabla\phi dx + \int_{\Omega} \theta\widehat{A}\nabla u_0 \nabla\phi dx - \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} A_\varepsilon \nabla v_\varepsilon \nabla\phi dx \\
&=^{(3.2),(3.3)} \int_{\Omega} l_\varepsilon^+ F\phi dx - \int_{\Omega} \theta F\phi dx + \int_{\Omega} \theta\widehat{A}\nabla u_0\nabla\phi dx - \int_{\Omega} \theta\widehat{A}\varphi\nabla\phi dx + \int_{\Omega} \theta\widehat{A}\varphi\nabla\phi dx \\
&\quad - \int_{\Omega} l_\varepsilon^+ A_\varepsilon \nabla u_0\nabla\phi dx - \int_{\Omega} l_\varepsilon^+ A_\varepsilon \nabla\tilde{\chi}_\varepsilon\varphi\nabla\phi dx - \varepsilon\int_{\Omega} l_\varepsilon^+ A_\varepsilon\tilde{\chi}_\varepsilon\nabla\varphi\nabla\phi dx
\end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

By a routine calculation, the right-hand side of (3.4) is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\Omega}(l_\varepsilon^+ - \theta)F\phi dx + \int_{\Omega}(\theta\widehat{A} - l_\varepsilon^+ A^\varepsilon)(\nabla u_0 - \varphi)\nabla\phi dx \\
&\qquad + \underbrace{\int_{\Omega}(\theta\widehat{A} - l_\varepsilon^+ A^\varepsilon - l_\varepsilon^+ A^\varepsilon\nabla\tilde{\chi}_\varepsilon)\varphi\nabla\phi dx}_{T} - \varepsilon\int_{\Omega} l_\varepsilon^+ A^\varepsilon\tilde{\chi}_\varepsilon\nabla\varphi\nabla\phi dx,
\end{aligned}$$

and so the remainder of the proof is to handle the term T. Let $b(y) = \theta\widehat{A} - l^+A(y) - l^+A(y)\nabla\tilde{\chi}$. On account of the antisymmetry property of flux corrector in Lemma 2.4, one may derive that

$$\begin{aligned}
T = \int_{\Omega} b(x/\varepsilon)\varphi\nabla\phi dx &= \varepsilon\int_{\Omega}\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}\{E_{kij}(x/\varepsilon)\}\varphi_j\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial x_i}dx \\
&= \underbrace{\varepsilon\int_{\Omega}\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}\{E_{kij}(x/\varepsilon)\varphi_j\}\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial x_i}dx}_{=0} - \varepsilon\int_{\Omega} E_{kij}(x/\varepsilon)\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}\{\varphi_j\}\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial x_i}dx.
\end{aligned}$$

and then set $\varpi := E + l^+A\tilde{\chi}$ on Y. This completes the proof. □

Lemma 3.2. *Assume the same conditions as in Theorem 1.2. Let w_ε be given in (1.11) and the periodic tensor ϖ be defined in Lemma 3.1. Then there holds*

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla w_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon)} &\lesssim \varepsilon^{1-s}\|F\|_{H^{1-s}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \\
&\quad + \left\{\varepsilon\Big(\|F\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\varpi(\cdot/\varepsilon)\nabla\varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\Big) + \|\nabla u_0 - \varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2(O_{2\varepsilon})}\right\},
\end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

where the up to constant depends on μ_0, μ_1, d, ω and Ω.

Proof. Firstly, we note that $w_\varepsilon \in H^1(\Omega_\varepsilon,\Gamma_\varepsilon;\mathbb{R}^d)$. By the extension results stated in Lemma 2.10, one may extend w_ε from $H^1(\Omega_\varepsilon,\Gamma_\varepsilon;\mathbb{R}^d)$ to $H_0^1(\Omega_0;\mathbb{R}^d)$, denoted by $\tilde{w}_\varepsilon$. Then we take w_ε and $\psi_\varepsilon'\tilde{w}_\varepsilon$ as the test function in (3.2) and (3.3), respectively, in which the cut-off function ψ_ε' is defined in (1.26).

By a similar calculation as we did in Lemma 3.1, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} A(x/\varepsilon)\nabla w_\varepsilon \nabla w_\varepsilon dx &= \int_\Omega (l_\varepsilon^+ - \theta\psi_\varepsilon')F\tilde{w}_\varepsilon dx \\ &\quad - \theta\int_\Omega \widehat{A}\nabla u_0 \nabla[(1-\psi_\varepsilon')\tilde{w}_\varepsilon]dx \\ &\quad + \int_\Omega [\theta\widehat{A} - l_\varepsilon^+ A(x/\varepsilon)][\nabla u_0 - \varphi]\nabla\tilde{w}_\varepsilon dx \\ &\quad - \varepsilon\int_\Omega \varpi(x/\varepsilon)\nabla\varphi\nabla\tilde{w}_\varepsilon dx =: I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4,\end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

recalling $\varpi = E + l^+ A\tilde{\chi}$ defined in Lemma 3.1.

We will compute each I_i for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. The arguments developed for the first term I_1 seem to be new while the techniques used in the remainder terms are similar to those shown in the case of unperforated domains. We first handle the term I_1, and

$$I_1 = \int_\Omega (l_\varepsilon^+ - \theta)F\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\psi_\varepsilon' dx + \int_\Omega (1-\psi_\varepsilon')l_\varepsilon^+ F\tilde{w}_\varepsilon dx := I_{11} + I_{12}.$$

Since $\mathrm{supp}(1-\psi_\varepsilon') \subseteq O_{8\varepsilon}$, we have

$$|I_{12}| \le \int_{O_{8\varepsilon}} |F\tilde{w}_\varepsilon| dx \le \|F\|_{L^2(O_{8\varepsilon})}\|\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\|_{L^8(O_{8\varepsilon})} \lesssim^{(2.9)} C\varepsilon\|F\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\nabla\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

To deal with the first term I_{11}, we consider the auxiliary equation:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta\Psi(y) = l^+(y) - \theta \ \text{ in } Y, \\ \fint_Y \Psi dy = 0, \ \Psi \in H^1_{\mathrm{per}}(Y). \end{cases} \tag{3.7}$$

On account of $\int_Y (l^+(y)-\theta)dy = 0$, it is known that (3.7) owns an unique solution $\Psi \in H^1_{\mathrm{per}}(Y)$. By interior Schauder's estimates we obtain $\|\nabla\Psi\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(Y)} \lesssim 1$. This gives

$$\begin{aligned}|I_{11}| &= \Big| -\varepsilon^2\int_\Omega \Delta_x\Psi(x/\varepsilon)F\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\psi_\varepsilon' dx\Big| = \varepsilon\Big|\int_\Omega \nabla_y\Psi(y)\cdot\nabla(F\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\psi_\varepsilon')dx\Big| \\ &\le \varepsilon\underbrace{\Big|\int_\Omega \nabla_y\Psi(y)\cdot\nabla F\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\psi_\varepsilon' dx\Big|}_{I_{11a}} + \varepsilon\underbrace{\Big|\int_\Omega \nabla_y\Psi(y)\cdot\nabla(\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\psi_\varepsilon')F dx\Big|}_{I_{11b}},\end{aligned}$$

in which $y = x/\varepsilon$. The easier term is

$$I_{11b} \lesssim \|F\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\Big\{\|\nabla\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \varepsilon^{-1}\|\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(O_{8\varepsilon})}\Big\} \lesssim^{(2.9)} \|F\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\nabla\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)},$$

while we proceed to address the term I_{11a}, and

$$\begin{aligned}I_{11a} &\le \|\nabla\Psi(\cdot/\varepsilon)\cdot\nabla F\|_{H^{-s}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\|\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\psi_\varepsilon'\|_{H_0^s(\Omega)} \\ &\lesssim^{(2.2)} \varepsilon^{-s}\|\nabla F\|_{H^{-s}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\|\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\psi_\varepsilon'\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon^{-s}\|F\|_{H^{1-s}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\Big\{\|\nabla\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \varepsilon^{-1}\|\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(O_{8\varepsilon})}\Big\} \\ &\lesssim^{(2.9)} \varepsilon^{-s}\|F\|_{H^{1-s}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\|\nabla\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)},\end{aligned}$$

where we also employ [23, Proposition 2.2] in the second step, as well as, Poincaré's inequality in the last one. (In the third step, we use that $\|\nabla F\|_{H^{-s}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq \|F\|_{H^{1-s}(\mathbb{R}^d)}$, and it may be observed from Plancherel's identity coupled with Fourier transform, while the definition of $H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $s \in \mathbb{R}$ via Fourier transform is equivalent to that given by Gagliardo norm (see for example [23, Proposition 3.4])). Plugging the terms I_{11a}, I_{11b} back into I_{11} and then combining I_{12} leads to

$$I_1 \lesssim \varepsilon^{1-s}\|F\|_{H^{1-s}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\|\nabla \tilde{w}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \varepsilon\|F\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\nabla \tilde{w}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}. \tag{3.8}$$

By the upper boundedness of $\widehat{A}$ in Lemma 2.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |I_2| &\lesssim \int_\Omega |\nabla u_0|\big|\nabla\big((1-\psi_\varepsilon')\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\big)\big|dx \lesssim^{(2.9)} \|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2(O_{2\varepsilon})}\|\nabla \tilde{w}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)};\\ |I_3| &\lesssim \big\|\nabla u_0 - \varphi\big\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\nabla \tilde{w}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)};\\ |I_4| &\lesssim \varepsilon\big\|\varpi(\cdot/\varepsilon)\nabla\varphi\big\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\nabla \tilde{w}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

where we merely use Hölder's inequality.

Inserting the estimates (3.8), (3.9) into (3.6), the desired estimate (3.5) finally follows from the elasticity (1.4) and the estimate (2.7). We have completed the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2. We first address the estimate (1.12), and thanks to Lemma 3.2 it is reduced to handle the right-hand side of (3.5). Recalling the notation $\varpi = E + l^+A\tilde{\chi}$ imposed in Lemma 3.1, as well as, the cut-off function ψ_ε satisfying (1.26), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varpi(\cdot/\varepsilon)\nabla S_\varepsilon(\psi_\varepsilon\nabla u_0)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\lesssim^{(2.3)} \|\nabla(\psi_\varepsilon\nabla u_0)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}\\ &\lesssim \|\nabla^2 u_0\|_{L^2(\Omega\setminus O_{3\varepsilon})} + \varepsilon^{-1}\|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2(O_{4\varepsilon})}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla u_0 - \varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\lesssim \|\psi_\varepsilon\nabla u_0 - S_\varepsilon(\psi_\varepsilon\nabla u_0)\|_{L_2(\Omega)} + \|(1-\psi_\varepsilon)\nabla u_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)}\\ &\lesssim^{(2.4)} \varepsilon\|\nabla(\psi_\varepsilon\nabla u_0)\|_{L_2(\Omega)} + \|(1-\psi_\varepsilon)\nabla u_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)}\\ &\lesssim \varepsilon\|\nabla^2 u_0\|_{L^2(\Omega\setminus O_{3\varepsilon})} + \|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2(O_{4\varepsilon})}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

Thus, plugging the estimates (3.10) and (3.11) back into (3.5) leads to

$$\|\nabla w_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon)} \lesssim \varepsilon^{1-s}\|F\|_{H^{1-s}(\mathbb{R}^d)} + \Big\{\|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2(O_{4\varepsilon})} + \varepsilon\|\nabla^2 u_0\|_{L^2(\Omega\setminus O_{3\varepsilon})} + \varepsilon\|F\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\Big\}, \tag{3.12}$$

and this coupled with estimates (8.21), (8.22) gives the desired estimate (1.12).

Then we proceed to show the estimate (1.13). To do so, setting $\tilde{w}_\varepsilon = P_\varepsilon(w_\varepsilon)$, it follows from the estimate (2.7) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla w_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon)} \gtrsim \|\nabla \tilde{w}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_0)} &\geq \|\nabla \tilde{w}_\varepsilon\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d+1}}(\Omega_0)}\\ &\gtrsim \|\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-1}}(\Omega_0)} \geq \|\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-1}}(\Omega_\varepsilon)} = \|w_\varepsilon\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-1}}(\Omega_\varepsilon)}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second line is due to Sobolev's inequality. This implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_\varepsilon - u_0\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-1}}(\Omega_\varepsilon)} &\leq \|\nabla w_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon)} + \varepsilon\|\chi_\varepsilon S_\varepsilon(\psi_\varepsilon\nabla u_0)\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-1}}(\Omega_\varepsilon)}\\ &\lesssim^{(3.12),(2.3)} \Big\{\|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2(O_{4\varepsilon})} + \varepsilon\|\nabla^2 u_0\|_{L^2(\Omega\setminus O_{3\varepsilon})} + \varepsilon\|\nabla u_0\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-1}}(\Omega)}\Big\}\\ &\lesssim \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}\|g\|_{H^1(\partial\Omega)}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Theorem 8.3 and this completes the whole proof. □

Corollary 3.3. *Assume the same conditions as in Theorem 1.2. Let $\tilde{w}_\varepsilon$ be the extension of w_ε in the way of Lemma 2.10, and $\|F\|_{H^{1-s}(\mathbb{R}^d)} + \|g\|_{H^1(\partial\Omega)} = 1$ with $0 \le s \le 1$. Then there holds*

$$\|\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim \max\{\varepsilon^{1-s}, \varepsilon^{1/2}\}, \tag{3.13}$$

where the up to constant is independent of s and ε.

Proof. The estimate (3.13) directly follows from the extension result (2.7) and the estimate (1.12), and we complete the proof. □

4 Convergence Rates in H^{-s}-norm

In this section, we manage to calculate some sharp error estimates by a duality argument, and then appealing to interpolation techniques one may accelerate the convergence rates derived from energy estimates. This method is insensitive to the smoothness assumption on domains. The adjoint operator of $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon$ is written by $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon^* := -\nabla\cdot A^*(\cdot/\varepsilon)\nabla$, and there holds $A^* = A$ according to (1.4). In order to show the duality argument (independent of the symmetry condition), we still keep the notation $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon^*$ in the proof. For any $\Phi \in H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $(1/2) \le \sigma \le 1$, we have the adjoint problem:

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon^*(\phi_\varepsilon) = \Phi & \text{in } \Omega_\varepsilon, \\ \sigma_\varepsilon^*(\phi_\varepsilon) = 0 & \text{on } S_\varepsilon, \\ \phi_\varepsilon = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_\varepsilon, \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

where $\sigma_\varepsilon^* := n\cdot A^*(\cdot/\varepsilon)\nabla$ is the related conormal derivative operator. The corresponding homogenized equation is given by

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_0^*\phi_0 \equiv -\nabla\cdot\widehat{A^*}\nabla\phi_0 = \Phi & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \phi_0 = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{4.2}$$

where the matrix $\widehat{A^*}$ is defined by

$$\widehat{a^*}_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} = \fint_{Y\cap\omega} a_{ik}^{*\alpha\gamma}(y)\frac{\partial \mathbb{X}_j^{*\gamma\beta}}{\partial y_k}dy,$$

in which $\mathbb{X}_j^{*\beta} = \{\mathbb{X}_j^{*\gamma\beta}\}_{1\le\gamma\le d}$ is the weak solution to the following cell problem

$$\begin{cases} \nabla\cdot A^*\nabla\mathbb{X}_j^{*\beta} = 0 & \text{in } Y\cap\omega, \\ \vec{n}\cdot A^*\nabla\mathbb{X}_j^{*\beta} = 0 & \text{on } Y\cap\partial\omega, \\ \mathbb{X}_j^{*\beta} - y_j e^\beta := \chi_j^{*\beta} \in H^1_{\text{per}}(\omega;\mathbb{R}^d), & \fint_{Y\cap\omega}\chi_j^{*\beta}dy = 0. \end{cases} \tag{4.3}$$

Let $z_\varepsilon = \phi_\varepsilon - \phi_0 - \varepsilon\chi^*(x/\varepsilon)\varphi^*$ be the related first order approximating corrector with $\varphi^* = S_\varepsilon(\psi_\varepsilon\nabla\phi_0)$, and it follows from the estimate (1.12) that

$$\|\nabla z_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon)} \lesssim \varepsilon^{1/2}\|\Phi\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^d)}. \tag{4.4}$$

Later on, we will employ the equality $\phi_\varepsilon = z_\varepsilon + \phi_0 + \varepsilon\chi^*(x/\varepsilon)\varphi^*$ to show

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} w_\varepsilon\Phi dx &= \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} A_{ij}(x/\varepsilon)\nabla_{x_j}w_\varepsilon\nabla_{x_i}\phi_\varepsilon dx \\ &= \underbrace{\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} A(x/\varepsilon)\nabla w_\varepsilon\nabla[\phi_0 + \varepsilon\chi_\varepsilon^*\varphi^*]dx}_{R_1} + \underbrace{\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} A(x/\varepsilon)\nabla w_\varepsilon\nabla z_\varepsilon dx}_{R_2}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

where $w_\varepsilon = u_\varepsilon - u_0 - \varepsilon\chi_\varepsilon\varphi$ with $\varphi = S_\varepsilon(\psi_\varepsilon\nabla u_0)$ is defined in (1.11). This together with (1.24) leads to

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\theta\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\Phi dx &= \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon}A(x/\varepsilon)\nabla w_\varepsilon\nabla[\phi_0+\varepsilon\chi_\varepsilon^*\varphi^*]dx+\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon}A(x/\varepsilon)\nabla w_\varepsilon\nabla z_\varepsilon dx\\ &\quad+\int_{\Omega}(\theta-l_\varepsilon^+)\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\Phi dx+\int_{\Omega_0\setminus\Omega}\theta\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\Phi dx\\ &:= R_1+R_2+R_3+R_4.\end{aligned}\tag{4.6}$$

Obviously, obtaining the quantity $\|\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\|_{H^{-\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^d)}$ may be reduced to estimate the right-hand side of (4.6), and we state the main result of this section as follows.

Theorem 4.1 (duality argument I)**.** *Let $\Omega\subset\mathbb{R}^d$ be a Lipschitz domain. Suppose that $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon$ and ω satisfy the hypothesises* (H1) *and* (H2)*. The given data $F\in H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $g\in H^1(\partial\Omega;\mathbb{R}^d)$ are assumed to meet the condition*

$$\Big(\int_\Omega|\nabla F|^2\delta^2dx\Big)^{1/2}+\|F\|_{L^2(\Omega)}+\|g\|_{H^1(\partial\Omega)}=1.$$

Let w_ε be given in (1.11), and $\tilde{w}_\varepsilon$ be the extension of w_ε in the way of Lemma 2.10. Then, for any $\Phi\in H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $(1/2)\le\sigma\le 1$ and $\|\Phi\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^d)}=1$, there hold the weak formulation (4.6) and the following estimate

$$\Big|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\theta\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\Phi dx\Big|\lesssim\varepsilon\ln(1/\varepsilon),\tag{4.7}$$

where the up to constant depends on μ_0,μ_1,d and the characters of Ω and ω.

Remark 4.2. *If $\Omega\subset\mathbb{R}^d$ is a $C^{1,1}$ domain, then there holds the sharp error estimate $\big|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\theta\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\Phi dx\big|\lesssim\varepsilon$, provided the boundary data $g\in H^{3/2}(\partial\Omega;\mathbb{R}^d)$.*

Corollary 4.3. *Assume the same conditions as in Theorem 4.1, and fix $\sigma=1/2$ therein. Let w_ε be given in (1.11), and $\tilde{w}_\varepsilon$ be the corresponding extension. Then we have the following results.*

1. *Convergence rates in $H^{-1/2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, i.e.,*

$$\|\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\|_{H^{-1/2}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\lesssim\varepsilon\ln(1/\varepsilon).\tag{4.8}$$

2. *Convergence rates in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, i.e.,*

$$\|\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}\lesssim\varepsilon^{\frac{5}{6}}\ln^{\frac{2}{3}}(1/\varepsilon).\tag{4.9}$$

Here the up to constant is independent of ε.

Proof. The estimate (4.8) follows from (4.7) immediately by noting the arbitrariness of Φ, and the up to constant additionally depends on the constant θ. To show the estimate (4.9), we seek for an interpolation's inequality argument (see [8, Proposition 1.52]). Thus, there holds

$$\|\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}\le\|\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\|^{\frac{2}{3}}_{H^{-1/2}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\|\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\|^{\frac{1}{3}}_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)}\lesssim\varepsilon^{\frac{5}{6}}\ln^{\frac{2}{3}}(1/\varepsilon),$$

where we employ the estimates (3.13) and (4.8) in the last inequality, and this ends the proof. □

To handle R_1 in the right-hand side of (4.6), we have the following result.

Lemma 4.4. *Given $F, \Phi \in L^2(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $g \in H^1(\partial\Omega;\mathbb{R}^d)$, let w_ε be given in (1.11), and the weak solution ϕ_0 be associated with Φ by (4.2). Assume χ_ε^* is the corrector satisfying the equation (4.3) and $\varphi^* = S_\varepsilon(\psi_\varepsilon' \nabla\phi_0)$, where ψ_ε' is cut-off function given in (1.26). Then one may have*

$$\begin{aligned}\Big| \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} A(x/\varepsilon)\nabla w_\varepsilon \nabla\big(\phi_0 + \varepsilon\chi_\varepsilon^*\varphi^*\big)dx\Big| \\ \lesssim \varepsilon\ln(1/\varepsilon)\|\Phi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\bigg\{\Big(\int_\Omega |\nabla F|^2\delta^2 dx + \|F\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|g\|_{H^1(\partial\Omega)}\bigg\},\end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

where the up to constant is independent of ε.

Proof. The main idea of the proof is inspired by [47], while we provide a proof for the sake of the completeness. Observing that $\phi := \phi_0 + \varepsilon\chi_\varepsilon^*\varphi^* \in H_0^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^d)$, one may treat it as a whole in computations at first, and then handle each term of ϕ. So, the proof is divided into two parts.

Part 1. The main job is to establish the following estimate

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} A(x/\varepsilon)\nabla w_\varepsilon\nabla\phi dx \lesssim \varepsilon^{1/2}\big\|\mathrm{M_r}(\nabla u_0)\big\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}\|\nabla\phi\|_{L^2(O_{4\varepsilon})} \\ &+\varepsilon\bigg\{\Big(\int_\Omega |\nabla F|^2\delta^2 dx\Big)^{\frac12} + \Big(\int_\Omega |F|^2 dx\Big)^{\frac12}\bigg\}\Big(\int_\Omega |\nabla\phi|^2 dx\Big)^{\frac12} \\ &+\varepsilon\bigg\{\|\mathrm{M_r}(\nabla u_0)\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \Big(\int_{\Omega\setminus O_{3\varepsilon}} |\nabla^2 u_0|^2\delta dx\Big)^{\frac12}\bigg\}\Big(\int_{\Omega\setminus O_{3\varepsilon}} |\nabla\phi|^2\delta^{-1}dx\Big)^{\frac12},\end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

where the notation $\mathrm{M_r}$ is referred to as the radial maximal operator, defined in (1.27). First of all, in view of Lemma 3.1 and the same trick employed to deal with I_1 in (3.6), we start from

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} A(x/\varepsilon)\nabla w_\varepsilon\nabla\phi dx \\ =&^{(3.1)} \int_\Omega (l_\varepsilon^+ - \theta)F\phi dx + \int_\Omega (\theta\widehat{A} - l_\varepsilon^+ A^\varepsilon)(\nabla u_0 - \varphi)\nabla\phi dx - \varepsilon\int_\Omega \varpi(x/\varepsilon)\nabla\varphi\nabla\phi dx \\ =&^{(3.7)} \varepsilon\int_\Omega \nabla_y\Psi(y)\cdot\big(\nabla F\phi + \nabla\phi F\big)dx \\ &+\int_\Omega (\theta\widehat{A} - l_\varepsilon^+ A^\varepsilon)(\nabla u_0 - \varphi)\nabla\phi dx - \varepsilon\int_\Omega \varpi(x/\varepsilon)\nabla\varphi\nabla\phi dx := J_1 + J_2 + J_3,\end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

where $y = x/\varepsilon$, and we remark that $\|\nabla\Psi\|_{L^\infty(Y)} \lesssim 1$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}|\varepsilon^{-1}J_1| &\lesssim \Big(\int_\Omega |\nabla F|^2\delta^2 dx\Big)^{1/2}\Big(\int_\Omega |\phi|^2\delta^{-2}dx\Big)^{1/2} + \Big(\int_\Omega |F|^2 dx\Big)^{1/2}\Big(\int_\Omega |\nabla\phi|^2 dx\Big)^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim \bigg\{\Big(\int_\Omega |\nabla F|^2\delta^2 dx\Big)^{1/2} + \Big(\int_\Omega |F|^2 dx\Big)^{1/2}\bigg\}\Big(\int_\Omega |\nabla\phi|^2 dx\Big)^{1/2},\end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

where the second line follows from Hardy's inequality (see for example [9, Proposition III.2.40]).

In order to handle the terms J_2 and J_3, we appeal to the radial maximal function (see (1.27)),

again. Now, we proceed to study the term J_2, and

$$\begin{aligned}|J_2| &\lesssim \int_{O_{4\varepsilon}} |\nabla u_\varepsilon||\nabla\phi|dx + \int_{\Omega\setminus O_{3\varepsilon}} |\psi_\varepsilon\nabla u_0 - S_\varepsilon(\psi_\varepsilon\nabla u_0)||\nabla\phi|dx\\ &\lesssim \|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2(O_{4\varepsilon})}\|\nabla\phi\|_{L^2(O_{4\varepsilon})} + \Big(\int_{\Omega\setminus O_{3\varepsilon}} |\psi_\varepsilon\nabla u_0 - S_\varepsilon(\psi_\varepsilon\nabla u_0)|^2\delta dx\Big)^{\frac12}\Big(\int_{\Omega\setminus O_{3\varepsilon}} |\nabla\phi|^2\delta^{-1}dx\Big)^{\frac12}\\ &\lesssim^{(2.6)} \|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2(O_{4\varepsilon})}\|\nabla\phi\|_{L^2(O_{4\varepsilon})} + \varepsilon\Big(\int_{\Omega\setminus O_{2\varepsilon}} |\nabla(\psi_\varepsilon\nabla u_0)|^2\delta dx\Big)^{\frac12}\Big(\int_{\Omega\setminus O_{3\varepsilon}} |\nabla\phi|^2\delta^{-1}dx\Big)^{\frac12}.\end{aligned}$$

By the co-area formula [20, Theorem 3.13] coupled with the definition of the radial maximal operator, the right-hand side above is controlled by

$$\begin{aligned}&\varepsilon^{1/2}\|\mathrm{M_r}(\nabla u_0)\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}\|\nabla\phi\|_{L^2(O_{4\varepsilon})}\\ &\qquad + \varepsilon\Big\{\|\mathrm{M_r}(\nabla u_0)\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \Big(\int_{\Omega\setminus O_{3\varepsilon}} |\nabla^2 u_0|^2\delta dx\Big)^{1/2}\Big\}\Big(\int_{\Omega\setminus O_{3\varepsilon}} |\nabla\phi|^2\delta^{-1}dx\Big)^{\frac12}\end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

(up to an universal constant). Finally, since $\mathrm{supp}(\varphi)\subseteq\Omega\setminus O_{2\varepsilon}$ according to (1.26), we acquire

$$\begin{aligned}|J_3| &\le \varepsilon\Big(\int_{\Omega\setminus O_{2\varepsilon}} |\varpi(x/\varepsilon)\nabla S_\varepsilon(\psi_\varepsilon\nabla u_0)|^2\delta dx\Big)^{1/2}\Big(\int_{\Omega\setminus O_{2\varepsilon}} |\nabla\varphi|^2\delta^{-1}dx\Big)^{1/2}\\ &\lesssim^{(2.5)} \varepsilon\Big(\int_{\Omega\setminus O_{2\varepsilon}} |\nabla(\psi_\varepsilon\nabla u_0)|^2\delta dx\Big)^{1/2}\Big(\int_{\Omega\setminus O_{2\varepsilon}} |\nabla\varphi|^2\delta^{-1}dx\Big)^{1/2}.\end{aligned}$$

By the same token, the right-hand side of the above estimate is dominated by the second line of (4.14). Thus, one may conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}&|J_2| + |J_3|\\ &\quad\lesssim \varepsilon^{1/2}\|\mathrm{M_r}(\nabla u_0)\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}\|\nabla\phi\|_{L^2(O_{4\varepsilon})}\\ &\qquad + \varepsilon\Big\{\|\mathrm{M_r}(\nabla u_0)\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \Big(\int_{\Omega\setminus O_{3\varepsilon}} |\nabla^2 u_0|^2\delta dx\Big)^{1/2}\Big\}\Big(\int_{\Omega\setminus O_{3\varepsilon}} |\nabla\phi|^2\delta^{-1}dx\Big)^{\frac12},\end{aligned}$$

and this together with (4.13) and (4.12) yields the desired estimate (4.11).

Part 2. Recalling $\phi = \phi_0 + \varepsilon\chi^*_\varepsilon\varphi^*$, and $\varphi^* = S_\varepsilon(\psi'_\varepsilon\nabla\phi_0)$ with ψ'_ε being cut-off function given in (1.26), we need to compute the following quantities:

$$\|\nabla\phi\|_{L^2(O_{4\varepsilon})};\quad \Big(\int_\Omega |\nabla\phi|^2dx\Big)^{1/2};\quad \Big(\int_{\Omega\setminus O_{3\varepsilon}} |\nabla\phi|^2\delta^{-1}dx\Big)^{1/2}. \tag{4.15}$$

Since $\mathrm{supp}(\varphi^*)\cap O_{4\varepsilon} = \emptyset$, there simply holds

$$\|\nabla\phi\|_{L^2(O_{4\varepsilon})} \lesssim \varepsilon^{1/2}\|\mathrm{M_r}(\nabla\phi_0)\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}. \tag{4.16}$$

Then we are interested in the third term of (4.15), and its leading term is $\int_{\Omega\setminus O_{3\varepsilon}} |\nabla(\varepsilon\chi^*_\varepsilon\varphi^*)|^2\delta^{-1}dx$. So we calculate it as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\Omega\setminus O_{3\varepsilon}} |\nabla(\varepsilon\chi^*_\varepsilon S_\varepsilon(\psi'_\varepsilon\nabla\phi_0))|^2\delta^{-1}dx\\ &\lesssim \int_{\Omega\setminus O_{3\varepsilon}} |\nabla\chi^*(y)S_\varepsilon(\psi'_\varepsilon\nabla\phi_0)|^2\delta^{-1}dx + \varepsilon^2\int_{\Omega\setminus O_{3\varepsilon}} \big|\chi^*(y)S_\varepsilon\big(\nabla(\psi'_\varepsilon\nabla\phi_0)\big)\big|^2\delta^{-1}dx\\ &\lesssim^{(2.5)} \int_{\Omega\setminus O_{7\varepsilon}} |\nabla\phi_0|^2\delta^{-1}dx + \varepsilon^2\int_{\Omega\setminus O_{3\varepsilon}} \big|\nabla(\psi'_\varepsilon\nabla\phi_0)\big|^2\delta^{-1}dx\\ &\lesssim \int_{\Omega\setminus O_{7\varepsilon}} |\nabla\phi_0|^2\delta^{-1}dx + \int_{O_{8\varepsilon}\setminus O_{3\varepsilon}} |\nabla\phi_0|^2\delta^{-1}dx + \varepsilon^2\int_{\Omega\setminus O_{3\varepsilon}} |\nabla^2\phi_0|^2\delta^{-1}dx.\end{aligned}$$

Using the co-area formula again, the above estimate implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big(\int_{\Omega\setminus O_{3\varepsilon}}|\nabla\phi|^2\delta^{-1}dx\Big)^{\frac12}\\
&\lesssim \Big(\int_{\Omega\setminus O_{3\varepsilon}}|\nabla\phi_0|^2\delta^{-1}dx\Big)^{\frac12}+\Big(\int_{O_{8\varepsilon}\setminus O_{3\varepsilon}}|\nabla\phi_0|^2\delta^{-1}dx\Big)^{\frac12}+\varepsilon\Big(\int_{\Omega\setminus O_{3\varepsilon}}|\nabla^2\phi_0|^2\delta^{-1}dx\Big)^{\frac12}\\
&\lesssim \|\nabla\phi_0\|_{L^2(\Omega\setminus O_{c_0})}+\ln^{\frac12}(c_0/\varepsilon)\|\mathrm{M_r}(\nabla\phi_0)\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}+\varepsilon^{\frac12}\|\nabla^2\phi_0\|_{L^2(\Omega\setminus O_{3\varepsilon})},
\end{aligned}\tag{4.17}$$

where we use the fact that $\varepsilon\le\delta(x)\le r_0$ for $x\in\Omega\setminus O_{3\varepsilon}$ in the last inequality. Then, the same arguments that we used for (4.17) leads to

$$\Big(\int_\Omega|\nabla\phi|^2dx\Big)^{1/2}\lesssim^{(2.3)}\|\nabla\phi_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}+\varepsilon^{\frac12}\|\mathrm{M_r}(\nabla\phi_0)\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}+\varepsilon\|\nabla^2\phi_0\|_{L^2(\Omega\setminus O_{7\varepsilon})}.\tag{4.18}$$

Thus, in view of the estimates (4.16), (4.17), (4.18) and (4.15) we consequently obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max\Big\{\|\nabla\phi\|_{L^2(O_{4\varepsilon})},\ \Big(\int_\Omega|\nabla\phi|^2dx\Big)^{1/2},\ \Big(\int_{\Omega\setminus O_{3\varepsilon}}|\nabla\phi|^2\delta^{-1}dx\Big)^{1/2}\Big\}\\
&\quad\lesssim\|\nabla\phi_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}+\ln^{\frac12}(1/\varepsilon)\|\mathrm{M_r}(\nabla\phi_0)\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}+\varepsilon^{\frac12}\|\nabla^2\phi_0\|_{L^2(\Omega\setminus O_{3\varepsilon})}\\
&\quad\lesssim^{(8.19),(8.20),(8.22)}\ln^{\frac12}(1/\varepsilon)\|\Phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}.
\end{aligned}\tag{4.19}$$

To complete the whole arguments, we still need

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max\Big\{\|\mathrm{M_r}(\nabla u_0)\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)},\ \Big(\int_{\Omega\setminus O_{3\varepsilon}}|\nabla^2u_0|^2\delta dx\Big)^{1/2}\Big\}\\
&\qquad\lesssim^{(8.20),(8.22)}\ln^{\frac12}(1/\varepsilon)\Big\{\|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}+\|g\|_{H^1(\partial\Omega)}\Big\}.
\end{aligned}\tag{4.20}$$

Consequently, plugging the estimates (4.19) and (4.20) back into (4.11), we have proved the stated estimate (4.10), and therefore completed the whole proof. □

The proof of Theorem 4.1. To show the estimate (4.7), it suffices to study the right-hand side of the identity (4.6) term by term. The tricky one is R_1 and it has already been studied in Lemma 4.4. From the estimate (4.10), we have

$$|R_1|\lesssim\varepsilon\ln(1/\varepsilon).\tag{4.21}$$

Obviously, the easy one in (4.6) is the term R_2, and it follows from (1.12), (4.4) and Hölder's inequality that

$$|R_2|=\Big|\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon}A(x/\varepsilon)\nabla w_\varepsilon\nabla z_\varepsilon dx\Big|\lesssim\varepsilon\|\Phi\|_{H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\Big\{\|F\|_{H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^d)}+\|g\|_{H^1(\partial\Omega)}\Big\}\lesssim\varepsilon.\tag{4.22}$$

We now address the estimates for R_3 and R_4. In terms of R_3, we first observe that

$$\int_\Omega(\theta-l_\varepsilon^+)\tilde w_\varepsilon\Phi dx=\int_\Omega\psi_\varepsilon'(\theta-l_\varepsilon^+)\tilde w_\varepsilon\Phi dx+\int_\Omega(1-\psi_\varepsilon')(\theta-l_\varepsilon^+)\tilde w_\varepsilon\Phi dx:=R_{31}+R_{32},$$

where the cut-off function ψ_ε' satisfies (1.26). Thanks to the auxiliary equation (3.7), the arguments used for I_{11} in the proof of Lemma 3.2 lead to

$$\begin{aligned}
R_{31}&\lesssim\varepsilon^\sigma\Big\{\|\Phi\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^d)}+\varepsilon^{1-\sigma}\|\Phi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\Big\}\|\nabla\tilde w_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\\
&\lesssim^{(2.7),(1.12)}\varepsilon^{\sigma+\frac12}\|\Phi\|_{H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\Big\{\|F\|_{H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^d)}+\|g\|_{H^1(\partial\Omega)}\Big\}\lesssim\varepsilon^{\frac12+\sigma},
\end{aligned}$$

while one may have

$$R_{32} \lesssim \int_{O_{4\varepsilon}} |\Phi \tilde{w}_\varepsilon| dx \le \|\Phi\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(O_{4\varepsilon})} \lesssim^{(2.9)} \varepsilon \|\Phi\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\nabla \tilde{w}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim^{(2.7),(1.12)} \varepsilon.$$

This together with the estimates on R_{31} yields

$$|R_3| = \Big| \int_\Omega (\theta - l_\varepsilon^+) \tilde{w}_\varepsilon \Phi dx \Big| \lesssim \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma}. \tag{4.23}$$

Since $\Omega_0 \setminus \Omega \subseteq \tilde{O}_{20\varepsilon} =: \{x \in \Omega_0 : \mathrm{dist}(x, \partial\Omega_0) \le 20\varepsilon\}$, we similarly arrive at

$$|R_4| \le \theta \int_{\tilde{O}_{20\varepsilon}} |\tilde{w}_\varepsilon \Phi| dx \lesssim \|\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\tilde{O}_{20\varepsilon})} \|\Phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim^{(2.9)} \varepsilon \|\nabla \tilde{w}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_0)} \lesssim^{(2.7),(1.12)} \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}. \tag{4.24}$$

Hence, plugging the estimates (4.21), (4.22), (4.23) and (4.24) back into (4.6), we have the desired estimate (4.7). We have completed the whole proof. □

5 Estimates for Weak Formulation from Duality

Theorem 5.1 (duality argument II). *Let Ω be a bounded $C^{1,\eta}$ domain with $\eta \in (0,1]$. Suppose that $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon$ and ω satisfy the hypothesises* (H1) *and* (H2). *Given $F \in H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $g \in H^1(\partial\Omega;\mathbb{R}^d)$, let u_ε and u_0 be the weak solutions to the equations* (1.2) *and* (1.6), *respectively. Let w_ε be given in* (1.11), *and $\rho = \delta^{1-\tau}$ with $0 < \tau < 1$. Then, for any $f \in L^2(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{d\times d})$, we obtain*

$$\begin{aligned} &\Big| \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \nabla w_\varepsilon \cdot f dx \Big| \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon^{1-\frac{\tau}{2}} \ln^{\frac{1}{2}}(1/\varepsilon) \Big\{ \Big(\int_\Omega |\nabla F|^2 \delta^{3-\tau} dx \Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \|F\|_{H^{1/2}(\Omega)} + \|g\|_{H^1(\partial\Omega)} \Big\} \Big(\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} |f|^2 \rho^{-1} dx \Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

where the up to constant is independent of ε.

Corollary 5.2 (square function estimates). *Assume the same conditions as in Theorem 5.1. Given $F \in H^1(\Omega_0;\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $g \in H^1(\partial\Omega;\mathbb{R}^d)$, let w_ε be given in* (1.11). *Then there holds the square function estimate*

$$\Big(\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} |\nabla w_\varepsilon|^2 \delta dx \Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim \varepsilon^{1-\frac{\tau}{2}} \ln^{\frac{1}{2}}(1/\varepsilon) \Big\{ \Big(\int_{\Omega_0} |\nabla F|^2 \delta dx \Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \|F\|_{L^2(\Omega_0)} + \|g\|_{H^1(\partial\Omega)} \Big\}, \tag{5.2}$$

where the up to constant is independent of ε.

Proof. Recall that $\rho = \delta^{1-\tau}$ with $\delta(x) = \mathrm{dist}(x, \partial\Omega_0)$ and $0 < \tau < 1$. On the one hand, it follows from the estimate (5.1) that

$$\begin{aligned} \Big(\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} |\nabla w_\varepsilon|^2 \rho dx \Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} &\lesssim \varepsilon^{1-\frac{\tau}{2}} \ln^{\frac{1}{2}}(1/\varepsilon) \Big\{ \Big(\int_\Omega |\nabla F|^2 \delta^{3-\tau} dx \Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \|F\|_{H^{1/2}(\Omega)} + \|g\|_{H^1(\partial\Omega)} \Big\} \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon^{1-\frac{\tau}{2}} \ln^{\frac{1}{2}}(1/\varepsilon) \Big\{ \Big(\int_{\Omega_0} |\nabla F|^2 \delta dx \Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \|F\|_{L^2(\Omega_0)} + \|g\|_{H^1(\partial\Omega)} \Big\}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

where we employ [38, Lemma 8.11.3] in the second step. On the other hand, we observe that

$$\Big(\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon}|\nabla w_\varepsilon|^2\rho dx\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}\gtrsim\Big(\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon}|\nabla w_\varepsilon|^2\delta dx\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

since $\delta\le r_0$ on Ω_ε with $r_0=\mathrm{diam}(\Omega)$. This together with (5.3) gives the stated estimate (5.2) and we have completed the proof. □

The proof of Theorem 5.1. The main idea is the duality argument. For any $f\in L^2(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{d\times d})$, we construct the adjoint equation:

$$\begin{cases}\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon^*(\phi_\varepsilon)=\nabla\cdot f & \text{in } \Omega_\varepsilon,\\ \sigma_\varepsilon^*(\phi_\varepsilon)=-n\cdot f & \text{on } S_\varepsilon,\\ \phi_\varepsilon=0 & \text{on } \Gamma_\varepsilon.\end{cases}\tag{5.4}$$

Integration by parts, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon}\nabla w_\varepsilon\cdot f dx&=-\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon}w_\varepsilon\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon^*(\phi_\varepsilon)dx-\int_{S_\varepsilon}n\cdot f w_\varepsilon dS\\&=\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon}A_{ij}(x/\varepsilon)\nabla_{x_j}w_\varepsilon\nabla_{x_i}\phi_\varepsilon dx\\&=\underbrace{\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon}A(x/\varepsilon)\nabla w_\varepsilon\nabla(\phi_\varepsilon-\phi)dx}_{K_1}+\underbrace{\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon}A(x/\varepsilon)\nabla w_\varepsilon\nabla\phi dx}_{K_2},\end{aligned}\tag{5.5}$$

where $\phi=\psi_\varepsilon'\tilde{\phi}_\varepsilon$ with $\tilde{\phi}_\varepsilon:=\Lambda_\varepsilon(\phi_\varepsilon)$ being the related extension function in the way of Theorem 1.3. Owning to the equality (3.1) and the auxiliary equation (3.7), one may have

$$\begin{aligned}K_2=&\varepsilon\int_\Omega\nabla_y\Psi(y)\cdot\nabla F\phi dx+\varepsilon\int_\Omega\varpi_1(y)\nabla\varphi\nabla\phi dx\\&+\int_\Omega\varpi_2(y)(\nabla u_0-\varphi)\nabla\phi dx+\varepsilon\int_\Omega\nabla_y\Psi(y)F\nabla\phi dx=:K_{21}+K_{22}+K_{23}+K_{24},\end{aligned}\tag{5.6}$$

where $y=x/\varepsilon$, and $\varpi_1:=-\varpi$ (see Lemma 3.1) with $\varpi_2:=\theta\widehat{A}-l_\varepsilon^+A^\varepsilon$.

We proceed to handle the term K_1, by definition of ϕ we have

$$\begin{aligned}K_1&\lesssim\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\int_{O_\varepsilon\cap\Omega_\varepsilon}|\nabla w_\varepsilon||\phi_\varepsilon|+\int_{O_{2\varepsilon}\cap\Omega_\varepsilon}|\nabla w_\varepsilon||\nabla\phi_\varepsilon|\\&\lesssim\|\nabla w_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon)}\|\nabla\phi_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(O_{2\varepsilon}\cap\Omega_\varepsilon)}\lesssim\|\nabla w_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon)}\|\rho\|_{L^\infty(O_{4\varepsilon})}^{1/2}\Big(\int_{O_{2\varepsilon}\cap\Omega_\varepsilon}|\nabla\phi_\varepsilon|^2\rho^{-1}dx\Big)^{1/2}\\&\lesssim^{(5.13)}\|\nabla w_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon)}\|\rho\|_{L^\infty(O_{4\varepsilon})}^{1/2}\Big(\int_\Omega\fint_{B_\varepsilon(x)\cap\Omega_\varepsilon}|\nabla\phi_\varepsilon|^2dy\rho^{-1}dx\Big)^{1/2},\end{aligned}$$

where we recall $\rho(x)=[\delta(x)]^{1-\tau}$ with $\delta(x)=\mathrm{dist}(x,\partial\Omega_0)$. It is not hard to see that $\rho(x)\sim\varepsilon^{1-\tau}$ whenever $x\in O_{2\varepsilon}$. Then it follows from the weighted quenched Calderón-Zygmund estimate (1.16) that

$$\Big(\int_\Omega\fint_{B_\varepsilon(x)\cap\Omega_\varepsilon}|\nabla\phi_\varepsilon|^2dy\rho^{-1}dx\Big)^{1/2}\lesssim\Big(\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon}|f|^2\rho^{-1}dx\Big)^{1/2}.$$

Together with this, we have

$$\begin{aligned} K_1 &\lesssim \|\nabla w_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon)}\|\rho\|^{1/2}_{L^\infty(O_{4\varepsilon})}\Big(\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon}|f|^2\rho^{-1}dx\Big)^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim^{(1.12)} \varepsilon^{1-\frac{\tau}{2}}\Big\{\|F\|_{H^{1/2}(\Omega)}+\|g\|_{H^1(\partial\Omega)}\Big\}\Big(\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon}|f|^2\rho^{-1}dx\Big)^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

Then on account of (5.6) we turn to address the expression K_2 term by term. The first one is K_{21}, and

$$\begin{aligned} K_{21} &\le \varepsilon\Big(\int_\Omega|\nabla F|^2\delta^{3-\tau}dx\Big)^{\frac12}\Big(\int_{\Omega_0}|\tilde\phi_\varepsilon|^2\delta^{\tau-3}dx\Big)^{\frac12} \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon\Big(\int_\Omega|\nabla F|^2\delta^{3-\tau}dx\Big)^{\frac12}\Big(\int_{\Omega_0}|\nabla\tilde\phi_\varepsilon|^2\delta^{\tau-1}dx\Big)^{\frac12} \\ &\lesssim^{(1.14)} \varepsilon\Big(\int_\Omega|\nabla F|^2\delta^{3-\tau}dx\Big)^{\frac12}\Big(\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon}|\nabla\tilde\phi_\varepsilon|^2\rho^{-1}dx\Big)^{\frac12} \\ &\lesssim^{(5.9)} \varepsilon\Big(\int_\Omega|\nabla F|^2\delta^{3-\tau}dx\Big)^{\frac12}\Big(\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon}|f|^2\rho^{-1}dx\Big)^{\frac12}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

where we use weighted Hardy's inequality (see for example [31, Theorem 1.1] or [34]) in the second step. Since the support of $\nabla\varphi$ is included in the set $\Omega\setminus O_{4\varepsilon}$, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} K_{22} &\le \varepsilon\Big(\int_{\Omega\setminus O_{2\varepsilon}}\big|\varpi_1(x/\varepsilon)\nabla\varphi\big|^2\delta(x)dx\Big)^{\frac12}\Big(\int_{\Omega\setminus O_{2\varepsilon}}|\nabla\tilde\phi_\varepsilon|^2[\delta(x)]^{-1}dx\Big)^{\frac12} \\ &\le \varepsilon^{1-\frac{\tau}{2}}\Big(\int_{\Omega\setminus O_{2\varepsilon}}\big|\nabla(\psi_\varepsilon\nabla u_0)\big|^2\delta(x)dx\Big)^{\frac12}\Big(\int_{\Omega_0}|\nabla\tilde\phi_\varepsilon|^2\rho^{-1}dx\Big)^{\frac12} \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon^{-\frac{\tau}{2}}\Big\{\Big(\int_{O_{4\varepsilon}}\big|\nabla u_0\big|^2\delta dx\Big)^{\frac12}+\varepsilon\Big(\int_{\Omega\setminus O_{2\varepsilon}}\big|\nabla^2u_0\big|^2\delta dx\Big)^{\frac12}\Big\}\Big(\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon}|\nabla\phi_\varepsilon|^2\rho^{-1}dx\Big)^{\frac12}, \end{aligned}$$

where we employ Lemma 2.8 in the second inequality, and the last one follows from the weighted extension result (1.14). Note that

$$\Big(\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon}|\nabla\phi_\varepsilon|^2\rho^{-1}dx\Big)^{\frac12}\lesssim^{(5.13)}\Big(\int_\Omega\fint_{B_\varepsilon(x)\cap\Omega_\varepsilon}|\nabla\phi_\varepsilon|^2dy\rho^{-1}dx\Big)^{\frac12}\lesssim^{(1.16)}\Big(\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon}|f|^2\rho^{-1}dx\Big)^{\frac12}, \tag{5.9}$$

and this together with the estimates (8.21), (8.22) and the previous computations leads to

$$K_{22}\lesssim\varepsilon^{1-\frac{\tau}{2}}\ln^{\frac12}(1/\varepsilon)\Big\{\|F\|_{L^2(\Omega)}+\|g\|_{H^1(\partial\Omega)}\Big\}\Big(\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon}|f|^2\rho^{-1}dx\Big)^{\frac12}. \tag{5.10}$$

By the same token, we have

$$\begin{aligned} K_{23} &\lesssim \int_\Omega|(\nabla u_0-\varphi)\nabla\phi|dx \\ &\lesssim \int_{O_{4\varepsilon}\setminus O_\varepsilon}|\nabla u_0||\nabla\tilde\phi_\varepsilon|dx+\frac1\varepsilon\int_{O_{2\varepsilon}\setminus O_\varepsilon}|\nabla u_0||\tilde\phi_\varepsilon|dx+\int_{\Omega\setminus O_{2\varepsilon}}|\psi_\varepsilon\nabla u_0-S_\varepsilon(\psi_\varepsilon\nabla u_0)||\nabla\tilde\phi_\varepsilon|dx \\ &\lesssim^{(2.6)} \varepsilon^{-\frac{\tau}{2}}\Big\{\Big(\int_{O_{4\varepsilon}}|\nabla u_0|^2\delta dx\Big)^{\frac12}+\varepsilon\Big(\int_\Omega|\nabla(\psi_\varepsilon\nabla u_0)|^2\delta dx\Big)^{\frac12}\Big\}\Big(\int_\Omega|\nabla\tilde\phi_\varepsilon|\rho^{-1}dx\Big)^{\frac12} \\ &\lesssim^{(1.14)} \varepsilon^{-\frac{\tau}{2}}\Big\{\Big(\int_{O_{4\varepsilon}}|\nabla u_0|^2\delta dx\Big)^{\frac12}+\varepsilon\Big(\int_\Omega|\nabla^2u_0|^2\delta dx\Big)^{\frac12}\Big\}\Big(\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon}|\nabla\phi_\varepsilon|\rho^{-1}dx\Big)^{\frac12}, \end{aligned}$$

in which we also employ the following computation

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\int_{O_{2\varepsilon}\setminus O_\varepsilon}|\nabla u_0||\tilde{\phi}_\varepsilon|dx &\leq \varepsilon^{-\frac{3}{2}}\Big(\int_{O_{2\varepsilon}}|\nabla u_0|^2\delta dx\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}\Big(\int_{O_{2\varepsilon}}|\tilde{\phi}_\varepsilon|^2dx\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}\\ &\lesssim^{(2.9)} \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}\Big(\int_{O_{2\varepsilon}}|\nabla u_0|^2\delta dx\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}\Big(\int_{O_{2\varepsilon}}|\nabla\tilde{\phi}_\varepsilon|^2dx\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}\\ &\lesssim \varepsilon^{-\frac{\tau}{2}}\Big(\int_{O_{2\varepsilon}}|\nabla u_0|^2\delta dx\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}\Big(\int_{O_{2\varepsilon}}|\nabla\tilde{\phi}_\varepsilon|^2\rho^{-1}dx\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}\end{aligned}$$

in the third step. Moreover, it follows from the estimates (8.21), (8.22) and (5.13) that

$$\begin{aligned}K_{23}&\lesssim \varepsilon^{1-\frac{\tau}{2}}\ln^{\frac{1}{2}}(1/\varepsilon)\Big\{\|F\|_{L^2(\Omega)}+\|g\|_{H^1(\partial\Omega)}\Big\}\int_\Omega\fint_{B_\varepsilon(x)\cap\Omega_\varepsilon}|\nabla\phi_\varepsilon|^2dy\rho^{-1}dx\\ &\lesssim^{(1.16)} \varepsilon^{1-\frac{\tau}{2}}\ln^{\frac{1}{2}}(1/\varepsilon)\Big\{\|F\|_{L^2(\Omega)}+\|g\|_{H^1(\partial\Omega)}\Big\}\Big(\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon}|f|^2\rho^{-1}dx\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}.\end{aligned}\tag{5.11}$$

Now, we turn to study the term K_{24}, and

$$\begin{aligned}K_{24}&\lesssim \varepsilon\int_\Omega|F||\nabla\tilde{\phi}_\varepsilon|dx+\int_{O_{2\varepsilon}}|F||\tilde{\phi}_\varepsilon|dx\\ &\lesssim^{(2.9)} \varepsilon\|F\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\nabla\tilde{\phi}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}+\varepsilon\|F\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\nabla\tilde{\phi}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(O_{2\varepsilon})}\\ &\lesssim \varepsilon\|F\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\nabla\tilde{\phi}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\lesssim\varepsilon\|F\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\Big(\int_\Omega|\nabla\tilde{\phi}_\varepsilon|^2\rho^{-1}dx\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}\\ &\lesssim^{(1.14)} \varepsilon\|F\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\Big(\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon}|\nabla\phi_\varepsilon|^2\rho^{-1}dx\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}\\ &\lesssim^{(5.9)} \varepsilon\|F\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\Big(\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon}|f|^2\rho^{-1}dx\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}.\end{aligned}\tag{5.12}$$

Consequently, combining the estimates (5.8), (5.10), (5.11) and (5.12) leads to

$$K_2\lesssim\varepsilon^{1-\frac{\tau}{2}}\ln^{\frac{1}{2}}(1/\varepsilon)\Big\{\Big(\int_\Omega|\nabla F|^2\delta^{3-\tau}dx\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}+\|F\|_{L^2(\Omega)}+\|g\|_{H^1(\partial\Omega)}\Big\}\Big(\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon}|f|^2\rho^{-1}dx\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

This together with the estimate (5.7) shows the desired estimate (5.1) and we have completed the whole proof. □

Remark 5.3. *Set $\rho(x)=[\delta(x)]^{1-\tau}$ with $\delta(x)=dist(x,\partial\Omega_0)$ and $0<\tau<1$. Assume that ϕ_ε is the solution to (5.4) and let $\tilde{\phi}_\varepsilon$ be the related extension function of ϕ_ε according to Theorem 1.3. Then for any fixed $U\subseteq\Omega$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{U\cap\Omega_\varepsilon}|\nabla\phi_\varepsilon|^2\rho^{-1}dx&=\int_U l_\varepsilon^+|\nabla\tilde{\phi}_\varepsilon|^2\rho^{-1}dx\\ &\lesssim^{(6.4)}\int_\Omega\fint_{B_\varepsilon(x)}l_\varepsilon^+|\nabla\tilde{\phi}_\varepsilon|^2\rho^{-1}dydx\lesssim\int_\Omega\fint_{B_\varepsilon(x)\cap\Omega_\varepsilon}|\nabla\phi_\varepsilon|^2dy\rho^{-1}dx,\end{aligned}\tag{5.13}$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that $\rho(x)\sim\rho(y)$ since $|x-y|<\varepsilon$.

The proof of Theorem 1.1. We first handle the estimate (1.9), which is in fact based upon the duality arguments sated in Theorem 5.1. On the one hand, recalling $\rho = \delta^{1-\tau}$ with $\delta(x) = \mathrm{dist}(x, \partial\Omega_0)$, for any fixed $\tau \in (0,1)$, one may derive that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} |\nabla w_\varepsilon|^2 \delta^{1-\tau} dx &\gtrsim^{(1.14)} \int_{\Omega_0} |\nabla \Lambda_\varepsilon(w_\varepsilon)|^2 \delta^{1-\tau} dx \\ &\gtrsim \Big(\int_{\Omega_0} |\Lambda_\varepsilon(w_\varepsilon)|^{\frac{2d}{d-1-\tau}} dx \Big)^{\frac{d-1-\tau}{d}} \geq \Big(\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} |w_\varepsilon|^{\frac{2d}{d-1-\tau}} dx \Big)^{\frac{d-1-\tau}{d}},\end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

in which we apply the weighted Hardy-Sobolev inequality [32, Theorem 2.1] to the last step for the extended function $\Lambda_\varepsilon(w_\varepsilon)$ vanishes near $\partial\Omega_0$. Also, the condition $\tau \neq 0$ is very important, which avoided the critical case of the weighted Hardy inequality (see [31, Theorem 1.1]). On the other hand, it follows from the estimate (5.3) that

$$\Big(\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} |\nabla w_\varepsilon|^2 \rho dx \Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim \varepsilon^{1-\frac{\tau}{2}} \ln^{\frac{1}{2}}(1/\varepsilon) \Big\{ \Big(\int_{\Omega_0} |\nabla F|^2 \delta dx \Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \|F\|_{L^2(\Omega_0)} + \|g\|_{H^1(\partial\Omega)} \Big\},$$

and this together with (5.14) leads to

$$\|w_\varepsilon\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-1-\tau}}(\Omega_\varepsilon)} \lesssim \varepsilon^{1-\frac{\tau}{2}} \ln^{\frac{1}{2}}(1/\varepsilon) \Big\{ \Big(\int_{\Omega_0} |\nabla F|^2 \delta dx \Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \|F\|_{L^2(\Omega_0)} + \|g\|_{H^1(\partial\Omega)} \Big\}.$$

Thus, setting $p = \frac{2d}{d-1-\tau}$ and $q = \frac{2(d-1)}{d-1-\tau}$, the above estimate together with

$$\|\varepsilon \chi_\varepsilon S_\varepsilon(\psi_\varepsilon \nabla u_0)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \lesssim^{(2.3)} \varepsilon \|\nabla u_0\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \lesssim^{(8.30)} \varepsilon \Big\{ \|F\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|g\|_{W^{1,q}(\partial\Omega)} \Big\}$$

and a triangle inequality leads to the almost-sharp error estimate (1.9).

By virtue of (4.9), we have the desired estimate (1.10), where we employed the estimate (8.19) instead of (8.30) in the computations. This completes the whole proof. □

6 Weighted Quenched Calderón-Zygmund Estimates

Lemma 6.1 (Shen's lemma). *Let $q > 2$ and Ω be a bounded Lipschitz domain. Let $F \in L^2(\Omega)$ and $f \in L^p(\Omega)$ for some $2 < p < q$. Suppose that for each ball B with the property that $|B| \leq c_0|\Omega|$ and either $4B \subset \Omega$ or B is centered on $\partial\Omega$, there exist two measurable functions F_B and R_B on $\Omega \cap 2B$, such that $|F| \leq |F_B| + |R_B|$ on $\Omega \cap 2B$,*

$$\begin{aligned}\Big(\fint_{2B\cap\Omega} |R_B|^q \Big)^{\frac{1}{q}} &\leq N_1 \Big\{ \Big(\fint_{4B\cap\Omega} |F|^2 \Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \sup_{4B_0 \supseteq B' \supseteq B} \Big(\fint_{B'\cap\Omega} |f|^2 \Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Big\} \\ \Big(\fint_{2B\cap\Omega} |F_B|^2 \Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} &\leq N_2 \sup_{4B_0 \supseteq B' \supseteq B} \Big(\fint_{B'\cap\Omega} |f|^2 \Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}\end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$

where $N_1, N_2 > 0$ and $0 < c_0 < 1$. Then $F \in L^p(\Omega)$ and

$$\Big(\int_\Omega |F|^p \Big)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq C \Big\{ \Big(\int_\Omega |F|^2 \Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \Big(\int_\Omega |f|^p \Big)^{\frac{1}{p}} \Big\}, \tag{6.2}$$

where C depends at most on N_1, N_2, c_0, p, q and the Lipschitz character of Ω.

Proof. See [37, Theorem 4.2.6] or [40, Theorem 4.13]. □

Remark 6.2. *Recently, we noticed that Z. Shen [39] extended real arguments to the weighted Sobolev spaces as we were preparing this project. So, it is very likely to follow his new scheme to have a proof for Theorem 1.4 concerned with a Lipschitz domain. In fact, the idea on the proof of Theorem 1.4 was inspired by he and his cooperator's work [41]. Moreover, weighted quenched Calderón-Zygmund estimates were noticed by the second author because of F. Otto's personal interests.*

Lemma 6.3 (primary geometry on integrals)**.** *Let $f \in L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded domain. Then there hold the following inequalities:*

- *If $0 < r < (\varepsilon/4)$ and $D_r(x_0)$ is given, then for any $x \in D_r(x_0)$ we have*
$$\fint_{B_\varepsilon(x)\cap\Omega} |f| \lesssim \fint_{D_{4r}(x_0)} \fint_{B_\varepsilon(x)\cap\Omega} |f| dx. \tag{6.3}$$
- *If $r \geq (\varepsilon/4)$ and $D_r(x_0)$ is given, then there holds*
$$\fint_{D_r(x_0)} |f| \lesssim \fint_{D_{2r}(x_0)} \fint_{B_\varepsilon(x)\cap\Omega} |f| \lesssim \fint_{D_{6r}(x_0)} |f|. \tag{6.4}$$
- *If $\rho \in A_1$ and $0 < r < r_0/10$, then one may derive that*
$$\int_{\tilde{\Omega}} \fint_{B_r(x)\cap\tilde{\Omega}} |f(y)| dy \rho(x) dx \lesssim \int_\Omega |f| \rho dx, \qquad \tilde{\Omega} := \{x \in \Omega : \mathrm{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) > r\}, \tag{6.5}$$

where the up to constant depends only on d.

Proof. The proof is standard and we provide a proof for the sake of the completeness, while in the case of $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^d$ we refer the reader to [18, Lemma 6.5] for a detail. We first show the estimate (6.3). For any set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, let I_K be the indicator function of K. There holds

$$\begin{aligned}\fint_{D_{4r}(x_0)} \fint_{B(x,\varepsilon)\cap\Omega} |f| dx &= \frac{1}{|D_{4r}||B_\varepsilon|} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f(y)| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} I_{D_{4r}(x_0)}(x) I_{\{(x,y)\in\Omega\times\Omega : |x-y|<\varepsilon\}}(x,y) dx dy \\ &\gtrsim \fint_{D_{2\varepsilon}(x_0)} |f(y)| dy \geq \fint_{B_\varepsilon(x)\cap\Omega} |f(y)| dy\end{aligned}$$

for any $x \in D_r(x_0)$, where we note that $B_\varepsilon(x) \cap \Omega \subset D_{2\varepsilon}(x_0)$, provided $x \in D_r(x_0)$. Then we turn to the inequality (6.4). On the one hand,

$$\begin{aligned}\fint_{D_{2r}(x_0)} \fint_{B_\varepsilon(x)\cap\Omega} |f| &= \frac{1}{|D_{2r}||B_\varepsilon|} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f(y)| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} I_{D_{2r}(x_0)}(x) I_{\{(x,y)\in\Omega\times\Omega : |x-y|<\varepsilon\}}(x,y) dx dy \\ &\gtrsim \fint_{D_r(x_0)} |f(y)| dy.\end{aligned} \tag{6.6}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}\fint_{D_{2r}(x_0)} \fint_{B_\varepsilon(x)\cap\Omega} |f| &= \frac{1}{|D_{2r}||B_\varepsilon|} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \underbrace{|f(y)| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} I_{D_{2r}(x_0)}(x) I_{\{(x,y)\in\Omega\times\Omega : |x-y|<\varepsilon\}}(x,y) dx}_{:=\tilde{f}(y)} dy \\ &\lesssim \fint_{D_{6r}(x_0)} |f(y)| dy,\end{aligned} \tag{6.7}$$

since the support of $\tilde{f}$ is included in $D_{6r}(x_0)$. Then we proceed to show the estimate (6.5), and

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\tilde{\Omega}} \fint_{B_r(x)\cap\tilde{\Omega}} |f(y)|dy\rho(x)dx &\le \int_{\Omega} |f(y)| \fint_{B_r(y)} \rho(x)dxdy \\ &\le \int_{\Omega} |f(y)|\mathcal{M}(\rho)(y)dy \lesssim \int_{\Omega} |f(y)|\rho(y)dy,\end{aligned}$$

where we use the Fubini's theorem in the first inequality and the definition of A_1 (see for example [17, pp.134]) in the last one. We have completed the proof. □

The proof of Theorem 1.5. The main idea is based upon Prof. Felix Otto's unpublished lectures given in CIMI (Toulouse). We first consider $p \ge 2$, while the case $1 < p < 2$ would be done by a duality argument. The core ingredient of the proof is Shen's real methods [40].

Let $B := B_r(x_0)$ be any ball with $0 < r < r_0/10$, such that $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$ or $4B \subset \Omega$. To achieve the target, we impose the following quantities:

$$\begin{aligned} U(x) &:= \Big(\fint_{B_\varepsilon(x)\cap\Omega_\varepsilon} |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad F(x) := \Big(\fint_{B_\varepsilon(x)\cap\Omega_\varepsilon} |f|^2\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \\ W_B(x) &:= \Big(\fint_{B_\varepsilon(x)\cap\Omega_\varepsilon} |\nabla w_\varepsilon|^2\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad V_B(x) := \Big(\fint_{B_\varepsilon(x)\cap\Omega_\varepsilon} |\nabla v_\varepsilon|^2\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}\end{aligned}$$

for any $x \in \Omega$, and later on one may prefer W_B and V_B according to B, such that $|U| \le |W_B| + |V_B|$. For the ease of the statement, $\tilde{u}_\varepsilon$, $\tilde{v}_\varepsilon$ and $\tilde{w}_\varepsilon$ are corresponding extension function (in the way of Lemma 2.10).

Case 1. If $0 < r < \varepsilon/4$, then it is fine to fix $W_B = U$ and $V_B = 0$. For any $x \in B \cap \Omega$, one may show that

$$\begin{aligned} W_B^2(x) = \fint_{B_\varepsilon(x)\cap\Omega_\varepsilon} |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 &= \fint_{B_\varepsilon(x)\cap\Omega} l_\varepsilon^+ |\nabla \tilde{u}_\varepsilon|^2 \\ &\lesssim \fint_{4B\cap\Omega} \fint_{B_\varepsilon(x)\cap\Omega} l_\varepsilon^+ |\nabla \tilde{u}_\varepsilon|^2 = \fint_{4B\cap\Omega} U^2,\end{aligned} \tag{6.8}$$

where we employ the estimate (6.3) in the inequality. Thus, we have

$$\Big(\fint_{B\cap\Omega} W_B^p\Big)^{\frac{1}{p}} \le \sup_{x\in B\cap\Omega} |W_B(x)| \lesssim \Big(\fint_{4B\cap\Omega} U^2\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \Big(\fint_{B\cap\Omega} F^2\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tag{6.9}$$

and trivially,

$$\Big(\fint_{B\cap\Omega} V_B^p\Big)^{\frac{1}{p}} \lesssim \Big(\fint_{B\cap\Omega} F^2\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tag{6.10}$$

in such the case.

Case 2. For $r \ge (\varepsilon/4)$, let $u_\varepsilon = v_\varepsilon + w_\varepsilon$, and v_ε with w_ε satisfies the following equations:

$$\text{(i)} \begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(v_\varepsilon) = \nabla\cdot(I_B f) & \text{in } \Omega_\varepsilon, \\ \sigma_\varepsilon(v_\varepsilon) = n\cdot(I_B f) & \text{on } S_\varepsilon, \\ v_\varepsilon = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_\varepsilon, \end{cases} \qquad \text{(ii)} \begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(w_\varepsilon) = 0 & \text{in } D_r^\varepsilon(x_0), \\ \sigma_\varepsilon(w_\varepsilon) = 0 & \text{on } D_r(x_0)\cap S_\varepsilon, \\ w_\varepsilon = 0 & \text{on } \Delta_r(x_0)\cap\Gamma_\varepsilon, \end{cases} \tag{6.11}$$

respectively. For any $x \in B \cap \Omega$, in terms of (ii) above, it follows from boundary (and interior) Lipschitz estimates (1.19) (and [36, Theorem 1.1]) that

$$\begin{aligned} \fint_{B_\varepsilon(x)\cap\Omega_\varepsilon} |\nabla w_\varepsilon|^2 \lesssim \fint_{D_{5r}^\varepsilon(x_0)} |\nabla w_\varepsilon|^2 &= \fint_{D_{5r}(x_0)} l_\varepsilon^+ |\nabla \tilde{w}_\varepsilon|^2 \\ &\lesssim \fint_{D_{10r}(x_0)} \fint_{B_\varepsilon(x)\cap\Omega} l_\varepsilon^+ |\nabla \tilde{w}_\varepsilon|^2 \lesssim \fint_{B_{10r}(x_0)\cap\Omega} W_B^2,\end{aligned} \tag{6.12}$$

where we have use the estimate (6.4) in the second inequality, and this implies

$$\sup_{x\in B\cap\Omega}|W_B(x)|^2\lesssim \fint_{B_{10r}(x_0)\cap\Omega}\big(U^2+V_B^2\big). \tag{6.13}$$

Then in view of (i) in (6.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\fint_{D_{10r}(x_0)}V_B^2\lesssim\fint_{D_{14r}(x_0)}l_\varepsilon^+|\nabla\tilde{v}_\varepsilon|^2&=\fint_{D^\varepsilon_{14r}(x_0)}|\nabla v_\varepsilon|^2\\&\lesssim\fint_{D^\varepsilon_r(x_0)}|f|^2=\fint_{D_r(x_0)}l_\varepsilon^+|f|^2\lesssim\fint_{D_{2r}(x_0)}F^2,\end{aligned}$$

where we employ the estimate (6.4) in the first and last inequalities and energy estimates in the second one. This together with (6.13) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big(\fint_{B\cap\Omega}W_B^p\Big)^{\frac{1}{p}}\le\sup_{x\in B\cap\Omega}|W_B(x)|\lesssim\Big(\fint_{10B\cap\Omega}U^2\Big)^{\frac12}+\Big(\fint_{2B\cap\Omega}F^2\Big)^{\frac12},\\&\Big(\fint_{B\cap\Omega}V_B^2\Big)^{\frac12}\lesssim\Big(\fint_{2B\cap\Omega}F^2\Big)^{\frac12}.\end{aligned}\tag{6.14}$$

Hence, the condition (6.1) has been verified by the estimates (6.14), (6.9) and (6.10), and so one may obtain

$$\Big(\int_\Omega U^p\Big)^{1/p}\lesssim\Big(\int_\Omega U^2\Big)^{1/2}+\Big(\int_\Omega F^p\Big)^{1/p}$$

for any $p\ge 2$, and this together with

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega U^2=\int_\Omega\fint_{B_\varepsilon(x)\cap\Omega_\varepsilon}|\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2dx&\lesssim\int_{\Omega_0}|\nabla\tilde{u}_\varepsilon|^2dx\\&\lesssim\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon}|\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2dx\lesssim\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon}|f|^2dx\lesssim\int_\Omega F^2dx\lesssim\Big(\int_\Omega F^pdx\Big)^{2/p}\end{aligned}$$

implies the desired estimate (7.2), where we employ Lemma 2.10 in the second inequality, and also use the zero extension of f and (6.4) in the fourth one. We have completed the whole proof. □

The proof of Theorem 1.4. For the ease of the statement, we still use the notation imposed in the proof of Theorem 1.5. The main idea is to reuse the estimate (1.17) in the case of $1<p<2$ and maximal function arguments. Roughly speaking, we use the arguments developed in Lemma 6.1 twice. To achieve the goal, we define the localized Hardy-Littlewood maximal function as

$$\mathcal{M}_\Omega(U)(x)=\sup_{\substack{Q\subset\Omega\\ Q\ni x}}\fint_Q|U(y)|dy, \tag{6.15}$$

where Q is cubes in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function, and it is not hard to see $\mathcal{M}_\Omega(U)(x)\le\mathcal{M}(I_\Omega U)(x)$ for any $x\in\Omega$. Due to the relationship between the Hardy-Littlewood maximal functions and A_p weights, there holds

$$\Big(\int_\Omega\big[\mathcal{M}_\Omega(F^s)\big]^{\frac{p}{s}}\rho dx\Big)^{1/p}\le\Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\big[\mathcal{M}(I_\Omega F^s)\big]^{\frac{p}{s}}\rho dx\Big)^{1/p}\lesssim\Big(\int_\Omega|F|^p\rho dx\Big)^{1/p}, \tag{6.16}$$

where we use [17, Theorem 2.5] in the second inequality, and where we ask for $1 < s < p < \infty$ and $\rho \in A_{p/s}$. For ρ satisfies the reverse Hölder property, i.e.,

$$\Big(\fint_Q \rho^{1+\epsilon}\Big)^{\frac{1}{1+\epsilon}} \lesssim \fint_Q \rho, \tag{6.17}$$

(In fact, the above estimate holds for any $\rho \in A_p$ with $1 \le p < \infty$.) and this property implies that if $\rho \in A_{p/s}$ then it will belong to A_p whenever s is close to 1, which plays an important role in the whole arguments. To show the estimate (1.15), it will be accomplished through

$$\int_\Omega \big[\mathcal{M}_\Omega(U^s)(x)\big]^{\frac{p}{s}}\rho(x)dx \lesssim \rho(\Omega)\Big(\fint_\Omega U^s\Big)^{\frac{p}{s}} + \int_\Omega \big[\mathcal{M}_\Omega(F^s)(x)\big]^{\frac{p}{s}}\rho(x)dx. \tag{6.18}$$

On the one hand, from the fact that $[U(x)]^p \le [\mathcal{M}_\Omega(U^s)(x)]^{\frac{p}{s}}$ for a.e. $x \in \Omega$, there holds

$$\int_\Omega [U(x)]^p\rho(x)dx \le \int_\Omega \big[\mathcal{M}_\Omega(U^s)(x)\big]^{\frac{p}{s}}\rho(x)dx. \tag{6.19}$$

On the other hand, it follows from the quenched Calderón-Zygmund estimate (1.17) that

$$\begin{aligned}\rho(\Omega)\Big(\fint_\Omega U^s\Big)^{\frac{p}{s}} &\lesssim \rho(\Omega)\Big(\fint_\Omega F^s\Big)^{\frac{p}{s}}\\ &\lesssim \rho(\Omega)\Big(\fint_\Omega F^p\rho dx\Big)\Big(\fint_\Omega \rho^{-\frac{s}{p-s}}dx\Big)^{\frac{p-s}{s}} \lesssim \int_\Omega F^p\rho dx\end{aligned} \tag{6.20}$$

in which we use the fact that there exists an universal constant C such that

$$\Big(\fint_\Omega \rho dx\Big)\Big(\fint_\Omega \rho^{-\frac{s}{p-s}}dx\Big)^{\frac{p-s}{s}} \le C,$$

since ρ belongs to $A_{p/s}$ classes. Hence combining the estimates (6.18), (6.16), (6.19) and (6.20) we arrive at the desired estimate (1.15).

Thus, our task is reduced to establish the estimate (6.18). By a real method developed by Z. Shen, it suffices to verify the following two conditions: for any ball $B := B_r(x_0) \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$ or $4B \subset \Omega$, there exists W_B and V_B satisfying

$$\Big(\fint_{B\cap\Omega} |V_B|^s\Big)^{1/s} \lesssim \Big(\fint_{5B\cap\Omega} |F|^s\Big)^{1/s} \tag{6.21}$$

and

$$\sup_{B\cap\Omega} W_B \lesssim \Big(\fint_{3B\cap\Omega} |W_B|^s\Big)^{1/s} \tag{6.22}$$

where $1 < s < \infty$. Obviously, we are interested in the case $1 < s < 2$. As we have shown in the proof of Theorem 1.5, we take $W_B = U$ for $0 < r < (\varepsilon/4)$, while we set $u_\varepsilon = v_\varepsilon + w_\varepsilon$ in the case of $r \ge (\varepsilon/4)$, where v_ε and w_ε are the solutions of (6.11), respectively. Therefore, $U \le V_B + W_B$.

We first to show the estimate (6.22). For any $r > 0$, it follows from the estimates (6.8) and (6.12) that

$$\sup_{B\cap\Omega} W_B \lesssim \Big(\fint_{2B\cap\Omega} W_B^2\Big)^{1/2} \tag{6.23}$$

This in fact implies that for any $0 < s < 2$ we have

$$\Big(\fint_{\frac{1}{2}B\cap\Omega} W_B^2\Big)^{1/2} \lesssim \Big(\fint_{B\cap\Omega} W_B^s\Big)^{1/s}$$

where we employ an convexity argument (see [21, pp.173]), and this together with (6.23) leads to the stated estimate (6.22). Now, we proceed to verify the estimate (6.21). The case $0 < r < (\varepsilon/4)$ is trivial since one may prefer $V_B = 0$, while in the case of $r > (\varepsilon/4)$, it follows from the quenched Calderón-Zygmund estimate (1.17) that

$$\fint_B |V_B|^s dx \lesssim \frac{1}{|B|}\int_\Omega |V_B|^s dx \lesssim \frac{1}{|B|}\int_\Omega \Big(\fint_{B_\varepsilon(x)\cap\Omega_\varepsilon} |fI_B|^2\Big)^{\frac{s}{2}} dx \lesssim \fint_{5B\cap\Omega} F^s dx \tag{6.24}$$

and its last inequality follows from the observation that $\mathrm{supp}\big(I_B * I_{B_\varepsilon}\big) \subset \mathrm{supp}(I_B) \cup \mathrm{supp}(I_{B_\varepsilon})$. Moreover, we have $|x - x_0| \le |x - y| + |y - x_0| \le \varepsilon + r \le 5r$ for any $y \in B$ and some $x \in \Omega$. This yields the estimate (6.21).

Hence, the remainder of the proof is devoted to show the estimate (6.18) under the conditions (6.21) and (6.22). Let $E(\lambda) = \{x \in \Omega : \mathcal{M}_\Omega(U^s)(x) > \lambda\}$, and $K(\lambda) = \{x \in \Omega : \mathcal{M}_\Omega(F^s)(x) > \lambda\}$. Let ϵ be given in (6.17), it suffices to prove the following good-λ inequality

$$\rho(E(T\lambda)) \le \delta^\sigma \rho(E(\lambda)) + \rho(K(\theta\lambda)) \tag{6.25}$$

for any $\lambda \ge \lambda_0$, where $T = (2\delta^\sigma)^{-\frac{s}{p}}$, $\sigma = \epsilon/(1+\epsilon)$, and $\delta, \theta \in (0,1)$ will be determined later. There exists $C_0 = C_d/\delta$, such that

$$\lambda_0 = C_0 \fint_\Omega U^s(y)dy \quad \text{and} \quad |E(\lambda)| \le \delta|\Omega|.$$

Observe that

$$E(T\lambda) \subset \big\{E(T\lambda) \cap K^c(\theta\lambda)\big\} \cup K(\theta\lambda),$$

where the notation $K^c(\theta\lambda)$ represents the complementary set of $K(\theta\lambda)$. Due to the property

$$\rho(S) \le \Big(\frac{|S|}{|Q|}\Big)^\sigma \rho(Q) \tag{6.26}$$

for any $S \subset Q \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, (which is true for any $\rho \in A_p$ with $1 \le p < \infty$,) it suffices to show $\big|E(T\lambda) \cap K^c(\theta\lambda)\big| \le \delta|E(\lambda)|$ as $\lambda \ge \lambda_0$. It will be done by the Calderón-Zygmund decomposition, that means the previous estimate is reduced to show

$$\big|E(T\lambda) \cap K^c(\theta\lambda) \cap Q_j\big| \le \delta|Q_j|, \tag{6.27}$$

where $\{Q_j\}$ is a family of dyadic cubes, satisfying $E(\lambda) = \cup_j Q_j$ and $Q_j \cap Q_i = \emptyset$ if $i \ne j$, and

$$\lambda < \fint_{Q_j} U^s \le 2^d\lambda. \tag{6.28}$$

Since $T\lambda < \mathcal{M}_\Omega(U^s)(x) \le \mathcal{M}(U^s I_{2Q_j})(x)$ if $x \in Q_j$, we have

$$Q_j \cap E(T\lambda) \subset \{x \in Q_j : \mathcal{M}(U^s I_{2Q_j}) > T\lambda\},$$

and therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}&\big\{x\in Q_j:\mathcal{M}(U^sI_{2Q_j})>T\lambda\big\}\\&\subset\big\{x\in Q_j:\mathcal{M}((U-W_{B_j})^sI_{2Q_j})>\frac{T\lambda}{2^s}\big\}\cup\big\{x\in Q_j:\mathcal{M}((W_{B_j})^sI_{2Q_j})>\frac{T\lambda}{2^s}\big\}=:A\cup B.\end{aligned}$$

Then it follows from the estimate (6.21) and weak (1,1) property of the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function (see for example [17, Theorem 2.5]) that

$$|A|\le\frac{C_d}{T\lambda}\int_{2B_j\cap\Omega}|U-W_{B_j}|^sdy\le\frac{C_d|Q_j|}{T\lambda}\fint_{6B_j\cap\Omega}F^sdy\le C_d|Q_j|T^{-1}\theta,\tag{6.29}$$

where the last inequality follows from the condition $Q_j\cap K^c(\theta\lambda)\neq\emptyset$. In view of the estimates (6.21) and (6.22), we also acquire

$$\begin{aligned}|B|&\le\frac{C_d}{(T\lambda)^{\frac{q}{s}}}\int_{2B_j\cap\Omega}|W_{B_j}|^qdy\\&\le\frac{C_d|Q_j|}{(T\lambda)^{\frac{q}{s}}}\Big\{\Big(\fint_{4B_j\cap\Omega}U^sdy\Big)^{\frac{1}{s}}+\Big(\fint_{4B_j\cap\Omega}F^sdy\Big)^{\frac{1}{s}}\Big\}^q\\&\le C_d|Q_j|(T\lambda)^{-\frac{q}{s}}\Big\{\lambda^{\frac{q}{s}}+(\theta\lambda)^{\frac{q}{s}}\Big\}\\&\le C_d|Q_j|T^{-\frac{q}{s}},\end{aligned}\tag{6.30}$$

where $q>\frac{p}{\sigma}$, and we use the conditions (6.28) and $Q_j\cap K^c(\theta\lambda)\neq\emptyset$ in the third inequality. Now, it is not hard to see

$$\big|E(T\lambda)\cap K^c(\theta\lambda)\cap Q_j\big|\le\delta|Q_j|\Big\{C_d\delta^{\sigma(s/p)-1}\theta+C_d\delta^{\sigma(q/p)-1}\Big\}$$

by recaling $T=(2\delta^\sigma)^{-\frac{s}{p}}$. Therefore one may choose $\delta\in(0,1)$ small enough such that $C_d\delta^{\sigma(q/p)-1}\le 1/2$, and then by choosing $\theta\in(0,1)$ we can also have $C_d\delta^{\sigma(s/p)-1}\theta\le 1/2$. Thus, we have proved the desired estimate (6.27) and this together with the estimate (6.26) leads to

$$\rho(E(T\lambda)\cap K^c(\theta\lambda))\le\delta^\sigma\rho(E(\lambda))$$

and consequently yields (6.25).

In the last step, we show the estimate (6.18) by a routine computation. On account of (6.25), it is not hard to see

$$\int_{\lambda_0}^{N_0}\lambda^{\frac{p}{s}-1}\rho(E(T\lambda))d\lambda\le\delta^\sigma\int_{\lambda_0}^{N_0}\lambda^{\frac{p}{s}-1}\rho(E(\lambda))d\lambda+\int_0^{N_0}\lambda^{\frac{p}{s}-1}\rho(K(\theta\lambda))d\lambda$$

holds for any $N_0>T\lambda_0$. Moreover, by changing variable and merger of similar items,

$$\big(T^{-\frac{p}{s}}-\delta^\sigma\big)\int_{T\lambda_0}^{N_0}\lambda^{\frac{p}{s}-1}\rho(E(\lambda))d\lambda\le C\rho(\Omega)\lambda_0^{\frac{p}{s}}+C\int_\Omega\big[\mathcal{M}_\Omega(F^s)(x)\big]^{\frac{p}{s}}\rho dx.$$

Noting that $T^{-\frac{p}{s}}-\delta^\sigma=\delta^\sigma$, we obtain

$$\int_0^{N_0}\lambda^{\frac{p}{s}-1}\rho(E(\lambda))d\lambda\le C\rho(\Omega)\lambda_0^{\frac{p}{s}}+C\int_\Omega\big[\mathcal{M}_\Omega(F^s)(x)\big]^{\frac{p}{s}}\rho dx$$

and then let $N_0\to\infty$. This consequently yields the stated estimate (6.18), and we have completed the whole argument. □

7 Boundary Estimates at Large-scales

Lemma 7.1 (boundary Caccioppoli's inequality). *Suppose that the coefficient A satisfies (1.4). Let $u_\varepsilon \in H^1(D_4^\varepsilon;\mathbb{R}^d)$ be the solution to $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon)=0$ in D_4^ε and $\sigma_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon)=0$ on $D_4\cap\partial(\varepsilon\omega)$ and $u_\varepsilon=0$ on $\Delta_4\cap\varepsilon\omega$. Then, for any $0<r\le 1$, one may have*

$$\left(\fint_{D_r^\varepsilon}|\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2\right)^{1/2}\lesssim\frac{1}{r}\left(\fint_{D_{2r}^\varepsilon}|u_\varepsilon|^2\right)^{1/2}, \tag{7.1}$$

where the constant depends only on μ_0, μ_1 and d.

Proof. The proof is standard, and we just let the test function be $\varphi^2 u_\varepsilon$ and then use the elasticity conditions (1.4) (here we also need to use Korn's inequality). □

Lemma 7.2 (quenched L^2-error estimates). *Let $\varepsilon\le r\le 1$. Suppose that $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon$ and ω satisfy the hypothesises* (H1) *and* (H2). *Let u_ε be a weak solution to $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon)=0$ in D_{4r}^ε, $\sigma_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon)=0$ on $D_{4r}\cap\partial(\varepsilon\omega)$ and $u_\varepsilon=0$ on $\Delta_{4r}\cap\varepsilon\omega$. Then there exist a weak solution $v\in H^1(D_r;\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\mathcal{L}_0(v)=0$ in D_r and $v=0$ on Δ_r, and*

$$\left(\fint_{D_r^\varepsilon}|u_\varepsilon-v|^2\right)^{1/2}\lesssim\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{r}\right)^{1/2}\left(\fint_{D_{3r}^\varepsilon}|u_\varepsilon|^2\right)^{1/2}. \tag{7.2}$$

Proof. By rescaling one may assume $r=1$. First, we should extend u_ε from $H^1(D_2^\varepsilon)$ to $H^1(D_3)$, denoted by $\tilde{u}_\varepsilon$. To do so, let φ be a smooth cut-off function satisfying $\varphi=1$ on D_2 and $\varphi=0$ outside $D_{5/2}$ with $|\nabla\varphi|\lesssim 1$, and $\varphi u_\varepsilon=0$ on $\partial D_{5/2}^\varepsilon$. Then one may apply the extension result of Lemma 2.10 to φu_ε and we have $\|\tilde{u}_\varepsilon\|_{H^1(D_3)}\lesssim\|\varphi u_\varepsilon\|_{H^1(D_{5/2}^\varepsilon)}$. This together with boundary Caccioppoli's inequality (7.1) gives

$$\|\tilde{u}_\varepsilon\|_{H^1(D_3)}\lesssim\|\varphi u_\varepsilon\|_{H^1(D_{5/2}^\varepsilon)}\lesssim\|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(D_3^\varepsilon)}. \tag{7.3}$$

Thus, there exists $t\in[5/4,3/2]$ such that

$$\|\tilde{u}_\varepsilon\|_{H^1(\partial D_t\setminus\Delta_t)}\lesssim\|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(D_3)}\quad\text{and}\quad\tilde{u}_\varepsilon=u_\varepsilon\quad\text{in } D_t^\varepsilon. \tag{7.4}$$

Moreover, in terms of the radius t, we construct $v_h\in H^1(D_t;\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\mathcal{L}_0(v_h)=0$ in D_t and $v_h=\tilde{u}_\varepsilon$ on ∂D_t. It follows from the estimates (1.13) and (7.4) that

$$\|u_\varepsilon-v_h\|_{L^2(D_1^\varepsilon)}\le\|u_\varepsilon-v_h\|_{L^2(D_t^\varepsilon)}\lesssim\varepsilon^{1/2}\|\tilde{u}_\varepsilon\|_{H^1(\partial D_t\setminus\Delta_t)}\lesssim\varepsilon^{1/2}\|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(D_3)}. \tag{7.5}$$

Then, we further construct the equation $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(v)=0$ in D_t and $v=\widetilde{u}_\varepsilon^0$ on ∂D_t, where $\widetilde{u}_\varepsilon^0=0$ on Δ_t and $\widetilde{u}_\varepsilon^0=\tilde{u}_\varepsilon$ on $\partial D_t\setminus\Delta_t$. Let $w=v_h-v$, and there holds $\mathcal{L}_0(w)=0$ in D_t and $w=\tilde{u}_\varepsilon-\widetilde{u}_\varepsilon^0$ on ∂D_t. Note that $\Delta_t\setminus\Gamma_\varepsilon$ represents the holes intersected with the boundary set Δ_t, which are disconnected. For each connected component, one may appeal to the trace theorem and its estimated constant would rely on the diameter of the component which is around the ε-scale. Thus, we obtain the following computation:

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\Delta_t\setminus\Gamma_\varepsilon}|\tilde{u}_\varepsilon|^2dS&\lesssim\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\int_{O_\varepsilon\cap D_t}|\tilde{u}_\varepsilon|^2dx+\varepsilon\int_{O_\varepsilon\cap D_t}|\nabla\tilde{u}_\varepsilon|^2dx\\&\lesssim\varepsilon\int_{O_\varepsilon\cap D_t}|\nabla\tilde{u}_\varepsilon|^2dx\lesssim\varepsilon\int_{D_{3/2}}|\nabla\tilde{u}_\varepsilon|^2dx\lesssim\varepsilon\int_{D_3^\varepsilon}|u_\varepsilon|^2dx\end{aligned} \tag{7.6}$$

where we use Poincaré's inequality in the second step. The last one follows from the estimate (7.3). Then, on account of nontangential maximal function estimates (see [16, Theorem 3.6]) that

$$\|w\|_{L^2(D_t)} \lesssim \|(w)^*\|_{L^2(\partial D_t)} \lesssim \|\tilde{u}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Delta_t)} \lesssim \varepsilon^{1/2}\|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(D_3)}, \tag{7.7}$$

where we refer the reader to (1.28) for the notation $(w)^*$, and we employ the estimate (7.6) in the last inequality. Combining the estimates (7.5) and (7.7) we have

$$\|u_\varepsilon - v\|_{L^2(D_1)} \le \|u_\varepsilon - v_h\|_{L^2(D_1)} + \|w\|_{L^2(D_1)} \lesssim \varepsilon^{1/2}\|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(D_3)},$$

and rescaling back leads to the desired result (7.2). We have completed the proof. □

For the ease of the statement, we impose the following notation:

$$\begin{aligned} G(r,u) &:= \frac{1}{r}\inf_{M\in\mathbb{R}^{d\times d}}\left\{\left(\fint_{D_r}|u-Mx|^2dx\right)^{\frac12} + r\|T(M)\|_{L^\infty(\Delta_r)} + \|Mx\|_{L^\infty(\Delta_r)}\right\},\\ G_\varepsilon(r,u) &:= \frac{1}{r}\inf_{M\in\mathbb{R}^{d\times d}}\left\{\left(\fint_{D_r^\varepsilon}|u-Mx|^2dx\right)^{\frac12} + r\|T(M)\|_{L^\infty(\Delta_r)} + \|Mx\|_{L^\infty(\Delta_r)}\right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{7.8}$$

where we denote $T(M) := \nabla_{\tan}(Mx)$, and its component may be written as $(n_jM_{ik} - n_iM_{jk})$ and $n = (n_1, \cdots, n_d)$ is the outward unit normal to $\partial\Omega$. The notation D_r, Δ_r and D_r^ε are introduced in Subsection 1.6.

Lemma 7.3 (comparing at large-scales)**.** *Let $\varepsilon \le r \le 1$. Suppose that ω satisfies the hypothesis* (H2). *Assume that $v \in H^1(D_{4r};\mathbb{R}^d)$ is a solution to $\mathcal{L}_0(v) = 0$ in D_{4r} with $v = 0$ on Δ_{4r}. Then one may derive that*

$$G(r,v) \lesssim G_\varepsilon(2r,v), \tag{7.9}$$

where the up to constant depends on μ_0, μ_1, d, $\mathfrak{g}^\omega$ and the character of ω.

Proof. Let $\tilde{v} = v - Mx$, and we have $\mathcal{L}_0(\tilde{v}) = 0$ in D_{4r} with $\tilde{v} = -Mx$ on Δ_{4r}. The proof is reduced to show there exists a constant, in dependent of ε and r, such that

$$\fint_{D_r}|\tilde{v}|^2 \le C\fint_{D_{2r}^\varepsilon}|\tilde{v}|^2 + r^2\|T(M)\|^2_{L^\infty(\Delta_{2r})} + \|Mx\|^2_{L^\infty(\Delta_{2r})}. \tag{7.10}$$

If so, for any $M \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$ one may have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\fint_{D_r}|v-Mx|^2\right)^{1/2} + r\|T(M)\|_{L^\infty(\Delta_r)} + \|Mx\|_{L^\infty(\Delta_r)}\\ &\qquad\lesssim \left(\fint_{D_{2r}^\varepsilon}|v-Mx|^2\right)^{1/2} + r\|T(M)\|_{L^\infty(\Delta_{2r})} + \|Mx\|_{L^\infty(\Delta_{2r})}, \end{aligned}$$

and this implies the desired estimate (7.9). The reminder of the proof is devoted to the estimate (7.10). Recalling that $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \varepsilon\omega = \cup_{k=1}^\infty H_k^\varepsilon$, we impose two parameters $0 < c_1 < c_2 < (\mathfrak{g}^\omega/10)$. In fact, let $\varphi_1^\varepsilon = 1$ on $\mathbb{R}^d\setminus(\varepsilon\omega)$ and $\varphi_1^\varepsilon(x) = 0$ whenever $\mathrm{dist}(x, H_k^\varepsilon) > c_1\varepsilon\}$ for each k and $|\nabla\varphi_1^\varepsilon| \lesssim 1/\varepsilon$, while we set $\varphi_2^\varepsilon(x) = 1$ if $\mathrm{dist}(x, H_k^\varepsilon) > c_1\varepsilon\}$ for each k, and $\varphi_2^\varepsilon(x) = 0$ if $\mathrm{dist}(x, H_k^\varepsilon) > c_2\varepsilon$ and $|\nabla\varphi_2^\varepsilon| \lesssim 1/\varepsilon$. These two are cut-off functions whose supports are around the holes $\{H_k^\varepsilon\}$. Since

$$\fint_{D_r}|\tilde{v}|^2 \le \fint_{D_r^\varepsilon}|\tilde{v}|^2 + \fint_{D_r\setminus\varepsilon\omega}|\tilde{v}|^2,$$

we just study the second term of the right-hand side above, and

$$\begin{aligned}\fint_{D_r\setminus\varepsilon\omega}|\tilde{v}|^2 \le \fint_{D_r\cap\mathrm{supp}(\varphi_1^\varepsilon)}|\varphi_1^\varepsilon\tilde{v}|^2 &\lesssim \varepsilon^2\fint_{D_r\cap\mathrm{supp}(\varphi_1^\varepsilon)}|\nabla(\varphi_1^\varepsilon\tilde{v})|^2\\ &\lesssim \fint_{D_{2r}^\varepsilon}|\tilde{v}|^2+\varepsilon^2\fint_{\tilde{D}_r\cap\mathrm{supp}(\varphi_2^\varepsilon)}|\varphi_2^\varepsilon\nabla\tilde{v}|^2\\ &\lesssim \fint_{D_{2r}^\varepsilon}|\tilde{v}|^2+\|Mx\|^2_{L^\infty(\Delta_{2r})}+\varepsilon^2\|T(M)\|^2_{L^\infty(\Delta_{2r})},\end{aligned}$$

where one may prefer the region $\tilde{D}_r$ such that $D_r\subset\tilde{D}_r\subset D_{2r}$ and $\varphi_2^\varepsilon v=0$ on $\partial\tilde{D}_r\setminus\Delta_{2r}$, and the last inequality above actually comes from the boundary Caccioppoli's inequality (8.1). This proved the stated estimate (7.10) (by noting that $\varepsilon\le r\le 1$), and we have completed the whole proof. □

Lemma 7.4 (decay estimates for homogenized equations)**.** *Let $\varepsilon\le r<1$ and Ω be a bounded $C^{1,\eta}$ domain. Let v be the solution to $\mathcal{L}_0(v)=0$ in D_{4r} with $v=0$ on Δ_{4r}. Then for any $\theta\in(0,1)$ there holds*

$$G_\varepsilon(\theta r,v)\lesssim\theta^\kappa G_\varepsilon(r,v) \tag{7.11}$$

where $\kappa\in(0,1)$, and the up to constant depends μ_0,μ_1,d, $\mathfrak{g}^\omega$ and the characters of ω and Ω.

Proof. The desired result follows from Lemma 7.3 and classical boundary Schauder estimates. The argument is the same to that given in [6, Lemma 7.1] and we provide a proof for the sake of the completeness. One may prefer $M=\nabla v(x)$ for any $x\in\Delta_{4r}$. Then $T(M)=\nabla_{\tan}v=0$ (since $v=0$ on Δ_{4r}), and we have

$$G_\varepsilon(\theta r,v)\le G(\theta r,v)\le C(\theta r)^\kappa\big[\nabla v\big]_{C^{0,\kappa}(D_{\theta r})}+\|v-\nabla v\cdot x\|_{L^\infty(D_{\theta r})}\lesssim(\theta r)^\kappa\big[\nabla v\big]_{C^{0,\kappa}(D_r)}.$$

By noting that $[\nabla v]_{C^{0,\kappa}(D_r)}=[\nabla\tilde{v}]_{C^{0,\kappa}(D_r)}$ and $\tilde{v}:=v-Mx$ for any $M\in\mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$, one may have

$$r^\kappa\big[\nabla v\big]_{C^{0,\kappa}(D_r)}\lesssim\frac{1}{r}\bigg\{\Big(\fint_{D_{2r}}|\tilde{v}|^2dx\Big)^{1/2}+\|Mx\|_{L^\infty(\Delta_{2r})}\bigg\}+\|\nabla_{\tan}(Mx)\|_{L^\infty(\Delta_{2r})},$$

since $\mathcal{L}_0(\tilde{v})=0$ in D_{4r} and $\tilde{v}=-Mx$ on Δ_{4r}. For $M\in\mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$ is arbitrary, the desired estimate (7.11) consequently follows from the estimate (7.9), and we have completed the proof. □

Lemma 7.5 (iteration's inequality)**.** *Suppose that $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon$ and ω satisfy the hypothesises* (H1) *and* (H2)*. Let u_ε be a weak solution to the equation $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon)=0$ in D_4^ε, $\sigma_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon)=0$ on $D_4\cap\partial(\varepsilon\omega)$ and $u_\varepsilon=0$ on $\Delta_4\cap\varepsilon\omega$. Define the quantity*

$$\Phi(r):=\frac{1}{r}\Big(\fint_{D_r^\varepsilon}|u_\varepsilon|^2dx\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Then, there exists $\theta\in(0,1/4)$, such that

$$G_\varepsilon(\theta r,u_\varepsilon)\le\frac{1}{2}G_\varepsilon(r,u_\varepsilon)+C\Big(\frac{\varepsilon}{r}\Big)^{1/2}\Phi(r) \tag{7.12}$$

holds for any $\varepsilon\le r<1$.

Proof. The proof directly follows from Lemmas 7.2 and 7.4 and we omit the details. □

The proof of Theorem 1.6. The desired estimate (1.19) mainly follows from (7.12) coupled with [38, Lemma 8.5] and Caccioppoli's inequality (7.1). For the scheme on interior Lipschitz estimates had already been well stated in the proof [36, Theorem 1.1] in details, we left these computations to the reader. □

8 Appendix

Lemma 8.1 (Caccioppoli's inequality with nonvanishing boundary data). *Let Ω be a Lipschitz domain and $0 < r \le 1$. Suppose $\mathcal{L}$ is an elliptic operator with a constant coefficient and satisfies the condition (1.4). Let v be the solution to $\mathcal{L}(v) = 0$ in D_{2r} and $v = g$ on Δ_{2r} with $g \in H^1(\Delta_{2r}; \mathbb{R}^d)$. Then we have*

$$\left(\fint_{D_r} |\nabla v|^2 dx\right)^{1/2} \lesssim \frac{1}{r}\left\{\left(\fint_{D_r} |v|^2 dx\right)^{1/2} + \left(\fint_{\Delta_{2r}} |g|^2 dx\right)^{1/2}\right\} + \left(\fint_{\Delta_{2r}} |\nabla_{\tan} g|^2 dx\right)^{1/2}, \tag{8.1}$$

where the constant depends on μ_0, μ_1, d and the character of Ω.

Proof. By rescaling argument it is fine to assume $r = 1$. Let $\tilde{g}$ be the extension of g such that $\tilde{g} = g$ on Δ_2 with $\tilde{g} \in H_0^1(\Delta_3)$, and $\|\tilde{g}\|_{H^1(\partial D_3)} \lesssim \|g\|_{H^1(\Delta_2)}$. Then we construct an auxiliary function G satisfying

$$\mathcal{L}(G) = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad D_3 \qquad G = \tilde{g} \quad \text{on} \quad \partial D_3.$$

Then there holds

$$\|G\|_{L^2(D_3)} \lesssim \|\nabla G\|_{L^2(D_3)} \lesssim \|\tilde{g}\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial D_3)} \lesssim \|\tilde{g}\|_{H^1(\partial D_3)} \lesssim \|g\|_{H^1(\Delta_2)}, \tag{8.2}$$

where we use the fact that $G = 0$ on $\partial D_3 \setminus \Delta_3$ in the first inequality. Let $w = v - G$, and then $\mathcal{L}(w) = 0$ in D_2 and $w = 0$ on Δ_2, it follows from the estimate similar to (7.1) that

$$\|\nabla w\|_{L^2(D_1)} \lesssim \|w\|_{L^2(D_2)}$$

and therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(D_1)} &\le \|\nabla w\|_{L^2(D_1)} + \|\nabla G\|_{L^2(D_3)} \\ &\lesssim \|w\|_{L^2(D_1)} + \|\nabla G\|_{L^2(D_3)} \lesssim \|v\|_{L^2(D_2)} + \|g\|_{H^1(\Delta_2)}, \end{aligned}$$

where we use the estimate (8.2) in the last step. Then rescaling back there holds the desired estimate (8.1) and we have completed the proof. □

Theorem 8.2 (weighted $W^{1,p}$ estimates for mixed boundary conditions). *Let $|\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{2}| < \frac{1}{2d} + \epsilon$ with $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$, and $\rho \in A_p$. Assume that Ω is a bounded Lipschitz domain, and $\partial\Omega = (\partial\Omega)_D \cup (\partial\Omega)_N$ with $(\partial\Omega)_D \cap (\partial\Omega)_N = \emptyset$ satisfy the same geometry conditions as in [10, Theorem 1.5]. Suppose that $\bar{a}$ is a constant coefficient satisfying the ellipticity and symmetry conditions (1.4). Let u be associated with f by*

$$\begin{cases} \nabla \cdot \bar{a}\nabla u = \nabla \cdot f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \partial u/\partial \nu = -n \cdot f & \text{on } (\partial\Omega)_N, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } (\partial\Omega)_D, \end{cases} \tag{8.3}$$

in which $\partial u/\partial \nu := n \cdot \bar{a}\nabla u$ is the conormal derivative of u. Then, there holds the weighted estimate

$$\left(\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^p \rho dx\right)^{1/p} \lesssim \left(\int_\Omega |f|^p \rho dx\right)^{1/p}, \tag{8.4}$$

where the up to constant depends on μ_0, μ_1, p, d and the character of Ω.

Proof. For the ease of the statement, we impose the following notation: $\Delta_{4r}^N := (\partial\Omega)_N \cap \partial D_{4r}$; $\Delta_{4r}^D := (\partial\Omega)_D \cap \partial D_{4r}$. The main idea is actually parallel to that given for Theorem 1.4, and we provide a proof for the reader's convenience. The proof is divided into four steps.

Step 1. We first show the reverse Hölder's inequality

$$\Big(\fint_{D_r} |\nabla u|^{\bar{p}}\Big)^{1/\bar{p}} \lesssim \Big(\fint_{D_{2r}} |\nabla u|^2\Big)^{1/2} \tag{8.5}$$

holds for $\bar{p} = \frac{2d}{d-1}$, provided u satisfies $\nabla \cdot \bar{a}\nabla u = 0$ in D_{4r}, and $\partial u/\partial\nu = 0$ on Δ_{4r}^N with $u = 0$ on Δ_{4r}^D. Based upon the Sobolev embedding theorem and duality arguments (see for example [29, Remark 9.3]), for $t \in (1,2)$, one may derive that

$$\begin{aligned}\Big(\int_{D_{tr}} |\nabla u|^{\bar{p}} dx\Big)^{1/\bar{p}} &\lesssim \Big(\int_{\partial D_{tr}} |(\nabla u)^*|^2 dx\Big)^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim \Big(\int_{\partial D_{tr}\setminus\Delta_{4r}} |\nabla u|^2 dS\Big)^{1/2} + \Big(\int_{\Delta_{tr}^D} |\nabla_{\tan} u|^2 dS\Big)^{1/2} + \Big(\int_{\Delta_{tr}^N} |\frac{\partial u}{\partial\nu}|^2 dS\Big)^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim \Big(\int_{\partial D_{tr}\setminus\Delta_{4r}} |\nabla u|^2 dS\Big)^{1/2},\end{aligned} \tag{8.6}$$

where we employ the Rellich's estimate [10, Theorem 1.5] in the second inequality (we remark that the Rellich's estimate comes from Rellich's identity, which is still valid for elliptic systems with a symmetry coefficient), and the last inequality is due to the assumption on the boundary data. Then, squaring and integrating both sides of (8.6) with respect to $t \in (1,2)$, we obtain

$$\Big(\int_{D_r} |\nabla u|^{\bar{p}} dx\Big)^{2/\bar{p}} \lesssim \frac{1}{r}\int_{D_{2r}} |\nabla u|^2 dx, \tag{8.7}$$

and this implies the desired inequality (8.5). Moreover, it follows from a self-improvement property that there exits a small parameter $\epsilon > 0$, depending on μ_0, μ_1, d and the character of Ω, such that the estimate (8.5) is still true for the new index $\bar{p}^+ := \frac{2d}{d-1} + \epsilon$.

Step 2. The real arguments lead to $W^{1,p}$ estimates for $2 \le p < \bar{p}^+$, i.e.,

$$\Big(\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p dx\Big)^{1/p} \lesssim \Big(\int_{\Omega} |f|^p dx\Big)^{1/p}. \tag{8.8}$$

To do so, we decompose the equation (8.3) as follows:

$$\text{(i)}\begin{cases} \nabla\cdot\bar{a}\nabla v = \nabla\cdot(I_B f) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \partial v/\partial\nu = -n\cdot(I_B f) & \text{on } (\partial\Omega)_N, \\ v = 0 & \text{on } (\partial\Omega)_D, \end{cases} \qquad \text{(ii)}\begin{cases} \nabla\cdot\bar{a}\nabla w = \nabla\cdot g & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \partial w/\partial\nu = -n\cdot g & \text{on } (\partial\Omega)_N, \\ w = 0 & \text{on } (\partial\Omega)_D, \end{cases} \tag{8.9}$$

where $g := (1 - I_B)f$, and $B := B(x,r)$ with $r > 0$ and $x \in \bar{\Omega}$ are arbitrary. Hence, it is not hard to see that $u = v + w$. On the one hand, from the equation (i) one may get

$$\Big(\fint_{\frac{1}{4}B\cap\Omega} |\nabla v|^2\Big)^{1/2} \lesssim \Big(\fint_{B\cap\Omega} |f|^2\Big)^{1/2}, \tag{8.10}$$

where we merely employ the energy estimate for the solution of (i). One the other hand, it is known by Step 1 that w in (ii) satisfies the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}\Big(\fint_{\frac14 B\cap\Omega}|\nabla w|^{\bar p^+}\Big)^{1/\bar p^+}&\lesssim\Big(\fint_{\frac12 B\cap\Omega}|\nabla w|^2\Big)^{1/2}\\&\lesssim\Big(\fint_{\frac12 B\cap\Omega}|\nabla u|^2\Big)^{1/2}+\Big(\fint_{\frac12 B\cap\Omega}|\nabla v|^2\Big)^{1/2}\\&\lesssim^{(8.10)}\Big(\fint_{\frac12 B\cap\Omega}|\nabla u|^2\Big)^{1/2}+\Big(\fint_{B\cap\Omega}|f|^2\Big)^{1/2}.\end{aligned}\tag{8.11}$$

Thus, for any $2\le p<\bar p^+$, the estimates (8.10) and (8.11) together with Lemma 6.1 leads to

$$\Big(\int_\Omega|\nabla u|^p dx\Big)^{1/p}\lesssim\Big(\int_\Omega|\nabla u|^2\Big)^{1/2}+\Big(\int_\Omega|f|^p\Big)^{1/p}\lesssim\Big(\int_\Omega|f|^p\Big)^{1/p},$$

and the last step follows from energy estimate and Hölder's inequality. This completes the proof of (8.8). Consequently, the duality argument implies that the estimate (8.8) holds for any p satisfying $|\frac1p-\frac12|<\frac{1}{2d}+\epsilon$.

Step 3. Let $U=|\nabla u|$ and $F=|f|$. For $\frac{2d}{d+1}-\epsilon<s<p<\frac{2d}{d-1}+\epsilon$, we claim that the next estimate

$$\int_\Omega\big[\mathcal{M}_\Omega(U^s)(x)\big]^{\frac ps}\rho(x)dx\lesssim\rho(\Omega)\Big(\fint_\Omega U^s\Big)^{\frac ps}+\int_\Omega\big[\mathcal{M}_\Omega(F^s)(x)\big]^{\frac ps}\rho(x)dx\tag{8.12}$$

implies the desired estimate (8.4), where the localized Hardy-Littlewood maximal operator $\mathcal{M}_\Omega$ is defined by (6.15), and $\rho\in A_{p/s}$. On the one hand, recalling the estimate (6.16) we have

$$\Big(\int_\Omega\big[\mathcal{M}_\Omega(F^s)\big]^{\frac ps}\rho dx\Big)^{1/p}\lesssim\Big(\int_\Omega|f|^p\rho dx\Big)^{1/p}.\tag{8.13}$$

Moreover, it follows from Step 2 and the computation given for (6.20) that

$$\begin{aligned}\rho(\Omega)\Big(\fint_\Omega|\nabla u|^s\Big)^{\frac ps}&\lesssim\rho(\Omega)\Big(\fint_\Omega|f|^s\Big)^{\frac ps}\\&\lesssim\rho(\Omega)\Big(\fint_\Omega|f|^p\rho dx\Big)\Big(\fint_\Omega\rho^{-\frac{s}{p-s}}dx\Big)^{\frac{p-s}{s}}\lesssim\int_\Omega|f|^p\rho dx.\end{aligned}\tag{8.14}$$

One the other hand, in terms of the Lebesgue's differentiation theorem, it is known that for a.e. $x\in\Omega$ there holds $|\nabla u(x)|^s=\lim_{r\to0}\fint_{B(x,r)}|\nabla u|^s$, and so $|\nabla u(x)|^s\lesssim\mathcal{M}_\Omega(|\nabla u|^s)(x)$. This implies

$$\int_\Omega|\nabla u(x)|^p\rho(x)dx\lesssim\int_\Omega\big[\mathcal{M}_\Omega(|\nabla u|^s)(x)\big]^{\frac ps}\rho(x)dx,\tag{8.15}$$

since $\rho\ge0$. Plugging the estimates (8.13), (8.14) and (8.15) back into (8.12) we have completed the arguments for the claim and therefore obtained the stated estimate (8.4). Hence, the remainder of the proof is devoted to (8.12).

Step 4. Show the estimate (8.12). In fact, it may be reduced to the so-called good-λ inequality (6.25), which finally relies on the decomposition $u=v+w$ as in (8.9), as well as, the following estimates

$$\Big(\fint_{\frac14 B\cap\Omega}|\nabla v|^s\Big)^{1/s}\lesssim\Big(\fint_{B\cap\Omega}|f|^s\Big)^{1/s}\tag{8.16}$$

and

$$\Big(\fint_{\frac{1}{4}B\cap\Omega}|\nabla w|^{\bar{p}^+}\Big)^{1/\bar{p}^+}\lesssim\Big(\fint_{B\cap\Omega}|\nabla w|^{s}\Big)^{1/s}. \tag{8.17}$$

The estimate (8.16) follows from Step 2 directly, while the estimate (8.17) involves a little more (in the case of $s<2$) compared with the estimate (8.5). Recalling the estimate (8.7), a covering argument leads to

$$\Big(\int_{B(0,s)\cap\Omega}|\nabla w|^{\bar{p}}dx\Big)^{1/\bar{p}}\le\frac{C_0}{s^{\frac{1}{2}}(t-s)^{\frac{1}{2}}}\Big(\int_{B(0,t)\cap\Omega}|\nabla w|^2dx\Big)^{1/2}$$

for any $0<s<t<1$. Then, applying the convexity argument [21, pp.173] to the above estimate we arrive at

$$\Big(\int_{B(0,r_0)}|\nabla w|^2dx\Big)^{1/2}\lesssim\Big(\int_{B(0,1)}|\nabla w|^{\underline{s}}dx\Big)^{1/\underline{s}} \tag{8.18}$$

for any $0<\underline{s}<2$, where $r_0\in(0,1)$ and the up to constant depends $\underline{s},\bar{p}$ and C_0. Thus, combining the estimates (8.5) and (8.18) gives the desired estimate (8.17). Finally, repeating the same arguments given for the good-λ inequality (6.25), we refer the reader to the proof of Theorem 1.4 and therefore omit these details here. We have completed the whole proof. □

Theorem 8.3 (layer & co-layer type estimates)**.** *Let $\Omega\subset\mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded Lipschitz domain and $0<\varepsilon\ll1$. Given $F\in L^2(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $g\in H^1(\partial\Omega;\mathbb{R}^d)$, let u_0 be associated with F and g by the equation (1.6), where the coefficient $\widehat{A}$ satisfies the elasticity condition (2.1). Then there hold the following estimates.*

1. *L^p estimates:*

$$\|\nabla u_0\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-1}}(\Omega)}\lesssim\Big\{\|F\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d+1}}(\Omega)}+\|g\|_{H^1(\partial\Omega)}\Big\}. \tag{8.19}$$

2. *Radial maximal function estimates*

$$\|\mathrm{M_r}(\nabla u_0)\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}\lesssim\Big\{\|F\|_{L^2(\Omega)}+\|g\|_{H^1(\partial\Omega)}\Big\}, \tag{8.20}$$

   where the operator $\mathrm{M_r}$ is defined by (1.27).

3. *Layer type estimates*

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2(O_{4\varepsilon})}&\lesssim\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}\Big\{\|g\|_{H^1(\partial\Omega)}+\|F\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\Big\};\\ \Big(\int_{O_{4\varepsilon}}|\nabla u_0|^2\delta dx\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}&\lesssim\varepsilon\Big\{\|g\|_{H^1(\partial\Omega)}+\|F\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\Big\}.\end{aligned} \tag{8.21}$$

4. *Co-layer type estimates*

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla^2 u_0\|_{L^2(\Omega\setminus O_{4\varepsilon})}&\lesssim\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}\Big\{\|g\|_{H^1(\partial\Omega)}+\|F\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\Big\};\\ \Big(\int_{\Omega\setminus O_{4\varepsilon}}|\nabla^2 u_0|^2\delta dx\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}&\lesssim\ln^{\frac{1}{2}}(1/\varepsilon)\Big\{\|g\|_{H^1(\partial\Omega)}+\|F\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\Big\};\\ \Big(\int_{\Omega\setminus O_{4\varepsilon}}|\nabla u_0|^2\delta^{-1}dx\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}&\lesssim\ln^{\frac{1}{2}}(1/\varepsilon)\Big\{\|g\|_{H^1(\partial\Omega)}+\|F\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\Big\}.\end{aligned} \tag{8.22}$$

The up to constant depends only on $\widehat{\mu}_0$, $\widehat{\mu}_1$, d and the character of Ω.

Remark 8.4. *To the authors' best knowledge, the first line of the estimates (8.21) and (8.22) were originally investigated by Z. Shen in [38, Theorems 2.6], while the second author generalized his arguments to the weighted type estimates (see [47, Lemma 4.5]).*

Proof. Here we merely show the proofs of (8.19) and (8.20) by using a similar idea given for the estimates (8.21) and (8.22), which is inspired by [38, Theorems 2.6] as we have mentioned in Remark 8.4.

Firstly, we decompose u_0 into two parts: v and w, which satisfy the following systems:

$$-\nabla\cdot(\widehat{A}\nabla v)=\tilde{F}\qquad\text{in}\quad\mathbb{R}^d, \tag{8.23}$$

and

$$\begin{cases}-\nabla\cdot(\widehat{A}\nabla w)=0 & \text{in }\Omega,\\ w=g-v & \text{on }\partial\Omega,\end{cases} \tag{8.24}$$

respectively. Let $\tilde{F}$ be a zero-extension of F, satisfying $\tilde{F}=F$ in Ω and $\tilde{F}=0$ in $\mathbb{R}^d\backslash\Omega$. In terms of (8.23), by the well-known fractional integral estimates and singular integral estimates for v (see for example [43]), we have that

$$\|\nabla v\|_{L^{p'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}+\|\nabla^2 v\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}\le C\|\tilde{F}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}\qquad\text{for } 1<p<d,\quad \frac{1}{p'}=\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{d}. \tag{8.25}$$

It follows from the divergence theorem that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\partial\Omega}|\nabla v|^2dS&\le C\bigg[\int_\Omega|\nabla v|^2dx+\int_\Omega|\nabla v||\nabla^2 v|dx\bigg]\\&\lesssim\|\nabla v\|^2_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-1}}(\Omega)}+\|\nabla^2 v\|^2_{L^{\frac{2d}{d+1}}(\Omega)},\end{aligned} \tag{8.26}$$

where we use Hölder's inequality. Then we turn to the equation (8.24). It follows from the nontangential maximal function estimates for L^2-regular problem in Lipschitz domains (see [16]) that

$$\begin{aligned}\|(\nabla w)^*\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}&\le C\Big(\|\nabla_{\tan}g\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}+\|\nabla_{\tan}v\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}\Big)\\&\lesssim\|g\|_{H^1(\partial\Omega)}+\|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)},\end{aligned}$$

where $(\nabla w)^*$ denotes the nontangential maximal function of ∇w (see (1.28) for its definition). On account of (8.26), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|(\nabla w)^*\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}&\lesssim\|g\|_{H^1(\partial\Omega)}+\|\nabla v\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-1}}(\Omega)}+\|\nabla^2 v\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d+1}}(\Omega)}\\&\lesssim^{(8.25)}\|g\|_{H^1(\partial\Omega)}+\|F\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d+1}}(\Omega)}.\end{aligned} \tag{8.27}$$

Secondly, for any $(u)^*\in L^2(\partial\Omega)$, the fractional integral coupled with a duality argument gives the following inequality

$$\|u\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-1}}(\Omega)}\lesssim\|(u)^*\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \tag{8.28}$$

(see for example [29, Remark 9.3]). In terms of the radial maximal function estimate, it follows from [48, Lemma 2.24] that

$$\|\mathrm{M_r}(u)\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}\lesssim\|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)}. \tag{8.29}$$

Consequently, based upon the decomposition $u_0 = v + w$ above, there hold

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla u_0\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-1}}(\Omega)} &\leq \|\nabla v\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-1}}(\Omega)} + \|\nabla w\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-1}}(\Omega)}\\ &\lesssim^{(8.25),(8.28)} \|F\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d+1}}(\Omega)} + \|(\nabla w)^*\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}\\ &\lesssim^{(8.27)} \|F\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d+1}}(\Omega)} + \|g\|_{H^1(\partial\Omega)},\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathrm{M_r}(\nabla u_0)\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} &\leq \|\mathrm{M_r}(\nabla v)\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \|\mathrm{M_r}(\nabla w)\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}\\ &\lesssim^{(8.29)} \|\nabla v\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|(\nabla w)^*\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}\\ &\lesssim^{(8.25),(8.27)} \|F\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|g\|_{H^1(\partial\Omega)},\end{aligned}$$

where we note the fact that $\mathrm{M_r}(\nabla w)(Q) \leq (\nabla w)^*(Q)$ for a.e. $Q \in \partial\Omega$. This ends the proof. □

Remark 8.5. *If $\partial\Omega \in C^1$, then, for any $1 < q < \infty$, the solution w to (8.24) owns the nontangential maximal function estimates $\|(\nabla w)^*\|_{L^q(\partial\Omega)} \lesssim \|\nabla w\|_{L^q(\partial\Omega)}$. Thus, for $2 \leq p < \frac{2d}{d-2}$, there holds*

$$\|\nabla u_0\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \lesssim \Big\{\|F\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|g\|_{W^{1,\bar{p}}(\partial\Omega)}\Big\}, \tag{8.30}$$

where $\bar{p} = p - p/d$, and the proof is as the same as that given for (8.19), and so is omitted.

Acknowledgements

Some referees had read the previous version (arXiv:2001.06874v1) and kindly pointed out a fatal mistake therein. The authors were grateful for this, since it started a real "improvement". The first author acknowledged the hospitality when she visited the Max Planck Institute for Mathematics in the Sciences in the winter of 2019. The second author deeply appreciated Prof. Felix Otto and his lectures, as well as financial support in CIMI (Toulouse), for the source of the idea of Theorem 1.5. Also, the research was supported by the Young Scientists Fund of the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 11901262), and supported by the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (Grant No. lzujbky-2019-21).

References

[1] E.Acerbi, V. Piat, G. Maso, D. Percivale, An extension theorem from connected sets, and homogenization in general periodic domains. Nonlinear Anal. 18(1992), no.5, 481-496.

[2] G. Allaire, Homogenization and two-scale convergence. SIAM J. Math. Anal. 23(1992), no.6, 1482-1518.

[3] S. Armstrong, J.-P. Daniel, Calderon-Zygmund estimates for stochastic homogenization, J. Funct. Anal. 270 (2016), no.1, 312-329.

[4] S. Armstrong, T. Kuusi, J.-C. Mourrat, The additive structure of elliptic homogenization, Invent. Math. 208 (2017), no.3, 999-1154.

[5] S. Armstrong, J.-C. Mourrat, Lipschitz regularity for elliptic equations with random coefficients, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 219 (2016), no.1, 255-348.

[6] S. Armstrong, Z. Shen, Lipschitz estimates in almost-periodic homogenization, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 69(2016), no.10, 1882-1923.

[7] M. Avellaneda, F. Lin, Compactness methods in the theory of homogenization, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 40, (1987) 803-847.

[8] H. Bahouri, Hajer; J.-Y. Chemin, R. Danchin, Fourier Analysis and Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], 343. Springer, Heidelberg, 2011.

[9] F. Boyer, P. Fabrie, Mathematical tools for the study of the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations and related models, Applied Mathematical Sciences, 183. Springer, New York, 2013.

[10] R. Brown, The mixed problem for Laplace's equation in a class of Lipschitz domains, Comm. Partial Differential Equations 19 (1994), no.7-8, 1217-1233.

[11] S.-S. Byun, L. Wang, Elliptic equations with BMO coefficients in Reifenberg domains, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 57 (2004), no.10, 1283-1310.

[12] L. Caffarelli, I. Peral, On $W^{1,p}$ estimates for elliptic equations in divergence form, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 51, 1-21 (1998).

[13] S.-K. Chua, Extension theorems on weighted Sobolev spaces, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 41(1992), no.4, 1027-1076.

[14] D. Cioranescu, A. Damlamian, G. Griso, The periodic unfolding method. Theory and applications to partial differential problems. Series in Contemporary Mathematics,3. Springer, Singapore, 2018.

[15] D. Cioranescu, J. Paulin, Homogenization in open sets with holes, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 71 (1979), no.2, 590-607.

[16] B. Dahlberg, C. Kenig, G. Verchota, Boundary value problems for the systems of elastostatics in Lipschitz domains. Duke Math. J. 57 (1988), no.3, 795-818.

[17] J. Duoandikoetxea, Fourier Analysis, translated and revised from the 1995 Spanish original by David Cruz-Uribe, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 29. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001.

[18] M. Duerinckx, F. Otto, Higher-order pathwise theory of flucuations in stochastic homogenization, Stoch PDE: Anal Comp (2019) (https://doi.org/10.1007/s40072-019-00156-4).

[19] R.-G. Duran, M. Sanmartino, M. Toschi, Weighted a priori estimates for the Poisson equation, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 57 (2008), no.7, 3463-3478.

[20] L. Evans, R. Gariepy, Measure Theory and Fine Properties of Functions (Rewised Edition), CRC Press, Boca Raton, 2015.

[21] C. Fefferman, E. Stein, H^p spaces of several variables, Acta Math. 129(1972), no.3-4, 137-193.

[22] A. Gloria, S. Neukamm, F. Otto, A regularity theory for random elliptic operators, *ArXiv e-print arXiv:1409.2678v3*, 2015.

[23] E. Di Nezza, G. Palatucci, E. Valdinoci, Hitchhiker's guide to the fractional Sobolev spaces, Bull. Sci. Math. 136 (2012), no. 5, 521-573.

[24] J. Geng, Z. Shen, L. Song, Boundary Korn inequality and Neumann problems in homogenization of systems of elasticity. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 224 (2017), no.3, 1205-1236.

[25] J. Geng, Z. Shen, L. Song, Uniform $W^{1,p}$ estimates for systems of linear elasticity in a periodic medium, J. Funct. Anal. 262(2012), no.4, 1742-1758.

[26] V. Jikov, S. Kozlov, O. Oleinik, Homogenization of differential operators and integral functionals. (English summary) Translated from the Russian by G. A. Yosifian [G.A. Iosif'yan]. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1994.

[27] M. Josien, F. Otto, The annealed Calderon-Zygmund estimates as convenient tool in quantitative schochastic homogenization, arXiv:2005.08811v1.

[28] C. Kenig, F. Lin, Z. Shen, Convergence rates in L^2 for elliptic homogenization problems, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 203(2012), no. 3, 1009-1036.

[29] C. Kenig, F. Lin, Z. Shen, Homogenization of elliptic systems with Neumann boundary conditions, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 26(2013), no.4, 901-937.

[30] C. Kenig, Z. Shen, Layer potential methods for elliptic homogenization problems, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 64(2011), no.1, 1-44.

[31] J. Lehrbäck, Weighted Hardy inequalities beyond Lipschitz domains, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 142 (2014), no.5, 1705-1715.

[32] J. Lehrbäck, A. Vähäkangas, In between the inequalities of Sobolev and Hardy, J. Funct. Anal. 271 (2016), no.2, 330-364.

[33] A. Lunardi, Interpolation Theory, Third edition, Appunti. Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa (Nuova Serie), 16. Edizioni della Normale, Pisa, 2018.

[34] J. Necas, Sur une methode pour resoudre les equations aux drives partielles du type elliptique, voisine de la variationnelle, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (3) 16 (1962), 305-326 (French).

[35] O. Oleinik, A. Shamaev, G. Yosifian, Mathematical problems in elasticity and homogenization. Studies in Mathematics and its Applications, 26. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1992.

[36] B. Russell, Homogenization in perforated domains and interior Lipschitz estimates, J. Differential Equations 263 (2017), no.6, 3396-3418.

[37] Z. Shen, Periodic homogenization of elliptic systems. Operator Theory: Advances and Applications, 269. Advances in Partial Differential Equations (Basel). Birkhuser/Springer, Cham, 2018.

[38] Z. Shen, Boundary estimates in elliptic homogenization, Anal. PDE 10, 653-694 (2017).

[39] Z. Shen, Weighted L^2 estimates for elliptic homogenization in Lipschitz domains, arXiv:2004.03087v1.

[40] Z. Shen, Bounds of Riesz transforms on L^p spaces for second order elliptic operators, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) 55, 173-197 (2005).

[41] Z. Shen, J. Zhuge, Boundary layers in periodic homogenization of Neumann problems, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 71 (2018), no. 11, 21632219.

[42] Z. Shen, J. Zhuge, Convergence rates in periodic homogenization of systems of elasticity. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 145 (2017), no.3, 1187-1202.

[43] E. Stein, Singular Integrals and Differentiability Properties of Functions, Princeton Mathematical Series, No.30, Princeton University Press, 1970.

[44] T. Suslina, Homogenization of the Neumann problem for elliptic systems with periodic coefficients.(English summary) SIAM J. Math. Anal. 45(2013), no.6, 3453-3493.

[45] T. Suslina, Homogenization of the Dirichlet problem for elliptic systems: L^2-operator error estimates, Mathematika 59 (2013), no.2, 463-476.

[46] L. Wang, Q. Xu, P. Zhao, Quantitative estimates for homogenization of nonlinear elliptic operators in perforated domains, Preprinted in arXiv (2020).

[47] Q. Xu, Convergence rates for general elliptic homogenization problems in Lipschitz domains, SIAM J. Math. Anal. 48(2016), no.6, 3742-3788.

[48] Q. Xu, Uniform regularity estimates in homogenization theory of elliptic systems with lower order terms on the Neumann boundary problem, J. Differential Equations 261(2016), no.8, 4368-4423.

[49] V. Zhikov, M. Rychago, Homogenization of nonlinear elliptic equations of the second order in perforated domains, Izv. Ross. Akad. Nauk, Ser. Mat 61, 69-89 (1997).

Li Wang
School of Mathematics and Statistics, Lanzhou University, Lanzhou, 710000, China.
E-mail:lwang10@lzu.edu.cn

Qiang Xu
Max Planck Institute for Mathematics in the Sciences, Inselstrasse 22, 04103 Leipzig, Germany
E-mail:qiangxu@mis.mpg.de

Peihao Zhao
School of Mathematics and Statistics, Lanzhou University, Lanzhou, 710000, China.
E-mail:zhaoph@lzu.edu.cn