

QUANTITATIVE CHARACTERIZATION OF TRACES OF SOBOLEV MAPS

KATARZYNA MAZOWIECKA AND JEAN VAN SCHAFTINGEN

ABSTRACT. We give a quantitative characterization of traces on the boundary of Sobolev maps in $\dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$, where \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{N} are compact Riemannian manifolds, $\partial\mathcal{M} \neq \emptyset$: the Borel-measurable maps $u: \partial\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ that are the trace of a map $U \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$ are characterized as the maps for which there exists an extension energy density $w: \partial\mathcal{M} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ that controls the Sobolev energy of extensions from $[p-1]$ -dimensional subsets of $\partial\mathcal{M}$ to $[p]$ -dimensional subsets of \mathcal{M} .

1. INTRODUCTION

Given \mathcal{M} a compact Riemannian manifold with non-empty boundary $\partial\mathcal{M}$, we consider the homogeneous Sobolev space defined as

$$\dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{R}) := \left\{ U: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}: U \text{ is weakly differentiable and } DU \in L^p(\mathcal{M}) \right\}.$$

The classical trace theorem of E. Gagliardo [12] states that for $p > 1$ there is a well-defined continuous and surjective trace operator

$$\text{tr}_{\partial\mathcal{M}}: \dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \dot{W}^{1-1/p,p}(\partial\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{R}),$$

such that for functions U that are additionally continuous we have $\text{tr}_{\partial\mathcal{M}} U = U|_{\partial\mathcal{M}}$. Here, for $0 < s < 1$ and $p \geq 1$, $\dot{W}^{s,p}(\partial\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{R})$ is the homogeneous Sobolev–Slobodeckij space, or fractional Sobolev space, defined as

$$(1.1) \quad \dot{W}^{s,p}(\partial\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{R}) := \left\{ u: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}: \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^p}{d_{\partial\mathcal{M}}(x, y)^{m-1+sp}} dx dy < \infty \right\},$$

where $m := \dim \mathcal{M} = \dim \partial\mathcal{M} + 1$ and $d_{\partial\mathcal{M}}$ is the geodesic distance on $\partial\mathcal{M}$.

If \mathcal{N} is a compact Riemannian manifold, that by J. Nash’s embedding theorem [21] can be assumed without loss of generality to be isometrically embedded into some Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^\nu \supseteq \mathcal{N}$, then the homogeneous spaces of Sobolev mappings can be defined for $p \geq 1$ as

$$\dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}) := \{U \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{R}^\nu): U(x) \in \mathcal{N} \text{ for almost every } x \in \mathcal{M}\}$$

and for $0 < s < 1$ and $p \geq 1$

$$\dot{W}^{s,p}(\partial\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}) := \{u \in \dot{W}^{s,p}(\partial\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{R}^\nu): u(x) \in \mathcal{N} \text{ for almost every } x \in \partial\mathcal{M}\};$$

these nonlinear Sobolev spaces arise naturally, for example, as domains of functionals in the calculus of variations and of partial differential equations in geometric analysis and physical models.

As a consequence of the straightforward vector version of Gagliardo’s trace theorem, the trace operator $\text{tr}_{\partial\mathcal{M}}$ is well-defined and continuous from $\dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$ to $\dot{W}^{1-1/p,p}(\partial\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 58D15 (46E35, 46T10, 46T20, 55S35).

The question of surjectivity of the trace operator is however much more delicate: given a map $u \in \dot{W}^{1-1/p,p}(\partial\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$, the classical linear extension construction gives a function $U \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\partial\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{R}^\nu)$ such that $\text{tr}_{\partial\mathcal{M}} U = u$ with no guarantee whatsoever about the range of the extension U .

Indeed, the surjectivity of the trace operator can first fail because of *global topological obstructions*: For instance if $p > m$, by the Morrey–Sobolev embedding, mappings in the spaces $\dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$ and $\dot{W}^{1-1/p,p}(\partial\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$ are almost everywhere equal to continuous maps, and classical topological obstructions for the extension of continuous maps results in obstructions for the extension of Sobolev mappings. When $1 \leq p < m$, a *Lipschitz-continuous* map $u \in \text{Lip}(\partial\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$ is known to be a trace of a map in $\dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$ if and only if u has a continuous extension to $\partial\mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{M}^{[p]}$, where $\mathcal{M}^{[p]}$ is a $[p]$ -dimensional skeleton of \mathcal{M} [24, Section 4]; here and in the sequel $[t]$ denotes the integer part of the real number t , so that $[t] \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $[t] \leq t < [t] + 1$.

Local topological obstructions can prevent locally the surjectivity of the trace operator: If $p < m$ and if the homotopy group $\pi_{[p-1]}(\mathcal{N})$ is not trivial, by definition there exists a map $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{S}^{[p-1]}, \mathcal{N})$ which is not homotopic to a constant; define the mapping $u: \mathbb{B}^{m-1} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ for $x = (x', x'') \in \mathbb{B}^{m-1} \subset \mathbb{R}^{[p]} \times \mathbb{R}^{m-[p+1]}$ by $u(x) := f(x'/|x'|)$; we have $u \in \dot{W}^{1-1/p,p}(\partial\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$, whereas there is no $U \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathbb{B}^{m-1} \times (0, 1), \mathcal{N})$ such that $\text{tr}_{\mathbb{B}^{m-1}} U = u$ [3, Theorem 4; 14, Section 6.3].

Analytical obstructions finally arise locally for the extension problem: There exist maps in $\dot{W}^{1-1/p,p}(\mathbb{B}^{m-1}, \mathcal{N})$ that are strong limits of smooth maps from \mathbb{B}^{m-1} to \mathcal{N} but are not traces of maps in $\dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathbb{B}^{m-1} \times (0, 1), \mathcal{N})$. This is known to happen when either the homotopy group $\pi_\ell(\mathcal{N})$ is infinite for some $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\ell \leq \max\{m, p\} - 1$ [1] (see also [3, Theorem 6]) and when $p \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 1\}$ and the homotopy group $\pi_{p-1}(\mathcal{N})$ is nontrivial [19]. These analytical obstructions can be seen in view of a nonlinear uniform boundedness principle as a consequence of the failure of linear estimates on extensions for smooth maps [20]; when $2 \leq p < 3$, these analytical obstructions are connected to similar analytical obstructions for the lifting problem in fractional Sobolev spaces [2, 18].

On the other hand, the trace is known to be surjective from $\dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathbb{B}^{m-1} \times (0, 1), \mathcal{N})$ onto $\dot{W}^{1-1/p,p}(\mathbb{B}^{m-1}, \mathcal{N})$ in the following cases: when $p \geq m$ [3, Theorem 1 & 2], for $p > m$ it is a consequence of the Morrey–Sobolev embedding whereas for $p = m$ it is a consequence of the embedding into maps of vanishing mean oscillation (VMO) [8, 9]; when $1 < p < 2 \leq m$ or $2 \leq p < 3 \leq m$ with $\pi_1(\mathcal{N}) \simeq \{0\}$ [14, Theorem 6.2]; when $3 \leq p < m$, $\pi_1(\mathcal{N})$ is finite, and $\pi_2(\mathcal{N}) \simeq \dots \simeq \pi_{[p-1]}(\mathcal{N}) \simeq \{0\}$ [14, Theorem 6.2; 19]. The case when $4 \leq p < m$, $\pi_1(\mathcal{N}), \dots, \pi_{[p-2]}(\mathcal{N})$ are finite, and $\pi_{[p-1]}(\mathcal{N}) \simeq \{0\}$ remains open.

We are interested in the question of characterizing in general the range of the trace operator. T. Isobe [15] has provided characterization of the maps $u: \partial\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ that are the traces of maps in $\dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$ as the maps satisfying the two conditions:

(\mathfrak{o}_A) The mapping u satisfies

$$\overline{\lim}_{t \rightarrow 0} \overline{\lim}_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \inf \left\{ \int_{[0,t] \times \partial\mathcal{M}} |DU|^p + \frac{\text{dist}(U, \mathcal{N})^p}{\varepsilon^p} : U \in \dot{W}^{1,p}([0, t] \times \partial\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{R}^\nu) \text{ and } \text{tr}_{\partial\mathcal{M}} U = u \right\} = 0.$$

(\mathfrak{o}_B) The restriction of the mapping u to a generic triangulation $\mathcal{M}^{[p-1]} \cap \partial\mathcal{M}$ is homotopic in $\text{VMO}(\mathcal{M}^{[p-1]} \cap \partial\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$ to the restriction of a continuous function from $\mathcal{M}^{[p]}$ to \mathcal{N} ,

where \mathcal{M}^ℓ with $\ell \in \{0, \dots, m\}$ stands for the ℓ -dimensional skeleton of a triangulation of \mathcal{M} .

Isobe's first obstruction (\mathfrak{o}_A) is equivalent to u belonging to the image of the trace operator on $\dot{W}^{1,p}(\partial\mathcal{M} \times [0,1], \mathcal{N})$, implying in particular through classical linear trace theory that $u \in W^{1-1/p,p}(\partial\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$; this condition (\mathfrak{o}_A) can be seen as an asymptotic condition on a family of Ginzburg–Landau functionals; according to Isobe the problem of characterizing in general maps satisfying (\mathfrak{o}_A) remains open [15, p. 367]. In (\mathfrak{o}_B) , the notion of generic skeleton has to be understood in the sense of holding for almost every value of the parameter for a parametrized family of triangulations (see [13, Section 3; 23, Section 3; 24, Section 3]); the homotopy in $\text{VMO}(\mathcal{M}^{[p-1]} \cap \partial\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$ is understood in the sense of [8] (see also Section 2.4). When $p \notin \mathbb{N}$, (\mathfrak{o}_B) can be simplified into requiring that restrictions of the mapping u to generic triangulations $\mathcal{M}^{[p-1]} \cap \partial\mathcal{M}$ are equal almost everywhere to restrictions of continuous mappings from $\mathcal{M}^{[p]}$ to \mathcal{N} .

The goal of the present work is to characterize the image of the trace by the properties of mappings on lower-dimensional subsets. This approach is motivated by the fact that in the Gagliardo energy appearing in the definition (1.1) of the fractional Sobolev space $\dot{W}^{1-1/p,p}(\partial\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$, the quotient

$$\frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^p}{d_{\partial\mathcal{M}}(x, y)^{p-1}}$$

can be interpreted as the minimal energy in $\dot{W}^{1,p}([0, d_{\partial\mathcal{M}}(x, y)], \mathbb{R})$ to connect $u(x)$ to $u(y)$. Because of the quantitative nature of the phenomenon of analytical obstructions, we expect any characterization of the trace space to have some quantitative character. Finally, a workable characterization should be based on a robust definition of generic lower-dimensional set, as developed as topological screening by P. Bousquet, A. Ponce, and J. Van Schaftingen [4].

We first consider the case where the domain manifold \mathcal{M} is the m -dimensional half-space $\mathbb{R}_+^m := \mathbb{R}^{m-1} \times (0, \infty)$ with boundary $\partial\mathbb{R}_+^m = \mathbb{R}^{m-1} \times \{0\}$ and closure $\bar{\mathbb{R}}_+^m := \mathbb{R}^{m-1} \times [0, \infty)$. In order to formulate our results we settle some terminology and notation.

We assume that simplexes of a simplicial complex inherit the metric and the measure from their canonical realization as an equilateral simplex of side-length 1; on the full complex Σ , a measure is defined by additivity and a distance d^Σ . Given simplicial complexes Σ and Σ_0 and $\lambda > 0$, we define the quantity

$$(1.2) \quad \gamma_{\Sigma_0, \Sigma}^\lambda := \sup_{\substack{z \in \Sigma_0 \\ \delta > 0}} \frac{|B_{\lambda\delta}^\Sigma(z)|}{\delta |\Sigma_0 \cap B_\delta^\Sigma(z)|},$$

with the measure in the numerator being taken relatively to Σ and in the denominator relatively to Σ_0 ; we note that $\gamma_{\Sigma_0, \Sigma}^\lambda < \infty$ for every $\lambda > 0$ whenever Σ is a finite homogeneous simplicial complex and if $\Sigma_0 \subset \Sigma$ is a homogeneous simplicial complex of codimension 1; (1.2) is reminiscent of an *Alhfors upper codimension-1 bound* (see [16, 17, 22], where a doubling condition is made separately). The quantity $|\sigma|_{\text{Lip}}$ denotes the Lipschitz constant of the map $\sigma: \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^m$

$$|\sigma|_{\text{Lip}} := \sup_{x, y \in \Sigma} \frac{|\sigma(x) - \sigma(y)|}{d_\Sigma(x, y)}.$$

We define the *canonical cubication of the half-space* \mathbb{R}_+^m of size κ as follows. For $\ell \in \{0, \dots, m\}$ and $\kappa > 0$, we write

$$(1.3) \quad \mathcal{Q}^{\kappa, \ell} := \left\{ Q \subset \mathbb{R}^m : Q \text{ is a closed } \ell\text{-dimensional face of } \left[-\frac{\kappa}{2}, \frac{\kappa}{2} \right]^m + \kappa k \text{ with } k \in \mathbb{Z}^m \right\}$$

and we let then

$$(1.4) \quad \mathcal{Q}_+^{\kappa, \ell} := \{Q \cap \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+^m : Q \in \mathcal{Q}^{\kappa, \ell}\}, \quad \mathcal{Q}_0^{\kappa, \ell} := \{Q \cap \partial\mathbb{R}_+^m : Q \in \mathcal{Q}^{\kappa, \ell+1}\}$$

(with $\ell \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$ in the definition of $\mathcal{Q}_0^{\kappa, \ell}$; since the faces of cubes of $\mathcal{Q}^{\kappa, \ell}$ all intersect transversally $\partial\mathbb{R}_+^m$, the cubes in $\mathcal{Q}_0^{\kappa, \ell}$ are ℓ -dimensional) and

$$(1.5) \quad \mathcal{C}_+^{\kappa, \ell} = \bigcup \mathcal{Q}_+^{\kappa, \ell}, \quad \mathcal{C}_0^{\kappa, \ell} = \bigcup \mathcal{Q}_0^{\kappa, \ell}.$$

We will state our results for a mapping u from $\partial\mathbb{R}_+^m$ defined everywhere following [13, p. 66; 24, p. 5]. In other words, we do not consider equivalence classes of functions equal almost everywhere. (Otherwise, given any σ or any h , there exists a map equal almost everywhere that satisfies (ii) or (iii) in Theorem 1.1 by being constant on the set $\sigma(\Sigma_0)$ or on $\mathcal{C}_0^{\kappa_i, [p-1]} + h$.)

We obtain the following characterization of traces.

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that $2 \leq m \in \mathbb{N}$, the map $u : \partial\mathbb{R}_+^m \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ is Borel-measurable, and $\lambda > 1$. If $1 < p < m$, then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) *There exists $U \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}_+^m, \mathcal{N})$ such that $u = \text{tr}_{\partial\mathbb{R}_+^m} U$.*
- (ii) *There exists a summable Borel-measurable function $w : \partial\mathbb{R}_+^m \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ such that for every finite homogeneous simplicial complex Σ of dimension $[p]$ and every subcomplex $\Sigma_0 \subset \Sigma$ of dimension $[p-1]$, and every Lipschitz-continuous map $\sigma : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^m$ which satisfies $\sigma(\Sigma_0) \subset \partial\mathbb{R}_+^m$ and for which $w \circ \sigma$ is summable, there exists a mapping $V \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\Sigma, \mathcal{N})$ such that $\text{tr}_{\Sigma_0} V = u \circ \sigma|_{\Sigma_0}$ and*

$$\int_{\Sigma} |DV|^p \leq \gamma_{\Sigma_0, \Sigma}^{\lambda} |\sigma|_{\text{Lip}}^{p-1} \int_{\Sigma_0} w \circ \sigma.$$

- (iii) *There exist a constant $\theta > 0$, a sequence $(\kappa_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $(0, \infty)$ converging to 0, and sets $H_i \subset [0, \kappa_i]^{m-1}$, such that*

$$\liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|H_i|}{\kappa_i^{m-1}} > 0$$

and if $h \in H_i \times \{0\}$, then there exists a map $V \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}_+^{\kappa_i, [p]} + h, \mathcal{N})$ such that $\text{tr } V = u|_{\mathcal{C}_0^{\kappa_i, [p-1]} + h}$ and

$$\kappa_i^{m-[p]} \int_{\mathcal{C}_+^{\kappa_i, [p]} + h} |DV|^p \leq \theta.$$

The function w appearing in (ii) can be interpreted as an *extension energy density*; the mappings σ can be interpreted as generalized paths going through $\bar{\mathbb{R}}_+^m$.

In the paths condition (ii), we emphasize the facts that, as in singular homology, we do not assume anything about the local or global injectivity of σ — the map σ could even take a constant value where w is finite, in which case $u \circ \sigma|_{\Sigma_0}$ is of course trivially extended by a constant — and that there is no Jacobian appearing in $\int_{\Sigma_0} w \circ \sigma$: we are integrating $w \circ \sigma$ on Σ_0 rather than integrating w on the set $\sigma(\Sigma_0)$.

Assertion (iii) is very rigid because of the presence of a cubication, whereas assertion (ii) is very robust — it is invariant under diffeomorphisms whose derivative and its inverse are controlled uniformly — and is thus a natural candidate for a geometrical characterization of the image of the trace operator.

In broad terms, the proof of Theorem 1.1 consists in deducing (ii) from (i) by a Fubini type argument (the proof is given in Section 2.1), (iii) from (ii) by the particularization to families of translations of canonical cubical complexes (the proof is given in Section 2.2), and (i) from (iii) by defining homogeneous extensions on cubical skeletons (the proof is given in Section 2.3).

We next have a geometric statement of Theorem 1.1 on manifolds.

Theorem 1.2. *Let \mathcal{M} be an m -dimensional compact Riemannian manifold with boundary $\partial\mathcal{M}$ and $1 < p < m$. There exists a $\delta > 0$ and a $\lambda > 1$ such that the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) *For any Borel-measurable map $u: \partial\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$, there exists a map $U \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$ with $\text{tr}_{\partial\mathcal{M}} U = u$.*
- (ii) *There exists a summable Borel-measurable function $w: \partial\mathcal{M} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ such that for every homogeneous simplicial complex Σ of dimension $[p]$, for every subcomplex $\Sigma_0 \subset \Sigma$ of dimension $[p-1]$, and for every Lipschitz-continuous map $\sigma: \Sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ satisfying*

$$\sigma(\Sigma_0) \subseteq \partial\mathcal{M}, \quad |\sigma|_{\text{Lip}} \sup_{\Sigma} d_0 \leq \delta, \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\Sigma_0} w \circ \sigma < \infty,$$

there exists a mapping $V \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\Sigma, \mathcal{N})$ such that $\text{tr}_{\Sigma_0} V = u \circ \sigma|_{\Sigma_0}$ and

$$(1.6) \quad \int_{\Sigma} |DV|^p \leq \gamma_{\Sigma_0, \Sigma}^{\lambda} |\sigma|_{\text{Lip}}^{p-1} \int_{\Sigma_0} w \circ \sigma.$$

Here we have defined $d_0: \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ to be the distance to Σ_0 in Σ by

$$(1.7) \quad d_0(y) := \inf\{d^{\Sigma}(y, z): z \in \Sigma_0\};$$

the quantity $\sup_{\Sigma} d_0$ quantifies how far points in Σ can be from Σ_0 .

In comparison with Theorem 1.1, the map σ is assumed to satisfy the nonlinear conditions that $\sigma(\Sigma) \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ and $\sigma(\Sigma_0) \subseteq \partial\mathcal{M}$. The proof of Theorem 1.2 is based on the proof of Theorem 1.1 through suitable localization arguments.

Finally, as in Isobe's characterization by (o_A) and (o_B), the obstruction to the extension can be decoupled into a quantitative obstruction to the extension to a neighborhood of the boundary and a qualitative obstruction to the extension to the whole manifold.

Theorem 1.3. *Let \mathcal{M} be an m -dimensional compact Riemannian manifold with boundary $\partial\mathcal{M}$ and let $1 < p < m$. There exists a $\delta > 0$ and a $\lambda > 1$ such that for each $u: \partial\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ the existence of an extension $U \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$ with $\text{tr}_{\partial\mathcal{M}} U = u$ is equivalent to the following property:*

There exists a summable function $w: \partial\mathcal{M} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ such that for every finite homogeneous simplicial complex Σ of dimension $[p]$, every subcomplex $\Sigma_0 \subset \Sigma$ of codimension 1, and every Lipschitz-continuous mapping $\sigma: \Sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ satisfying $\int_{\Sigma_0} w \circ \sigma < \infty$, one has:

- (a) If $\sigma(\Sigma) \subseteq \partial\mathcal{M}$ and $|\sigma|_{\text{Lip}} \sup_{\Sigma} d_0 \leq \delta$, then there exists a mapping $V \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\Sigma, \mathcal{N})$ such that $\text{tr}_{\Sigma_0} V = u \circ \sigma|_{\Sigma_0}$ and

$$\int_{\Sigma} |DV|^p \leq \gamma_{\Sigma_0, \Sigma}^{\lambda} |\sigma|_{\text{Lip}}^{p-1} \int_{\Sigma_0} w \circ \sigma.$$

- (b) If $\sigma(\Sigma_0) \subseteq \partial\mathcal{M}$, then $u \circ \sigma|_{\Sigma_0}$ is homotopic in $\text{VMO}(\Sigma_0, \mathcal{N})$ to $V|_{\Sigma_0}$ for some $V \in C(\Sigma, \mathcal{N})$.

The assertion (a) differs from the condition of Theorem 1.2, by the fact that in (a) we assume the stronger condition that $\sigma(\Sigma) \subseteq \partial\mathcal{M}$ instead of the weaker condition that $\sigma(\Sigma_0) \subseteq \partial\mathcal{M}$ and $\sigma(\Sigma) \subseteq \mathcal{M}$, resulting in a weaker condition; in order to keep the equivalence we supplement (a) with (b), which is a reformulation of Isobe's condition (\mathfrak{o}_B) as a condition on paths, as it appears in topological screening for the approximation of Sobolev mappings [4]. In the particular case where $p \notin \mathbb{N}$, assertion (b) is equivalent to the fact that $u \circ \sigma|_{\Sigma_0}$ is almost everywhere equal to the restriction to Σ_0 of some $V \in C(\Sigma, \mathcal{N})$. In contrast with Theorem 1.2, Theorem 1.3 does not give a quantitative estimate; such an estimate is precluded by the qualitative character of assertion (b).

Acknowledgments. K.M. was supported by FSR Incoming postdoc. K.M. and J.V.S. were both supported by the Mandat d'Impulsion Scientifique F.4523.17, "Topological singularities of Sobolev maps" of the Fonds de la Recherche Scientifique-FNRS.

2. THE CASE OF HALF-SPACES

2.1. From the extension to the paths condition. We prove that (i) implies (ii) in Theorem 1.1.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $2 \leq m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lambda > 1$, and $p \in [1, \infty)$. There exists a constant C such that given any $U \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}_+^m, \mathcal{N})$ there exists a Borel-measurable function $w: \partial\mathbb{R}_+^m \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ with*

$$\int_{\partial\mathbb{R}_+^m} w \leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m} |DU|^p$$

with the following property:

Suppose that Σ is a finite homogeneous simplicial complex, $\Sigma_0 \subset \Sigma$ is a subcomplex of codimension 1, that the map $\sigma: \Sigma \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+^m$ is Lipschitz-continuous and satisfies $\sigma(\Sigma_0) \subset \partial\mathbb{R}_+^m$, and that

$$\int_{\Sigma_0} w \circ \sigma < \infty.$$

Then there exists a map $V \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\Sigma, \mathcal{N})$ with $\text{tr}_{\Sigma_0} V = U \circ \sigma|_{\Sigma_0}$ almost everywhere on Σ_0 and

$$(2.1) \quad \int_{\Sigma} |DV|^p \leq \gamma_{\Sigma_0, \Sigma}^{\lambda} |\sigma|_{\text{Lip}}^{p-1} \int_{\Sigma_0} w \circ \sigma,$$

where $\gamma_{\Sigma_0, \Sigma}^{\lambda}$ is defined as in (1.2).

The conclusion of Theorem 1.1 where the complex Σ has arbitrary -dimension is slightly stronger than (ii) in Theorem 1.1 where the dimension of Σ is $[p]$.

Here and in the sequel, for $0 < \eta < 1$ and $\rho > 0$ we define the *solid spherical cap*

$$(2.2) \quad C_\rho^\eta := \{x = (x', x_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m : |x| < \rho \text{ and } x_m > \eta\rho\} = B_\rho \cap (\mathbb{R}^{m-1} \times (\eta\rho, \rho))$$

and note that

$$|C_\rho^\eta| = \rho^m |C_1^\eta|.$$

The main ingredient of the proof is the following integration lemma.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $0 < \eta < 1$, $\lambda > \frac{1}{\eta}$, and $\rho > 0$. Assume that $F: \mathbb{R}_+^m \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is a Borel-measurable function, Σ is a finite simplicial complex, and $\Sigma_0 \subset \Sigma$ is a homogeneous subcomplex of codimension one. Assume moreover that $\sigma: \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^m$ is a Lipschitz-continuous map with $\sigma(\Sigma_0) \subseteq \partial\mathbb{R}_+^m$ and $|\sigma|_{\text{Lip}} < (\eta\lambda - 1)\rho$. Then we have*

$$(2.3) \quad \int_{C_\rho^\eta} \left(\int_\Sigma F \circ (\sigma + d_0\xi) \right) d\xi \leq \frac{(\eta\lambda - 1)^m (\rho + |\sigma|_{\text{Lip}})^{2m}}{\eta^m ((\eta\lambda - 1)\rho - |\sigma|_{\text{Lip}})^{m+1}} \gamma_{\Sigma_0, \Sigma}^\lambda \int_{\Sigma_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m} \frac{F(x) x_m}{|x - \sigma(z)|^m} dx dz.$$

We recall that the quantity $\gamma_{\Sigma_0, \Sigma}^\lambda$ was defined in (1.2); here and in the sequel we write $(x', x_m) = x \in \mathbb{R}_+^m = \mathbb{R}^{m-1} \times (0, \infty)$.

Proof of Lemma 2.2. By a change of variables $x = \sigma(y) + d_0(y)\xi$, with d_0 having been defined in (1.7), and in view of (2.2) and of the non-negativity of the last component σ_m of $\sigma: \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^m$, we have

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{C_\rho^\eta} \left(\int_\Sigma F \circ (\sigma + d_0\xi) \right) d\xi &= \int_\Sigma \left(\int_{\substack{|x - \sigma(y)| \leq \rho d_0(y) \\ x_m \geq \eta\rho d_0(y) + \sigma_m(y)}} \frac{F(x)}{d_0(y)^m} dx \right) dy \\ &\leq \int_\Sigma \left(\int_{\substack{|x - \sigma(y)| \leq \rho d_0(y) \\ x_m \geq \eta\rho d_0(y)}} \frac{F(x)}{d_0(y)^m} dx \right) dy \\ &= \int_\Sigma \int_{\Sigma_0 \cap B_{\tau d_0(y)}^\Sigma(y)} \left(\int_{\substack{|x - \sigma(y)| \leq \rho d_0(y) \\ x_m \geq \eta\rho d_0(y)}} \frac{F(x)}{d_0(y)^m} dx \right) dz dy, \end{aligned}$$

where $\tau > 1$ is to be chosen later (see (2.10) below).

Noting that for every $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ satisfying $|x - \sigma(y)| \leq \rho d_0(y)$ and $z \in \Sigma_0 \cap B_{\tau d_0(y)}^\Sigma(y)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |x - \sigma(z)| &\leq |x - \sigma(y)| + |\sigma(y) - \sigma(z)| \\ &\leq |x - \sigma(y)| + |\sigma|_{\text{Lip}} d^\Sigma(z, y) \leq (\rho + |\sigma|_{\text{Lip}} \tau) d_0(y), \end{aligned}$$

and since, by assumption, $\sigma_m(y) \geq 0$ and $\sigma(\Sigma_0) \subseteq \partial\mathbb{R}_+^m$ we also have

$$x_m \leq |x_m - \sigma_m(y)| + \sigma_m(y) \leq (\rho + |\sigma|_{\text{Lip}}) d_0(y).$$

Thus, we estimate by (2.4)

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{C_\rho^\eta} \left(\int_\Sigma F \circ (\sigma + d_0 \xi) \right) d\xi \\
 (2.5) \quad & \leq (\rho + |\sigma|_{\text{Lip}})^m \int_{\Sigma_0} \int_{|x - \sigma(z)| \leq \frac{\rho + |\sigma|_{\text{Lip}} \tau}{\kappa} x_m} \frac{F(x)}{x_m^m} \left(\int_{S_{x,z}} \frac{1}{|\Sigma_0 \cap B_{\tau d_0(y)}^\Sigma(y)|} dy \right) dx dz,
 \end{aligned}$$

with the set $S_{x,z} \subseteq \Sigma$ being defined as

$$S_{x,z} := \left\{ y \in \Sigma : d^\Sigma(y, z) \leq \tau d_0(y) \text{ and } \frac{x_m}{K} \leq d_0(y) \leq \frac{x_m}{\kappa} \right\}$$

and

$$(2.6) \quad K := \rho + |\sigma|_{\text{Lip}}, \quad \kappa := \eta \rho.$$

We estimate now the innermost integral of the right-hand side of (2.5). Since the set Σ_0 is compact, for every $y \in \Sigma$, there exists a point $y_0 \in \Sigma_0$ such that $d_0(y) = d^\Sigma(y, y_0)$. Thus, if $d_0(y) \geq x_m/K$, we have

$$(2.7) \quad |\Sigma_0 \cap B_{\tau d_0(y)}^\Sigma(y)| \geq |\Sigma_0 \cap B_{(\tau-1)d_0(y)}^\Sigma(y_0)| \geq |\Sigma_0 \cap B_{(\tau-1)x_m/K}^\Sigma(y_0)|.$$

Moreover,

$$(2.8) \quad S_{x,z} \subseteq B_{(\tau x_m)/\kappa}^\Sigma(z).$$

It follows thus from (2.7) and (2.8) that for every $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ and $z \in \Sigma_0$

$$\begin{aligned}
 (2.9) \quad & \int_{S_{x,z}} \frac{dy}{|\Sigma_0 \cap B_{\tau d_0(y)}^\Sigma(y)|} \leq \frac{(\tau-1)x_m}{K} \sup_{y_0 \in \Sigma_0} \frac{|B_{(\tau x_m)/\kappa}^\Sigma(y_0)|}{\frac{(\tau-1)x_m}{K} |\Sigma_0 \cap B_{(\tau-1)x_m/K}^\Sigma(y_0)|} \\
 & \leq \frac{(\tau-1)x_m}{K} \sup_{\substack{y_0 \in \Sigma_0 \\ \delta > 0}} \frac{|B_{\frac{\tau-1}{\kappa} x_m}^\Sigma(y_0)|}{\delta |\Sigma_0 \cap B_\delta^\Sigma(y_0)|}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Recalling that by assumption $(\eta\lambda - 1)\rho - |\sigma|_{\text{Lip}} > 0$, we set

$$(2.10) \quad \tau := \frac{\eta\lambda\rho}{(\eta\lambda - 1)\rho - |\sigma|_{\text{Lip}}},$$

so that one can directly check that in view of (2.6)

$$\frac{\tau}{\tau-1} \frac{K}{\kappa} = \lambda, \quad \frac{\tau-1}{K} = \frac{1}{(\eta\lambda - 1)\rho - |\sigma|_{\text{Lip}}}, \quad \frac{\rho + |\sigma|_{\text{Lip}}\tau}{\kappa} = \frac{(\rho + |\sigma|_{\text{Lip}})(\eta\lambda - 1)}{\eta((\eta\lambda - 1)\rho - |\sigma|_{\text{Lip}})}.$$

Moreover, setting $\theta := \frac{\rho + |\sigma|_{\text{Lip}}\tau}{\kappa} = \frac{(\eta\lambda - 1)(\rho + |\sigma|_{\text{Lip}})}{\eta((\eta\lambda - 1)\rho - |\sigma|_{\text{Lip}})}$ we get

$$(2.11) \quad \int_{\substack{x \in \mathbb{R}_+^m \\ |x - \sigma(z)| \leq \theta x_m}} \frac{F(x)}{x_m^{m-1}} dx \leq \theta^m \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m} \frac{x_m F(x)}{|x - \sigma(z)|^m} dx.$$

Combining (2.5) with (2.9) and (2.11) we conclude. \square

Proof of Proposition 2.1. Without loss of generality, we assume that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m} |DU|^p > 0.$$

We consider a sequence $(U_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $C^\infty(\bar{\mathbb{R}}_+^m, \mathbb{R}^\nu)$ such that for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$

$$(2.12) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m} |DU_j - DU|^p \leq \frac{1}{2^j},$$

$$(2.13) \quad \int_{B_j^m(0)} |U_j - U|^p \leq \frac{1}{2^j},$$

$$(2.14) \quad \int_{B_j^{m-1}(0)} |U_j - u|^p \leq \frac{1}{2^j},$$

where $u := \text{tr}_{\partial\mathbb{R}_+^m} U$. Defining the function $W: \mathbb{R}_+^m \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ by

$$(2.15) \quad W := |DU|^p + \left(\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} |DU_j - DU|^p + \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_{\mathbb{R}_+^m \cap B_j^m(0)} |U_j - U|^p \right) \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m} |DU|^p,$$

we have by (2.15), (2.12), and (2.13)

$$(2.16) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m} W &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m} |DU|^p \left(1 + \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m} (|DU_j - DU|^p + \chi_{\mathbb{R}_+^m \cap B_j^m(0)} |U_j - U|^p) \right) \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m} |DU|^p \left(1 + 2 \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{2^j} \right) = 5 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m} |DU|^p. \end{aligned}$$

We define the function $w: \partial\mathbb{R}_+^m \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ for each $y \in \partial\mathbb{R}_+^m$ by

$$(2.17) \quad w(y) := \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m} \frac{W(x)x_m}{|x - y|^m} dx + \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_{B_j^{m-1}(0)} |U_j - u|^p \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m} |DU|^p.$$

We have by (2.16) and (2.17)

$$(2.18) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{\partial\mathbb{R}_+^m} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m} \frac{W(x)x_m}{|x - y|^m} dx dy &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m} W(x) \int_{\partial\mathbb{R}_+^m} \frac{x_m}{|x - y|^m} dy dx \\ &= \int_{\partial\mathbb{R}_+^m} \frac{1}{(|y|^2 + 1)^{\frac{m}{2}}} dy \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m} W \leq C_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m} |DU|^p. \end{aligned}$$

We also have by (2.14)

$$(2.19) \quad \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \int_{B_j^{m-1}(0)} |U_j - u|^p < \infty,$$

so that in view of (2.17), (2.18), and (2.19)

$$\int_{\partial\mathbb{R}_+^m} w \leq C_2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m} |DU|^p < \infty.$$

We assume now that $\sigma: \Sigma \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+^m$ is Lipschitz-continuous, that $\sigma(\Sigma_0) \subset \partial\mathbb{R}_+^m$, and that

$$\int_{\Sigma_0} w \circ \sigma < \infty.$$

For each $\xi \in C_\rho^\eta$, we define the map

$$(2.20) \quad \sigma_\xi := \sigma + d_0 \xi : \Sigma \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+^m.$$

We claim that the map $V := U \circ \sigma_\xi$ satisfies the conclusion for a suitable $\xi \in C_\rho^\eta$.

Indeed, by Lemma 2.2 with

$$(2.21) \quad \rho = 2|\sigma|_{\text{Lip}}/(\eta\lambda - 1),$$

we first obtain

$$\int_{C_\rho^\eta} \int_\Sigma W \circ \sigma_\xi \, d\mu \, d\xi \leq \frac{(\eta\lambda + 1)^{2m}}{\eta^m(\eta\lambda - 1)^m} |\sigma|_{\text{Lip}}^{m-1} \gamma_{\Sigma_0, \Sigma}^\lambda \int_{\Sigma_0} w \circ \sigma.$$

Since $|C_\rho^\eta| = \rho^m |C_1^\eta|$, there exists a $\xi \in C_\rho^\eta$ such that

$$(2.22) \quad \int_\Sigma W \circ \sigma_\xi \, d\mu \leq \frac{(\eta\lambda + 1)^{2m}}{2^m \eta^m |C_1^\eta|} \frac{\gamma_{\Sigma_0, \Sigma}^\lambda}{|\sigma|_{\text{Lip}}} \int_{\Sigma_0} w \circ \sigma;$$

we fix such a ξ for the remainder of the proof. Since we have assumed that $\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m} |DU|^p > 0$, (2.22) implies in view of (2.15) that

$$(2.23) \quad \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \int_\Sigma |DU_j(\sigma_\xi(y)) - DU(\sigma_\xi(y))|^p \, dy \\ + \int_\Sigma \chi_{\mathbb{R}_+^m \cap B_j^m(0)}(\sigma_\xi(y)) |U_j(\sigma_\xi(y)) - U(\sigma_\xi(y))|^p \, dy < \infty.$$

By Lipschitz-continuity of σ_ξ and smoothness of U_j , we have $D(U_j \circ \sigma_\xi) = DU_j(\sigma_\xi) \cdot D\sigma_\xi$ almost everywhere (here, by \cdot we mean the composition of differential as linear mappings, or equivalently, the multiplication of the Jacobian matrices) and thus by (2.23)

$$(2.24) \quad \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \int_\Sigma |D(U_j \circ \sigma_\xi) - DU(\sigma_\xi) \cdot D\sigma_\xi|^p \, dy \\ \leq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \int_\Sigma |DU_j(\sigma_\xi(y)) - DU(\sigma_\xi(y))|^p |D\sigma_\xi|^p \, dy < \infty.$$

Thus, by (2.23) and (2.24), we have

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_\Sigma |U_j \circ \sigma_\xi - U \circ \sigma_\xi|^p + \int_\Sigma |D(U_j \circ \sigma_\xi) - DU(\sigma_\xi) \cdot D\sigma_\xi|^p = 0,$$

this implies that $U \circ \sigma_\xi \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\Sigma, \mathcal{N})$ and $D(U \circ \sigma_\xi) = DU(\sigma_\xi) \cdot D\sigma_\xi$. Finally, since by definition of w we have

$$\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \int_{\Sigma_0} (\chi_{B_j^{m-1}(0)} \circ \sigma_\xi) |U_j \circ \sigma_\xi - u \circ \sigma_\xi|^p < \infty,$$

and hence $U_j \circ \sigma_\xi \rightarrow u \circ \sigma_\xi$ in $L_{\text{loc}}^p(\Sigma_0)$. By continuity of the trace, $\text{tr}_{\Sigma_0} U \circ \sigma_\xi = u \circ \sigma_\xi|_{\Sigma_0}$.

In order to conclude, we note that since $\rho = 2|\sigma|_{\text{Lip}}/(\eta\lambda - 1)$ and $\xi \in C_\rho^\eta$, we have

$$|D\sigma_\xi| \leq |D\sigma| + |\xi| \quad \text{and} \quad |\xi| \leq \frac{2|\sigma|_{\text{Lip}}}{(\eta\lambda - 1)}.$$

Thus,

$$\int_{\Sigma} |D(U \circ \sigma_{\xi})|^p \leq |\sigma_{\xi}|_{\text{Lip}}^p \int_{\Sigma} |DU \circ \sigma_{\xi}|^p \leq \frac{|\sigma|_{\text{Lip}}^p (\eta\lambda + 1)^p}{(\eta\lambda - 1)^p} \int_{\Sigma} |DU \circ \sigma_{\xi}|^p,$$

which gives, by (2.22),

$$\int_{\Sigma} |D(U \circ \sigma_{\xi})|^p \leq \frac{(\eta\lambda + 1)^{2m+p}}{2^m \eta^m (\eta\lambda - 1)^p |C_1^{\eta}|} |\sigma|_{\text{Lip}}^{p-1} \gamma_{\Sigma_0, \Sigma}^{\lambda} \int_{\Sigma_0} w \circ \sigma.$$

We take $\eta := \frac{\lambda+1}{2\lambda}$ and multiply w by a suitable constant, so that (2.1) holds. \square

2.2. From paths to cubical meshes. The implication (ii) \implies (iii) in Theorem 1.1 will follow from the next proposition.

Proposition 2.3. *Let $2 \leq m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lambda > 1$, $p \in [1, \infty)$, $\ell \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ and let $u: \partial\mathbb{R}_+^m \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ be a Borel-measurable map. Assume further that $w: \partial\mathbb{R}_+^m \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is a Borel-measurable function, such that for every finite homogeneous simplicial complex Σ of dimension ℓ , any subcomplex $\Sigma_0 \subset \Sigma$ of dimension $\ell - 1$, and every Lipschitz-continuous map $\sigma: \Sigma \rightarrow \partial\mathbb{R}_+^m$ satisfying*

$$\int_{\Sigma_0} w \circ \sigma < \infty,$$

there exists a map $W \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\Sigma, \mathcal{N})$ with $\text{tr}_{\Sigma_0} W = u \circ \sigma|_{\Sigma_0}$ almost everywhere on Σ_0 with the estimate

$$(2.25) \quad \int_{\Sigma} |DW|^p \leq \gamma_{\Sigma_0, \Sigma}^{\lambda} |\sigma|_{\text{Lip}}^{p-1} \int_{\Sigma_0} w \circ \sigma,$$

where the quantity $\gamma_{\Sigma_0, \Sigma}^{\lambda}$ is defined in (1.2).

Then, there exists a constant $C > 0$, such that for given $h \in \partial\mathbb{R}_+^m$ and $\kappa > 0$ for which

$$\int_{C_0^{\kappa, \ell-1} + h} w < \infty,$$

there exists a map $V \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(C_+^{\kappa, \ell} + h, \mathcal{N})$ satisfying $\text{tr}_{C_0^{\kappa, \ell-1} + h} V = u|_{C_0^{\kappa, \ell-1} + h}$ with the estimate

$$\int_{C_+^{\kappa, \ell} + h} |DV|^p \leq C \int_{C_0^{\kappa, \ell-1} + h} w.$$

The cubications $C_+^{\kappa, \ell}$ and $C_0^{\kappa, \ell-1}$ were defined in (1.3)–(1.5).

It follows from Proposition 2.3 that (ii) implies (iii) in Theorem 1.1, since by Fubini's theorem

$$\int_{[0, \kappa]^{m-1}} \int_{C_0^{\kappa, \ell-1} + h} w(x') \, dx' \, dh = \kappa^{m-\ell} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{m-1}} w.$$

Proof of Proposition 2.3. We define for $j \in \mathbb{N}$ the sets

$$\Sigma^j := \{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_+^{1, \ell} : Q \subset [-j, j]^m\} \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma_0^j := \{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_0^{1, \ell-1} : Q \subset [-j, j]^m\},$$

where $\mathcal{Q}_+^{1, \ell}$ and $\mathcal{Q}_0^{1, \ell-1}$ are defined in (1.3)–(1.4).

By a classical realization of cubes as simplicial complexes, we can assume that Σ^j is a simplicial complex of dimension ℓ and Σ_0^j is a simplicial subcomplex of Σ^j of codimension 1. Moreover, we observe that for every $\lambda > 1$,

$$C_1 := \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \gamma_{\Sigma_0^j, \Sigma^j}^\lambda < \infty.$$

For $\kappa > 0$ and $h \in [0, \kappa]^{m-1}$, we define the Lipschitz maps $\sigma_{\kappa, h}^j: \Sigma^j \rightarrow \partial \mathbb{R}_+^m \simeq \mathbb{R}^{m-1}$ by $\sigma_{\kappa, h}^j(y) := \kappa y' + h$, where for $y \in \Sigma^j$ we write $y = (y', y_m) \in \mathbb{R}^{m-1} \times \mathbb{R}$. By assumption, we have

$$(2.26) \quad \int_{\Sigma_0^j} w \circ \sigma_{\kappa, h}^j \leq \frac{1}{\kappa^{\ell-1}} \int_{\mathcal{C}_0^{\kappa, \ell-1} + h} w < \infty.$$

By assumption, there exists a map $W^j \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\Sigma^j, \mathcal{N})$ such that $\text{tr}_{\Sigma_0^j} W^j = u \circ \sigma_{\kappa, h}^j|_{\Sigma_0^j}$ and

$$(2.27) \quad \int_{\Sigma^j} |DW^j|^p \leq C_1 \kappa^{p-1} \int_{\Sigma_0^j} w \circ \sigma_{\kappa, h}^j.$$

In view of (2.26) and (2.27), we have

$$(2.28) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{\sigma^j(\Sigma^j)} |DW^j \circ (\sigma_{\kappa, h}^j)^{-1}|^p &= \frac{1}{\kappa^{p-\ell}} \int_{\Sigma^j} |DW^j|^p \\ &\leq C_1 \kappa^{\ell-1} \int_{\Sigma_0^j} w \circ \sigma_{\kappa, h}^j \leq C_1 \int_{\mathcal{C}_0^{\kappa, \ell-1} + h} w. \end{aligned}$$

In view of (2.28) and by weak compactness in Sobolev spaces, up to a subsequence, we have $W^j \circ (\sigma_{\kappa, h}^j)^{-1} \rightarrow V$ almost everywhere on $\mathcal{C}_+^{\kappa, \ell} + h$, where $V \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}_+^{\kappa, \ell} + h, \mathcal{N})$, $\text{tr}_{\mathcal{C}_0^{\kappa, \ell-1} + h} V = u|_{\mathcal{C}_0^{\kappa, \ell-1} + h}$ and

$$\int_{\mathcal{C}_+^{\kappa, \ell} + h} |DV|^p \leq C_2 \int_{\mathcal{C}_0^{\kappa, \ell-1} + h} w. \quad \square$$

2.3. From cubical meshes to the half-space. We now prove the implication (iii) \implies (i) in Theorem 1.1.

Proposition 2.4. *Assume that $2 \leq m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $1 < p < m$. There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for every Borel-measurable map $u: \mathbb{R}^{m-1} \times \{0\} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$, every $\theta > 0$, every sequence $(\kappa_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $(0, \infty)$ converging to 0, and every sequence of sets $H_j \subset [0, \kappa_j]^{m-1}$, if*


$$(2.29) \quad \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|H_j|}{\kappa_j^{m-1}} > 0$$

and if for each $h \in H_j \times \{0\}$, there exists $V \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}_+^{\kappa_j, \lfloor p \rfloor} + h, \mathcal{N})$ such that $\text{tr}_{\mathcal{C}_0^{\kappa_j, \lfloor p-1 \rfloor} + h} V = u|_{\mathcal{C}_0^{\kappa_j, \lfloor p-1 \rfloor} + h}$ and

$$(2.30) \quad \kappa_j^{m-\lfloor p \rfloor} \int_{\mathcal{C}_+^{\kappa_j, \lfloor p \rfloor} + h} |DV|^p \leq \theta,$$

then there exists a mapping $U \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}_+^m, \mathcal{N})$ such that $\text{tr}_{\mathbb{R}^{m-1} \times \{0\}} U = u$ and

$$(2.31) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m} |DU|^p \leq C\theta,$$

FIGURE 1. The mapping $\mathcal{P}^{\kappa, \ell}$

where the cubications $\mathcal{C}_+^{\kappa_j, [p]}$ and $\mathcal{C}_0^{\kappa_j, [p-1]}$ are defined in (1.3)–(1.5).

Proof. STEP 1. CONSTRUCTION OF U_h^j BY HOMOGENEOUS EXTENSION. For each $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and every $h \in H_j$, we define the map $U_h^j: \mathbb{R}_+^m \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ by a homogeneous extension. In order to define the extension we begin by introducing a retraction of $\mathbb{R}_+^m \setminus \mathcal{E}^{\kappa_j, m-[p]}$ onto $\mathcal{C}_+^{\kappa_j, [p-1]}$, where the dual skeleton $\mathcal{E}^{\kappa, \ell}$ is defined for $\ell \in \{0, \dots, m\}$ and $\kappa > 0$ by

$$\mathcal{E}^{\kappa, \ell} := \bigcup \{Q: Q \text{ is an } \ell\text{-dimensional face of } [0, \kappa]^m + k\kappa, \text{ for } k \in \mathbb{Z}^m\}.$$

For $\ell \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, we define the mapping $P_{\kappa, \ell}: \mathcal{C}_+^{\kappa, \ell} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_+^{\kappa, \ell-1}$ to be the homogeneous retraction defined on each cube $Q \in \mathcal{Q}^{\kappa, \ell}$ in the following way: Let x_Q be the center of the cube Q , so that $Q \cap \mathcal{E}^{\kappa, m-\ell} = \{x_Q\}$ (note that when $Q \cap \partial \mathbb{R}_+^m \neq \emptyset$ then $Q \cap \mathbb{R}_+^m$ is a half-cube and $x_Q \in \partial \mathbb{R}_+^m$). On this cube the map $P_{\kappa, \ell}: Q \setminus \{x_Q\} \rightarrow \partial Q$ (with the boundary taken in the ℓ -dimensional affine plane containing Q) is given by the formula

$$(2.32) \quad P_{\kappa, \ell}(x) := x_Q + \kappa \frac{x - x_Q}{|x - x_Q|_\infty}.$$

We define now $\mathcal{P}^{\kappa, \ell}: \mathbb{R}_+^m \setminus \mathcal{E}^{\kappa, m-\ell-1} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_+^{\kappa, \ell}$ by

$$(2.33) \quad \mathcal{P}^{\kappa, \ell} := P_{\kappa, \ell+1} \circ \dots \circ P_{\kappa, m}.$$

(The map $\mathcal{P}^{\kappa, \ell}$ is illustrated in Figure 1.) For any $h \in H_j$, we define $U^{j, h}: \mathbb{R}_+^m \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ for almost every $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ by

$$(2.34) \quad U^{j, h}(x) := V^{j, h}(\mathcal{P}^{\kappa_j, [p]}(x - h) + h),$$

where $V^{j, h} \in \dot{W}^{1, p}(\mathcal{C}_+^{\kappa_j, [p]} + h, \mathcal{N})$ is a map given by assumptions, such that $\text{tr}_{\mathcal{C}_0^{\kappa_j, [p-1]} + h} V^{j, h} = u|_{\mathcal{C}_0^{\kappa_j, [p-1]} + h}$ and (2.30) holds.

STEP 2. UNIFORM BOUNDEDNESS IN L^p OF THE GRADIENTS. We prove that when $h \in H_j$, the sequence $(U^{j, h})_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ remains bounded in $\dot{W}^{1, p}(\mathbb{R}_+^m)$. We begin with a well-known lemma.

Lemma 2.5. *If $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, $p < \ell$ and $V \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}_+^{\kappa,\ell-1}, \mathcal{N})$, then we have $V \circ P_{\kappa,\ell} \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}_+^{\kappa,\ell}, \mathcal{N})$ with the estimate*

$$(2.35) \quad \int_{\mathcal{C}_+^{\kappa,\ell}} |DV \circ P_{\kappa,\ell}|^p \leq \frac{2\ell^{p/2}}{p-\ell} \kappa \int_{\mathcal{C}_+^{\kappa,\ell-1}} |DV|^p.$$

Lemma 2.5 follows by the application of the next Lemma 2.6 on a suitable decomposition of cubes in pyramids (with a factor 2 coming from the fact that by definition of $\dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}_+^{\kappa,\ell-1}, \mathcal{N})$ traces coincide on common faces).

Lemma 2.6. *Let $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and for $\kappa > 0$ we let*

$$\Gamma_\kappa := \{x = (x', x_\ell) \in [-\kappa, \kappa]^\ell : 0 \leq x_\ell \leq \kappa \text{ and } x_\ell = |x|_\infty\}.$$

If $\ell > p$, $f \in \dot{W}^{1,p}([-\kappa, \kappa]^{\ell-1}, \mathcal{N})$, and if $g: \Gamma_\kappa \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ is defined by

$$g(x', x_\ell) = f(\kappa x' / x_\ell),$$

then $g \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\Gamma_\kappa, \mathcal{N})$ and

$$\int_{\Gamma_\kappa} |Dg|^p \leq \frac{\ell^{p/2} \kappa}{p-\ell} \int_{[-\kappa, \kappa]^{\ell-1}} |Df|^p.$$

Proof. We have

$$Dg(x', x_\ell) = \kappa \left(\frac{Df(\kappa x' / x_\ell)}{x_\ell}, -\frac{Df(\kappa x' / x_\ell) \cdot x'}{x_\ell^2} \right),$$

so that

$$|Dg(x', x_\ell)|^2 = \kappa^2 \left(\frac{|Df(\kappa x' / x_\ell)|^2}{x_\ell^2} + \frac{|Df(\kappa x' / x_\ell) \cdot x'|^2}{x_\ell^4} \right) \leq \ell \frac{\kappa^2}{x_\ell^2} |Df(\kappa x' / x_\ell)|^2,$$

and thus, by Fubini's theorem and the change of variable $y' = \kappa x' / x_\ell$, since $p < \ell$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Gamma_\kappa} |Dg|^p &\leq \ell^{p/2} \int_0^\kappa \int_{[-x_\ell, x_\ell]^{\ell-1}} \kappa^p \frac{|Df(\kappa x' / x_\ell)|^p}{x_\ell^p} dx' dx_\ell \\ &= \ell^{p/2} \int_0^\kappa \int_{[-\kappa, \kappa]^{\ell-1}} |Df(y')|^p \frac{x_\ell^{\ell-p-1}}{\kappa^{\ell-p-1}} dy' dx_\ell = \kappa \frac{\ell^{p/2}}{\ell-p} \int_{[0, \kappa]^{\ell-1}} |Df(y')|^p dy'. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

We pursue the proof of Proposition 2.4. Iterating Lemma 2.5, in view of (2.34), (2.33), and (2.30), we obtain that for every $h \in H_j$, we have $U^{j,h} \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}_+^m, \mathcal{N})$ with the estimate

$$(2.36) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m} |DU^{j,h}|^p = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m} |DV^{j,h} \circ (\mathcal{P}^{\kappa_j, [p]}(\cdot - h) + h)|^p \leq C_3 \kappa^{m-[p]} \int_{\mathcal{C}_+^{\kappa_j, [p]} + h} |DV^{j,h}|^p \leq C_4 \theta,$$

the constants in the estimates depend only on m and p .

STEP 3. CONVERGENCE OF THE BOUNDARY DATA. We follow Brezis and Mironescu's proof, see [7, Lemma 4.1 (Step 1)].

By the definition of the map $U^{j,h}$ in (2.34) and since $U^{j,h} \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}_+^m, \mathcal{N})$ (see (2.36)), for every $h \in H_j$ we have

$$\text{tr}_{\mathbb{R}^{m-1}} U^{j,h} = \text{tr}_{\mathbb{R}^{m-1}} V^{j,h}(\mathcal{P}^{\kappa_j, [p]}(\cdot - h) + h) =: u^{j,h},$$

thus,

$$u^{j,h} = u \circ (\mathcal{P}^{\kappa_j, [p]}(\cdot - h) + h)|_{\mathbb{R}^{m-1} \times \{0\}}.$$

We are going to show that for a suitable choice of $h_j \in H_j$, $u^{j,h_j} \rightarrow u$ in $L^p_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^{m-1})$.

We start with the observation that if $k \in \mathbb{Z}^{m-1} \times \{0\}$, then $\mathcal{P}^{\kappa_j, [p]}(x - \kappa k) = \mathcal{P}^{\kappa_j, [p]}(x) - \kappa k$, and thus the map $\partial \mathbb{R}_+^m \ni x \mapsto x - \mathcal{P}^{\kappa_j, [p]}(x) \in \partial \mathbb{R}_+^m$ is periodic.

Lemma 2.7. *Let $f: \mathbb{R}^\ell \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ be a Borel-measurable function and let $\Psi \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^\ell)$. Assume that for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}^\ell$, $\Psi(x + \kappa k) = \Psi(x)$. Then, we have for every Borel-measurable set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^\ell$*

$$\int_{[0, \kappa]^\ell} \int_A |f(x) - f(x - \Psi(x - h))|^p dx dh \leq \kappa^\ell \sup_{|h| \leq \|\Psi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^\ell)}} \int_A |f - f(\cdot - h)|^p.$$

Lemma 2.7 is reminiscent to the opening of maps [6, Section 1.1] and the related estimates [5].

Proof. Since the function Ψ is periodic, we have by Fubini's theorem and the change of variable $z = x - h$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{[0, \kappa]^\ell} \int_A |f(x) - f(x - \Psi(x - h))|^p dx dh &= \int_A \int_{x - [0, \kappa]^\ell} |f(x) - f(x - \Psi(z))|^p dz dx \\ &= \int_A \int_{[0, \kappa]^\ell} |f(x) - f(x - \Psi(z))|^p dz dx \\ &\leq \kappa^\ell \sup_{|z| \leq \|\Psi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^\ell)}} \int_A |f - f(\cdot - z)|^p. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Continuing, the proof of Proposition 2.4, we set $\Psi(x) := x - \mathcal{P}^{\kappa_j, [p]}(x)$, so that for every $x, h \in \partial \mathbb{R}_+^m$, $\mathcal{P}^{\kappa_j, [p]}(x - h) + h = x - \Psi(x - h)$. By Lemma 2.7 with $\ell = m - 1$, $f = u$, and $A = B_R$ we obtain

$$\frac{1}{\kappa_j^{m-1}} \int_{[0, \kappa_j]^{m-1}} \left(\int_{B_R} |u - u(\mathcal{P}^{\kappa_j, [p]}(\cdot - h) + h)|^p \right) dh \leq \sup_{|h| \leq \sqrt{\ell-1} \kappa_j} \|u - u(\cdot - h)\|_{L^p(B_R)}^p.$$

Since $u \in L^p_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^{m-1})$, there exists a sequence $(R_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ diverging to ∞ such that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\kappa_j^{m-1}} \int_{[0, \kappa_j]^{m-1}} \int_{B_{R_j}} |u(x') - u(\mathcal{P}^{\kappa_j, [p]}(x' - h) + h)|^p dx' dh = 0.$$

By our assumption (2.29), for $j \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough, we can choose an $h_j \in H_j \simeq H_j \times \{0\}$ such that

$$(2.37) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_{R_j}} |u - u(\mathcal{P}^{\kappa_j, [p]}(\cdot - h_j) + h_j)|^p = 0.$$

We set

$$(2.38) \quad U_j := U^{j, h_j}.$$

CONCLUSION. By (2.36), the sequence $(U_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ that we defined in (2.38) is bounded in $\dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}_+^m, \mathcal{N})$. Therefore, up to a subsequence it converges weakly in $\dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}_+^m, \mathbb{R}^\nu)$ to a map $U \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}_+^m, \mathbb{R}^\nu)$. Since \mathcal{N} is compact, by Rellich–Kondrachov's compactness theorem we have strong convergence in $L^p(B_R)$ for every $R > 0$, which implies, up to a subsequence,

convergence almost everywhere; hence U also takes values in the manifold \mathcal{N} and thus $U \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}_+^m, \mathcal{N})$. Finally, on the boundary we have

$$\mathrm{tr}_{\mathbb{R}^{m-1}} U_j \rightarrow \mathrm{tr}_{\mathbb{R}^{m-1}} U \quad \text{in } L_{\mathrm{loc}}^p(\partial\mathbb{R}_+^m, \mathcal{N}) \text{ as } j \rightarrow \infty,$$

and thus in view of (2.37), we conclude by continuity of the trace that $\mathrm{tr}_{\mathbb{R}^{m-1}} U = u$. \square

2.4. A qualitative necessary condition. Isobe's characterization of the obstruction to the extension of Sobolev mappings [15] consisted of an analytical obstruction (\mathfrak{o}_A) and a topological obstruction (\mathfrak{o}_B). On the other hand, the characterization of Theorem 1.1 is essentially quantitative. As a complement to the proof of Theorem 1.1 and in preparation of the proof of Theorem 1.3, we state and prove the next qualitative necessary condition for the extension.

Proposition 2.8. *Let $2 \leq m \in \mathbb{N}$, $p \in (1, \infty)$. If $u = \mathrm{tr}_{\partial\mathbb{R}_+^m} U$ for some $U \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}_+^m, \mathcal{N})$, then there exists a Borel-measurable function $w: \partial\mathbb{R}_+^m \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ with $\int_{\partial\mathbb{R}_+^m} w < \infty$ such that if Σ is a finite simplicial complex of dimension at most $\lfloor p \rfloor$, $\Sigma_0 \subset \Sigma$ is a subcomplex of codimension 1, the map $\sigma: \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^m$ is Lipschitz-continuous, $\sigma(\Sigma_0) \subset \partial\mathbb{R}_+^m$, and*

$$\int_{\Sigma_0} w \circ \sigma < \infty,$$

then $u \circ \sigma|_{\Sigma_0}$ is homotopic in $\mathrm{VMO}(\Sigma_0, \mathcal{N})$ to $V|_{\Sigma_0}$ for some $V \in C(\Sigma, \mathcal{N})$; if moreover $\dim \Sigma < p$, then $u \circ \sigma|_{\Sigma_0}$ is equal almost everywhere to $V|_{\Sigma_0}$ for some $V \in C(\Sigma, \mathcal{N})$.

We recall following [8] that a mapping $V: \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\nu$ belongs to the space $\mathrm{VMO}(\Sigma, \mathbb{R}^\nu)$ whenever V is Borel-measurable and

$$\limsup_{\rho \rightarrow 0} \sup_{a \in \Sigma} \int_{B_\rho^\Sigma(a)} \int_{B_\rho^\Sigma(a)} |V(x) - V(y)| \, dx \, dy = 0;$$

the space $\mathrm{VMO}(\Sigma, \mathbb{R}^\nu)$ endowed with bounded mean oscillation semi-norm

$$(2.39) \quad \|V\|_{\mathrm{BMO}} = \sup_{\substack{\rho > 0 \\ a \in \Sigma}} \int_{B_\rho^\Sigma(a)} \int_{B_\rho^\Sigma(a)} |V(x) - V(y)| \, dx \, dy < \infty$$

and the distance of convergence in measure is complete. We finally set

$$\mathrm{VMO}(\Sigma, \mathcal{N}) := \{V \in \mathrm{VMO}(\Sigma, \mathbb{R}^\nu) : V(x) \in \mathcal{N} \text{ for almost every } x \in \Sigma\}.$$

In particular, the maps $V_0, V_1 \in \mathrm{VMO}(\Sigma, \mathcal{N})$ are homotopic in $\mathrm{VMO}(\Sigma, \mathcal{N})$ whenever there exists a map $H \in C([0, 1], \mathrm{VMO}(\Sigma, \mathcal{N}))$ such that $V_0 = H(0)$ and $V_1 = H(1)$; the continuity is understood with respect to convergence in measure and convergence with respect to the bounded mean oscillation semi-norm (2.39).

We recall that Proposition 2.1 gave under the same assumptions the conclusion that $u \circ \sigma|_{\Sigma_0} = \mathrm{tr}_{\Sigma_0} W$ for some $W \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\Sigma, \mathcal{N})$. Proposition 2.8 would follow from Proposition 2.1, embeddings of $\dot{W}^{1,p}(\Sigma, \mathcal{N})$ into $\mathrm{VMO}(\Sigma, \mathcal{N})$, an embedding of $\dot{W}^{1-1/p,p}(\Sigma_0, \mathcal{N})$ into $\mathrm{VMO}(\Sigma_0, \mathcal{N})$ together with a suitable approximation by continuous map. In order for this approach to work, one would need our assumption $\dim \Sigma \leq p$ together with a regularity assumption on the simplicial complex: for instance the embedding theorem fails for simplicial complex composed of two simplices intersecting on a set of codimension at least p .

In order to avoid these technical issues, we follow [4] and give a direct proof of Proposition 2.8.

Proof of Proposition 2.8. As in the proof of Proposition 2.1, we define for $y \in \partial\mathbb{R}_+^m$

$$(2.40) \quad w(y) := \begin{cases} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m} \frac{W(x)x_m^\gamma}{|x-y|^{m-1+\gamma}} dx & \text{if } \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m \cap B_\rho(y)} |u(y) - U| = 0, \\ \infty & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $0 < \gamma \leq 1$ will be chosen later. The function $W: \mathbb{R}_+^m \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is chosen as

$$(2.41) \quad W(x) := \begin{cases} (\mathcal{M}|DU|)^p(x) & \text{if } \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m \cap B_\rho(x)} |U(x) - U| = 0, \\ \infty & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

with $\mathcal{M}|DU|: \mathbb{R}_+^m \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ denoting the Hardy–Littlewood maximal function, given for $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ by

$$\mathcal{M}|DU|(x) = \sup_{\delta > 0} \frac{1}{|B_\delta(x)|} \int_{B_\delta(x) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^m} |DU|.$$

By classical properties of Lebesgue points of functions and of traces (see for example [11, Sections 1.7 and 5.3]), the first case in the definitions (2.40) and (2.41) is taken almost everywhere. By the classical Hardy–Littlewood maximal function theorem, since $p > 1$,

$$(2.42) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{\partial\mathbb{R}_+^m} w &= \int_{\partial\mathbb{R}_+^m} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m} \frac{W(x)x_m^\gamma}{|x-y|^{m-1+\gamma}} dx dy = C_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m} W \\ &= C_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m} (\mathcal{M}|DU|)^p \leq C_2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m} |DU|^p < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Arguing as in the proof of Proposition 2.1, since $\gamma \leq 1$, we obtain by an application of Lemma 2.2 that given an ℓ -dimensional simplicial complex Σ , a subcomplex $\Sigma_0 \subset \Sigma$ of codimension 1, a Lipschitz-continuous $\sigma: \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^m$ such that $\sigma(\Sigma_0) \subset \partial\mathbb{R}_+^m$ and $\int_{\Sigma_0} w \circ \sigma < \infty$, there exists a $\xi \in C_\rho^\eta$ such that

$$\int_{\Sigma} W \circ \sigma_\xi < \infty,$$

where the map $\sigma_\xi: \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^m$ is defined in (2.20) and the solid cone $C_\rho^\eta \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ is defined in (2.2).

If $W(x) < \infty$ then by definition of W in (2.41), x is Lebesgue point of U and for each $\rho > 0$, by a suitable version of the Sobolev representation formula, we have in view of the definition of the maximal function

$$(2.43) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m \cap B_\rho(x)} |U(x) - U(z)| dz \leq C_3 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m \cap B_\rho(x)} \frac{|DU(z)|}{|z-x|^{m-1}} dz \leq C_4 \rho \mathcal{M}|DU|(x).$$

If $|x-y| \leq \rho$, then $B_{\rho/2}(\frac{x+y}{2}) \subseteq B_\rho(x) \cap B_\rho(y)$. If $x, y \in \Sigma$ and $|y-x| \leq \delta$, then $|\sigma_\xi(x) - \sigma_\xi(y)| \leq |\sigma|_{\text{Lip}} \delta$. Thus, taking $\rho := |\sigma|_{\text{Lip}} \delta$, we obtain, in view of (2.43), the Lusin–Lipschitz inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
 |U(\sigma_\xi(x)) - U(\sigma_\xi(y))| &= \int_{B_{\frac{\rho}{2}}((\sigma_\xi(x) + \sigma_\xi(y))/2)} |U(\sigma_\xi(x)) - U(\sigma_\xi(y))| dz \\
 (2.44) \quad &\leq C_5 \left(\int_{B_\rho(\sigma_\xi(x))} |U(\sigma_\xi(x)) - U(z)| dz + \int_{B_\rho(\sigma_\xi(y))} |U(\sigma_\xi(y)) - U(z)| dz \right) \\
 &\leq C_6 \rho (\mathcal{M}|DU|(\sigma_\xi(x)) + \mathcal{M}|DU|(\sigma_\xi(y))).
 \end{aligned}$$

Let $a \in \Sigma$ and $\delta > 0$. Taking the mean value over $x, y \in \Sigma \cap B_\delta(a)$ on both sides of (2.44) with $\rho = |\sigma|_{\text{Lip}} \delta$ and applying Hölder's inequality, we get, since $\dim \Sigma = \ell$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 (2.45) \quad &\int_{B_\delta^\Sigma(a)} \int_{B_\delta^\Sigma(a)} |U(\sigma_\xi(x)) - U(\sigma_\xi(y))| dx dy \leq \frac{C_7 |\sigma|_{\text{Lip}}}{\delta^{\ell-1}} \int_{B_\delta^\Sigma(a)} \mathcal{M}|DU|(\sigma_\xi(y)) dy \\
 &\leq C_8 |\sigma|_{\text{Lip}} \delta^{1-\frac{\ell}{p}} \left(\int_{B_\delta^\Sigma(a)} (\mathcal{M}|DU|)^p \circ \sigma_\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} = C_8 |\sigma|_{\text{Lip}} \delta^{1-\frac{\ell}{p}} \left(\int_{B_\delta^\Sigma(a)} W \circ \sigma_\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{p}},
 \end{aligned}$$

where the constants depend on Σ .

Similarly, if $w(x) < \infty$, then

$$(2.46) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m \cap B_\rho(y)} |u(y) - U(z)| dz \leq C_9 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m \cap B_\rho(y)} \frac{|DU(z)|}{|z-y|^{m-1}} dz.$$

Hence, similarly as before, for $x, y \in \Sigma_0$ we have

$$(2.47) \quad |U(\sigma_\xi(y)) - U(\sigma_\xi(x))| \leq C_{10} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m \cap B_\rho(\sigma_\xi(x))} \frac{|DU(z)|}{|z - \sigma_\xi(x)|^{m-1}} dz + \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m \cap B_\rho(\sigma_\xi(y))} \frac{|DU(z)|}{|z - \sigma_\xi(y)|^{m-1}} dz \right).$$

Hence, choosing $\rho = \delta |\sigma|_{\text{Lip}}$, taking the mean value over $x, y \in B_\delta^{\Sigma_0}(a)$ on both sides, and applying Hölder's inequality we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\int_{B_\delta^{\Sigma_0}(a)} \int_{B_\delta^{\Sigma_0}(a)} |U(\sigma_\xi(x)) - U(\sigma_\xi(y))| dx dy \\
 &\leq C_{11} \int_{B_\delta^{\Sigma_0}(a)} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m \cap B_\rho(\sigma_\xi(x))} \frac{|DU(z)|}{|z - \sigma_\xi(x)|^{m-1}} dz dx \\
 (2.48) \quad &\leq C_{12} \left(\int_{B_\delta^{\Sigma_0}(a)} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m} \frac{|DU(z)|^p z_m^\gamma}{|z - \sigma_\xi(x)|^{m-1+\gamma}} dz dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
 &\quad \left(\int_{B_\delta^{\Sigma_0}(a)} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m \cap B_\rho(\sigma_\xi(x))} \frac{1}{z_m^{\gamma/(p-1)} |z - \sigma_\xi(x)|^{m-1-\gamma/(p-1)}} dz dx \right)^{1-\frac{1}{p}} \\
 &= C_{13} \delta^{1-\frac{\ell}{p}} |\sigma|_{\text{Lip}}^{1-1/p} \left(\int_{B_\delta^{\Sigma_0}(a)} w \circ \sigma \right)^{\frac{1}{p}},
 \end{aligned}$$

provided $\gamma < p-1$, with constants depending on Σ_0 .

Finally, if $x \in \Sigma_0$, $y \in \Sigma$ and $|x - y| \leq \delta$ so that $|\sigma_\xi(x) - \sigma_\xi(y)| \leq \rho = \delta|\sigma|_{\text{Lip}}$, we have by (2.43), (2.46), and the triangle inequality,

$$(2.49) \quad |U(\sigma_\xi(x)) - U(\sigma_\xi(y))| \leq C_{14} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m \cap B_\rho(\sigma_\xi(x))} \frac{|DU(z)|}{|z - \sigma_\xi(x)|^{m-1}} dz + \rho \mathcal{M}|DU|(\sigma_\xi(y)) \right).$$

Taking the average with respect to $x \in B_\delta^{\Sigma_0}(a)$ and $y \in B_\delta^\Sigma(a)$, we proceed as in (2.45) and (2.48), and we obtain

$$(2.50) \quad \int_{B_\delta^{\Sigma_0}(a)} \int_{B_\delta^\Sigma(a)} |U(\sigma_\xi(x)) - U(\sigma_\xi(y))| dy dx \leq C_{15} \delta^{1-\frac{\ell}{p}} \left(|\sigma|_{\text{Lip}}^{p-1} \int_{B_\delta^{\Sigma_0}(a)} w \circ \sigma + |\sigma|_{\text{Lip}}^p \int_{B_\delta^\Sigma(a)} W \circ \sigma_\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

By Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem, we have in view of (2.45), (2.48), and (2.50),

$$(2.51) \quad \limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \sup_{a \in \Sigma} \frac{1}{\delta^{1-\frac{\ell}{p}}} \int_{B_\delta^\Sigma(a)} \int_{B_\delta^{\Sigma_0}(a)} |U(\sigma_\xi(x)) - U(\sigma_\xi(y))| dx dy = 0,$$

$$(2.52) \quad \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \sup_{a \in \Sigma_0} \frac{1}{\delta^{1-\frac{\ell}{p}}} \int_{B_\delta^{\Sigma_0}(a)} \int_{B_\delta^\Sigma(a)} |U(\sigma_\xi(x)) - U(\sigma_\xi(y))| dx dy = 0,$$

and

$$(2.53) \quad \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \sup_{a \in \Sigma_0} \frac{1}{\delta^{1-\frac{\ell}{p}}} \int_{B_\delta^{\Sigma_0}(a)} \int_{B_\delta^\Sigma(a)} |U(\sigma_\xi(x)) - U(\sigma_\xi(y))| dx dy = 0.$$

We define

$$v_\delta(x) := \int_{B_\delta^{\Sigma_0}(x)} u \circ \sigma \quad \text{and} \quad V_\delta(x) := \int_{B_\delta^\Sigma(x)} U \circ \sigma_\xi.$$

By (2.51), we have $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \text{dist}(V_\delta, \mathcal{N}) = 0$, by (2.52) $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \text{dist}(v_\delta, \mathcal{N}) = 0$, and by (2.53) $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \|V_\delta - v_\delta\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_0)} = 0$. Hence for $\delta > 0$ small enough, $\Pi_{\mathcal{N}} \circ V_\delta$ and $\Pi_{\mathcal{N}} \circ v_\delta$ are well-defined and continuous respectively on Σ and on Σ_0 and are close to each other on Σ_0 . Hence for $\delta > 0$ small enough, $\Pi_{\mathcal{N}} \circ v_\delta$ is homotopic to the restriction of a continuous map. Since $\Pi_{\mathcal{N}} \circ v_\delta \rightarrow u \circ \sigma|_{\Sigma_0}$ in $\text{VMO}(\Sigma_0, \mathcal{N})$, we conclude that $u \circ \sigma|_{\Sigma_0}$ is homotopic in $\text{VMO}(\Sigma_0, \mathcal{N})$ to the restriction to Σ_0 of a continuous map on δ . The case $p > \ell$ follows from (2.46), (2.48), (2.50), and Campanato's characterization of Hölder continuous functions by averages [10]. \square

3. THE GLOBAL CASE

In this Section we give the proof of Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3.

3.1. Embedding into the half-space. In order to reduce the situation of manifolds to an open subset of a Euclidean half-space, we rely on the following isometrical embedding.

Proposition 3.1 (Isometrical embedding into a half-space and retraction). *If \mathcal{M} is a compact Riemannian manifold with boundary $\partial\mathcal{M}$, then there exists an isometric embedding $i: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+^\mu$ such that $i(\partial\mathcal{M}) = i(\mathcal{M}) \cap \partial\bar{\mathbb{R}}_+^\mu$, and there exists a smooth map $\Pi_{\mathcal{M}}: \mathcal{U} \rightarrow i(\mathcal{M})$ such that $\mathcal{U} \subset \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+^\mu$ is relatively open, $\Pi_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{U} \cap \partial\bar{\mathbb{R}}_+^\mu) \subset i(\partial\mathcal{M})$, and for every $x \in i(\mathcal{M})$, $x \in \mathcal{U}$, and $\Pi_{\mathcal{M}}(x) = x$.*

Proof. By a collar neighborhood theorem, we can assume that $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{M}'$, where \mathcal{M}' is a compact Riemannian manifold without boundary and the inclusion is an isometry. We consider a function $f: \mathcal{M}' \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $f^{-1}(0) = \partial\mathcal{M}$, $f^{-1}([0, \infty)) = \mathcal{M}$ and $0 < |Df| < 1$ on \mathcal{M}' with respect to the metric g' of \mathcal{M}' . In particular, $g_0 := g' - Df \otimes Df$ also defines a metric. By Nash's embedding theorem, there exists a $\mu \in \mathbb{N}$ and an embedding $i_0: \mathcal{M}' \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mu-1}$ which is isometric for the metric g_0 . The mapping $i': \mathcal{M}' \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\mu$ defined by $i'(x) = (i_0(x), f(x))$ is then an isometric embedding for \mathcal{M}' endowed with the metric g' and $i := i'|_{\mathcal{M}}: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\mu$ is the required embedding.

Since $i'(\mathcal{M}')$ is an embedded submanifold of the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^μ , there exists an open set $\mathcal{U}' \subset \mathbb{R}^\mu$ and $\Pi' \in C^\infty(\mathcal{U}', i'(\mathcal{M}'))$ such that $i'(\mathcal{M}') \subset \mathcal{U}'$ and for every $x \in i'(\mathcal{M}')$, $\Pi'(x) = x$. Moreover, since $Df \neq 0$ in the construction of the embedding i' , the submanifolds $i'(\mathcal{M}')$ and $\partial\mathbb{R}_+^\mu$ are transverse; there exists thus an open set $\mathcal{U}^* \subset \mathbb{R}^\mu$ and a $\delta > 0$ such that $i'(\mathcal{M}') \cap (\mathbb{R}^{\mu-1} \times (-\delta, \delta)) \subset \mathcal{U}^*$ and a mapping $\Pi^* \in C^\infty(\mathcal{U}^*, i(\mathcal{M}))$ such that for every $(x', x_\mu) \in \mathcal{U}^*$, $\Pi^*(x', x_\mu) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mu-1} \times \{x_\mu\}$ and for every $x \in i(\mathcal{M}') \cap \mathcal{U}^*$, $\Pi^*(x) = x$. By taking the set \mathcal{U}^* smaller if necessary, we can also assume that for every $x \in \mathcal{U}^*$ and every $t \in [0, 1]$, we have $(1-t)\Pi^*(x) + tx \in \mathcal{U}'$. We conclude by defining the set

$$\mathcal{U} := (\mathcal{U}^* \cap \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+^\mu) \cup (\mathcal{U}' \cap (\mathbb{R}^{\mu-1} \times (\delta/2, \infty))),$$

and the mapping $\Pi_{\mathcal{M}}: \mathcal{U} \rightarrow i(\mathcal{M})$ for $x = (x', x_\mu) \in \mathcal{U}$ by

$$\Pi_{\mathcal{M}}(x', x_\mu) := \Pi'((1 - \psi(x_\mu))\Pi^*(x) + \psi(x_\mu)x),$$

where the function $\psi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}, [0, 1])$ is taken to satisfy $\psi(t) = 1$ when $t \leq \delta/2$ and $\psi(t) = 0$ when $t \geq \delta$. \square

3.2. Characterization of the trace space. We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.2 characterizing the traces of Sobolev maps between manifolds. The idea is to first use Proposition 3.1 to replace maps with a manifold in the domain to maps defined on a subset of the Euclidean half-space, by composing original maps with the retraction, and next to apply to those modified maps a localized version of Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Applying Proposition 3.1 we may assume, without loss of generality, that the manifold \mathcal{M} is identified with its isometrical embedding into the half-space $\bar{\mathbb{R}}_+^\mu$ and that $\Pi_{\mathcal{M}}: \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is the corresponding smooth retraction, where the set $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathbb{R}^{\mu-1} \times [0, \infty)$ is relatively open in the closed half-space $\bar{\mathbb{R}}_+^\mu$. We define the sets

$$(3.1) \quad \mathcal{U}_0 := \mathcal{U} \cap \partial\mathbb{R}_+^\mu \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{U}_+ := \mathcal{U} \cap \mathbb{R}_+^\mu;$$

we choose the set $\mathcal{V} \subset \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+^\mu$ relatively open in $\bar{\mathbb{R}}_+^\mu$ such that $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{V}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{V}} \subset \mathcal{U}$, and define the sets

$$(3.2) \quad \mathcal{V}_0 := \mathcal{V} \cap \partial\mathbb{R}_+^\mu \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{V}_+ := \mathcal{V} \cap \mathbb{R}_+^\mu.$$

NECESSARY CONDITION. Fix $\delta > 0$. By assumption there exists a map $U \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$ such that $\text{tr}_{\partial\mathcal{M}} U = u$. We define the maps $\bar{U} := U \circ \Pi_{\mathcal{M}}|_{\mathcal{U}_+}$ and $\bar{u} := u \circ \Pi_{\mathcal{M}}|_{\mathcal{U}_0}$, so that in particular $\bar{U} \in W^{1,p}(\mathcal{U}_+, \mathcal{N})$ and $\text{tr}_{\mathcal{U}_0} \bar{U} = \bar{u}$.

We continue by observing that Lemma 2.2 and Proposition 2.1 with $m = \mu$ admit localized versions. First, in Lemma 2.2 under the additional assumption that for each $y \in \Sigma$ we have

$$(3.3) \quad \sigma(y) + d_0(y)C_\rho^\eta \subseteq \mathcal{U}_+,$$

the integral in (2.3) can be taken over \mathcal{U}_+ instead of \mathbb{R}_+^μ , and we thus have

$$\int_{C_\rho^\eta} \left(\int_{\Sigma} F \circ (\sigma + d_0 \xi) \right) d\xi \leq \frac{(\eta\lambda - 1)^\mu (\rho + |\sigma|_{\text{Lip}})^{2\mu}}{\eta^\mu ((\eta\lambda - 1)\rho - |\sigma|_{\text{Lip}})^{\mu+1}} \gamma_{\Sigma_0, \Sigma}^\lambda \int_{\Sigma_0} \int_{\mathcal{U}_+} \frac{F(x) x_\mu}{|x - \sigma(z)|^\mu} dx dz.$$

Indeed, it suffices to observe that the dimension has changed from m to μ and that in view of the condition (3.3) and of the change of variable $x = \sigma(y) + d_0(y)\xi$, the integration domain of all the integrals with respect to x can be restricted to the set \mathcal{U}_+ .

Next, for the localized version of Proposition 2.1, we define the function $\bar{W}: \mathcal{U}_+ \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ as in (2.15), with \mathbb{R}_+^m replaced by \mathcal{U}_+ and U by \bar{U} , we define $\bar{w}: \mathcal{V}_0 \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ by (2.17), with the integrals restricted to \mathcal{U}_+ ; we have

$$(3.4) \quad \int_{\mathcal{V}_0} \bar{w} \leq C \int_{\mathcal{V}_+} |D\bar{U}|^p.$$

By Fubini's theorem, there is an $h \in \partial\mathbb{R}_+^\mu$ such that $\partial\mathcal{M} + h \subset \mathcal{V}_0$ and $\int_{\partial\mathcal{M}+h} \bar{w} \leq C_1 \int_{\mathcal{V}_0} \bar{w} < \infty$. Taking h to be small enough, we have that $\Pi_{\mathcal{M}}|_{\mathcal{M}+h}: \mathcal{M} + h \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is a diffeomorphism by the implicit function theorem. We define $w := \bar{w} \circ (\Pi_{\mathcal{M}}|_{\mathcal{M}+h})^{-1}: \partial\mathcal{M} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$.

If the mapping $\sigma: \Sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is Lipschitz-continuous and if we set $\bar{\sigma} = (\Pi_{\mathcal{M}}|_{\mathcal{M}+h})^{-1} \circ \sigma$, then $|\bar{\sigma}|_{\text{Lip}} \leq C_2 |\sigma|_{\text{Lip}}$. Thus, $|\sigma|_{\text{Lip}} \sup_{\Sigma} d_0 \leq \delta$ implies for $\delta = \bar{\delta}/C_2$

$$(3.5) \quad |\bar{\sigma}|_{\text{Lip}} \sup_{\Sigma} d_0 \leq \bar{\delta}.$$

Taking $\eta = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2\lambda}$ in (2.21), we get

$$(3.6) \quad \rho = 4|\bar{\sigma}|_{\text{Lip}}/(\lambda - 1).$$

Thus, for any $y \in \Sigma$ we have

$$\sigma(y) + d_0(y)C_\rho^\eta \subset \mathcal{V}_+ + \sup_{y \in \Sigma} d_0(y)B_\rho \cap \mathbb{R}_+^\mu$$

and combining (3.6) with (3.5) we obtain

$$\sup_{y \in \Sigma} d_0(y)\rho \leq \frac{4\bar{\delta}}{\lambda - 1} \leq \frac{4C_2\delta}{\lambda - 1},$$

This implies, from the choice of the set \mathcal{V} , that for a sufficiently large $\lambda > 1$ we have for all $y \in \Sigma$

$$\sigma(y) + d_0(y)C_\rho^\eta \subset \mathcal{U}_+$$

and thus condition (3.3) is satisfied. Moreover, since $\Pi_{\mathcal{M}} \circ \bar{\sigma} = \sigma$, we have

$$\int_{\Sigma_0} \bar{w} \circ \bar{\sigma} = \int_{\Sigma_0} w \circ \sigma < \infty.$$

We apply now localized Lemma 2.2 and proceed exactly as in the proof of Proposition 2.1: For the Lipschitz-continuous function $\bar{\sigma}: \Sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_+$ with $\bar{\sigma}(\Sigma_0) \subset \mathcal{V}_0$, $|\bar{\sigma}|_{\text{Lip}} \leq \bar{\delta}$, and $\int_{\Sigma_0} \bar{w} \circ \bar{\sigma} < \infty$ we obtain the existence of a map $V \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\Sigma, \mathcal{N})$ such that $\text{tr}_{\Sigma_0} V = \bar{u} \circ \bar{\sigma}|_{\Sigma_0} = u \circ \sigma|_{\Sigma_0}$ and

$$(3.7) \quad \int_{\Sigma} |DV|^p \leq \gamma_{\Sigma_0, \Sigma}^\lambda |\bar{\sigma}|_{\text{Lip}}^{p-1} \int_{\Sigma_0} \bar{w} \circ \bar{\sigma} \leq C_2^{p-1} \gamma_{\Sigma_0, \Sigma}^\lambda |\sigma|_{\text{Lip}}^{p-1} \int_{\Sigma_0} w \circ \sigma.$$

Multiplying w by a suitable constant we obtain (1.6). This finishes the proof of the necessity part.

SUFFICIENT CONDITION: Let $u: \partial\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ and $w: \partial\mathcal{M} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ with $\int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} w < \infty$ be Borel-measurable maps given by assumptions. Since $\Pi_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{U}_0) \subset \partial\mathcal{M}$, the map $\bar{w} := w \circ \Pi_{\mathcal{M}}: \mathcal{U}_0 \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is well-defined. If the mapping $\bar{\sigma}: \Sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ is Lipschitz-continuous and if we set $\sigma := \Pi_{\mathcal{M}} \circ \bar{\sigma}: \Sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$, then

$$|\sigma|_{\text{Lip}} \leq C_3 |\bar{\sigma}|_{\text{Lip}}$$

and

$$\int_{\Sigma_0} w \circ \sigma = \int_{\Sigma_0} \bar{w} \circ \bar{\sigma},$$

so that if $\bar{\sigma}(\Sigma_0) \subset \mathcal{V}_0$, then for $\bar{\delta} = \delta/C_3$ the condition $|\bar{\sigma}|_{\text{Lip}} \sup_{\Sigma} d_0 \leq \bar{\delta}$ implies $|\sigma|_{\text{Lip}} \sup_{\Sigma} d_0 \leq \delta$, and if $\int_{\Sigma_0} \bar{w} \circ \sigma < \infty$, then by assumption there exists a map $V \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\Sigma, \mathcal{N})$ such that $\text{tr}_{\Sigma_0} V = u \circ \sigma|_{\Sigma_0}$ and

$$(3.8) \quad \int_{\Sigma} |DV|^p \leq \gamma_{\Sigma_0, \Sigma}^{\lambda} |\sigma|_{\text{Lip}}^{p-1} \int_{\Sigma_0} w \circ \sigma.$$

Thus by construction of σ and \bar{w} , $\text{tr}_{\Sigma_0} V = \bar{u} \circ \bar{\sigma}|_{\Sigma_0}$, where we have set again $\bar{u} := u \circ \Pi_{\mathcal{M}}|_{\mathcal{U}_0}$, and

$$\int_{\Sigma} |DV|^p \leq C_3^{p-1} \gamma_{\Sigma_0, \Sigma}^{\lambda} |\bar{\sigma}|_{\text{Lip}}^{p-1} \int_{\Sigma_0} \bar{w} \circ \bar{\sigma}.$$

For small enough $\kappa_0 > 0$, we have by construction of \mathcal{U}_+ and \mathcal{V}_+

$$\mathcal{V}_+ \subset \mathcal{W}_+ := \bigcup \{Q \cap \mathbb{R}_+^{\mu} \in \mathcal{Q}^{\kappa_0, \mu} : Q \cap \mathbb{R}_+^{\mu} \subset \mathcal{U}_+\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{V}_0 \subset \mathcal{W}_0 := \bigcup \{Q \cap \partial\mathbb{R}_+^{\mu} \in \mathcal{Q}^{\kappa_0, \mu} : Q \cap \partial\mathbb{R}_+^{\mu} \subset \mathcal{U}_0\},$$

where the cubication $\mathcal{Q}^{\kappa_0, \mu}$ is defined as in (1.3), with m replaced by μ . We define for $\ell \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}$ and $j \in \mathbb{N}$, the sets

$$(3.9) \quad \mathcal{W}_+^{j, \ell} := \bigcup \{Q \cap \mathbb{R}_+^{\mu} : Q \in \mathcal{Q}^{\kappa_j, \ell} \text{ and } Q \cap \mathbb{R}_+^{\mu} \subset \mathcal{W}_+\},$$

$$(3.10) \quad \mathcal{W}_0^{j, \ell} := \bigcup \{Q \cap \partial\mathbb{R}_+^{\mu} : Q \in \mathcal{Q}^{\kappa_j, \ell+1} \text{ and } Q \cap \partial\mathbb{R}_+^{\mu} \subset \mathcal{W}_0\},$$

and

$$(3.11) \quad \mathcal{W}^{j, \ell} := \mathcal{W}_+^{j, \ell} \cup \mathcal{W}_0^{j, \ell-1},$$

where $\kappa_j := 2^{-j} \kappa_0$. If j is large enough, then for every $h \in [0, \kappa_j]^{\mu-1} \times \{0\}$, we have

$$\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{W}^{j, \mu} + h \subset \mathcal{U}_+.$$

We let Σ^j be a sequence of homogeneous simplicial complexes, $\Sigma_0^j \subset \Sigma^j$ be a sequence of subcomplexes of codimension 1 and $\sigma^j: \Sigma^j \rightarrow \mathcal{W}^{j, [p]}$ be a simplicial parametrization such that $\sigma^j(\Sigma_0^j) = \mathcal{W}_0^{j, [p-1]}$. We observe that for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$|\sigma^j|_{\text{Lip}} \sup_{\Sigma^j} d_0 \leq C_4,$$

so taking $\bar{\delta} = C_4$ we get $|\sigma^j|_{\text{Lip}} \sup_{\Sigma^j} d_0 \leq \bar{\delta}$. Moreover, we have for any $\lambda > 0$

$$\sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \gamma_{\Sigma_0^j, \Sigma^j}^{\lambda} < \infty.$$

Thus, as in (3.8), we obtain the existence of maps $V^j \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\Sigma^j, \mathcal{N})$. We then may proceed as in the proofs of Propositions 2.3 and 2.4 to construct a map $\bar{U} \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathcal{V}_+, \mathcal{N})$ such that $\text{tr}_{\mathcal{V}_0} \bar{U} = \bar{u}$ and

$$\int_{\mathcal{V}_+} |D\bar{U}|^p \leq C_5 \int_{\mathcal{U}_0} \bar{w} \leq C_6 \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} w.$$

By Fubini's theorem there is a set of positive measure of $h \in \partial\mathbb{R}_+^\mu$, such that we have $\mathcal{M}+h \subset \mathcal{V}$, $\bar{U}|_{\mathcal{M}+h} \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathcal{M}+h, \mathcal{N})$, $\text{tr}_{\partial\mathcal{M}+h} \bar{U}|_{\mathcal{M}+h} = \bar{u}|_{\partial\mathcal{M}+h}$, and

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}+h} |D\bar{U}|^p \leq C_7 \int_{\mathcal{V}_+} |D\bar{U}|^p.$$

For such h , we set $U := \bar{U} \circ (\Pi_{\mathcal{M}}|_{\mathcal{M}+h})^{-1} \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$ and we have $\text{tr}_{\partial\mathcal{M}} U = u$ on $\partial\mathcal{M}$ and

$$(3.12) \quad \int_{\mathcal{M}} |DU|^p \leq C_8 \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} w.$$

This finishes the proof of the sufficiency part for $\delta = C_3 C_4$. \square

Remark 3.2. In view of (3.4) and (3.12), the infima of $\int_{\mathcal{M}} |DU|^p$ and $\int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} w$ are comparable.

3.3. Combining a qualitative and quantitative condition. In this Section we focus on proving Theorem 1.3. Let us first remark that if $p \notin \mathbb{N}$, then since $\dim \Sigma = \lfloor p \rfloor$ and $V \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\Sigma, \mathcal{N})$ we obtain by the Morrey–Sobolev embedding and the homotopy extension property that the condition (b) is equivalent to the existence of $V \in C(\Sigma, \mathcal{N})$ such that $V|_{\Sigma_0} = u \circ \sigma$ almost everywhere on Σ_0 .

The first tool of the proof is the following proposition about the extension of boundary data already in $W^{1,p}(\partial\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$ which can be extended trivially to a neighborhood of the boundary.

Proposition 3.3. *Let \mathcal{M} be a compact Riemannian manifold with boundary $\partial\mathcal{M}$ and let $u \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\partial\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$ be a Borel-measurable map.*

Suppose that there exists a summable function $w: \partial\mathcal{M} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ with the following property: if Σ is a homogeneous simplicial complex of dimension $\lfloor p \rfloor$, $\Sigma_0 \subset \Sigma$ is a subcomplex of Σ of dimension $\lfloor p-1 \rfloor$, $\sigma: \Sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is a Lipschitz-continuous map such that $\sigma(\Sigma_0) \subseteq \partial\mathcal{M}$ satisfying $\int_{\Sigma_0} w \circ \sigma < \infty$, then $u \circ \sigma|_{\Sigma_0}$ is homotopic in $\text{VMO}(\Sigma_0, \mathcal{N})$ to the restriction of $V|_{\Sigma_0}$ for some $V \in C(\Sigma, \mathcal{N})$.

Then there exists an extension $U \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$ with $\text{tr}_{\partial\mathcal{M}} U = u$ on $\partial\mathcal{M}$.

Proof. We use the same definitions as in the [Proof of Theorem 1.2](#). In particular, for the summable function $w: \partial\mathcal{M} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ from the assumptions, we define $\bar{w} := w \circ \Pi_{\mathcal{M}}$. If $\bar{\sigma}: \Sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is Lipschitz-continuous and if $\int_{\Sigma_0} \bar{w} \circ \bar{\sigma} < \infty$, then, defining $\sigma := \Pi_{\mathcal{M}} \circ \bar{\sigma}$, we also have that σ is Lipschitz-continuous and $\int_{\Sigma_0} w \circ \sigma < \infty$. Thus, by assumption, the map $\bar{u} \circ \bar{\sigma} = u \circ \sigma$ is homotopic in $\text{VMO}(\Sigma_0, \mathcal{N})$ to the restriction of $V|_{\Sigma_0}$ for some $V \in C(\Sigma, \mathcal{N})$, where $\bar{u} = u \circ \Pi_{\mathcal{M}}|_{\mathcal{U}_0}$.

Again, proceeding as in the proof of the [SUFFICIENT CONDITION](#) in Theorem 1.2, we obtain that for some fixed large enough $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and each $h \in [0, \kappa_j]^{\mu-1} \simeq [0, \kappa_j]^{\mu-1} \times \{0\}$, where $\kappa_j = 2^{-j} \kappa_0 > 0$, we have

$$\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{W}^{j,\mu} + h \subset \mathcal{U}$$

and for almost every $h \in [0, \kappa_j]^{\mu-1} \simeq [0, \kappa_j]^{\mu-1} \times \{0\}$, and for each $\ell \in \{0, \dots, \mu-1\}$, we have

$$(3.13) \quad \bar{u}|_{\mathcal{W}_0^{j,\ell}+h} \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathcal{W}_0^{j,\ell}+h, \mathcal{N})$$

and $\bar{u}|_{\mathcal{W}_0^{j,[p-1]}+h}$ is homotopic in $\text{VMO}(\mathcal{W}_0^{j,[p-1]}+h, \mathcal{N})$ to the restriction $V|_{\mathcal{W}_0^{j,[p-1]}+h}$ of a continuous map $V \in C(\mathcal{W}^{j,[p]}+h, \mathcal{N})$. By a regularization argument and the homotopy extension property, there exists a $\bar{U}^{[p]} \in C(\mathcal{W}^{j,[p]}+h, \mathcal{N})$ such that $\text{tr}_{\mathcal{W}_0^{j,[p-1]}+h} \bar{U}^{[p]} = \bar{u}$.

Now we define inductively maps \bar{U}^ℓ for $\ell \in \{[p+1], \dots, \mu\}$. Given $\bar{U}^{\ell-1} \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathcal{W}_+^{j,\ell-1}+h, \mathcal{N})$, we define $\bar{U}^\ell \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathcal{W}_+^{j,\ell}+h, \mathcal{N})$ on each $Q \in \mathcal{Q}^{\kappa_j, \ell}$ by

$$\bar{U}^\ell := \begin{cases} \bar{u} & \text{if } Q \subset \mathcal{W}_0^{j,\ell} \\ \bar{U}^{\ell-1}(P_{\kappa_j, \ell}(\cdot - h) + h) & \text{if } Q \subset \mathcal{W}_+^{j,\ell}, (\text{but } Q \not\subset \mathcal{W}_0^{j,\ell}), \end{cases}$$

where the projection $P_{\kappa_j, \ell}$ is defined in (2.32) and we take any $h \in [0, \kappa_j]^{\mu-1}$ on which (3.13) holds. In view of Lemma 2.6, we have $\bar{U}^\ell \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathcal{W}_+^{j,\ell}+h, \mathcal{N})$. We set $\bar{U} = \bar{U}^\mu$ and in order to obtain $U \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$ we use a Fubini argument exactly as at the end of the proof of the SUFFICIENT CONDITION of Theorem 1.2. \square

The second tool is a localized version of Proposition 2.8.

Proposition 3.4. *Let $2 \leq m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $p \in (1, \infty)$. If $u = \text{tr}_{\partial\mathcal{M}} U$ for some $U \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$, then there exists a Borel-measurable function $w: \partial\mathcal{M} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ with $\int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} w < \infty$ such that if Σ is a finite simplicial complex of dimension at most $[p]$, $\Sigma_0 \subset \Sigma$ is a subcomplex of codimension 1, $\sigma: \Sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is a Lipschitz-continuous with $\sigma(\Sigma_0) \subset \partial\mathcal{M}$, and $\int_{\Sigma_0} w \circ \sigma < \infty$, then $u \circ \sigma|_{\Sigma_0}$ is homotopic in $\text{VMO}(\Sigma_0, \mathcal{N})$ to $V|_{\Sigma_0}$ for some $V \in C(\Sigma, \mathcal{N})$.*

We omit the proof of Proposition 3.4 which is a straightforward variant of the proof of Proposition 3.4.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. NECESSARY CONDITION. The condition (a) follows immediately from Theorem 1.2 since the condition $\sigma(\Sigma) \subseteq \partial\mathcal{M}$ implies $\sigma(\Sigma) \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ and $\sigma(\Sigma_0) \subseteq \partial\mathcal{M}$; the condition (b) follows from Proposition 3.4.

SUFFICIENT CONDITION. In view of the assumption in (a), by a variant of Theorem 1.2 applied to the manifold $\partial\mathcal{M} \times (0, 1)$ with boundary $\partial\mathcal{M} \times \{0\}$ ¹ there exists a map $V \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\partial\mathcal{M} \times [0, 1], \mathcal{N})$ such that $\text{tr}_{\partial\mathcal{M} \times \{0\}} V = u$. By Fubini's theorem, for almost every $t \in (0, 1]$, $V|_{\partial\mathcal{M} \times \{t\}} = \text{tr}_{\partial\mathcal{M} \times \{t\}} V \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\partial\mathcal{M} \times \{t\}, \mathcal{N})$. Through a suitable rescaling in the t variable we can assume without loss of generality that this is the case for $t = 1$.

By Proposition 3.4 applied to the manifold $\partial\mathcal{M} \times [0, 1]$ with boundary $\partial\mathcal{M} \times \{0, 1\}$ and the boundary map $V|_{\partial\mathcal{M} \times \{0, 1\}}$, there exists a summable function $\tilde{w}: \partial\mathcal{M} \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ such that for every finite homogeneous simplicial complex $\tilde{\Sigma}$ of dimension $[p]$, every subcomplex $\tilde{\Sigma}_0 \subset \tilde{\Sigma}$ of codimension 1, every Lipschitz-continuous map $\tilde{\sigma}: \tilde{\Sigma} \rightarrow \partial\mathcal{M} \times [0, 1]$ satisfying $\tilde{\sigma}(\tilde{\Sigma}_0) \subset \partial\mathcal{M} \times \{0, 1\}$ and $\int_{\tilde{\Sigma}_0} \tilde{w} \circ \tilde{\sigma} < \infty$, the map $V \circ \tilde{\sigma}|_{\tilde{\Sigma}_0}$ is homotopic in $\text{VMO}(\tilde{\Sigma}_0, \mathcal{N})$ to the restriction to $\tilde{\Sigma}_0$ of a continuous map from $\tilde{\Sigma}$ to \mathcal{N} .

¹Theorem 1.2, is proved for \mathcal{M} compact; here we have $\mathcal{M} = \partial\mathcal{M} \times [0, 1]$ to which the construction of the isometric embedding and retraction in \mathbb{R}_+^μ also apply.

In order to apply Proposition 3.3, we define $\hat{w}: \partial\mathcal{M} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ by $\hat{w} := \tilde{w}(\cdot, 0) + \tilde{w}(\cdot, 1) + w$, where w is the summable map given by assumptions. If Σ is a finite $[p]$ -dimensional simplicial complex and Σ_0 is a $[p-1]$ -dimensional subcomplex, and if $\sigma: \Sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is Lipschitz-continuous such that $\sigma(\Sigma_0) \subset \partial\mathcal{M}$, we define $\tilde{\Sigma}$ to be a simplicial realization of $\Sigma_0 \times [0, 1]$ and set $\tilde{\sigma}(y, t) := (\sigma(y), t) \in \partial\mathcal{M} \times [0, 1]$. If $\int_{\Sigma_0} \hat{w} \circ \sigma < \infty$, then $\int_{\Sigma_0 \times \{0,1\}} \tilde{w} \circ \tilde{\sigma} < \infty$, and thus since $\dim(\Sigma) = [p] \leq p$, the maps $V \circ \tilde{\sigma}|_{\Sigma_0 \times \{0\}}$ and $V \circ \tilde{\sigma}|_{\Sigma_0 \times \{1\}}$ are homotopic in $\text{VMO}(\Sigma_0, \mathcal{N})$. Moreover, in view of (b), since $\int_{\Sigma_0} w \circ \sigma < \infty$, the map $u \circ \sigma|_{\Sigma_0} = V|_{\Sigma_0 \times \{0\}}$ is homotopic in $\text{VMO}(\Sigma_0, \mathcal{N})$ to the restriction to Σ_0 of a map in $C(\Sigma, \mathcal{N})$. By transitivity of homotopies, $V|_{\Sigma_0 \times \{1\}}$ is homotopic in $\text{VMO}(\Sigma_0, \mathcal{N})$ to the restriction of a map in $C(\Sigma, \mathcal{N})$. By Proposition 3.3, $V|_{\partial\mathcal{M} \times \{1\}} \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\partial\mathcal{M} \times \{1\}, \mathcal{N})$ is the trace of a map in $\dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$ and the conclusion follows. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] F. Bethuel, *A new obstruction to the extension problem for Sobolev maps between manifolds*, J. Fixed Point Theory Appl. **15** (2014), no. 1, 155–183. [↑2](#)
- [2] F. Bethuel and D. Chiron, *Some questions related to the lifting problem in Sobolev spaces*, Perspectives in nonlinear partial differential equations, 2007, pp. 125–152. [↑2](#)
- [3] F. Bethuel and F. Demengel, *Extensions for Sobolev mappings between manifolds*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **3** (1995), no. 4, 475–491. [↑2](#)
- [4] P. Bousquet, A. Ponce, and J. Van Schaftingen, *Generic topological screening and approximation of sobolev maps*, in preparation. [↑3](#), [6](#), [16](#)
- [5] P. Bousquet, A. C. Ponce, and J. Van Schaftingen, *Strong density for higher order Sobolev spaces into compact manifolds*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **17** (2015), no. 4, 763–817. [↑15](#)
- [6] H. Brezis and Y. Li, *Topology and Sobolev spaces*, J. Funct. Anal. **183** (2001), no. 2, 321–369. [↑15](#)
- [7] H. Brezis and P. Mironescu, *Density in $W^{s,p}(\Omega; N)$* , J. Funct. Anal. **269** (2015), no. 7, 2045–2109. [↑14](#)
- [8] H. Brezis and L. Nirenberg, *Degree theory and BMO. I. Compact manifolds without boundaries*, Selecta Math. (N.S.) **1** (1995), no. 2, 197–263. [↑2](#), [3](#), [16](#)
- [9] ———, *Degree theory and BMO. II. Compact manifolds with boundaries*, Selecta Math. (N.S.) **2** (1996), no. 3, 309–368. [↑2](#)
- [10] S. Campanato, *Proprietà di hölderianità di alcune classi di funzioni*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (3) **17** (1963), 175–188. [↑19](#)
- [11] L. C. Evans and R. F. Gariepy, *Measure theory and fine properties of functions*, Studies in Advanced Mathematics, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 1992. [↑17](#)
- [12] E. Gagliardo, *Caratterizzazioni delle tracce sulla frontiera relative ad alcune classi di funzioni in n variabili*, Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Padova **27** (1957), 284–305. [↑1](#)
- [13] F. Hang and F. Lin, *Topology of Sobolev mappings. II*, Acta Math. **191** (2003), no. 1, 55–107. [↑3](#), [4](#)
- [14] R. Hardt and F.-H. Lin, *Mappings minimizing the L^p norm of the gradient*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **40** (1987), no. 5, 555–588. [↑2](#)
- [15] T. Isobe, *Obstructions to the extension problem of Sobolev mappings*, Topol. Methods Nonlinear Anal. **21** (2003), no. 2, 345–368. [↑2](#), [3](#), [16](#)
- [16] L. Malý, *Trace and extension theorems for Sobolev-type functions in metric spaces*, available at [arXiv:1704.06344](#). [↑3](#)
- [17] L. Malý, N. Shanmugalingam, and M. Snipes, *Trace and extension theorems for functions of bounded variation*, Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5) **18** (2018), no. 1, 313–341. [↑3](#)
- [18] P. Mironescu and J. Van Schaftingen, *Lifting in compact covering spaces for fractional Sobolev mappings*, Anal. PDE **14** (2021), no. 6, 1851–1871. [↑2](#)
- [19] ———, *Trace theory for Sobolev mappings into a manifold*, Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math. (6) **30** (2021), no. 2, 281–299. [↑2](#)
- [20] A. Monteil and J. Van Schaftingen, *Uniform boundedness principles for Sobolev maps into manifolds*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **36** (2019), no. 2, 417–449. [↑2](#)
- [21] J. Nash, *The imbedding problem for Riemannian manifolds*, Ann. of Math. (2) **63** (1956), 20–63. [↑1](#)
- [22] E. Saksman and T. Soto, *Traces of Besov, Triebel–Lizorkin and Sobolev spaces on metric spaces*, Anal. Geom. Metr. Spaces **5** (2017), no. 1, 98–115. [↑3](#)

- [23] B. White, *Infima of energy functionals in homotopy classes of mappings*, J. Differential Geom. **23** (1986), no. 2, 127–142. [↑3](#)
- [24] ———, *Homotopy classes in Sobolev spaces and the existence of energy minimizing maps*, Acta Math. **160** (1988), no. 1-2, 1–17. [↑2](#), [3](#), [4](#)

(Katarzyna Mazowiecka) LEHRSTUHL FÜR ANGEWANDTE ANALYSIS, RWTH AACHEN UNIVERSITY, PONTDRIESCH 14-16, 52062 AACHEN, GERMANY

Email address: `mazowiecka@math1.rwth-aachen.de`

(Jean Van Schaftingen) UNIVERSITÉ CATHOLIQUE DE LOUVAIN, INSTITUT DE RECHERCHE EN MATHÉMATIQUE ET PHYSIQUE, CHEMIN DU CYCLOTRON 2 BTE L7.01.02, 1348 LOUVAIN-LA-NEUVE, BELGIUM

Email address: `Jean.VanSchaftingen@uclouvain.be`