

Operator estimates for non-periodically perforated domains with Dirichlet and nonlinear Robin conditions: strange term

D.I. Borisov^{1,2,3}

- 1) Institute of Mathematics, Ufa Federal Research Center, Russian Academy of Sciences, Chernyshevsky str. 112, Ufa, Russia, 450008
 2) Bashkir State University, Zaki Validi str. 32, Ufa, Russia, 450076
 3) University of Hradec Králové 62, Rokitanského, Hradec Králové 50003, Czech Republic
 Emails: borisovdi@yandex.ru

Abstract. We consider a boundary value problem for a general second order linear equation in a domain with an arbitrary fine perforation. The latter is made by small cavities; both the shapes of the cavities and their distribution are arbitrary. The boundaries of the cavities are subject either the Dirichlet or a nonlinear Robin condition. On the perforation, certain rather weak conditions are imposed to ensure that under the homogenization procedure we obtain a similar problem in a non-perforated domain with an additional potential in the equation usually called a strange term. Our main results state the convergence of the solution of the perturbed problem to that of the homogenized one in W_2^1 - and L_2 -norms uniformly in L_2 -norm of the right hand side in the equation. The estimates for the convergence rates are established and their order sharpness is discussed.

Keywords: perforated domain, non-periodic perforation, operator estimates, strange term, order sharp estimates

Mathematics Subject Classification: 35B27, 35B40

1 Introduction

Nowadays a new direction in the homogenization theory devoted to so-called operator estimates is quite intensively developed. In contrast to classical results in the homogenization theory on strong and weak convergence of the solutions, here the studies are aimed on proving the norm resolvent convergence and obtaining estimates for the convergence rates; the latter are often called operator estimates. Recently, such results were obtained in few papers for problems in domains with fine perforation distributed along entire domain. Problems in such perforated domains are classical in the homogenization theory, see, for instance, [12], [13], [15], [7], [9], and the references therein, and there are many results describing the convergence in a strong or weak sense in L_2 and W_2^1 for fixed right hand sides in the equations and boundary conditions. In papers [22], [16], [24], [10], [11] the classical results were improved and operator estimates were established for several cases of periodic and almost periodic perforation in arbitrary domains. The case of the Neumann condition was addressed in [22], [16], [24] and the sizes of the cavities were of the same order as the distances between them and the perforation was pure periodic.

In [10], on the boundaries of the cavities the Dirichlet condition was imposed and the linear sizes of these cavities were assumed to satisfy certain relation with respect to the size of the periodicity cell. All cavities were of the same shapes up to an arbitrary rotation and its location in the periodicity cell was also quite arbitrary. In [11], the perforation was pure periodic and it was made by small balls with the Robin condition on the the boundaries. The main results of the cited papers were the formulation of the homogenized problems and various operator estimates; their order sharpness was not established.

A non-periodic perforation was studied in [1]. Here the domain was a manifold with a perforation made by arbitrary cavities with the Dirichlet or Neumann condition and the operator was the Laplacian. The main results were again homogenized problems and operator estimates and they were established under the validity of certain local upper bounds for L_2 -norm in terms of W_2^1 -norms. And these bounds were the main tools in proving the convergence and operator estimates. Then several cases of possible homogenized problems were addressed and as examples, it was shown that the developed scheme worked for perforation by small balls.

We also mention several recent papers on operator estimates for domain perforated along a given manifold [3], [4], [6]. The perforation was assumed to be non-periodic, with arbitrary cavities and their distribution. The homogenized problems were classified and a series of operator estimates was established. In some cases these estimates turned out to be order sharp.

In this paper we study a boundary value problem for a linear second order elliptic equation in a perforated domain. The differential expression is general, involves complex-valued varying coefficients and is not formally symmetric. The perforation is arbitrary and non-periodic and is assumed to satisfy natural geometric conditions. On the boundaries of the cavities we impose the Dirichlet or a nonlinear Robin condition; both types of conditions can be simultaneously present on different cavities. Then we impose additional rather weak conditions on the perforation to describe the case, when the homogenization produces a so-called strange term, namely, when in the homogenized equation an additional potential appears. Our main results states the convergence of the perturbed solution to the homogenized one in L_2 - and W_2^1 -norms uniformly in L_2 -norm of the right hand side in the equation. The estimates for the convergence rates are also proved and some terms in these estimates are shown to be order sharp. An important feature of our results is that our assumptions are rather weak and do not apriori require any local estimates like in [1]. Instead of this we prove that similar estimates are guaranteed by our assumptions. One more advantage of our study is that we can deal with a nonlinear Robin condition.

In conclusion we mention that a similar problem was studied in a very recent paper [2] but in the situation, when the solution to the perturbed problem vanishes in the limit. Operator estimates in such case were obtained and the convergence rates were shown to be order sharp.

2 Problem and main results

Let $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ be Cartesian coordinates in \mathbb{R}^n and Ω be an arbitrary domain in \mathbb{R}^n ; if its boundary is non-empty, we suppose that the smoothness of this boundary is C^2 . The domain Ω can be both bounded or unbounded. In this domain, we choose a family of points M_k^ε , $k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon$, where ε is a small positive parameter and \mathbb{M}^ε is some at most countable set of indices. We also choose a family of bounded non-empty domains $\omega_{k,\varepsilon} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon$, with C^3 -boundaries and we define

$$\omega_k^\varepsilon := \{x : (x - M_k^\varepsilon)\varepsilon^{-1}\eta^{-1}(\varepsilon) \in \omega_{k,\varepsilon}\}, \quad k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon, \quad \theta^\varepsilon := \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon} \omega_k^\varepsilon,$$

where $\eta = \eta(\varepsilon)$ is some function obeying $0 \leq \eta(\varepsilon) \leq 1$. By means of the domains ω_k^ε we introduce a perforation of the domain Ω as $\Omega^\varepsilon := \Omega \setminus \theta^\varepsilon$.

Let $B_r(M)$ be a ball in \mathbb{R}^n of a radius r centered at a point M . In the vicinity of the boundaries $\partial\omega_{k,\varepsilon}$ we define a local variable τ denoting the distance measured along the normal vector to $\partial\omega_{k,\varepsilon}$

directed outside $\omega_{k,\varepsilon}$. The main geometric assumption on the cavities ω_k^ε is as follows.

A1. The points M_k^ε and the domains $\omega_{k,\varepsilon}$ obey the conditions

$$B_{R_1}(y_{k,\varepsilon}) \subseteq \omega_{k,\varepsilon} \subseteq B_{R_2}(0), \quad B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \cap B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_j^\varepsilon) = \emptyset, \quad k \neq j, \quad k, j \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon, \quad (2.1)$$

$$\text{dist}(M_k^\varepsilon, M_j^\varepsilon) \geq R_4\varepsilon, \quad \text{dist}(M_k^\varepsilon, \partial\Omega) \geq R_4\varepsilon, \quad k \neq j, \quad k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon, \quad (2.2)$$

where $y_{k,\varepsilon}$ are some points, and $R_1 < R_2$, $R_3 < R_4$ are some fixed constants independent of ε , η , k and j . The sets $B_{R_2}(0) \setminus \omega_{k,\varepsilon}$ are connected. For each $k \in \mathbb{M}_R^\varepsilon$ there exist a local variable s on $\partial\omega_{k,\varepsilon}$ such that the variables (τ, s) are well-defined at least on $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \omega_{k,\varepsilon} : \text{dist}(x, \partial\omega_{k,\varepsilon}) \leq \tau_0\} \subseteq B_{R_2}(0)$, where τ_0 is a fixed constant independent of $k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon$ and ε , and the Jacobians corresponding to passing from variables x to (τ, s) are separated from zero and bounded from above uniformly in ε , $k \in \mathbb{M}_R^\varepsilon$ and x as $0 \leq \tau \leq \tau_0$.

In the perforated domain Ω^ε we consider a boundary value problem for an elliptic equations with the coefficients $A_{ij} = A_{ij}(x)$, $A_j = A_j(x)$, $A_0 = A_0(x)$ defined in the non-perforated domain Ω , which are supposed to satisfy the conditions

$$A_{ij} \in W_\infty^1(\Omega), \quad A_j, A_0 \in L_\infty(\Omega), \quad (2.3)$$

$$A_{ij} = \overline{A_{ji}}, \quad \sum_{i,j=1}^n A_{ij}(x) \xi_i \overline{\xi_j} \geq c_0 \sum_{j=1}^n |\xi_j|^2, \quad x \in \Omega, \quad \xi_i \in \mathbb{C}, \quad (2.4)$$

where $c_0 > 0$ is some fixed constant independent of ε , ξ and x . The functions A_{ij} are real-valued, while A_j and A_0 are complex-valued.

The boundaries of the cavities ω_k^ε are subject to either the Dirichlet condition or a nonlinear Robin condition. In order to introduce them, we first arbitrary partition the set θ^ε :

$$\theta_D^\varepsilon := \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{M}_D^\varepsilon} \omega_k^\varepsilon, \quad \theta_R^\varepsilon := \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{M}_R^\varepsilon} \omega_k^\varepsilon, \quad \mathbb{M}_D^\varepsilon \cup \mathbb{M}_R^\varepsilon = \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon, \quad \mathbb{M}_D^\varepsilon \cap \mathbb{M}_R^\varepsilon = \emptyset.$$

Then for $x \in \partial\theta_R^\varepsilon$ and $u \in \mathbb{C}$ we define a measurable complex-valued function $a^\varepsilon = a^\varepsilon(x, u)$, for which we postulate the following conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Re}(a^\varepsilon(x, u_1) - a^\varepsilon(x, u_2)) \overline{(u_1 - u_2)} &\geq -\vartheta(\varepsilon) |u_1 - u_2|^2, \\ |a^\varepsilon(x, u_1) - a^\varepsilon(x, u_2)| &\leq c_1(\varepsilon) |u_1 - u_2|, \quad a(x, 0) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

where $c_1(\varepsilon)$ is some constant independent of $x \in \partial\theta_R^\varepsilon$ and $u_1, u_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\vartheta(\varepsilon)$ is some nonnegative function such that

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon \eta(\varepsilon) \varkappa(\varepsilon) \vartheta(\varepsilon) &\rightarrow +0, \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow +0, \\ \varkappa(\varepsilon) &:= |\ln \eta(\varepsilon)| \quad \text{as } n = 2, \quad \varkappa(\varepsilon) := 1 \quad \text{as } n \geq 3. \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

The main object of our study is the following boundary value problem:

$$(\mathcal{L} - \lambda)u = f \quad \text{in } \Omega^\varepsilon, \quad u = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \cup \partial\theta_D^\varepsilon, \quad \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} + a^\varepsilon(x, u) = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\theta_R^\varepsilon. \quad (2.7)$$

Here \mathcal{L} and $\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}$ are a differential expression and a conormal derivative:

$$\mathcal{L} := -\text{div} A \nabla + \sum_{j=1}^n A_j \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} + A_0, \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} = \nu \cdot A \nabla, \quad (2.8)$$

$$A(x) := \begin{pmatrix} A_{11}(x) & \dots & A_{1n}(x) \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ A_{n1}(x) & \dots & A_{nn}(x) \end{pmatrix},$$

$f \in L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)$ is an arbitrary function, $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ is a fixed constant, ν is the unit normal to $\partial\theta_R^\varepsilon$ directed inside θ_R^ε .

Our main aim is analyze the behavior of a solution to problem (2.7) as $\varepsilon \rightarrow +0$. A solution is understood in the generalized sense and is defined as follows. For a domain $Q \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and a manifold $S \subset \overline{Q}$ of codimension one, by $\dot{W}_2^1(Q, S)$ we denote the subspace of the Sobolev space $W_2^1(Q)$ formed by the functions with the zero trace on a manifold S . A generalized solution to problem (2.7) is a function $u \in \dot{W}_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon, \partial\Omega \cup \partial\theta_D^\varepsilon)$ satisfying the integral identity

$$\mathfrak{h}_a(u_\varepsilon, v) - \lambda(u_\varepsilon, v)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} = (f, v)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \quad (2.9)$$

for each $v \in \dot{W}_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon, \partial\Omega \cup \partial\theta_D^\varepsilon)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{h}_a(u, v) &:= \mathfrak{h}_0(u, v) + (a(\cdot, u), v)_{L_2(\partial\theta_R^\varepsilon)}, \\ \mathfrak{h}_0(u, v) &:= (A\nabla u, \nabla v)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} + \sum_{j=1}^n \left(A_j \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_j}, v \right)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} + (A_0 u, v)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}. \end{aligned}$$

The first question we address is how a homogenized problem for (2.7), (2.8) looks like. This issue is known to be very dependent on the geometry of perforation and we address one of the typical case, when a so-called strange term appears. We show that such situation occurs under the following additional conditions.

A2. The set \mathbb{M}_R^ε is partitioned into two disjoint subsets $\mathbb{M}_{R,1}^\varepsilon$ and $\mathbb{M}_{R,2}^\varepsilon$ obeying the following conditions:

$$\operatorname{Re} a^\varepsilon(x, u)\bar{u} \geq \mu_1(\varepsilon)|u|^2, \quad x \in \partial\omega_k^\varepsilon, \quad u \in \mathbb{C}, \quad k \in \mathbb{M}_{R,1}^\varepsilon,$$

where $\mu_1 = \mu_1(\varepsilon)$ is a fixed function independent of $k \in \mathbb{M}_{R,1}^\varepsilon$ such that

$$\varepsilon\eta(\varepsilon)\varkappa(\varepsilon)\mu_1(\varepsilon) \rightarrow +\infty, \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow +0,$$

and

$$a^\varepsilon(x, u) = \varepsilon^{-1}\eta^{-1}(\varepsilon)b_k((x - M_k^\varepsilon)\varepsilon^{-1}\eta^{-1}, \varepsilon)u + \tilde{a}^\varepsilon(x, u), \quad x \in \partial\omega_k^\varepsilon, \quad u \in \mathbb{C}, \quad k \in \mathbb{M}_{R,2}^\varepsilon, \quad (2.10)$$

where $b_k(\xi, \varepsilon)$, $\xi \in \partial\omega_k^\varepsilon$, and $\tilde{a}^\varepsilon(x, u)$ are some complex-valued measurable functions such that

$$\begin{aligned} b_k(\xi, \varepsilon) &\in \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty), \quad |b_k(\varepsilon)| \leq c_2, \quad \xi \in \partial\omega_{k,\varepsilon}, \\ |\tilde{a}^\varepsilon(x, u)| &\leq \mu_2(\varepsilon)|u|, \quad x \in \partial\omega_k^\varepsilon, \quad u \in \mathbb{C}, \quad \varepsilon\eta(\varepsilon)\varkappa(\varepsilon)\mu_2(\varepsilon) \rightarrow +0, \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow +0, \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

c_2 is a constant independent of ε , $\xi \in \partial\omega_{k,\varepsilon}$, $x \in \partial\omega_k^\varepsilon$ and $k \in \mathbb{M}_{R,2}^\varepsilon$.

In order to formulate one more condition, we need to introduce some additional notations. We denote $\dot{W}_1^2(\Omega) := \dot{W}_1^2(\Omega, \partial\Omega)$ and let $\dot{W}_2^{-1}(\Omega, \partial\Omega)$ be the dual space for $\dot{W}_2^1(\Omega)$, that is, the space of linear bounded functionals on $\dot{W}_2^1(\Omega, \partial\Omega)$. By \mathfrak{M} we denote the space of the multipliers from $\dot{W}_2^1(\Omega) \cap W_2^2(\Omega)$ into $\dot{W}_2^{-1}(\Omega)$, that is, it is formed by the functions β defined on Ω such that the multiplication by β is a bounded operator from $\dot{W}_2^1(\Omega) \cap W_2^2(\Omega)$ into $\dot{W}_2^{-1}(\Omega)$. By $\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{M}}$ we denote the norm in this space which can be defined as

$$\|\beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}} = \sup_{u \in \dot{W}_2^1(\Omega) \cap W_2^2(\Omega)} \frac{\|\beta u\|_{\dot{W}_2^{-1}(\Omega, \partial\Omega)}}{\|u\|_{W_2^2(\Omega)}} = \sup_{\substack{u \in \dot{W}_2^1(\Omega) \cap W_2^2(\Omega) \\ v \in \dot{W}_2^1(\Omega)}} \frac{|\langle \beta u, v \rangle|}{\|u\|_{W_2^2(\Omega)} \|v\|_{W_2^1(\Omega)}}, \quad (2.12)$$

where $\langle F, v \rangle$ denotes the action of a functional $F \in \dot{W}_2^{-1}(\Omega)$ on a function $v \in \dot{W}_2^1(\Omega)$.

A homogenized problem for (2.7) is expressed in terms of certain capacities of the domains $\omega_{k,\varepsilon}$ and we define them via special auxiliary functions. Namely, we first observe that in view of ellipticity condition (2.4), the matrix A is Hermitian and positive definite uniformly in $x \in \overline{\Omega}$. This is why the matrix $A^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ is well-defined, Hermitian and positive definite uniformly in $x \in \overline{\Omega}$. We also observe that condition (2.3) ensures that both matrices A and $A^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ are bounded uniformly in $x \in \overline{\Omega}$. By $X_{k,\varepsilon} = X_{k,\varepsilon}(\xi)$, $\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we denote unique classical solutions to the following boundary value problems:

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{div}_\xi A(M_k^\varepsilon) \nabla_\xi X_{k,\varepsilon} &= 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{\omega_{k,\varepsilon}}, \quad k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon, \\ X_{k,\varepsilon} &= 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\omega_{k,\varepsilon}, \quad k \in \mathbb{M}_D^\varepsilon \cup \mathbb{M}_{R,1}^\varepsilon, \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

$$\nu_\xi \cdot A(M_k^\varepsilon) \nabla_\xi X_{k,\varepsilon} + b_k(\xi, \varepsilon) X_{k,\varepsilon} = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\omega_{k,\varepsilon}, \quad k \in \mathbb{M}_{R,2}^\varepsilon, \quad (2.14)$$

$$X_{k,\varepsilon}(\xi) = \begin{cases} 1 + K_{k,\varepsilon} |A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon) \xi|^{-n+2} + O(|\xi|^{-n+1}), & \xi \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{as } n \geq 3, \\ \ln |A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon) \xi| + K_{k,\varepsilon} + O(|\xi|^{-1}), & \xi \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{as } n = 2, \end{cases} \quad (2.15)$$

where $K_{k,\varepsilon}$ are some constants and ν_ξ is the unit normal to $\partial\omega_{k,\varepsilon}$ directed inside $\omega_{k,\varepsilon}$. By the standard Schauder estimates, the functions $X_{k,\varepsilon}$ belong to $C^2(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \omega_{k,\varepsilon}) \cap C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{\omega_{k,\varepsilon}})$. We also make the following assumption on the functions $X_{k,\varepsilon}$ for $k \in \mathbb{M}_R^\varepsilon$.

A3. The estimates hold

$$\left| \frac{\partial X_{k,\varepsilon}}{\partial \nu}(\xi) \right| \leq c_3 \quad \text{on } \partial\omega_{k,\varepsilon}, \quad k \in \mathbb{M}_{R,1}^\varepsilon, \quad |X_{k,\varepsilon}| \leq c_3 \quad \text{on } \partial\omega_{k,\varepsilon}, \quad k \in \mathbb{M}_{R,2}^\varepsilon, \quad (2.16)$$

where c_3 is a constant independent of k and ε and ν in the unit normal to $\partial\omega_{k,\varepsilon}$ directed inside $\omega_{k,\varepsilon}^\varepsilon$.

We define:

$$\Upsilon(x) := \sqrt{\det A(x)} \int_{\partial B_1(0)} |A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x)y| dy, \quad x \in \overline{\Omega}.$$

In view of conditions (2.3), (2.4), the function Υ is an element of the space $W_\infty^1(\Omega)$. We introduce one more function:

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_\varepsilon(x) &:= \frac{(2-n)K_{k,\varepsilon}}{R_3^n \operatorname{mes} B_1(0)} \quad \text{on } B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon), \quad k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon, \quad \text{as } n \geq 3, \\ \beta_\varepsilon(x) &:= \frac{1}{R_3^2 \operatorname{mes} B_1(0)} \quad \text{on } B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon), \quad k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon, \quad \text{as } n = 2, \\ \beta_\varepsilon(x) &:= 0 \quad \text{on } \Omega \setminus \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon} B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon), \end{aligned} \quad (2.17)$$

This function is supposed to obey the following assumption.

A4. The family of the functions β^ε converges in \mathfrak{M} , that is, there exists a function $\beta \in \mathfrak{M}$ such that $\|\beta^\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}} \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow +0$.

Finally, we assume that

$$\varepsilon^{-2} \eta^{n-2}(\varepsilon) \varkappa^{-1}(\varepsilon) \rightarrow \gamma, \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow +0, \quad (2.18)$$

where γ is a non-negative constant.

It turns out that under the above assumptions, the homogenized problem for (2.7) is

$$(\mathcal{L} + \gamma \Upsilon \beta - \lambda)u_0 = f \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad u_0 = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \quad (2.19)$$

We define:

$$\Xi_\varepsilon(x) := \begin{cases} \frac{X_{k,\varepsilon}(|A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon)(x - M_k^\varepsilon)|\varepsilon^{-1}\eta^{-1})}{X_{k,\varepsilon}(R_5\eta^{-1})} & \text{in } E_k \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon, \quad k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon, \\ 1 & \text{in } \Omega \setminus \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon} E_k, \end{cases} \quad (2.20)$$

where

$$E_k := \{x : |A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon)(x - M_k^\varepsilon)| < R_5\varepsilon\} \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon,$$

and R_5 is a fixed constant independent of ε and k such that

$$\omega_k^\varepsilon \subset B_{\varepsilon\eta R_2}(M_k^\varepsilon) \subset E_k \subset B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon).$$

In view of Assumption A1 and conditions (2.3), (2.4), such constant R_5 obviously exists.

We denote:

$$\begin{aligned} \varrho(\varepsilon) &:= \eta^{\frac{n}{2}}(\varepsilon), \quad n \geq 5, & \varrho(\varepsilon) &:= \eta^2(\varepsilon) |\ln \eta(\varepsilon)|^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad n = 4, \\ \varrho(\varepsilon) &:= \eta(\varepsilon), \quad n = 3, & \varrho(\varepsilon) &:= \eta(\varepsilon) |\ln \eta(\varepsilon)|^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad n = 2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.21)$$

Now we are in position to formulate our main result.

Theorem 2.1. *Let Assumption A1 and (2.18) be satisfied. In the case $\mathbb{M}_R^\varepsilon \neq \emptyset$ suppose also that Assumptions A2, A3 hold true and if $\gamma \neq 0$, let Assumption A4 holds as well. Then there exists a fixed $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ independent of ε such that as $\text{Re } \lambda \leq \lambda_0$, problems (2.7), (2.19) are uniquely solvable for each $f \in L_2(\Omega)$ and the solutions satisfy the estimates:*

$$\|u_\varepsilon - u_0 \Xi_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \leq C \left(\varepsilon + |\eta^{n-2}\varepsilon^{-2}\varkappa^{-1} - \gamma| + \gamma \|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}} + (\varepsilon\eta\varkappa\mu_1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \varepsilon\eta\varkappa\mu_2 \right) \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)}, \quad (2.22)$$

$$\|u_\varepsilon - u_0\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \leq C \left(\varepsilon + |\eta^{n-2}\varepsilon^{-2}\varkappa^{-1} - \gamma| + \gamma \|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}} + (\varepsilon\eta\varkappa\mu_1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \varepsilon\eta\varkappa\mu_2 \right) \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)}, \quad (2.23)$$

where C is some constant independent of ε and f . If the set \mathbb{M}_R^ε is empty, then the terms $(\varepsilon\eta\mu_1)^{-1}$ and $\varepsilon\eta\mu_2$ can be omitted in the above estimates.

Let condition (2.18) hold with $\gamma = 0$ and Assumption A1 be satisfied. Then for the solution u_ε of problem (2.23) and solution u_0 of problem (2.19) with $\beta = 0$ the estimate holds:

$$\|u_\varepsilon - u_0\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \leq C \left(\varepsilon^{-1}\eta^{\frac{n}{2}-1}(\varepsilon)\varkappa^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\varepsilon) + \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}\eta^{\frac{1}{2}}(\varepsilon) + \varepsilon + \varrho^{\frac{1}{2}}(\varepsilon) \right) \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)}, \quad (2.24)$$

and if, in addition, $A_j \in W_\infty^1(\Omega)$, then

$$\|u_\varepsilon - u_0\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \leq C \left(\varepsilon^{-2}\eta^{n-2}(\varepsilon)\varkappa^{-1}(\varepsilon) + \varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon\eta(\varepsilon) + \varrho(\varepsilon) \right) \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)}, \quad (2.25)$$

where C are some constants independent of ε and f . The terms ε , $|\eta^{n-2}\varepsilon^{-2}\varkappa^{-1} - \gamma|$, $\|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}}$ and $\varepsilon\eta\varkappa\mu_2$ in estimate (2.22) are order sharp. The term $\eta^{\frac{n}{2}-1}\varepsilon^{-1}\varkappa^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ in (2.24) is order sharp. The terms $|\eta^{n-2}\varepsilon^{-2}\varkappa^{-1} - \gamma|$ and $\|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}}$ in (2.23) are order sharp.

Let us discuss briefly the problem and main result. There are several main features of our problem. The first is that we consider a general perforation of a rather arbitrary non-periodic structure. The main conditions are imposed by Assumption A1, which is very natural. It says that all cavities are of approximately the same sizes and there is a minimal distance of order $O(\varepsilon)$ between the cavities. We stress that at the same time there are no upper bound for the distances between the cavities and in particular, these distances can be uniformly bounded from below or even growing as ε goes to zero. In particular, this means that our results also applies to the case of finitely many small cavities separated by fixed distances.

In addition, Assumption A1 postulates natural regularity properties of the cavities as well as the connectedness of the sets $B_{R_2(0)} \setminus \omega_{k,\varepsilon}$. The latter condition ensures that the perforated domain Ω^ε is also connected, which is very natural. We also mention condition (2.18), which describes the linear sizes of the cavities.

The second feature is that the boundaries of the cavities can be subject either to the Dirichlet condition or to the nonlinear Robin condition; both types of these conditions can be simultaneously present on the boundaries of the cavities. The structure of Robin condition is described by Assumption A2 and we in fact deal with two main cases. In the first case, as $k \in \mathbb{M}_{R,1}^\varepsilon$, the nonlinear term a^ε is in certain sense positive definite and large; as ε goes to zero, this condition behaves as the Dirichlet condition. In the second case identity (2.10) means that now the Robin condition is almost linear with the coefficients $\varepsilon^{-1}\eta^{-1}b_k$. The presence of the nonlinear Robin condition requires one more Assumption A3, which is an implicit condition for the shapes of the cavities stating certain uniformity in $k \in \mathbb{M}_R^\varepsilon$.

The third feature of our model is that we consider a general second linear elliptic equation and the differential expression \mathcal{L} is not supposed to be formally symmetric. The coefficients A_j and A_0 are allowed to be complex-valued.

An important condition is introduced by Assumption A4. In view of definition (2.17) of the function β_ε , this assumption controls the distribution of the cavities and also their shapes as $n \geq 2$. As $n = 2$, the function β_ε depends only on the distribution. Assumption A4 says that the function β_ε should possess a limit in the space of multipliers \mathfrak{M} . In this way we select the non-periodic perforations, for which the homogenization of problem (2.7) is possible. The next natural questions are about important examples, when Assumption A4 is satisfied, and how to generate new perforations from the given ones keeping this assumption. These questions are discussed below in a separate Section 4.

Our main theorem states that under the above discussed conditions, the homogenized problem is (2.19) and the convergence in $W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)$ - and $L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)$ holds uniformly in $L_2(\Omega)$ -norm of the right hand side f ; the estimates for the convergence rates are our main results. In the case when the Robin condition is present and is linear, these are operator estimates describing the norm resolvent convergence of the perturbed operator to the homogenized one.

Estimate (2.22) says that the solution u_ε to problem (2.7) can be approximated by $u_0 \Xi_\varepsilon$ in $W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)$ and the estimate for the convergence rate is provided. The function Ξ_ε here plays a role of a corrector. It can be omitted and then we have a similar result but only in $L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)$ with the same convergence rate. The terms involving μ_1 and μ_2 are generated only due to the presence of the nonlinear Robin condition. If the set \mathbb{M}_R^ε is empty, they can be removed from the estimates.

It is also shown that all terms except for $(\varepsilon\eta\kappa\mu_1)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ are order sharp in (2.22). In particular, this implies that the term $\|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}}$ can not be omitted and hence, the same concerns Assumption A4. We also believe that the term $(\varepsilon\eta\kappa\mu_1)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ is also order sharp but we failed to provide an appropriate example. In estimate (2.23), two terms in the convergence rate are also order sharp. It is unclear to us whether other terms in (2.23) are also order sharp or the estimate could be improved by using some additional techniques. This question remained open.

As $\gamma = 0$, it is possible to omit Assumptions A2, A3, A4 and to prove similar results only under Assumption A1, see estimates (2.24), (2.25). We stress that in (2.24) the corrector is absent in com-

parison with (2.22) but the price we pay for this and for omitting additional assumptions is a worse convergence rate. However, estimating then in $L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)$ -norm, the order of the convergence rate can be improved twice, see (2.25). The term $\varepsilon^{-1}\eta^{\frac{n}{2}-1}\varkappa^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ is shown to be order sharp in (2.24). The sharpness of the other terms in (2.24) and of all terms in (2.25) remains an open question.

We observe that the sharpness of the term $\varepsilon^{-1}\eta^{\frac{n}{2}-1}\varkappa^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ does not contradict the sharpness of a similar term in (2.22) since in (2.24) we have omitted the corrector. We also stress that if $\gamma \neq 0$, then by omitting the corrector in (2.22) we destroy the convergence in $W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)$, namely, it turns out that $\|u_\varepsilon - u_0\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)}$ is just of order $O(1)$ once $\gamma \neq 0$.

3 Auxiliary lemmata

In this section we provide of series of auxiliary lemmata, which will be employed then in the proof of Theorem 2.1. Two of them were proved in [3], [4] for $n \geq 3$, while in the case $n = 2$ the proofs can be reproduced literally.

Our first lemma is Lemma 3.3 in [3].

Lemma 3.1. *Under Assumption A1 for all $k \in \mathbb{M}_R^\varepsilon$ and all $u \in W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)$ the estimate*

$$\|u\|_{L_2(\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \leq C \left(\varepsilon \eta \varkappa \|\nabla u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 + \varepsilon^{-1} \eta^{n-1} \|u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus B_{\varepsilon R_2}(M_k^\varepsilon))}^2 \right)$$

holds, where C is a constant independent of the parameters k , ε , η and the function u .

We note that under the second convergence in (2.18) the estimate in the above lemma can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{L_2(\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 &\leq C \varepsilon \eta \varkappa \left(\|\nabla u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 + \varepsilon^{-2} \eta^{n-2} \varkappa^{-1} \|u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus B_{\varepsilon R_2}(M_k^\varepsilon))}^2 \right) \\ &\leq C \varepsilon \eta \varkappa \|u\|_{W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

The second lemma is inequality (74) established in the proof of Lemma 11 in [4].

Lemma 3.2. *Under Assumption A1 for all $k \in \mathbb{M}_R^\varepsilon$ and all $u \in W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)$ obeying the identity*

$$\int_{B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon} u(x) dx = 0 \quad (3.2)$$

the estimate

$$\|u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \leq C \varepsilon^2 \|\nabla u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2, \quad (3.3)$$

holds, where C is a constant independent of the parameters k , ε , η and the function u .

The third lemma provides one more auxiliary estimate.

Lemma 3.3. *Under Assumption A1 for all $k \in \mathbb{M}_R^\varepsilon$ and all $u \in W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)$ the estimate*

$$\|u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon \eta R}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \leq C \left(\varepsilon^2 \eta^2 \varkappa \|\nabla u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 + \eta^n \|u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \right)$$

holds for each fixed R and sufficiently small ε with a constant C independent of k , ε and u .

Proof. Let R and η be such that $B_{\varepsilon\eta R}(M_k^\varepsilon) \subset B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)$. For each $u \in W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)$ we integrate by parts as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} n\|u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon\eta R}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_{\varepsilon\eta R}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon} |u|^2 \Delta |x|^2 dx \\ &= \varepsilon\eta R \int_{\partial B_{\varepsilon\eta R}(M_k^\varepsilon)} |u|^2 ds + \int_{\partial \omega_k^\varepsilon} |u|^2 x \cdot \nu ds - \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_{\varepsilon\eta R}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon} x \cdot \nabla |u|^2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

We estimate the integral over $B_{\varepsilon\eta R}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon$ in this inequality as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \left| \int_{B_{\varepsilon\eta R}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon} x \cdot \nabla |u|^2 dx \right| &\leq \varepsilon\eta R \int_{B_{\varepsilon\eta R}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon} |u| |\nabla u| dx \\ &\leq \|u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon\eta R}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 + \frac{\varepsilon^2 \eta^2 R^2}{4} \|\nabla u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon\eta R}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

The integrals over $\partial B_{\varepsilon\eta R}(M_k^\varepsilon)$ and $\partial \omega_k^\varepsilon$ are estimated by means of (3.1) and this finally completes the proof. \square

The second convergence in (2.18) allows us to rewrite the estimate in the above lemma as

$$\|u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon\eta R}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \leq C \varepsilon^2 \eta^2 \varkappa \|\nabla u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2. \quad (3.4)$$

Lemma 3.4. *For all $v \in W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon\eta R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)$, $k \in \mathbb{M}_R^\varepsilon$, the estimate*

$$\|v\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon\eta R_2}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \leq C \left(\varepsilon\eta \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\partial \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 + \varepsilon^2 \eta^2 \|\nabla v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \right), \quad (3.5)$$

holds, where C is a constant independent of ε , k and v . If, in addition,

$$\int_{B_{\varepsilon\eta R_2}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon} v dx = 0, \quad (3.6)$$

then the estimate

$$\|v\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon\eta R_2}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \leq C \varepsilon^2 \eta^2 \|\nabla v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \quad (3.7)$$

holds, where C is a constant independent of ε , k and v .

Proof. Estimate (3.7) follows Lemma 3.2 once we replace ε and η by $\varepsilon\eta$ and 1 in this lemma. The rest of the proof is devoted to establishing (3.5).

Given arbitrary $k \in \mathbb{M}_R^\varepsilon$ and $v \in W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon\eta R_2}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)$, we denote

$$\langle v \rangle_k := \frac{1}{|B_{\varepsilon\eta R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon|} \int_{B_{\varepsilon\eta R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon} v dx, \quad v_k := v - \langle v \rangle_k. \quad (3.8)$$

The function v_k satisfies condition (3.6) and by (3.7) we have

$$\|v_k\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon\eta R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_{k,\varepsilon})}^2 \leq C \varepsilon^2 \eta^2 \|\nabla v\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon\eta R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_{k,\varepsilon})}^2; \quad (3.9)$$

hereinafter in the proof by C we denote inessential constants independent of ε , η , k and v .

Let $\chi_1 = \chi_1(t)$ be an infinitely differentiable cut-off function vanishing as $t > R_3$ and equalling to one as $t < R_2$. Then the function $\tilde{v}^\perp(x) := v_k(x)\chi_1(|x - M_k^\varepsilon|\varepsilon^{-1}\eta^{-1})$ is an element of $W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon\eta R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_{k,\varepsilon})$ and vanishes on $\partial B_{\varepsilon\eta R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)$. Then by Lemma 3.1 in [3] the function $\tilde{u}^\perp(\xi\varepsilon\eta + M_k^\varepsilon)$ satisfies the estimate

$$\|\tilde{v}^\perp(\cdot\varepsilon\eta + M_k^\varepsilon)\|_{L_2(\partial\omega_{k,\varepsilon})} \leq C\|\nabla_\xi\tilde{v}^\perp(\cdot\varepsilon\eta + M_k^\varepsilon)\|_{L_2(B_{R_3}\setminus\omega_{k,\varepsilon})}.$$

Returning back to the variables x in the above inequality and using estimate (3.9), we find:

$$\|v_k\|_{L_2(\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon)} \leq C\varepsilon\eta\|\nabla v\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon\eta R_3}\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)}. \quad (3.10)$$

Employing the first condition in (2.1), we argue as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon} |v|^2 ds &= |\langle v \rangle_k|^2 \text{mes } \partial\omega_k^\varepsilon + 2 \text{Re } \overline{\langle v \rangle_k} \int_{\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon} v_k ds + \int_{\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon} |v_k|^2 ds \\ &\geq (R_1\varepsilon\eta)^{n-1} |\langle v \rangle_k|^2 \text{mes } \partial B_1(0) - 2|\langle v \rangle_k| \int_{\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon} |v_k| ds \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}(R_1\varepsilon\eta)^{n-1} |\langle v \rangle_k|^2 \text{mes } \partial B_1(0) - C(\varepsilon\eta)^{-n+1} \left(\int_{\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon} |v_k| ds \right)^2 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}(R_1\varepsilon\eta)^{n-1} |\langle v \rangle_k|^2 \text{mes } \partial B_1(0) - C\|v_k\|_{L_2(\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by (3.10),

$$(\varepsilon\eta)^n |\langle v \rangle_k|^2 \leq C \left(\varepsilon\eta \|v\|_{L_2(\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 ds + \varepsilon^2 \eta^2 \|\nabla v\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon\eta R_3}\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \right).$$

Using this estimate and (3.10), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \|v\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon\eta R_2}(M_k^\varepsilon)\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 &\leq 2|\langle v \rangle_k|^2 \text{mes}(B_{\varepsilon\eta R_2}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon) + 2\|v_k\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon\eta R_3}\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \\ &\leq C \left(\varepsilon\eta \|v\|_{L_2(\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 ds + \varepsilon^2 \eta^2 \|\nabla v\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon\eta R_3}\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

This proves (3.5). □

We also need certain properties of the functions $X_{k,\varepsilon}$, which are collected in the following lemma.

Lemma 3.5. *Under Assumption A1 and the second inequality in (2.16), the functions $X_{k,\varepsilon}$ and the constants $K_{k,\varepsilon}$ satisfy the following uniform estimates:*

$$|K_{k,\varepsilon}| \leq C, \quad (3.11)$$

$$|X_{k,\varepsilon}(\xi)| \leq C \quad \text{as } n \geq 3, \quad |X_{k,\varepsilon}(\xi) + \ln |A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon)\xi|| \leq C, \quad \text{as } n = 2, \quad (3.12)$$

$$|X_{k,\varepsilon} - 1 - K_{k,\varepsilon}|A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon)\xi|^{-n+2}| \leq C|\xi|^{-n+1}, \quad |\xi| \geq c, \quad \text{as } n \geq 3, \quad (3.13)$$

$$|X_{k,\varepsilon} - \ln |A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon)\xi| - K_{k,\varepsilon}| \leq C|\xi|^{-1}, \quad |\xi| \geq c, \quad \text{as } n = 2, \quad (3.14)$$

$$\left| \frac{\partial X_{k,\varepsilon}}{\partial \xi_i} - K_{k,\varepsilon} \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi_i} |A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon)\xi|^{-n+2} \right| \leq C|\xi|^{-n}, \quad |\xi| \geq c, \quad \text{as } n \geq 3, \quad (3.15)$$

$$\left| \frac{\partial X_{k,\varepsilon}}{\partial \xi_i} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi_i} \ln |A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon)\xi| \right| \leq C|\xi|^{-2}, \quad |\xi| \geq c, \quad \text{as } n \geq 3, \quad (3.16)$$

where C, c are some inessential constants independent of k, ε, ξ .

Proof. We first pass to a new variable

$$\tilde{\xi} := \frac{A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon)(\xi - y_{k,\varepsilon})}{|A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon)(\xi - y_{k,\varepsilon})|^2},$$

where $y_{k,\varepsilon}$ are the points introduced in Assumption A1. By $\tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}$ we denote the images of the domains $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \omega_{k,\varepsilon}$ arising while passing to the variable $\tilde{\xi}$. It is clear that the domains $\tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}$ are bounded, namely, $\tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon} \subset B_{R_1^{-1}}(0)$, and the boundaries of these domains are smooth. It is also easy to see that the origin belongs to $\tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}$ and moreover, $B_{(2R_2)^{-1}}(0) \subset \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}$. These properties mean that the function

$$\tilde{\phi}_{k,\varepsilon}(\tilde{\xi}) := (X_{k,\varepsilon}(\tilde{\xi}) - 1)|\tilde{\xi}|^{n-2} \quad \text{as } n \geq 3, \quad \tilde{\phi}_{k,\varepsilon}(\tilde{\xi}) := X_{k,\varepsilon}(\tilde{\xi}) - \ln|\tilde{\xi}| \quad \text{as } n = 2,$$

is well-defined and infinitely differentiable on $\partial\tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}$. Since $\tilde{\phi}_{k,\varepsilon} = 0$ on $\partial\tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}$ for $k \in \mathbb{M}_D^\varepsilon \cup \mathbb{M}_{R,1}^\varepsilon$ and $X_{k,\varepsilon}(\tilde{\xi})$ is bounded uniformly in $\tilde{\xi}$, ε and $k \in \mathbb{M}_{R,2}^\varepsilon$ due to the second inequality in (2.16), we hence have

$$|\tilde{\phi}_{k,\varepsilon}(\tilde{\xi})| \leq C \quad \text{on } \partial\tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}; \quad (3.17)$$

here and below in the proof by C we denote various inessential constants independent of k , ε and the spatial variables.

We consider the problem

$$\Delta_{\tilde{\xi}} \tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon} = 0 \quad \text{in } \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}, \quad \tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon} = \tilde{\phi}_{k,\varepsilon} \quad \text{on } \partial\tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}.$$

This problem is uniquely solvable and possesses a classical solution belonging to $C^2(\overline{\tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}}) \cap C^\infty(\tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon})$. The classical maximum principle and estimate (3.17) imply

$$|\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}(\tilde{\xi})| \leq C, \quad \tilde{\xi} \in \overline{\tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}}. \quad (3.18)$$

The well-known estimates for the derivatives of the harmonic function, see, for instance, [14, Ch. IV, Sect. 3.2, Lm. 3], then yield

$$\left| \frac{\partial \tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}}{\partial \tilde{\xi}_i}(\tilde{\xi}) \right| \leq C, \quad \left| \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}}{\partial \tilde{\xi}_i \partial \tilde{\xi}_j}(\tilde{\xi}) \right| \leq C, \quad \tilde{\xi} \in B_{(3R_2)^{-1}}(0). \quad (3.19)$$

We make the Kelvin transform passing to the function

$$\hat{X}_{k,\varepsilon}(\xi) := \frac{1}{|A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon)(\xi - y_{k,\varepsilon})|^{n-2}} \tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon} \left(\frac{A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon)(\xi - y_{k,\varepsilon})}{|A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon)(\xi - y_{k,\varepsilon})|^2} \right)$$

and we see immediately that

$$X_{k,\varepsilon}(\xi) = \begin{cases} 1 + \hat{X}_{k,\varepsilon}(\xi) & \text{as } n \geq 3, \\ \ln |A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon)(\xi - y_{k,\varepsilon})| + \hat{X}_{k,\varepsilon}(\xi) & \text{as } n = 2. \end{cases}$$

Estimates (3.18), (3.19) then imply (3.11), (3.12), (3.13), (3.14), (3.15), (3.16). The proof is complete. \square

The above lemma implies several properties of the function Ξ_ε . We first observe that estimates (3.11), (3.13), (3.14) imply

$$|X_{k,\varepsilon}(R_5\eta^{-1}) - 1| \leq C\eta^{n-2} \quad \text{as } n \geq 3, \quad |X_{k,\varepsilon}(R_5\eta^{-1}) - \ln \eta| \leq C \quad \text{as } n = 2, \quad (3.20)$$

where C are constants independent of k , ε , and the spatial variables. Hence,

$$|\Xi_\varepsilon(x) - 1| \leq C \quad \text{in} \quad B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon). \quad (3.21)$$

Employing the definition of Ξ_ε and (3.15), (3.16), by straightforward calculations we find:

$$\begin{aligned} A(M_k^\varepsilon) \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu &= \frac{K_{k,\varepsilon}(2-n)}{X_{k,\varepsilon}(R_5 \eta^{-1}) \varepsilon^2 R_5^n} \frac{\eta^{n-2}}{\varepsilon^2 R_5^n} |A^{-1}(M_k^\varepsilon)(x - M_k^\varepsilon)| \quad \text{on} \quad \partial E_k \quad \text{as} \quad n \geq 3, \\ A(M_k^\varepsilon) \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu &= \frac{1}{X_{k,\varepsilon}(R_5 \eta^{-1}) \varepsilon^2 R_5^2} |A^{-1}(M_k^\varepsilon)(x - M_k^\varepsilon)| \quad \text{on} \quad \partial E_k \quad \text{as} \quad n = 2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

Using (3.20) and (2.18), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2-n}{X_{k,\varepsilon}(R_5 \eta^{-1}) \varepsilon^2 R_5^n} \frac{\eta^{n-2}}{\varepsilon^2 R_5^n} &= (2-n + O(\eta^{n-2})) \frac{\eta^{n-2}}{\varepsilon^2 R_5^n} = (2-n) \frac{\eta^{n-2}}{\varepsilon^2 R_5^n} + O(\varepsilon^2) \quad \text{as} \quad n \geq 3, \\ \frac{1}{X_{k,\varepsilon}(R_5 \eta^{-1}) \varepsilon^2 R_5^2} &= -\frac{1}{R_5^2 \varepsilon^2 \ln \eta} + O(\varepsilon^{-2} \ln^{-2} \eta) = -\frac{1}{R_5^2 \varepsilon^2 \ln \eta} + O(\varepsilon^2) \quad \text{as} \quad n = 2, \end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$

where the O -term is uniform in k .

Lemma 3.6. *The estimates hold*

$$\|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \leq C\varepsilon \|u\|_{W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \quad (3.24)$$

for all $u \in W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)$ and

$$\|u \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \leq C(\eta^{\frac{n}{2}-1} \varepsilon^{-1} \varkappa^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} + \varepsilon + \varrho^{\frac{1}{2}}) \|u\|_{W_2^2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}, \quad (3.25)$$

$$\|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \leq C(\varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon \eta + \varrho) \|u\|_{W_2^2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \quad (3.26)$$

for all $u \in W_2^2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)$, where C are some constants independent of the parameters ε , k and the function u .

Proof. We fix $k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon$ and given $u \in W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)$, we denote

$$\langle u \rangle := \frac{1}{\text{mes } B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon} \int_{B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k)} u(x) dx, \quad u^\perp := u - \langle u \rangle. \quad (3.27)$$

Then

$$\|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \leq 2|\langle u \rangle|^2 \|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 + 2\|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)u^\perp\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2. \quad (3.28)$$

Since the function u^\perp obeys condition (3.2), by Lemma 3.2 it satisfies estimate (3.3) and by (3.21), (3.11), (3.12) we immediately get

$$\|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)u^\perp\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \leq C\varepsilon^2 \|u\|_{W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2; \quad (3.29)$$

hereinafter in the proof by C we denote various inessential constants independent of ε , k and u .

Then we can express the norm in the first term in the right hand side of (3.28) as follows:

$$\|\Xi_\varepsilon - 1\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 = \|\Xi_\varepsilon - 1\|_{L_2(E_k)}^2 = \varepsilon^n \eta^n X_{k,\varepsilon}^2 (R_5 \eta^{-1}) \|X_{k,\varepsilon} - X_{k,\varepsilon}(R_5 \eta^{-1})\|_{L_2(B_{C\eta^{-1}}(0) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2$$

and hence, by (3.12), (3.13), (3.20),

$$\|\Xi_\varepsilon - 1\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \leq C\varepsilon^n \varrho^2. \quad (3.30)$$

We also see easily that

$$|\langle u \rangle|^2 \leq C\varepsilon^{-n} \|u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2. \quad (3.31)$$

Employing this estimate and (3.29), (3.30), (2.18), we obtain (3.24). In the same way as above we also prove easily the estimate

$$\|\|\Xi_\varepsilon - 1\|^{\frac{1}{2}} u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)} \leq C\varepsilon \|u\|_{W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)}. \quad (3.32)$$

We proceed to proving (3.25) and (3.26). We begin with simple relations:

$$\|u \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 = \|u \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(E_k \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \leq C(A(M_k^\varepsilon) u \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon, u \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon)_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)}. \quad (3.33)$$

Then we integrate by parts employing the definition of the function Ξ_ε :

$$\begin{aligned} (A(M_k^\varepsilon) u \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon, u \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon)_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)} &= \operatorname{Re} \int_{\partial E_k} |u|^2 A(M_k^\varepsilon) \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu \, ds + \operatorname{Re} \int_{\partial \omega_k^\varepsilon} \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon} |u|^2 A(M_k^\varepsilon) \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu \, ds \\ &\quad - \operatorname{Re} \int_{E_k \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon} \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon} \operatorname{div} A(M_k^\varepsilon) |u|^2 \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon \, dx \\ &= \operatorname{Re} \int_{\partial E_k} |u|^2 A(M_k^\varepsilon) \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu \, ds + \operatorname{Re} \int_{\partial \omega_k^\varepsilon} \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon} |u|^2 A(M_k^\varepsilon) \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu \, ds \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \int_{E_k \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon} A(M_k^\varepsilon) \nabla (|\Xi_\varepsilon|^2 - 1) \cdot \nabla |u|^2 \, dx \\ &= \operatorname{Re} \int_{\partial E_k} |u|^2 A(M_k^\varepsilon) \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu \, ds + \operatorname{Re} \int_{\partial \omega_k^\varepsilon} \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon} |u|^2 A(M_k^\varepsilon) \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu^\varepsilon \, ds \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial \omega_k^\varepsilon} (|\Xi_\varepsilon|^2 - 1) A(M_k^\varepsilon) \nabla |u|^2 \cdot \nu^\varepsilon \, ds \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_{E_k \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon} (|\Xi_\varepsilon|^2 - 1) \operatorname{div} A(M_k^\varepsilon) \nabla |u|^2 \, dx, \end{aligned} \quad (3.34)$$

where ν denotes the unit normal to ∂E_k directed outside E_k and ν^ε is the unit normal to $\partial \omega_k^\varepsilon$ directed insider ω_k^ε . In view of the boundary conditions for $X_{k,\varepsilon}$ in (2.13), (2.14) and the inequality for b_k in (2.11) we also have:

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Re} \int_{\partial \omega_k^\varepsilon} \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon} |u|^2 A(M_k^\varepsilon) \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu^\varepsilon \, ds &= 0, \quad k \in \mathbb{M}_D^\varepsilon \cup \mathbb{M}_{R,1}^\varepsilon, \\ \operatorname{Re} \int_{\partial \omega_k^\varepsilon} \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon} |u|^2 A(M_k^\varepsilon) \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu^\varepsilon \, ds &= -\varepsilon^{-1} \eta^{-1} \operatorname{Re} b_k(\varepsilon) \|u\|_{L_2(\partial \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \leq 0, \quad k \in \mathbb{M}_{R,2}^\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, in view of relations (3.21), (3.22), (3.23), (3.32), (3.33), (3.1), (2.18) and the definition of the function Ξ_ε , by (3.34) we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 &\leq C(\eta^{n-2} \varepsilon^{-1} \varkappa^{-1} \|u\|_{L_2(\partial E_k)}^2 + \|\nabla u\|_{L_2(\partial \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \|u\|_{L_2(\partial \omega_k^\varepsilon)}) \\
&\quad + C\|u\|_{W_2^2(E_k \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)u\|_{L_2(E_k \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} + C\|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla u\|_{L_2(E_k \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \\
&\leq C(\varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon \eta \varkappa) \|u\|_{W_2^2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 + C\eta^{n-2} \varepsilon^{-1} \varkappa^{-1} \|u\|_{L_2(\partial E_k)}^2 \\
&\quad + C\|u\|_{W_2^2(E_k \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)u\|_{L_2(E_k \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.35}$$

This inequality gives an opportunity to improve (3.29) for $u \in W_2^2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)$. Namely, we integrate by parts and estimate then using the above inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)u^\perp\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 &= \frac{1}{n} \int_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} (\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)^2 |u^\perp|^2 \operatorname{div} x \, dx \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \int_{\partial \omega_k^\varepsilon} |u^\perp|^2 x \cdot \nu^\varepsilon \, ds - \frac{2}{n} \int_{B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)} |u^\perp| (\Xi_\varepsilon - 1) x \cdot \nabla |u^\perp| (\Xi_\varepsilon - 1) \, dx \\
&\leq C\varepsilon \eta \|u^\perp\|_{L_2(\partial \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 + C\varepsilon \|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)u^\perp\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)\nabla u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \\
&\quad + C\varepsilon \|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)u^\perp\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \|u^\perp \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \\
&\leq C\varepsilon \eta \|u^\perp\|_{L_2(\partial \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 + \frac{1}{4} \|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)u^\perp\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \\
&\quad + C\varepsilon^2 \left(\|u^\perp \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 + \|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)\nabla u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \right) \\
&\leq C\varepsilon \eta \|u^\perp\|_{L_2(\partial \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)u^\perp\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \\
&\quad + C\varepsilon^2 \|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)\nabla u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 + C(\varepsilon^4 + \varepsilon^3 \eta \varkappa) \|u\|_{W_2^2(E_k \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \\
&\quad + C\eta^{n-2} \varepsilon \varkappa^{-1} \|u^\perp\|_{L_2(\partial E_k)}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, due to (3.1), (3.24) and Lemma 3.2,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)u^\perp\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 &\leq C(\varepsilon^2 \eta^2 \varkappa + \varepsilon^4 + \varepsilon^3 \eta \varkappa) \|u\|_{W_2^2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \\
&\leq C(\varepsilon^4 + \varepsilon^2 \eta^2) \|u\|_{W_2^2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

This estimate and (3.28), (3.30), (3.31) yield (3.26). Substituting then (3.26) into the right hand side of (3.35) and using (3.1), we arrive at (3.25). The proof is complete. \square

The next lemma ensures the unique solvability of problems (2.7), (2.19).

Lemma 3.7. *Under Assumption A1 and also under Assumption A2 if $\mathbb{M}_R^\varepsilon \neq \emptyset$, there exists $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ independent of ε such that for $\operatorname{Re} \lambda < \lambda_0$ problems (2.7), (2.19) are uniquely solvable for each $f \in L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)$ and for their solutions the estimates*

$$\|u_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \leq C(\lambda) \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}, \tag{3.36}$$

$$\|u_0\|_{W_2^2(\Omega)} \leq C(\lambda) \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \tag{3.37}$$

hold, where $C(\lambda)$ are some constants independent of ε and f .

Proof. Assumption A2 guarantees that estimate (2.5) in [2] is satisfied and hence, by Lemma 3.4 in [2], there exists $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ independent of ε such that for $\operatorname{Re} \lambda < \lambda_0$ problem (2.7) is uniquely solvable in $\dot{W}_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon, \partial\Omega \cup \partial\theta_D^\varepsilon)$ for each $f \in L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)$. This is why we just need to check the uniqueness of the solution.

Supposing that there are two solutions u_ε and \tilde{u}_ε for some f , the difference $\hat{u}_\varepsilon := u_\varepsilon - \tilde{u}_\varepsilon$ then solves the boundary value problem

$$(\mathcal{L} - \lambda)\hat{u}_\varepsilon = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega^\varepsilon, \quad \hat{u}_\varepsilon = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \cup \partial\theta_D^\varepsilon, \quad \frac{\partial \hat{u}_\varepsilon}{\partial \nu} + a^\varepsilon(x, u_\varepsilon) - a^\varepsilon(x, \tilde{u}_\varepsilon) = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\theta_R^\varepsilon.$$

Writing the corresponding integral identity with \hat{u}_ε as the test function, we immediately get:

$$\mathfrak{h}_0(\hat{u}_\varepsilon, \hat{u}_\varepsilon) - \lambda \|\hat{u}_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}^2 + (a(\cdot, u_\varepsilon) - a(\cdot, \hat{u}_\varepsilon), \hat{u}_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial\theta_R^\varepsilon)} = 0. \quad (3.38)$$

Thanks to the lower bound in the two-sided inequality in (2.5) and also to Lemma 3.1, the second term in the above identity satisfies the estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Re} (a(\cdot, u_\varepsilon) - a(\cdot, \hat{u}_\varepsilon), \hat{u}_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial\theta_R^\varepsilon)} &\geq -\vartheta(\varepsilon) \|u_1 - u_2\|_{L_2(\partial\theta_R^\varepsilon)}^2 \\ &\geq -C\vartheta \sum_{k \in \mathbb{M}_R^\varepsilon} \left(\varepsilon \eta \varkappa \|\nabla u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \varepsilon^{-1} \eta^{n-1} \|u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus B_{\varepsilon R_2}(M_k^\varepsilon))}^2 \right) \\ &\geq C \left(\vartheta \varepsilon \eta \varkappa \|\nabla u\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}^2 + \vartheta \varepsilon^{-1} \eta^{n-1} \|u\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.39)$$

By (2.6) and (2.18) we have:

$$\vartheta \varepsilon^{-1} \eta^{n-1} = \vartheta \varepsilon \eta \varkappa \cdot \varkappa^{-2} \cdot \varepsilon^{-2} \eta^{n-2} \varkappa^{-1} \rightarrow +0, \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow +0. \quad (3.40)$$

In the proof of Lemma 3.4 in [2], the following estimate was established:

$$\operatorname{Re} \mathfrak{h}_0(u, u) \geq \frac{3c_0}{4} \|\nabla u\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}^2 - C \|u\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}^2, \quad (3.41)$$

where C is some absolute constant independent of ε and $u \in W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)$. This estimate and (3.38), (3.39), (3.40) then yield

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \operatorname{Re} \mathfrak{h}_0(\hat{u}_\varepsilon, \hat{u}_\varepsilon) - \operatorname{Re} \lambda \|\hat{u}_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}^2 + \operatorname{Re} (a(\cdot, u_\varepsilon) - a(\cdot, \hat{u}_\varepsilon), \hat{u}_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial\theta_R^\varepsilon)} \\ &\geq \frac{c_0}{2} \|\nabla \hat{u}_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}^2 - (\operatorname{Re} \lambda + C) \|\hat{u}_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}^2 \end{aligned}$$

for ε small enough, where C is some fixed constant independent of ε and \hat{u}_ε . Hence, as $\operatorname{Re} \lambda < -C - 1$, we necessarily have $\hat{u}_\varepsilon = 0$ and this proves the uniqueness of solution to problem (2.7). Writing the integral identity corresponding to problem (2.7) with u_ε as the test function and proceeding as above, we prove easily estimate (3.36).

Problem (2.19) can be treated as a resolvent equation for the operator generated by the differential expression $\mathcal{L} + \gamma \Upsilon \beta$ in $L_2(\Omega)$ subject to the Dirichlet condition. Conditions (2.3), (2.4) imply easily that such operator is m -sectorial and this is why the unique solvability is just a standard fact from the theory of m -sectorial operators. This operator is bounded as that from $W_2^2(\Omega) \cap \dot{W}_2^1(\Omega)$ into $L_2(\Omega)$ and this is why, by the Banach theorem, its resolvent is a bounded operator from $L_2(\Omega)$ into $W_2^2(\Omega) \cap \dot{W}_2^1(\Omega)$. This implies estimate (3.37). The proof is complete. \square

4 Convergence in $\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{M}}$ -norm

In this section we discuss the convergence postulated in Assumption A4. We provide some examples, for which such convergence can be established. We also show how to produce new perforations from given ones keeping at the same time Assumption A4.

We observe that owing to estimates (3.11), the function β_ε is bounded uniformly in x and ε as $n \geq 3$. For $n = 2$, the same fact follows immediately from definition (2.17) of this function.

We begin with considering two situations, in which Assumption A4 is guaranteed. The first concerns a sparsely distributed perforation.

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose that there exists a function $\rho = \rho(\varepsilon)$ such that*

$$\varepsilon\rho^{-1}(\varepsilon) \rightarrow +0, \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow +0, \quad B_\rho(M_k^\varepsilon) \cap B_\rho(M_j^\varepsilon) = \emptyset, \quad k \neq j.$$

Then Assumption A4 is satisfied with $\beta = 0$ and

$$\|\beta_\varepsilon\|_{\mathfrak{M}} \leq C(\varepsilon^n \rho^{-n} + \varepsilon^2), \quad n \geq 3, \quad \|\beta_\varepsilon\|_{\mathfrak{M}} \leq C(\varepsilon^n \rho^{-n} + \varepsilon^2 |\ln \varepsilon|), \quad n = 2,$$

where C are some constants independent of ε and $\rho(\varepsilon)$.

Proof. Given arbitrary function $u \in W_2^1(B_\rho(M_k^\varepsilon))$, by Lemma 3.3 with $\omega_k^\varepsilon = \emptyset$ and (ε, η) replaced by $(\rho, \varepsilon\rho^{-1})$ we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon))}^2 &\leq C(\varepsilon^n \rho^{-n} + \varepsilon^2) \|u\|_{W_2^1(B_\rho(M_k^\varepsilon))}^2, & n \geq 3, \\ \|u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon))}^2 &\leq C(\varepsilon^n \rho^{-n} + \varepsilon^2 |\ln \varepsilon|) \|u\|_{W_2^1(B_\rho(M_k^\varepsilon))}^2, & n = 2, \end{aligned}$$

where C is a constant independent of ε , u and k . Hence, by (3.11),

$$|(\beta_\varepsilon u, v)_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon))}| \leq C(\varepsilon^n \rho^{-n} + \varepsilon^2) \|u\|_{W_2^1(B_\rho(M_k^\varepsilon))}^2,$$

where C is a constant independent of ε , u and k . Summing up this estimate over $k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon$, we complete the proof. \square

The proven lemma says that if the distances between the cavities are much larger than ε , then Assumption A4 holds with $\beta = 0$. In particular, this is the case when we deal with cavities separated by finite distances.

The second situation describes a locally periodic perforation. Given a domain Ω , by ς we denote the distance measured along the inward unit normal and we assume that ς is well-defined at least for $\varsigma \leq \varsigma_0$ for some fixed positive ς_0 and the vector $\frac{\partial x}{\partial \tau}$ is uniformly bounded for such values of ς . Then we choose a fixed lattice Γ in \mathbb{R}^n with a periodicity cell \square and an arbitrary point $M \in \square$. For a given domain Ω we choose the points M_k^ε via rescaling Γ , namely,

$$M_k^\varepsilon := \varepsilon M + \varepsilon k, \quad k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon, \quad \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon := \{k \in \Gamma : \varepsilon \square + \varepsilon k \subset \Omega\}.$$

The above definition means that the points M_k^ε are obtained by all possible shifts of M along the lattice Γ and each point M_k^ε is contained in Ω with the corresponding cell $\varepsilon \square + \varepsilon z$, $z \in \Gamma$, to which the point M_k^ε belongs. We also fix the number R_3 so that the balls $B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)$ are contained strictly inside the cells $\varepsilon \square + \varepsilon k$.

In the case $n \geq 3$ we additionally assume that the constants $K_{k,\varepsilon}$ satisfy the identity

$$(2 - n)K_{k,\varepsilon} = \psi_\varepsilon(M_k^\varepsilon), \tag{4.1}$$

where $\psi_\varepsilon \in L_\infty(\Omega) \cap C(\overline{\Omega})$ is some family of functions such that

$$\rho_1(\varepsilon) := \max_{x \in \overline{\Omega}} |\psi_\varepsilon(x) - \psi_0(x)| \rightarrow +0, \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow +0, \quad (4.2)$$

where $\psi_0 \in L_\infty(\Omega) \cap C(\overline{\Omega})$ is some uniformly continuous in $\overline{\Omega}$ function, namely,

$$\rho_2(\varepsilon) := \max_{k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon} \max_{x, y \in \varepsilon \overline{\square} + \varepsilon k} |\psi_0(x) - \psi_0(y)| \rightarrow +0, \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow +0. \quad (4.3)$$

In what follows, the above described conditions are briefly called the case of locally periodic perforation.

We stress that condition (4.1) is imposed only on the constants $K_{k,\varepsilon}$ and not on the shapes of the corresponding cavities. This means that the cavities corresponding to different k are not necessarily of the same shapes even if the constants $K_{k,\varepsilon}$ coincide.

Lemma 4.2. *In the case of locally periodic perforation, Assumption A4 is satisfied with*

$$\beta = \frac{2-n}{|\square|} \psi_0, \quad n \geq 3, \quad \beta = \frac{1}{|\square|}, \quad n \geq 2,$$

and

$$\|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}} \leq C(\varepsilon + \rho_1 + \rho_2), \quad n \geq 3, \quad \|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}} \leq C\varepsilon, \quad n = 2,$$

where C are some constants independent of ε .

Proof. We let $\square_k^\varepsilon := \varepsilon \square + \varepsilon k$ and given $u \in W_2^1(\Omega)$, for each $k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon$ we denote:

$$\langle u \rangle_{\square_k^\varepsilon} := \frac{1}{\varepsilon^n |\square|} \int_{\square_k^\varepsilon} u(x) dx, \quad u_{\square_k^\varepsilon}(x) := u(x) - \langle u \rangle_{\square_k^\varepsilon}. \quad (4.4)$$

These definitions and the Poincaré inequality yield

$$\|u\|_{L_2(\square_k^\varepsilon)}^2 = \varepsilon^n |\square| |\langle u \rangle_{\square_k^\varepsilon}|^2 + \|u_{\square_k^\varepsilon}\|_{L_2(\square_k^\varepsilon)}^2, \quad \|u_{\square_k^\varepsilon}\|_{L_2(\square_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \leq C\varepsilon^2 \|\nabla u\|_{L_2(\square_k^\varepsilon)}^2; \quad (4.5)$$

hereinafter in the proof C are some inessential constants independent of ε , ρ_1 , ρ_2 , k , u , v and the spatial variables. Hence, for arbitrary $u, v \in \dot{W}_2^1(\Omega)$,

$$\int_{\square_k^\varepsilon} (\beta_\varepsilon - \beta) u \bar{v} dx = \langle u \rangle_{\square_k^\varepsilon}^{(k)} \overline{\langle v \rangle_{\square_k^\varepsilon}} \int_{\square_k^\varepsilon} (\beta_\varepsilon - \beta) dx + \langle u \rangle_{\square_k^\varepsilon} \int_{\square_k^\varepsilon} (\beta_\varepsilon - \beta) \overline{v_{\square_k^\varepsilon}} dx + \int_{\square_k^\varepsilon} (\beta_\varepsilon - \beta) u_{\square_k^\varepsilon} \bar{v} dx$$

and in view of the aforementioned uniform boundedness of β_ε we have the estimates:

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\square_k^\varepsilon} (\beta_\varepsilon - \beta) u \bar{v} dx \right| &\leq |\langle u \rangle_{\square_k^\varepsilon}| |\langle v \rangle_{\square_k^\varepsilon}| \left| \int_{\square_k^\varepsilon} (\beta_\varepsilon - \beta) dx \right| \\ &\quad + C(|\langle u \rangle_{\square_k^\varepsilon}^{(k)}| \varepsilon^{\frac{n}{2}} |\square|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|v_{\square_k^\varepsilon}^{(k)}\|_{L_2(\square_k^\varepsilon)} + \|u_{\square_k^\varepsilon}^{(k)}\|_{L_2(\square_k^\varepsilon)}) \|v\|_{L_2(\square_k^\varepsilon)} \\ &\leq C \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^n |\square|} \left| \int_{\square_k^\varepsilon} (\beta_\varepsilon - \beta) dx \right| + \varepsilon \right) \|u\|_{W_2^1(\square_k^\varepsilon)} \|v\|_{W_2^1(\square_k^\varepsilon)}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

Using the definition of the function β_ε and identity (4.1), for $n \geq 3$ we see that

$$\int_{\varepsilon \square + \varepsilon k} (\beta_\varepsilon(x) - \beta(x)) dx = \varepsilon^n \psi_\varepsilon(M_k^\varepsilon) - \frac{1}{|\square|} \int_{\varepsilon \square + \varepsilon k} \psi_0(x) dx = \int_{\varepsilon \square + \varepsilon k} \frac{\psi_\varepsilon(M_k^\varepsilon) - \psi_0(x)}{|\square|} dx$$

$$= \int_{\varepsilon\Box+\varepsilon k} \frac{\psi_\varepsilon(M_k^\varepsilon) - \psi_0(M_k^\varepsilon)}{|\Box|} dx + \int_{\varepsilon\Box+\varepsilon k} \frac{\psi_0(M_k^\varepsilon) - \psi_0(x)}{|\Box|} dx.$$

The right hand side of the above identity can be estimated by means of the functions ρ_1, ρ_2 introduced in (4.2), (4.3) and this yields

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon^n |\Box|} \left| \int_{\varepsilon\Box+\varepsilon k} (\beta_\varepsilon - \beta) dx \right| \leq \rho_1 + \rho_2.$$

Substituting this estimate into (4.6) and summing up over $k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon$, we find:

$$((\beta_\varepsilon - \beta)u, v)_{L_2(\tilde{\Omega})} \leq C(\varepsilon + \rho_1 + \rho_2) \|u\|_{W_2^1(\tilde{\Omega})} \|v\|_{W_2^1(\tilde{\Omega})}, \quad \tilde{\Omega} := \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon} (\varepsilon\Box + \varepsilon k). \quad (4.7)$$

As $n = 2$, the same calculations give a similar estimate:

$$((\beta_\varepsilon - \beta)u, v)_{L_2(\tilde{\Omega})} \leq C\varepsilon \|u\|_{W_2^1(\tilde{\Omega})} \|v\|_{W_2^1(\tilde{\Omega})}. \quad (4.8)$$

It follows from the definition of $\tilde{\Omega}$ that $\Omega \setminus \tilde{\Omega} \subset \{x : \varsigma < C\varepsilon\} := \hat{\Omega}_\varepsilon$ with some $C > 0$ independent of ε . Then in view of the boundary condition for u we have

$$u(x) = \int_0^\varsigma \frac{\partial u}{\partial \varsigma} d\varsigma, \quad x \in \hat{\Omega}_\varepsilon,$$

and hence,

$$|u(x)|^2 \leq C\varepsilon \int_0^{\varsigma_0} |\nabla u|^2 d\varsigma.$$

Integrating this estimate over $\hat{\Omega}_\varepsilon$, we get:

$$\|u\|_{L_2(\hat{\Omega}_\varepsilon)}^2 \leq C\varepsilon^2 \|u\|_{W_2^1(\Omega)}^2.$$

The same estimate holds also for v and this implies:

$$|((\beta_\varepsilon - \beta)u, v)_{L_2(\Omega \setminus \tilde{\Omega})}| \leq C\varepsilon^2 \|u\|_{W_2^1(\Omega)} \|v\|_{W_2^1(\Omega)}.$$

This inequality and (4.7), (4.8) imply the needed statement and complete the proof. \square

Our next step is to show how to generate new perforations obeying Assumption A4 if we are given one already obeying this assumption. The first way is provided by the following lemma.

Lemma 4.3. *Let a perforation described by the points M_k^ε and cavities $\omega_{k,\varepsilon}$ obeys Assumption A4. Let \tilde{M}_k^ε , $k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon$, be another set of points satisfying Assumption A1 with the same constants R_i , $i = 1, \dots, 4$, as for M_k^ε . Suppose that there exists a fixed bounded domain ϖ with a piecewise C^1 -boundary such that for each $k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon$ both balls $B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)$ and $B_{\varepsilon R_3}(\tilde{M}_k^\varepsilon)$ are contained in some shift of the set $\varepsilon\varpi$ and this shift does not intersect with other balls $B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_j^\varepsilon)$ and $B_{\varepsilon R_3}(\tilde{M}_j^\varepsilon)$, $j \neq k$. Then the function $\tilde{\beta}_\varepsilon$ corresponding to the perforation described by the points \tilde{M}_k^ε and the same cavities $\omega_{k,\varepsilon}$ also obeys Assumption A4 with the same function β . The estimate holds:*

$$\|\tilde{\beta}_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}} \leq \|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}} + C\varepsilon, \quad (4.9)$$

where C is a constant independent of ε .

Proof. It follows from definition (2.17) of the function β_ε with the points M_k^ε and of the function $\tilde{\beta}_\varepsilon$ with the points \tilde{M}_k^ε that

$$\tilde{\beta}_\varepsilon(x) = \beta_\varepsilon(x - M_k^\varepsilon + \tilde{M}_k^\varepsilon) \quad \text{on} \quad \varpi_k^\varepsilon := \varepsilon\varpi + z_k^\varepsilon, \quad (4.10)$$

where z_k^ε is the shift of the set $\varepsilon\varpi$ mentioned in the formulation of the lemma.

Similar to (4.4), for each $u \in W_2^1(\varpi_k^\varepsilon)$ we define

$$\langle u \rangle_{\varpi_k^\varepsilon} := \frac{1}{\varepsilon^n |\varpi|} \int_{\varpi_k^\varepsilon} u(x) dx, \quad u_{\varpi_k^\varepsilon}(x) := u(x) - \langle u \rangle_{\varpi_k^\varepsilon}.$$

As in (4.5), we have the estimates:

$$\|u\|_{L_2(\varpi_k^\varepsilon)}^2 = \varepsilon^n |\varpi| |\langle u \rangle_{\varpi_k^\varepsilon}|^2 + \|u_{\varpi_k^\varepsilon}\|_{L_2(\varpi_k^\varepsilon)}^2, \quad \|u_{\varpi_k^\varepsilon}\|_{L_2(\varpi_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \leq C\varepsilon^2 \|\nabla u\|_{L_2(\varpi_k^\varepsilon)}^2, \quad (4.11)$$

where C is some absolute constant independent of ε , k and u .

Since the sets ϖ_k^ε contain only the balls $B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)$ and $B_{\varepsilon R_3}(\tilde{M}_k^\varepsilon)$ and are disjoint with the balls $B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_j^\varepsilon)$ and $B_{\varepsilon R_3}(\tilde{M}_j^\varepsilon)$, $j \neq k$, for arbitrary $u, v \in \dot{W}_2^1(\Omega)$ we have:

$$(\beta_\varepsilon u, v)_{L_2(\Omega)} - (\tilde{\beta}_\varepsilon u, v)_{L_2(\Omega)} = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon} ((\beta_\varepsilon - \tilde{\beta}_\varepsilon)u, v)_{L_2(\varpi_k^\varepsilon)}. \quad (4.12)$$

At the same time, identity (4.10) implies that

$$\int_{\varpi_k^\varepsilon} \beta_\varepsilon(x) dx = \int_{\varpi_k^\varepsilon} \tilde{\beta}_\varepsilon(x) dx$$

and hence,

$$\begin{aligned} ((\beta_\varepsilon - \tilde{\beta}_\varepsilon)u, v)_{L_2(\varpi_k^\varepsilon)} &= \langle u \rangle_{\varpi_k^\varepsilon} \langle \bar{v} \rangle_{\varpi_k^\varepsilon} \int_{\varpi_k^\varepsilon} (\beta_\varepsilon - \tilde{\beta}_\varepsilon) dx + \langle u \rangle_{\varpi_k^\varepsilon} \int_{\varpi_k^\varepsilon} (\beta_\varepsilon - \tilde{\beta}_\varepsilon) \bar{v}_{\varpi_k^\varepsilon} dx + \int_{\varpi_k^\varepsilon} (\beta_\varepsilon - \tilde{\beta}_\varepsilon) u_{\varpi_k^\varepsilon} \bar{v} dx \\ &= \langle u \rangle_{\varpi_k^\varepsilon}^{(k)} \int_{\varpi_k^\varepsilon} (\beta_\varepsilon - \tilde{\beta}_\varepsilon) \bar{v}_{\varpi_k^\varepsilon} dx + \int_{\varpi_k^\varepsilon} (\beta_\varepsilon - \tilde{\beta}_\varepsilon) u_{\varpi_k^\varepsilon} \bar{v} dx. \end{aligned}$$

Similar to (4.6), by the uniform boundedness of the functions β_ε and $\tilde{\beta}_\varepsilon$ and estimates (4.11) we then obtain:

$$|((\beta_\varepsilon - \tilde{\beta}_\varepsilon)u, v)_{L_2(\varpi_k^\varepsilon)}| \leq C\varepsilon \|u\|_{W_2^1(\varpi_k^\varepsilon)} \|v\|_{W_2^1(\varpi_k^\varepsilon)}, \quad (4.13)$$

where C is a constant independent of ε , k , u and v .

Since the domain ϖ is bounded, there exists a fixed constant R_6 independent ε and $k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon$ such that $\varpi_k^\varepsilon \subset B_{\varepsilon R_6}(M_k^\varepsilon)$. Using then conditions (2.1), (2.2) and reproducing literally the proof Lemma 4.2 from [3], we see that for each point $x \in \Omega$, the number of the balls $B_{\varepsilon R_6}(M_k^\varepsilon)$ containing x is finite and is bounded uniformly in x and ε . Hence, the same is true for the domains ϖ_k^ε . Then it follows from (4.12), (4.13) that

$$|(\beta_\varepsilon u, v)_{L_2(\Omega)} - (\tilde{\beta}_\varepsilon u, v)_{L_2(\Omega)}| \leq C\varepsilon \|u\|_{W_2^1(\Omega)} \|v\|_{W_2^1(\Omega)}$$

with a constant C independent of ε , u , v . Recalling now definition (2.12) of the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{M}}$, we get estimate (4.9), which implies then other statements of the lemma. The proof is complete. \square

The proven lemma shows that given a perforation obeying Assumption A4, we can shift the points M_k^ε by the distance of order $O(\varepsilon)$ provided the new points satisfy the conditions of the lemma. This gives an easy way to generate many new non-periodic perforations from a given one keeping Assumption A4 satisfied.

The second way of generating new perforations obeying Assumption A4 is as follows. Suppose that we are given two perforations described by $M_k^\varepsilon, \omega_{k,\varepsilon}, k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon$, and $\tilde{M}_k^\varepsilon, \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}, k \in \tilde{\mathbb{M}}^\varepsilon$. Let these perforations satisfy Assumption A4 respectively with the functions β_ε, β and $\tilde{\beta}_\varepsilon, \tilde{\beta}$. Consider then the union of these perforations formed by the unions of the points and cavities $M_k^\varepsilon \cup \tilde{M}_j^\varepsilon, \omega_{k,\varepsilon}, \omega_{j,\varepsilon}, k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon, j \in \tilde{\mathbb{M}}^\varepsilon$ and let this union of the perforations satisfy Assumption A1. Then function (2.17) corresponding to this union of the perforations is $\beta_\varepsilon + \tilde{\beta}_\varepsilon$ and it satisfies Assumption A4 with the limiting function $\beta + \tilde{\beta}$ thanks to the following simple estimate:

$$\|\beta_\varepsilon + \tilde{\beta}_\varepsilon - \beta - \tilde{\beta}\|_{\mathfrak{M}} \leq \|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}} + \|\tilde{\beta}_\varepsilon - \tilde{\beta}\|_{\mathfrak{M}}.$$

It is also possible to remove some cavities from a given perforation keeping at the same time Assumption A4 and this is our third way of producing new perforations. Namely, given a perforation described by the points and cavities $M_k^\varepsilon, \omega_{k,\varepsilon}, k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon$ and obeying Assumption A4, suppose that there is a subset $\tilde{\mathbb{M}}^\varepsilon \subset \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon$ such that the corresponding perforation satisfies Assumption A4 with $\beta = 0$; the associated function (2.17) is denoted by $\tilde{\beta}_\varepsilon$. Then we consider a difference of perforations corresponding to $\mathbb{M}^\varepsilon \setminus \tilde{\mathbb{M}}^\varepsilon$ and we see that its function (2.17) is $\beta_\varepsilon - \tilde{\beta}_\varepsilon$. Hence,

$$\|\beta_\varepsilon - \tilde{\beta}_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}} \leq \|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}} + \|\tilde{\beta}_\varepsilon\|_{\mathfrak{M}}, \quad \|\tilde{\beta}_\varepsilon\|_{\mathfrak{M}} \rightarrow +0, \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow +0,$$

and the introduced difference of perforations also satisfies Assumption A4 with the same function β .

The fourth way of producing new perforations is to vary the shapes of the cavities. In the dimension $n = 2$ the function β_ε is independent on the shapes of the cavities and we therefore have a very rich freedom in choosing the shapes of the cavities. As $n \geq 3$, the shapes of the cavities are reflected in the constants $K_{k,\varepsilon}$. Then, given a perforation obeying Assumption A4 with functions β_ε and β , one can deform slightly the shapes of the cavities so that new constants $\tilde{K}_{k,\varepsilon}$ differ from $K_{k,\varepsilon}$ by a small quantity, namely, $|\tilde{K}_{k,\varepsilon} - K_{k,\varepsilon}| \leq \rho_3(\varepsilon)$, where $\rho_3(\varepsilon) \rightarrow +0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow +0$. Then it is clear that the new function $\tilde{\beta}_\varepsilon$ corresponding to the constants $\tilde{K}_{k,\varepsilon}$ satisfies the estimate

$$\|\tilde{\beta}_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}} \leq \|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}} + \rho_3(\varepsilon),$$

which means that Assumption A4 holds also for modified perforation.

5 Operator estimates

In this section we prove Theorem 2.1. The proof consists of three main steps. At the first step we prove estimates (2.22), (2.24). At the second step we establish estimates (2.23), (2.25). And at third step we show the order sharpness of the certain terms in the estimates.

5.1 W_2^1 -estimates

We choose an arbitrary $f \in L_2(\Omega)$ and by means of the solutions of problems (2.7), (2.19) we define $v_\varepsilon := u_\varepsilon - u_0 \Xi_\varepsilon$. In view of the definition of the function Ξ_ε , the function v_ε belongs to $W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)$ and satisfies the boundary conditions

$$v_\varepsilon = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \partial\theta_D^\varepsilon, \quad v_\varepsilon = u_\varepsilon \quad \text{on} \quad \partial\theta_R^\varepsilon. \quad (5.1)$$

We write integral identity (2.9) choosing v_ε as the test function:

$$\mathfrak{h}_0(u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon) - \lambda(u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} + (a(\cdot, u_\varepsilon), v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial\theta_{\bar{R}}^\varepsilon)} = (f, v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}. \quad (5.2)$$

Then we multiply the equation in (2.19) by $v_\varepsilon \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon}$ in $L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)$ and integrate once by parts:

$$\mathfrak{h}_0(u_0, v_\varepsilon \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon}) - \left(\frac{\partial u_0}{\partial \nu}, v_\varepsilon \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon} \right)_{L_2(\partial\theta_{\bar{R}}^\varepsilon)} + \gamma(\beta \Upsilon u_0 \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon}, v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} - \lambda(u_0 \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon}, v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} = (f, v_\varepsilon \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon})_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}. \quad (5.3)$$

It follows from the definition of the form \mathfrak{h}_0 that

$$\mathfrak{h}_0(u_0, v_\varepsilon \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon}) = \mathfrak{h}_0(u_0 \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon}, v_\varepsilon) + (A \nabla u_0, v_\varepsilon \nabla \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon})_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} - (A u_0 \nabla \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon}, \nabla v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} - \sum_{j=1}^n \left(A_j u_0 \frac{\partial \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon}}{\partial x_j}, v_\varepsilon \right)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}. \quad (5.4)$$

Having this identity and (5.1) in mind, we calculate the difference of identities (5.2), (5.3) and take then the real part of the resulting relation:

$$\operatorname{Re} \mathfrak{h}_0(v_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon) - \operatorname{Re} \lambda \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}^2 + \operatorname{Re} (a(\cdot, u_\varepsilon) - a(\cdot, u_0 \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon}), v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial\theta_{\bar{R}}^\varepsilon)} = \operatorname{Re} h_\varepsilon, \quad (5.5)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} h_\varepsilon &:= h_\varepsilon^{(1)} + h_\varepsilon^{(2)} + h_\varepsilon^{(3)} + h_\varepsilon^{(4)}, \\ h_\varepsilon^{(1)} &:= (f, (1 - \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon}) v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} + \gamma(\beta \Upsilon u_0, (\overline{\Xi_\varepsilon} - 1) v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}, \\ h_\varepsilon^{(2)} &:= - \sum_{k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon} ((A - A(M_k^\varepsilon)) u_0 \nabla \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon}, \nabla v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(E_k \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}, \\ h_\varepsilon^{(3)} &:= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon} h_{\varepsilon, k}^{(3)}, \\ h_\varepsilon^{(4)} &:= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon} h_{\varepsilon, k}^{(4)} + \gamma(\beta \Upsilon u_0, v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}, \\ h_{\varepsilon, k}^{(3)} &:= - \sum_{j=1}^n \left(A_j u_0 \frac{\partial \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon}}{\partial x_j}, v_\varepsilon \right)_{L_2(E_k \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} + ((A + A(M_k^\varepsilon)) \nabla u_0, v_\varepsilon \nabla \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon})_{L_2(E_k \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \\ &\quad - (A(M_k^\varepsilon) \nabla u_0 \cdot \nu^\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon})_{L_2(\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon)}, \\ h_{\varepsilon, k}^{(4)} &:= -(A(M_k^\varepsilon) u_0 \nabla \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon}, \nabla v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(E_k \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} - (A(M_k^\varepsilon) \nabla u_0, v_\varepsilon \nabla \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon})_{L_2(E_k \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} - (a(\cdot, u_0 \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon}), v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon)}; \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

we recall that ν^ε is the unit normal to $\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon$ directed inside ω_k^ε .

Letting $\theta_{R, i}^\varepsilon := \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{M}_{R, i}^\varepsilon} \omega_k^\varepsilon$, $i = 1, 2$, we observe that the function Ξ_ε vanishes on $\partial\theta_{R, 1}^\varepsilon$. By Assumption A2 and (2.5) we therefore get:

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Re} (a(\cdot, u_\varepsilon) - a(\cdot, u_0 \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon}), v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial\theta_{\bar{R}}^\varepsilon)} &= \operatorname{Re} (a(\cdot, v_\varepsilon), v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial\theta_{\bar{R}, 1}^\varepsilon)} + \operatorname{Re} (a(\cdot, u_\varepsilon) - a(\cdot, u_0 \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon}), v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial\theta_{\bar{R}, 2}^\varepsilon)} \\ &\geq \mu_1 \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\partial\theta_{R, 1}^\varepsilon)} - \vartheta \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\partial\theta_{R, 2}^\varepsilon)}. \end{aligned}$$

Using then inequalities (3.41), (3.1) and Assumption A2, we find a lower bound for the left hand side of identity (5.5):

$$\operatorname{Re} \mathfrak{h}_0(v_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon) - \operatorname{Re} \lambda \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}^2 + (a(\cdot, u_\varepsilon) - a(\cdot, u_0 \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon}), v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\theta_{\bar{R}}^\varepsilon)} \geq C \|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)}^2 + \mu_1 \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\partial\theta_{R, 1}^\varepsilon)}^2. \quad (5.7)$$

Hereinafter in this section by C we denote various inessential constants independent of ε , x , k , u_ε , u_0 , v_ε , f but, generally speaking, depending on λ . Our next important step is to estimate the right hand side of (5.5) and to get in this way a bound for $\|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)}$.

Inequality (3.24) allows us to estimate the function $h_\varepsilon^{(1)}$:

$$\begin{aligned} |h_\varepsilon^{(1)}| &\leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon} |(f, (1 - \overline{\Xi}_\varepsilon)v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(E_k \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}| + \gamma \sum_{k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon} |(\beta \Upsilon u_0, (1 - \overline{\Xi}_\varepsilon)v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(E_k \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}| \\ &\leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon} \|f\|_{L_2(E_k \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(E_k \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} + C \sum_{k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon} \|u_0\|_{L_2(E_k \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(E_k \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \\ &\leq C\varepsilon \sum_{k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon} (\|f\|_{L_2(E_k \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} + \|u_0\|_{L_2(E_k \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}) \|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \leq C\varepsilon \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

The assumed smoothness of the functions A_{ij} implies the inequality

$$|A(x) - A(M_k^\varepsilon)| \leq C|x| \leq C\varepsilon \quad \text{a.e. in } E_k,$$

and this is why by (3.25), (2.18) we get:

$$|h_\varepsilon^{(2)}| \leq C\varepsilon (\eta^{\frac{n}{2}-1} \varepsilon^{-1} \varkappa^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} + \varepsilon + \varrho^{\frac{1}{2}}) \|u_0\|_{W_2^2(\Omega)} \|\nabla v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}. \quad (5.9)$$

In order to estimate $h_\varepsilon^{(3)}$, we first integrate by parts using the properties of the function Ξ_ε :

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\varepsilon,k}^{(3)} &= - \sum_{j=1}^n \left(A_j u_0 \frac{\partial(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)}{\partial x_j}, v_\varepsilon \right)_{L_2(E_k \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} + ((A + A(M_k^\varepsilon)) \nabla u_0, v_\varepsilon \nabla(\overline{\Xi}_\varepsilon - 1))_{L_2(E_k \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \\ &\quad - (A(M_k^\varepsilon) \nabla u_0 \cdot \nu^\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon \Xi_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial \omega_k^\varepsilon)} = h_{\varepsilon,k}^{(5)} + h_{\varepsilon,k}^{(6)}, \\ h_{\varepsilon,k}^{(5)} &:= - \sum_{j=1}^n ((\Xi_\varepsilon - 1) A_j \nu_j^\varepsilon u_0, v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial \omega_k^\varepsilon)} + (((\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)A - A(M_k^\varepsilon)) \nabla u_0 \cdot \nu^\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial \omega_k^\varepsilon)}, \\ h_{\varepsilon,k}^{(6)} &:= \sum_{j=1}^n \left(A_j (\Xi_\varepsilon - 1) \frac{\partial u_0}{\partial x_j}, v_\varepsilon \right)_{L_2(E_k \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} + \sum_{j=1}^n \left(A_j (\Xi_\varepsilon - 1) u_0, \frac{\partial v_\varepsilon}{\partial x_j} \right)_{L_2(E_k \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \\ &\quad - ((\Xi_\varepsilon - 1) \operatorname{div}(A + A(M_k^\varepsilon)) \nabla u_0, v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(E_k \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} - ((\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)(A + A(M_k^\varepsilon)) \nabla u_0, \nabla v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(E_k \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

where ν_j^ε are the components of the unit normal ν^ε . Inequality (3.24) applied with $v = u_0$ and $v = v_\varepsilon$ allows us to estimate $h_{\varepsilon,k}^{(6)}$:

$$|h_{\varepsilon,k}^{(6)}| \leq C\varepsilon \|u_0\|_{W_2^2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}. \quad (5.11)$$

Inequalities (3.1) and (3.21) give rise to a similar estimate for $h_{\varepsilon,k}^{(5)}$:

$$|h_{\varepsilon,k}^{(5)}| \leq C\varepsilon \eta \varkappa \|u_0\|_{W_2^2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}.$$

This estimate and (5.11), (5.10), (5.6) imply:

$$|h_\varepsilon^{(3)}| \leq C\varepsilon \|u_0\|_{W_2^2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)}. \quad (5.12)$$

We proceed to estimating the function $h_{\varepsilon,k}^{(4)}$, which is one of the most non-trivial steps in the proof. As above, we first integrate by parts in $h_{\varepsilon,k}^{(4)}$ taking into consideration the definition of Ξ_ε and the equation for $X_{k,\varepsilon}$:

$$h_{\varepsilon,k}^{(4)} = -(A(M_k^\varepsilon) u_0 \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu, v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial E_k)} - (A(M_k^\varepsilon) u_0 \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu^\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial \omega_k^\varepsilon)} - (a(\cdot, u_0 \Xi_\varepsilon), v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial \omega_k^\varepsilon)}, \quad (5.13)$$

where ν denotes the unit outward normal to ∂E_k .

We fix $k \in \mathbb{M}_R^\varepsilon$ and we represent the functions u_0 and v_ε as

$$u_0 = \langle u_0 \rangle + u_0^\perp, \quad v_\varepsilon = \langle v_\varepsilon \rangle_k + v_\varepsilon^\perp, \quad (5.14)$$

where the operations $\langle \cdot \rangle$ and \cdot^\perp were defined in (3.27). Then by Lemma 3.1 with $\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon = \partial E_k$ and $\eta = 1$ and by Lemma 3.2 the functions $u_0, u_0^\perp, v_\varepsilon^\perp$ satisfy the estimates

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_0\|_{L_2(\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon)} &\leq C\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|u_0\|_{W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)}, & \|u_0^\perp\|_{L_2(\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon)} &\leq C\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla u_0\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)}, \\ \|v_\varepsilon^\perp\|_{L_2(\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon)} &\leq C\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.15)$$

By identities (5.14), we rewrite formula (5.13) as

$$\begin{aligned} (A(M_k^\varepsilon)u_0\nabla\Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu, v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial E_k)} &= \langle u_0 \rangle \langle \overline{v_\varepsilon} \rangle \int_{\partial E_k} A(M_k^\varepsilon)\nabla\Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu \, ds + (A(M_k^\varepsilon)u_0\nabla\Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu, v_\varepsilon^\perp)_{L_2(\partial E_k)} \\ &\quad + \langle \overline{v_\varepsilon} \rangle \int_{\partial E_k} A(M_k^\varepsilon)u_0^\perp \Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu \, ds. \end{aligned} \quad (5.16)$$

The second and the third term in the right hand side of the above identity can be estimated by means of (3.22), (3.23), (5.15), (2.18):

$$\begin{aligned} |(A(M_k^\varepsilon)u_0\nabla\Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu, v_\varepsilon^\perp)_{L_2(\partial E_k)}| &\leq C\varepsilon\|u_0\|_{W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)}\|\nabla v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)}, \\ \left| \langle \overline{v_\varepsilon} \rangle \int_{\partial E_k} A(M_k^\varepsilon)u_0^\perp \Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu \, ds \right| &\leq C\varepsilon^{\frac{n+2}{2}}|\langle \overline{v_\varepsilon} \rangle|\|\nabla u_0\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)} \\ &\leq C\varepsilon\|\nabla u_0\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)}\|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.17)$$

We calculate the integral in first term in the right hand side in (5.16) by using (3.22), (3.23):

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial E_k} A(M_k^\varepsilon)\nabla\Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu \, ds &= \frac{K_{k,\varepsilon}(2-n)}{R_5^n} \frac{\eta^{n-2}}{\varepsilon^2} \int_{\partial E_k} |A^{-1}(M_k^\varepsilon)(x - M_k^\varepsilon)| \, ds + O(\varepsilon^{n+2}) \quad \text{as } n \geq 3, \\ \int_{\partial E_k} A(M_k^\varepsilon)\nabla\Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu \, ds &= -\frac{1}{R_5\varepsilon^2 \ln \eta} \int_{\partial E_k} |A^{-1}(M_k^\varepsilon)(x - M_k^\varepsilon)| \, ds + O(\varepsilon^4) \quad \text{as } n = 2, \end{aligned}$$

where the O -terms are uniform in k . In the integrals in the right hand sides of the above identities we make the change of variables $y = \varepsilon^{-1}R_5^{-1}A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon)(x - M_k^\varepsilon)$ and then we get:

$$\frac{1}{R_5^n} \int_{\partial E_k} |A^{-1}(M_k^\varepsilon)(x - M_k^\varepsilon)| \, ds = \varepsilon^n \Upsilon(M_k^\varepsilon) \quad \text{for all } n \geq 2.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial E_k} A(M_k^\varepsilon)\nabla\Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu \, ds &= \varepsilon^n \gamma K_{k,\varepsilon}(2-n)\Upsilon(M_k^\varepsilon) + O(\varepsilon^n |\eta^{n-2}\varepsilon^{-2} - \gamma| + \varepsilon^{n+2}) \quad \text{as } n \geq 3, \\ \int_{\partial E_k} A(M_k^\varepsilon)\nabla\Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu \, ds &= \varepsilon^2 \gamma \Upsilon(M_k^\varepsilon) + O(\varepsilon^2 |\varepsilon^{-2} \ln^{-1} \eta - \gamma| + \varepsilon^4) \quad \text{as } n = 2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.18)$$

It is clear that

$$\begin{aligned} (\Upsilon u_0, v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} &= \langle u_0 \rangle \langle \overline{v_\varepsilon} \rangle \int_{B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon} \Upsilon dx + \langle \overline{v_\varepsilon} \rangle \int_{B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon} \Upsilon u_0^\perp dx \\ &\quad + (\Upsilon u_0, v_\varepsilon^\perp)_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}, \\ \left| \int_{B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon} \Upsilon dx - \Upsilon(M_k^\varepsilon) \text{mes } B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \right| &\leq C\varepsilon^{n+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Then by Lemma 3.2 the estimates

$$\begin{aligned} |(\Upsilon u_0, v_\varepsilon^\perp)_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}| &\leq C\varepsilon \|u_0\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \|\nabla v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}, \\ \left| \langle \overline{v_\varepsilon} \rangle \int_{B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon} \Upsilon u_0^\perp dx \right| &\leq C \|u_{0,k}\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \\ &\leq C\varepsilon \|\nabla u_0\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}, \end{aligned}$$

hold and therefore,

$$\left| (\Upsilon u_0, v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} - \langle u_0 \rangle \langle \overline{v_\varepsilon} \rangle \Upsilon(M_k^\varepsilon) \text{mes } B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \right| \leq C\varepsilon \|u_0\|_{W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}.$$

The above estimate and (5.13), (5.16), (5.17), (5.18) imply:

$$(A(M_k^\varepsilon)u_0 \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu, v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial E_k)} = h_{\varepsilon,k}^{(7)} + h_{\varepsilon,k}^{(8)}, \quad (5.19)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\varepsilon,k}^{(7)} &:= -\frac{K_{k,\varepsilon}(2-n)\gamma}{R_3^n \text{mes } B_1(0)} (\Upsilon u_0, v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \quad \text{as } n \geq 3, \\ h_{\varepsilon,k}^{(7)} &:= -\frac{\gamma}{R_3^2 \text{mes } B_1(0)} (\Upsilon u_0, v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \quad \text{as } n = 2, \end{aligned}$$

while the functions $h_{\varepsilon,k}^{(8)}$ obey the estimates

$$\begin{aligned} |h_{\varepsilon,k}^{(8)}| &\leq C\varepsilon \|u_0\|_{W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \\ &\quad + C |\eta^{n-2} \varepsilon^{-2} \varkappa^{-1}(\varepsilon) - \gamma| \|u_0\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.20)$$

We observe that

$$h_{\varepsilon,k}^{(7)} = -\gamma (\Upsilon \beta_\varepsilon u_0, v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}. \quad (5.21)$$

We proceed to estimating two other terms in the right hand side of (5.13). We first of all observe that as $k \in \mathbb{M}_D^\varepsilon$, this term vanishes since $v_\varepsilon = 0$ on $\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon$ for such k . This is why we need to estimate it only for $k \in \mathbb{M}_R^\varepsilon$.

We first consider the case $k \in \mathbb{M}_{R,1}^\varepsilon$. The function Ξ_ε vanishes on $\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon$ and hence, in view of (2.5), the function $a^\varepsilon(\cdot, \Xi_\varepsilon v_\varepsilon)$ vanishes and the same is true for the third term in the right hand side of (5.13). Since $X_k^\varepsilon = 1$ on $\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon$ and $X_k^\varepsilon \in C^2(\overline{B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)} \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)$, we have

$$\frac{\partial X_k^\varepsilon}{\partial x_j} = \frac{\partial \tau}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial X_k^\varepsilon}{\partial \tau} \quad \text{on } \partial\omega_k^\varepsilon;$$

where τ is the distance measured along the unit normal to $\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon$, see Assumption A1. According to this assumption, the derivatives are bounded uniformly in k , ε and the spatial variables. By Assumption A3 we then obtain:

$$\left| \frac{\partial X_k^\varepsilon}{\partial x_j} \right| \leq C(\varepsilon\eta)^{-1} \quad \text{on } \partial\omega_{k,\varepsilon}, \quad k \in \mathbb{M}_R^\varepsilon.$$

Hence, by (3.1), (2.5),

$$\begin{aligned} |(A(M_k^\varepsilon)u_0 \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu, v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon)}| &\leq C(\varepsilon\eta\mathcal{K})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|u_0\|_{W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon)}, \\ (a^\varepsilon(\cdot, u_0 \Xi_\varepsilon), v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon)} &= (a^\varepsilon(\cdot, 0), v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon)} = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (5.22)$$

as $k \in \mathbb{M}_{R,1}^\varepsilon$.

As $k \in \mathbb{M}_{R,2}^\varepsilon$, by boundary condition (2.15) and the definition of Ξ_ε we see that

$$A(M_k^\varepsilon) \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu^\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{-1} \eta^{-1} b_k \Xi_\varepsilon \quad \text{on } \partial\omega_k^\varepsilon,$$

and therefore, in view of (2.10),

$$-(A(M_k^\varepsilon)u_0 \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu^\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon)} - (a^\varepsilon(\cdot, u_0 \Xi_\varepsilon), v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon)} = -(\tilde{a}^\varepsilon(\cdot, u_0 \Xi_\varepsilon), v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon)}.$$

Using then the estimate for \tilde{a}^ε in (2.11) as well as (3.1), (3.21), we get:

$$\begin{aligned} |(A(M_k^\varepsilon)u_0 \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu^\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon)} + (a(\cdot, u_0 \Xi_\varepsilon), v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon)}| &\leq C\varepsilon\eta\mathcal{K}\mu_2 \|u_0\|_{W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_{k,\varepsilon})} \\ &\quad \cdot \|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_{k,\varepsilon})}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.23)$$

Summing up the above estimates over $k \in \mathbb{M}_{R,2}^\varepsilon$, relations (5.22) over $k \in \mathbb{M}_{R,1}^\varepsilon$ and identities (5.19), (5.21) and inequalities (5.20) over $k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon$, by (3.5) we finally obtain:

$$h_\varepsilon^{(4)} = \gamma((\beta - \beta_\varepsilon)u_0, \Upsilon v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} + h_\varepsilon^{(8)}, \quad (5.24)$$

$$\begin{aligned} |h_\varepsilon^{(8)}| &\leq C(\varepsilon + \varepsilon\eta\mathcal{K}\mu_2) \|u_0\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)} + C(\varepsilon\eta\mathcal{K})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|u_0\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\partial\theta_{R,1}^\varepsilon)} \\ &\quad + C|\eta^{n-2}\varepsilon^{-2}\mathcal{K}^{-1} - \gamma| \|u_0\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.25)$$

If $\gamma \neq 0$, then the first term in the left hand side of (5.24) is generally speaking non-zero and we need Assumption A4 to estimate it. Under this assumption, we continue the function v_ε inside ω_k^ε as follows. We first let

$$v_\varepsilon := 0 \quad \text{in } \omega_k^\varepsilon \quad \text{for } k \in \mathbb{M}_D^\varepsilon. \quad (5.26)$$

For $k \in \mathbb{M}_R^\varepsilon$ we introduce the quantities $\langle v_\varepsilon \rangle_k$ and the functions $v_{\varepsilon,k}$ by formulae (3.8). By Lemma 3.2 with ε replaced by $\varepsilon\eta$ we have

$$\|v_{\varepsilon,k}\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon\eta R_2}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \leq C\varepsilon^2\eta^2 \|\nabla v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon\eta R_2}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2. \quad (5.27)$$

Let $\chi_2 = \chi_2(\tau)$ be an infinitely differentiable function vanishing as $|\tau| > \frac{2\tau_0}{3}$ and equalling to one as $|\tau| < \frac{\tau_0}{3}$. Then for $k \in \mathbb{M}_R^\varepsilon$ we define the continuation of the function v_ε inside ω_k^ε in terms of the local variables (τ, s) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} v_\varepsilon(\tau, s) &:= \langle v_\varepsilon \rangle_k + v_{\varepsilon,k}(-\tau, s) \chi_2(\tau \varepsilon^{-1} \eta^{-1}) \quad \text{for } x \in \omega_k^\varepsilon, \quad \text{dist}(x, \partial\omega_k^\varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon\eta\tau_0, \\ v_\varepsilon(\tau, s) &:= \langle v_\varepsilon \rangle_k \quad \text{for } x \in \omega_k^\varepsilon, \quad \text{dist}(x, \partial\omega_k^\varepsilon) > \varepsilon\eta\tau_0. \end{aligned} \quad (5.28)$$

It is obvious that this continuation gives a function in $W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon))$, which in view of estimates (3.4), (5.27) satisfies the inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 &\leq C \left(|\langle v_\varepsilon \rangle_k|^2 + \|v_{\varepsilon,k}\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon\eta R_2}(M_k^\varepsilon)\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \right) \\ &\leq C \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon\eta R_2}(M_k^\varepsilon)\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \leq C \varepsilon^2 \eta^2 \varkappa \|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (5.29)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 &\leq C \left(\|\nabla v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon\eta R_2}(M_k^\varepsilon)\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 + \varepsilon^{-2} \eta^{-2} \|v_{\varepsilon,k}\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon\eta R_2}(M_k^\varepsilon)\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \right) \\ &\leq C \|\nabla v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.30)$$

Due to these inequalities and identity (5.26), the continued function v_ε , regarded as defined on entire domain Ω , is an element of $\mathring{W}_2^1(\Omega)$ and

$$\|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\theta^\varepsilon)}^2 \leq C \varepsilon^2 \eta^2 \varkappa \|v_\varepsilon\|_{\Omega^\varepsilon}^2, \quad \|\nabla v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\theta^\varepsilon)}^2 \leq C \|\nabla v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}^2. \quad (5.31)$$

These inequalities and (3.4) allow us to rewrite the scalar product in the right hand side of (5.24) as

$$((\beta - \beta_\varepsilon)u_0, \Upsilon v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} = ((\beta - \beta_\varepsilon)u_0, \Upsilon v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\Omega)} + h_\varepsilon^{(9)}, \quad (5.32)$$

where $h_\varepsilon^{(9)}$ is a function satisfying the estimate

$$|h_\varepsilon^{(9)}| \leq C \|u_0\|_{L_2(\theta^\varepsilon)} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\theta^\varepsilon)} \leq C \varepsilon^2 \eta^2 \varkappa \|u_0\|_{W_2^1(\Omega)} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)}. \quad (5.33)$$

In the scalar product in the right hand of (5.32) the function Υv_ε is an element of $\mathring{W}_2^1(\Omega)$ and then the function $(\beta - \beta_\varepsilon)u_0$ can be regarded as a functional from the space $\mathring{W}_2^{-1}(\Omega)$. Then by formula (2.12), Assumption A4 and inequalities (5.31) we can estimate this scalar product as follows:

$$\left| ((\beta - \beta_\varepsilon)u_0, \Upsilon v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\Omega)} \right| \leq C \|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}} \|u_0\|_{W_2^2(\Omega)} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\Omega)} \leq C \|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}} \|u_0\|_{W_2^2(\Omega)}. \quad (5.34)$$

The above estimate and (5.8), (5.9), (5.12), (5.24), (5.25), (5.32), (5.33), (3.37) yield a final estimate for the right hand side in (5.5):

$$\begin{aligned} |\operatorname{Re} h_\varepsilon| \leq |h_\varepsilon| &\leq C \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \left((\varepsilon + \varepsilon\eta\kappa\mu_2) \|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)} + |\eta^{n-2}\varepsilon^{-2}\varkappa^{-1}(\varepsilon) - \gamma| \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \gamma \|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)} + (\varepsilon\eta\kappa)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\partial\theta_{R,1}^\varepsilon)} \right) \\ &\leq \delta (\|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)}^2 + \mu_1 \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\partial\theta_{R,1}^\varepsilon)}^2) \\ &\quad + C(\delta) (\varepsilon^2 + (\varepsilon\eta\kappa\mu_2)^2 + |\eta^{n-2}\varepsilon^{-2}\varkappa^{-1} - \gamma|^2 + (\varepsilon\eta\kappa\mu_1)^{-1} + \gamma^2 \|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}}^2) \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (5.35)$$

where $\delta > 0$ is arbitrary but fixed, while $C(\delta)$ is a constant independent of ε , f , u_0 and v_ε . Substituting the above estimate with a sufficiently small δ into the left hand side of (5.5) and employing then (5.7), we obtain:

$$\|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)}^2 + \mu_1 \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\partial\theta_{R,1}^\varepsilon)}^2 \leq C (\varepsilon^2 + (\varepsilon\eta\kappa\mu_2)^2 + |\eta^{n-2}\varepsilon^{-2}\varkappa^{-1} - \gamma|^2 + (\varepsilon\eta\kappa\mu_1)^{-1} + \gamma^2 \|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}}^2) \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)}^2. \quad (5.36)$$

This estimate implies (2.22).

Assume now that $\gamma = 0$ and only Assumption A1 holds. In this case, the function h_ε can be written as $h_\varepsilon = g_\varepsilon[v_\varepsilon]$, where

$$\begin{aligned} g_\varepsilon[v] &:= (f, (1 - \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon})v)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} - \sum_{k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon} \left((Au_0 \nabla \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon}, \nabla v)_{L_2(E_k \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} - (A \nabla u_0, v \nabla \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon})_{L_2(E_k \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \right) \\ &\quad - \sum_{k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon} (A \nabla u_0 \cdot \nu^\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon})_{L_2(\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon)} - \sum_{k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon} \sum_{j=1}^n \left(A_j u_0 \frac{\partial \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon}}{\partial x_j}, v \right)_{L_2(E_k \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.37)$$

We also integrate by parts as follows:

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon} (A \nabla u_0, v \nabla \overline{\Xi}_\varepsilon)_{L_2(E_k \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} = - \sum_{k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon} \int_{k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon} (\Xi_\varepsilon - 1) \operatorname{div} A \bar{v} \nabla u_0 \, dx + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon} (A \nabla u_0 \cdot \nu^\varepsilon, (\overline{\Xi}_\varepsilon - 1) v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial \omega_k^\varepsilon)}$$

and this allows us to rewrite (5.37) as

$$\begin{aligned} g_\varepsilon[v] := & (f, (1 - \overline{\Xi}_\varepsilon) v)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} - \sum_{k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon} \sum_{j=1}^n \left(A_j u_0 \frac{\partial \Xi_\varepsilon}{\partial x_j}, v \right)_{L_2(E_k \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} - \sum_{k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon} (A \nabla u_0 \cdot \nu^\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \\ & - \sum_{k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon} (A u_0 \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon, \nabla v)_{L_2(E_k \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} - \sum_{k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon} \int_{k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon} (\Xi_\varepsilon - 1) \operatorname{div} A \bar{v} \nabla u_0 \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

Then the function h_ε can be directly estimated by means of Lemmata 3.1, 3.6 and inequalities (3.37), (3.21):

$$\begin{aligned} |h_\varepsilon| = |g_\varepsilon[v_\varepsilon]| & \leq C \left(\varepsilon \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)} + (\eta^{\frac{n}{2}-1} \varepsilon^{-1} \varkappa^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} + \varepsilon + \varrho^{\frac{1}{2}}) \|u_0\|_{W_2^2(\Omega)} \right) \|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \\ & \leq C (\eta^{\frac{n}{2}-1} \varepsilon^{-1} \varkappa^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} + \varepsilon + \varrho^{\frac{1}{2}}) \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)}. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting this estimate into the right hand side of (5.5) and using (5.7), we obtain

$$\|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \leq C (\eta^{\frac{n}{2}-1} \varepsilon^{-1} \varkappa^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} + \varepsilon + \varrho^{\frac{1}{2}}) \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)}. \quad (5.38)$$

By Lemma 3.6 and inequality (3.37) we also have:

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1) u_0\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} & \leq C(\varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon \eta + \varrho) \|u_0\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \leq C \varepsilon \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)}, \\ \|\nabla(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1) u_0\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} & \leq \|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1) \nabla u_0\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} + \|u_0 \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \\ & \leq C (\eta^{\frac{n}{2}-1} \varepsilon^{-1} \varkappa^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} + \varepsilon + \varrho^{\frac{1}{2}}) \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

These estimates and (5.38) and an obvious identity

$$u_\varepsilon - u_0 = v_\varepsilon + (1 - \overline{\Xi}_\varepsilon) u_0 \quad (5.39)$$

prove (2.24).

If the set \mathbb{M}_R is empty, then the second term in (5.13) is zero for $k \in \mathbb{M}_R$ just because the function v_ε vanishes on $\partial \omega_k^\varepsilon$. Then estimates (5.22), (5.23) are no longer needed. Assumption A3 can be also omitted if $\mathbb{M}_{R,1}^\varepsilon = \mathbb{M}_{R,2}^\varepsilon = \mathbb{M}_R^\varepsilon = \emptyset$. Estimate (5.25) also simplifies:

$$|h_\varepsilon^{(8)}| \leq C \varepsilon \|u_0\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)} + C |\eta^{n-2} \varepsilon^{-2} \varkappa^{-1}(\varepsilon) - \gamma| \|u_0\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}.$$

We also do not need continuation (5.28) and, hence, Assumption A2. Estimates (5.31) are also omitted in the considered case. Estimates (5.34), (5.35) then become

$$\begin{aligned} \left| ((\beta - \beta_\varepsilon) u_0, \Upsilon v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\Omega)} \right| & \leq C \|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}} \|u_0\|_{W_2^2(\Omega)} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)}, \\ |\operatorname{Re} h_\varepsilon| & \leq \delta \|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)}^2 + C(\delta) \left(\varepsilon^2 + |\eta^{n-2} \varepsilon^{-2} \varkappa^{-1} - \gamma|^2 + \|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}}^2 \right) \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

All other above arguing remain the same and we arrive at estimates (2.22), (2.23).

5.2 L_2 -estimates

Here we prove inequalities (2.23) and (2.25). The former is implied immediately by identity (5.39) and estimates (3.24), (3.37).

In the proof of (2.25) we follow an approach proposed recently in [5], which is a modification of the technique used in [20], [21], [17], [18], [19]. Namely, we first introduce a differential expression

$$\mathcal{L}^* := - \sum_{i,j=1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} A_{ij}^\varepsilon \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} - \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \overline{A}_j + \overline{A}_0$$

and consider an auxiliary boundary value problem

$$(\mathcal{L}^* - \overline{\lambda})w = f_\varepsilon \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad w = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \quad (5.40)$$

where $f_\varepsilon = v_\varepsilon$ in Ω^ε and $f_\varepsilon = 0$ in θ^ε . Since $A_j \in W_\infty^1(\Omega)$, this problem is of the same nature as (2.19). This is why is solvable for $\text{Re } \lambda \leq \lambda_0$ and its solution belongs to $W_2^2(\Omega)$ and satisfies the estimate

$$\|w\|_{W_2^2(\Omega)} \leq C \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}. \quad (5.41)$$

Hereinafter by C we denote inessential constants independent of ε , k , v_ε and w .

In what follows we assume that the function v_ε is supposed to be continued inside θ^ε in accordance with (5.26), (5.28) and thus is regarded as an element of $W_2^1(\Omega)$. We then write an integral identity associated with problem (5.40) choosing v_ε as a test function:

$$\begin{aligned} (v_\varepsilon, F_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\Omega)} = \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}^2 &= \mathfrak{h}_0(w, v_\varepsilon) - \lambda(w, v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} + (A \nabla w, \nabla v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\theta^\varepsilon)} \\ &+ \sum_{j=1}^n \left(A_j \frac{\partial w}{\partial x_j}, v_\varepsilon \right)_{L_2(\theta^\varepsilon)} + (A_0 w, v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\theta^\varepsilon)} - \lambda(w, v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\theta^\varepsilon)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.42)$$

By estimates (3.4), (5.41), (5.29), (5.30) we then immediately obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{j=1}^n \left(A_j \frac{\partial w}{\partial x_j}, v_\varepsilon \right)_{L_2(\theta^\varepsilon)} + (A_0 w, v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\theta^\varepsilon)} - \lambda(w, v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\theta^\varepsilon)} \right| &\leq C \varepsilon \eta \varkappa^{\frac{1}{2}} \|w\|_{W_2^2(\Omega)} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \\ &\leq C \varepsilon \eta \varkappa^{\frac{1}{2}} (\eta^{\frac{n}{2}-1} \varepsilon^{-1} \varkappa^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} + \varepsilon + \varrho) \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.43)$$

By Π_ε we denote a particular case of function Ξ_ε in the case when on the boundaries of all cavities the Dirichlet condition is imposed. In other words, only the functions $X_{k,\varepsilon}$ satisfying Dirichlet condition (2.13) are used in (2.20) for all $k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon$ while defining Π_ε . The function Π_ε vanishes on $\partial\theta^\varepsilon$ and is real.

We write identities (5.2), (5.3), (5.4) replacing there v_ε by $\Pi_\varepsilon w$ and then we take the difference of the obtained analogues of (5.2), (5.3). This gives:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{h}_0(v_\varepsilon, \Pi_\varepsilon w) - \lambda(v_\varepsilon, \Pi_\varepsilon w)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} &= (f, (1 - \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon}) \Pi_\varepsilon w)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} + (A \nabla u_0, \Pi_\varepsilon w \nabla \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon})_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \\ &- (A u_0 \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon, \nabla (\Pi_\varepsilon w))_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} - \sum_{j=1}^n \left(A_j u_0 \frac{\partial \Xi_\varepsilon}{\partial x_j}, \Pi_\varepsilon w \right)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.44)$$

Let us estimate the right hand side of this identity.

Since the function Π_ε is a particular case of Ξ_ε , it possesses the same properties, namely, relations (3.21), (3.22), (3.23) and Lemma 3.6 hold true for Π_ε . Then by (3.24) we obtain:

$$\left| (f, (1 - \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon}) \Pi_\varepsilon w)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \right| \leq C \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \|(1 - \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon}) w\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \leq C \varepsilon \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}. \quad (5.45)$$

Using the definition of the functions Ξ_ε and Π_ε , we integrate by parts as follows:

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \left(A_j u_0 \frac{\partial \Xi_\varepsilon}{\partial x_j}, \Pi_\varepsilon w \right)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} = \sum_{j=1}^n \left(A_j u_0 \frac{\partial (\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)}{\partial x_j}, \Pi_\varepsilon w \right)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} = \sum_{j=1}^n \int_{\Omega^\varepsilon} (\Xi_\varepsilon - 1) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} A_j u_0 \Pi_\varepsilon \bar{w} \, dx.$$

Hence, by estimates (3.21), (3.25), (3.24) for the functions Ξ_ε and Π_ε and by estimates (3.37), (5.41) we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{j=1}^n \left(A_j u_0 \frac{\partial \Xi_\varepsilon}{\partial x_j}, \Pi_\varepsilon w \right)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \right| &\leq C \|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)u_0\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} (\|w\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)} + \|w \nabla \Pi_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}) \\ &\quad + C \|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)w\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \|u_0\|_{W_2^1(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C(\varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon\eta + \varrho) \|u_0\|_{W_2^2(\Omega)} \|w\|_{W_2^2(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C(\varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon\eta + \varrho) \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.46)$$

We rewrite two remaining terms in the right hand side of (5.44) as

$$\begin{aligned} (A \nabla u_0, \Pi_\varepsilon w \nabla \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon})_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} - (A u_0 \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon, \nabla (\Pi_\varepsilon w))_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \\ = (A \nabla u_0, w \nabla \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon})_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} - (A u_0 \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon, \nabla w)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \\ + (A \nabla u_0, (\Pi_\varepsilon - 1)w \nabla \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon})_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} - (A u_0 \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon, (\Pi_\varepsilon - 1)\nabla w)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \\ - (A u_0 \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon, w \nabla \Pi_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.47)$$

By Lemma 3.6 and estimates (3.37), (5.41) we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| (A \nabla u_0, (\Pi_\varepsilon - 1)w \nabla \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon})_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} - (A u_0 \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon, (\Pi_\varepsilon - 1)\nabla w)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} - (A u_0 \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon, w \nabla \Pi_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \right| \\ \leq C \left(\|(\Pi_\varepsilon - 1)\nabla u_0\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \|w \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \right. \\ \left. + \|(\Pi_\varepsilon - 1)\nabla w\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \|u_0 \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} + \|u_0 \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \|w \nabla \Pi_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \right) \\ \leq C(\eta^{n-2} \varepsilon^{-2} \varkappa^{-1} + \varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon\eta + \varrho) \|u_0\|_{W_2^2(\Omega)} \|w\|_{W_2^2(\Omega)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.48)$$

In the other two terms in the right hand side of (5.47) we integrate by parts using the definition of the functions Ξ_ε and Π_ε :

$$\begin{aligned} (A \nabla u_0, w \nabla \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon})_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} - (A u_0 \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon, \nabla w)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} &= (A \nabla u_0, w \nabla \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon})_{L_2(\Omega)} - (A u_0 \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon, \nabla w)_{L_2(\Omega)} \\ &= \int_{\Omega} (\Xi_\varepsilon - 1) (\operatorname{div} A u_0 \nabla \bar{w} - \operatorname{div} A \bar{w} \nabla u_0) \, dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} (\Xi_\varepsilon - 1) (u_0 \operatorname{div} A \nabla \bar{w} - \bar{w} \operatorname{div} A \nabla u_0) \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

By estimates (3.24), (3.37), (5.41), (3.21), (3.4) we then obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \left| (A \nabla u_0, w \nabla \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon})_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} - (A u_0 \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon, \nabla w)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \right| \\ \leq C \|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)u_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \|w\|_{W_2^2(\Omega)} + C \|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)w\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \|u_0\|_{W_2^2(\Omega)} \\ \leq C \left(\|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)u_0\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} + \|u_0\|_{L_2(\theta^\varepsilon)} \right) \|w\|_{W_2^2(\Omega)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + C \left(\|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)w\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} + \|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)w\|_{L_2(\theta^\varepsilon)} \right) \|u_0\|_{W_2^2(\Omega)} \\
& \leq C(\varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon\eta + \varrho) \|u_0\|_{W_2^2(\Omega)} \|w\|_{W_2^2(\Omega)} \\
& \leq C(\varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon\eta + \varrho) \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}.
\end{aligned}$$

These estimates and (5.44), (5.45), (5.46), (5.47), (5.48) yield

$$|\mathfrak{h}_0(v_\varepsilon, \Pi_\varepsilon w) - \lambda(v_\varepsilon, \Pi_\varepsilon w)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}| \leq C(\eta^{n-2}\varepsilon^{-2}\varkappa^{-1} + \varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon\eta + \varrho) \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}. \quad (5.49)$$

It also follows from Lemma 3.6 and estimate (3.21) for the function Π_ε and from (5.38) that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathfrak{h}_0(v_\varepsilon, (1 - \Pi_\varepsilon)w) - \lambda(v_\varepsilon, (1 - \Pi_\varepsilon)w)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}| & \leq C \|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)} (\|(1 - \Pi_\varepsilon)\nabla w\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} + \|w\nabla\Pi_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}) \\
& \leq C(\eta^{n-2}\varepsilon^{-2}\varkappa^{-1} + \varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon\eta + \varrho) \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \|w\|_{W_2^2(\Omega)} \\
& \leq C(\eta^{n-2}\varepsilon^{-2}\varkappa^{-1} + \varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon\eta + \varrho) \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}.
\end{aligned}$$

These inequalities and (5.49), (5.42), (5.43) allow us to estimate the left hand side in (5.42):

$$\|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}^2 \leq C(\eta^{n-2}\varepsilon^{-2}\varkappa^{-1} + \varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon\eta + \varrho) \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}$$

and hence,

$$\|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \leq C(\eta^{n-2}\varepsilon^{-2}\varkappa^{-1} + \varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon\eta + \varrho) \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)}.$$

Employing now estimate (3.24) with $u = u_0$ and identity (5.39), we arrive at (2.25).

5.3 Sharpness of estimates

In this subsection we prove that inequalities (2.22), (2.23), (2.24), (2.25) are order sharp. First let us show that the term $\|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}}$ in (2.22), (2.23) is order sharp.

We choose $\mathcal{L} := -\Delta$ and we impose only the Dirichlet condition on the boundaries of the cavities, that is, $\mathbb{M}_R^\varepsilon = \emptyset$. In this case, the function β_ε is non-negative. For $n = 2$ this fact is implied by definition (2.17), while for $n \geq 3$ it follows from a simple integration by parts:

$$\begin{aligned}
0 & = \lim_{R \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\{\xi: |A(M_k^\varepsilon)\xi| < R, \xi \notin \omega_{k,\varepsilon}\}} X_{k,\varepsilon} \operatorname{div}_\xi A(M_k^\varepsilon) \nabla_\xi X_{k,\varepsilon} d\xi \\
& = \lim_{R \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\{\xi: |A(M_k^\varepsilon)\xi| = R\}} X_{k,\varepsilon} A(M_k^\varepsilon) \nabla_\xi X_{k,\varepsilon} \cdot \nu ds - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \omega_{k,\varepsilon}} A(M_k^\varepsilon) \nabla_\xi X_{k,\varepsilon} \cdot \nabla_\xi X_{k,\varepsilon} d\xi \\
& = (2 - n) K_{k,\varepsilon} \operatorname{mes} \partial B_1(0) \det^{\frac{1}{2}} A(M_k^\varepsilon) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \omega_{k,\varepsilon}} A(M_k^\varepsilon) \nabla_\xi X_{k,\varepsilon} \cdot \nabla_\xi X_{k,\varepsilon} d\xi.
\end{aligned}$$

We also assume that η is so that $\eta^{n-2}\varepsilon^{-2}\varkappa^{-1} = 1$ for all ε and that the choice $\lambda = \lambda_0 = 0$ ensures the solvability of both perturbed and limiting problems (2.7), (2.19) as well as of the following auxiliary boundary problem:

$$(-\Delta + \gamma\beta_\varepsilon)\tilde{u}_0 = f \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad \tilde{u}_0 = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \quad (5.50)$$

Since the function β_ε is piece-wise constant, non-negative and is uniformly bounded due its definition and (3.11), the above problem is solvable in $W_2^2(\Omega)$ and its solution also satisfies estimate (3.37). Then we can replace the function u_0 and problem (2.19) by \tilde{u}_0 and problem (5.50) and reproduce all calculations in Section 5.1 up to (5.24), (5.25). In the right hand side of identity (5.24) then the first term vanishes

and this removes the term $\|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}}$ from (5.35), (5.36). In this way we get a modification of estimate (2.22):

$$\|u_\varepsilon - \Xi_\varepsilon \tilde{u}_0\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \leq C(\varepsilon + (\varepsilon\eta\kappa\mu_1)^{-1} + \varepsilon\eta\kappa\mu_2)\|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)}.$$

Therefore, it is sufficient to prove that

$$\|\tilde{u}_0 - u_0\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \geq C\|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}}\|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \quad (5.51)$$

for some f to show the sharpness of the term $\|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}}$ in (2.22). If $\|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}} = 0$, then the above inequality is obvious.

Assume that $\|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}} \neq 0$ but $\beta = 0$. Then it follows from definition (2.12) of the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{M}}$ that there exist two non-zero functions $u^\varepsilon \in W_2^2(\Omega) \cap \dot{W}_2^1(\Omega)$ and $\phi^\varepsilon \in \dot{W}_2^1(\Omega)$ such that

$$|(\beta_\varepsilon u^\varepsilon, \phi^\varepsilon)_{L_2(\Omega)}| \geq \frac{1}{2}\|\beta_\varepsilon\|_{\mathfrak{M}}\|u^\varepsilon\|_{W_2^2(\Omega)}, \quad \|\phi^\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\Omega)} = 1. \quad (5.52)$$

The space $W_2^2(\Omega) \cap \dot{W}_2^1(\Omega)$ is dense in $\dot{W}_2^1(\Omega)$ and without loss of generality we can suppose that ϕ^ε belongs also to $W_2^2(\Omega)$. Since the function ϕ^ε vanishes on $\partial\Omega$, it satisfies the estimate

$$\|\nabla\phi^\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \geq c_3\|\phi_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega)}$$

with some absolute positive constant c_3 depending on the domain Ω only. Hence, in view of the above normalization of the function ϕ^ε ,

$$1 = \|\phi_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\Omega)} \leq (1 + c_3^{-1})\|\nabla\phi^\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega)}. \quad (5.53)$$

We choose $f := (-\Delta + \gamma\beta_\varepsilon)u^\varepsilon$ and we see that $\tilde{u}_0 = u^\varepsilon$ solves problem (5.50). Using the corresponding solution u_0 to problem (2.19) with $\beta = 0$, we define $v^\varepsilon := \tilde{u}_0 - u_0$. Then we write the integral identities associated with problems (5.50), (2.19) with ϕ^ε as the test function and calculate their difference. This gives the identity:

$$(\beta_\varepsilon u^\varepsilon, \phi^\varepsilon)_{L_2(\Omega)} = -(\nabla v^\varepsilon, \nabla\phi^\varepsilon)_{L_2(\Omega)}.$$

Hence, by (5.52),

$$|(\nabla v^\varepsilon, \nabla\phi^\varepsilon)_{L_2(\Omega)}| \geq \frac{1}{2}\|\beta_\varepsilon\|_{\mathfrak{M}}\|u^\varepsilon\|_{W_2^2(\Omega)}. \quad (5.54)$$

We can equip the space $\dot{W}_2^1(\Omega)$ by an equivalent scalar product $(\nabla\cdot, \nabla\cdot)_{L_2(\Omega)}$ and then the above inequality and (5.53) yield:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla v^\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega)} &\geq |(\nabla v^\varepsilon, \nabla\phi^\varepsilon)_{L_2(\Omega)}| \|\nabla\phi^\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \geq \frac{c_3}{2(1+c_3)}\|\beta_\varepsilon\|_{\mathfrak{M}}\|u^\varepsilon\|_{W_2^2(\Omega)}\|\nabla\phi^\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \\ &\geq \frac{c_3}{2(1+C\gamma)(1+c_3)}\|\beta_\varepsilon\|_{\mathfrak{M}}\|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.55)$$

where C comes from (3.11). The obtained inequality proves (5.51). Since

$$(\nabla v^\varepsilon, \nabla\phi^\varepsilon)_{L_2(\Omega)} = -(v^\varepsilon, \Delta\phi^\varepsilon)_{L_2(\Omega)},$$

it also follows from (5.54) that

$$|(v^\varepsilon, \Delta\phi^\varepsilon)_{L_2(\Omega)}| \geq \frac{1}{2}\|\beta_\varepsilon\|_{\mathfrak{M}}\|u^\varepsilon\|_{W_2^2(\Omega)}.$$

Taking then into consideration an obvious inequality

$$\|\nabla\phi^\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \leq c_4\|\Delta\phi^\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega)}$$

with some absolute constant c_4 depending only on the domain Ω and proceeding as in (5.55), we obtain:

$$\|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \geq C \|\beta_\varepsilon\|_{\mathfrak{M}} \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)}$$

with some constant C independent of f and ε . This proves the sharpness of the term $\|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}}$ in estimate (2.23).

In order to prove the sharpness of the term $|\eta^{n-2}\varepsilon^{-2}\varkappa^{-1} - \gamma|$ in estimates (2.22), (2.23), we proceed in a similar way. Namely, assuming that $\eta^{n-2}\varepsilon^{-2}\varkappa^{-1}$ does not coincide with its limit γ , now we define \tilde{u}_0 as a solution to the problem

$$(-\Delta + \alpha\beta_0)\tilde{u}_0 = f \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad \tilde{u}_0 = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \quad (5.56)$$

with $\alpha := \eta^{n-2}\varepsilon^{-2}\varkappa^{-1}$. Then we can again reproduce the calculations from Section 5.1 skipping just identities (5.18) and replacing γ by $\eta^{n-2}\varepsilon^{-2}\varkappa^{-1}$ in all relations after (5.18). This gives the estimates

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_\varepsilon - \Xi_\varepsilon \tilde{u}_0\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)} &\leq C(\varepsilon + \|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}} + (\varepsilon\eta\varkappa\mu_1)^{-1} + \varepsilon\eta\varkappa\mu_2) \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)}, \\ \|u_\varepsilon - \tilde{u}_0\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)} &\leq C(\varepsilon + \|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}} + (\varepsilon\eta\varkappa\mu_1)^{-1} + \varepsilon\eta\varkappa\mu_2) \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

At the same time, it is easy to see that the solution of problem (5.56) is analytic in α and for $\alpha = \gamma$, this solution coincides with the solution u_0 to homogenized problem (2.19). Hence, in the general situation, the next-to-leading term in the Taylor expansion of \tilde{u}_0 in $\alpha - \gamma$ is non-zero and the estimates

$$\|u_0 - \tilde{u}_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \leq C|\alpha - \gamma| \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)}, \quad \|u_0 - \tilde{u}_0\|_{W_2^1(\Omega)} \leq C|\alpha - \gamma| \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)},$$

are order sharp. In particular, we can calculate the norms in their left hand sides over the set $\{x \in \Omega : \Xi_\varepsilon(x) = 1\}$ and this proves that the term $|\eta^{n-2}\varepsilon^{-2}\varkappa^{-1} - \gamma|$ in estimates (2.22), (2.23) is order sharp.

We proceed to checking the sharpness of other terms in (2.22) and (2.24). We are going to do this by adducing an appropriate example. We let $\square := [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^n$, $\omega := B_1(0)$ and $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^n$. Here it is convenient to count the points M_k^ε by a multi-index $k \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ and the set \mathbb{M}^ε and points M_k^ε are introduced as

$$\mathbb{M}^\varepsilon := \{k \in \mathbb{Z}^n : \varepsilon k + \varepsilon \square \subset \Omega\}, \quad M_k^\varepsilon := \varepsilon k.$$

In this case, we deal with a periodic perforation in Ω . Each cavity is ball of the radius $\varepsilon\eta$ centered at a point εk , $k \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, and hence,

$$\theta^\varepsilon = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^n} B_{\varepsilon\eta}(k), \quad \Omega^\varepsilon = \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \theta^\varepsilon. \quad (5.57)$$

The differential expression is chosen to be the negative Laplacian, $\mathcal{L} := -\Delta$. We first consider the case of only Dirichlet conditions on the boundaries of the cavities, that is, $\mathbb{M}_R^\varepsilon = \emptyset$ and $\mathbb{M}_D^\varepsilon = \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon$. It is clear that we can take $\lambda_0 = -1$. We choose $R_2 := 2$, $R_3 := \frac{1}{5}$, $R_4 := \frac{1}{3}$, $R_5 := \frac{3}{8}$.

The functions $X_{k,\varepsilon}$ for the considered model can be found explicitly

$$X_{k,\varepsilon}(\xi) = \begin{cases} 1 - |\xi|^{-n+2}, & n \geq 3, \\ \ln |\xi|, & n = 2, \end{cases} \quad (5.58)$$

The corresponding function β_ε given by (2.17) then is $\varepsilon\square$ -periodic and reads as $\beta_\varepsilon(x) = \beta_0(x\varepsilon^{-1})$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_0(\zeta) &:= \frac{(n-2)}{R_3^n \text{mes } B_1(0)} && \text{on } B_{R_3}(k), \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}^n, \quad n \geq 3, \\ \beta_0(\zeta) &:= \frac{1}{R_3^2 \text{mes } B_1(0)} && \text{on } B_{R_3}(k), \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}^n, \quad n = 2, \\ \beta_0(\zeta) &:= 0 && \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^n} B_{R_3}(k). \end{aligned} \quad (5.59)$$

By $Y_0 = Y_0(\zeta)$ we denote the \square -periodic solution to the following boundary value problem

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta_\zeta Y_0 &= \beta_0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathbb{Z}^n, \\ Y_0(\zeta) &= -\frac{1}{|\zeta - k|^{n-2}} + O(|\zeta - k|), \quad \zeta \rightarrow k, \quad n \geq 3, \\ Y_0(\zeta) &= \ln |\zeta - k| + O(|\zeta - k|), \quad \zeta \rightarrow k, \quad n = 2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.60)$$

It is easy to see that this problem satisfies the standard solvability condition; the uniqueness of the solution is ensured by the order of the error terms in the prescribed asymptotics.

Given an arbitrary infinitely differentiable function $\tilde{u}_0 = \tilde{u}_0(x)$, we denote

$$\begin{aligned} f &:= (-\Delta + \eta^{n-2} \varepsilon^{-2} \varkappa^{-1} \beta_\varepsilon - \lambda) \tilde{u}_0 \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d), \\ U_\varepsilon(x) &:= \left(1 + \eta^{n-2}(\varepsilon) \varkappa^{-1}(\varepsilon) Y_0\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right)\right) \tilde{u}_0(x). \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (5.60) that the function U_ε solves the boundary value problem

$$\begin{aligned} (-\Delta - \lambda)U_\varepsilon &= f + f_\varepsilon \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \theta^\varepsilon, \quad U_\varepsilon = \eta^{n-2} \varkappa^{-1} \varphi_D^\varepsilon \quad \text{on } \theta^\varepsilon, \\ f_\varepsilon(x) &:= \eta^{n-2}(\varepsilon) \varkappa^{-1}(\varepsilon) (-\Delta - \lambda) \tilde{u}_0 - 2\eta^{n-2}(\varepsilon) \varkappa^{-1}(\varepsilon) \nabla Y_0\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) \cdot \nabla \tilde{u}_0(x), \\ \varphi_D^\varepsilon(x) &:= \left(Y_0\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) + \eta^{-n+2}(\varepsilon) \varkappa(\varepsilon)\right) \tilde{u}_0(x). \end{aligned} \quad (5.61)$$

By straightforward calculations we confirm that

$$\begin{aligned} f_\varepsilon(x) &= \eta^{n-2}(\varepsilon) \varkappa^{-1}(\varepsilon) f_{\varepsilon,0}(x) - 2\eta^{n-2}(\varepsilon) \varkappa^{-1}(\varepsilon) \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial f_{\varepsilon,j}}{\partial x_j}(x), \\ f_{\varepsilon,0}(x) &:= Y_0\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) (\Delta - \lambda) \tilde{u}_0(x), \quad f_{\varepsilon,j}(x) := Y_0\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) \frac{\partial \tilde{u}_0}{\partial x_j}(x). \end{aligned}$$

By $\chi_3 = \chi_3(\zeta, \eta)$ we denote an infinitely differentiable \square -periodic cut-off function equalling to one as $|\zeta - k| \leq 2\eta$ and vanishing as $|\zeta - k| \geq 3\eta$ for $k \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ and obeying the uniform estimate $|\nabla_\zeta \chi_3(\zeta, \eta)| \leq C\eta^{-1}$ with a constant C independent of ζ and η . The function

$$\tilde{\varphi}_D^\varepsilon(x) := \varphi_D^\varepsilon(x) \chi_3\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right)$$

multiplied by $\eta^{n-2} \varkappa^{-1}$ satisfies the boundary condition in (5.61). Then we consider the solution u_ε to problem (2.7) with the introduced function f and in a standard way we get the estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} \|U_\varepsilon - u_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \theta^\varepsilon)} &\leq C \left(\eta^{n-2} \varkappa^{-1} \|\tilde{\varphi}_D^\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \theta^\varepsilon)} + \eta^{n-2} \varkappa^{-1} \|f_{\varepsilon,0}\|_{L_2(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \theta^\varepsilon)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \eta^{n-2} \varkappa^{-1} \varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^n \|f_{\varepsilon,j}\|_{L_2(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \theta^\varepsilon)} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (5.62)$$

where C is a fixed constant independent of ε , η , f_ε , $\tilde{\varphi}_D^\varepsilon$.

In view of the asymptotics for Y_0 in (5.60) and the smoothness of this function, it is easy to see that

$$\eta^{n-2} \varkappa^{-1} \|\tilde{\varphi}_D^\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \theta^\varepsilon)} \leq C(\eta^{n-2} \varkappa^{-1} + \varrho), \quad (5.63)$$

where C is some constant independent of ε and η but depending on the choice of the function \tilde{u}_0 . In the same way we find that

$$\sum_{j=0}^n \|f_{\varepsilon,j}\|_{L_2(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \theta^\varepsilon)} \leq C(\eta^{n-2} \varkappa^{-1} + \varrho),$$

where C is a constant independent of ε but depending on the choice of the function \tilde{u}_0 . Substituting these estimates and (5.63) into (5.62), we obtain:

$$\|U_\varepsilon - u_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \theta^\varepsilon)} \leq C(\eta^{n-2}\varkappa^{-1} + \varrho), \quad (5.64)$$

where C is some constant independent of ε but depending on \tilde{u}_0 .

The function Ξ_ε defined by (2.20) with the functions $X_{k,\varepsilon}$ from (5.58) reads as

$$\Xi_\varepsilon(x) := \begin{cases} \frac{1 - \left|\frac{x}{\varepsilon} - k\right|^{-n+2} \eta^{n-2}}{1 - \left(\frac{8\eta}{3}\right)^{n-2}} & \text{in } B_{\frac{3}{8}\varepsilon}(\varepsilon k) \setminus B_{\varepsilon\eta}(\varepsilon k), \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}^n, \\ 1 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon} B_{\frac{3}{8}\varepsilon}(\varepsilon k), \end{cases}$$

as $n \geq 3$, and

$$\Xi_\varepsilon(x) := \begin{cases} \frac{\ln \left|\frac{x}{\varepsilon} - k\right| - \ln \eta}{\ln \frac{3}{8}\eta} & \text{in } B_{\frac{3}{8}\varepsilon}(\varepsilon k) \setminus B_{\varepsilon\eta}(\varepsilon k), \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}^n, \\ 1 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon} B_{\frac{3}{8}\varepsilon}(\varepsilon k), \end{cases}$$

as $n = 2$. As above, by straightforward calculations we easily confirm that

$$\|\nabla(U_\varepsilon - \Xi_\varepsilon \tilde{u}_0)\|_{L_2(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \theta^\varepsilon)} \geq C\eta^{n-2}\varepsilon^{-1}\varkappa^{-1}, \quad (5.65)$$

$$\|\nabla(U_\varepsilon - \tilde{u}_0)\|_{L_2(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \theta^\varepsilon)} \geq C\eta^{\frac{n}{2}-1}\varepsilon^{-1}\varkappa^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (5.66)$$

provided $|u_0|$ is uniformly separated from zero on some fixed ball.

It is clear that the function \tilde{u}_0 solves the equation

$$(-\Delta + \eta^{n-2}\varepsilon^{-2}\varkappa^{-1}\beta_\varepsilon - \lambda)\tilde{u}_0 = f \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d$$

and hence, as in the first part of section, by reproducing the arguing from Section 5.1, the solution u_ε to the corresponding equation in (2.7) satisfies the modified versions of estimates (2.22), (2.23):

$$\|u_\varepsilon - \tilde{u}_0 \Xi_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \theta^\varepsilon)} \leq C\varepsilon \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)},$$

where C is some constant independent of ε and f . If $\eta^{n-2}\varepsilon^{-2}\varkappa^{-1} \equiv \gamma$, then by this estimate, inequalities (5.64), (5.65), definition (2.21) of ϱ and condition (2.18) we see that the term ε in the right hand side of (2.22) is order sharp. As $\gamma = 0$, the solution u_0 to the equation

$$(-\Delta - \lambda)u_0 = f \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d$$

obviously satisfies the estimate

$$\|\tilde{u}_0 - u_0\|_{W_2^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C\eta^{n-2}\varepsilon^{-2}\varkappa^{-1}$$

and in view of (5.64), (5.66), (2.21), (2.18) we also see that the term $\eta^{\frac{n}{2}-1}\varepsilon^{-1}\varkappa^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ in the right hand side of (2.24) is order sharp.

Let us show that the term $\varepsilon\eta\varkappa\mu_2$ in (2.22) is order sharp. Here we again consider the example of negative Laplacian in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \theta^\varepsilon$ with the perforation defined by (5.57), but on the boundaries of the cavities we impose the Robin condition

$$\frac{\partial u_\varepsilon}{\partial \nu} + (\varepsilon^{-1}\eta^{-1} + \mu_2)u_\varepsilon = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\theta^\varepsilon, \quad a^\varepsilon(x, u) = (\varepsilon^{-1}\eta^{-1} + \mu_2)u, \quad b_k = 1.$$

The functions $X_{k,\varepsilon}$ can be again found explicitly

$$X_{k,\varepsilon}(\xi) = \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{|\xi|^{-n+2}}{n-1}, & n \geq 3, \\ \ln|\xi| + 1, & n = 2. \end{cases}$$

The corresponding function β_ε then again reads as $\beta_\varepsilon(x) = \beta_0(x\varepsilon^{-1})$, where the function β_0 is defined by the formula

$$\beta_0(\zeta) := \frac{(n-2)}{(n-1)R_3^n \text{mes } B_1(0)} \quad \text{on } B_{R_3}(k), \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}^n, \quad n \geq 3,$$

and by the second and third formulae in (5.59). We suppose that $\eta^{n-2}\varepsilon^{-2}\varkappa^{-1} \equiv 1$ for all ε .

By u_ε we define the solution to problem (2.7) for an arbitrary μ_2 , while $u_\varepsilon^{(0)}$ is the solution to the same problem for $\mu_2 = 0$. Both these solutions converge to the same solution u_0 of the homogenized problem (2.19). The function u_ε satisfies estimate (2.22), while the function $u_\varepsilon^{(0)}$ satisfies the same estimate with $\mu_2 = 0$. This is why, in order to prove that the term $\varepsilon\eta\mu_2$ is order sharp in estimate (2.22), it is sufficient to find an example of the function f such that

$$\|u_\varepsilon - u_\varepsilon^{(0)}\|_{L_2(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \theta^\varepsilon)} \geq C\varepsilon\eta\mu_2\|f\|_{L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)}. \quad (5.67)$$

We choose an arbitrary infinitely differentiable compactly supported in \mathbb{R}^n function $u_0 = u_0(x)$ and we choose the aforementioned function f as $f := (-\Delta + \beta - \lambda)u_0$. Then we define:

$$\begin{aligned} U_\varepsilon(x) &:= u_\varepsilon^{(0)}(x) + \varepsilon\eta^{n-1}(\varepsilon)\mu_2(\varepsilon)Y_1\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right)u_0(x), \\ Y_1 &:= \frac{1}{n-1}Y_0, \quad n \geq 3, \quad Y_1 := Y_0 - \ln \eta, \quad n = 2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.68)$$

This function solves the following boundary value problem:

$$\begin{aligned} (-\Delta - \lambda)U_\varepsilon &= f + f_\varepsilon && \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \theta^\varepsilon, \\ \frac{\partial U_\varepsilon}{\partial \nu} + (\varepsilon^{-1}\eta^{-1} + \mu_2)U_\varepsilon &= \varphi_R^\varepsilon && \text{on } \partial\theta^\varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} f_\varepsilon(x) &= f_{\varepsilon,0}(x) - 2 \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial f_{\varepsilon,j}}{\partial x_j}(x), \\ f_{\varepsilon,0}(x) &:= \varepsilon\eta^{n-1}\mu_2 Y_1\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right)(\Delta - \lambda)u_0(x), \quad f_{\varepsilon,j}(x) := \varepsilon\eta^{n-1}\mu_2 Y_1\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) \frac{\partial u_0}{\partial x_j}(x), \\ \varphi_R^\varepsilon(x) &:= \varepsilon\eta^{n-1} Y_1\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} + \mu_2(\varepsilon)\right) u_0(x) + \varepsilon\eta^{n-1} u_0(x) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} + \varepsilon^{-1}\eta^{-1}\right) Y_2\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) \\ &\quad + \mu_2(\varepsilon)(u_\varepsilon^{(0)}(x) - u_0(x)), \\ Y_2(\zeta) &:= \frac{1}{n-1}(Y_0(\zeta) + \eta^{-n+2}), \quad n \geq 3, \quad Y_2(\zeta) := Y_1(\zeta), \quad n = 2. \end{aligned}$$

Writing then a problem for $U_\varepsilon - u_0$ and an associated integral identity with $U_\varepsilon - u_0$ as the test function and using (3.1), we obtain an analogue of inequality (5.62):

$$\|U_\varepsilon - u_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \theta^\varepsilon)} \leq C \left(\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} \varkappa^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\varphi_R^\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\partial\theta^\varepsilon)} + \sum_{j=0}^n \|f_{\varepsilon,j}\|_{L_2(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \theta^\varepsilon)} \right), \quad (5.69)$$

where C is some constant independent of ε , φ_R^ε and $f_{\varepsilon,j}$, $j = 0, \dots, n$. Using (3.1), (3.37), the asymptotics for Y_0 in (5.60) and the definition of the function Y_2 , we find:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varphi_R^\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\partial\theta^\varepsilon)} &\leq C((\varepsilon\eta\kappa\mu_2 + \eta^{n-1})\|u_0\|_{L_2(\partial\theta^\varepsilon)} + \varepsilon\eta\kappa\|\nabla u_0\|_{L_2(\partial\theta^\varepsilon)} + \mu_2\|u_\varepsilon^{(0)} - u_0\|_{L_2(\partial\theta^\varepsilon)}) \\ &\leq C(\varepsilon\eta\kappa)^{\frac{1}{2}}((\varepsilon\eta\kappa\mu_2 + \varepsilon\eta\kappa)\|f\|_{L_2(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \mu_2\|u_\varepsilon^{(0)} - u_0\|_{W_2^1(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \theta^\varepsilon)}), \end{aligned} \quad (5.70)$$

where C is some constant independent of ε , u_0 , $u_\varepsilon^{(0)}$. The functions $f_{\varepsilon,j}$ can be estimated as follows:

$$\|f_{\varepsilon,j}\|_{L_2(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \theta^\varepsilon)} \leq C\varepsilon\eta\mu_2(\eta^{n-2} + \varrho)\|u_0\|_{C^2(\text{supp } u_0)}, \quad j = 0, \dots, n,$$

where C is some constant independent of ε and u_0 . This estimate and (5.70), (5.69) yield:

$$\|U_\varepsilon - u_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \theta^\varepsilon)} \leq C((\varepsilon\eta\kappa\mu_2(\varepsilon\eta\kappa + \eta^{n-2} + \varrho) + \varepsilon^2\eta^2\kappa^2)\|u_0\|_{C^2(\text{supp } u_0)} + \varepsilon\eta\kappa\mu_2\|u_\varepsilon^{(0)} - u_0\|_{W_2^1(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \theta^\varepsilon)}), \quad (5.71)$$

where C is some constant independent of ε , u_0 , $u_\varepsilon^{(0)}$. At the same time, it follows from definition (5.68) of U_ε that provided $|u_0|$ is uniformly separated from zero on some fixed ball, the estimate

$$\|U_\varepsilon - u_\varepsilon^{(0)}\|_{W_2^1(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \theta^\varepsilon)} \geq C\eta^{\frac{n}{2}}\kappa^{\frac{1}{2}}\mu_2 = C\varepsilon\eta\kappa\mu_2$$

holds with some fixed constant C independent of ε , where we have also assumed that $\eta^{\frac{n}{2}-1}\varepsilon^{-1}\kappa^{-\frac{1}{2}} = 1$. This estimate, (5.71) and (2.22) for $\|u_\varepsilon^{(0)} - u_0\|_{W_2^1(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \theta^\varepsilon)}$ prove (5.67) and hence, the term $\varepsilon\eta\kappa\mu_2$ is order sharp in (2.22).

Funding

The work is supported by the Czech Science Foundation within the project 22-18739S.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

Data availability

Not applicable in the manuscript as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

References

- [1] Anné, C., Post, O.: Wildly perturbed manifolds: norm resolvent and spectral convergence. *J. Spectr. Theory* **11**:1, 229–279 (2021).
- [2] Borisov, D.I., Kříž, J.: Operator estimates for non-periodically perforated domains with Dirichlet and nonlinear Robin conditions: vanishing limit. Preprint: arXiv 2204.04829 (2022).
- [3] Borisov, D.I., Mukhametrakhimova, A.I.: Uniform convergence and asymptotics for problems in domains finely perforated along a prescribed manifold in the case of the homogenized Dirichlet condition. *Sb. Math.* **212**:8, 1068–1121 (2021).

- [4] Borisov, D.I., Mukhametrakhimova, A.I.: Norm convergence for problems with perforation along a given manifold with nonlinear Robin condition on boundaries of cavities. Preprint: arXiv:2202.10767 (2022).
- [5] Borisov, D.I.: On operator estimates for planar domains with non-regular curving of boundary: Dirichlet and Neumann condition. *J. Math. Sci.* (2022), to appear
- [6] Borisov, D., Cardone, G., Durante, T.: Homogenization and uniform resolvent convergence for elliptic operators in a strip perforated along a curve. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh. Sec. A. Math.* **146**:6, 1115–1158 (2016).
- [7] Díaz, J. I., Gómez-Castro, D., Shaposhnikova, T. A.: Nonlinear reaction-diffusion processes for nanocomposites: anomalous improved homogenization. De Gruyter, Berlin, 2021.
- [8] Dubinskii, Yu.A.: Nonlinear elliptic and parabolic equations. *J. Math. Sci.*, **12**:5, 475–554 (1979).
- [9] Jikov, V.V., Kozlov, S.M., Oleinik, O.A.: Homogenization of differential operators. *Fiziko-Matematicheskaya Literatura, Moscow* (1993). (in Russian).
- [10] Khrabustovskiy, A., Plum, M.: Operator estimates for homogenization of the Robin Laplacian in a perforated domain. Preprint: arXiv:2106.10216 (2021).
- [11] Khrabustovskiy, A., Post, O.: Operator estimates for the crushed ice problem. *Asymp. Anal.* **110**(3-4), 137–161 (2018).
- [12] Marchenko, V.A., Khruslov, E.Ya.: Boundary value problems in domains with a fine-grained boundary, *Naukova Dumka, Kiev*, (1974). (in Russian).
- [13] Marchenko, V.A., Khruslov, E.Ya.: Homogenization of partial differential equations. Birkhäuser, Boston (2006).
- [14] Mikhailov V.P.: Partial differential equations. Mir Publ., Moscow (1978).
- [15] Oleinik, O.A., Iosifyan, G.A., Shamaev, A.S.: Mathematical problems in elasticity and homogenization. North- Holland, Amsterdam (1992).
- [16] Pastukhova, S.E.: Resolvent approximations in L_2 -norm for elliptic operators acting in a perforated space. *Contem. Math. Fund. Direct.* **66**:2, 314–334 (2020). (in Russian).
- [17] Pastukhova S.E.: Homogenization estimates for singularly perturbed operators. *J. Math. Sci.* **251**:5, 724–747 (2020).
- [18] Pastukhova S.E: L_2 -approximation of resolvents in homogenization of higher order elliptic operators. *J. Math. Sci.* **251**:6, 902–925 (2020).
- [19] Pastukhova S.E.: L_2 -approximation of resolvents in homogenization of fourth-order elliptic operators. *Sb. Math.* **212**:1, 111–134 (2020).
- [20] Senik N.N.: Homogenization for non-self-adjoint periodic elliptic operators on an infinite cylinder. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* 49:2, 874–898 (2017).
- [21] Senik N.N.: Homogenization for locally periodic elliptic operators. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **505**:2, id 125581 (2021).
- [22] Suslina, T.A.: Spectral approach to homogenization of elliptic operators in a perforated space. *Rev. Math. Phys.* **30**:08, 1840016 (2018).

- [23] Vainberg, M.M.: Variational method and method of monotone operators in the theory of nonlinear equations. A Halsted Press Book, New York-Toronto; John Wiley & Sons; Jerusalem- London. (1973).
- [24] Zhikov, V.V.: Spectral method in homogenization theory. Proc. Steklov Inst. Math. **250**, 85–94 (2005).