

A GEOMETRIC RESULT FOR COMPOSITE MATERIALS WITH $C^{1,\gamma}$ -BOUNDARIES

YOUNG KIM AND PILSOO SHIN

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we obtain a geometric result for composite materials related to elliptic and parabolic partial differential equations. In the classical papers [13, 14], they assumed that for any scale and for any point there exists a coordinate system such that the boundaries of the individual components of a composite material locally become $C^{1,\gamma}$ -graphs. We prove that if the individual components of a composite material are composed of $C^{1,\gamma}$ -boundaries then such a coordinate system in [13, 14] exists, and therefore obtaining the gradient boundedness and the piecewise gradient Hölder continuity results for linear elliptic systems related to composite materials.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we study a geometric property of composite materials related to elliptic and parabolic partial differential equations. The classical results [13, 14] obtained gradient boundedness and gradient Hölder continuity of the weak solutions to linear elliptic equations and systems related to composite materials under the assumption that for any scale and for any point there exists a coordinate system such that the boundaries of the individual components become $C^{1,\gamma}$ -graphs. A natural question then arises, “for a composite material, if the individual components are composed of $C^{1,\gamma}$ -boundaries then this geometry satisfies the assumption in [13, 14]?”. For this geometry, we prove that for any scale and for any point there exists a coordinate system such that the boundaries of the individual component become $C^{1,\gamma}$ -graphs.

A typical composite material $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ ($n \geq 2$) composed of $C^{1,\gamma}$ -boundaries can be described as the following. Let $D_m \subset U$ be a connected component in U and $U_2, \dots, U_m \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be the connected components contained in D_1 . Without loss of generality, we may assume that $D_1 \cup (U_2 \cup \dots \cup U_m)$, U_2, \dots, U_m are open. Then one can find an open set $U_1 \subset U$ satisfying $D_1 = U_1 \setminus (U_2 \cup \dots \cup U_m)$. If U_1, U_2, \dots, U_l are $C^{1,\gamma}$ -domains then we may say that D_1 is composed of $C^{1,\gamma}$ -boundaries. Moreover, for any $U_i, U_j \in \{U_1, \dots, U_m\}$ one of the followings holds: (1) $U_i \subset U_j$ (2) $U_j \subset U_i$ (3) $U_i \cap U_j = \emptyset$. With the observation in this paragraph, we define $C^{1,\gamma}$ -class composite domains in Definition 1.2. Before stating Definition 1.2, we introduce the following notations.

- (1) $x' = (x^2, \dots, x^n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ and $x = (x^1, x') \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$.
- (2) $B_r(y) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x - y| < r\}$, $B'_r(y') = \{x' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} : |x' - y'| < r\}$ and $Q_r(y) = (y^1 - r, y^1 + r) \times B'_r(y')$.

Date: June 17, 2022.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 74A40, 26B10, Secondary 35J47, 35B65.

Key words and phrases. Composite materials, Coordinate transformation, Regularity, Linear elliptic systems.

- (3) $B_r = B_r(\mathbf{0})$, $B'_r = B'_r(\mathbf{0}')$ and $Q_r = Q_r(\mathbf{0})$
- (4) $A = A_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup A_i$ means that $A = A_1 \cup \cdots \cup A_i$ and A_1, \dots, A_i are mutually disjoint.
- (5) e_i denotes the vector with one 1 in the i -th coordinate and 0's elsewhere, say $e_1 = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$, \dots , $e_n = (0, \dots, 0, 1)$.
- (6) For the matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, let M^T be the transpose of M . Also we denote

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} M_1 \\ \vdots \\ M_m \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} M_{11} & \cdots & M_{1n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ M_{m1} & \cdots & M_{mn} \end{pmatrix} \text{ for } M_i \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n}.$$

Definition 1.1. For $n \geq 2$, $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a $(C^{1,\gamma}, R, \theta)$ -domain, if for any $B_R(y)$ with $B_R(y) \cap \partial U \neq \emptyset$ there exists x -coordinate system and $C^{1,\gamma}$ -function $\psi : B'_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$U \cap B_R(y) = \{x \in B_R : x^1 > \psi(x')\} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\psi\|_{C^{1,\gamma}(B'_R)} \leq \theta$$

where y is the origin in the new x -coordinate system.

Definition 1.2. For $n \geq 2$, $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a composite $(C^{1,\gamma}, R, \theta)$ -domain with subdomains $\{U_1, \dots, U_K\}$ if

- (a) $U_0 := U$ and $\{U_1, \dots, U_K\}$ are $(C^{1,\gamma}, R, \theta)$ -domains
- (b) one of the following holds for any U_i, U_j ($i, j \in \{0, \dots, K\}$, $i \neq j$):

$$(1.1) \quad (1) U_i \subsetneq U_j \quad (2) U_j \subsetneq U_i \quad (3) U_i \cap U_j = \emptyset.$$

Then for the family of set $S = \{U_0 := U, U_1, \dots, U_K\}$,

$$(1.2) \quad W_j = U_j \setminus \left(\bigcup_{U_i \in S, U_i \subsetneq U_j} U_i \right)$$

represents an individual component in U_j . Also $\bigcup_{U_i \in S, U_i \subsetneq U_j} U_i$ represents the union of the components contained in U_j except W_j . So the coefficient of an elliptic equation on composite material U can be written by

$$a_{ij} = \sum_{0 \leq k \leq K} a_{ij}^k \chi_{W_k}$$

where a_{ij}^k represent the physical property of the material in component W_k . In this paper we prove that for any B_R , there exists a coordinate system such that $W_j \cap B_R$ ($j \in \{0, \dots, K\}$) can be described by $C^{1,\gamma}$ -functions as in the following theorems. We first state the interior result.

Theorem 1.3. For any $\tau \in (0, 1]$, one can find $R_0 = R_0(n, \gamma, \theta, \tau) \in (0, 1]$ so that the following holds for any $R \in (0, R_0]$. Suppose that $U \supset B_R$ is a composite $(C^{1,\gamma}, 80R, \theta)$ -domain with subdomains $\{U_1, \dots, U_K\}$. Let

$$S = \{U_0 := U, U_1, \dots, U_K, U_{K+1} := \emptyset\}$$

and

$$W_j = U_j \setminus \left(\bigcup_{U_i \in S, U_i \subsetneq U_j} U_i \right) \quad (j \in \{0, \dots, K\}).$$

Then there exist y -coordinate system and $C^{1,\gamma}$ -functions $\varphi_{-m}, \dots, \varphi_{l+1} : B'_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ($l, m \geq 0$) satisfying

$$(1.3) \quad U \cap B_R = (W_{i_{-m}} \sqcup \dots \sqcup W_{i_l}) \cap B_R$$

and

$$(1.4) \quad \begin{aligned} & \{(y^1, y') \in B_R : \varphi_d(y') < y^1 < \varphi_{d+1}(y')\} \\ & \subset W_{i_d} \cap B_R \\ & \subset \{(y^1, y') \in B_R : \varphi_d(y') \leq y^1 \leq \varphi_{d+1}(y')\} \end{aligned}$$

with the estimates

$$(1.5) \quad \|D_{y'} \varphi_d\|_{L^\infty(B'_R)} \leq \tau \quad \text{and} \quad [D_{y'} \varphi_d]_{C^\gamma(B'_R)} \leq 288n\theta$$

for any $d \in \{-m, \dots, l\}$ where $\varphi_{l+1} \equiv R$ and $\varphi_{-m} \equiv -R$. Moreover, if $B_R \not\subset W_0$ then

$$(1.6) \quad \mathbf{0} \in W_k, \quad (\varphi_k(0'), 0') \in B_R \quad \text{and} \quad D_{y'} \varphi_k(0') = 0'$$

for some $k \in \{-m, \dots, l\}$.

We next state the boundary result. We remark that the general case that $\mathbf{0} \notin \partial U$ can be handled by the case that $\mathbf{0} \in \partial U$ by taking a sufficiently larger ball.

Theorem 1.4. For any $\tau \in (0, 1]$, one can find $R_0 = R_0(n, \gamma, \theta, \tau) \in (0, 1]$ so that the following holds for any $R \in (0, R_0]$. Suppose that U is a composite $(C^{1,\gamma}, 80R, \theta)$ -domain with subdomains $\{U_1, \dots, U_K\}$ and $\mathbf{0} \in \partial U$. Let

$$S = \{U_0 := U, U_1, \dots, U_K, U_{K+1} := \emptyset\}$$

and

$$W_j = U_j \setminus \left(\bigcup_{U_i \in S, U_i \subsetneq U_j} U_i \right) \quad (j \in \{0, \dots, K\}).$$

Then there exist y -coordinate system and $C^{1,\gamma}$ -functions $\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_{l+1} : B'_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ($l \geq 0$) satisfying

$$(1.7) \quad U \cap B_R = (W_{i_0} \sqcup \dots \sqcup W_{i_l}) \cap B_R$$

and

$$(1.8) \quad \begin{aligned} & \{(y^1, y') \in B_R : \varphi_d(y') < y^1 < \varphi_{d+1}(y')\} \\ & \subset W_{i_d} \cap B_R \\ & \subset \{(y^1, y') \in B_R : \varphi_d(y') \leq y^1 \leq \varphi_{d+1}(y')\} \end{aligned}$$

with the estimates

$$(1.9) \quad \|D_{y'} \varphi_d\|_{L^\infty(B'_R)} \leq \tau \quad \text{and} \quad [D_{y'} \varphi_d]_{C^\gamma(B'_R)} \leq 288n\theta$$

for any $d \in \{0, \dots, l\}$ where $\varphi_{l+1} \equiv R$. Moreover, we have that

$$(1.10) \quad \varphi_0(0') = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad D_{y'} \varphi_0(0') = 0'.$$

By Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4, for the coefficients $a_{ij} = \sum_{0 \leq k \leq K} a_{ij}^k \chi_{W_k}$, we have that

$$a_{ij} = \sum_{-m-k \leq d \leq l-k} a_{ij}^{i_{d+k}} \chi_{\varphi_d(y') < y^1 \leq \varphi_{d+1}(y')} \quad \text{a.e. in } U \cap B_R.$$

So one can use Theorem 1.3 and [13, Theorem 1.1] to obtain the following lemma.

Corollary 1.5. *For any $R \in (0, R_0]$ with $R_0 = R_0(n, \gamma, \theta, 1) \in (0, 1]$ in Theorem 1.3, let U be composite $(C^{1,\gamma}, 80R, \theta)$ -domain with subdomains $\{U_1, \dots, U_K\}$. Assume that $A_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ($1 \leq i, j \leq N$, $1 \leq \alpha, \beta \leq n$) satisfy*

$$A_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}(x) \xi_\alpha \xi_\beta \eta^i \eta^j \geq \lambda |\xi|^2 |\eta|^2 \quad (x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n, \eta \in \mathbb{R}^N) \quad \text{and} \quad \|A_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \Lambda.$$

Then for any $\epsilon > 0$ and a weak solution u of

$$\partial_\alpha (A_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}(x) \partial_\beta u^j) = h_i + \partial_\beta g_i^\beta$$

with $A_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} \in C^\mu(\overline{W_k})$, $h_i \in L^\infty(U)$, $g_i^\beta \in C^\mu(\overline{W_k})$ ($i = 1, \dots, N$, $k = 0, \dots, K$) and

$$\gamma' \in \left(0, \min \left\{ \mu, \frac{\gamma}{2(\gamma+1)} \right\} \right],$$

there exists $c = c(n, N, K, \lambda, \Lambda, \mu, \gamma, \epsilon, \|A\|_{C^{\gamma'}(\overline{W_i})}, \theta)$ such that

$$\sum_{0 \leq k \leq K} \|u\|_{C^{1,\gamma'}(\overline{W_k} \cap U_\epsilon)} \leq c \left(\|u\|_{L^2(U)} + \|h\|_{L^\infty(U)} + \sum_{0 \leq k \leq K} \|g\|_{C^{\gamma'}(\overline{W_k})} \right),$$

and

$$\|Du\|_{L^\infty(U_\epsilon)} \leq c \left(\|u\|_{L^2(U)} + \|h\|_{L^\infty(U)} + \sum_{0 \leq k \leq K} \|g\|_{C^{\gamma'}(\overline{W_k})} \right),$$

where

$$U_\epsilon = \{x \in U : \text{dist}(x, \partial U) > \epsilon\}.$$

We explain the main idea of this paper. For $C^{1,\gamma}$ -domain U_1 , there exists y -coordinate system such that $U_1 \cap B_R = \{y \in B_R : y^1 > \psi(y')\}$ for some $C^{1,\gamma}$ -function $\psi : B'_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Then for $C^{1,\gamma}$ -domain U_2 with $U_1 \cap U_2 = \emptyset$, by [8, Lemma 2.4], the normals on ∂U_1 and ∂U_2 are almost opposite in B_R if $R > 0$ is sufficiently small. So by using the implicit function theorem, one can find $C^{1,\gamma}$ -function $\varphi : B'_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $U_2 \cap B_R = \{y \in B_R : y^1 < \varphi(y')\}$. By Definition 1.2, one of the followings holds for composite $(C^{1,\gamma}, R, \theta)$ -domains : (1) $U_i \subsetneq U_j$, (2) $U_j \subsetneq U_i$, (3) $U_i \cap U_j = \emptyset$. So we will prove Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4 by applying the argument in this paragraph to $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{U_j}$ and U_i when (1) holds, to $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{U_i}$ and U_j when (2) holds, and to U_i and U_j when (3) holds instead of U_1 and U_2 .

Elliptic and parabolic equations in composite materials have been studied by many researchers, see for instance [1, 2]. For piecewise gradient boundedness and gradient Hölder continuity for linear elliptic equation and systems related to composite $C^{1,\gamma}$ -domain, we refer to [13, 14]. For Lipschitz regularity results for linear laminates, we refer to [3, 4, 5, 6, 7]. Partial regularity result for monotone systems had been obtained in [15]. Gradient L^p -estimates for composite materials had been considered in [8, 9, 10, 16, 17]. Also we refer to [11, 12] for the blow up phenomena when the coefficients of an elliptic equation have critical values.

2. COORDINATE SYSTEM FOR GRAPH FUNCTIONS

The implicit function theorem give the existence of the graph function in a local neighborhood, but does not give an information about the precise size of that neighborhood. To control the size of that neighborhood, we derive Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.2.

Let $S = \{(\psi(x'), x') : x' \in B'_{8R}\}$ be a graph in x -coordinate system. Let y -coordinate system has the orthonormal basis $\{W_1, \dots, W_n\}$ and $O = (W_1^T \dots W_n^T)$. We prove in Lemma 2.1 that if the implicit function theorem can be applied to zO for any $z \in S$ with respect to y^1 -variable which gives a local existence of a graph function with respect to y^1 -variable on $(zO)'$, then one can find a graph function defined in B'_R with respect to y^1 -variable. In Lemma 2.1, a point $z \in S$ in x -coordinate system is represented by zO with respect to y -coordinate system.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\tau \in (0, 1]$, $O \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be an orthonormal matrix with $\det O > 0$ and C^1 -function $\psi : B'_{8R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a given function. Then for the graph*

$$(2.1) \quad S = \{(\psi(x'), x') : x' \in B'_{8R}\} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$$

assume that

$$(2.2) \quad S \cap B_R \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad O_{11} - \sum_{2 \leq j \leq n} O_{j1} D_{x^j} \psi \neq 0 \text{ in } B'_{8R}.$$

Also further assume that for any $z \in S$, there exist ball $U_z \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ and C^1 -function $\varphi_z : U_z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$(2.3) \quad (zO)' \in U_z, \quad (zO)^1 = \varphi_z((zO)'), \quad \|D_{y'} \varphi_z\|_{L^\infty(U_z)} \leq \tau,$$

$$(2.4) \quad (\varphi_z(y'), y') \cdot O_1 - \psi((\varphi_z(y'), y') \cdot O_2, \dots, (\varphi_z(y'), y') \cdot O_n) = 0 \quad (y' \in U_z),$$

and

$$(2.5) \quad \{(\varphi_z(y'), y') : y' \in U_z\} \subset B_{8R}.$$

Then there exists C^1 -function $\varphi : B'_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$(2.6) \quad (\varphi(y'), y') \cdot O_1 - \psi((\varphi(y'), y') \cdot O_2, \dots, (\varphi(y'), y') \cdot O_n) = 0 \quad (y' \in B'_R),$$

$$(2.7) \quad (zO)^1 = \varphi((zO)') \quad (z \in S \cap B_R),$$

$$(2.8) \quad \|D_{y'} \varphi\|_{L^\infty(B'_R)} \leq \tau,$$

and

$$(2.9) \quad \{(\varphi(y'), y') : y' \in B'_R\} \subset B_{8R}.$$

Proof. Let $U = \cup_{z \in S} U_z$. For any $z' \in U$, we define $\phi_{z'} : B'_{\rho_{z'}}(z') \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ in the following way. Since $U = \cup_{z \in S} U_z$, there exists $\tilde{z} \in S$ and $B'_{\rho_{\tilde{z}}}(z')$ such that $B'_{\rho_{z'}}(z') \subset U_{\tilde{z}}$. Then we set

$$(2.10) \quad \phi_{z'} = \varphi_{\tilde{z}} \quad \text{in } B'_{\rho_{z'}}(z').$$

So by (2.3), (2.4) and (2.5), we have that

$$(2.11) \quad \|D_{y'} \phi_{z'}\|_{L^\infty(B'_{\rho_{z'}}(z'))} \leq \|D_{y'} \varphi_{\tilde{z}}\|_{L^\infty(U_{\tilde{z}})} \leq \tau,$$

$$(2.12) \quad (\phi_{z'}(y'), y') \cdot O_1 - \psi((\phi_{z'}(y'), y') \cdot O_2, \dots, (\phi_{z'}(y'), y') \cdot O_n) = 0 \quad \text{in } B'_{\rho_{z'}}(z'),$$

and

$$(2.13) \quad \{(\phi_{z'}(y'), y') : y' \in B'_{\rho_{z'}}(z')\} \subset B_{8R}.$$

We claim that for $z', \tilde{z}' \in U$, if $\phi_{z'} : B'_{\rho_{z'}}(z') \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\phi_{\tilde{z}'} : B'_{\rho_{\tilde{z}'}}(\tilde{z}') \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfy (2.12) for z' and \tilde{z}' respectively then

$$(2.14) \quad \phi_{z'}(y') = \phi_{\tilde{z}'}(y') \text{ for any } y' \in B'_{\rho_{z'}}(z') \cap B'_{\rho_{\tilde{z}'}}(\tilde{z}').$$

Suppose not. Then by (2.12), there exists $z', \tilde{z}' \in l_m$ such that

$$(2.15) \quad \phi_{z'}(y') \neq \phi_{\tilde{z}'}(y') \text{ for some } y' \in B'_{\rho_{z'}}(z') \cap B'_{\rho_{\tilde{z}'}}(\tilde{z}')$$

and

$$(2.16) \quad \begin{aligned} & (\phi_{\tilde{z}'}(y'), y') \cdot O_1 - (\phi_{z'}(y'), y') \cdot O_1 \\ &= \psi((\phi_{\tilde{z}'}(y'), y') \cdot O_2, \dots, (\phi_{\tilde{z}'}(y'), y') \cdot O_n) \\ & \quad - \psi((\phi_{z'}(y'), y') \cdot O_2, \dots, (\phi_{z'}(y'), y') \cdot O_n). \end{aligned}$$

By a direct calculation,

$$\left((\phi_{z'}(y'), y') \cdot O_2, \dots, (\phi_{z'}(y'), y') \cdot O_n \right) = \left((\phi_{z'}(y'), y') O^T \right)',$$

and

$$\left((\phi_{\tilde{z}'}(y'), y') \cdot O_2, \dots, (\phi_{\tilde{z}'}(y'), y') \cdot O_n \right) = \left((\phi_{\tilde{z}'}(y'), y') O^T \right)'.$$

So we find from (2.16) that

$$\begin{aligned} & (\phi_{\tilde{z}'}(y') - \phi_{z'}(y')) \cdot O_{11} \\ &= \int_0^1 \sum_{2 \leq k \leq n} D_{x^k} \psi \left(t((\phi_{\tilde{z}'}(y'), y') O^T)' + (1-t)((\phi_{z'}(y'), y') O^T)' \right) dt \cdot (\phi_{\tilde{z}'}(y') - \phi_{z'}(y')) O_{k1}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$(\phi_{\tilde{z}'}(y') - \phi_{z'}(y')) \cdot \left(O_{11} - \sum_{2 \leq j \leq n} \int_0^1 O_{j1} D_{x^j} \psi \left(t((\phi_{\tilde{z}'}(y'), y') O^T)' + (1-t)((\phi_{z'}(y'), y') O^T)' \right) dt \right) = 0.$$

In view of (2.13), the fact that $z', \tilde{z}' \in B'_R$ gives that for any $t \in [0, 1]$, we have that $(1-t)((\phi_{\tilde{z}'}(y'), y') O^T)' + t((\phi_{z'}(y'), y') O^T)' \in B'_{8R}$. So it follows from (2.2) that

$$\int_0^1 \left(O_{11} - \sum_{2 \leq j \leq n} O_{j1} D_{x^j} \psi \left(t((\phi_{\tilde{z}'}(y'), y') O^T)' + (1-t)((\phi_{z'}(y'), y') O^T)' \right) \right) dt \neq 0,$$

and we obtain $\phi_{\tilde{z}'}(y') = \phi_{z'}(y')$, which contradicts (2.15). So (2.14) follows.

Next, we claim that

$$(2.17) \quad \overline{B'_R} \subset U.$$

Suppose not. Then $\overline{B'_R} \not\subset U$ and there exists a point p' such that

$$(2.18) \quad p' \in U^c \cap \overline{B'_R}.$$

Next, we will choose a point q' in $U \cap \overline{B'_R}$ and a point w' on $\partial U \cap \overline{B'_R}$. By (2.2), there exists $\bar{z} \in S \cap B_R$. From the fact that $\bar{z} \in B_R$,

$$(\bar{z}O)' \in B'_R.$$

Also from the fact that $\bar{z} \in S$,

$$(\bar{z}O)' \in U_{\bar{z}O} \subset U.$$

So by combining the above two inclusions,

$$(2.19) \quad q' := (\bar{z}O)' \in U \cap B'_R.$$

Let $l : [0, 1] \rightarrow \overline{B'_R}$ be the line connecting from q' to p' . Then from (2.18) and (2.19), we find that $l \cap \partial U \neq \emptyset$. Let

$$(2.20) \quad w' \in \overline{B'_R} \cap \partial U$$

be the point which the line l from q' to p' first meets ∂U .

To prove (2.17), we will choose $w^1 \in \mathbb{R}$ so that

$$(2.21) \quad (w^1, w')O^T \in S.$$

If (2.21) holds, then by the fact that $(zO)' \in U_z \subset U$ for any $z \in S$, we have that

$$w' = ((w^1, w')O^T O)' \in U_{(w^1, w')O^T} \subset U,$$

and a contradiction occurs from (2.20). So the claim (2.17) follows. To prove (2.17), we will show (2.21).

Since $w' \in \overline{U} \cap \overline{B'_R} = \overline{U \cap B'_R}$, one can choose a sequence $\{w'_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ so that

$$(2.22) \quad w'_m \in U \cap B'_R \quad \text{and} \quad w'_m \rightarrow w'.$$

For a fixed $w'_m \in U \cap B'_R$, let $l_m \subset U \cap B'_R$ be the line connecting from q' to w'_m . Then for any point $z' \in l_m \subset U$, by (2.11) and (2.12), there exist $B'_{\rho_{z'}}(z') \subset U$ and C^1 -function $\phi_{z'} : B'_{\rho_{z'}}(z') \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$(2.23) \quad (\phi_{z'}(y'), y') \cdot O_1 - \psi((\phi_{z'}(y'), y') \cdot O_2, \dots, (\phi_{z'}(y'), y') \cdot O_n) = 0 \text{ in } B'_{\rho_{z'}}(z')$$

and

$$(2.24) \quad \|D_{y'} \phi_{z'}\|_{L^\infty(B'_{\rho_{z'}}(z'))} \leq \tau.$$

Since $z' \in l_m$ was arbitrary chosen in (2.23) and l_m is compact, by using partition of unity, one can choose functions $\eta_i : B'_{\rho_{z'_i}}(z'_i) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for $i \in [1, I]$ so that

$$\eta_i \in C_c^\infty(B'_{\rho_{z'_i}}(z'_i)), \quad 0 \leq \eta_i \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{1 \leq i \leq I} \eta_i = 1 \text{ on } l_m,$$

where $\phi_{z'_i}$ and $B'_{\rho_{z'_i}}(z'_i)$ in (2.23) chosen for z'_i instead of z' . So we take

$$(2.25) \quad \phi_m = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq I} \phi_{z'_i} \eta_i \quad \text{on } l_m.$$

By (2.23) and (2.14),

$$(2.26) \quad \phi_m = \phi_{z'_i} \quad \text{in } B'_{\rho_{z'_i}}(z'_i).$$

Since $w'_m \in l_m$, we have that

$$(\phi_{w'_m}(w'_m), w'_m) \cdot O_1 - \psi((\phi_{w'_m}(w'_m), w'_m) \cdot O_2, \dots, (\phi_{w'_m}(w'_m), w'_m) \cdot O_n) = 0.$$

So it follows from (2.26) that

$$(2.27) \quad (\phi_m(w'_m), w'_m) \cdot O_1 = \psi((\phi_m(w'_m), w'_m) \cdot O_2, \dots, (\phi_m(w'_m), w'_m) \cdot O_n).$$

By (2.19), we have that $\bar{z} \in S$ and $(\bar{z}O)' = q' \in l_m$. So by (2.10), (2.25) and (2.14),

$$(2.28) \quad (\bar{z}O)^1 = \varphi_{\bar{z}}((\bar{z}O)') = \phi_{q'}((\bar{z}O)') = \phi_m((\bar{z}O)'),$$

From (2.24), (2.14) and the fact that $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq I} \eta_i = 1$, we find that

$$\|D_{y'}\phi_m\|_{L^\infty(l_m)} = \left\| \sum_{1 \leq i \leq I} (D_{y'}\phi_{z'_i})\eta_i \right\|_{L^\infty(l_m)} \leq \tau \leq 1.$$

So from (2.28) and the fact that $|\bar{z}|, |q'|, |w'_m| < R$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi_m(w'_m)| &\leq |(\bar{z}O)^1| + |(\bar{z}O)^1 - \phi_m(w'_m)| \\ &= |(\bar{z}O)^1| + |\phi_m(q') - \phi_m(w'_m)| \leq R + 4R \leq 5R. \end{aligned}$$

Thus by Bolzano-Weierstrass theorem, there exists a subsequence of $\{w'_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ which still denoted by $\{w'_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ such that

$$(2.29) \quad \phi_m(w'_m) \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} w^1 \quad \text{and} \quad |w^1| \leq 5R.$$

It follows from (2.22) and (2.29) that

$$(2.30) \quad (\phi_m(w'_m), w'_m) \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} (w^1, w') = w \in B_{8R}.$$

From (2.27) and (2.30), the continuity of ψ gives that

$$0 = w \cdot O_1 - \psi(w \cdot O_2, \dots, w \cdot O_n).$$

Since $(w \cdot O_1, \dots, w \cdot O_n) = wO^T$, it follows that $0 = (wO^T)^1 - \psi((wO^T)').$ So by the definition of S and the fact that $(wO^T)' \in B'_{8R}$,

$$wO^T = ((wO^T)^1, (wO^T)') = (\psi((wO^T)'), (wO^T)') \in S,$$

and by the assumption of the lemma, we have

$$w' = ((wO^T)O)' \in U_{wO^T} \subset U,$$

and we have a contradiction from (2.20). So the claim (2.17) holds.

We next show that (2.6), (2.7), (2.8) and (2.9). Since $\overline{B'_R}$ is compact, by using partition of unity and (2.17), one can choose finite number of functions $\eta_i \in C_c^\infty(B'_{\rho_{z'_i}}(z'_i))$ for $1 \leq i \leq I$ such that $0 \leq \eta_i \leq 1$ and $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq I} \eta_i = 1$ in $\overline{B'_R}$. So we take

$$(2.31) \quad \varphi = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq I} \phi_{z'_i} \eta_i \quad \text{in} \quad \overline{B'_R}.$$

It follows from (2.14) and (2.31) that

$$(2.32) \quad \varphi = \phi_{z'_i} \quad \text{in} \quad B'_{\rho_{z'_i}}(z'_i).$$

So by (2.11), (2.12) and the fact that $\{B'_{\rho_{z'_i}}(z'_i)\}_{1 \leq i \leq I}$ is a covering of $\overline{B'_R}$,

$$(\varphi(y'), y') \cdot O_1 - \psi((\varphi(y'), y') \cdot O_2, \dots, (\varphi(y'), y') \cdot O_n) = 0 \quad (y' \in \overline{B'_R}),$$

and

$$\|D_{y'}\varphi\|_{L^\infty(\overline{B'_R})} = \left\| \sum_{1 \leq i \leq I} (D\phi_{z'_i})\eta_i \right\|_{L^\infty(\overline{B'_R})} \leq \tau.$$

Thus (2.6) and (2.8) follows. So it only remains to prove (2.7) and (2.9). Since $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq I} \eta_i = 1$ in $\overline{B'_R}$, for any $\tilde{z} \in S \cap B_R$, there exists z'_i with $(\tilde{z}O)' \in B'_{\rho_{z'_i}}(z'_i)$. So (2.10), (2.14) and (2.32) imply that

$$(\tilde{z}O)^1 = \varphi_{\tilde{z}}((\tilde{z}O)') = \phi_{(\tilde{z}O)'}((\tilde{z}O)') = \phi_{z'_i}((\tilde{z}O)') = \varphi((\tilde{z}O)'),$$

and we obtain (2.7). Since $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq I} \eta_i = 1$ in $\overline{B'_R}$, $0 \leq \eta_i \leq 1$, and $\eta_i \in C_c^\infty(B'_{\rho_{z'_i}}(z'_i))$, we have from (2.13) and (2.31) that

$$\{(\varphi(y'), y') : y' \in B'_R\} = \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq i \leq I} (\phi_{z'_i}(y'), y') \eta_i(y') : y' \in B'_R \right\} \subset B'_{8R}.$$

and (2.9) follows. \square

In Lemma 2.2, we prove that for an individual component in a neighborhood, there exists a coordinate system such that the boundary becomes almost flat graph.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\psi : B'_{8R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be $C^{1,\gamma}$ -function with*

$$(2.33) \quad S = \{(\psi(x'), x') \in B_{8R} : x \in B'_{8R}\}.$$

Assume that

$$(2.34) \quad S \cap B_R \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad n[D_{x'}\psi]_{C^\gamma(B'_{8R})}(16R)^\gamma \leq 1/4.$$

Then there exist an orthonormal matrix $O \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with $\det O > 0$ and $C^{1,\gamma}$ -function $\varphi : B'_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$(2.35) \quad (\varphi(y'), y') \cdot O_1 - \psi((\varphi(y'), y') \cdot O_2, \dots, (\varphi(y'), y') \cdot O_n) = 0 \quad (y' \in B'_R),$$

$$(2.36) \quad (zO)^1 = \varphi((zO)') \quad (z \in S \cap B_R),$$

$$(2.37) \quad O_1 \cdot e_1 > 0,$$

and

$$(2.38) \quad \{(\varphi(y'), y') : y' \in B'_R\} \subset B_{8R},$$

with the estimate

$$(2.39) \quad |\varphi(0')| < R, \quad D_{y'}\varphi(0') = 0', \quad \|D_{y'}\varphi\|_{L^\infty(B'_R)} \leq 2\sqrt{n}$$

and

$$(2.40) \quad [D_{y'}\varphi]_{C^\gamma(B'_R)} \leq \frac{18n[D_{y'}\psi]_{C^\gamma(B'_{8R})}}{\|(-1, D_{y'}\psi)\|_{L^\infty(B'_{8R})}}.$$

Proof. By the assumption in (2.34), there exists

$$(2.41) \quad \text{a point } \bar{x} = (\psi(\bar{x}'), x') \in B_R \text{ with } |\bar{x}| = \min_{x' \in B'_R} |(\psi(x'), x')|.$$

To prove the lemma, we use the implicit function theorem.

[Step 1: Choosing the new y -coordinate system] We define a vector

$$(2.42) \quad \begin{aligned} V_1 = (V_{11}, \dots, V_{1n}) &= -\frac{(-1, D_{x'}\psi(\bar{x}'))}{|(-1, D_{x'}\psi(\bar{x}'))|} \\ &= -\left(-\frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + |D_{x'}\psi(\bar{x}')|^2}}, \frac{D_{x'}\psi(\bar{x}')}{\sqrt{1 + |D_{x'}\psi(\bar{x}')|^2}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Also let H be the hyperplane orthogonal to V_1 at the origin, and let $\{V_2, \dots, V_n\}$ be an orthonormal basis of the hyperplane H satisfying $\det(V_1^T, \dots, V_n^T) > 0$. Then let y -coordinate system be the coordinate system with the orthonormal basis $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$.

[Step 2: Transformation matrix between y -coordinate system and x -coordinate system] Set the orthonormal matrix O as

$$(2.43) \quad O = \begin{pmatrix} V_{11} & \cdots & V_{n1} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ V_{1n} & \cdots & V_{nn} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} V_1 \\ \vdots \\ V_n \end{pmatrix}^T \implies \det O = \det V > 0.$$

Since y -coordinate system has the basis $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$, we have that

$$x^k = \left\langle \sum_{j=1}^n y^j V_j, e_k \right\rangle = \sum_{j=1}^n y^j V_{jk} = \sum_{j=1}^n y^j O_{kj} = y \cdot O_k \quad (k \in [1, n]),$$

and so

$$(2.44) \quad x = (y \cdot O_1, \dots, y \cdot O_n) = y O^T \quad \text{and} \quad y = (x \cdot V_1, \dots, x \cdot V_n) = x O.$$

Moreover, by (2.42),

$$O_1 \cdot e_1 = V_{11} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + |D_{x'} \psi(\bar{x}')|^2}} > 0,$$

and (2.37) follows.

[Step 3: Local existence of the graph function] To apply Lemma 2.1 with respect to y -coordinate system, we show that local existence of the graph function.

In view of (2.44), the point z in x -coordinate system is represented by the point zO with respect to y -coordinate system. So to use the implicit function theorem, we compute the following. For a fixed $z \in S$,

$$(2.45) \quad \begin{aligned} & D_{y^1} [y \cdot O_1 - \psi(y \cdot O_2, \dots, y \cdot O_n)] \big|_{y=zO} \\ &= O_{11} - \sum_{2 \leq k \leq n} O_{k1} D_{x^k} \psi(zO \cdot O_2, \dots, zO \cdot O_n) \\ &= O_{11} - \sum_{2 \leq k \leq n} O_{k1} D_{x^k} \psi(z'). \end{aligned}$$

We estimate the last term of (2.45). In view of (2.42) and (2.43), we find that

$$(O_{11}, \dots, O_{n1}) = V_1 = -\frac{(-1, D_{x'} \psi(\bar{x}'))}{|(-1, D_{x'} \psi(\bar{x}'))|},$$

which implies that

$$O_{11} - \sum_{2 \leq k \leq n} O_{k1} D_{x^k} \psi(z') = \frac{(-1, D_{x'} \psi(\bar{x}')) \cdot (-1, D_{x'} \psi(z'))}{|(-1, D_{x'} \psi(\bar{x}'))|} \quad (z' \in B'_{8R}).$$

So we find that for any $z' \in B'_{8R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & O_{11} - \sum_{2 \leq k \leq n} O_{k1} D_{x^k} \psi(z') \\ &= \frac{(-1, D_{x'} \psi(\bar{x}')) \cdot [(-1, D_{x'} \psi(\bar{x}')) + (-1, D_{x'} \psi(z')) - (-1, D_{x'} \psi(\bar{x}'))]}{|(-1, D_{x'} \psi(\bar{x}'))|}. \end{aligned}$$

From the assumption that $n[D_{x'}\psi]_{C^\gamma(B'_{8R})}(16R)^\gamma \leq 1/4$, for any $z' \in B'_{8R}$,

$$\frac{|(-1, D_{x'}\psi(\bar{x}')) \cdot [(-1, D_{x'}\psi(z')) - (-1, D_{x'}\psi(\bar{x}'))]|}{|(-1, D_{x'}\psi(\bar{x}'))|} \leq |D_{x'}\psi(z') - D_{x'}\psi(\bar{x}')| \leq \frac{1}{4}.$$

By combining the above two estimates, we obtain that

$$(2.46) \quad O_{11} - \sum_{2 \leq k \leq n} O_{k1} D_{x^k} \psi(z') \geq \frac{3|(-1, D_{x'}\psi(\bar{x}'))|}{4} \quad (z' \in B'_{8R}).$$

It follows from (2.45) and (2.46) that

$$(2.47) \quad D_{y^1} [y \cdot O_1 - \psi(y \cdot O_2, \dots, y \cdot O_n)] \big|_{y=zO} \geq \frac{1}{2} \quad (z \in S).$$

Fix an arbitrary point $z \in S$. By the implicit function theorem with (2.47), there exist ball $U_z \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ and function $\varphi_z : U_z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$(2.48) \quad (zO)' \in U_z, \quad (zO)^1 = \varphi_z((zO)'),$$

and

$$(2.49) \quad (\varphi_z(y'), y') \cdot O_1 - \psi((\varphi_z(y'), y') \cdot O_2, \dots, (\varphi_z(y'), y') \cdot O_n) = 0 \quad (y' \in U_z).$$

Also (2.48) yields that $(\varphi_z((zO)'), (zO)') = ((zO)^1, (zO)') = zO \in B_{8R}$. So with that $(zO)' \in U_z$, one can choose ball U_z satisfying (2.48) and (2.49) so small that

$$(2.50) \quad \{(\varphi_z(y'), y') : y' \in U_z\} \subset B_{8R}.$$

To apply Lemma 2.1, we need to check the assumptions (2.2), (2.3), (2.4) and (2.5). By comparing with (2.34), (2.46), (2.48), (2.49) and (2.50), we only need to estimate $\|D_{y'}\varphi_z\|_{L^\infty(U_z)}$.

From (2.49), we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_{y^k}\varphi_z(w') &= -\frac{D_{y^k} [y \cdot O_1 - \psi(y \cdot O_2, \dots, y \cdot O_n)] \big|_{y=(\varphi_z(w'), w')}}{D_{y^1} [y \cdot O_1 - \psi(y \cdot O_2, \dots, y \cdot O_n)] \big|_{y=(\varphi_z(w'), w')}} \\ &= -\frac{O_{1k} - \sum_{2 \leq i \leq n} O_{ik} D_{x^i} \psi(y \cdot O_2, \dots, y \cdot O_n) \big|_{y=(\varphi_z(w'), w')}}{O_{11} - \sum_{2 \leq i \leq n} O_{i1} D_{x^i} \psi(y \cdot O_2, \dots, y \cdot O_n) \big|_{y=(\varphi_z(w'), w')}} \end{aligned}$$

for any $w' \in U_z$. Then from the fact that $(y \cdot O_2, \dots, y \cdot O_n) = (yO^T)'$, we have

$$(2.51) \quad D_{y^k}\varphi_z(w') = -\frac{O_{1k} - \sum_{2 \leq i \leq n} O_{ik} D_{x^i} \psi\left([\varphi_z(w'), w')O^T\right]'}{O_{11} - \sum_{2 \leq i \leq n} O_{i1} D_{x^i} \psi\left([\varphi_z(w'), w')O^T\right]'} \quad (w' \in U_z).$$

To estimate (2.51), we claim that

$$(2.52) \quad O_{11} - \sum_{2 \leq k \leq n} O_{i1} D_{x^i} \psi(x') \geq \frac{\|(-1, D_{x'}\psi)\|_{L^\infty(B'_{8R})}}{2} \quad (x' \in B'_{8R}).$$

By the triangle inequality,

$$2|D_{x'}\psi(\bar{x}')|^2 + 2|D_{x^i}\psi(x') - D_{x'}\psi(\bar{x}')|^2 \geq |D_{x^i}\psi(x')|^2 \quad (x' \in B'_{8R}).$$

Then from the assumption that $n[D_{x'}\psi]_{C^\gamma(B'_{8R})}(16R)^\gamma \leq 1/4$, we have that

$$2|D_{x'}\psi(\bar{x}')|^2 \geq |D_{x'}\psi(x')|^2 - 1 \quad (x' \in B'_{8R}),$$

which implies that

$$1 + |D_{x'}\psi(\bar{x}')|^2 \geq \frac{1 + |D_{x'}\psi(x')|^2}{2} \quad (x' \in B'_{8R}),$$

and so

$$\frac{3|(-1, D_{x'}\psi(\bar{x}'))|}{4} \geq \frac{3\|(-1, D_{x'}\psi)\|_{L^\infty(B'_{8R})}}{4\sqrt{2}} \geq \frac{\|(-1, D_{x'}\psi)\|_{L^\infty(B'_{8R})}}{2}.$$

Thus the claim (2.52) follows from (2.46). On the other-hand, for any $k \in [2, n]$,

$$(2.53) \quad \begin{aligned} O_{1k} - \sum_{2 \leq i \leq n} O_{ik} D_{x^i} \psi \left([(\varphi_z(w'), w') O^T]' \right) \\ = -(O_{1k}, \dots, O_{nk}) \cdot \left(-1, D_{x'} \psi \left([(\varphi_z(w'), w') O^T]' \right) \right) \quad (w' \in U_z). \end{aligned}$$

In view of (2.50), we have that $[(\varphi_z(w'), w') O^T]' \in B'_{8R}$ for any $w' \in U_z$. So by (2.51), (2.52) and (2.53), we have that

$$(2.54) \quad \|D_{y^k} \varphi_z\|_{L^\infty(U_z)} \leq \frac{2 \left| \left(-1, D_{x'} \psi \left([(\varphi_z(w'), w') O^T]' \right) \right) \right|}{\|(-1, D_{x'} \psi)\|_{L^\infty(B'_{8R})}} \leq 2 \quad (k \in [2, n]).$$

[Step 4: Existence of the graph function φ in B'_R] We apply Lemma 2.1 by comparing (2.41) and (2.46) with (2.2), (2.48) and (2.54) with (2.3), (2.49) with (2.4) and (2.50) with (2.5). Then there exists C^1 -function $\varphi : B'_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$(2.55) \quad (\varphi(y'), y') \cdot O_1 - \psi((\varphi(y'), y') \cdot O_2, \dots, (\varphi(y'), y') \cdot O_n) = 0 \quad (y' \in B'_R),$$

$$(2.56) \quad (zO)^1 = \varphi((zO)') \quad (z \in S \cap B_R),$$

$$(2.57) \quad D_{y^k} \varphi(w') = - \frac{O_{1k} - \sum_{2 \leq i \leq n} O_{ik} D_{x^i} \psi \left([(\varphi(w'), w') O^T]' \right)}{O_{11} - \sum_{2 \leq i \leq n} O_{i1} D_{x^i} \psi \left([(\varphi(w'), w') O^T]' \right)} \quad (w' \in B'_R),$$

$$(2.58) \quad \|D_{y'} \varphi\|_{L^\infty(B'_R)} \leq 2\sqrt{n},$$

and

$$(2.59) \quad \{(\varphi(y'), y') : y' \in B'_R\} \subset B_{8R}.$$

We find that (2.35), (2.36) and (2.38) hold from (2.55), (2.56) and (2.59) respectively. Moreover, (2.52) and (2.59) yields that

$$(2.60) \quad O_{11} - \sum_{2 \leq k \leq n} O_{i1} D_{x^i} \psi \left([(\varphi(w'), w') O^T]' \right) \geq \frac{\|(-1, D_{x'} \psi)\|_{L^\infty(B'_{8R})}}{2}$$

for any $w' \in B'_R$. We will prove (2.39) and (2.40) in Step 5.

[Step 5: Estimate of $|\varphi(0')|$, $D_{y'} \varphi(0')$ and $[D_{y'} \varphi]_{C^\gamma(B'_R)}$] From the minimality of \bar{x} in (2.41), we use Lagrange multiplier method to find that $D[x^1 - \psi(x')] = (1, -D_{x'} \psi(\bar{x}'))$ and $D(|x|^2) = 2x$ are parallel at $\bar{x} = (\psi(\bar{x}'), x')$. Thus

$$(2.61) \quad \bar{x} = C_* |\bar{x}| \cdot \frac{(1, -D_{x'} \psi(\bar{x}'))}{\sqrt{1 + |D_{x'} \psi(\bar{x}')|^2}} = C_* |\bar{x}| V_1 \quad \text{for } C_* = 1 \text{ or } C_* = -1.$$

It follows from (2.43), (2.56) and (2.61) that

$$(2.62) \quad (\bar{x}O)' = (\bar{x} \cdot V_2, \dots, \bar{x} \cdot V_n) = 0' \quad \text{and} \quad (\bar{x}O)^1 = \varphi((\bar{x}O)') = \varphi(0').$$

So we find that

$$(2.63) \quad |\varphi(0')| = |(\bar{x}O)^1| < R.$$

Also if $\psi(0') = 0$ then by letting $\bar{x} = (0, 0')$, we have that $\varphi(0') = 0$. We find from (2.62) that

$$D_{x'}\psi\left([\varphi(0'), 0']O^T\right)' = D_{x'}\psi\left([\bar{x}OO^T]'\right) = D_{x'}\psi(\bar{x}'),$$

and (2.43) implies that for any $k \in [2, n]$,

$$\begin{aligned} O_{1k} - \sum_{2 \leq i \leq n} O_{ik} D_{x^i} \psi\left([\varphi(0'), 0']O^T\right)' &= -V_k \cdot (-1, D_{x'}\psi(\bar{x}')) \\ &= (V_k \cdot V_1)|(-1, D_{x'}\psi(\bar{x}'))| = 0. \end{aligned}$$

So we have from (2.57) that

$$(2.64) \quad D_{y^k} \varphi(0') = -\frac{O_{1k} - \sum_{2 \leq i \leq n} O_{ik} D_{x^i} \psi\left([\varphi(0'), 0']O^T\right)'}{O_{11} - \sum_{2 \leq i \leq n} O_{i1} D_{x^i} \psi\left([\varphi(0'), 0']O^T\right)'} = 0 \quad (k \in [2, n]),$$

and (2.39) follows from (2.58), (2.63) and (2.64).

Next, we estimate $[D_{y'} \varphi]_{C^\gamma(B'_R)}$. For any $w', z' \in B'_R$, we have from (2.58) that

$$(2.65) \quad |(\varphi(w'), w') - (\varphi(z'), z')| \leq |(2\sqrt{n}|w' - z'|, w' - z')| \leq 3\sqrt{n}|w' - z'|$$

for any $w', z' \in B'_R$. Recall from (2.57) that

$$D_{y^k} \varphi(w') = -\frac{O_{1k} - \sum_{2 \leq i \leq n} O_{ik} D_{x^i} \psi\left([\varphi(w'), w']O^T\right)'}{O_{11} - \sum_{2 \leq i \leq n} O_{i1} D_{x^i} \psi\left([\varphi(w'), w']O^T\right)'} \quad (w' \in B'_R).$$

Then for any $w', z' \in B'_R$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (2.66) \quad |D_{y^k} \varphi(w') - D_{y^k} \varphi(z')| &\leq \left| \frac{I}{II} - \frac{III}{IV} \right| \\ &\leq \left| \frac{I(IV - II) + II(I - III)}{II \cdot IV} \right| \\ &\leq \left| \frac{I}{II} \right| \left| \frac{IV - II}{IV} \right| + \left| \frac{I - III}{IV} \right|, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I &= O_{1k} - \sum_{2 \leq i \leq n} O_{ik} D_{x^i} \psi\left([\varphi(w'), w']O^T\right)', \\ II &= O_{11} - \sum_{2 \leq i \leq n} O_{i1} D_{x^i} \psi\left([\varphi(w'), w']O^T\right)', \\ III &= O_{1k} - \sum_{2 \leq i \leq n} O_{ik} D_{x^i} \psi\left([\varphi(z'), z']O^T\right)', \end{aligned}$$

and

$$IV = O_{11} - \sum_{2 \leq i \leq n} O_{i1} D_{x^i} \psi \left([(\varphi(z'), z') O^T]' \right).$$

So one can check from (2.59), (2.60) and (2.65) that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{IV - II}{IV} \right| &\leq \frac{2|(O_{2k}, \dots, O_{nk})| |D_{x'} \psi([(\varphi(w'), w') O^T]') - D_{x'} \psi([(\varphi(z'), z') O^T]')|}{\|(-1, D_{x'} \psi)\|_{L^\infty(B'_{8R})}} \\ &\leq \frac{2[D_{x'} \psi]_{C^\gamma(B'_{8R})} |[(\varphi(w'), w') O^T]' - (\varphi(z'), z') O^T|^\gamma}{\|(-1, D_{x'} \psi)\|_{L^\infty(B'_{8R})}} \\ &\leq \frac{6\sqrt{n}[D_{x'} \psi]_{C^\gamma(B'_{8R})} |w' - z'|^\gamma}{\|(-1, D_{x'} \psi)\|_{L^\infty(B'_{8R})}}, \end{aligned}$$

and one can easily check from (2.60) that

$$\left| \frac{I}{II} \right| \leq \frac{2|(O_{1k}, \dots, O_{nk})| \|(-1, D_{x'} \psi)\|_{L^\infty(B'_{8R})}}{\|(-1, D_{x'} \psi)\|_{L^\infty(B'_{8R})}} \leq 2.$$

By combining the above two estimates,

$$(2.67) \quad \left| \frac{I}{II} \right| \left| \frac{IV - II}{IV} \right| \leq \frac{12\sqrt{n}[D_{x'} \psi]_{C^\gamma(B'_{8R})} |w' - z'|^\gamma}{\|(-1, D_{x'} \psi)\|_{L^\infty(B'_{8R})}}.$$

Similarly,

$$(2.68) \quad \left| \frac{I - III}{IV} \right| \leq \frac{6\sqrt{n}[D_{x'} \psi]_{C^\gamma(B'_{8R})} |w' - z'|^\gamma}{\|(-1, D_{x'} \psi)\|_{L^\infty(B'_{8R})}}.$$

By combining (2.66), (2.67) and (2.68), we have that

$$(2.69) \quad |D_{y^k} \varphi(w') - D_{y^k} \varphi(z')| \leq \frac{18\sqrt{n}[D_{x'} \psi]_{C^\gamma(B'_{8R})} |w' - z'|^\gamma}{\|(-1, D_{x'} \psi)\|_{L^\infty(B'_{8R})}} \quad (w', z' \in B'_R).$$

So we discover that the estimate (2.40) holds from (2.69). \square

To apply Lemma 2.2 to a domain, we will use Lemma 2.5 which can be obtained by Lemma 2.3.

Lemma 2.3. *For $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, orthonormal matrices $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $W \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with $\det V > 0$ and $\det W > 0$, assume that C^1 -functions $\psi : B'_{8R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\varphi : B'_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfy*

$$(2.70) \quad U \cap B_R = \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} x^k V_k \in B_R : x^1 > \psi(x') \right\},$$

$$(2.71) \quad (\varphi(y'), y') \cdot W_1 - \psi((\varphi(y'), y') \cdot W_2, \dots, (\varphi(y'), y') \cdot W_n) = 0 \quad (y' \in B'_R),$$

and

$$\{(\varphi(y'), y') : y' \in B'_R\} \subset B_{8R}.$$

For the orthonormal matrix

$$O = W^T V \quad \text{with} \quad \det O > 0,$$

the corresponding sets

$$U^+ = \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} x^k V_k \in B_R : x^1 > \psi(x') \right\}, \quad V^+ = \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} y^k O_k \in B_R : y^1 > \varphi(y') \right\},$$

$$U^- = \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} x^k V_k \in B_R : x^1 < \psi(x') \right\}, \quad V^- = \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} y^k O_k \in B_R : y^1 < \varphi(y') \right\},$$

and

$$U^0 = \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} x^k V_k \in B_R : x^1 = \psi(x') \right\}, \quad V^0 = \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} y^k O_k \in B_R : y^1 = \varphi(y') \right\},$$

further assume that

$$(2.72) \quad U^+ \cap V^+ \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad U^- \cap V^- \neq \emptyset.$$

Then $U^+ = V^+$, $U^0 = V^0$, $U^- = V^-$ and

$$(2.73) \quad U \cap B_R = \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} y^k O_k \in B_R : y^1 > \varphi(y') \right\}.$$

Proof. (2.73) follows from $U^+ = V^+$. So we will prove that $U^+ = V^+$, $U^0 = V^0$ and $U^- = V^-$. One can easily check that

$$(2.74) \quad U^+ \sqcup U^0 \sqcup U^- = B_R = V^+ \sqcup V^0 \sqcup V^-.$$

[Step 1 : $U^+ \subset V^+$ and $U^- \subset V^-$] We claim that

$$(2.75) \quad U^+ \subset V^+ \quad \text{and} \quad U^- \subset V^-.$$

To prove it, suppose that

$$(2.76) \quad U^+ \cap (V^- \cup V^0) \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad U^+ \cap (V^0 \cup V^+) \neq \emptyset.$$

Then there exist $z_1 = \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} (z_1 \cdot O_k) O_k \in U^+$ and $z_2 = \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} (z_2 \cdot O_k) O_k \in U^+$ satisfying

$$z_1 \in U^+ \quad \text{with} \quad z_1 \cdot O_1 \leq \varphi(z_1 \cdot O_2, \dots, z_2 \cdot O_n),$$

and

$$z_2 \in U^+ \quad \text{with} \quad z_2 \cdot O_1 \geq \varphi(z_2 \cdot O_2, \dots, z_2 \cdot O_n).$$

Since U^+ is connected, one can choose a path $l \subset U^+$ connecting z_1 and z_2 . So there exists $z \in l \subset U^+$ such that

$$z \in l \subset U^+ \quad \text{and} \quad z \cdot O_1 = \varphi(z \cdot O_2, \dots, z \cdot O_n),$$

and by letting $\bar{z} = (\bar{z}^1, \bar{z}') := zO^T = (z \cdot O_1, \dots, z \cdot O_n)$,

$$(2.77) \quad z \in U^+, \quad (zO^T)^1 = \varphi((zO^T)') \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{z}^1 = \varphi(\bar{z}').$$

By the fact that $\bar{z} = zO^T \in B_R$, we have that $\bar{z}' \in B'_R$. So we find from (2.71) that

$$(\varphi(\bar{z}'), \bar{z}') \cdot W_1 = \psi((\varphi(\bar{z}'), \bar{z}') \cdot W_2, \dots, (\varphi(\bar{z}'), \bar{z}') \cdot W_n),$$

and (2.77) implies that

$$(2.78) \quad \bar{z} \cdot W_1 = \psi(\bar{z} \cdot W_2, \dots, \bar{z} \cdot W_n).$$

By a direct calculation,

$$\bar{z} \cdot W_l = (zO^T) \cdot W_l = \left(\sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} z^i O_{1i}, \dots, \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} z^i O_{ni} \right) \cdot W_l = \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} z^i O_{ji} W_{lj}.$$

Since $O = W^T V$, we have that $O_{ji} = \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} W_{kj} V_{ki}$. Thus

$$\bar{z} \cdot W_l = \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} z^i O_{ji} W_{lj} = \sum_{1 \leq i, j, k \leq n} z^i W_{kj} V_{ki} W_{lj} = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} z^i V_{li} = z \cdot V_l.$$

So it follows from (2.78) that

$$z \cdot V_1 = \psi(z \cdot V_2, \dots, z \cdot V_n),$$

and by the fact that $z = \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} (z \cdot V_k) V_k$, $z \in U^0$ holds. Since U^+ , U^- and U^0 are

mutually disjoint, this contradicts $z \in U^+$ in (2.77). So (2.76) can not occur, and

$$(2.79) \quad \text{one of } U^+ \cap (V^- \cup V^0) = \emptyset \text{ or } U^+ \cap (V^0 \cup V^+) = \emptyset \text{ holds.}$$

If $U^+ \cap (V^0 \cup V^+) = \emptyset$ then (2.74) implies that $U^+ \subset V^-$. So (2.72) yields that

$$\emptyset \neq U^+ \cap V^+ \subset V^- \cap V^+ = \emptyset,$$

which gives a contradiction. Thus by (2.79), we obtain that

$$U^+ \cap (V^- \cup V^0) = \emptyset.$$

and it follows from (2.74) that

$$(2.80) \quad U^+ \subset V^+.$$

By repeating the same argument for proving (2.80), one can also prove that

$$(2.81) \quad U^- \subset V^-,$$

and (2.75) follows from (2.80) and (2.81).

[Step 3 : $U^0 \subset V^0$] We prove that

$$(2.82) \quad U^0 \subset V^0.$$

To prove it, we claim that

$$(2.83) \quad U^0 \cap (V^+ \cup V^-) = \emptyset.$$

Suppose not. Then one of $U^0 \cap V^+ \neq \emptyset$ or $U^0 \cap V^- \neq \emptyset$ holds. If $z \in U^0 \cap V^+$ then by the fact that V^+ is open, there exists $\rho > 0$ such that

$$B_\rho(z) \subset V^+.$$

By the definition of U^0 , $B_\rho(z) \cap U^+ \neq \emptyset$ and $B_\rho(z) \cap U^- \neq \emptyset$, which implies that

$$V^+ \cap U^- \supset B_\rho(z) \cap U^- \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad V^+ \cap U^+ \supset B_\rho(z) \cap U^+ \neq \emptyset.$$

So by (2.74) and (2.75),

$$\emptyset \neq V^+ \cap U^- \subset V^+ \cap V^- = \emptyset,$$

and a contradiction occurs. Similarly, also for the case that $z \in U^0 \cap V^-$, one can obtain a contradiction. Thus we find that the claim (2.83) holds. By (2.74) and (2.83), (2.82) follows.

[Step 4 : $U^+ = V^+$, $U^0 = V^0$ and $U^- = V^-$] Recall from (2.74) that $U^+ \sqcup U^0 \sqcup U^- = B_R = V^+ \sqcup V^0 \sqcup V^-$. So it follows from (2.75) and (2.82) that

$$U^+ = V^+, \quad U^0 = V^0 \quad \text{and} \quad U^- = V^-,$$

which proves the lemma. \square

The proof of Lemma 2.3 and Lemma 2.4 are similar and we only state the lemma.

Lemma 2.4. *For $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, orthonormal matrices $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $W \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with $\det V > 0$ and $\det W > 0$, assume that C^1 -functions $\psi : B'_{8R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\varphi : B'_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfy*

$$(2.84) \quad U \cap B_R = \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} y^k V_k \in B_R : x^1 > \psi(x') \right\},$$

$$(2.85) \quad (\varphi(y'), y') \cdot W_1 - \psi((\varphi(y'), y') \cdot W_2, \dots, (\varphi(y'), y') \cdot W_n) = 0 \quad (y' \in B'_R),$$

and

$$\{(\varphi(y'), y') : y' \in B'_R\} \subset B_{8R}.$$

For the orthonormal matrix

$$O = W^T V \quad \text{with} \quad \det O > 0,$$

the corresponding sets

$$U^+ = \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} y^k V_k \in B_R : y^1 > \psi(y') \right\}, \quad V^+ = \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} x^k O_k \in B_R : x^1 > \varphi(x') \right\},$$

$$U^- = \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} y^k V_k \in B_R : y^1 < \psi(y') \right\}, \quad V^- = \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} x^k O_k \in B_R : x^1 < \varphi(x') \right\},$$

and

$$U^0 = \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} y^k V_k \in B_R : y^1 = \psi(y') \right\}, \quad V^0 = \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} x^k O_k \in B_R : x^1 = \varphi(x') \right\},$$

further assume that

$$(2.86) \quad U^+ \cap V^- \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad U^- \cap V^+ \neq \emptyset.$$

Then $U^+ = V^-$, $U^0 = V^0$, $U^- = V^+$ and

$$(2.87) \quad U \cap B_R = \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} x^k O_k \in B_R : x^1 < \varphi(x') \right\}.$$

In view of Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.3, we obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 2.5. *For $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $C^{1,\gamma}$ -function $\psi : B'_{8R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with*

$$(2.88) \quad S = \{(\psi(x'), x') \in B_{8R} : x \in B'_{8R}\}.$$

Assume that

$$(2.89) \quad S \cap B_R \neq \emptyset, \quad n[D_{x'} \psi]_{C^\gamma(B'_{8R})} (16R)^\gamma \leq 1/4,$$

and

$$(2.90) \quad U \cap B_R = \{(x^1, x') \in B_R : x^1 > \psi(x')\}.$$

Then there exist an orthonormal matrix $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with $\det V > 0$ and $C^{1,\gamma}$ -function $\varphi : B'_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$(2.91) \quad U \cap B_R = \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} y^k V_k \in B_R : y^1 > \varphi(y') \right\},$$

and

$$(2.92) \quad z \cdot V_1 = \varphi(z \cdot V_2, \dots, z \cdot V_n) \quad (z \in S \cap B_R),$$

with the estimate

$$(2.93) \quad |\varphi(0')| < R, \quad D_{y'} \varphi(0') = 0', \quad \|D_{y'} \varphi\|_{L^\infty(B'_R)} \leq 2\sqrt{n},$$

and

$$(2.94) \quad [D_{y'} \varphi]_{C^\gamma(B'_R)} \leq \frac{18n[D_{y'} \psi]_{C^\gamma(B'_{8R})}}{\|(-1, D_{y'} \psi)\|_{L^\infty(B'_{8R})}}.$$

Moreover, if $\psi(0') = 0$ then $\varphi(0') = 0$.

Remark 2.6. In Lemma 2.5, $U \cap B_R = \{(x^1, x') \in B_R : x^1 > \psi(x')\}$ in x -coordinate system is represented by the set $\{(y^1, y') \in B_R : y^1 > \varphi(y')\}$ with respect to y -coordinate system which has the basis $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$.

Proof. By Lemma 2.2, there exists an orthonormal matrix $O \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with $\det O > 0$ and $C^{1,\gamma}$ -function $\varphi : B'_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$(2.95) \quad (\varphi(y'), y') \cdot O_1 - \psi((\varphi(y'), y') \cdot O_2, \dots, (\varphi(y'), y') \cdot O_n) = 0 \quad (y' \in B'_R),$$

$$(2.96) \quad (zO)^1 = \varphi((zO)') \quad (z \in S \cap B_R),$$

$$(2.97) \quad O_1 \cdot e_1 > 0$$

and

$$(2.98) \quad \{(\varphi(y'), y') : y' \in B'_R\} \subset B_{8R},$$

with the estimate

$$(2.99) \quad |\varphi(0')| < R, \quad D_{y'} \varphi(0') = 0', \quad \|D_{y'} \varphi\|_{L^\infty(B'_R)} \leq 2\sqrt{n},$$

and

$$(2.100) \quad [D_{y'} \varphi]_{C^\gamma(B'_R)} \leq \frac{18n[D_{x'} \psi]_{C^\gamma(B'_{8R})}}{\|(-1, D_{x'} \psi)\|_{L^\infty(B'_{8R})}}.$$

Also if $\psi(0') = 0$ then $\varphi(0') = 0$. So φ satisfies (2.92), (2.93) and (2.94) for

$$V = O^T \quad \implies \quad \det V > 0,$$

and it only remains to prove (2.91). By a direct calculation,

$$(2.101) \quad V_1 \cdot e_1 = O_{11} = O_1 \cdot e_1 > 0.$$

Let

$$U^+ = \{(x^1, x') \in B_R : x^1 > \psi(x')\}, \quad V^+ = \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} y^k V_k \in B_R : y^1 > \varphi(y') \right\},$$

$$U^0 = \{(x^1, x') \in B_R : x^1 = \psi(x')\}, \quad V^0 = \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} y^k V_k \in B_R : y^1 = \varphi(y') \right\},$$

$$U^- = \{(x^1, x') \in B_R : x^1 < \psi(x')\}, \quad V^- = \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} y^k V_k \in B_R : y^1 < \varphi(y') \right\}.$$

To apply Lemma 2.3, we need to check that

$$(2.102) \quad U^+ \cap V^+ \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad U^- \cap V^- \neq \emptyset.$$

We will only prove that $U^+ \cap V^+ \neq \emptyset$, because $U^- \cap V^- \neq \emptyset$ can be proved similarly. Let $\bar{z} = (\varphi(0'), 0')V \in B_R$. From (2.95) and the fact that

$$\bar{z} = (\varphi(0'), 0')V = (\varphi(0'), 0')O^T = ((\varphi(0'), 0') \cdot O_1, \dots, (\varphi(0'), 0') \cdot O_n),$$

we have that

$$(2.103) \quad \bar{z}^1 = \psi(\bar{z}').$$

Since $\bar{z} \in B_R$, there exists $\epsilon_0 \in (0, 1]$ such that

$$\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0] \implies \epsilon e_1 + \bar{z} \in B_R,$$

and we have from (2.103) that

$$(2.104) \quad \epsilon e_1 + \bar{z} \in U^+ \quad \text{for} \quad \epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0].$$

So it only need to prove that there exists $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]$ with

$$\epsilon e_1 + \bar{z} \in V^+.$$

Since $\epsilon e_1 + \bar{z} = \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} [(\epsilon e_1 + \bar{z}) \cdot V_k] V_k$, we claim that

$$(2.105) \quad (\epsilon e_1 + \bar{z}) \cdot V_1 > \varphi((\epsilon e_1 + \bar{z}) \cdot V_2, \dots, (\epsilon e_1 + \bar{z}) \cdot V_n).$$

Since $\bar{z} \cdot V_1 = (\varphi(0'), 0')V V_1^T = \varphi(0')$ and $\bar{z} \cdot V_k = (\varphi(0'), 0')V V_k^T = 0$ for $2 \leq k \leq n$, it is suffice to prove that

$$(2.106) \quad \epsilon e_1 \cdot V_1 > \varphi((\epsilon e_1 + \bar{z}) \cdot V_2, \dots, (\epsilon e_1 + \bar{z}) \cdot V_n) - \bar{z} \cdot V_1 = \varphi((\epsilon e_1 V^T)') - \varphi(0').$$

By mean value theorem,

$$(2.107) \quad \varphi((\epsilon e_1 V^T)') - \varphi(0') = D_{y'} \varphi((\bar{\epsilon} e_1 V^T)') \cdot (\epsilon e_1 V^T)' \text{ for some } \bar{\epsilon} \in (0, \epsilon].$$

From (2.101), $V_1 \cdot e_1 > 0$. Also by (2.99) and the fact that $\varphi \in C^{1,\gamma}(B'_R)$,

$$D_{y'} \varphi((\bar{\epsilon} e_1 V^T)') \cdot (e_1 V^T)' \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad \epsilon \rightarrow 0,$$

and the claim (2.105) holds from (2.106) and (2.107) for some $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]$. Thus $\epsilon e_1 + \bar{z} \in V^+$ and (2.104) implies that $U^+ \cap V^+ \neq \emptyset$. Similarly, one can prove that $U^- \cap V^- \neq \emptyset$, and obtain (2.102). The lemma follows by applying Lemma 2.3 to (2.90), (2.95) and (2.98) for V , O and I_n instead of O , W and V respectively. \square

In Lemma 2.8, we prove that for $C^{1,\gamma}$ -domain U , if the normal on $\partial U \cap B_{8R}$ is almost opposite to e_1 , then U is also a graph in B_R with respect to x^1 -variable. To obtain Lemma 2.8, we derive Lemma 2.7.

Lemma 2.7. *Let $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be an orthonormal matrix with $\det V > 0$ satisfying*

$$(2.108) \quad |V_1 + e_1| \leq \tau \quad \text{for some } \tau \in (0, 1/(8n)].$$

Assume that $\psi : B'_{8R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is C^1 -function with

$$(2.109) \quad |\psi(0')| < R, \quad D_{y'}\psi(0') = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \|D_{y'}\psi\|_{L^\infty(B'_{8R})} \leq \tau.$$

Then there exists C^1 -function $\varphi : B'_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$(2.110) \quad (\varphi(x'), x') \cdot V_1 - \psi((\varphi(x'), x') \cdot V_2, \dots, (\varphi(x'), x') \cdot V_n) = 0 \quad (x' \in B'_R),$$

$$(2.111) \quad \|D_{x'}\varphi\|_{L^\infty(B'_R)} \leq 8\tau\sqrt{n}, \quad (zV)^1 = \varphi((zV)') \quad (z \in S \cap B_R),$$

and

$$(2.112) \quad \{(\varphi(x'), x') : x' \in B'_R\} \subset B_{8R}.$$

Moreover, if $\psi \in C^{1,\gamma}(B'_{8R})$ then $\varphi \in C^{1,\gamma}(B'_R)$ with the estimate

$$(2.113) \quad [D_{x'}\varphi]_{C^\gamma(B'_R)} \leq 16[D_{y'}\psi]_{C^\gamma(B'_{8R})}.$$

Proof. Set $S = \{(\psi(y'), y') \in B_{8R} : y' \in B'_{8R}\}$. Since $|\psi(0')| < R$, we have that $(\psi(0'), 0') \in S \cap B_R$. Thus

$$(2.114) \quad S \cap B_R \neq \emptyset.$$

We prove the lemma by using Lemma 2.1. To use the notation in Lemma 2.1, set

$$(2.115) \quad O = V.$$

One can check that

$$x^k = \left\langle \sum_{j=1}^n y^j V_j, e_k \right\rangle = \sum_{j=1}^n y^j V_{jk} \quad (k \in [1, n]),$$

which implies that $x = yO$. Since O is an orthonormal matrix, we have that

$$(2.116) \quad x = yO \quad \text{and} \quad y = xO^T = (x \cdot O_1, \dots, x \cdot O_n).$$

With the fact that $((zO) \cdot O_2, \dots, (zO) \cdot O_n) = ((zO)O^T)' = z'$, we estimate

$$(2.117) \quad \begin{aligned} & D_{x^1} [x \cdot O_1 - \psi(x \cdot O_2, \dots, x \cdot O_n)]|_{x=zO} \\ &= O_{11} - \sum_{2 \leq k \leq n} O_{k1} D_{y^k} \psi((zO) \cdot O_2, \dots, (zO) \cdot O_n) \\ &= O_{11} - \sum_{2 \leq k \leq n} O_{k1} D_{y^k} \psi(z') \end{aligned}$$

in S . In view of (2.108) and (2.115), we have

$$(2.118) \quad O_{11} = V_{11} \leq -1 + \tau \leq -\frac{1}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad |(O_{12}, \dots, O_{1n})| = |(V_{12}, \dots, V_{1n})| \leq \tau.$$

Since $\{O_1, \dots, O_n\}$ is orthonormal, we have that $O_i \cdot O_1 = 0$ ($i \in [2, n]$), and so

$$(2.119) \quad |O_{i1}| \leq \frac{|(O_{i2}, \dots, O_{in}) \cdot (O_{12}, \dots, O_{1n})|}{|O_{11}|} \leq 2\tau \quad (i \in [2, n]).$$

Since $\tau \in (0, 1/4]$, it follows from (2.109) that for any $z' \in B'_{8R}$,

$$(2.120) \quad O_{11} - \sum_{2 \leq k \leq n} O_{k1} D_{y^k} \psi(z') \leq -\frac{1}{2} + |(O_{21}, \dots, O_{n1})| \|D_{y'}\psi\|_{L^\infty(B'_{8R})} \leq -\frac{1}{4}.$$

So we have from (2.117) and (2.120) that

$$(2.121) \quad D_{x^1} [x \cdot O_1 - \psi(x \cdot O_2, \dots, x \cdot O_n)] \Big|_{x=zO} \leq -\frac{1}{4} \quad (z \in S).$$

For any $z \in S \in B_{8R}$, we have that $zO \in B_{8R}$ and $(zO)' \in B'_{8R}$. So by the implicit function theorem using (2.121), for any $z \in S$, there exist a ball $U_z \subset B'_{8R}$ and C^1 -function $\varphi_z : U_z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$(2.122) \quad (zO)' \in U_z, \quad (zO)^1 = \varphi_z((zO)'), \quad \{(\varphi_z(w'), w') : w' \in U_z\} \subset B_{8R},$$

$$(2.123) \quad 0 = (\varphi_z(y'), y') \cdot O_1 - \psi((\varphi_z(y'), y') \cdot O_2, \dots, (\varphi_z(y'), y') \cdot O_n) \quad \text{in } U_z,$$

and for any $k \in [2, n]$,

$$(2.124) \quad D_k \varphi_z(y') = -\frac{D_{x^k} [x \cdot O_1 - \psi(x \cdot O_2, \dots, x \cdot O_n)] \Big|_{x=(\varphi_z(y'), y')}}{D_{x^1} [x \cdot O_1 - \psi(x \cdot O_2, \dots, x \cdot O_n)] \Big|_{x=(\varphi_z(y'), y')}} \quad \text{in } U_z.$$

We remark that if $\{(\varphi_z(y'), y') : y' \in U_z\} \not\subset B_{8R}$ then one can choose a smaller ball U_z satisfying $\{(\varphi_z(y'), y') : y' \in U_z\} \subset B_{8R}$. In view of (2.114), (2.120), (2.122) and (2.123), to apply Lemma 2.1, we need to estimate $\|D_{y'} \varphi_z\|_{L^\infty(U_z)}$.

Fix $k \in [2, n]$. We next estimate $\|D_k \varphi_z\|_{L^\infty(U_z)}$. By (2.124), for any $w' \in U_z$,

$$\begin{aligned} D_k \varphi_z(w') &= -\frac{D_{x^k} [x \cdot O_1 - \psi(x \cdot O_2, \dots, x \cdot O_n)] \Big|_{x=(\varphi_z(w'), w')}}{D_{x^1} [x \cdot O_1 - \psi(x \cdot O_2, \dots, x \cdot O_n)] \Big|_{x=(\varphi_z(w'), w')}} \\ &= -\frac{O_{1k} - \sum_{2 \leq i \leq n} O_{ik} D_{y^i} \psi((\varphi_z(w'), w') \cdot O_2, \dots, (\varphi_z(w'), w') \cdot O_n)}{O_{11} - \sum_{2 \leq i \leq n} O_{i1} D_{y^i} \psi((\varphi_z(w'), w') \cdot O_2, \dots, (\varphi_z(w'), w') \cdot O_n)} \\ &= -\frac{O_{1k} - \sum_{2 \leq i \leq n} O_{ik} D_{y^i} \psi([(\varphi_z(w'), w') O^T]')}{O_{11} - \sum_{2 \leq i \leq n} O_{i1} D_{y^i} \psi([(\varphi_z(w'), w') O^T]')}. \end{aligned}$$

For any $w' \in U_z$, we find from (2.122) that $(\varphi_z(w'), w') \in B_{8R}$, which implies that $[(\varphi_z(w'), w') O^T]' \in B'_{8R}$. So by Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality,

$$\left| O_{1k} - \sum_{2 \leq i \leq n} O_{ik} D_{y^i} \psi([(\varphi_z(w'), w') O^T]') \right| \leq |O_{1k}| + |(O_{2k}, \dots, O_{nk})| \|D_{y'} \psi\|_{L^\infty(B'_{8R})}.$$

From (2.109) and (2.118), we have that $|O_{1k}| \leq \tau$ and $\|D_{y'} \psi\|_{L^\infty(B'_{8R})} \leq \tau$. So by using the above two estimates and (2.120), we find that

$$(2.125) \quad \|D_k \varphi_z\|_{L^\infty(U_z)} \leq 4(|O_{1k}| + |(O_{2k}, \dots, O_{nk})| \|D_{y'} \psi\|_{L^\infty(B'_{8R})}) \leq 8\tau.$$

Since $k \in [2, n]$ was arbitrary chosen, we apply Lemma 2.1 by comparing (2.2) with (2.114) and (2.120), (2.3) and (2.5) with (2.122) and (2.125), and (2.4) and (2.123). Then there exists C^1 -function $\varphi : B'_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$(\varphi(x'), x') \cdot O_1 - \psi((\varphi(x'), x') \cdot O_2, \dots, (\varphi(x'), x') \cdot O_n) = 0 \quad (x' \in B'_R),$$

$$(2.126) \quad \|D_{x'} \varphi\|_{L^\infty(B'_R)} \leq 8\sqrt{n}\tau, \quad (zO)^1 = \varphi((zO)'), \quad (z \in S \cap B_R),$$

and

$$\{(\varphi(x'), x') : x' \in B_R\} \subset B_{8R}.$$

So we find that (2.110), (2.111) and (2.112) holds from (2.115).

To prove the lemma, it only remains to estimate $[D_{x'}\varphi]_{C^\gamma(B'_R)}$ in (2.113) under the assumption $\psi \in C^{1,\gamma}(B'_{8R})$. We repeat the proof for showing (2.69) in the proof of Lemma 2.2. One can check from (2.110) that

$$D_{x^k}\varphi(w') = -\frac{O_{1k} - \sum_{2 \leq i \leq n} O_{ik} D_{y^i} \psi \left([(\varphi(w'), w') O^T]' \right)}{O_{11} - \sum_{2 \leq i \leq n} O_{i1} D_{y^i} \psi \left([(\varphi(w'), w') O^T]' \right)} \quad \text{in } B'_R.$$

Since $\tau \in (0, 1/(8n)]$, for any $w', z' \in B'_R$, we have from (2.111) and (2.112) that

$$(2.127) \quad |(\varphi(w'), w') - (\varphi(z'), z')| \leq |(8\tau\sqrt{n}|w' - z'|, w' - z')| \leq 2|w' - z'|.$$

Then for any $w', z' \in B'_R$, we have

$$(2.128) \quad \begin{aligned} |D_{x^k}\varphi(w') - D_{x^k}\varphi(z')| &\leq \left| \frac{I}{II} - \frac{III}{IV} \right| \\ &\leq \left| \frac{I(IV - II) + II(I - III)}{II \cdot IV} \right| \\ &\leq \left| \frac{I}{II} \right| \left| \frac{IV - II}{IV} \right| + \left| \frac{I - III}{IV} \right|, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I &= O_{1k} - \sum_{2 \leq i \leq n} O_{ik} D_{y^i} \psi \left([(\varphi(w'), w') O^T]' \right), \\ II &= O_{11} - \sum_{2 \leq i \leq n} O_{i1} D_{y^i} \psi \left([(\varphi(w'), w') O^T]' \right), \\ III &= O_{1k} - \sum_{2 \leq i \leq n} O_{ik} D_{y^i} \psi \left([(\varphi(z'), z') O^T]' \right), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$IV = O_{11} - \sum_{2 \leq i \leq n} O_{i1} D_{y^i} \psi \left([(\varphi(z'), z') O^T]' \right).$$

By (2.112), we find that $[(\varphi(w'), w') O^T]' \in B'_{8R}$ for any $w' \in B'_R$. So one can check from (2.120) and (2.127) that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{IV - II}{IV} \right| &\leq \frac{4 \left| D_{y'} \psi \left([(\varphi(w'), w') O^T]' \right) - D_{y'} \psi \left([(\varphi(z'), z') O^T]' \right) \right|}{\|(-1, D_{x'} \psi)\|_{L^\infty(B'_{8R})}} \\ &\leq \frac{4 [D_{y'} \psi]_{C^\gamma(B'_{8R})} \left| [(\varphi(w'), w') O^T]' - [(\varphi(z'), z') O^T]' \right|^\gamma}{\|(-1, D_{x'} \psi)\|_{L^\infty(B'_{8R})}} \\ &\leq 8 [D_{y'} \psi]_{C^\gamma(B'_{8R})} |w' - z'|^\gamma, \end{aligned}$$

and one can easily check from (2.109), (2.118) and (2.120) that

$$\left| \frac{I}{II} \right| \leq 4(|O_{1k}| + |(O_{2k}, \dots, O_{nk})| \|D_{x'} \psi\|_{L^\infty(B'_{8R})}) \leq 8\tau \leq 1.$$

By combining the above two estimates,

$$(2.129) \quad \left| \frac{I}{II} \right| \left| \frac{IV - II}{IV} \right| \leq 8 [D_{x'} \psi]_{C^\gamma(B'_{8R})} |w' - z'|^\gamma.$$

Similarly,

$$(2.130) \quad \left| \frac{I - III}{IV} \right| \leq 8[D_{x'}\psi]_{C^\gamma(B'_{8R})}|w' - z'|^\gamma.$$

By combining (2.128), (2.129) and (2.130), we obtain that

$$(2.131) \quad |D_{x^k}\varphi(w') - D_{x^k}\varphi(z')| \leq 16[D_{x'}\psi]_{C^\gamma(B'_{8R})}|w' - z'|^\gamma \quad (w', z' \in B'_R).$$

So we discover that the estimate (2.113) holds from (2.131). \square

With Lemma 2.7, we obtain Lemma 2.8.

Lemma 2.8. *Let $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be an orthonormal matrix with $\det V > 0$. Let $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ and $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$ be the orthonormal bases of x -coordinate system and y -coordinate system respectively, satisfying*

$$(2.132) \quad |V_1 + e_1| \leq \tau \quad \text{for some } \tau \in (0, 1/(8n)).$$

For $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, assume that there exists C^1 -function $\psi : B'_{8R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$(2.133) \quad U \cap B_R = \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} y^k V_k \in B_R : y^1 > \psi(y') \right\},$$

$$(2.134) \quad |\psi(0')| < R, \quad D_{y'}\psi(0') = 0' \quad \text{and} \quad \|D_{y'}\psi\|_{L^\infty(B'_{8R})} \leq \tau.$$

Then there exists C^1 -function $\varphi : B'_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$(2.135) \quad U \cap B_R = \{(x^1, x') \in B_R : x^1 < \varphi(x')\},$$

with the estimate

$$(2.136) \quad \|D_{x'}\varphi\|_{L^\infty(B'_R)} \leq 8\sqrt{n}\tau.$$

Moreover, if $\psi \in C^{1,\gamma}(B'_{8R})$ then $\varphi \in C^{1,\gamma}(B'_R)$ with the estimate

$$(2.137) \quad [D_{x'}\varphi]_{C^\gamma(B'_R)} \leq 16[D_{y'}\psi]_{C^\gamma(B'_{8R})}.$$

Remark 2.9. *In Lemma 2.8, the set $U \cap B_R = \{(y^1, y') \in B_R : y^1 > \psi(y')\}$ in y -coordinate system is represented by $U \cap B_R = \{(x^1, x') \in B_R : x^1 < \varphi(x')\}$ with respect to x -coordinate system.*

Proof. With (2.132) and (2.134), by Lemma 2.7, there exists C^1 -function $\varphi : B'_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$(2.138) \quad (\varphi(x'), x') \cdot V_1 - \psi((\varphi(x'), x') \cdot V_2, \dots, (\varphi(x'), x') \cdot V_n) = 0 \quad (x' \in B'_R),$$

$$(2.139) \quad \|D_{x'}\varphi\|_{L^\infty(B'_R)} \leq 8\tau\sqrt{n}, \quad (zV)^1 = \varphi((zV)') \quad (z \in S \cap B_{8R}),$$

and

$$(2.140) \quad \{(\varphi(x'), x') : x' \in B'_R\} \subset B_{8R}.$$

Moreover, if $\psi \in C^{1,\gamma}(B'_{8R})$ then $\varphi \in C^{1,\gamma}(B'_R)$ with the estimate

$$(2.141) \quad [D_{x'}\varphi]_{C^\gamma(B'_R)} \leq 16[D_{y'}\psi]_{C^\gamma(B'_{8R})}.$$

By (2.133), (2.138), (2.140) and (2.141), to apply Lemma 2.4, set

$$U^+ = \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} y^k V_k \in B_R : y^1 > \psi(y') \right\}, \quad V^+ = \{(x^1, x') \in B_R : x^1 > \varphi(x')\},$$

$$U^- = \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} y^k V_k \in B_R : y^1 < \psi(y') \right\}, \quad V^- = \{(x^1, x') \in B_R : x^1 < \varphi(x')\},$$

and

$$U^0 = \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} y^k V_k \in B_R : y^1 = \psi(y') \right\}, \quad V^0 = \{(x^1, x') \in B_R : x^1 = \varphi(x')\},$$

and need to check that

$$(2.142) \quad U^+ \cap V^- \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad U^- \cap V^+ \neq \emptyset.$$

Since the proof for that $U^+ \cap V^- \neq \emptyset$ is similar to that of $U^- \cap V^+ \neq \emptyset$, we only prove $U^- \cap V^+ \neq \emptyset$.

Since V is orthonormal, let $O = V^T V = Id_n$. Since $(\psi(0'), 0') \in S \cap B_R$, we have from (2.139) that

$$(2.143) \quad \bar{z} := (\psi(0'), 0')V = \psi(0')V_1 \in B_R \implies \bar{z}^1 = \varphi(\bar{z}') \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{z} \in V^0.$$

So by the definition of $V^+ \subset B_R$, one can choose $\epsilon_0 \in (0, 8R)$ so that

$$(2.144) \quad \epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0] \implies \epsilon e_1 + \bar{z} \in V^+.$$

Then we claim that

$$(2.145) \quad \epsilon e_1 + \bar{z} \in U^- \quad \text{for some } \epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0].$$

Since $e_1 = (e_1 \cdot V_1)V_1 + \cdots + (e_1 \cdot V_n)V_n = (V_{11})V_1 + \cdots + (V_{n1})V_n$, we have that

$$\epsilon e_1 + \bar{z} = \epsilon e_1 + \psi(0')V_1 = \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} [\epsilon V_{k1} + \delta_{k1} \psi(0')] V_k.$$

So to prove the claim (2.145), by the definition of U^- , it is suffice to show that

$$(2.146) \quad \epsilon V_{11} + \psi(0') < \psi(\epsilon(V_{21}, \dots, V_{n1})) \iff \epsilon V_{11} < \psi(\epsilon(V_{21}, \dots, V_{n1})) - \psi(0').$$

Since $\epsilon_0 \in (0, 8R)$, we have that $\epsilon(V_{21}, \dots, V_{n1}) \in B'_{8R}$. Thus

$$(2.147) \quad \psi(\epsilon(V_{21}, \dots, V_{n1})) - \psi(0') = D_{y'} \psi(\bar{\epsilon}(V_{21}, \dots, V_{n1})) \cdot \epsilon(V_{21}, \dots, V_{n1})$$

for some $\bar{\epsilon} \in (0, \epsilon]$. By (2.132), we have that $V_{11} < 0$. Since ψ is C^1 -function and $D_{y'} \psi(0') = 0'$ in (2.134), we find from (2.147) that

$$\epsilon^{-1} [\psi(\epsilon(V_{21}, \dots, V_{n1})) - \psi(0')] \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0,$$

and there exists a small $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]$ such that (2.146) holds. So the claim (2.145) holds. From (2.144) and (2.145), we obtain that $V^+ \cap U^- \neq \emptyset$. Similarly, one can also prove that $V^- \cap U^+ \neq \emptyset$. Thus (2.142) holds, and the lemma follows by applying Lemma 2.4 with (2.138), (2.139), (2.140), (2.141) and (2.142) for V , V and $Id_n = V^T V$ instead of V , W and $O = W^T V$. \square

3. COORDINATE SYSTEM IN COMPOSITE MATERIALS

Our proof is based on the fact that for two disjoint Reifenberg flat domains U_1 and U_2 , the (outward) normals on $\partial U_1 \cap B_R$ and $\partial U_2 \cap B_R$ are almost opposite if the radius $R > 0$ is sufficiently small. This result obtained in [8], and we start this section with the following definition of Reifenberg flat domains which appears in [8]. For (δ, R) -Reifenberg flat domains, for any boundary point and for any scale less than R , there exists a coordinate system such that the boundaries trapped between two narrow hyperplanes distance less than $2\delta R$.

Definition 3.1 (Reifenberg flat domain). *U is a (δ, R) -Reifenberg flat domain if for any $y \in \partial U$ and any $r \in (0, R]$, there exists a coordinate system such that*

$$\{x \in Q_r(y) : x^1 > y^1 + \delta r\} \subset Q_r(y) \cap U \subset \{x \in Q_r(y) : x^1 > y^1 - \delta r\}.$$

We use the following Lemma 3.2 for handling the normal vectors on the boundaries of two disjoint Reifenberg flat domains.

Lemma 3.2. [8, Lemma 2.4] *There exists $\delta_1(n) \in (0, 1/16)$ such that the following holds. Suppose that U_k and U_l are disjoint $(\delta, 5R)$ -Reifenberg flat domains with $\delta \in (0, \delta_1]$. For any $r \in (0, R]$, if $P \in \partial U_k$ and $Q \in \partial U_l$ satisfy $|P - Q| < r$ then*

$$|\vec{n}_{P,5r} + \vec{n}_{Q,5r}| \leq \frac{\delta^{\frac{1}{4}}}{2},$$

where $\vec{n}_{P,5r}$ and $\vec{n}_{Q,5r}$ are the normal vectors at $P \in \partial U_k$ and $Q \in \partial U_l$ with the radius $5r$.

With Lemma 3.3, our problem can be turned to a simpler problem. In view of Lemma 3.3, we only need to consider the case that at most two disjoint Reifenberg flat domains intersect a small ball.

Lemma 3.3. [8, Lemma 2.5] *For $\delta_1(n) \in (0, 1/16)$ in Lemma 3.2, if U_1, U_2, U_3 are mutually disjoint nonempty $(\delta, 10R)$ -Reifenberg flat domains with $\delta \in (0, \delta_1]$ then*

$$U_k \cap B_R = \emptyset \text{ for some } k \in [1, 3].$$

We use the following $C^{1,\gamma}$ -class domains which was defined in Definition 1.1.

Definition 1.1. *For $n \geq 2$, $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a $(C^{1,\gamma}, R, \theta)$ -domain, if for any $B_R(y)$ with $B_R(y) \cap \partial U \neq \emptyset$ there exists x -coordinate system and $C^{1,\gamma}$ -function $\psi : B'_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$U \cap B_R(y) = \{x \in B_R : x^1 > \psi(x')\} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\psi\|_{C^{1,\gamma}(B'_R)} \leq \theta$$

where y is the origin in the new x -coordinate system.

Remark 3.4. *If U is $(C^{1,\gamma}, R, \theta)$ -domain then $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{U}$ is also $(C^{1,\gamma}, R, \theta)$ -domain.*

To use Lemma 3.2, we need to check that $(C^{1,\gamma}, R, \theta)$ -domains are also Reifenberg flat domains, which will be done in Lemma 3.5 and Lemma 3.6.

Lemma 3.5. *For any $\tau \in (0, 1]$, there exists $R_1 = R_1(n, \gamma, \theta, \tau) \in (0, 1]$ such that the following holds for any $R \in (0, R_1]$. If U is $(C^{1,\gamma}, 8R, \theta)$ -domain with $\partial U \cap B_R \neq \emptyset$ then there exist an orthonormal matrix V with $\det V > 0$ and $C^{1,\gamma}$ -function $\varphi : B'_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$(3.1) \quad U \cap B_R = \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} y^k V_k \in B_R : y^1 > \varphi(y') \right\}$$

with the estimate

$$(3.2) \quad |\varphi(0')| < R, \quad D_{y'}\varphi(0') = 0', \quad \|D_{y'}\varphi\|_{L^\infty(B'_R)} \leq \tau \text{ and } [D_{y'}\varphi]_{C^\gamma(B'_R)} \leq 18n\theta.$$

Also if $0 \in \partial U$ then $\varphi(0') = 0$.

Proof. We take $R_* = R_*(n, \gamma, \theta) \in (0, R_1]$ so that

$$(3.3) \quad n\theta(16R_*)^\gamma \leq 1/4.$$

Since U is $(C^{1,\gamma}, 8R, \theta)$ -domain, there exists $C^{1,\gamma}$ -function $B'_{8R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$(3.4) \quad U \cap B_R = \{(x^1, x') \in B_R : x^1 > \psi(x')\} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\psi\|_{C^{1,\gamma}(B'_R)} \leq \theta.$$

Recall from (3.3), we find that $n[D_{x'}\psi]_{C^\gamma(B'_{8R})}(16R)^\gamma \leq n\theta(16R_*)^\gamma \leq 1/4$. So from the fact that $\partial U \cap B_R \neq \emptyset$, we obtain that

$$(3.5) \quad \{(\psi(x'), x') \in B_{8R} : x \in B'_{8R}\} \cap B_R \neq \emptyset \text{ and } n[D_{x'}\psi]_{C^\gamma(B'_{8R})}(16R)^\gamma \leq 1/4.$$

Apply Lemma 2.5 by comparing (3.4) and (3.5) with (2.89) and (2.90). Then there exist an orthonormal matrix $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with $\det V > 0$ and $C^{1,\gamma}$ -function $\varphi : B'_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$U \cap B_R = \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} y^k V_k \in B_R : y^1 > \varphi(y') \right\}$$

with the estimate

$$|\varphi(0')| < R, \quad D_{y'}\varphi(0') = 0' \quad \text{and} \quad [D_{y'}\varphi]_{C^\gamma(B'_R)} \leq 18n[D_{x'}\psi]_{C^\gamma(B'_{8R})} \leq 18n\theta.$$

So there exists $R_1 = R_1(n, \gamma, \theta, \tau) \in (0, R_*]$ such that (3.1) and (3.2) holds. Also if $\mathbf{0} \in \partial U$ then $\psi(0') = 0$ in (3.4), and so Lemma 2.5 gives that $\varphi(0') = 0$. \square

In view of Lemma 3.5, for $(C^{1,\gamma}, R, \theta)$ -domains, there exists a coordinate system such that the boundary is almost flat, and which will be obtained Lemma 3.6.

Lemma 3.6. *For any $\delta \in (0, 1/8]$, there exists $R_2(n, \gamma, \theta, \delta) \in (0, R_1(n, \gamma, \theta, 2)]$ such that if U is $(C^{1,\gamma}, 8R, \theta)$ -domain with $R \in (0, R_2]$ then U is (δ, R) -Reifenberg flat domain. Set $R_3(n, \gamma, \theta) = R_2(n, \gamma, \theta, \delta_1)/10$ for $\delta_1(n)$ in Lemma 3.2.*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{0} \in \partial U$. Since U is $(C^{1,\gamma}, 8R, \theta)$ -domain, by Lemma 3.5, there exist an orthonormal matrix V with $\det V > 0$ and $C^{1,\gamma}$ -function $\varphi : B'_{2R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$(3.6) \quad U \cap B_R = \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} y^k V_k \in B_R : y^1 > \varphi(y') \right\}$$

with the estimate

$$(3.7) \quad \varphi(0') = 0, \quad D_{y'}\varphi(0') = 0' \quad \text{and} \quad [D_{y'}\varphi]_{C^\gamma(B'_R)} \leq 18n\theta.$$

Choose $R_2 = R_2(n, \gamma, \theta, \delta) \in (0, R_1]$ so that $36n\theta(4R_2)^\gamma \leq \delta$. Then (3.7) gives that

$$\sup_{y' \in B'_R} |\varphi(y')| = \sup_{y' \in B'_R} |\varphi(y') - \varphi(0') - D_{y'}\varphi(0') \cdot y'| \leq [D_{y'}\varphi]_{C^\gamma(B'_R)}(2R)^\gamma < \delta R.$$

So the boundary ∂U in B_R is trapped between two narrow hyperplanes with distance less than $2\delta R$. Since the boundary point can be arbitrary chosen, U is (δ, R) -Reifenberg flat domain by Definition 3.1. \square

If two disjoint $(C^{1,\gamma}, R, \theta)$ -domains U_1 and U_2 intersect a ball, then one can find a coordinate system such that ∂U_1 and ∂U_2 become graph, and ∂U_1 is almost flat in that ball.

Lemma 3.7. *For any $\tau \in (0, 1]$, there exists $R_4 = R_4(n, \gamma, \theta, \tau) \in (0, \min\{R_1, R_3\}]$ such that the following holds for any $R \in (0, R_4]$. Suppose that U_1 and U_2 are disjoint $(C^{1,\gamma}, 80R, \theta)$ -domains with $\partial U_1 \cap B_R \neq \emptyset$ and $\partial U_2 \cap B_R \neq \emptyset$. Also assume that there exists $C^{1,\gamma}$ -function $\varphi_1 : B'_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$(3.8) \quad U_1 \cap B_R = \{(x^1, x') \in B_R : x^1 > \varphi_1(x')\} \quad \text{and} \quad |\varphi_1(0')| < R$$

with the estimate

$$D_{x'}\varphi_1(0') = 0', \quad \|D_{x'}\varphi_1\|_{L^\infty(B'_R)} \leq 2\sqrt{n} \quad \text{and} \quad [D_{x'}\varphi_1]_{C^\gamma(B'_R)} \leq 18n\theta.$$

Then there exists $C^{1,\gamma}$ -function $\varphi_2 : B'_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$U_2 \cap B_R = \{(x^1, x') \in B_R : x^1 < \varphi_2(x')\}$$

with the estimates

$$\|D_{x'}\varphi_1\|_{L^\infty(B'_R)}, \|D_{x'}\varphi_2\|_{L^\infty(B'_R)} \leq \tau \quad \text{and} \quad [D_{x'}\varphi_1]_{C^\gamma(B'_R)}, [D_{x'}\varphi_2]_{C^\gamma(B'_R)} \leq 288n\theta.$$

Proof. Since U_1 and U_2 are $(C^{1,\gamma}, 80R, \theta)$ -domain, by Lemma 3.6 there exists a constant $R_* = R_*(n, \gamma, \theta, \tau) \in (0, R_3]$ such that

$$(3.9) \quad R \in (0, R_*) \implies U_1, U_2 \text{ are } (\min\{\delta_1, [\tau/(8n)]^4\}, 10R)\text{-Reifenberg flat.}$$

By (3.9) and Lemma 3.2,

$$(3.10) \quad P \in \partial U_1, \quad Q \in \partial U_2 \quad \text{and} \quad |P - Q| < 2R \implies |\vec{n}_P + \vec{n}_Q| \leq \tau/(8n),$$

where \vec{n}_P and \vec{n}_Q are the normal vectors at $P \in \partial U_1$ and $Q \in \partial U_2$. We remark that for $(C^{1,\gamma}, R, \theta)$ -class domains, the normals do not depend on the size and we use the notation \vec{n}_P and \vec{n}_Q instead of $\vec{n}_{P,5r}$ and $\vec{n}_{Q,5r}$.

By the assumption of the lemma

$$|\varphi_1(0')| < R, \quad D_{x'}\varphi_1(0') = 0', \quad \|D_{x'}\varphi_1\|_{L^\infty(B'_R)} \leq 2\sqrt{n} \quad \text{and} \quad [D_{x'}\varphi_1]_{C^\gamma(B'_R)} \leq 18n\theta.$$

So there exists $R_{**} = R_{**}(n, \gamma, \theta, \tau) \in (0, R_*)$ such that

$$(3.11) \quad \|D_{x'}\varphi_1\|_{L^\infty(B'_R)} \leq \tau.$$

From (3.8) and the fact that $D_{x'}\varphi_1(0') = 0'$, we find that

$$(3.12) \quad -e_1 \text{ is the normal vector of } U_1 \text{ at } (\varphi_1(0'), 0') \in \partial U_1 \cap B_R.$$

With the fact that U_2 is a $(C^{1,\gamma}, 80R, \theta)$ -domain and $\partial U_2 \cap B_R \neq \emptyset$, we apply Lemma 3.5 to U_2 . Then there exists $R_{***} = R_{***}(n, \gamma, \theta) \in (0, R_3]$ such that if $R \in (0, R_{***}]$, then there exist an orthonormal matrix $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with $\det V > 0$ and $C^{1,\gamma}$ -function $\psi : B'_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$(3.13) \quad U_2 \cap B_{8R} = \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} y^k V_k \in B_{8R} : y^1 > \psi(y') \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad |\psi(0')| < R,$$

with the estimate

$$(3.14) \quad D_{y'}\psi(0') = 0' \quad \text{and} \quad [D_{y'}\psi]_{C^\gamma(B'_{8R})} \leq 18n\theta.$$

So by (3.14), there exists $R_4 = R_4(n, \gamma, \theta, \tau) \in (0, \min\{R_*, R_{**}, R_{***}\}]$ such that $R \in (0, R_4]$ implies that $\|D_{y'}\psi\|_{L^\infty(B'_{8R})} \leq \tau/(8n)$. Thus

$$(3.15) \quad D_{y'}\psi(0') = 0', \quad \|D_{y'}\psi\|_{L^\infty(B'_{8R})} \leq \tau/(8n) \quad \text{and} \quad [D_{y'}\psi]_{C^\gamma(B'_{8R})} \leq 18n\theta.$$

By (3.13) and (3.15),

$$(3.16) \quad -V_1 \text{ is the normal vector of } U_2 \text{ at } \psi(0')V_1 \in \partial U_2 \cap B_R.$$

By recalling from (3.12) and (3.16) that $-e_1$ is the normal vector of U_1 at $(\varphi_1(0'), 0') \in \partial U_1 \cap B_R$ and $-V_1$ is the normal vector of U_2 at $\psi(0')V_1 \in \partial U_2 \cap B_R$, and it follows from (3.10) that

$$(3.17) \quad |e_1 + V_1| \leq \tau/(8n) \quad \text{and} \quad \tau/(8n) \leq 1/(8n).$$

By comparing (3.17), (3.13) and (3.15) with (2.132), (2.133), (2.134) and (2.137), we apply Lemma 2.8 to ψ for $\tau/(8n)$ instead of τ . Then there exists $C^{1,\gamma}$ -function $\varphi_2 : B'_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$(3.18) \quad U_2 \cap B_R = \{(x^1, x') \in B_R : x^1 < \varphi_2(x')\},$$

with the estimate

$$(3.19) \quad \|D_{x'}\varphi_2\|_{L^\infty(B'_R)} \leq \tau \quad \text{and} \quad [D_{x'}\varphi_2]_{C^\gamma(B'_R)} \leq 16[D_{y'}\psi]_{C^\gamma(B'_{8R})} \leq 288n\theta.$$

So the lemma follows from (3.11), (3.18) and (3.19). \square

We considered only two disjoint $(C^{1,\gamma}, R, \theta)$ -domains in Lemma 3.7. To handle the general case which appears in composite materials, we use Definition 1.2 which already mentioned in the introduction.

Definition 1.2. For $n \geq 2$, $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a composite $(C^{1,\gamma}, R, \theta)$ -domain with subdomains $\{U_1, \dots, U_K\}$ if

- (a) $U_0 := U$ and $\{U_1, \dots, U_K\}$ are $(C^{1,\gamma}, R, \theta)$ -domains
- (b) one of the following holds for any U_i, U_j ($i, j \in \{0, \dots, K\}, i \neq j$):

$$(1.1) \quad (1) U_i \subsetneq U_j \quad (2) U_j \subsetneq U_i \quad (3) U_i \cap U_j = \emptyset.$$

The following Lemma 3.8 is a simple application of Lemma 3.3 to composite $(C^{1,\gamma}, 80R, \theta)$ -domains.

Lemma 3.8. For any $R \in (0, R_3]$ with $R_3(n, \gamma, \theta) \in (0, 1]$ in Lemma 3.6, suppose that U is composite $(C^{1,\gamma}, 80R, \theta)$ -domain with subdomains $\{U_1, \dots, U_K\}$ and

$$U_k \cap B_R \neq \emptyset, \quad U_l \cap B_R \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad U_m \cap B_R \neq \emptyset \quad (k, l, m \in \{0, \dots, K\}).$$

If $U_k \cap U_l = \emptyset$ and $U_k \cap U_m = \emptyset$ then $U_l \cap U_m \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. Since $10R \in (0, 10R_3] \subset (0, R_2]$ for $R_2(n, \gamma, \theta, \delta_1)$ in Lemma 3.6, U is composite $(C^{1,\gamma}, 80R, \theta)$ -domain with subdomains $\{U_1, \dots, U_K\}$. So by Lemma 3.6, $\{U_0 := U, U_1, \dots, U_K\}$ are $(\delta_1, 10R)$ -Reifenberg domains. Assume that $U_l \cap U_m = \emptyset$. Since $U_k \cap U_l = \emptyset$ and $U_k \cap U_m = \emptyset$, Lemma 3.3 gives that

$$U_k \cap B_R = \emptyset \quad \text{or} \quad U_l \cap B_R = \emptyset \quad \text{or} \quad U_m \cap B_R = \emptyset,$$

which contradicts the assumption of the lemma. So we find that $U_l \cap U_m \neq \emptyset$. \square

W_j in (1.2) represents an individual component and $\bigcup_{U_i \in S, U_i \subsetneq U_j} U_i$ represents the union of the components inside W_j . In fact, we have the following lemma holds.

Lemma 3.9. *Assume that U is composite $(C^{1,\gamma}, R, \theta)$ -domain with subdomains $\{U_1, \dots, U_K\}$. Set $S = \{U_0 := U, U_1, \dots, U_K\}$ and*

$$(3.20) \quad W_j = U_j \setminus \left(\bigcup_{U_i \in S, U_i \subsetneq U_j} U_i \right) \quad (j \in \{0, \dots, K\}).$$

Then $\{W_0, \dots, W_K\}$ are mutually disjoint and

$$(3.21) \quad U = W_0 \sqcup W_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup W_K.$$

Proof. [Step 1] We prove that $\{W_0, \dots, W_K\}$ are mutually disjoint. Suppose not. Then there exists W_k and W_j such that

$$(3.22) \quad W_k \cap W_j \neq \emptyset,$$

which implies that $U_k \cap U_j \neq \emptyset$. So by (1.1), $U_k \subsetneq U_j$ or $U_j \subsetneq U_k$ holds. Without loss of generality, we assume that $U_j \subsetneq U_k$. Then from the definition of $W_k = U_k \setminus \left(\bigcup_{U_i \in S, U_i \subsetneq U_k} U_i \right)$, we have that $W_k \cap U_j = \emptyset$, which contradicts (3.22). So we find that $\{W_0, \dots, W_K\}$ are mutually disjoint.

[Step 2] We prove that $U = W_0 \cup \dots \cup W_K$ in (3.21). Fix $y \in U = U_0$, and let

$$(3.23) \quad W = \bigcap_{U_i \in S, y \in U_i} U_i.$$

From (1.1), if $U_i \ni y$, $U_j \ni y$ and $U_i, U_j \in S$ then $U_i \subsetneq U_j$ or $U_j \subsetneq U_i$ holds. Thus

$$U_i \ni y, U_j \ni y \text{ and } U_i, U_j \in S \implies U_i \cap U_j = U_i \text{ or } U_i \cap U_j = U_j.$$

So by the fact that the number of elements in S is finite, one can easily prove that

$$(3.24) \quad W = U_k \in S \text{ for some } k \in \{0, \dots, K\}.$$

With the chosen U_k in (3.24), we claim that

$$(3.25) \quad y \in W_k.$$

Suppose not. Then $y \notin W_k$. Since $U_k = W \ni y$ and $W_k = U_k \setminus \left(\bigcup_{U_i \subsetneq U_k, U_i \in S} U_i \right)$, there exists $j \in \{0, \dots, K\}$ such that $U_j \subsetneq U_k$ and $y \in U_j \in S$. Then (3.24) and that $U_j \subsetneq U_k$ give that $U_j \supsetneq U_k = W$. On the other-hand, from the definition of W in (3.23) and the fact that $y \in U_j \in S$, we have that $W \subset U_j$, and a contradiction occurs. So the claim (3.25) holds. Since $y \in U$ was arbitrary chosen, for any $y \in U$ there exists $W_k \in \{W_0, \dots, W_K\}$ with $W_k \ni y$. This proves (3.21). \square

Let U be composite $(C^{1,\gamma}, 8R, \theta)$ -domain with subdomains $\{U_1, \dots, U_K\}$ and $S = \{U_0 := U, U_1, \dots, U_K, U_{K+1} := \emptyset\}$. In Lemma 3.10 and Lemma 3.11, we decompose $U_j \in S$ with W_j in (3.20) and the elements in S . For this decomposition, we use Lemma 3.10 when $U_j \not\supset U \cap B_R$ and Lemma 3.11 when $U_j \supset U \cap B_R$. We remark that the center of the ball in Lemma 3.10 and Lemma 3.11 are chosen as the origin but it can be chosen as any point in U by using the translation.

Lemma 3.10. *For any $R \in (0, R_3]$ with $R_3(n, \gamma, \theta)$ in Lemma 3.6, suppose that U is composite $(C^{1,\gamma}, 80R, \theta)$ -domain with subdomains $\{U_1, \dots, U_K\}$. Also for $S = \{U_0 := U, U_1, \dots, U_K, U_{K+1} := \emptyset\}$, suppose that*

$$U_j \cap B_R \neq \emptyset \text{ and } U_j \not\supset U \cap B_R \text{ for some } U_j \in S.$$

Set

$$(3.26) \quad U_k = \bigcup_{U_i \in S, U_i \subsetneq U_j, U_i \cap B_R \neq \emptyset} U_i.$$

Then

$$(3.27) \quad U_k \in S \quad \text{and} \quad U_k \subsetneq U_j.$$

In addition, for

$$(3.28) \quad W_j = U_j \setminus \left(\bigcup_{U_i \in S, U_i \subsetneq U_j} U_i \right) \quad (j \in \{0, \dots, K\}),$$

we have

$$(3.29) \quad U_j \cap B_R = (W_j \sqcup U_k) \cap B_R.$$

Proof. If $\{U_i \in S : U_i \subsetneq U_j \text{ and } U_i \cap B_R \neq \emptyset\} = \emptyset$, then the lemma holds by taking $U_k = \emptyset$. So we assume that

$$\{U_i \in S : U_i \subsetneq U_j \text{ and } U_i \cap B_R \neq \emptyset\} \neq \emptyset.$$

We first prove (3.27). Since $U_j \in S$ and $U_j \not\subset U \cap B_R$, we have

$$(3.30) \quad B_R \cap (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{U_j}) \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{U_j} \text{ is a } (C^{1,\gamma}, 80R, \theta)\text{-domain}.$$

We claim that

$$(3.31) \quad \begin{aligned} U_\alpha, U_\beta \in S, \quad U_\alpha, U_\beta \subsetneq U_j, \quad U_\alpha \cap B_R \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad U_\beta \cap B_R \neq \emptyset. \\ \implies \quad U_\alpha \cup U_\beta \in S \quad \text{and} \quad U_\alpha \cup U_\beta \subsetneq U_j. \end{aligned}$$

To prove this claim, fix $U_\alpha, U_\beta \in S$ with

$$(3.32) \quad U_\alpha, U_\beta \in S, \quad U_\alpha, U_\beta \subsetneq U_j, \quad U_\alpha \cap B_R \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad U_\beta \cap B_R \neq \emptyset.$$

Then we have that

$$(3.33) \quad U_\alpha \cap (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{U_j}) = \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad U_\beta \cap (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{U_j}) = \emptyset.$$

With (3.30), (3.32) and (3.33), we apply Lemma 3.8 to U_α, U_β and $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{U_j}$. Then we have that $U_\alpha \cap U_\beta \neq \emptyset$, and so (1.1) yields that

$$U_\alpha \subset U_\beta \quad \text{or} \quad U_\beta \subset U_\alpha.$$

It follows from (3.32) that

$$(3.34) \quad U_\alpha \cup U_\beta \in S \quad \text{and} \quad U_\alpha \cup U_\beta \subsetneq U_j.$$

So under the assumption (3.32), we have (3.34). This proves the claim (3.31).

Since the number of the elements of S is finite, by an induction using (3.31), one can prove that

$$(3.35) \quad U_k \in S \quad \text{and} \quad U_k \subsetneq U_j,$$

which proves (3.27). So it only remains to prove (3.29).

By the choice of U_k in (3.26), we have that

$$(3.36) \quad U_k \cap B_R = \bigcup_{U_i \in S, U_i \subsetneq U_j, U_i \cap B_R \neq \emptyset} [U_i \cap B_R] = \bigcup_{U_i \in S, U_i \subsetneq U_j} [U_i \cap B_R].$$

So we find from (3.28) and (3.36) that

$$(3.37) \quad W_j \cap B_R = [U_j \cap B_R] \setminus \left(\bigcup_{U_i \in S, U_i \subsetneq U_j} [U_i \cap B_R] \right) = [U_j \cap B_R] \setminus [U_k \cap B_R].$$

In view of (3.35), we obtain that $U_k \cap B_R \subset U_j \cap B_R$. So it follows from (3.37) that

$$(3.38) \quad U_j \cap B_R = [W_j \cap B_R] \cup [U_k \cap B_R].$$

On the other-hand, by (3.35) and the definition of W_j in (3.28), we have that

$$(3.39) \quad W_j \cap U_k = \emptyset.$$

So (3.29) holds from (3.38) and (3.39). \square

Lemma 3.11. *For any $R \in (0, R_3]$ with $R_3(n, \gamma, \theta)$ in Lemma 3.6, let U be composite $(C^{1,\gamma}, 80R, \theta)$ -domain with subdomains $\{U_1, \dots, U_K\}$ and $U \cap B_R \neq \emptyset$. Set $S = \{U_0 := U, U_1, \dots, U_K, U_{K+1} := \emptyset\}$ and*

$$(3.40) \quad U_j = \bigcap_{U_i \in S, U_i \cap B_R \supset U \cap B_R} U_i.$$

Then

$$(3.41) \quad U_j \in S \quad \text{and} \quad U_j \cap B_R = U \cap B_R.$$

In addition, for

$$(3.42) \quad W_j = U_j \setminus \left(\bigcup_{U_i \in S, U_i \subsetneq U_j} U_i \right) \quad (j \in \{0, \dots, K\}),$$

there exist $U_k, U_l \in S$ such that

$$(3.43) \quad U_j \cap B_R = (W_j \sqcup U_k \sqcup U_l) \cap B_R,$$

$$(3.44) \quad U_k, U_l \subsetneq U_j \quad \text{and} \quad U_k \cap B_R, U_l \cap B_R \subsetneq U_j \cap B_R.$$

Proof. [Step 1 : Proof of (3.41)] For any $U_\alpha, U_\beta \in S$ with $U_\alpha \cap B_R, U_\beta \cap B_R \supset U \cap B_R \neq \emptyset$, (1.1) gives that $U_\alpha \subset U_\beta$ or $U_\beta \supset U_\alpha$, and so we find that $U_\alpha \cap U_\beta \in S$. Since the number of the elements in S are finite, one can prove that

$$(3.45) \quad U_j \in S$$

by using an induction. Also with the definition of U_j in (3.40) and the fact that the number of the elements in S are finite, one can easily check that

$$(3.46) \quad U_j \cap B_R \supset U \cap B_R.$$

Since $U_j \subset U$, (3.41) holds from (3.45) and (3.46).

[Step 2 : Splitting into three cases] We only consider the following three cases :

(1) for any $U_i \in S$ with $U_i \cap B_R \neq \emptyset$, $U_i \supset U \cap B_R$ holds.

(2) there exists $U_\alpha \in S$ such that

$$(3.47) \quad U_\alpha \cap B_R \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad U_\alpha \not\supset U \cap B_R$$

satisfying

$$(3.48) \quad U_i \in S \quad \text{and} \quad U_i \cap B_R \neq \emptyset \quad \implies \quad U_i \cap U_\alpha \neq \emptyset.$$

(3) there exists $U_\alpha, U_\beta \in S$ such that

$$(3.49) \quad U_\alpha \cap U_\beta = \emptyset, \quad U_\alpha, U_\beta \not\supset U \cap B_R, \quad U_\alpha \cap B_R \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad U_\beta \cap B_R \neq \emptyset$$

satisfying

$$(3.50) \quad U_i \in S \quad \text{and} \quad U_i \cap B_R \neq \emptyset \implies U_i \cap U_\alpha \neq \emptyset \quad \text{or} \quad U_i \cap U_\beta \neq \emptyset.$$

We explain about these three cases. Suppose that (1) does not hold. Then there exists $U_\alpha \in S$ with $U_\alpha \cap B_R \neq \emptyset$ and $U_\alpha \not\supset U \cap B_R$. If three mutually disjoint $U_1, U_2, U_3 \in S$ satisfy

$$(3.51) \quad U_i \in S, \quad U_i \cap B_R \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad U_i \not\supset U \cap B_R \quad (i \in \{1, 2, 3\})$$

then by Lemma 3.8, we have a contradiction because U_1, U_2, U_3 are mutually disjoint $(C^{1,\gamma}, 80R, \theta)$ -domains. So there exist at most two disjoint $U_\alpha, U_\beta \in S$ with

$$U_\alpha, U_\beta \in S, \quad U_\alpha \cap B_R \neq \emptyset, \quad U_\beta \cap B_R \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad U_\alpha, U_\beta \not\supset U \cap B_R$$

satisfying

$$U_i \in S, \quad U_i \cap B_R \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad U_i \not\supset U \cap B_R \implies U_i \cap U_\alpha \neq \emptyset \quad \text{or} \quad U_i \cap U_\beta \neq \emptyset.$$

Also if $U_i \supset U \cap B_R$ then by the fact that $U_\alpha \cap B_R \neq \emptyset$ and $U_\beta \cap B_R \neq \emptyset$, we have that $U_i \cap U_\alpha \neq \emptyset$ and $U_i \cap U_\beta \neq \emptyset$. So Case (2) or Case (3) holds depending on the number of disjoint U_i satisfying (3.51).

[Step 3 : Case (1)] In Case (1), we take $U_k = U_l = \emptyset$. First, suppose that

$$(3.52) \quad U_i \in S, \quad U_i \subsetneq U_j \quad \text{and} \quad U_i \cap B_R \neq \emptyset.$$

Then by the assumption of Case (1), $U_i \cap B_R \supset U \cap B_R \neq \emptyset$. So from (3.40), we find that $U_j \subset U_i$, which contradicts that (3.52). Thus

$$(3.53) \quad \{U_i \in S : U_i \subsetneq U_j \quad \text{and} \quad U_i \cap B_R \neq \emptyset\} = \emptyset.$$

By (3.53) and the definition of W_j in (3.42), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} W_j \cap B_R &= [U_j \cap B_R] \setminus \left(\bigcup_{U_i \in S, U_i \subsetneq U_j} [U_i \cap B_R] \right) \\ &= [U_j \cap B_R] \setminus \left(\bigcup_{U_i \in S, U_i \subsetneq U_j, U_i \cap B_R \neq \emptyset} [U_i \cap B_R] \right) \\ &= U_j \cap B_R. \end{aligned}$$

So lemma holds for the Case (1) with $U_k = \emptyset$ and $U_l = \emptyset$.

[Step 4 : Preliminary for Case (2) and (3)] For Case (2) and (3), we will use that

$$(3.54) \quad \begin{aligned} U_\alpha \in S, U_\alpha \not\supset U \cap B_R, U_\alpha \cap B_R \neq \emptyset, U_k &= \bigcup_{U_i \in S, U_i \subsetneq U_j, U_i \cap U_\alpha \neq \emptyset, U_i \cap B_R \neq \emptyset} U_i \\ \implies U_k \in S, U_k \subsetneq U_j \quad \text{and} \quad U_k \cap B_R &\subsetneq U_j \cap B_R. \end{aligned}$$

To prove (3.54), we show the following holds for $U_\alpha \in S$ with $U_\alpha \not\supset U \cap B_R$:

$$(3.55) \quad \begin{aligned} U_i \in S, U_i \subsetneq U_j, U_i \cap U_\alpha \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad U_i \cap B_R &\neq \emptyset \quad \text{for } i \in \{1, 2\} \\ \implies U_1 \cap U_2 &\neq \emptyset. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose not. Then there exist $U_1, U_2 \in S$ satisfying

$$(3.56) \quad U_i \in S, \quad U_i \subsetneq U_j, \quad U_i \cap U_\alpha \neq \emptyset, \quad U_i \cap B_R \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad U_1 \cap U_2 = \emptyset \quad \text{for } i \in \{1, 2\}.$$

So we have that $U_1 \cap U_\alpha \neq \emptyset$ and $U_2 \cap U_\alpha \neq \emptyset$, and it follows from (1.1) that

$$U_1 \subset U_\alpha \quad \text{or} \quad U_\alpha \subset U_1,$$

and

$$U_2 \subset U_\alpha \quad \text{or} \quad U_\alpha \subset U_2.$$

By comparing with $U_1 \cap U_2 = \emptyset$ in (3.56), $U_1 \cap U_\alpha \neq \emptyset$ and $U_2 \cap U_\alpha \neq \emptyset$ in (3.55),

$$(3.57) \quad U_1, U_2 \subset U_\alpha.$$

Since $U_\alpha \not\supset U \cap B_R$, we have that $B_R \setminus \overline{U_\alpha} \neq \emptyset$. So we obtain from (3.57) that

$$(3.58) \quad U_1 \cap (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{U_\alpha}) = \emptyset, \quad U_2 \cap (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{U_\alpha}) = \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad B_R \cap (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{U_\alpha}) \neq \emptyset.$$

By (3.56), $U_1 \cap B_R \neq \emptyset$, $U_2 \cap B_R \neq \emptyset$ and $U_1 \cap U_2 = \emptyset$. So with (3.58) and the fact that $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{U_\alpha}$ is $(C^{1,\gamma}, 80R, \theta)$ -domain, Lemma 3.8 gives a contradiction for U_1, U_2 and $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{U_\alpha}$. So (3.55) holds. In view of (3.55) and (1.1),

$$(3.59) \quad \begin{aligned} U_i \in S, \quad U_i \subsetneq U_j, \quad U_i \cap U_\alpha \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad U_i \cap B_R \neq \emptyset \quad \text{for } i \in \{1, 2\} \\ \implies U_1 \cap U_2 \neq \emptyset \\ \implies U_1 \subset U_2 \quad \text{or} \quad U_2 \subset U_1 \\ \implies U_1 \cup U_2 \in S \quad \text{and} \quad U_1 \cup U_2 \subsetneq U_j. \end{aligned}$$

Since the number of the elements in S are finite, by an induction using the definition of U_k in (3.54) and (3.59), one can show that

$$(3.60) \quad U_k \in S \quad \text{and} \quad U_k \subsetneq U_j.$$

So it only remains to prove that $U_k \cap B_R \subsetneq U_j \cap B_R$. Suppose not. Then $U_k \cap B_R \supset U_j \cap B_R$. By (3.41),

$$U_k \cap B_R \supset U_j \cap B_R \supset U \cap B_R.$$

So by the definition of U_j in (3.40), we have that $U_j \subset U_k$, which contradicts (3.60). So we find that $U_k \cap B_R \subsetneq U_j \cap B_R$, and (3.54) holds from (3.60).

[Step 5 : Case (2)] We handle Case (2). With the assumption (3.47) and (3.48), set

$$(3.61) \quad U_k = \bigcup_{U_i \in S, U_i \subsetneq U_j, U_i \cap U_\alpha \neq \emptyset, U_i \cap B_R \neq \emptyset} U_i \quad \text{as in (3.54)} \quad \text{and} \quad U_l = \emptyset.$$

Then by (3.54), (3.44) holds. We next prove (3.43). We claim that

$$(3.62) \quad U_i \in S, \quad U_i \subsetneq U_j \quad \text{and} \quad U_i \cap B_R \neq \emptyset \implies U_i \subset U_k.$$

By (3.48),

$$(3.63) \quad U_i \in S, \quad U_i \subsetneq U_j \quad \text{and} \quad U_i \cap B_R \neq \emptyset \implies U_i \cap U_\alpha \neq \emptyset.$$

From (3.63) and (3.61), if $U_i \in S$ satisfies $U_i \subsetneq U_j$ and $U_i \cap B_R \neq \emptyset$ then

$$U_i \subset \left(\bigcup_{U_i \in S, U_i \subsetneq U_j, U_i \cap U_\alpha \neq \emptyset, U_i \cap B_R \neq \emptyset} U_i \right) = U_k,$$

and the claim (3.62) follows. By (3.62),

$$\bigcup_{U_i \in S, U_i \subsetneq U_j} [U_i \cap B_R] = \bigcup_{U_i \in S, U_i \subsetneq U_j, U_i \cap B_R \neq \emptyset} [U_i \cap B_R] \subset U_k \cap B_R.$$

On the other-hand, by the definition of U_k in (3.61),

$$U_k \cap B_R = \bigcup_{U_i \in S, U_i \subsetneq U_j, U_i \cap U_\alpha \neq \emptyset, U_i \cap B_R \neq \emptyset} [U_i \cap B_R] \subset \bigcup_{U_i \in S, U_i \subsetneq U_j} [U_i \cap B_R].$$

By combining the above two inclusions,

$$(3.64) \quad \bigcup_{U_i \in S, U_i \subsetneq U_j} [U_i \cap B_R] = U_k \cap B_R.$$

From the definition of W_j in (3.42), (3.64) yields that

$$(3.65) \quad \begin{aligned} W_j \cap B_R &= [U_j \cap B_R] \setminus \left(\bigcup_{U_i \in S, U_i \subsetneq U_j} [U_i \cap B_R] \right) \\ &= [U_j \cap B_R] \setminus [U_k \cap B_R]. \end{aligned}$$

Also by (3.44),

$$U_k \cap B_R \subset U_j \cap B_R,$$

and we find from (3.65) that

$$(3.66) \quad U_j \cap B_R = (W_j \cap B_R) \cup (U_k \cap B_R).$$

In view of (3.44), we have that $U_k \subsetneq U_j$. So by the definition of W_j in (3.42),

$$(3.67) \quad W_j \cap U_k = \emptyset.$$

Since $U_l = \emptyset$, it follows from (3.66) and (3.67) that

$$(3.68) \quad U_j \cap B_R = (W_j \sqcup U_k) \cap B_R = (W_j \sqcup U_k \sqcup U_l) \cap B_R$$

which proves (3.43) for Case (2).

[Step 6 : Case (3)] We handle Case (3). With the assumption (3.49) and (3.50), set

$$(3.69) \quad U_k = \bigcup_{U_i \in S, U_i \subsetneq U_j, U_i \cap U_\alpha \neq \emptyset, U_i \cap B_R \neq \emptyset} U_i$$

and

$$(3.70) \quad U_l = \bigcup_{U_i \in S, U_i \subsetneq U_j, U_i \cap U_\beta \neq \emptyset, U_i \cap B_R \neq \emptyset} U_i.$$

Then by (3.54),

$$(3.71) \quad U_k, U_l \in S, \quad U_k, U_l \subsetneq U_j, \quad U_k \cap B_R \subsetneq U_j \cap B_R \quad \text{and} \quad U_l \cap B_R \subsetneq U_j \cap B_R,$$

and (3.44) holds. So it only remains to prove (3.43). To prove (3.43), we claim that

$$(3.72) \quad U_i \in S, \quad U_i \subsetneq U_j \quad \text{and} \quad U_i \cap B_R \neq \emptyset \implies U_i \subset U_k \cup U_l.$$

By (3.50),

$$(3.73) \quad U_i \in S, \quad U_i \subsetneq U_j \quad \text{and} \quad U_i \cap B_R \neq \emptyset \implies U_i \cap U_\alpha \neq \emptyset \text{ or } U_i \cap U_\beta \neq \emptyset,$$

It follows from (3.73), the definition of U_k in (3.69) and U_l in (3.70) that if $U_i \in S$, $U_i \subsetneq U_j$ and $U_i \cap B_R \neq \emptyset$ then

$$\begin{aligned} U_i &\subset \left(\bigcup_{U_m \in S, U_m \subsetneq U_j, U_m \cap U_\alpha \neq \emptyset, U_m \cap B_R \neq \emptyset} U_m \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{U_m \in S, U_m \subsetneq U_j, U_m \cap U_\alpha \neq \emptyset, U_m \cap B_R \neq \emptyset} U_m \right) \\ &= U_k \cup U_l, \end{aligned}$$

and the claim (3.72) follows. In view of (3.72),

$$\bigcup_{U_i \in S, U_i \subsetneq U_j} [U_i \cap B_R] = \bigcup_{U_i \in S, U_i \subsetneq U_j, U_i \cap B_R \neq \emptyset} [U_i \cap B_R] \subset (U_k \cup U_l) \cap B_R.$$

On the other-hand, by the definition of U_k ,

$$U_k \cap B_R = \bigcup_{U_i \in S, U_i \subsetneq U_j, U_i \cap U_\alpha \neq \emptyset, U_i \cap B_R \neq \emptyset} [U_i \cap B_R] \subset \bigcup_{U_i \in S, U_i \subsetneq U_j} [U_i \cap B_R].$$

Similarly, by the definition of U_l ,

$$U_l \cap B_R = \bigcup_{U_i \in S, U_i \subsetneq U_j, U_i \cap U_\beta \neq \emptyset, U_i \cap B_R \neq \emptyset} [U_i \cap B_R] \subset \bigcup_{U_i \in S, U_i \subsetneq U_j} [U_i \cap B_R].$$

By combining the above three inclusions,

$$(3.74) \quad \bigcup_{U_i \in S, U_i \subsetneq U_j} [U_i \cap B_R] = (U_k \cup U_l) \cap B_R.$$

From the definition of W_j in (3.42), (3.74) yields that

$$\begin{aligned} (3.75) \quad W_j \cap B_R &= [U_j \cap B_R] \setminus \left(\bigcup_{U_i \in S, U_i \subsetneq U_j} [U_i \cap B_R] \right) \\ &= [U_j \cap B_R] \setminus [(U_k \cup U_l) \cap B_R]. \end{aligned}$$

In view of (3.71),

$$(3.76) \quad (U_k \cup U_l) \cap B_R \subset U_j \cap B_R,$$

We find from (3.75) and (3.76) that

$$(3.77) \quad U_j \cap B_R = [W_j \cap B_R] \cup [(U_k \cup U_l) \cap B_R].$$

From (3.71), we have that $U_k, U_l \subsetneq U_j$. So by the definition of W_j in (3.42),

$$(3.78) \quad W_j \cap U_k = \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad W_j \cap U_l = \emptyset.$$

We claim that

$$(3.79) \quad U_k \cap U_l \neq \emptyset \implies \text{the assumption in Case (2) holds.}$$

Suppose that $U_k \cap U_l = \emptyset$. From (1.1), we have that $U_k \subset U_l$ or $U_l \subset U_k$ holds. Without loss of generality, we assume that $U_k \subset U_l$. Then there exists

$$U_m \in \{U_i \in S : U_i \subsetneq U_j, U_i \cap U_\alpha \neq \emptyset, U_i \cap B_R \neq \emptyset\} \neq \emptyset,$$

which holds from (3.69) and the fact that $U_k \neq \emptyset$. So again by (3.69),

$$U_\alpha \cap U_k = \bigcup_{U_i \in S, U_i \subsetneq U_j, U_i \cap U_\alpha \neq \emptyset, U_i \cap B_R \neq \emptyset} (U_i \cap U_\alpha) \supset (U_m \cap U_\alpha) \neq \emptyset.$$

Similarly, one can prove that $U_\beta \cap U_l \neq \emptyset$. So by the fact that $U_k \subset U_l$,

$$(3.80) \quad U_\alpha \cap U_l \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad U_\beta \cap U_l \neq \emptyset.$$

From (1.1) and (3.80),

$$U_\alpha \subset U_l \quad \text{or} \quad U_l \subset U_\alpha,$$

and

$$U_\beta \subset U_l \quad \text{or} \quad U_l \subset U_\beta.$$

We have from (3.49) that $U_\alpha \cap U_\beta = \emptyset$. So by comparing (3.80) with the two above inclusions,

$$U_\alpha, U_\beta, U_k \subset U_l,$$

and it follows from (3.50) that

$$U_i \in S \text{ and } U_i \cap B_R \neq \emptyset \implies U_i \cap U_k \neq \emptyset \text{ or } U_i \cap U_l \neq \emptyset. \implies U_i \cap U_l \neq \emptyset.$$

From (3.44), we have that $U_l \not\supset U \cap B_R$. Also by that $U_l \neq \emptyset$, we have that $\{U_i \in S : U_i \subsetneq U_j, U_i \cap U_\beta \neq \emptyset, U_i \cap B_R \neq \emptyset\} \neq \emptyset$, which gives that $U_l \cap B_R \neq \emptyset$ by (3.70). So U_l satisfies the assumption of Case (2) instead of U_α . Under the assumption $U_k \cap U_l \neq \emptyset$, Case (3) turns to Case (2) which we proved earlier. So we only consider the case that $U_k \cap U_l = \emptyset$.

If $U_k \cap U_l = \emptyset$ then we obtain from (3.77) and (3.78) that

$$U_j \cap B_R = (W_j \sqcup U_k \sqcup U_l) \cap B_R$$

which proves (3.43). This completes the proof. \square

Let U be composite $(C^{1,\gamma}, 80R, \theta)$ -domain with subdomains $\{U_1, \dots, U_K\}$. By using Lemma 3.10 and Lemma 3.11, we prove in Lemma 3.12 that $U \cap B_R$ can be decomposed into $W_{i_l} \sqcup \dots \sqcup W_{i_{-m}}$ for W_k in (3.81) so that $U_{i_0} \supsetneq \dots \supsetneq U_{i_l}$, $U_{i_0} \supsetneq \dots \supsetneq U_{i_{-m}}$ and $U_{i_{-m}}, \dots, U_{i_0}, \dots, U_{i_l} \in S$ ($l, m \geq 0$).

Lemma 3.12. *For any $R \in (0, R_4]$ with $R_4(n, \gamma, \theta, \tau)$ in Lemma 3.7, let U be composite $(C^{1,\gamma}, 80R, \theta)$ -domain with subdomains $\{U_1, \dots, U_K\}$ and $U \cap B_R \neq \emptyset$. Set $S = \{U_0 := U, U_1, \dots, U_K, U_{K+1} := \emptyset\}$ and*

$$(3.81) \quad W_j = U_j \setminus \left(\bigcup_{U_i \in S, U_i \subsetneq U_j} U_i \right) \quad (j \in \{0, \dots, K\}).$$

Then there exist $U_{i_{l+1}}, \dots, U_{i_{-m-1}} \in S$ with $l, m \geq 0$ such that

$$(3.82) \quad U \cap B_R = (W_{i_l} \sqcup \dots \sqcup W_{i_{-m}}) \cap B_R,$$

$$(3.83) \quad U_{i_k} \supsetneq U_{i_{k+1}} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq k \leq l, \quad U_{i_k} \supsetneq U_{i_{k-1}} \quad \text{for } -m \leq k \leq 0$$

and

$$(3.84) \quad U_{i_{-m-1}} = U_{i_{l+1}} = \emptyset$$

satisfying

$$(3.85) \quad U \cap B_R = U_{i_0} \cap B_R = (W_{i_0} \sqcup U_{i_1} \sqcup U_{i_{-1}}) \cap B_R$$

$$(3.86) \quad U_{i_k} \cap B_R = (W_{i_k} \sqcup U_{i_{k+1}}) \cap B_R \quad (1 \leq k \leq l)$$

$$(3.87) \quad U_{i_k} \cap B_R = (W_{i_k} \sqcup U_{i_{k-1}}) \cap B_R \quad (-m \leq k \leq -1),$$

and

$$(3.88) \quad U_{i_1} \cap B_R, U_{i_{-1}} \cap B_R \subsetneq U_{i_0} \cap B_R.$$

Moreover, if $\partial U \cap B_R \neq \emptyset$ then $m = 0$.

Remark 3.13. In view of Lemma 3.12, if $a_{ij} = \sum_k a_{ij}^k \chi_{W_k}$ then

$$a_{ij} = a_{ij}^{i_0} \chi_{U_{i_0} \setminus (U_{i_1} \cup U_{i_{-1}})} + \sum_{1 \leq k \leq l} a_{ij}^{i_k} \chi_{U_{i_k} \setminus U_{i_{k+1}}} + \sum_{-m \leq k \leq -1} a_{ij}^{i_k} \chi_{U_{i_k} \setminus U_{i_{k-1}}} \text{ in } U \cap B_R.$$

Proof. [Step 1 : $\partial U \cap B_R = \emptyset$] Assume that $\partial U \cap B_R = \emptyset$. By using Lemma 3.11, one can choose U_{i_0} , U_{i_1} and $U_{i_{-1}}$ satisfying (3.85), (3.88),

$$(3.89) \quad U_{i_0} \supsetneq U_{i_1}, \quad U_{i_0} \supsetneq U_{i_{-1}} \quad \text{and} \quad U_{i_1} \cap B_R, U_{i_{-1}} \cap B_R \subsetneq U_{i_0} \cap B_R = U \cap B_R.$$

With Lemma 3.10, we decompose U_{i_1} and $U_{i_{-1}}$. We first handle U_{i_1} . If $U_{i_1} \cap B_R = \emptyset$ then the chain is finished by taking $l = 0$ and $U_{i_1} = \emptyset$. Otherwise, $U_{i_1} \cap B_R \neq \emptyset$ and $U_{i_1} \not\supset U \cap B_R$ by (3.89). So from Lemma 3.10, there exists U_{i_2} satisfying (3.86) for $k = 1$ and $U_{i_2} \subsetneq U_{i_1}$ and $U_{i_2} \cap B_R \subsetneq U_{i_1} \cap B_R$. Since the number of the element in S is finite, repeat this process until $U_{i_{l+1}} \cap B_R = \emptyset$. Then by letting $U_{i_{l+1}} = \emptyset$, we have (3.86) and

$$U_{i_k} \supsetneq U_{i_{k+1}} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq k \leq l \quad \text{and} \quad U_{i_{l+1}} = \emptyset.$$

Similarly, one can repeat this process for handling $U_{i_{-1}}$ to obtain (3.87) and

$$U_{i_k} \supsetneq U_{i_{k+1}} \quad \text{for } -m \leq k \leq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad U_{i_{-m-1}} = \emptyset.$$

In view of (3.84), (3.85), (3.86) and (3.87), we obtain that (3.82).

[Step 2 : $\partial U \cap B_R \neq \emptyset$] Assume that $\partial U \cap B_R \neq \emptyset$. Then

$$(3.90) \quad (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{U}) \cap B_R \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{U} \text{ is } (C^{1,\gamma}, 80R, \theta)\text{-domain}.$$

By Lemma 3.11, one can find U_{i_0} , U_{i_1} , $U_{i_{-1}}$ in S satisfying (3.85), (3.88) and

$$U_{i_0} \supsetneq U_{i_1}, \quad U_{i_0} \supsetneq U_{i_{-1}} \quad \text{and} \quad U_{i_1} \cap B_R, U_{i_{-1}} \cap B_R \subsetneq U_{i_0} \cap B_R = U \cap B_R,$$

which implies that $U_{i_1} \cap U_{i_{-1}} = \emptyset$, $U_{i_1} \subset U$ and $U_{i_{-1}} \subset U$. So if $U_{i_1} \cap B_R \neq \emptyset$ and $U_{i_{-1}} \cap B_R \neq \emptyset$ then with (3.90), one can apply Lemma 3.8 to U_{i_1} , $U_{i_{-1}}$ and $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{U}$ obtaining a contradiction. So $U_{i_1} = \emptyset$ or $U_{i_{-1}} = \emptyset$ holds, and without loss of generality we let $U_{i_{-1}} = \emptyset$ to obtain $m = 0$. Then one can apply Lemma 3.10 inductively as in the case that $\partial U \cap B_R = \emptyset$ to obtain (3.83) - (3.87). Since $m = 0$, (3.82) follows from (3.85) - (3.87). \square

To prove Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4, we apply Lemma 3.5 and Lemma 3.7 to $U_{i_0} \supsetneq \cdots \supsetneq U_{i_l}$ and $U_{i_0} \supsetneq \cdots \supsetneq U_{i_{-m}}$ in Lemma 3.12. Then we find that the boundaries of a composite $(C^{1,\gamma}, 80R, \theta)$ -domain become graphs with respect to some coordinate system. We first handle the case that $B_R \subset U$.

Theorem 1.3. For any $\tau \in (0, 1]$, one can find $R_0 = R_0(n, \gamma, \theta, \tau) \in (0, 1]$ so that the following holds for any $R \in (0, R_0]$. Suppose that $U \supset B_R$ is a composite $(C^{1,\gamma}, 80R, \theta)$ -domain with subdomains $\{U_1, \dots, U_K\}$. Let

$$S = \{U_0 := U, U_1, \dots, U_K, U_{K+1} := \emptyset\}$$

and

$$W_j = U_j \setminus \left(\bigcup_{U_i \in S, U_i \subsetneq U_j} U_i \right) \quad (j \in \{0, \dots, K\}).$$

Then there exist y -coordinate system and $C^{1,\gamma}$ -functions $\varphi_{-m}, \dots, \varphi_{l+1} : B'_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ($l, m \geq 0$) satisfying

$$(1.3) \quad U \cap B_R = (W_{i_{-m}} \sqcup \dots \sqcup W_{i_l}) \cap B_R$$

and

$$(1.4) \quad \begin{aligned} & \{(y^1, y') \in B_R : \varphi_d(y') < y^1 < \varphi_{d+1}(y')\} \\ & \subset W_{i_d} \cap B_R \\ & \subset \{(y^1, y') \in B_R : \varphi_d(y') \leq y^1 \leq \varphi_{d+1}(y')\} \end{aligned}$$

with the estimates

$$(1.5) \quad \|D_{y'} \varphi_d\|_{L^\infty(B'_R)} \leq \tau \quad \text{and} \quad [D_{y'} \varphi_d]_{C^\gamma(B'_R)} \leq 288n\theta$$

for any $d \in \{-m, \dots, l\}$ where $\varphi_{l+1} \equiv R$ and $\varphi_{-m} \equiv -R$. Moreover, if $B_R \not\subset W_0$ then

$$(1.6) \quad \mathbf{0} \in W_k, \quad (\varphi_k(0'), 0') \in B_R \quad \text{and} \quad D_{y'} \varphi_k(0') = 0'$$

for some $k \in \{-m, \dots, l\}$.

Proof. For $R_4(n, \gamma, \theta, \tau) \in (0, 1]$ in Lemma 3.7, we let $R_0 = R_4 \in (0, 1]$.

[Step 1: Settings] By Lemma 3.12, there exist $U_{i_{l+1}}, \dots, U_{i_{-m-1}} \in S$ ($l, m \geq 0$) such that

$$(3.91) \quad U \cap B_R = (W_{i_l} \sqcup \dots \sqcup W_{i_{-m}}) \cap B_R,$$

$$(3.92) \quad U_{i_k} \supsetneq U_{i_{k+1}} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq k \leq l, \quad U_{i_k} \supsetneq U_{i_{k-1}} \quad \text{for } -m \leq k \leq 0$$

and

$$(3.93) \quad U_{i_{-m-1}} = U_{i_{l+1}} = \emptyset$$

satisfying

$$(3.94) \quad U \cap B_R = U_{i_0} \cap B_R = (W_{i_0} \sqcup U_{i_1} \sqcup U_{i_{-1}}) \cap B_R$$

$$(3.95) \quad U_{i_k} \cap B_R = (W_{i_k} \sqcup U_{i_{k+1}}) \cap B_R \quad (1 \leq k \leq l)$$

$$(3.96) \quad U_{i_k} \cap B_R = (W_{i_k} \sqcup U_{i_{k-1}}) \cap B_R \quad (-m \leq k \leq -1)$$

and

$$(3.97) \quad U_{i_1} \cap B_R, U_{i_{-1}} \cap B_R \subsetneq U_{i_0} \cap B_R.$$

So (1.3) holds from (3.91).

We claim that

$$(3.98) \quad U_{i_k} \not\supset B_R \quad (k \in \{-m, \dots, l\}, k \neq 0).$$

Suppose not. Then we have that $B_R \subset U_{i_k}$ for some $k \in \{-m, \dots, l\}$, $k \neq 0$. On the other-hand, we have from (3.94), (3.95) and (3.96) that

$$U_{i_k} \cap B_R \subsetneq U_{i_0} \cap B_R \subset B_R,$$

and a contradiction occurs from the fact that $B_R \subset U_{i_k}$. So the claim (3.100) holds.

One can easily prove that

$$(3.99) \quad \partial V \cap B_R = \emptyset \quad \implies \quad B_R \subset V \quad \text{or} \quad B_R \cap V = \emptyset,$$

and

$$(3.100) \quad \partial V \cap B_R \neq \emptyset \quad \implies \quad V \not\supset B_R \quad \text{and} \quad V^c \not\supset B_R.$$

We claim that

$$(3.101) \quad \partial U_{i_0} \cap B_R = \emptyset.$$

Suppose not. Then we discover that $\partial U_{i_0} \cap B_R \neq \emptyset$, and so (3.100) implies that $U_{i_0} \not\supset B_R$. From (3.94), we have that $U \cap B_R = U_{i_0} \cap B_R \not\supset B_R$, and this contradicts the assumption of the lemma that $U \supset B_R$. So the claim (3.101) holds.

From (3.91) and the fact that $B_R \subset U$, there exists $k \in \{-m, \dots, l\}$ satisfying

$$(3.102) \quad \mathbf{0} \in W_{i_k} \subset U_{i_k}.$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $k \geq 0$. We first prove the lemma when $k \geq 1$.

[Step 2] In this step, we prove the lemma for $k \geq 1$.

[Step 2-1 : $U_{i_k}, U_{i_{k+1}}, \dots, U_{i_l}$] In this step, we show that (1.4), (1.5) for $d \in \{k, \dots, l\}$ and (1.6) hold when $k \geq 1$. We claim that

$$(3.103) \quad \partial U_{i_k} \cap B_R \neq \emptyset.$$

Suppose not. Then we have that $\partial U_{i_k} \cap B_R = \emptyset$, and it follows from (3.99) and (3.102) that $B_R \subset U_{i_k}$. But this contradicts (3.98). So the claim (3.103) holds.

Since U_{i_k} is $(C^{1,\gamma}, 80R, \theta)$ -domain, by applying Lemma 3.5, there exist an orthonormal matrix V with $\det V > 0$ and $C^{1,\gamma}$ -function $\varphi : B'_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$(3.104) \quad U_{i_k} \cap B_R = \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} y^k V_k \in B_R : y^1 > \varphi_k(y') \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad |\varphi_k(0')| < R,$$

with the estimates

$$(3.105) \quad D_{y'} \varphi_k(0') = 0', \quad \|D_{y'} \varphi_k\|_{L^\infty(B'_R)} \leq \tau \quad \text{and} \quad [D_{y'} \varphi_k]_{C^\gamma(B'_R)} \leq 18n\theta.$$

So for y -coordinate system with the orthonormal basis $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$, we have that

$$(3.106) \quad U_{i_k} \cap B_R = \{(y^1, y') \in B_R : y^1 > \varphi_k(y')\} \quad \text{and} \quad |\varphi_k(0')| < R.$$

Thus (1.5) for $d = 0$ and (1.6) hold. We next handle $U_{i_{k+1}}$.

Suppose that $\partial U_{i_{k+1}} \cap B_R = \emptyset$. Then by (3.99), we have that $B_R \subset U_{i_{k+1}}$ or $B_R \cap U_{i_{k+1}} = \emptyset$. On the other-hand, from (3.92) and (3.97), we have that $U_{i_{k+1}} \cap B_R \subset U_{i_1} \cap B_R \subsetneq U_{i_0} \cap B_R \subset B_R$. So we find that $B_R \cap U_{i_{k+1}} = \emptyset$. So with (3.106), choose $l = k$ and $\varphi_{l+1} \equiv R$. This finishes the proof for [Step 2-1] when $\partial U_{i_{k+1}} \cap B_R = \emptyset$.

Next, assume that for some $l \geq k + 1$, we have that

$$(3.107) \quad U_{i_{k+1}} \cap B_R \neq \emptyset, \dots, U_{i_l} \cap B_R \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad U_{i_{l+1}} \cap B_R = \emptyset.$$

Let z -coordinate system be the coordinate system with $z = -y$. Then by letting $\bar{\varphi}_k(z') = -\varphi_k(-z')$, we have that $(C^{1,\gamma}, 80R, \theta)$ -domain $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{U_{i_k}}$ satisfy

$$(3.108) \quad (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{U_{i_k}}) \cap B_R = \{(z^1, z') \in B_R : z^1 > \bar{\varphi}_k(z')\} \quad \text{and} \quad |\bar{\varphi}_k(0')| < R,$$

with the estimates

$$(3.109) \quad D_{z'} \bar{\varphi}_k(0') = 0, \quad \|D_{z'} \bar{\varphi}_k\|_{L^\infty(B'_R)} \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad [D_{z'} \bar{\varphi}_k]_{C^\gamma(B'_R)} \leq 18n\theta.$$

Since $k \geq 1$, we have from (3.92) that $(C^{1,\gamma}, 80R, \theta)$ -domains $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{U_{i_k}}$ and $U_{i_{k+1}}$ are disjoint. So we apply Lemma 3.7 to $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{U_{i_k}}$, $U_{i_{k+1}}$, $\bar{\varphi}_0$ and $\bar{\varphi}_1$ instead of U_1 , U_2 ,

φ_1 and φ_2 with respect to z -coordinate by using (3.108) and (3.109). Then there exists $C^{1,\gamma}$ -function $\bar{\varphi}_{k+1} : B'_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$U_{i_{k+1}} \cap B_R = \{(z^1, z') \in B_R : z^1 < \bar{\varphi}_{k+1}(z')\}$$

with the estimates

$$\|D_{z'} \bar{\varphi}_k\|_{L^\infty(B'_R)}, \|D_{z'} \bar{\varphi}_{k+1}\|_{L^\infty(B'_R)} \leq \tau$$

and

$$[D_{z'} \bar{\varphi}_k]_{C^\gamma(B'_R)}, [D_{z'} \bar{\varphi}_{k+1}]_{C^\gamma(B'_R)} \leq 288n\theta.$$

Thus by letting $\varphi_{k+1}(y') = -\bar{\varphi}_{k+1}(-y')$, we obtain that

$$U_{i_{k+1}} \cap B_R = \{(y^1, y') \in B_R : y^1 > \varphi_{k+1}(y')\}$$

with the estimates

$$\|D_{y'} \varphi_k\|_{L^\infty(B'_R)}, \|D_{y'} \varphi_{k+1}\|_{L^\infty(B'_R)} \leq \tau$$

and

$$[D_{y'} \varphi_k]_{C^\gamma(B'_R)}, [D_{y'} \varphi_{k+1}]_{C^\gamma(B'_R)} \leq 288n\theta.$$

Repeat this process for $U_{i_{k+2}}, U_{i_{k+3}}, \dots, U_{i_l}$ instead of $U_{i_{k+1}}$. Then one can find $C^{1,\gamma}$ -functions $\varphi_k, \dots, \varphi_l : B'_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that for $d \in \{k, \dots, l\}$,

$$(3.110) \quad U_{i_d} \cap B_R = \{(y^1, y') \in B_R : y^1 > \varphi_d(y')\}$$

with the estimates

$$(3.111) \quad \|D_{y'} \varphi_d\|_{L^\infty(B'_R)} \leq \tau \quad \text{and} \quad [D_{y'} \varphi_d]_{C^\gamma(B'_R)} \leq 288n\theta.$$

Recall from (3.92) and (3.95) that

$$W_{i_d} \cap B_R = [U_{i_d} \setminus U_{i_{d+1}}] \cap B_R \quad \text{and} \quad U_{i_d} \supsetneq U_{i_{d+1}} \quad \text{for} \quad d \in \{k, \dots, l\}.$$

So by (3.110) and (3.111), we find that (1.4) and (1.5) holds for $d \in \{k, \dots, l\}$ by taking $\varphi_{l+1} \equiv R$. Moreover, (1.6) follows from (3.102) and (3.105). To finish [Step 2] for $k \geq 1$, it only remains to prove (1.4) and (1.5) for $d \in \{-m, \dots, k-1\}$.

[Step 2-2 : $U_{i_1}, U_{i_2}, \dots, U_{i_{k-1}}$] In this step, we show that (1.4), (1.5) for $d \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$ and (1.6) hold when $k \geq 1$.

If $k \leq 1$ then $\{1, \dots, k-1\} = \emptyset$ and there is nothing to prove. So we assume that $k \geq 2$. We claim that

$$(3.112) \quad \partial U_{i_{k-1}} \cap B_R \neq \emptyset.$$

Suppose not. Then we have that $\partial U_{i_{k-1}} \cap B_R = \emptyset$. So with the fact that $U_{i_{k-1}} \supset U_{i_k} \ni \mathbf{0}$, we find from (3.99) that $U_{i_{k-1}} \supset B_R$. This contradict (3.98) and the fact that $k \geq 2$. So the claim (3.112) holds.

Since $(C^{1,\gamma}, 80R, \theta)$ -domains $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{U_{i_{k-1}}}$ and U_{i_k} are disjoint, and so we apply Lemma 3.7 to U_{i_k} , $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{U_{i_{k-1}}}$, φ_k and φ_{k-1} instead of U_1 , U_2 , φ_1 and φ_2 by using (3.105) and (3.106). Then there exists $C^{1,\gamma}$ -function $\varphi_{k-1} : B'_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{U_{i_{k-1}}}) \cap B_R = \{(y^1, y') \in B_R : y^1 < \varphi_{k-1}(y')\}$$

with the estimates

$$\|D_{y'} \varphi_{k-1}\|_{L^\infty(B'_R)} \leq \tau \quad \text{and} \quad [D_{y'} \varphi_{k-1}]_{C^\gamma(B'_R)} \leq 288n\theta,$$

which implies that

$$U_{i_{k-1}} \cap B_R = \{(y^1, y') \in B_R : y^1 > \varphi_{k-1}(y')\}$$

Repeat the process for $U_{i_{k-2}}, U_{i_{k-3}}, \dots, U_{i_1}$ instead of $U_{i_{k-1}}$. Then one can find $C^{1,\gamma}$ -functions $\varphi_{k-1}, \dots, \varphi_1 : B'_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that for $d \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$,

$$(3.113) \quad U_{i_d} \cap B_R = \{(y^1, y') \in B_R : y^1 > \varphi_d(y')\}$$

with the estimates

$$(3.114) \quad \|D_{y'} \varphi_d\|_{L^\infty(B'_R)} \leq \tau \quad \text{and} \quad [D_{y'} \varphi_d]_{C^\gamma(B'_R)} \leq 288n\theta.$$

Recall from (3.92) and (3.95) that

$$W_{i_d} \cap B_R = [U_{i_d} \setminus U_{i_{d+1}}] \cap B_R \quad \text{and} \quad U_{i_d} \supsetneq U_{i_{d+1}} \quad \text{for} \quad d \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}.$$

By (3.106), (3.113) and (3.114), (1.4) and (1.5) hold for $d \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$.

[Step 2-3 : U_{-1}, \dots, U_{-m}] In this step, we show that (1.4) and (1.5) for $d \in \{-m, \dots, -1\}$ when $k \geq 1$.

Since $k \geq 1$, we have that $(C^{1,\gamma}, 80R, \theta)$ -domains $U_{i_{-1}}$ and U_{i_k} are disjoint. If $\partial U_{i_{-1}} \cap B_R = \emptyset$, then we have from (3.99) and (3.98) that $B_R \cap U_{i_{-1}} = \emptyset$, and so the proof for [Step 1-4] finished by taking $m = 0$ and $\varphi_{-m} \equiv -R$.

Next, assume that for some $m \geq 1$,

$$(3.115) \quad \partial U_{i_{-1}} \cap B_R \neq \emptyset, \dots, \partial U_{i_{-m}} \cap B_R \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad \partial U_{i_{-m-1}} \cap B_R = \emptyset.$$

Then by using (3.105) and (3.106), we apply Lemma 3.7 to $U_{i_k}, U_{i_{-1}}, \varphi_k$ and φ_0 instead of U_1, U_2, φ_1 and φ_2 to find that there exists $C^{1,\gamma}$ -function $\varphi_{-k} : B'_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$U_{i_{-1}} \cap B_R = \{(y^1, y') \in B_R : y^1 < \varphi_0(y')\}$$

with the estimates

$$\|D_{y'} \varphi_0\|_{L^\infty(B'_R)} \leq \tau \quad \text{and} \quad [D_{y'} \varphi_0]_{C^\gamma(B'_R)} \leq 288n\theta.$$

Repeat the process for $U_{i_{-2}}, U_{i_{-3}}, \dots, U_{i_{-m}}$ instead of $U_{i_{-1}}$. Then one can find $C^{1,\gamma}$ -functions $\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_{-m+1} : B'_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that for $d \in \{-m, \dots, -1\}$,

$$(3.116) \quad U_{i_d} \cap B_R = \{(y^1, y') \in B_R : y^1 < \varphi_{d+1}(y')\}$$

with the estimates

$$(3.117) \quad \|D_{y'} \varphi_{d+1}\|_{L^\infty(B'_R)} \leq \tau \quad \text{and} \quad [D_{y'} \varphi_{d+1}]_{C^\gamma(B'_R)} \leq 288n\theta.$$

Recall from (3.92) and (3.96) that

$$W_{i_d} \cap B_R = [U_{i_d} \setminus U_{i_{d-1}}] \cap B_R \quad \text{and} \quad U_{i_d} \supsetneq U_{i_{d-1}} \quad \text{for} \quad d \in \{-m, \dots, -1\}.$$

So by (3.113), (3.116) and (3.117), we find that (1.4) and (1.5) holds for $d \in \{-m, \dots, -1\}$ by taking $\varphi_{-m} \equiv -R$.

[Step 2-4 : W_{i_0}] In this step, we show that (1.4), (1.5) for $d = 0$ and (1.6) hold when $k \geq 1$.

Recall from (3.92) and (3.94) that

$$W_{i_0} \cap B_R = [U_{i_0} \setminus (U_{i_1} \sqcup U_{i_{-1}})] \cap B_R \quad \text{and} \quad U_{i_1}, U_{i_{-1}} \subsetneq U_{i_0}.$$

So it follows from (3.113) and (3.116) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \{(y^1, y') \in B_R : \varphi_0(y') < y^1 < \varphi_1(y')\} \\ & \subset W_{i_0} \cap B_R \\ & \subset \{(y^1, y') \in B_R : \varphi_0(y') \leq y^1 \leq \varphi_1(y')\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus (1.4) and (1.5) for $d = 0$ follows by taking $d = -1$ in (3.117).

By [Step 2-1] to [Step 2-3], we find that the lemma holds when $k \geq 1$.

[Step 3 : $k = 0$] Suppose that $k = 0$. If $\partial U_{i_1} \cap B_R = \emptyset$ and $\partial U_{i_{-1}} \cap B_R = \emptyset$ then we have from (3.99) and (3.98) that $B_R \cap U_{i_1} = \emptyset$ and $B_R \cap U_{i_{-1}} = \emptyset$. So it follows from (3.94) that $W_{i_0} \cap B_R = U_{i_0} \cap B_R = U \cap B_R = B_R$, and the proof is finished by taking $l = m = 0$ because of that $B_R \subset W_0$.

Next, suppose that one of $\partial U_{i_1} \cap B_R = \emptyset$ or $\partial U_{i_{-1}} \cap B_R = \emptyset$ holds. Without loss of generality, we assume that

$$(3.118) \quad \partial U_{i_{-1}} \cap B_R \neq \emptyset.$$

Then there exists $l \geq 0$ such that

$$(3.119) \quad \partial U_{i_{-1}} \cap B_R \neq \emptyset, \partial U_{i_1} \cap B_R \neq \emptyset, \dots, \partial U_{i_l} \cap B_R \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad \partial U_{i_{l+1}} \cap B_R = \emptyset.$$

By comparing (3.107) and (3.119), one can repeat the proof of [Step 2-1] for $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{U_{i_{-1}}}, U_{i_1}, \dots, U_{i_{l+1}}$ instead of $U_{i_k}, U_{i_{k+1}}, \dots, U_{i_{l+1}}$ to find that one can find $C^{1,\gamma}$ -functions $\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_{l+1} : B'_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ instead of $\varphi_k, \dots, \varphi_{l+1} : B'_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying (1.4), (1.5) and (1.6) holds for $d \in \{0, \dots, l\}$.

In view of (3.118), there exists $m \geq 1$ satisfying that

$$(3.120) \quad \partial U_{i_{-1}} \cap B_R \neq \emptyset, \dots, \partial U_{i_{-m}} \cap B_R \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad \partial U_{i_{-m-1}} \cap B_R = \emptyset.$$

By comparing (3.115) and (3.120), one can repeat [Step 2-3] to find that one can find $C^{1,\gamma}$ -functions $\varphi_0, \varphi_{-1}, \dots, \varphi_{-m+1} : B'_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ instead of $\varphi_k, \varphi_{-1}, \dots, \varphi_{-m+1} : B'_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying (1.4), (1.5) and (1.6) for $d \in \{-m, \dots, -1\}$.

By [Step 3], the lemma holds when $k = 0$. This completes the proof. \square

Next, we handle the case that $\mathbf{0} \in \partial U$. For the convenience of the reader, we restate Theorem 1.4.

Theorem 1.4. *For any $\tau \in (0, 1]$, one can find $R_0 = R_0(n, \gamma, \theta, \tau) \in (0, 1]$ so that the following holds for any $R \in (0, R_0]$. Suppose that U is a composite $(C^{1,\gamma}, 80R, \theta)$ -domain with subdomains $\{U_1, \dots, U_K\}$ and $\mathbf{0} \in \partial U$. Let*

$$S = \{U_0 := U, U_1, \dots, U_K, U_{K+1} := \emptyset\}$$

and

$$W_j = U_j \setminus \left(\bigcup_{U_i \in S, U_i \subsetneq U_j} U_i \right) \quad (j \in \{0, \dots, K\}).$$

Then there exist y -coordinate system and $C^{1,\gamma}$ -functions $\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_{l+1} : B'_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ($l \geq 0$) satisfying

$$(1.7) \quad U \cap B_R = (W_{i_0} \sqcup \dots \sqcup W_{i_l}) \cap B_R$$

and

$$(1.8) \quad \begin{aligned} & \{(y^1, y') \in B_R : \varphi_d(y') < y^1 < \varphi_{d+1}(y')\} \\ & \subset W_{i_d} \cap B_R \\ & \subset \{(y^1, y') \in B_R : \varphi_d(y') \leq y^1 \leq \varphi_{d+1}(y')\} \end{aligned}$$

with the estimates

$$(1.9) \quad \|D_{y'} \varphi_d\|_{L^\infty(B'_R)} \leq \tau \quad \text{and} \quad [D_{y'} \varphi_d]_{C^\gamma(B'_R)} \leq 288n\theta$$

for any $d \in \{0, \dots, l\}$ where $\varphi_{l+1} \equiv R$. Moreover, we have that

$$(1.10) \quad \varphi_0(0') = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad D_{y'} \varphi_0(0') = 0'.$$

Proof. For $R_4(n, \gamma, \theta, \tau) \in (0, 1]$ in Lemma 3.7, we let $R_0 = R_4 \in (0, 1]$.

In view of Lemma 3.12, there exist $U_{i_{l+1}}, \dots, U_{i_0} \in S$ ($l \geq 0$) with

$$(3.121) \quad U \cap B_R = (W_{i_l} \sqcup \dots \sqcup W_{i_0}) \cap B_R, \quad U_{i_k} \supsetneq U_{i_{k+1}} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq k \leq l \quad \text{and} \quad U_{i_{l+1}} = \emptyset$$

satisfying

$$(3.122) \quad U \cap B_R = U_{i_0} \cap B_R \quad \text{and} \quad U_{i_k} \cap B_R = (W_{i_k} \sqcup U_{i_{k+1}}) \cap B_R \quad (0 \leq k \leq l).$$

In view of (3.121), (1.7) holds.

One can easily check that

$$(3.123) \quad \partial V \cap B_R = \emptyset \quad \implies \quad B_R \subset V \quad \text{or} \quad B_R \cap V = \emptyset,$$

We claim that

$$(3.124) \quad \mathbf{0} \in \partial U_{i_0}.$$

One can check from (3.122) that for any $\rho \in (0, R]$,

$$B_\rho \cap U_{i_0}^c = (B_\rho \cap B_R^c) \cup (B_\rho \cap U_{i_0}^c) = B_\rho \cap (B_R^c \cup U_{i_0}^c) = B_\rho \cap (B_R \cap U_{i_0})^c$$

and

$$B_\rho \cap (B_R \cap U_{i_0})^c = B_\rho \cap (B_R \cap U)^c = B_\rho \cap (B_R^c \cup U^c) = B_\rho \cap U^c.$$

So from the fact that $\mathbf{0} \in \partial U$, we have that for any $\rho \in (0, R]$,

$$B_\rho \cap U_{i_0} = B_\rho \cap (B_R \cap U_{i_0}) = B_\rho \cap (B_R \cap U) = B_\rho \cap U \neq \emptyset$$

and

$$B_\rho \cap U_{i_0}^c = B_\rho \cap U^c \neq \emptyset.$$

Thus we find that the claim (3.124) holds.

Since U_{i_0} is $(C^{1,\gamma}, 80R, \theta)$ -domain, by applying Lemma 3.5 with (3.124), there exist an orthonormal matrix V with $\det V > 0$ and $C^{1,\gamma}$ -function $\varphi : B'_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$(3.125) \quad U_{i_0} \cap B_R = \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} y^k V_k \in B_R : y^1 > \varphi_0(y') \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad |\varphi_0(0')| = 0,$$

with the estimates

$$(3.126) \quad D_{y'} \varphi_0(0') = 0', \quad \|D_{y'} \varphi_0\|_{L^\infty(B'_R)} \leq \tau \quad \text{and} \quad [D_{y'} \varphi_0]_{C^\gamma(B'_R)} \leq 18n\theta.$$

So for y -coordinate system with the orthonormal basis $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$, we have that

$$(3.127) \quad U_{i_0} \cap B_R = \{(y^1, y') \in B_R : y^1 > \varphi_0(y')\} \quad \text{and} \quad |\varphi_0(0')| < R.$$

Thus (1.10) holds. We next prove (1.8) and (1.9).

Suppose that $\partial U_{i_1} \cap B_R = \emptyset$. Then by (3.123), we have that $B_R \subset U_{i_1}$ or $B_R \cap U_{i_1} = \emptyset$. On the other-hand, from (3.121) and (3.122), we have that $U_{i_1} \cap B_R \subsetneq U_{i_0} \cap B_R \subset B_R$. So we find that $B_R \cap U_{i_1} = \emptyset$. So with (3.127), choose $l = 1$ and $\varphi_l \equiv R$. This finishes the proof for when $\partial U_{i_1} \cap B_R = \emptyset$.

Next assume that for some $l \geq 1$,

$$(3.128) \quad U_{i_1} \cap B_R \neq \emptyset, \dots, U_{i_l} \cap B_R \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad U_{i_{l+1}} \cap B_R = \emptyset.$$

Let z -coordinate system be the coordinate system with $z = -y$. Then by letting $\bar{\varphi}_0(z') = -\varphi_0(-z')$, we have that $(C^{1,\gamma}, 80R, \theta)$ -domain $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{U_{i_0}}$ satisfy

$$(3.129) \quad (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{U_{i_0}}) \cap B_R = \{(z^1, z') \in B_R : z^1 > \bar{\varphi}_0(z')\} \quad \text{and} \quad |\bar{\varphi}_0(0')| < R,$$

with the estimates

$$(3.130) \quad D_{z'}\bar{\varphi}_0(0') = 0, \quad \|D_{z'}\bar{\varphi}_0\|_{L^\infty(B'_R)} \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad [D_{z'}\bar{\varphi}_0]_{C^\gamma(B'_R)} \leq 18n\theta.$$

We have from (3.122) that $(C^{1,\gamma}, 80R, \theta)$ -domains $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{U_{i_0}}$ and U_{i_1} are disjoint. So we apply Lemma 3.7 to $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{U_{i_0}}$, U_{i_1} , $\bar{\varphi}_0$ and $\bar{\varphi}_1$ instead of U_1 , U_2 , φ_1 and φ_2 with respect to z -coordinate by using (3.129) and (3.130). Then there exists $C^{1,\gamma}$ -function $\bar{\varphi}_1 : B'_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$U_{i_1} \cap B_R = \{(z^1, z') \in B_R : z^1 < \bar{\varphi}_1(z')\}$$

with the estimates

$$\|D_{z'}\bar{\varphi}_0\|_{L^\infty(B'_R)}, \|D_{z'}\bar{\varphi}_1\|_{L^\infty(B'_R)} \leq \tau$$

and

$$[D_{z'}\bar{\varphi}_0]_{C^\gamma(B'_R)}, [D_{z'}\bar{\varphi}_1]_{C^\gamma(B'_R)} \leq 288n\theta.$$

Thus by letting $\varphi_1(y') = -\bar{\varphi}_1(-y')$, we obtain that

$$U_{i_1} \cap B_R = \{(y^1, y') \in B_R : y^1 > \varphi_1(y')\}$$

with the estimates

$$\|D_{y'}\varphi_0\|_{L^\infty(B'_R)}, \|D_{y'}\varphi_1\|_{L^\infty(B'_R)} \leq \tau$$

and

$$[D_{y'}\varphi_0]_{C^\gamma(B'_R)}, [D_{y'}\varphi_1]_{C^\gamma(B'_R)} \leq 288n\theta.$$

Repeat this process for $U_{i_2}, U_{i_{k+3}}, \dots, U_{i_l}$ instead of U_{i_1} . Then one can find $C^{1,\gamma}$ -functions $\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_l : B'_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that for $d \in \{0, \dots, l\}$,

$$(3.131) \quad U_{i_d} \cap B_R = \{(y^1, y') \in B_R : y^1 > \varphi_d(y')\}$$

with the estimates

$$(3.132) \quad \|D_{y'}\varphi_d\|_{L^\infty(B'_R)} \leq \tau \quad \text{and} \quad [D_{y'}\varphi_d]_{C^\gamma(B'_R)} \leq 288n\theta.$$

Recall from (3.122) that

$$(3.133) \quad W_{i_d} \cap B_R = [U_{i_d} \setminus U_{i_{d+1}}] \cap B_R \quad \text{and} \quad U_{i_d} \supsetneq U_{i_{d+1}} \quad \text{for} \quad d \in \{0, \dots, l\}.$$

So by (3.131), (3.132) and (3.133), we find that (1.8) and (1.9) holds for $d \in \{0, \dots, l\}$ by taking $\varphi_{l+1} \equiv R$. \square

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Y. Kim was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) grant funded by the Korea Government NRF-2020R1C1C1A01013363. P. Shin was supported by Basic Science Research Program through the National Research Foundation of Korea(NRF) funded by the Ministry of Education(No. NRF-2020R1I1A1A101066850).

REFERENCES

1. I. Babuška, B. Andersson, P. Smith, K. Levin, Damage analysis of fiber composites. I. Statistical analysis on fiber scale, *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Eng.* 172(1–4), 27–77 (1999).
2. E. Bonnetier, M. Vogelius, An elliptic regularity result for a composite medium with touching fibers of circular cross-section, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* 31 (2000), 651–677.
3. S.-S. Byun, Y. Kim, Elliptic equations with measurable nonlinearities in nonsmooth domains, *Adv. Math.* 288 (2016), 152–200.
4. S.-S. Byun, Y. Kim, Riesz potential estimates for parabolic equations with measurable nonlinearities, *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* 2018, no. 21, 6737–6779.
5. M. Chipot, D. Kinderlehrer, G. Vergara-Caffarelli, Smoothness of linear laminates, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 96(1), 81–96 (1986).
6. H. Dong, Gradient estimates for parabolic and elliptic systems from linear laminates, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 205 (2012), no. 1, 119–149.
7. H. Dong, D. Kim, Parabolic and elliptic systems in divergence form with variably partially BMO coefficients, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* 43 (2011), no. 3, 1075–1098.
8. Y. Jang, Y. Kim, Global gradient estimates for parabolic systems from composite materials. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 57 (2018), no. 2, Art. 63.
9. Y. Jang, Y. Kim, Gradient estimates for solutions of elliptic systems with measurable coefficients from composite material, *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.* 41 (2018), no. 16, 7007–7031.
10. F. Hu, D. Li, L. Wang, Hessian estimates for fourth order elliptic systems with singular BMO coefficients in composite Reifenberg domains, *J. Funct. Anal.* 268 (2015), no. 3, 555–584.
11. H. Kang, H. Lee, K. Yun, Optimal estimates and asymptotics for the stress concentration between closely located stiff inclusions, *Math. Ann.* 363 (2015), no. 3-4, 1281–1306.
12. J. Kim, M. Lim, Electric field concentration in the presence of an inclusion with eccentric core-shell geometry, *Math. Ann.* 373 (2019), no. 1-2, 517–551.
13. Y. Li, L. Nirenberg, Estimates for elliptic systems from composite material, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 56 (2003), no. 7, 892–925.
14. Y. Li, M. Vogelius, Gradient estimates for solutions to divergence form elliptic equations with discontinuous coefficients. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 153 (2000), no. 2, 91–151.
15. S. Neukamm, M. Schäffner, Lipschitz estimates and existence of correctors for nonlinearly elastic, periodic composites subject to small strains, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 58 (2019), no. 2, Paper No. 46, 51 pp.
16. K.W. Um, Elliptic equations with singular BMO coefficients in Reifenberg domains, *J. Differential Equations* 253 (2012), no. 11, 2993–3015.
17. C. Zhang, Gradient estimates for p-Laplacian equation in composite Reifenberg domains, *Nonlinear Anal.* 133 (2016), 134–143.

Email address, Youchan Kim: youchankim@uos.ac.kr

(Youchan Kim) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF SEOUL, SEOUL 02504, REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Email address, Pilsoo Shin: shinpilsoo.math@kgu.ac.kr

(Pilsoo Shin) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, KYONGGI UNIVERSITY, SUWON 16227, REPUBLIC OF KOREA