

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

D.I. Borisov<sup>1,2,3</sup>

1) Institute of Mathematics, Ufa Federal Research Center, Russian Academy of Sciences, Chernyshevsky str. 112, Ufa, Russia, 450008

2) Bashkir State University, Zaki Validi str. 32, Ufa, Russia, 450076

3) University of Hradec Králové 62, Rokitanského, Hradec Králové 50003, Czech Republic

Emails: borisovdi@yandex.ru

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

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

**Mathematics Subject Classification:** 35B27, 35B40

## 1 Introduction

Nowadays a new direction in the homogenization theory devoted to so-called operator estimates is quite intensively developed. In contrast to classical results in the homogenization theory on strong and weak convergence of the solutions, here the studies are aimed on proving the norm resolvent convergence and obtaining estimates for the convergence rates; the latter are often called operator estimates. Recently, such results were obtained in few papers for problems in domains with fine perforation distributed along entire domain. Problems in such perforated domains are classical in the homogenization theory, see, for instance, [17], [18], [20], [11], [13], and the references therein, and there are many results describing the convergence in a strong or weak sense in  $L_2$  and  $W_2^1$  for fixed right hand sides in the equations and boundary conditions. In [10], [14], [15], [21], [27], [28] the classical results were improved and operator estimates were established for several cases of periodic and almost periodic perforation in arbitrary domains. The case of the Neumann condition was addressed in [27], [21], [28] and the sizes of the cavities were of the same order as the distances between them and the perforation was purely periodic. In [15], on the boundaries of the cavities the Dirichlet condition was imposed and the sizes of these cavities were assumed to satisfy certain relation with respect to the size of the periodicity cell. All cavities were of the same shapes up to an arbitrary rotation and its location in the periodicity cell was also quite arbitrary. In [14], [10] the perforation was pure periodic and it was made by small balls with the Dirichlet or Neumann [10] or Robin [14] condition on the boundaries. The main results of the cited papers were the formulation of the homogenized problems and various operator estimates; their order sharpness was not established.

A non-periodic perforation was studied in [2]. Here the domain was a manifold with a perforation made by arbitrary cavities with the Dirichlet or Neumann condition and the operator was the Laplacian. The main results were again homogenized problems and operator estimates and they were established under the validity of certain local upper bounds for  $L_2$ -norm in terms of  $W_2^1$ -norms. And these bounds were the main tools in proving the convergence and operator estimates. Then several cases of possible homogenized problems were addressed and as examples, it was shown that the developed scheme worked for perforation by small balls.

We also mention several recent papers on operator estimates for domain perforated along a given manifold [4], [5], [8]. The perforation was non-periodic and formed by arbitrary cavities and distribution. The homogenized problems were classified and a series of operator estimates was established. In some cases these estimates turned out to be order sharp.

In this paper we study a boundary value problem for a linear second order elliptic equation in a perforated domain. The differential expression is general, involves complex-valued varying coefficients and is not formally symmetric. The perforation is arbitrary and non-periodic and is assumed to satisfy natural geometric conditions. On the boundaries of the cavities we impose the Dirichlet or a nonlinear Robin condition; both types of conditions can be simultaneously present on different cavities. Then we impose additional rather weak conditions on the perforation to describe the case, when the homogenization produces a so-called strange term, namely, when in the homogenized equation an additional potential appears. Our main results states the convergence of the perturbed solution to the homogenized one in  $L_2$ - and  $W_2^1$ -norms uniformly in  $L_2$ -norm of the right hand side in the equation. The estimates for the convergence rates are also proved and some terms in these estimates are shown to be order sharp. An important feature of our results is that our assumptions are rather weak and do not apriori require any local estimates like in [2]. Instead of this we prove that similar estimates are guaranteed by our assumptions. One more advantage of our study is that we can deal with a nonlinear Robin condition.

In conclusion we mention that a similar problem was studied in a very recent paper [3] but in the situation, when the solution to the perturbed problem vanishes as the perforation becomes finer. Operator estimates in such case were obtained and the convergence rates were shown to be order sharp.

## 2 Problem and main results

### 2.1 Formulation of problem

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

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

where  $\eta = \eta(\varepsilon)$  is some function obeying  $0 < \eta(\varepsilon) \leq 1$ . We shall formulate rigorously the assumptions on the cavities  $\omega_{k,\varepsilon}$  later, now we just say that they are assumed to be approximately of the same size (but not the shapes!) and there is a minimal distance between the points  $M_k^\varepsilon$ , which ensures that the domains  $\omega_k^\varepsilon$  are mutually disjoint.

By means of the domains  $\omega_k^\varepsilon$  we introduce a perforation of the domain  $\Omega$  as  $\Omega^\varepsilon := \Omega \setminus \theta^\varepsilon$ . In the perforated domain  $\Omega^\varepsilon$  we consider a boundary value problem for an elliptic equation with the coefficients  $A_{ij} = A_{ij}(x)$ ,  $A_j = A_j(x)$ ,  $A_0 = A_0(x)$  defined in the non-perforated domain  $\Omega$ , which are supposed to satisfy the conditions

$$A_{ij} \in W_\infty^1(\Omega), \quad A_j, A_0 \in L_\infty(\Omega), \quad (2.1)$$

$$A_{ij} = A_{ji}, \quad \sum_{i,j=1}^n A_{ij}(x)\xi_i\bar{\xi}_j \geq c_0 \sum_{j=1}^n |\xi_j|^2, \quad x \in \Omega, \quad \xi_i \in \mathbb{C}, \quad (2.2)$$

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

The boundaries of the cavities  $\omega_k^\varepsilon$  are subject to either the Dirichlet condition or a nonlinear Robin condition. In order to introduce them, we first partition arbitrarily the set  $\theta^\varepsilon$ :

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

For  $x \in \partial\theta_R^\varepsilon$  and  $u \in \mathbb{C}$  by  $a^\varepsilon = a^\varepsilon(x, u)$  we denote a measurable complex-valued function, which will serve as a nonlinear term in the Robin condition; the main assumptions about this function will be formulated later.

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

$$(\mathcal{L} - \lambda)u = f \quad \text{in } \Omega^\varepsilon, \quad u = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \cup \partial\theta_D^\varepsilon, \quad \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} + a^\varepsilon(x, u) = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\theta_R^\varepsilon. \quad (2.3)$$

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

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

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

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

Our main aim is analyze the behavior of a generalized solution to problem (2.3) as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow +0$ . Namely, we address two questions: how does a homogenized problem (2.3) read and whether the operator estimates can be established and if so, what are the corresponding convergence rates? It is very well known that the homogenized problem depends very much on the distribution and shapes of the cavities as well as on their sizes and the distances between them. In this paper consider the case, when a so-called strange term appears and we ensure such situation by a few assumptions on the cavities and the nonlinearity  $a^\varepsilon$  in the Robin condition. All of them will be formulated later, now we just say that the sizes of cavities, controlled by the function  $\eta(\varepsilon)$ , depends on the small parameter  $\varepsilon$ , governing the distances between the holes, as follows:

$$\varepsilon^{-2}\eta^{n-2}(\varepsilon)\varkappa^{-1}(\varepsilon) \rightarrow \gamma, \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow +0, \quad (2.4)$$

where  $\gamma$  is a non-negative constant and

$$\varkappa(\varepsilon) := |\ln \eta(\varepsilon)| + 1 \quad \text{as } n = 2, \quad \varkappa(\varepsilon) := 1 \quad \text{as } n \geq 3.$$

Convergence (2.4) is the key point guaranteeing the appearance of the strange term in our model. Namely, we show that under our assumptions the homogenized problem reads as

$$(\mathcal{L} + \gamma\Upsilon\beta - \lambda)u_0 = f \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad u_0 = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \quad (2.5)$$

where  $\beta \in L_\infty(\Omega)$  is some function determined by the shapes and distribution of the cavities  $\omega_k^\varepsilon$  and  $\Upsilon$  is just a fixed function:

$$\Upsilon(x) := \sqrt{\det A(x)} \text{mes}_{n-1} \partial B_1(0), \quad x \in \Omega;$$

hereinafter by  $B_r(M)$  we denote a ball in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  of a radius  $r$  centered at a point  $M$ , while  $\text{mes}_{n-1}$  denotes the  $(n-1)$ -dimensional measure on surfaces. We observe that in view of ellipticity condition (2.2) the matrix  $A(x)$  is symmetric, positive and bounded uniformly in  $x$  and this is why the function  $\Upsilon$  is well-defined. The assumed smoothness of the functions  $A_{ij}$  implies that  $\Upsilon \in W_\infty^1(\Omega)$ .

## 2.2 Main assumptions

In this subsection we formulate our main assumptions. We begin with a geometric assumption on the cavities  $\omega_k^\varepsilon$ . In the vicinity of the boundaries  $\partial\omega_{k,\varepsilon}$  we define a local variable  $\tau$  being the distance measured along the normal vector  $\nu$  to  $\partial\omega_{k,\varepsilon}$ .

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

$$B_{R_1}(y_{k,\varepsilon}) \subseteq \omega_{k,\varepsilon} \subset B_{R_2}(0), \quad B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \cap B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_j^\varepsilon) = \emptyset, \quad \text{dist}(M_k^\varepsilon, \partial\Omega) \geq R_3\varepsilon, \quad k \neq j, \quad k, j \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon, \quad (2.6)$$

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

The first relation in (2.6) means that all domains  $\omega_{k,\varepsilon}$  are approximately of the same sizes: we can inscribe a fixed ball of the radius  $R_1$  inside each domain, which in its turn is contained in a fixed ball  $B_{R_2}(0)$ . The second condition in (2.6) guarantees that each two neighbouring cavities do not intersect and there is a minimal distance  $2R_3$  between each two neighbouring points  $M_k^\varepsilon$ , while the third condition says that the cavities are not too close to the boundary of  $\Omega$ , see Figure 1. The connectedness of the domains  $B_{R_2}(0) \setminus \omega_{k,\varepsilon}$  is also a natural condition meaning that the perforation produces no new isolated connected components in the domain  $\Omega$ . The rest of Assumption A1 postulates a regularity of the boundaries  $\partial\omega_{k,\varepsilon}$  uniformly in  $k$  and  $\varepsilon$ .

Our second assumptions concern the function  $a^\varepsilon$ . We first suppose that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Re}(a^\varepsilon(x, u_1) - a^\varepsilon(x, u_2))\overline{(u_1 - u_2)} &\geq -\mu_0(\varepsilon)|u_1 - u_2|^2, \\ |a^\varepsilon(x, u_1) - a^\varepsilon(x, u_2)| &\leq c_1|u_1 - u_2|, \quad a^\varepsilon(x, 0) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$




Figure 1: Domains  $\omega_k^\varepsilon$  (indicated by solid black lines) and points  $M_k^\varepsilon$  (indicated by gray color). Dotted lines show (rescaled) balls  $B_{\varepsilon R_1}(M_{k,\varepsilon} + \varepsilon y_{k,\varepsilon})$  and  $B_{\varepsilon R_2}(M_k^\varepsilon)$  from the first condition in (2.6) and balls  $B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)$  from the second condition.

where  $c_1$  is some constant independent of  $\varepsilon$ ,  $x \in \partial\omega_R^\varepsilon$  and  $u_1, u_2 \in \mathbb{C}$  and  $\mu_0(\varepsilon)$  is some nonnegative function such that

$$\varepsilon\eta(\varepsilon)\varkappa(\varepsilon)\mu_0(\varepsilon) \rightarrow +0, \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow +0. \quad (2.8)$$

These conditions describe the class of admissible nonlinearities and in view of the technique we use, they guarantee the unique solvability of problem (2.3).

A more important assumption for  $a^\varepsilon$  is as follows; it is needed to ensure that the homogenized problem is indeed (2.5).

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

$$\operatorname{Re} a^\varepsilon(x, u)\bar{u} \geq \mu_1(\varepsilon)|u|^2, \quad x \in \partial\omega_k^\varepsilon, \quad u \in \mathbb{C}, \quad k \in \mathbb{M}_{R,1}^\varepsilon, \quad (2.9)$$

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

where  $\mu_1 = \mu_1(\varepsilon)$  is a fixed function independent of  $k \in \mathbb{M}_{R,1}^\varepsilon$ , the functions  $b_k(\xi, \varepsilon)$ ,  $\xi \in \partial\omega_k^\varepsilon$ , and  $\tilde{a}_k^\varepsilon(x, u)$ ,  $(x, u) \in \partial\omega_k^\varepsilon \times \mathbb{C}$ , are complex-valued, the functions  $b_k(\xi, \varepsilon)$  belong to  $C^1(\partial\omega_{k,\varepsilon})$ , while  $\tilde{a}_k^\varepsilon(x, u)$  are measurable in  $x$  and  $u$  for each  $\varepsilon$  and

$$\varepsilon\eta(\varepsilon)\varkappa^{-1}(\varepsilon)\mu_1(\varepsilon) \rightarrow +\infty, \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow +0, \quad (2.11)$$

$$\|b_k(\cdot, \varepsilon)\|_{C^1(\partial\omega_{k,\varepsilon})} \leq c_3, \quad \operatorname{Re} b_k(\xi, \varepsilon) \geq c_2, \quad \xi \in \partial\omega_{k,\varepsilon}, \quad (2.12)$$

$$|\tilde{a}_k^\varepsilon(x, u)| \leq \mu_2(\varepsilon)|u|, \quad x \in \partial\omega_k^\varepsilon, \quad u \in \mathbb{C}, \quad \varepsilon\eta(\varepsilon)\varkappa(\varepsilon)\mu_2(\varepsilon) \rightarrow +0, \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow +0,$$

$c_2, c_3$  are some positive constants independent of  $\varepsilon, \xi$  and  $k$  and  $\mu_2$  is some function independent of  $k$ .

This condition says that we deal with two main types of the nonlinear Robin condition. The first is imposed for  $k \in \mathbb{M}_{R,1}^\varepsilon$  and here the nonlinear term  $a^\varepsilon$  is sign definite and large in the sense of inequality (2.9) and convergence (2.11). These conditions ensure that the corresponding cavities, for  $k \in \mathbb{M}_{R,1}^\varepsilon$ , behave similar to ones with the Dirichlet condition for  $k \in \mathbb{M}_D^\varepsilon$ . Namely, the traces of the function  $u_\varepsilon$  on  $\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon$  for  $k \in \mathbb{M}_{R,1}^\varepsilon$  tend to zero as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow +0$ .

The second type of the Robin condition is imposed for  $k \in \mathbb{M}_{R,2}^\varepsilon$  and here the function  $a^\varepsilon$  is linear in the leading term as it is described by (2.10), (2.12). The coefficient  $\varepsilon^{-1}\eta^{-1}$  at the functions  $b_k$  indicates the minimal growth of the linear term in the Robin condition; a faster growth is also allowed since the functions  $b_k$  can additionally depend on  $\varepsilon$ .

All cavities with both the Dirichlet and the Robin conditions contribute to the function  $\beta$  in the strange term in (2.5). The contribution of each cavity is made via certain constants, which are related with the following

boundary value problems:

$$\operatorname{div}_\xi A(M_k^\varepsilon) \nabla_\xi X_{k,\varepsilon} = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{\omega_{k,\varepsilon}}, \quad k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon, \quad (2.13)$$

$$X_{k,\varepsilon} = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\omega_{k,\varepsilon}, \quad k \in \mathbb{M}_D^\varepsilon \cup \mathbb{M}_{R,1}^\varepsilon, \quad (2.14)$$

$$\nu_\xi \cdot A(M_k^\varepsilon) \nabla_\xi X_{k,\varepsilon} + b_k(\xi, \varepsilon) X_{k,\varepsilon} = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\omega_{k,\varepsilon}, \quad k \in \mathbb{M}_{R,2}^\varepsilon, \quad (2.15)$$

$$X_{k,\varepsilon}(\xi) = \begin{cases} 1 + K_{k,\varepsilon} |A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon)\xi|^{-n+2} + O(|\xi|^{-n+1}), & \xi \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{as } n \geq 3, \\ \ln |A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon)\xi| + K_{k,\varepsilon} + O(|\xi|^{-1}), & \xi \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{as } n = 2, \end{cases} \quad (2.16)$$

where  $K_{k,\varepsilon}$  are some constants and  $\nu_\xi$  is the unit normal to  $\partial\omega_{k,\varepsilon}$  directed inside  $\omega_{k,\varepsilon}$ . We shall show in Lemma 4.1 that these problems are uniquely solvable and have classical solutions belonging to  $C^2(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \omega_{k,\varepsilon}) \cap C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{\omega_{k,\varepsilon}})$ . As  $n \geq 3$ , the constants  $K_{k,\varepsilon}$  can be treated as certain capacities of the cavities  $\omega_{k,\varepsilon}$ .

We introduce an auxiliary function:

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

where  $\operatorname{mes}_n$  stands for the Lebesgue measure in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . It will be shown, see Lemma 4.4, that the constants  $K_{k,\varepsilon}$  for  $n \geq 3$  are bounded uniformly in  $k$  and  $\varepsilon$ . Then it follows from the above definition that the family of functions  $\beta_\varepsilon$  belongs to  $L_\infty(\Omega)$  and is bounded uniformly in  $\varepsilon$  in this space. Our third assumption says that the function  $\beta_\varepsilon$  converges to some limit  $\beta$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow +0$  in an appropriate space of multipliers; this is how the strange term in (2.5) appears and how the cavities contributes to this term. The mentioned space of multipliers is denoted by  $\mathfrak{M}$  and this is the space of the functions  $F$  defined on  $\Omega$  such that for each  $u \in \dot{W}_2^1(\Omega) \cap W_2^2(\Omega)$  the function  $Fu$  is a continuous antilinear functional on  $\dot{W}_2^1(\Omega)$ ; here  $\dot{W}_2^1(\Omega)$  is the space of the functions from  $W_2^1(\Omega)$  with the zero trace on  $\partial\Omega$ . The norm in  $\mathfrak{M}$  is introduced as

$$\|F\|_{\mathfrak{M}} = \sup_{\substack{u \in \dot{W}_2^1(\Omega) \cap W_2^2(\Omega) \\ v \in \dot{W}_2^1(\Omega)}} \frac{|\langle Fu, v \rangle|}{\|u\|_{W_2^2(\Omega)} \|v\|_{W_2^1(\Omega)}}, \quad (2.18)$$

where  $\langle Fu, v \rangle$  stands for the action of the functional  $Fu$  on a function  $v$ . The space  $L_\infty(\Omega)$  is a subset of  $\mathfrak{M}$  due to the identity  $\langle Fu, v \rangle = (Fu, v)_{L_2(\Omega)}$  for  $F \in L_\infty(\Omega)$ .

Our third assumption reads as follows.

A3. The family of the functions  $\beta^\varepsilon$  converges in  $\mathfrak{M}$ .

This assumption means that there exists a function  $\beta \in \mathfrak{M}$  such that  $\|\beta^\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}} \rightarrow 0$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow +0$ . Since the function  $\beta_\varepsilon$  is determined by the distribution of the points  $M_k^\varepsilon$  and also by the shapes of the cavities as  $n \geq 3$ , this assumption describes the class of non-periodic perforations, which we can consider. We shall discuss the convergence in the space  $\mathfrak{M}$  as well as possible examples of the perforations in a separate Section 6. In particular, it will be shown that the limit  $\beta$  is necessary an element of the space  $L_\infty(\Omega)$ .

## 2.3 Main results

Here we formulate our main results. They involve a special boundary corrector generated by the cavities and this corrector is introduced as follows. We denote

$$E_{k,\varepsilon} := \{\xi : |A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon)\xi| < R_4 \eta^{-1}\}, \quad E_k^\varepsilon := \{x : |A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon)(x - M_k^\varepsilon)| < R_4 \varepsilon\},$$

where  $R_4 > 0$  is some fixed positive constant independent of  $\varepsilon$ ,  $k$  and  $\eta$  such that

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

Convergence (2.4) yields that  $\eta(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow +0$  and in view of Assumption A1 and conditions (2.1), (2.2) such constant  $R_4$  obviously exists. We consider one more family of boundary value problem similar to (2.13), (2.14), (2.15), (2.16):

$$\operatorname{div}_\xi A(M_k^\varepsilon) \nabla_\xi Z_{k,\varepsilon} = 0 \quad \text{in } E_{k,\varepsilon} \setminus \overline{\omega_{k,\varepsilon}}, \quad k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon, \quad (2.19)$$

$$Z_{k,\varepsilon} = \begin{cases} 1 + K_{k,\varepsilon} R_4^{-n+2} \eta^{n+2} & \text{as } n \geq 3, \\ |\ln \eta| + \ln R_4 + K_{k,\varepsilon} & \text{as } n = 2, \end{cases} \quad \text{on } \partial E_{k,\varepsilon}, \quad (2.20)$$

with boundary conditions (2.14), (2.15) on  $\partial\omega_{k,\varepsilon}$ . We shall show in Lemma 4.5 that these problems are uniquely solvable and possess classical solutions belonging to  $C^2(\overline{E_{k,\varepsilon}} \setminus \omega_{k,\varepsilon}) \cap C^\infty(E_{k,\varepsilon} \setminus \overline{\omega_{k,\varepsilon}})$ . The aforementioned corrector is introduced as follows:

$$\Xi_\varepsilon(x) := \begin{cases} \frac{Z_{k,\varepsilon}((x - M_k^\varepsilon)\varepsilon^{-1}\eta^{-1})}{1 + K_{k,\varepsilon}R_4^{-n+2}\eta^{n-2}} & \text{in } E_k^\varepsilon \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon, \quad k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon, \quad n \geq 3, \\ \frac{Z_{k,\varepsilon}((x - M_k^\varepsilon)\varepsilon^{-1}\eta^{-1})}{|\ln \eta| + \ln R_4 + K_{k,\varepsilon}} & \text{in } E_k^\varepsilon \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon, \quad k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon, \quad n = 2, \\ 1 & \text{in } \Omega \setminus \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon} E_k^\varepsilon. \end{cases} \quad (2.21)$$

Now we are in position to formulate our main result.

**Theorem 2.1.** *Let Assumption A1 and (2.4) be satisfied. In the case  $\mathbb{M}_R^\varepsilon \neq \emptyset$  suppose also that Assumption A2 holds true and if  $\gamma \neq 0$ , let Assumption A3 hold as well. Then there exists a fixed  $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{R}$  independent of  $\varepsilon$  such that as  $\operatorname{Re} \lambda \leq \lambda_0$ , problems (2.3), (2.5) are uniquely solvable for each  $f \in L_2(\Omega)$  and the solutions satisfy the estimates:*

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

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

where  $C$  is some constant independent of  $\varepsilon$  and  $f$ . If the set  $\mathbb{M}_R^\varepsilon$  is empty, then the terms  $(\varepsilon \eta \mu_1 \varkappa)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$  and  $\varepsilon \eta \mu_2$  can be omitted in the above estimates. The terms  $\varepsilon$ ,  $|\eta^{n-2} \varepsilon^{-2} \varkappa^{-1} - \gamma|$ ,  $\|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}}$  and  $\varepsilon \eta \varkappa \mu_2$  in estimate (2.22) are order sharp. The terms  $|\eta^{n-2} \varepsilon^{-2} \varkappa^{-1} - \gamma|$  and  $\|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}}$  in (2.23) are order sharp.

In a particular case  $\gamma = 0$  the assumptions on the perforation can be weakened; this case is treated in the following theorem.

**Theorem 2.2.** *Let condition (2.4) hold with  $\gamma = 0$  and Assumption A1 be satisfied. Then there exists a fixed  $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{R}$  independent of  $\varepsilon$  such that as  $\operatorname{Re} \lambda \leq \lambda_0$ , problems (2.3) and (2.5) with  $\beta = 0$  are uniquely solvable for each  $f \in L_2(\Omega)$  and the solutions satisfy the estimates*

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

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

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

where  $C$  are some constants independent of  $\varepsilon$  and  $f$ . The term  $\eta^{\frac{n}{2}-1} \varepsilon^{-1} \varkappa^{-\frac{1}{2}}$  in (2.24) is order sharp.

Let us discuss briefly the problem and main result. There are several main features of our problem. The first is that we consider a general perforation of a rather arbitrary non-periodic structure. Assumption A1 is very natural and rather weak. While the second condition in (2.6) describes the minimal distance between the points  $M_k^\varepsilon$ , at the same time there are no upper bound for these distances and they can be uniformly bounded from below or even growing as  $\varepsilon$  goes to zero. In particular, this means that our results also applies to the case of finitely many small cavities separated by fixed distances.

The second feature is that the boundaries of the cavities can be subject either to the Dirichlet condition or to the nonlinear Robin condition; both types of these conditions can be simultaneously present on the boundaries of the cavities. The structure of the Robin condition is described by Assumption A2 and these the only serious restrictions. As we have already said, conditions (2.7), (2.8) are needed only to ensure the unique solvability of problem (2.3) and they hold immediately once we deal with the classical linear Robin condition, that is, as  $a^\varepsilon(x, u) = a_\varepsilon(x)u$  with an appropriate function  $a_\varepsilon(x)$ . The third feature of our model is that we consider a general second linear elliptic equation and the differential expression  $\mathcal{L}$  is not supposed to be formally symmetric. The coefficients  $A_j$  and  $A_0$  are allowed to be complex-valued.

Our main theorem states that under the above discussed conditions, the homogenized problem is (2.5) and the convergence in  $W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)$  and  $L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)$  holds uniformly in the right hand side  $f$ ; the estimates for the convergence rates are our main results. In the case when the Robin condition is present and is linear, these are operator estimates describing the norm resolvent convergence of the perturbed operator to the homogenized one. Estimate (2.22) says that the solution  $u_\varepsilon$  to problem (2.3) can be approximated by  $u_0 \Xi_\varepsilon$  in  $W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)$  and the estimate for the convergence rate is provided. The corrector  $\Xi_\varepsilon$  can be omitted and then we have a similar result but only in  $L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)$  with the same convergence rate. The terms involving  $\mu_1$  and  $\mu_2$  are generated only

due to the presence of the nonlinear Robin condition. If the set  $\mathbb{M}_R^\varepsilon$  is empty, they can be removed from the estimates.

It is also shown that all terms except for  $(\varepsilon\eta\chi\mu_1)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$  are order sharp in (2.22). In particular, this implies that the term  $\|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathcal{M}}$  can not be omitted and hence, the same concerns Assumption A3. In estimate (2.23), two terms in the convergence rate are also order sharp. It is unclear to us whether other terms in (2.22), (2.23) are also order sharp or the estimate could be improved by using some additional techniques. This question remained open.

As  $\gamma = 0$ , it is possible to omit Assumptions A2, A3 and to prove similar results only under Assumption A1, see estimates (2.24), (2.25). We stress that in (2.24) the corrector is absent in comparison with (2.22) but the price we pay for this and for omitting additional assumptions is a worse convergence rate. However, estimating then in  $L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)$ -norm, the order of the convergence rate can be improved twice, see (2.25). The term  $\varepsilon^{-1}\eta^{\frac{n}{2}-1}\chi^{-\frac{1}{2}}$  is shown to be order sharp in (2.24). The sharpness of the other terms in (2.24) and of all terms in (2.25) remains an open question.

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

### 3 Auxiliary lemmata

In this section we provide a series of auxiliary lemmata, which will be employed then in the proofs of Theorem 2.1, 2.2.

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

$$\|u\|_{L_2(\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \leq C \left( \varepsilon\eta\chi \|\nabla u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 + \varepsilon^{-1}\eta^{n-1} \|u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus B_{\varepsilon R_2}(M_k^\varepsilon))}^2 \right), \quad (3.1)$$

$$\|u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon\eta R_2}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \leq C \left( \varepsilon\eta \|u\|_{L_2(\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 + \varepsilon^2\eta^2 \|\nabla u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \right), \quad (3.2)$$

hold, where  $C$  are constants independent of  $k$ ,  $\varepsilon$ ,  $\eta$  and  $u$ . If, in addition,

$$\int_{B_{\varepsilon\eta R_2}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon} u \, dx = 0, \quad (3.3)$$

then the estimate

$$\|u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon\eta R_2}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \leq C\varepsilon^2\eta^2 \|\nabla u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \quad (3.4)$$

holds, where  $C$  is a constant independent of  $k$ ,  $\varepsilon$ ,  $\eta$  and  $u$ .

*Proof.* Inequality (3.1) was proved in [3, Lm. 3.6], while inequality (3.4) was established in [3, Lm. 3.5]. Given an arbitrary  $k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon$  and  $u \in W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon\eta R_2}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)$ , we denote

$$\langle u \rangle_k := \frac{1}{|B_{\varepsilon\eta R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon|} \int_{B_{\varepsilon\eta R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon} u \, dx, \quad u_k := u - \langle u \rangle_k. \quad (3.5)$$

The function  $u_k$  satisfies condition (3.3) and by (3.4) we have

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

hereinafter in the proof we denote by  $C$  inessential constants independent of  $\varepsilon$ ,  $\eta$ ,  $k$  and  $v$ . By [3, Lm. 3.5] we also have:

$$\|u_k\|_{L_2(\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \leq C\varepsilon\eta \|\nabla u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon\eta R_3} \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2. \quad (3.6)$$

Employing the first condition in (2.6), we argue as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon} |u|^2 \, ds &= |\langle u \rangle_k|^2 \operatorname{mes}_{n-1} \partial\omega_k^\varepsilon + 2 \operatorname{Re} \overline{\langle u \rangle_k} \int_{\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon} u_k \, ds + \int_{\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon} |u_k|^2 \, ds \\ &\geq (R_1\varepsilon\eta)^{n-1} |\langle u \rangle_k|^2 \operatorname{mes}_{n-1} \partial B_1(0) - 2 |\langle u \rangle_k| \int_{\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon} |u_k| \, ds \end{aligned}$$

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

Hence, by (3.6),

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

Using this estimate and (3.6), we obtain:

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

This proves (3.2).  $\square$

We note that under convergence (2.4) we have

$$\eta^{n-1} = \varepsilon^2\eta\chi \cdot \varepsilon^{-2}\eta^{n-2}\chi^{-1} \leq C\varepsilon^2\eta\chi, \quad (3.7)$$

where  $C$  is some fixed constant independent of  $\varepsilon$  and  $\eta$ . Then estimate (3.1) can be rewritten as

$$\|u\|_{L_2(\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \leq C\varepsilon\eta\chi\|u\|_{W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2. \quad (3.8)$$

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

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

holds with a constant  $C$  independent of  $k$ ,  $\varepsilon$  and  $u$ .

*Proof.* For each  $u \in W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)$  we integrate by parts as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon\eta R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 &= \frac{1}{n} \int_{B_{\varepsilon\eta R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon} |u|^2 \operatorname{div} x dx \\
&= \frac{\varepsilon\eta R_3}{n} \int_{\partial B_{\varepsilon\eta R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)} |u|^2 ds + \frac{1}{n} \int_{\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon} |u|^2 x \cdot \nu ds - \frac{1}{n} \int_{B_{\varepsilon\eta R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon} x \cdot \nabla |u|^2 dx.
\end{aligned}$$

We estimate the integral over  $B_{\varepsilon\eta R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon$  in this inequality as

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \int_{B_{\varepsilon\eta R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon} x \cdot \nabla |u|^2 dx \right| &\leq 2\varepsilon\eta R_3 \int_{B_{\varepsilon\eta R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon} |u| |\nabla u| dx \\
&\leq \|u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon\eta R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 + \varepsilon^2\eta^2 R_3^2 \|\nabla u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon\eta R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

The integrals over  $\partial B_{\varepsilon\eta R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)$  and  $\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon$  are estimated by means of inequality (3.1) and this finally completes the proof.  $\square$

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

$$\int_{B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon} u(x) dx = 0 \quad (3.9)$$

the estimate

$$\|u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \leq C\varepsilon^2\|\nabla u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2, \quad (3.10)$$

holds, where  $C$  is a constant independent of the parameters  $k$ ,  $\varepsilon$ ,  $\eta$  and the function  $u$ .

*Proof.* We first consider the Neumann Laplacian on the annulus  $B_{R_3}(0) \setminus B_{\eta R_3}(0)$ ; we denote it by  $\mathcal{D}_\eta^N$ . Since  $\eta \rightarrow +0$ , by [6, Thm. 1.2], this operator converges in the norm resolvent sense to the Neumann Laplacian on  $B_{R_3}(0)$ , which we denote by  $\mathcal{D}_0^N$ . Namely, the estimate holds:

$$\|(\mathcal{D}_\eta^N - i)^{-1}g - (\mathcal{D}_0^N - i)^{-1}g\|_{W_2^1(B_{R_3}(0) \setminus B_{\eta R_3}(0))} \leq C\eta^{\frac{1}{2}}\|g\|_{L_2(B_{R_3}(0))}$$



for each  $g \in L_2(B_{R_3}(0))$  with a constant  $C$  independent of  $\eta$  and  $g$ . Employing this estimate and proceeding as in [8, Sect. 7], we easily see that the spectrum of  $\mathcal{D}_\eta^N$  converges to that of  $\mathcal{D}_0^N$  as  $\eta \rightarrow +0$  and hence, the second eigenvalue of the operator  $\mathcal{D}_\eta^N$  is positive and separated from zero uniformly in  $\eta$ . Therefore, by the minimax principle, for each  $\tilde{u} \in W_2^1(B_{R_3}(0) \setminus B_{\eta R_3}(0))$  obeying the condition

$$\int_{B_{R_3}(0) \setminus B_{\eta R_3}(0)} \tilde{u} \, d\xi = 0$$

we have the estimate

$$\frac{\|\nabla \tilde{u}\|_{L_2(B_{R_3}(0) \setminus B_{\eta R_3}(0))}^2}{\|\tilde{u}\|_{L_2(B_{R_3}(0) \setminus B_{\eta R_3}(0))}^2} \geq C,$$

where  $C$  is a positive constant independent of  $\tilde{u}$  and  $\eta$ . Given then an arbitrary function  $u \in W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus B_{\varepsilon \eta R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon))$  such that

$$\int_{B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus B_{\varepsilon \eta R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)} u \, dx = 0 \quad (3.11)$$

and applying the above inequality to  $\tilde{u}(\xi) := u(M_k^\varepsilon + \varepsilon \xi)$ , we obtain:

$$\|u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus B_{\varepsilon \eta R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon))}^2 \leq C \varepsilon^2 \|\nabla u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus B_{\varepsilon \eta R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon))}^2, \quad (3.12)$$

where  $C$  is a positive constant independent of  $u$ ,  $k$ ,  $\varepsilon$  and  $\eta$ .

Let  $u \in W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)$  be an arbitrary function obeying condition (3.9). In  $B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus B_{\varepsilon \eta R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)$  we represent it as

$$u = u_\dagger + u_\ddagger, \quad u_\dagger := \frac{1}{\text{mes}_n B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus B_{\varepsilon \eta R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)} \int_{B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus B_{\varepsilon \eta R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)} u \, dx, \quad u_\ddagger := u - u_\dagger. \quad (3.13)$$

The function  $u_\ddagger$  obviously satisfies condition (3.11) and hence, inequality (3.12), while due to (3.9) and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality for the constant  $u_\dagger$  we have

$$|u_\dagger|^2 = \left| \frac{1}{\text{mes}_n B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus B_{\varepsilon \eta R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)} \int_{B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon} u \, dx \right|^2 \leq C \eta^n \varepsilon^{-n} \|u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon \eta R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2,$$

where  $C$  is a constant independent of  $u$ ,  $k$ ,  $\varepsilon$  and  $\eta$ . Then by the above estimate, inequality (3.12) for  $u_\ddagger$ , Lemma 3.2 and the convergence  $\eta \rightarrow 0$  we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 &\leq C(\varepsilon^n |u_\dagger|^2 + \|u_\ddagger\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus B_{\varepsilon \eta R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon))}^2) + \|u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon \eta R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \\ &\leq C \|u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon \eta R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 + C \varepsilon^2 \|\nabla u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus B_{\varepsilon \eta R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon))}^2 \\ &\leq C \eta^n \|u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon \eta R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 + C \varepsilon^2 \|\nabla u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C$  are some fixed constants independent of  $u$ ,  $k$ ,  $\varepsilon$  and  $\eta$ . The obtained estimates imply (3.10). The proof is complete.  $\square$

We recall that a generalized solution to problem (2.3) is a function  $u \in \dot{W}_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon, \partial\Omega \cup \partial\theta_D^\varepsilon)$  satisfying the integral identity

$$\mathfrak{h}(u, v) + (a^\varepsilon(\cdot, u), v)_{L_2(\partial\theta_{\bar{R}}^\varepsilon)} - \lambda(u_\varepsilon, v)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} = (f, v)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \quad (3.14)$$

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

$$\mathfrak{h}(u, v) := (A \nabla u, \nabla v)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} + \sum_{j=1}^n \left( A_j \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_j}, v \right)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} + (A_0 u, v)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}.$$

A generalized solution to problem (2.5) is defined in a similar way. The next lemma ensures the unique solvability of problems (2.3), (2.5).

**Lemma 3.4.** *Under Assumption A1 and also under Assumption A2 if  $\mathbf{M}_R^\varepsilon \neq \emptyset$ , there exists  $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{R}$  independent of  $\varepsilon$  such that for  $\text{Re } \lambda < \lambda_0$  problems (2.3), (2.5) are uniquely solvable for each  $f \in L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)$  and for their solutions the estimates*

$$\|u_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \leq C(\lambda) \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}, \quad (3.15)$$

$$\|u_0\|_{W_2^2(\Omega)} \leq C(\lambda) \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \quad (3.16)$$

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

*Proof.* Assumption A2 guarantees that estimate (2.5) in [3] is satisfied and hence, by Lemma 3.7 in [3], there exists  $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{R}$  independent of  $\varepsilon$  such that for  $\operatorname{Re} \lambda < \lambda_0$  problem (2.3) is solvable in  $\dot{W}_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon, \partial\Omega \cup \partial\theta_D^\varepsilon)$  for each  $f \in L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)$ . This is why we just need to check the uniqueness of the solution.

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

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

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

$$\mathfrak{h}(\hat{u}_\varepsilon, \hat{u}_\varepsilon) - \lambda \|\hat{u}_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}^2 + (a^\varepsilon(\cdot, u_\varepsilon) - a^\varepsilon(\cdot, \tilde{u}_\varepsilon), \hat{u}_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial\theta_R^\varepsilon)} = 0. \quad (3.17)$$

Thanks to the lower bound in the two-sided inequality in (2.7) and also to (3.1), the second term in the above identity satisfies the estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Re} (a^\varepsilon(\cdot, u_\varepsilon) - a^\varepsilon(\cdot, \tilde{u}_\varepsilon), \hat{u}_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial\theta_R^\varepsilon)} &\geq -\mu_0(\varepsilon) \|u_1 - u_2\|_{L_2(\partial\theta_R^\varepsilon)}^2 \\ &\geq -C\mu_0 \sum_{k \in \mathbb{M}_R^\varepsilon} \left( \varepsilon \eta \varkappa \|\nabla u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \varepsilon^{-1} \eta^{n-1} \|u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus B_{\varepsilon R_2}(M_k^\varepsilon))}^2 \right) \\ &\geq C \left( \mu_0 \varepsilon \eta \varkappa \|\nabla u\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}^2 + \mu_0 \varepsilon^{-1} \eta^{n-1} \|u\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

By (2.8) and (2.4) we have:

$$\mu_0 \varepsilon^{-1} \eta^{n-1} = \mu_0 \varepsilon \eta \varkappa \cdot \varkappa^{-2} \cdot \varepsilon^{-2} \eta^{n-2} \varkappa^{-1} \rightarrow +0, \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow +0. \quad (3.19)$$

Conditions (2.1), (2.2) and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality imply that

$$\operatorname{Re} \mathfrak{h}(u, u) \geq \frac{3c_0}{4} \|\nabla u\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}^2 - C \|u\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}^2 \quad (3.20)$$

for all  $u \in W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)$ , where  $C$  is some absolute constant independent of  $\varepsilon$  and  $u \in W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)$ . This estimate and (3.17), (3.18), (3.19) then yield

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

for  $\varepsilon$  small enough, where  $C$  is some fixed constant independent of  $\varepsilon$  and  $\hat{u}_\varepsilon$ . Hence, as  $\operatorname{Re} \lambda < -C - 1$ , we necessarily have  $\hat{u}_\varepsilon = 0$  and this proves the uniqueness of solution to problem (2.3). Writing the integral identity corresponding to problem (2.3) with  $u_\varepsilon$  as the test function and proceeding as above, we prove easily estimate (3.15).

Problem (2.5) can be treated as a resolvent equation for the operator generated by the differential expression  $\mathcal{L} + \gamma\Upsilon\beta$  in  $L_2(\Omega)$  subject to the Dirichlet condition. Conditions (2.1), (2.2) imply easily that such operator is  $m$ -sectorial and this is why the unique solvability is just a standard fact from the theory of  $m$ -sectorial operators. This operator is bounded as that from  $W_2^2(\Omega) \cap \dot{W}_2^1(\Omega)$  into  $L_2(\Omega)$  and this is why, by the Banach theorem, its resolvent is a bounded operator from  $L_2(\Omega)$  into  $W_2^2(\Omega) \cap \dot{W}_2^1(\Omega)$ . This implies estimate (3.16). The proof is complete.  $\square$

## 4 Properties of corrector

In this section we prove the solvability of problems (2.13), (2.14), (2.15), (2.16), (2.19), (2.20) and study certain properties of their solutions. Throughout this section we suppose that Assumption A1 is satisfied.

The main point in this study is an appropriate Kelvin transform reducing the problems (2.13), (2.14), (2.15), (2.16) to ones in bounded domains. This transform is defined as

$$\tilde{\xi} := \frac{A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon)(\xi - y_{k,\varepsilon})}{|A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon)(\xi - y_{k,\varepsilon})|^2}, \quad (4.1)$$

with the points  $y_{k,\varepsilon}$  introduced in Assumption A1. By  $\tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}$  we denote the images of the domains  $\omega_{k,\varepsilon}$  arising while passing to the variable  $\tilde{\xi}$ . It is clear that the domains  $\tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}$  are unbounded, namely,  $\tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon} \supset \mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_{R_1^{-1}}(0)$ ,

the boundaries of these domains are smooth and the domains  $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}$  are bounded. It is also easy to see that the origin does not belong to  $\tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}$  and moreover,  $B_{(2R_2)^{-1}}(0) \cap \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon} = \emptyset$ .

We seek a solution to problem (2.13), (2.14), (2.15), (2.16) as

$$X_{k,\varepsilon}(\xi) = \frac{1}{|A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon)(\xi - y_{k,\varepsilon})|^{n-2}} \tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon} \left( \frac{A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon)(\xi - y_{k,\varepsilon})}{|A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon)(\xi - y_{k,\varepsilon})|^2} \right) + \begin{cases} 1 & \text{as } n \geq 3, \\ \ln |A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon)(\xi - y_{k,\varepsilon})| & \text{as } n = 2. \end{cases} \quad (4.2)$$

Then for the functions  $\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}$  we obtain the boundary value problems

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\tilde{\xi}} \tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon} &= 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}, & \quad k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon, \\ \tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon} &= \tilde{\phi}_{k,\varepsilon}(\xi) & \text{on } \partial \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}, & \quad k \in \mathbb{M}_D^\varepsilon \cup \mathbb{M}_{R,1}^\varepsilon, \\ \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{\nu}} + \tilde{b}_{k,\varepsilon}(\tilde{\xi}) \right) \tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon} &= \tilde{\phi}_{k,\varepsilon}(\xi) & \text{on } \partial \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}, & \quad k \in \mathbb{M}_{R,2}^\varepsilon, \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

where  $\tilde{b}_{k,\varepsilon}$  and  $\tilde{\phi}_{k,\varepsilon}$  are some complex-valued functions. These functions are the elements of the following spaces:

$$\tilde{\phi}_{k,\varepsilon} \in C^2(\partial \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}), \quad k \in \mathbb{M}_D^\varepsilon \cup \mathbb{M}_{R,1}^\varepsilon, \quad \tilde{\phi}_{k,\varepsilon}, \tilde{b}_{k,\varepsilon} \in C^1(\partial \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}), \quad k \in \mathbb{M}_{R,2}^\varepsilon,$$

and they are bounded uniformly in  $k$  and  $\varepsilon$  in the norms of these spaces. The functions  $\tilde{b}_{k,\varepsilon}$  also satisfy the estimate

$$\operatorname{Re} \tilde{b}_{k,\varepsilon} \geq \tilde{c}_2, \quad (4.4)$$

where  $\tilde{c}_2$  is some fixed positive constant independent of  $k$  and  $\varepsilon$ , while  $\tilde{\nu}$  is the normal to  $\partial \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}$  directed inside  $\tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}$ .

**Lemma 4.1.** *Under Assumption A1 and conditions (2.1), (2.2), (2.12) problems (2.13), (2.14), (2.15), (2.16) are uniquely solvable in  $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{\tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}}) \cap W_2^2(B_{R_3}(0) \setminus \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon})$ .*

*Proof.* We treat problems (4.3) in the generalized sense seeking their solutions in  $W_2^1(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon})$ . We consider homogeneous problems (4.3) with  $\tilde{\phi}_{k,\varepsilon} = 0$ , write the corresponding integral identities and use inequality (4.4) for  $k \in \mathbb{M}_{R,2}^\varepsilon$ . Then we see easily that these homogeneous problems can have only trivial solutions. Hence, problems (4.3) are uniquely solvable in  $W_2^1(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon})$ . By standard smoothness improving estimates we immediately conclude that these functions are the elements of  $W_2^2(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon})$  and are infinitely differentiable in  $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}$ . Since the functions  $\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}$  are infinitely differentiable in the vicinity of the origin and are represented there by its Taylor series; in particular,

$$\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}(\tilde{\xi}) = K_{k,\varepsilon} + O(|\tilde{\xi}|), \quad \tilde{\xi} \rightarrow 0,$$

where  $K_{k,\varepsilon}$  are some constants. Recovering then functions  $X_{k,\varepsilon}$  by formulae (4.2), we complete the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.2.** *For all  $k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon$  the functions  $\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}$  belong to  $L_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon})$  and satisfy the uniform estimates*

$$\|\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}\|_{L_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon})} \leq C, \quad (4.5)$$

where  $C$  is some constant independent of  $k$  and  $\varepsilon$ .

*Proof.* As  $k \in \mathbb{M}_D^\varepsilon \cup \mathbb{M}_{R,1}^\varepsilon$ , by the weak maximum principle [12, Ch. 8, Sect. 8.1, Thm. 8.1] applied to the real and imaginary parts of the function  $\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}$  and by the uniform boundedness of the functions  $\tilde{\phi}_{k,\varepsilon}$  in  $C(\partial \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon})$  we immediately get the statement of the lemma for such  $k$ .

The case  $k \in \mathbb{M}_{R,2}^\varepsilon$  requires a more detailed study. We first state that for all  $u \in W_2^1(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon})$  and all  $k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon$  the estimate holds

$$\|u\|_{L_2(\partial \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon})} \leq C \|u\|_{W_2^1(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon})}, \quad (4.6)$$

where  $C$  is some constant independent of  $u$ ,  $\varepsilon$  and  $k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon$ . This is implied by a similar estimate for  $u \in B_{R_3}(0) \setminus \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}$  established in the proof of Lemma 3.5 in [3]. We write the integral identity corresponding to problem (4.3) with  $\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}$  as the test function and take then the real part of this identity. In view of (4.4), (4.6) and the uniform boundedness of  $\tilde{\phi}_{k,\varepsilon}$  this gives the estimate

$$\|\nabla_{\tilde{\xi}} \tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}\|_{L_2(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon})}^2 + \|\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}\|_{L_2(\partial \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon})}^2 \leq C; \quad (4.7)$$

hereinafter till the end of the proof by  $C$  we denote inessential constants independent of  $k$  and  $\varepsilon$ .

Now we use the technique from [16, Ch. III, Sect. 13]. We choose an arbitrary  $\varrho > 0$  and write the integral identity for problem (4.3) with the test function  $\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}$ ,  $Q_{\min,\varrho} := \min\{|\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}|^2, \varrho\}$ . Taking then the real part

of the obtained identity and using (4.4) and the uniform boundedness of  $\tilde{\phi}_{k,\varepsilon}$ , after some simple arithmetical calculations we get:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}} \left( |\nabla_{\tilde{\xi}} \tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}|^2 Q_{\min,\varrho} + \frac{1}{2} |\nabla_{\tilde{\xi}} |\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}|^2 \right) dx + \tilde{c}_2 \int_{\partial \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}} |\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}|^2 Q_{\min,\varrho} ds \\ & \leq C \int_{\partial \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}} |\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}| Q_{\min,\varrho} ds \leq \frac{\tilde{c}_2}{2} \int_{\partial \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}} |\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}|^2 Q_{\min,\varrho} ds + C \int_{\partial \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}} Q_{\min,\varrho} ds, \end{aligned}$$

where the constants  $C$  are independent of  $\varrho$ ,  $\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}$ ,  $k$  and  $\varepsilon$ . Passing to the limit as  $\varrho \rightarrow +\infty$  and using (4.7), we get

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}} \left( |\nabla_{\tilde{\xi}} \tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}|^2 |\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}|^2 + |\nabla_{\tilde{\xi}} |\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}|^2 \right) dx + \int_{\partial \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}} |\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}|^4 ds \leq C,$$

where  $C$  is a constant independent of  $\varepsilon$  and  $k$ .

We once again choose an arbitrary  $\varrho > 0$  and write the integral identity for problem (4.3) with the test function  $\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon} Q_{\max,\varrho}$ ,  $Q_{\max,\varrho} := \max\{|\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}|^2 - \varrho, 0\}$ , taking then the real part of the obtained identity. After simple estimates in the integrals over  $\partial \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}$  in this identity, in view of the uniform boundedness of  $\tilde{\phi}_{k,\varepsilon}$  and (4.4) we get:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\{\xi: |\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}|^2 \geq \varrho\}} \left( |\nabla_{\tilde{\xi}} \tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}|^2 Q_{\max,\varrho} + \frac{1}{2} |\nabla_{\tilde{\xi}} |\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}|^2 \right) dx + \tilde{c}_2 \int_{\partial \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}} |\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}|^2 Q_{\max,\varrho} ds \\ & \leq C \int_{\partial \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}} |\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}| Q_{\max,\varrho} ds \leq \frac{\tilde{c}_2}{2} \int_{\partial \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}} |\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}|^2 Q_{\max,\varrho} ds + C \int_{\partial \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}} Q_{\max,\varrho} ds \end{aligned}$$

and hence,

$$\int_{\partial \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}} \left( C - \frac{\tilde{c}_2}{2} |\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}|^2 \right) Q_{\max,\varrho} ds \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\{\xi: |\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}|^2 \geq \varrho\}} |\nabla_{\tilde{\xi}} |\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}|^2 \right) dx$$

Since the first integral in the left hand side of the above inequality is non-negative and  $|\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}|^2 \geq \varrho$  on  $\text{supp } Q_{\max,\varrho}$ , we conclude that

$$\left( C - \frac{\tilde{c}_2}{2} \varrho \right) \int_{\partial \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon} \cap \{\xi: |\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}|^2 \geq \varrho\}} Q_{\max,\varrho} ds \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\{\xi: |\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}|^2 \geq \varrho\}} |\nabla_{\tilde{\xi}} |\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}|^2 \right) dx.$$

As  $\varrho > \frac{2C}{\tilde{c}_2}$ , the above inequality is possible only if  $\text{mes}_n \{\xi : |\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}|^2 \geq \varrho\} = 0$ . Hence, the function  $\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}$  is belongs to  $L_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon})$  and satisfies (4.5). The proof is complete.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.3.** *The functions  $\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}$  belong to  $W_{2n}^2(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon})$  and satisfy the estimates*

$$\|\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}\|_{W_{2n+1}^2(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon})} \leq C,$$

where  $C$  is a constant independent of  $\varepsilon$  and  $k$ .

*Proof.* For  $k \in \mathbb{M}_D^\varepsilon \cup \mathbb{M}_{R,1}^\varepsilon$  by [16, Ch. III, Sect. 15, Thm. 15.1] we conclude that  $\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon} \in W_2^2(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon})$ . Then we observe that in view of definition (4.1) of the Kelvin transform and Assumption A1, the boundaries of the domains  $\tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}$  have the same regularity as described in this assumption. This allows us to reproduce the proof of the apriori estimate from [1, Ch. 15, Thm. 15] controlling at the same time the dependence of the constants on the boundaries; this is done while making a standard unity partition. Then, in view of Lemma 4.2 and the uniform boundedness of  $\tilde{\phi}_{k,\varepsilon}$  we have:

$$\|\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}\|_{W_{2n+1}^2(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon})} \leq C (\|\tilde{\phi}_{k,\varepsilon}\|_{C^2(\partial \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon})} + \|\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}\|_{L_{2n+1}(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon})}) \leq C.$$

For  $k \in \mathbb{M}_{R,2}^\varepsilon$  the above apriori estimate also holds true; one just should use the norm  $\|\tilde{\phi}_{k,\varepsilon}\|_{C^1(\partial \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon})}$ . This is why, to complete the proof, we need to show that  $\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}$  is an element of  $W_{2n}^2(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon})$ . This can be done by using an approximation technique from the proof of Theorem 8.34 in [12, Ch. 8, Sect. 8.11]. Namely, the domains  $\tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}$  are to be approximated by a sequence of domains  $\tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon,m}$  with  $C^3$ -boundaries; we can simply assume that the boundaries are described by the equations  $\tilde{\tau} = \alpha_m(\tilde{s})$ , where  $\tilde{\tau}$  is the distance along the normal vector  $\tilde{\nu}$  to  $\partial \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}$ , the symbol  $\tilde{s}$  denotes local variables on  $\partial \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}$  and  $\alpha_m$  is a sequence of some functions

converging to zero in  $C^2(\partial\tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon})$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ . The functions  $\tilde{b}_{k,\varepsilon}$  then are also extended to the surfaces  $\tilde{\tau} = \alpha_m(\tilde{s})$  just by assuming that they are independent of  $\tilde{\tau}$  and on each such surface the function  $\tilde{b}_{k,\varepsilon}$  is approximating by a  $C^2$ -function  $\tilde{b}_{k,\varepsilon,m}$  which, in the sense of the above translation along  $\tilde{\tau}$ , converges to  $\tilde{b}_{k,\varepsilon}$  in  $C^1$ -norm as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ . The functions  $\tilde{\phi}_{k,\varepsilon}$  are also approximated in the same way by a sequence of  $C^2$ -functions  $\tilde{\phi}_{k,\varepsilon,m}$  converging to  $\tilde{\phi}_{k,\varepsilon}$  in  $C^1(\partial\tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon})$ . Then we consider problems similar to (4.3) for  $k \in \mathbb{M}_{R,2}^\varepsilon$  and these solutions are uniquely solvable in  $C^2(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon})$  due to the standard Schauder estimates. We can then map the domains  $\tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon,m}$  onto  $\tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}$  and this also transforms the approximating problems; we denote their solutions (after the mapping onto  $\tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}$ ) by  $\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon,m}$ . These solutions are the elements of the space  $W_{2n}^2(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon})$  and they also satisfy uniform bounds

$$\|\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon,m}\|_{W_{2n+1}^2(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon})} \leq C$$

with some constant  $C$  independent of  $m$ . Then, as in the proof of Theorem 8.34 in [12, Ch. 8, Sect. 8.11], we easily show that the sequence  $\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon,m}$  contains a subsequence weakly converging in  $W_{2n}^2(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon})$  and its weak limit coincides with  $\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}$ . The proof is complete.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.4.** *There exists a fixed positive constant  $C_0 > 0$  independent of  $\varepsilon$  and  $k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon$  such that for  $|\xi| \geq C_0$  the functions  $X_{k,\varepsilon}$  satisfy the representations*

$$\begin{aligned} X_{k,\varepsilon}(\xi) &= 1 + \frac{K_{k,\varepsilon}}{|A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon)\xi|^{n-2}} + \sum_{j=1}^n K_{k,\varepsilon}^{(j)} \frac{(A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon)\xi)_j}{|A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon)\xi|^n} + \mathbf{X}_{k,\varepsilon}(\xi), \quad \xi \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{as } n \geq 3, \\ X_{k,\varepsilon}(\xi) &= \ln |A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon)\xi| + K_{k,\varepsilon} + \sum_{j=1}^2 K_{k,\varepsilon}^{(j)} \frac{(A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon)\xi)_j}{|A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon)\xi|^2} + \mathbf{X}_{k,\varepsilon}(\xi), \quad \xi \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{as } n = 2, \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

where  $K_{k,\varepsilon}^{(j)}$  are some constants,  $(A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon)\xi)_j$  is the  $j$ th component of the vector  $A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon)\xi$ , while  $\mathbf{X}_{k,\varepsilon}$  are some infinitely differentiable functions such that

$$\left| \frac{\partial^\vartheta \mathbf{X}_{k,\varepsilon}}{\partial \xi^\vartheta}(\xi) \right| \leq C_1 |\xi|^{n-|\vartheta|}, \quad |\xi| \geq C_0, \quad (4.9)$$

where  $C_1$  is some constant independent of  $k, \varepsilon, \xi$  and  $\vartheta \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$  is a multi-index,  $|\vartheta| \leq 3$ . The estimates hold:

$$|K_{k,\varepsilon}| \leq C, \quad |K_{k,\varepsilon}^{(j)}| \leq C, \quad j = 1, \dots, n, \quad (4.10)$$

$$|X_{k,\varepsilon}(\xi)| \leq C, \quad n \geq 3, \quad |X_{k,\varepsilon}(\xi) - \ln |A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon)\xi|| \leq C, \quad n = 2, \quad (4.11)$$

$$|\nabla_\xi X_{k,\varepsilon}(\xi)| \leq C, \quad (4.12)$$

where  $C$  are some constants independent of  $k, \varepsilon, \xi$ .

*Proof.* By Lemma 4.3 and the definition of the Kelvin transform in (4.1), the functions  $X_{k,\varepsilon}$  are the elements of the space  $W_{2n}^2(B_{R_3}(0) \setminus \omega_{k,\varepsilon})$  and are bounded in this space uniformly in  $k$  and  $\varepsilon$ . Using the regularity of the boundaries  $\partial\omega_{k,\varepsilon}$  postulated in Assumption A1, we continue the function  $X_{k,\varepsilon}$  into  $\omega_{k,\varepsilon}$  as follows:

$$X_{k,\varepsilon}(\tau, s) = X_{k,\varepsilon}(-\tau, s)\chi_1(\tau),$$

where  $\chi_1 = \chi_1(\tau)$  is an infinitely differentiable function vanishing as  $|\tau| > \frac{2r_0}{3}$  and equalling to one as  $|\tau| < \frac{r_0}{3}$ . In the same way we continue each derivative  $\frac{\partial X_{k,\varepsilon}}{\partial x_j}$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, n$ . It is clear that after such continuation the obtained functions are elements of  $W_{2n+1}^1(B_{R_3}(0))$  bounded in this space uniformly in  $\varepsilon$  and  $k$ . Applying then Sobolev theorem [16, Ch. II, Sect. 2, Thm. 2.2] we see that  $X_{k,\varepsilon}, \frac{\partial X_{k,\varepsilon}}{\partial x_j} \in C^{\frac{1}{2}}(\overline{B_{R_2}(0)} \setminus \omega_{k,\varepsilon})$  and the estimate holds:

$$\|X_{k,\varepsilon}\|_{C^{\frac{3}{2}}(\overline{B_{R_2}(0)} \setminus \omega_{k,\varepsilon})} \leq C, \quad (4.13)$$

where  $C$  is a constant independent of  $k$  and  $\varepsilon$ .

We again use the Kelvin transform introduced in the proof of Lemma 4.1 and even for  $k \in \mathbb{M}_{R,2}^\varepsilon$  we treat  $\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}$  as solutions to the Dirichlet problem with appropriate  $\tilde{\phi}_{k,\varepsilon}$ . Estimate (4.13) allows us to say that these functions  $\tilde{\phi}_{k,\varepsilon}$  are bounded uniformly in  $k, \varepsilon$  and  $\tilde{\xi}$ . The well-known estimates for the derivatives of the harmonic function, see, for instance, [19, Ch. IV, Sect. 3.2, Lm. 3], then yield

$$\left| \frac{\partial^\vartheta \tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}}{\partial \tilde{\xi}^\vartheta}(\tilde{\xi}) \right| \leq C, \quad \tilde{\xi} \in B_{(3R_2)^{-1}}(0), \quad \vartheta \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n, \quad |\kappa| \leq 3,$$

where  $C$  are some constants independent of  $k, \varepsilon$  and  $\tilde{\xi}$ . Using Lemma 4.2, writing the Taylor series for  $\tilde{X}_{k,\varepsilon}$  at zero and returning back to the function  $X_{k,\varepsilon}$  by formula (4.2), we get (4.8), (4.9), (4.10), (4.11), (4.12). The proof is complete.  $\square$

The next lemma states the unique solvability of problem (2.19), (2.20), (2.14), (2.15) and provides certain estimates for its solution.

**Lemma 4.5.** *Problems (2.19), (2.20), (2.14), (2.15) are uniquely solvable in  $W_2^2(E_{k,\varepsilon} \setminus \omega_{k,\varepsilon}) \cap C^1(\overline{E_{k,\varepsilon} \setminus \omega_{k,\varepsilon}})$  and satisfy the estimates*

$$|X_{k,\varepsilon} - Z_{k,\varepsilon}| \leq C\eta^{n-1}, \quad |\nabla_\xi X_{k,\varepsilon} - \nabla_\xi Z_{k,\varepsilon}| \leq C\eta^{n-1} \quad \text{in } \overline{E_{k,\varepsilon} \setminus \omega_{k,\varepsilon}}, \quad (4.14)$$

where  $C$  is some constant independent of  $\varepsilon$ ,  $\eta$ ,  $k$  and  $\xi$ .

*Proof.* The unique solvability in  $W_2^2(E_{k,\varepsilon} \setminus \omega_{k,\varepsilon})$  is easily checked in the same way how a similar fact was established in the proof of Lemma 4.1; here we even do not need to make the Kelvin transform since the domains  $E_{k,\varepsilon} \setminus \omega_{k,\varepsilon}$  are bounded. By the standard smoothness improving theorems we also see that  $Z_{k,\varepsilon} \in C^\infty(\overline{E_{k,\varepsilon} \setminus \omega_{k,\varepsilon}})$ .

We let

$$\psi_{k,\varepsilon}^+(\xi) := X_{k,\varepsilon}(\xi) - \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{K_{k,\varepsilon}^{(j)} \eta^n}{R_4^n} (A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon) \xi)_j - \begin{cases} 1 + K_{k,\varepsilon} |A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon) \xi|^{-n+2} & \text{as } n \geq 3, \\ \ln |A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon) \xi| + K_{k,\varepsilon} & \text{as } n = 2, \end{cases}$$

and by (4.8), (4.9) we see that

$$\|\psi_{k,\varepsilon}^+\|_{C^3(\partial E_{k,\varepsilon})} \leq C\eta^n; \quad (4.15)$$

hereinafter in the proof by  $C$  we denote inessential constants independent  $\varepsilon$ ,  $k$  and  $\eta$ . By  $T_{k,\varepsilon}^0(\zeta)$  we denote the solution to the problem

$$\Delta_\zeta T_{k,\varepsilon}^0 = 0 \quad \text{in } B_{R_4 \eta^{-1}}(0), \quad T_{k,\varepsilon}^0 = \psi_{k,\varepsilon}^+(A^{\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon) \zeta) \quad \text{on } \partial B_{R_4 \eta^{-1}}(0). \quad (4.16)$$

This problem is uniquely solvable. We reproduce the proof of the Schauder estimate [16, Ch. III, Sect. 1, 2] for problem (4.16) covering  $B_{R_4 \eta^{-1}}(0)$  by balls of a fixed radius and in view of (4.15) we conclude that  $T_{k,\varepsilon}^0 \in C^2(\overline{B_{R_4 \eta^{-1}}(0)})$  and

$$\|T_{k,\varepsilon}^0\|_{C^2(\overline{B_{R_4 \eta^{-1}}(0)})} \leq C\eta^n. \quad (4.17)$$

The functions

$$T_{k,\varepsilon}(\xi) := X_{k,\varepsilon}(\xi) - Z_{k,\varepsilon}(\xi) - \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{K_{k,\varepsilon}^{(j)} \eta^n}{R_4^n} (A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon) \xi)_j - T_{k,\varepsilon}^0(A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon) \xi) \quad (4.18)$$

solve the boundary value problems

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{div}_\xi A(M_k^\varepsilon) \nabla_\xi T_{k,\varepsilon} &= 0 \quad \text{in } E_{k,\varepsilon} \setminus \omega_{k,\varepsilon}, & T_{k,\varepsilon} &= 0 \quad \text{on } \partial E_{k,\varepsilon} \\ T_{k,\varepsilon} &= \psi_{k,\varepsilon}^-, \quad k \in \mathbb{M}_D^\varepsilon \cup \mathbb{M}_{R,1}^\varepsilon, & \nu_\xi \cdot A(M_k^\varepsilon) \nabla_\xi T_{k,\varepsilon} + b_k T_{k,\varepsilon} &= \psi_{k,\varepsilon}^-, \quad k \in \mathbb{M}_{R,2}^\varepsilon \quad \text{on } \partial \omega_{k,\varepsilon}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.19)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{k,\varepsilon}^-(\xi) &:= - \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{K_{k,\varepsilon}^{(j)} \eta^n}{R_4^n} (A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon) \xi)_j - T_{k,\varepsilon}^0, \quad k \in \mathbb{M}_D^\varepsilon \cup \mathbb{M}_{R,1}^\varepsilon, \\ \psi_{k,\varepsilon}^-(\xi) &:= - \left( \nu_\xi \cdot A(M_k^\varepsilon) \nabla_\xi T_{k,\varepsilon} + b_k T_{k,\varepsilon} \right) \left( \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{K_{k,\varepsilon}^{(j)} \eta^n}{R_4^n} (A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon) \xi)_j + T_{k,\varepsilon}^0 \right), \quad k \in \mathbb{M}_{R,2}^\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (4.17) that

$$\|\psi_{k,\varepsilon}^-\|_{C^2(\partial \omega_{k,\varepsilon})} \leq C\eta^n, \quad k \in \mathbb{M}_D^\varepsilon \cup \mathbb{M}_{R,1}^\varepsilon, \quad \|\psi_{k,\varepsilon}^-\|_{C^1(\partial \omega_{k,\varepsilon})} \leq C\eta^n, \quad k \in \mathbb{M}_{R,2}^\varepsilon.$$

Writing then integral identities associated with problem (4.19), we easily obtain:

$$\|\nabla_\xi T_{k,\varepsilon}\|_{L_2(E_{k,\varepsilon} \setminus \omega_{k,\varepsilon})} + \|T_{k,\varepsilon}\|_{L_2(\partial \omega_{k,\varepsilon})} \leq C\eta^n,$$

where the second term in the left hand side obviously vanishes for  $k \in \mathbb{M}_D^\varepsilon \cup \mathbb{M}_{R,1}^\varepsilon$ . By the standard smoothness improving theorems we then get:

$$\|T_{k,\varepsilon}\|_{C^3(\overline{B_{R_3}(0) \setminus B_{(R_2+R_3)/2}(0)})} \leq C\eta^n. \quad (4.20)$$

Let  $\chi_2 = \chi_2(\xi)$  be an infinitely differentiable cut-off function equalling to one as  $|\xi| < (R_2 + R_3)/2$  and vanishing as  $|\xi| > R_3$ . Then the functions  $T_{k,\varepsilon}\chi_2$  solve the boundary value problems

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{div}_\xi A(M_k^\varepsilon)\nabla_\xi T_{k,\varepsilon}\chi_2 &= 2\nabla_\xi \chi_2 \cdot A(M_k^\varepsilon)\nabla_\xi T_{k,\varepsilon} + T_{k,\varepsilon} \operatorname{div}_\xi A(M_k^\varepsilon)\nabla_\xi \chi_2 \quad \text{in } B_{R_3}(0) \setminus \omega_{k,\varepsilon}, \\ T_{k,\varepsilon}\chi_2 &= 0 \quad \text{on } \partial B_{R_3}(0) \end{aligned}$$

with boundary conditions (2.14), (2.15). These problems can be studied following the lines of the proofs of Lemmata 4.2, 4.3 by employing also estimate (4.20) and the inequality [3, Lm. 3.1]:

$$\|u\|_{L_2(B_{R_3}(0) \setminus \omega_{k,\varepsilon})} \leq C \|\nabla_\xi u\|_{L_2(B_{R_3}(0) \setminus \omega_{k,\varepsilon})} \quad \text{for all } u \in \dot{W}_2^1(B_{R_3}(0) \setminus \omega_{k,\varepsilon}, \partial B_{R_3}(0))$$

with a constant  $C$  independent of  $k$ ,  $\varepsilon$  and  $u$ . As a result we obtain:

$$\|T_{k,\varepsilon}\|_{C^1(\overline{B_{R_3}(0) \setminus \omega_{k,\varepsilon}})} \leq C\eta^n. \quad (4.21)$$

We also conclude that  $T_{k,\varepsilon} \in C^1(\overline{E_{k,\varepsilon} \setminus \omega_{k,\varepsilon}})$ . Since the function  $T_{k,\varepsilon}(A^{\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon)\xi)$  is obviously harmonic, by the classical maximum principle for the harmonic functions and the first estimate in (4.15) we immediately obtain

$$\|T_{k,\varepsilon}\|_{C(\overline{E_{k,\varepsilon} \setminus \omega_{k,\varepsilon}})} \leq C\eta^n. \quad (4.22)$$

For  $k \in \mathbb{M}_{R,2}^\varepsilon$  we also have an appropriate maximum principle. Namely, the real and imaginary parts of  $T_{k,\varepsilon}(A^{\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon)\xi)$  are harmonic functions and by the mean value theorem

$$T_{k,\varepsilon}(A^{\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon)\xi) = \frac{1}{\operatorname{mes}_n B_\delta(\xi)} \int_{B_\delta(\xi)} T_{k,\varepsilon}(A^{\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon)y) dy$$

for each  $\xi \in E_{k,\varepsilon} \setminus \omega_{k,\varepsilon}$  and each ball  $B_\delta(\xi)$  such that  $\{A^{\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon)y : y \in B_\delta(\xi)\} \subset E_{k,\varepsilon} \setminus \omega_{k,\varepsilon}$ . This identity implies

$$|T_{k,\varepsilon}(A^{\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon)\xi)| \leq \max_{y \in B_\delta(\xi)} |T_{k,\varepsilon}(A^{\frac{1}{2}}(M_k^\varepsilon)y)|.$$

If  $\xi \in E_{k,\varepsilon} \setminus \overline{\omega_{k,\varepsilon}}$  is a point of the global maximum of  $|T_{k,\varepsilon}|$ , then the above inequality implies that  $|T_{k,\varepsilon}|$  is constant in  $B_\delta(\xi)$ . Hence, the function  $|T_{k,\varepsilon}|$  attains its global maximum on the boundary  $\partial\omega_{k,\varepsilon}$  or on  $\partial E_{k,\varepsilon}$ . It follows from the boundary condition for  $T_{k,\varepsilon}$  that

$$\frac{\partial |T_{k,\varepsilon}|^2}{\partial \nu} + \operatorname{Re} b_{k,\varepsilon} |T_{k,\varepsilon}|^2 = 0.$$

If a point of the global maximum of  $T_{k,\varepsilon}$  is located on  $\partial\omega_{k,\varepsilon}$ , then  $\frac{\partial |T_{k,\varepsilon}|^2}{\partial \nu} \geq 0$  and the above identity due to the positivity of  $\operatorname{Re} b_k$ , see (2.12), implies that  $T_{k,\varepsilon} = 0$ . Hence, the function  $|T_{k,\varepsilon}|$  attains its maximum on  $\partial E_{k,\varepsilon}$  and this gives estimate (4.22) for  $k \in \mathbb{M}_{R,2}^\varepsilon$ .

We consider the function  $T_{k,\varepsilon}$  as a solution of the equation from (4.19) but on  $E_{k,\varepsilon} \setminus B_{R_3}(0)$  subject to the boundary condition on  $\partial E_{k,\varepsilon}$  from (4.19). Taking into consideration then (4.20) and reproducing again the proof of the Schauder estimate with covering by balls of fixed radius, we obtain

$$\|T_{k,\varepsilon}\|_{C^2(\overline{E_{k,\varepsilon} \setminus B_{R_3}(0)})} \leq C\eta^n.$$

This estimate and (4.21) yield

$$\|T_{k,\varepsilon}\|_{C^1(\overline{E_{k,\varepsilon} \setminus \omega_{k,\varepsilon}})} \leq C\eta^n.$$

Returning back then to the function  $X_{k,\varepsilon} - Z_{k,\varepsilon}$  by formula (4.18) and using estimates (4.17), (4.10), we arrive at (4.14). The proof is complete.  $\square$

The above lemmata implies several properties of the function  $\Xi_\varepsilon$ . We first observe that estimates (4.8), (4.9), (4.14) imply

$$|\Xi_\varepsilon(x) - 1| \leq C \quad \text{in } B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon. \quad (4.23)$$

Employing (4.8), (4.9), by straightforward calculations we find:

$$\begin{aligned} A(M_k^\varepsilon)\nabla_\xi X_{k,\varepsilon} \cdot \nu &= (2-n)K_{k,\varepsilon} \frac{\eta^{n-2}}{R_4^{n-2}} |A^{-1}(M_k^\varepsilon)\xi|^{-1} + O(\eta^n) \quad \text{as } n \geq 3, \\ A(M_k^\varepsilon)\nabla_\xi X_{k,\varepsilon} \cdot \nu &= |A^{-1}(M_k^\varepsilon)\xi|^{-1} + O(\eta^2) \quad \text{as } n = 2, \end{aligned}$$

on  $\partial E_{k,\varepsilon}$ , where  $\nu$  is the outward normal to  $\partial E_{k,\varepsilon}$  and the  $O$ -terms are uniform in  $\varepsilon$ ,  $k$  and  $\eta$ . Using then (2.4), (4.14) and the definition of  $\Xi_\varepsilon$  we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} A(M_k^\varepsilon) \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu &= (2-n) K_{k,\varepsilon} \frac{\eta^{n-2}}{R_4^{n-2}} |A^{-1}(M_k^\varepsilon)(x - M_k^\varepsilon)|^{-1} + O(\eta^{n-1} \varepsilon^{-1}) & \text{as } n \geq 3, \\ A(M_k^\varepsilon) \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu &= |\ln \eta|^{-1} |A^{-1}(M_k^\varepsilon)(x - M_k^\varepsilon)|^{-1} + O(\varepsilon^{-1} \ln^{-2} \eta) & \text{as } n = 2, \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

on  $\partial E_k^\varepsilon$ , where the  $O$ -terms are uniform in  $\varepsilon$ ,  $k$  and  $\eta$ .

**Lemma 4.6.** *The estimates hold*

$$\|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \leq C\varepsilon \|u\|_{W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \quad (4.25)$$

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

$$\|u \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \leq C(\eta^{\frac{n}{2}-1} \varepsilon^{-1} \varkappa^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} + \varepsilon) \|u\|_{W_2^2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}, \quad (4.26)$$

$$\|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \leq C(\varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon \eta) \|u\|_{W_2^2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \quad (4.27)$$

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

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

$$\langle u \rangle := \frac{1}{\text{mes}_n B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon} \int_{B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon} u(x) dx, \quad u^\perp := u - \langle u \rangle. \quad (4.28)$$

Then, in view of the fact that  $\Xi_\varepsilon$  is identically one in  $B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus E_k^\varepsilon$ ,

$$\|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \leq 2|\langle u \rangle|^2 \|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)\|_{L_2(E_k^\varepsilon \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 + 2\|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)u^\perp\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2. \quad (4.29)$$

Since the function  $u^\perp$  obeys condition (3.9), by Lemma 3.3 it satisfies estimate (3.10) and by (4.23) we immediately get

$$\|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)u^\perp\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \leq C\varepsilon^2 \|u\|_{W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2; \quad (4.30)$$

hereinafter in the proof by  $C$  we denote various inessential constants independent of  $\varepsilon$ ,  $k$  and  $u$ . Passing then to the variables  $\xi = (x - M_k^\varepsilon)\varepsilon^{-1}\eta^{-1}$ , by (4.8), (4.9), (4.10), (4.14), (4.23) for  $n \geq 3$  we find:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Xi_\varepsilon - 1\|_{L_2(E_k^\varepsilon \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 &\leq C\varepsilon^n \eta^n \|Z_{k,\varepsilon} - 1 - K_{k,\varepsilon} R_4^{-n+2} \eta^{n-2}\|_{L_2(E_{k,\varepsilon} \setminus \omega_{k,\varepsilon})}^2 \\ &\leq C\varepsilon^n \eta^{2n-2} + C\varepsilon^n \eta^n \|X_{k,\varepsilon} - 1 - K_{k,\varepsilon} R_4^{-n+2} \eta^{n-2}\|_{L_2(E_{k,\varepsilon} \setminus \omega_{k,\varepsilon})}^2 \\ &\leq C\varepsilon^n \eta^n + C\varepsilon^n \eta^n \int_{C_0}^{R_4 \eta^{-1}} ((r^{-n+2} - R_4^{-n+2} \eta^{n-2})^2 + r^{-2n+2}) r^{n-1} dr \\ &\leq C\varepsilon^n \eta^n \begin{cases} 1 + \eta^{n-4}, & n \neq 3, \\ |\ln \eta|, & n = 4. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

As  $n = 2$ , we estimate along the same lines:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Xi_\varepsilon - 1\|_{L_2(E_k^\varepsilon \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 &\leq C\varepsilon^2 \eta^2 \ln^{-2} \eta \|Z_{k,\varepsilon} - \ln R_4 \eta^{-1} 1 - K_{k,\varepsilon}\|_{L_2(E_{k,\varepsilon} \setminus \omega_{k,\varepsilon})}^2 \\ &\leq C\varepsilon^2 \eta^2 \ln^{-2} \eta + C\varepsilon^2 \eta^2 \ln^{-2} \eta \|X_{k,\varepsilon} - \ln R_4 \eta^{-1} 1 - K_{k,\varepsilon}\|_{L_2(E_{k,\varepsilon} \setminus \omega_{k,\varepsilon})}^2 \\ &\leq C\varepsilon^2 \eta^2 \ln^{-2} \eta + C\varepsilon^2 \eta^2 \ln^{-2} \eta \int_{C_0}^{R_4 \eta^{-1}} \left( \ln^2 \frac{r}{R_4 \eta^{-1}} + r^{-2} \right) r dr \leq C\varepsilon^2 \eta^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, in view of convergence (2.4),

$$\|\Xi_\varepsilon - 1\|_{L_2(E_k^\varepsilon \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \leq C\varepsilon^{n+2}. \quad (4.31)$$

We also see easily that

$$|\langle u \rangle|^2 \leq C\varepsilon^{-n} \|u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2. \quad (4.32)$$

Employing this estimate and (4.29), (4.30), (4.31), (2.4), we obtain (4.25). In the same way we also prove easily the estimate

$$\|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)^{\frac{1}{2}} u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \leq C\varepsilon \|u\|_{W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}. \quad (4.33)$$



We proceed to proving (4.26) and (4.27). We begin with simple relations:

$$\|u \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 = \|u \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(E_k^\varepsilon \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \leq C(A(M_k^\varepsilon)u \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon, u \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon)_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}. \quad (4.34)$$

Then we integrate by parts employing the definition of the function  $\Xi_\varepsilon$ :

$$\begin{aligned} (A(M_k^\varepsilon)u \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon, u \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon)_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} &= \operatorname{Re} \int_{\partial E_k^\varepsilon} |u|^2 A(M_k^\varepsilon) \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu \, ds + \operatorname{Re} \int_{\partial \omega_k^\varepsilon} \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon} |u|^2 A(M_k^\varepsilon) \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu \, ds \\ &\quad - \operatorname{Re} \int_{E_k^\varepsilon \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon} \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon} \operatorname{div} A(M_k^\varepsilon) |u|^2 \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon \, dx \\ &= \operatorname{Re} \int_{\partial E_k^\varepsilon} |u|^2 A(M_k^\varepsilon) \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu \, ds + \operatorname{Re} \int_{\partial \omega_k^\varepsilon} \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon} |u|^2 A(M_k^\varepsilon) \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu \, ds \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \int_{E_k^\varepsilon \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon} A(M_k^\varepsilon) \nabla (|\Xi_\varepsilon|^2 - 1) \cdot \nabla |u|^2 \, dx \\ &= \operatorname{Re} \int_{\partial E_k^\varepsilon} |u|^2 A(M_k^\varepsilon) \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu \, ds + \operatorname{Re} \int_{\partial \omega_k^\varepsilon} \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon} |u|^2 A(M_k^\varepsilon) \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu \, ds \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial \omega_k^\varepsilon} (|\Xi_\varepsilon|^2 - 1) A(M_k^\varepsilon) \nabla |u|^2 \cdot \nu \, ds \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_{E_k^\varepsilon \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon} (|\Xi_\varepsilon|^2 - 1) \operatorname{div} A(M_k^\varepsilon) \nabla |u|^2 \, dx, \end{aligned} \quad (4.35)$$

where  $\nu$  denotes the unit normal to  $\partial E_k^\varepsilon$  directed outside  $E_k^\varepsilon$  and also the unit normal to  $\partial \omega_k^\varepsilon$  directed inside  $\omega_k^\varepsilon$ . In view of the boundary conditions for  $X_{k,\varepsilon}$  in (2.14), (2.15) and the inequality for  $b_k$  in (2.12) we also have:

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

Hence, in view of relations (4.23), (4.33), (4.34), (3.8), (2.4), (4.24) and the definition of the function  $\Xi_\varepsilon$ , by (4.35) we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \|u \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 &\leq C(\eta^{n-2} \varepsilon^{-1} \varkappa^{-1} \|u\|_{L_2(\partial E_k^\varepsilon)}^2 + \|\nabla u\|_{L_2(\partial \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \|u\|_{L_2(\partial \omega_k^\varepsilon)}) \\ &\quad + C \|u\|_{W_2^2(E_k^\varepsilon \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)u\|_{L_2(E_k^\varepsilon \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} + C \| |\Xi_\varepsilon - 1|^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla u \|_{L_2(E_k^\varepsilon \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \\ &\leq C(\varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon \eta \varkappa) \|u\|_{W_2^2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 + C \eta^{n-2} \varepsilon^{-1} \varkappa^{-1} \|u\|_{L_2(\partial E_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \\ &\quad + C \|u\|_{W_2^2(E_k^\varepsilon \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)u\|_{L_2(E_k^\varepsilon \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.36)$$

This inequality gives an opportunity to improve (4.30) for  $u \in W_2^2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)$ . Namely, we integrate by parts and estimate then using (4.36) with  $u = u^\perp$ :

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

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C\varepsilon\eta\|u^\perp\|_{L_2(\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)u^\perp\|_{L_2(B_\varepsilon R_3(M_k^\varepsilon)\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \\
&\quad + C\varepsilon^2\|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)\nabla u\|_{L_2(B_\varepsilon R_3(M_k^\varepsilon)\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 + C(\varepsilon^4 + \varepsilon^3\eta\mathcal{K})\|u\|_{W_2^2(E_k^\varepsilon\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \\
&\quad + C\eta^{n-2}\varepsilon\mathcal{K}^{-1}\|u^\perp\|_{L_2(\partial E_k^\varepsilon)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

It also follows from (3.1) with  $\eta = 1$ ,  $\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon = \partial E_k^\varepsilon$ ,  $u = u^\perp$  and (3.10) that

$$\|u^\perp\|_{L_2(\partial E_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \leq C\varepsilon\|\nabla u\|_{L_2(B_\varepsilon R_3(M_k^\varepsilon)\setminus\omega_{k,\varepsilon})}^2.$$

Therefore, due to (3.8), (4.25), (3.7),

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

This estimate and (4.29), (4.31), (4.32) yield (4.27). Substituting then (4.27) into the right hand side of (4.36) and using (3.1) with  $\eta = 1$ ,  $\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon = \partial E_k^\varepsilon$ , we arrive at (4.26). The proof is complete.  $\square$

For each  $r > 0$  and  $x \in \Omega$  we denote

$$\mathbf{E}_r(x) := \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d : |A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x)\xi| < r\}.$$

**Lemma 4.7.** *For all  $x \in \Omega$  the identity holds:*

$$\int_{\partial\mathbf{E}_1(x)} \frac{ds}{|A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x)\xi|} = \Upsilon(x).$$

*Proof.* We first consider the case  $n \geq 3$ . For a given  $x \in \Omega$  we choose a sufficiently large  $r > 0$  and denoting by  $\nu$  the unit outward normal to  $\partial\mathbf{E}_r(x)$ , we integrate once by parts as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= (2-n)^{-1} \int_{\mathbf{E}_r(x)\setminus\mathbf{E}_1(x)} |A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x)\xi|^{-n+2} \operatorname{div}_\xi A(x)\nabla_\xi |A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x)\xi|^{-n+2} d\xi \\
&= (2-n)^{-1} \int_{\partial\mathbf{E}_r(x)} |A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x)\xi|^{-n+2} A(x)\nabla_\xi |A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x)\xi|^{-n+2} \cdot \nu d\xi \\
&\quad - (2-n)^{-1} \int_{\partial\mathbf{E}_1(x)} |A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x)\xi|^{-n+2} A(x)\nabla_\xi |A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x)\xi|^{-n+2} \cdot \nu d\xi \\
&\quad - (2-n)^{-1} \int_{\mathbf{E}_r(x)\setminus\mathbf{E}_1(x)} A(x)\nabla_\xi |A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x)\xi|^{-n+2} \cdot \nabla_\xi |A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x)\xi|^{-n+2} d\xi \\
&= \int_{\partial\mathbf{E}_r(x)} \frac{ds}{r^{2n-4}|A^{-1}(x)\xi|} - \int_{\mathbf{E}_r(x)\setminus\mathbf{E}_1(x)} \frac{ds}{|A^{-1}(x)\xi|} - (2-n) \int_{\mathbf{E}_r(x)\setminus\mathbf{E}_1(x)} \frac{d\xi}{|A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x)\xi|^{2n-2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Making the change of the variables  $y = A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x)\xi$  in the integral over  $\mathbf{E}_r(x) \setminus \mathbf{E}_1(x)$  and passing then to the limit as  $r \rightarrow +\infty$ , we obtain:

$$\int_{\mathbf{E}_r(x)\setminus\mathbf{E}_1(x)} \frac{ds}{|A^{-1}(x)\xi|} = (n-2)\sqrt{\det A(x)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1(0)} \frac{dy}{|y|^{2n-2}} = \Upsilon(x)$$

and this proves the needed formula for  $n \geq 3$ . For  $n = 2$  we integrate in a similar way:

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \int_{\mathbf{E}_r(x)\setminus\mathbf{E}_1(x)} \ln |A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x)\xi| \operatorname{div}_\xi A(x)\nabla_\xi \ln |A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x)\xi| d\xi = \ln r \int_{\mathbf{E}_r(x)} \frac{ds}{|A^{-1}(x)\xi|} - \int_{\mathbf{E}_r(x)\setminus\mathbf{E}_1(x)} \frac{d\xi}{|A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x)\xi|^2} \\
&= \ln r \int_{\mathbf{E}_1(x)} \frac{ds}{|A^{-1}(x)\xi|} - \sqrt{\det A(x)} \int_{B_r(0)\setminus B_1(0)} \frac{dy}{|y|^2} = \ln r \int_{\mathbf{E}_1(x)} \frac{ds}{|A^{-1}(x)\xi|} - 2\pi\sqrt{\det A(x)} \ln r
\end{aligned}$$

and we arrive at the statement of the lemma for  $n = 2$ . The proof is complete.  $\square$

Estimates (4.10) allow us to prove one more auxiliary lemma, which will be used then in the proof of our main theorems.

**Lemma 4.8.** *The family  $\beta_\varepsilon$  is uniformly bounded in  $L_\infty(\Omega)$ . Under Assumption A3, the limit  $\beta$  of the family  $\beta_\varepsilon$  in the space  $\mathfrak{M}$  is an element of  $L_\infty(\Omega)$ .*

*Proof.* The family  $\beta_\varepsilon$  is uniformly bounded in  $L_\infty(\Omega)$  due to its definition (2.17) and estimates (4.10). Since the space  $L_\infty(\Omega)$  is dual to  $L_1(\Omega)$ , there exists a sequence  $\varepsilon'$  such that  $\beta_{\varepsilon'}$  converges weakly in  $L_\infty(\Omega)$  to some limit  $\tilde{\beta} \in L_\infty(\Omega)$ . Hence,

$$(\beta_{\varepsilon'} u, v)_{L_2(\Omega)} = \int_{\Omega} \beta_{\varepsilon'} u \bar{v} dx \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} \tilde{\beta} u \bar{v} dx, \quad \varepsilon' \rightarrow 0,$$

for all  $u, v \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$  vanishing on  $\partial\Omega$ . At the same time, it follows from definition (2.18) of the norm in  $\mathfrak{M}$  that  $(\beta_{\varepsilon'} u, v)_{L_2(\Omega)} \rightarrow \langle \beta u, v \rangle$ ,  $\varepsilon' \rightarrow 0$ . Hence,  $\langle \beta u, v \rangle = (\tilde{\beta} u, v)_{L_2(\Omega)}$ , and due to the density of the functions from  $C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$  vanishing on  $\partial\Omega$  in  $\dot{W}_2^1(\Omega)$  and  $\dot{W}_2^1(\Omega) \cap W_2^2(\Omega)$ . Therefore,  $\beta = \tilde{\beta}$  and this proves the lemma.  $\square$

## 5 Operator estimates

In this section we prove Theorems 2.1, 2.2. The proofs consist of three main steps. At the first step we prove estimates (2.22), (2.24). At the second step we establish estimates (2.23), (2.25). And at third step we show the order sharpness of the certain terms in the estimates.

### 5.1 $W_2^1$ -estimates: general case

In this subsection we prove estimate (2.22). We choose an arbitrary  $f \in L_2(\Omega)$  and by means of the solutions of problems (2.3), (2.5) we define  $v_\varepsilon := u_\varepsilon - u_0 \Xi_\varepsilon$ . In view of the definition of the function  $\Xi_\varepsilon$ , the function  $v_\varepsilon$  belongs to  $W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)$  and satisfies the boundary conditions

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

We write integral identity (3.14) choosing  $v_\varepsilon$  as the test function:

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

Then we multiply the equation in (2.5) by  $\overline{v_\varepsilon \Xi_\varepsilon}$  and integrate once by parts over  $\Omega^\varepsilon$ :

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

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

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

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

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

where

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

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

Letting  $\theta_{R,i}^\varepsilon := \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{M}_R^\varepsilon, i} \omega_k^\varepsilon$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , we observe that the function  $\Xi_\varepsilon$  vanishes on  $\partial\theta_{R,1}^\varepsilon$ . By Assumption A2 and (2.7) we find:

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Re} (a^\varepsilon(\cdot, u_\varepsilon) - a^\varepsilon(\cdot, u_0 \Xi_\varepsilon), v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial\theta_{R,1}^\varepsilon)} &= \operatorname{Re} (a^\varepsilon(\cdot, v_\varepsilon), v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial\theta_{R,1}^\varepsilon)} + \operatorname{Re} (a^\varepsilon(\cdot, u_\varepsilon) - a^\varepsilon(\cdot, u_0 \Xi_\varepsilon), v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial\theta_{R,2}^\varepsilon)} \\ &\geq \mu_1 \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\partial\theta_{R,1}^\varepsilon)}^2 - \mu_0 \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\partial\theta_{R,2}^\varepsilon)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using then inequalities (3.20), (3.8) and Assumption A2, we find a lower bound for the left hand side of identity (5.5):

$$\operatorname{Re} \mathfrak{h}(v_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon) - \operatorname{Re} \lambda \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}^2 + \operatorname{Re} (a^\varepsilon(\cdot, u_\varepsilon) - a^\varepsilon(\cdot, u_0 \Xi_\varepsilon), v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial\theta_{R,1}^\varepsilon)} \geq C \|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)}^2 + \mu_1 \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\partial\theta_{R,1}^\varepsilon)}^2. \quad (5.6)$$

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

Taking into consideration (4.25) and Lemma 4.8, we can estimate the function  $h_\varepsilon^{(1)}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} |h_\varepsilon^{(1)}| &\leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon} |(f, (1 - \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon})v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(E_k^\varepsilon \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}| + \gamma \sum_{k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon} |(\beta \Upsilon u_0, (1 - \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon})v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(E_k^\varepsilon \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}| \\ &\leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon} \|f\|_{L_2(E_k^\varepsilon \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(E_k^\varepsilon \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} + C \sum_{k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon} \|u_0\|_{L_2(E_k^\varepsilon \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(E_k^\varepsilon \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \\ &\leq C\varepsilon \sum_{k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon} (\|f\|_{L_2(E_k^\varepsilon \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} + \|u_0\|_{L_2(E_k^\varepsilon \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}) \|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \leq C\varepsilon \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

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

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

and this is why by (4.26), (2.4) we get:

$$|h_\varepsilon^{(2)}| \leq C(\eta^{\frac{n}{2}-1} \varkappa^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}} \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} + \varepsilon^2) \|u_0\|_{W_2^2(\Omega)} \|\nabla v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}. \quad (5.8)$$

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

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\varepsilon,k}^{(3)} &= - \sum_{j=1}^n \left( A_j u_0 \frac{\partial(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)}{\partial x_j}, v_\varepsilon \right)_{L_2(E_k^\varepsilon \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} + ((A + A(M_k^\varepsilon)) \nabla u_0, v_\varepsilon \nabla(\overline{\Xi_\varepsilon} - 1))_{L_2(E_k^\varepsilon \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \\ &\quad - (A(M_k^\varepsilon) \nabla u_0 \cdot \nu, v_\varepsilon \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon})_{L_2(\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon)} = h_{\varepsilon,k}^{(5)} + h_{\varepsilon,k}^{(6)}, \\ h_{\varepsilon,k}^{(5)} &:= - \sum_{j=1}^n ((\Xi_\varepsilon - 1) A_j \nu_j u_0, v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon)} + (((\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)A - A(M_k^\varepsilon)) \nabla u_0 \cdot \nu, v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon)}, \\ h_{\varepsilon,k}^{(6)} &:= \sum_{j=1}^n \left( A_j (\Xi_\varepsilon - 1) \frac{\partial u_0}{\partial x_j}, v_\varepsilon \right)_{L_2(E_k^\varepsilon \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} + \sum_{j=1}^n \left( A_j (\Xi_\varepsilon - 1) u_0, \frac{\partial v_\varepsilon}{\partial x_j} \right)_{L_2(E_k^\varepsilon \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \\ &\quad - ((\Xi_\varepsilon - 1) \operatorname{div}(A + A(M_k^\varepsilon)) \nabla u_0, v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(E_k^\varepsilon \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} - ((\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)(A + A(M_k^\varepsilon)) \nabla u_0, \nabla v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(E_k^\varepsilon \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.9)$$

where  $\nu_j$  are the components of the unit normal  $\nu$ . Inequality (4.25) applied with  $v = u_0$  and  $v = v_\varepsilon$  allows us to estimate  $h_{\varepsilon,k}^{(6)}$ :

$$|h_{\varepsilon,k}^{(6)}| \leq C\varepsilon \|u_0\|_{W_2^2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}. \quad (5.10)$$

Inequalities (3.8) and (4.23) give rise to a similar estimate for  $h_{\varepsilon,k}^{(5)}$ :

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

This estimate and (5.10), (5.9) imply:

$$|h_\varepsilon^{(3)}| \leq C\varepsilon \|u_0\|_{W_2^2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)}. \quad (5.11)$$

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

$$h_{\varepsilon,k}^{(4)} = -(A(M_k^\varepsilon) u_0 \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu, v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial E_k^\varepsilon)} - (A(M_k^\varepsilon) u_0 \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu^\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon)} - (a^\varepsilon(\cdot, u_0 \Xi_\varepsilon), v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon)}, \quad (5.12)$$

where  $\nu$  stands for the unit outward normal to  $\partial E_k^\varepsilon$ . We fix  $k \in \mathbb{M}_R^\varepsilon$  and represent the functions  $u_0$  and  $v_\varepsilon$  as

$$u_0 = \langle u_0 \rangle + u_0^\perp, \quad v_\varepsilon = \langle v_\varepsilon \rangle + v_\varepsilon^\perp, \quad (5.13)$$

where the operations  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  and  $\cdot^\perp$  were defined in (4.28). Then by inequality (3.1) with  $\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon = \partial E_k^\varepsilon$  and  $\eta = 1$  and by Lemma 3.3 the functions  $u_0$ ,  $u_0^\perp$ ,  $v_\varepsilon^\perp$  satisfy the estimates

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_0\|_{L_2(\partial E_k^\varepsilon)} &\leq C\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|u_0\|_{W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)}, & \|u_0^\perp\|_{L_2(\partial E_k^\varepsilon)} &\leq C\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla u_0\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)}, \\ \|v_\varepsilon^\perp\|_{L_2(\partial E_k^\varepsilon)} &\leq C\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.14)$$

By identities (5.13), we rewrite the first term in formula (5.12) as

$$\begin{aligned} (A(M_k^\varepsilon)u_0\nabla\Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu, v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial E_k^\varepsilon)} &= \langle u_0 \rangle \langle \overline{v_\varepsilon} \rangle \int_{\partial E_k^\varepsilon} A(M_k^\varepsilon)\nabla\Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu \, ds + (A(M_k^\varepsilon)u_0\nabla\Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu, v_\varepsilon^\perp)_{L_2(\partial E_k^\varepsilon)} \\ &\quad + \langle \overline{v_\varepsilon} \rangle \int_{\partial E_k^\varepsilon} A(M_k^\varepsilon)u_0^\perp \Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu \, ds. \end{aligned} \quad (5.15)$$

The second and the third term in the right hand side can be estimated by means of (4.23), (4.24), (5.14), (3.7):

$$\begin{aligned} |(A(M_k^\varepsilon)u_0\nabla\Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu, v_\varepsilon^\perp)_{L_2(\partial E_k^\varepsilon)}| &\leq C\varepsilon \|u_0\|_{W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)} \|\nabla v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)}, \\ \left| \langle \overline{v_\varepsilon} \rangle \int_{\partial E_k^\varepsilon} A(M_k^\varepsilon)u_0^\perp \Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu \, ds \right| &\leq C\varepsilon^{\frac{n+2}{2}} |\langle \overline{v_\varepsilon} \rangle| \|\nabla u_0\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)} \\ &\leq C\varepsilon \|\nabla u_0\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.16)$$

We calculate the integral in first term in the right hand side in (5.15) by using (4.24), (3.7):

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial E_k^\varepsilon} A(M_k^\varepsilon)\nabla\Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu \, ds &= \frac{(2-n)K_{k,\varepsilon}\eta^{n-2}}{R_4^{n-2}} \int_{\partial E_k^\varepsilon} |A^{-1}(M_k^\varepsilon)(x - M_k^\varepsilon)|^{-1} \, ds + O(\varepsilon^{n+2}\eta^2) \quad \text{as } n \geq 3, \\ \int_{\partial E_k^\varepsilon} A(M_k^\varepsilon)\nabla\Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu \, ds &= -\frac{1}{\ln \eta} \int_{\partial E_k^\varepsilon} |A^{-1}(M_k^\varepsilon)(x - M_k^\varepsilon)|^{-1} \, ds + O(\varepsilon^4\eta) \quad \text{as } n = 2, \end{aligned}$$

where the  $O$ -terms are uniform in  $k$ . In the integrals in the right hand sides of the above identities we make the change of variables  $y = \varepsilon^{-1}R_4^{-1}(x - M_k^\varepsilon)$  and then we get:

$$\frac{1}{R_4^{n-2}} \int_{\partial E_k^\varepsilon} |A^{-1}(M_k^\varepsilon)(x - M_k^\varepsilon)|^{-1} \, ds = \varepsilon^n \Upsilon(M_k^\varepsilon), \quad n \geq 2.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial E_k^\varepsilon} A(M_k^\varepsilon)\nabla\Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu \, ds &= \varepsilon^n \gamma K_{k,\varepsilon} (2-n) \Upsilon(M_k^\varepsilon) + O(\varepsilon^n |\eta^{n-2} \varepsilon^{-2} - \gamma| + \varepsilon^{n+2} \eta^2) \quad \text{as } n \geq 3, \\ \int_{\partial E_k^\varepsilon} A(M_k^\varepsilon)\nabla\Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu \, ds &= \varepsilon^2 \gamma \Upsilon(M_k^\varepsilon) + O(\varepsilon^2 |\varepsilon^{-2} \ln^{-1} \eta - \gamma| + \varepsilon^4 \eta) \quad \text{as } n = 2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.17)$$

It is clear that

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

Then by Lemma 3.3 the estimates

$$|(\Upsilon u_0, v_\varepsilon^\perp)_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)}| \leq C\varepsilon \|u_0\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)} \|\nabla v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)},$$

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

hold and therefore,

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

The above estimate and (5.15), (5.16), (5.17) imply:

$$(A(M_k^\varepsilon)u_0 \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu, v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial E_k^\varepsilon)} = h_{\varepsilon, k}^{(7)} + h_{\varepsilon, k}^{(8)}, \quad (5.18)$$

where

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

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

$$\begin{aligned} |h_{\varepsilon, k}^{(8)}| &\leq C\varepsilon \|u_0\|_{W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \\ &\quad + C|\eta^{n-2}\varepsilon^{-2}\varkappa^{-1} - \gamma| \|u_0\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.19)$$

We observe that

$$h_{\varepsilon, k}^{(7)} = -\gamma (\Upsilon \beta_\varepsilon u_0, v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}. \quad (5.20)$$

We proceed to estimating two other terms in the right hand side of (5.12). We first of all note that as  $k \in \mathbb{M}_D^\varepsilon$ , this term vanishes since  $v_\varepsilon = 0$  on  $\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon$  for such  $k$ . This is why we need to estimate it only for  $k \in \mathbb{M}_R^\varepsilon$ . We first consider the case  $k \in \mathbb{M}_{R,1}^\varepsilon$ . The function  $\Xi_\varepsilon$  vanishes on  $\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon$  and hence, in view of the identity in (2.7), the function  $a^\varepsilon(\cdot, \Xi_\varepsilon v_\varepsilon)$  vanishes and the same is true for the third term in the right hand side of (5.12). Since  $Z_k^\varepsilon = 0$  on  $\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon$  and  $Z_k^\varepsilon \in C^1(\overline{B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)} \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)$ , we have

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

where  $\tau$  is the distance measured along the unit normal to  $\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon$ , see Assumption A1. According to this assumption, the derivatives of  $\tau$  in  $x_j$  are bounded uniformly in  $k$ ,  $\varepsilon$  and the spatial variables. By (4.12), (4.14) we then obtain:

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

Hence, by (3.8), (2.7),

$$\begin{aligned} |(A(M_k^\varepsilon)u_0 \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu, v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon)}| &\leq C(\varepsilon\eta\varkappa)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|u_0\|_{W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon)}, \\ (a^\varepsilon(\cdot, u_0 \Xi_\varepsilon), v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon)} &= (a^\varepsilon(\cdot, 0), v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon)} = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (5.21)$$

as  $k \in \mathbb{M}_{R,1}^\varepsilon$ . For  $k \in \mathbb{M}_{R,2}^\varepsilon$ , by boundary condition (2.16) and the definition of  $\Xi_\varepsilon$  we see that

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

and therefore, in view of (2.10),

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

Using then the estimate for  $\tilde{a}_k^\varepsilon$  in (2.12) as well as (3.8), (4.23), we get:

$$\begin{aligned} |(A(M_k^\varepsilon)u_0 \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon \cdot \nu, v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon)} + (a^\varepsilon(\cdot, u_0 \Xi_\varepsilon), v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon)}| &\leq C\varepsilon\eta\varkappa\mu_2 \|u_0\|_{W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_{k,\varepsilon})} \\ &\quad \cdot \|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \setminus \omega_{k,\varepsilon})}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.22)$$

Summing up the above estimates over  $k \in \mathbb{M}_{R,2}^\varepsilon$ , relations (5.21) over  $k \in \mathbb{M}_{R,1}^\varepsilon$  and identities (5.18), (5.20) and inequalities (5.19) over  $k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon$ , by (3.2), we finally obtain:

$$h_\varepsilon^{(4)} = \gamma((\beta - \beta_\varepsilon)u_0, \Upsilon v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} + h_\varepsilon^{(9)}, \quad (5.23)$$

$$\begin{aligned} |h_\varepsilon^{(9)}| &\leq C(\varepsilon + \varepsilon\eta\kappa\mu_2)\|u_0\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)}\|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)} + C(\varepsilon\eta\kappa)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|u_0\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)}\|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\partial\theta_{R,1}^\varepsilon)} \\ &\quad + C|\eta^{n-2}\varepsilon^{-2}\kappa^{-1} - \gamma|\|u_0\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}\|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.24)$$

If  $\gamma \neq 0$ , then the first term in the left hand side of (5.23) is, generally speaking, non-zero and we need Assumption A3 to estimate it. Under this assumption, we continue the function  $v_\varepsilon$  inside  $\omega_k^\varepsilon$  as follows. We first let

$$v_\varepsilon := 0 \quad \text{in } \omega_k^\varepsilon \quad \text{for } k \in \mathbb{M}_D^\varepsilon. \quad (5.25)$$

For  $k \in \mathbb{M}_R^\varepsilon$  we introduce the quantities  $\langle v_\varepsilon \rangle_k$  and the functions  $v_{\varepsilon,k}$  by formulae (3.5). By Lemma 3.3 with  $\varepsilon$  replaced by  $\varepsilon\eta$  we have

$$\|v_{\varepsilon,k}\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon\eta R_2}(M_k^\varepsilon)\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \leq C\varepsilon^2\eta^2\|\nabla v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon\eta R_2}(M_k^\varepsilon)\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2. \quad (5.26)$$

Then for  $k \in \mathbb{M}_R^\varepsilon$  we define the continuation of the function  $v_\varepsilon$  inside  $\omega_k^\varepsilon$  in terms of the local variables  $(\tau, s)$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} v_\varepsilon(\tau, s) &:= \langle v_\varepsilon \rangle_k + v_{\varepsilon,k}(-\tau, s)\chi_1(\tau\varepsilon^{-1}\eta^{-1}) \quad \text{for } x \in \omega_k^\varepsilon, \quad \text{dist}(x, \partial\omega_k^\varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon\eta\tau_0, \\ v_\varepsilon(\tau, s) &:= \langle v_\varepsilon \rangle_k \quad \text{for } x \in \omega_k^\varepsilon, \quad \text{dist}(x, \partial\omega_k^\varepsilon) > \varepsilon\eta\tau_0, \end{aligned} \quad (5.27)$$

where  $\chi_1$  is the cut-off function introduced in the proof of Lemma 4.4. It is obvious that this continuation gives a function in  $W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon))$ , which in view of estimates (3.4), (5.26) satisfies the inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 &\leq C\left(\langle v_\varepsilon \rangle_k^2 \text{mes}_n \omega_k^\varepsilon + \|v_{\varepsilon,k}\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon\eta R_2}(M_k^\varepsilon)\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2\right) \\ &\leq C\|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon\eta R_2}(M_k^\varepsilon)\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2 \leq C\varepsilon^2\eta^2\kappa\|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)\setminus\omega_k^\varepsilon)}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (5.28)$$

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

Due to these inequalities and identity (5.25), the continued function  $v_\varepsilon$ , regarded as defined on the entire domain  $\Omega$ , is an element of  $\dot{W}_2^1(\Omega)$  and

$$\|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\theta^\varepsilon)}^2 \leq C\varepsilon^2\eta^2\kappa\|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}^2, \quad \|\nabla v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\theta^\varepsilon)}^2 \leq C\|\nabla v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}^2. \quad (5.30)$$

These inequalities and (3.13) allow us to rewrite the scalar product in the right hand side of (5.23) as

$$((\beta - \beta_\varepsilon)u_0, \Upsilon v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} = ((\beta - \beta_\varepsilon)u_0, \Upsilon v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\Omega)} + h_\varepsilon^{(10)}, \quad (5.31)$$

where  $h_\varepsilon^{(10)}$  is a function satisfying the estimate

$$|h_\varepsilon^{(10)}| \leq C\|u_0\|_{L_2(\theta^\varepsilon)}\|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\theta^\varepsilon)} \leq C\varepsilon^2\eta^2\kappa\|u_0\|_{W_2^1(\Omega)}\|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)}. \quad (5.32)$$

In the scalar product in the right hand of (5.31) the function  $\Upsilon v_\varepsilon$  is an element of  $\dot{W}_2^1(\Omega)$  and then the function  $(\beta - \beta_\varepsilon)u_0$  can be regarded as a functional on this space. Then by formula (2.18), Assumption A3 and inequalities (5.30) we can estimate this scalar product as follows:

$$\left|((\beta - \beta_\varepsilon)u_0, \Upsilon v_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\Omega)}\right| \leq C\|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}}\|u_0\|_{W_2^1(\Omega)}\|\Upsilon v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\Omega)} \leq C\|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}}\|u_0\|_{W_2^2(\Omega)}\|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\Omega)}. \quad (5.33)$$

The above estimate and (5.7), (5.8), (5.11), (5.23), (5.24), (5.31), (5.32), (3.16) yield a final estimate for the right hand side in (5.5):

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{Re } h_\varepsilon| &\leq |h_\varepsilon| \leq C\|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)}\left((\varepsilon + \varepsilon\eta\kappa\mu_2)\|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)} + |\eta^{n-2}\varepsilon^{-2}\kappa^{-1}(\varepsilon) - \gamma|\|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}\right. \\ &\quad \left.+ \gamma\|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}}\|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)} + (\varepsilon\eta\kappa)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\partial\theta_{R,1}^\varepsilon)}\right) \\ &\leq \delta(\|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)}^2 + \mu_1\|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\partial\theta_{R,1}^\varepsilon)}^2) \\ &\quad + C(\delta)(\varepsilon^2 + (\varepsilon\eta\kappa\mu_2)^2 + |\eta^{n-2}\varepsilon^{-2}\kappa^{-1} - \gamma|^2 + (\varepsilon\eta\kappa\mu_1)^{-1} + \gamma^2\|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}}^2)\|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (5.34)$$

where  $\delta > 0$  is arbitrary but fixed, while  $C(\delta)$  is a constant independent of  $\varepsilon$ ,  $f$ ,  $u_0$  and  $v_\varepsilon$ . Substituting the above estimate with a sufficiently small  $\delta$  into the left hand side of (5.5) and employing then (5.6), we obtain:

$$\|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)}^2 + \mu_1\|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\partial\theta_{R,1}^\varepsilon)}^2 \leq C(\varepsilon^2 + (\varepsilon\eta\kappa\mu_2)^2 + |\eta^{n-2}\varepsilon^{-2}\kappa^{-1} - \gamma|^2 + (\varepsilon\eta\kappa\mu_1)^{-1} + \gamma^2\|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}}^2)\|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)}^2. \quad (5.35)$$

This estimate implies (2.22).

If the set  $\mathbb{M}_R$  is empty, then the second term in (5.12) is zero for  $k \in \mathbb{M}_R$  just because the function  $v_\varepsilon$  vanishes on  $\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon$ . Then estimates (5.21), (5.22) are no longer needed. Estimate (5.24) also simplifies:

$$|h_\varepsilon^{(9)}| \leq C\varepsilon\|u_0\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)}\|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)} + C|\eta^{n-2}\varepsilon^{-2}\varkappa^{-1} - \gamma|\|u_0\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}\|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}.$$

We also do not need continuation (5.27) and, hence, Assumption A2. Estimates (5.30) are also omitted in the considered case. Estimates (5.33), (5.34) then become

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

All other above arguing remain the same and we arrive at estimate (2.22) without the terms  $(\varepsilon\eta\mu_1\varkappa)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$  and  $\varepsilon\eta\varkappa\mu_2$ .

## 5.2 $W_2^1$ -estimates: $\gamma = 0$

Here we prove estimate (2.24). Assume that  $\gamma = 0$  and only Assumption A1 holds. In this case, the function  $h_\varepsilon$  can be written as  $h_\varepsilon = g_\varepsilon[v_\varepsilon]$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} g_\varepsilon[v] := & (f, (1 - \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon})v)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} - \sum_{k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon} \left( (Au_0 \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon, \nabla v)_{L_2(E_k^\varepsilon \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} - (A \nabla u_0, v \nabla \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon})_{L_2(E_k^\varepsilon \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)} \right) \\ & - \sum_{k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon} (A \nabla u_0 \cdot \nu^\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon})_{L_2(\partial\omega_k^\varepsilon)} - \sum_{k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon} \sum_{j=1}^n \left( A_j u_0 \frac{\partial \Xi_\varepsilon}{\partial x_j}, v \right)_{L_2(E_k^\varepsilon \setminus \omega_k^\varepsilon)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.36)$$

We also integrate by parts:

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

and this allows us to rewrite (5.36):

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

Then the function  $h_\varepsilon$  can be directly estimated by means of inequality inequalities (3.16), (4.23), (3.1) and Lemma 4.6:

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

Substituting this estimate into the right hand side of (5.5) and using (5.6), we obtain

$$\|v_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \leq C (\eta^{\frac{n}{2}-1} \varepsilon^{-1} \varkappa^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} + \varepsilon) \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)}. \quad (5.37)$$

By Lemma 4.6 and inequality (3.16) we also have:

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)u_0\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} & \leq C(\varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon\eta)\|u_0\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \leq C\varepsilon\|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)}, \\ \|\nabla(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)u_0\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} & \leq \|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)\nabla u_0\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} + \|u_0 \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \\ & \leq C(\eta^{\frac{n}{2}-1} \varepsilon^{-1} \varkappa^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} + \varepsilon) \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.38)$$

These estimates and (5.37) and an obvious identity

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

prove (2.24).



### 5.3 $L_2$ -estimates

Here we prove inequalities (2.23) and (2.25). The former is implied immediately by identity (5.39) and estimates (4.25), (3.16), (2.22).

In the proof of (2.25) we follow an approach proposed recently in [7], which is a modification of the technique used in [22], [23], [24], [25], [26]. Namely, we first introduce a differential expression

$$\mathcal{L}^* := - \sum_{i,j=1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} A_{ij}^\varepsilon \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} - \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \overline{A_j} + \overline{A_0}$$

and consider an auxiliary boundary value problem

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

where  $f_\varepsilon = v_\varepsilon$  in  $\Omega^\varepsilon$  and  $f_\varepsilon = 0$  in  $\theta^\varepsilon$ ; here we use the notations from Subsection 5.1. Since  $A_j \in W_\infty^1(\Omega)$ , this problem is of the same nature as (2.5). This is why it is solvable for  $\text{Re } \lambda \leq \lambda_0$  and its solution belongs to  $W_2^2(\Omega)$  and satisfies the estimate

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

Hereinafter by  $C$  we denote inessential constants independent of  $\varepsilon, k, f, v_\varepsilon$  and  $w$ .

In what follows the function  $v_\varepsilon$  is supposed to be continued inside  $\theta^\varepsilon$  in accordance with (5.25), (5.27) and thus is regarded as an element of  $W_2^1(\Omega)$ . We then write an integral identity associated with problem (5.40) choosing  $v_\varepsilon$  as a test function:

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

By estimates (5.28), (5.29), (5.37), (5.41) we then immediately obtain:

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

By  $\Pi_\varepsilon$  we denote a particular case of function  $\Xi_\varepsilon$  in the case when on the boundaries of all cavities the Dirichlet condition is imposed. In other words, only the functions  $X_{k,\varepsilon}$  satisfying Dirichlet condition (2.14) are used in (2.21) for all  $k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon$  while defining  $\Pi_\varepsilon$ . The function  $\Pi_\varepsilon$  vanishes on  $\partial\theta^\varepsilon$  and is real.

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

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

Let us estimate the right hand side of this identity.

Since the function  $\Pi_\varepsilon$  is a particular case of  $\Xi_\varepsilon$ , it possesses the same properties, namely, relations (4.23), (4.24) and Lemma 4.6 hold true for  $\Pi_\varepsilon$ . Then by (4.25), (5.41) we obtain:

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

Using the definition of the functions  $\Xi_\varepsilon$  and  $\Pi_\varepsilon$ , we integrate by parts as follows:

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

Hence, by estimates (4.23), (4.25), (4.26) for the functions  $\Xi_\varepsilon$  and  $\Pi_\varepsilon$  and by estimates (3.16), (5.41) we obtain:

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

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

$$\begin{aligned}
& (A\nabla u_0, \Pi_\varepsilon w \nabla \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon})_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} - (Au_0 \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon, \nabla(\Pi_\varepsilon w))_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \\
&= (A\nabla u_0, w \nabla \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon})_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} - (Au_0 \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon, \nabla w)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \\
&+ (A\nabla u_0, (\Pi_\varepsilon - 1)w \nabla \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon})_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} - (Au_0 \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon, (\Pi_\varepsilon - 1)\nabla w)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \\
&- (Au_0 \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon, w \nabla \Pi_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.47}$$

By Lemma 4.6 and estimates (3.16), (5.41) we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| (A\nabla u_0, (\Pi_\varepsilon - 1)w \nabla \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon})_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} - (Au_0 \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon, (\Pi_\varepsilon - 1)\nabla w)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} - (Au_0 \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon, w \nabla \Pi_\varepsilon)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \right| \\
& \leq C \left( \|(\Pi_\varepsilon - 1)\nabla u_0\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \|w \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \|(\Pi_\varepsilon - 1)\nabla w\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \|u_0 \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} + \|u_0 \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \|w \nabla \Pi_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \right) \\
& \leq C(\eta^{n-2} \varepsilon^{-2} \varkappa^{-1} + \varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon \eta) \|u_0\|_{W_2^2(\Omega)} \|w\|_{W_2^2(\Omega)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.48}$$

In the other two terms in the right hand side of (5.47) we integrate by parts using the definition of the functions  $\Xi_\varepsilon$  and  $\Pi_\varepsilon$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
& (A\nabla u_0, w \nabla \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon})_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} - (Au_0 \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon, \nabla w)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} = (A\nabla u_0, w \nabla \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon})_{L_2(\Omega)} - (Au_0 \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon, \nabla w)_{L_2(\Omega)} \\
&= \int_{\Omega} (\Xi_\varepsilon - 1) (\operatorname{div} Au_0 \nabla \overline{w} - \operatorname{div} A \overline{w} \nabla u_0) dx \\
&= \int_{\Omega} (\Xi_\varepsilon - 1) (u_0 \operatorname{div} A \nabla \overline{w} - \overline{w} \operatorname{div} A \nabla u_0) dx.
\end{aligned}$$

By estimates (3.16), (4.23), (4.25), (5.41) and Lemma 3.2 we then obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| (A\nabla u_0, w \nabla \overline{\Xi_\varepsilon})_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} - (Au_0 \nabla \Xi_\varepsilon, \nabla w)_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \right| \\
& \leq C \|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)u_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \|w\|_{W_2^2(\Omega)} + C \|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)w\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \|u_0\|_{W_2^2(\Omega)} \\
& \leq C \left( \|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)u_0\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} + \|u_0\|_{L_2(\theta^\varepsilon)} \right) \|w\|_{W_2^2(\Omega)} \\
& \quad + C \left( \|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)w\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} + \|(\Xi_\varepsilon - 1)w\|_{L_2(\theta^\varepsilon)} \right) \|u_0\|_{W_2^2(\Omega)} \\
& \leq C(\varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon \eta) \|u_0\|_{W_2^2(\Omega)} \|w\|_{W_2^2(\Omega)} \\
& \leq C(\varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon \eta) \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}.
\end{aligned}$$

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

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

It also follows from Lemma 4.6 and estimate (4.23) for the function  $\Pi_\varepsilon$  and from (5.37) that

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

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

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

and hence,

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

Employing now estimate (4.25) with  $u = u_0$  and identity (5.39), we arrive at (2.25).

## 5.4 Sharpness of estimates

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

We choose  $\mathcal{L} := -\Delta + 1$  and we impose only the Dirichlet condition on the boundaries of the cavities, that is,  $\mathbb{M}_R^\varepsilon = \emptyset$ . In this case, the function  $\beta_\varepsilon$  is non-negative. For  $n = 2$  this fact is implied by definition (2.17), while for  $n \geq 3$  it follows from a simple integration by parts:

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

Definition (2.18) of the norm in  $\mathfrak{M}$  yields that

$$\int_{\Omega} \beta_\varepsilon \phi dx \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} \beta \phi dx, \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow +0, \quad \text{for all } \phi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega).$$

Choosing then non-negative functions  $\phi$ , we see that  $\beta \geq 0$  almost everywhere in  $\Omega$ .

We also assume that  $\eta$  is so that  $\eta^{n-2} \varepsilon^{-2} \varkappa^{-1} = \gamma > 0$  for all  $\varepsilon$  and the domain  $\Omega$  is bounded. Then the choice  $\lambda = \lambda_0 = 0$  ensures the solvability of both perturbed and limiting problems (2.3), (2.5) as well as of the following auxiliary boundary problem:

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

Since the function  $\beta_\varepsilon$  is piece-wise constant, non-negative and is uniformly bounded due its definition and (4.10), the above problem is solvable in  $W_2^2(\Omega)$  and its solution also satisfies estimate (3.16). Then we can replace the function  $u_0$  and problem (2.5) by  $\tilde{u}_0$  and problem (5.50) and reproduce all calculations in Subsection 5.1 up to (5.23), (5.24) taking into consideration that  $\mathbb{M}_R^\varepsilon = \emptyset$ . In the right hand side of identity (5.23) then the first term vanishes and this removes the term  $\|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}}$  from (5.34), (5.35). Using then (5.38), (5.39), we get modifications of estimates (2.22), (2.23):

$$\|u_\varepsilon - \Xi_\varepsilon \tilde{u}_0\|_{W_2^1(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \leq C\varepsilon \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)}, \quad \|u_\varepsilon - \tilde{u}_0\|_{L_2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \leq C\varepsilon \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)}.$$

Therefore, it is sufficient to prove that

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

for some  $f$  to show the sharpness of the term  $\|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}}$  in (2.22), (2.23). If  $\|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}} = 0$ , then the above inequalities are obvious and this is why in what follows we assume that  $\|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}} \neq 0$ .

Assume that  $\|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}} \neq 0$ . We rewrite definition (2.18) of the norm  $\|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}}$  as

$$\|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}} = \sup_{u \in \dot{W}_2^1(\Omega) \cap W_2^2(\Omega)} \frac{1}{\|u\|_{W_2^2(\Omega)}} \sup_{v \in \dot{W}_2^1(\Omega)} \frac{|((\beta_\varepsilon - \beta)u, v)_{L_2(\Omega)}|}{\|v\|_{W_2^1(\Omega)}} \quad (5.52)$$

and conclude that there exists a non-zero function  $u^\varepsilon \in W_2^2(\Omega) \cap \dot{W}_2^1(\Omega)$  such that

$$|((\beta_\varepsilon - \beta)u^\varepsilon, v)_{L_2(\Omega)}| \geq \frac{1}{2} \|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}} \|u^\varepsilon\|_{W_2^2(\Omega)} \|v\|_{W_2^1(\Omega)} \quad \text{for all } v \in \dot{W}_2^1(\Omega). \quad (5.53)$$

We choose  $f := (\mathcal{L} + \gamma \beta_\varepsilon)u^\varepsilon$  and we see that  $\tilde{u}_0 = u^\varepsilon$  solves problem (5.50) and

$$\|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \leq C \|u^\varepsilon\|_{W_2^2(\Omega)} \quad (5.54)$$

with some fixed constant  $C$  independent of  $\varepsilon$  and  $u^\varepsilon$ . Using the corresponding solution  $u_0$  of problem (2.5) with  $\lambda = 0$ , we define  $\phi^\varepsilon := u^\varepsilon - u_0$ . The latter function solves the boundary value problem

$$(\mathcal{L} + \gamma \beta)\phi^\varepsilon + \gamma(\beta_\varepsilon - \beta)u^\varepsilon = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad \phi^\varepsilon = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \quad (5.55)$$

Let  $\Lambda$  and  $\Phi$  be a positive eigenvalue and an associated normalized in  $L_2(\Omega)$  eigenfunction of a self-adjoint operator in  $L_2(\Omega)$  with the differential expression  $\mathcal{L} + \gamma\beta$  and the Dirichlet condition on  $\partial\Omega$ . We write integral identity corresponding to (5.55) with  $\Phi$  as a test function to obtain:

$$(\phi^\varepsilon, \Phi)_{L_2(\Omega)} = -\frac{1}{\Lambda}((\beta_\varepsilon - \beta)u^\varepsilon, \Phi)_{L_2(\Omega)}.$$

Hence, by (5.53), (5.54)

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi^\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\Omega)} &\geq |(\phi^\varepsilon, \Phi)_{L_2(\Omega)}| \|\Phi\|_{L_2(\Omega)} = \frac{1}{\Lambda} |((\beta_\varepsilon - \beta)u^\varepsilon, \Phi)_{L_2(\Omega)}| \geq \frac{1}{2\Lambda} \|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}} \|u^\varepsilon\|_{W_2^2(\Omega)} \|\Phi\|_{W_2^1(\Omega)} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2\Lambda} \|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}} \|u^\varepsilon\|_{W_2^2(\Omega)} \|\Phi\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \geq \frac{1}{2\Lambda} \|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}} \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \end{aligned}$$

and this proves (5.51).

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

$$(-\Delta + \mu_3\beta_0)\tilde{u}_0 = f \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad \tilde{u}_0 = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \quad (5.56)$$

with  $\mu_3 := \eta^{n-2}\varepsilon^{-2}\varkappa^{-1}$ . Then we can again reproduce the calculations from Section 5.1 skipping just identities (5.17) and replacing  $\gamma$  by  $\eta^{n-2}\varepsilon^{-2}\varkappa^{-1}$  in all relations after (5.17). This gives the estimates

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

At the same time, it is easy to see that the solution of problem (5.56) is analytic in  $\mu_3$  and for  $\mu_3 = \gamma$ , this solution coincides with the solution  $u_0$  to homogenized problem (2.5). Hence, in the general situation, the next-to-leading term in the Taylor expansion of  $\tilde{u}_0$  in  $\mu_3 - \gamma$  is non-zero and the estimates

$$\|u_0 - \tilde{u}_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \leq C|\mu_3 - \gamma| \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)}, \quad \|u_0 - \tilde{u}_0\|_{W_2^1(\Omega)} \leq C|\mu_3 - \gamma| \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)},$$

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

We proceed to checking the sharpness of the other terms in (2.22) and (2.24). We are going to do this by adducing an appropriate example. We let  $\square := [-2, 2]^n$ ,  $\omega := B_1(0)$  and  $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^n$ . The points  $M_k^\varepsilon$  are defined as  $M_k^\varepsilon := \varepsilon k$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon := 4\mathbb{Z}^n$ . In this case, we deal with a periodic perforation in  $\Omega$ . Each cavity is ball of the radius  $\varepsilon\eta$  centered at a point  $\varepsilon k$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ , and hence,

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

The differential expression is chosen to be the negative Laplacian,  $\mathcal{L} := -\Delta + 1$ . It is clear that we can take  $\lambda = \lambda_0 = 0$ . We choose  $R_1 = 1$ ,  $R_2 := \frac{7}{6}$ ,  $R_3 := \frac{3}{2}$ ,  $R_4 := \frac{4}{3}$ .

We consider the solution to the problem

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

and hence, as in the first part of section, by reproducing the arguing from Section 5.1, the solution  $u_\varepsilon$  to the corresponding equation in (2.3) satisfies the modified versions of estimates (2.22), (2.23):

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_\varepsilon - \tilde{u}_0\Xi_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \theta^\varepsilon)} &\leq C(\varepsilon + (\varepsilon\eta\mu_1\varkappa)^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \varepsilon\eta\varkappa\mu_2) \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)}, \\ \|u_\varepsilon - \tilde{u}_0\|_{L_2(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \theta^\varepsilon)} &\leq C(\varepsilon + (\varepsilon\eta\mu_1\varkappa)^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \varepsilon\eta\varkappa\mu_2) \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.57)$$

This is why, to confirm the sharpness of the other terms in (2.22), (2.23), we need to estimate from below the norms in the left hand sides of the above inequalities.

We first consider the case of only Dirichlet conditions on the boundaries of the cavities, that is,  $\mathbb{M}_R^\varepsilon = \emptyset$  and  $\mathbb{M}_D^\varepsilon = \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon$ . Such choice of the boundary conditions on  $\partial\theta^\varepsilon$  removes the terms  $(\varepsilon\eta\mu_1\varkappa)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$  and  $\varepsilon\eta\varkappa\mu_2$  from inequalities (5.57). The functions  $X_{k,\varepsilon}$  and  $Z_{k,\varepsilon}$  for the considered model can be found explicitly

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

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

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_0(\zeta) &:= \frac{(n-2)}{R_3^n \text{mes}_n B_1(0)} && \text{on } B_{R_3}(k), \quad k \in 4\mathbb{Z}^n, \quad n \geq 3, \\ \beta_0(\zeta) &:= \frac{1}{R_3^2 \text{mes}_n B_1(0)} && \text{on } B_{R_3}(k), \quad k \in 4\mathbb{Z}^n, \quad n = 2, \\ \beta_0(\zeta) &:= 0 && \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bigcup_{k \in 4\mathbb{Z}^n} B_{R_3}(k).\end{aligned}\tag{5.59}$$

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

$$\begin{aligned}-\Delta_\zeta Y_0 &= \beta_0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus 4\mathbb{Z}^n, \\ Y_0(\zeta) &= -\frac{1}{|\zeta - k|^{n-2}} + O(|\zeta - k|), \quad \zeta \rightarrow k, \quad n \geq 3, \\ Y_0(\zeta) &= \ln |\zeta - k| + O(|\zeta - k|), \quad \zeta \rightarrow k, \quad n = 2.\end{aligned}\tag{5.60}$$

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

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

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

It is clear that

$$\|f\|_{L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C\|\tilde{u}_0\|_{W_2^2(\mathbb{R}^d)},\tag{5.61}$$

where a constant  $C$  is independent of  $\varepsilon$ ,  $\eta$  and  $\tilde{u}_0$ . It also follows from (5.60) that the function  $U_\varepsilon$  solves the boundary value problem

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}U_\varepsilon &= f + f_\varepsilon \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \theta^\varepsilon, \quad U_\varepsilon = \eta^{n-2}\varkappa^{-1}\varphi_D^\varepsilon \quad \text{on } \theta^\varepsilon, \\ f_\varepsilon(x) &:= \eta^{n-2}(\varepsilon)\varkappa^{-1}(\varepsilon)Y_0\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right)\mathcal{L}\tilde{u}_0 - 2\eta^{n-2}(\varepsilon)\varkappa^{-1}(\varepsilon)\nabla Y_0\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) \cdot \nabla \tilde{u}_0(x), \\ \varphi_D^\varepsilon(x) &:= \left(Y_0\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) + \eta^{-n+2}(\varepsilon)\varkappa(\varepsilon)\right)\tilde{u}_0(x).\end{aligned}\tag{5.62}$$

By straightforward calculations we confirm that

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

By  $\chi_3 = \chi_3(\zeta, \eta)$  we denote an infinitely differentiable  $\Box$ -periodic cut-off function equalling to one as  $|\zeta - k| \leq 2\eta$  and vanishing as  $|\zeta - k| \geq 3\eta$  for  $k \in 4\mathbb{Z}^n$  and obeying the uniform estimate  $|\nabla_\zeta \chi_3(\zeta, \eta)| \leq C\eta^{-1}$  with a constant  $C$  independent of  $\zeta$  and  $\eta$ . The function

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\varphi}_D^\varepsilon(x) &:= \tilde{u}_0(x)\chi_3\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}, \eta\right)Y_1\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) \quad \text{on } B_{3\varepsilon\eta}(k), \quad \tilde{\varphi}_D^\varepsilon(x) := 0 \quad \text{outside } B_{3\varepsilon\eta}(k), \quad k \in 4\mathbb{Z}^n, \\ Y_1(\xi) &:= Y_0(\xi) + \begin{cases} |\xi - k|^{-n+2} & \text{as } n \geq 3, \\ -\ln |\xi - k| & \text{as } n = 2, \end{cases} \quad k \in 4\mathbb{Z}^n,\end{aligned}$$

multiplied by  $\eta^{n-2}\varkappa^{-1}$  satisfies the boundary condition in (5.62). Then we consider the solution  $u_\varepsilon$  to problem (2.3) with the introduced function  $f$  and in a standard way we get the estimate:

$$\begin{aligned}\|U_\varepsilon - u_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \theta^\varepsilon)} &\leq C\left(\eta^{n-2}\varkappa^{-1}\|\tilde{\varphi}_D^\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \theta^\varepsilon)} + \eta^{n-2}\varkappa^{-1}\|f_{\varepsilon,0}\|_{L_2(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \theta^\varepsilon)}\right. \\ &\quad \left.+ \eta^{n-2}\varkappa^{-1}\varepsilon\sum_{j=1}^n \|f_{\varepsilon,j}\|_{L_2(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \theta^\varepsilon)}\right),\end{aligned}\tag{5.63}$$

where  $C$  is a fixed constant independent of  $\varepsilon$ ,  $\eta$ ,  $f_\varepsilon$ ,  $\tilde{\varphi}_D^\varepsilon$ .

In view of convergence (2.4) and the asymptotics for  $Y_0$  in (5.60) and the smoothness of this function, by routine straightforward calculations we find that

$$\eta^{n-2}\varkappa^{-1}\|\tilde{\varphi}_D^\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \theta^\varepsilon)} \leq C\varepsilon^{-1}\eta^{\frac{3n}{2}-2}\varkappa^{-1} \leq C\varepsilon^2\eta\varkappa,\tag{5.64}$$

where  $C$  are some constants independent of  $\varepsilon$  and  $\eta$  but depending on the choice of the function  $\tilde{u}_0$ . In the same way we find that

$$\sum_{j=0}^n \|f_{\varepsilon,j}\|_{L_2(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \theta^\varepsilon)} \leq C \begin{cases} 1 + \eta^{2-\frac{n}{2}}, & n \neq 4, \\ 1 + |\ln \eta|^{\frac{1}{2}}, & n = 4, \end{cases}$$

where  $C$  is a constant independent of  $\varepsilon$  and  $\eta$  but depending on the choice of the function  $\tilde{u}_0$ . We substitute these estimates and (5.64) into (5.63) and use convergence (2.4) to obtain:

$$\|U_\varepsilon - u_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \theta^\varepsilon)} \leq C\varepsilon^2 + C\varepsilon\eta \begin{cases} 1, & n \neq 4, \\ |\ln \eta|^{\frac{1}{2}} + 1, & n = 4, \end{cases} \quad (5.65)$$

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

The function  $\Xi_\varepsilon$  defined by (2.21) with the functions  $Z_{k,\varepsilon}$  from (5.58) reads as

$$\Xi_\varepsilon(x) := \begin{cases} \frac{1 - \left|\frac{x}{\varepsilon} - k\right|^{-n+2} \eta^{n-2}}{1 - \left(\frac{4\eta}{3}\right)^{n-2}} & \text{in } B_{\frac{3}{4}\varepsilon}(\varepsilon k) \setminus B_{\varepsilon\eta}(\varepsilon k), \quad k \in 4\mathbb{Z}^n, \\ 1 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon} B_{\frac{3}{4}\varepsilon}(\varepsilon k), \end{cases}$$

as  $n \geq 3$ , and

$$\Xi_\varepsilon(x) := \begin{cases} \frac{\ln \left|\frac{x}{\varepsilon} - k\right| - \ln \eta}{\ln \frac{3\eta}{4}} & \text{in } B_{\frac{3}{4}\varepsilon}(\varepsilon k) \setminus B_{\varepsilon\eta}(\varepsilon k), \quad k \in 4\mathbb{Z}^n, \\ 1 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon} B_{\frac{3}{4}\varepsilon}(\varepsilon k), \end{cases}$$

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

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

$$\|\nabla(U_\varepsilon - \tilde{u}_0)\|_{L_2(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \theta^\varepsilon)} \geq C\eta^{\frac{n}{2}-1}\varepsilon^{-1}\varkappa^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (5.67)$$

provided  $|u_0|$  is uniformly separated from zero on some fixed ball. Assuming that  $\eta^{n-2}\varepsilon^{-2}\varkappa^{-1} \equiv \gamma$ , by (5.61), (5.65), (5.66) we get

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

with a constant  $C$  independent of  $\varepsilon$  and this proves the sharpness of the term  $\varepsilon$  in the right hand side of (2.22).

As  $\gamma = 0$ , the solution  $u_0$  to the equation

$$\mathcal{L}u_0 = f \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d$$

obviously satisfies the estimate

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

and in view of (5.65), (5.67), (2.4) we also see that the term  $\eta^{\frac{n}{2}-1}\varepsilon^{-1}\varkappa^{-\frac{1}{2}}$  in the right hand side of (2.24) is order sharp.

Let us show that the term  $\varepsilon\eta\varkappa\mu_2$  in (2.22) is order sharp. Here we again consider the above example, but on the boundaries of the cavities we impose the Robin condition

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

Such choice of the boundary conditions removes the term  $(\varepsilon\eta\mu_1\varkappa)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$  from (5.57). The functions  $X_{k,\varepsilon}$  and  $Z_{k,\varepsilon}$  can be again found explicitly

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

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

$$\beta_0(\zeta) := \frac{(n-2)}{(n-1)R_3^n \text{mes}_n B_1(0)} \quad \text{on } B_{R_3}(k), \quad k \in 4\mathbb{Z}^n, \quad n \geq 3,$$

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

By  $u_\varepsilon$  we define the solution to problem (2.3) for an arbitrary  $\mu_2$ , while  $u_\varepsilon^{(0)}$  is the solution to the same problem for  $\mu_2 = 0$ . Both these solutions converge to the same solution  $u_0$  of the homogenized problem (2.5).

The function  $u_\varepsilon$  satisfies estimate (2.22), while the function  $u_\varepsilon^{(0)}$  satisfies the same estimate with  $\mu_2 = 0$ . This is why, in order to prove that the term  $\varepsilon\eta\kappa\mu_2$  is order sharp in estimate (2.22), it is sufficient to find an example of the function  $f$  such that

$$\|u_\varepsilon - u_\varepsilon^{(0)}\|_{L_2(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \theta^\varepsilon)} \geq C\varepsilon\eta\mu_2\|f\|_{L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)}. \quad (5.68)$$

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

$$\begin{aligned} U_\varepsilon(x) &:= u_\varepsilon^{(0)}(x) + \varepsilon\eta^{n-1}(\varepsilon)\mu_2(\varepsilon)Y_2\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right)u_0(x), \\ Y_2 &:= \frac{1}{n-1}Y_0, \quad n \geq 3, \quad Y_2 := Y_0 - \ln \eta, \quad n = 2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.69)$$

This function solves the following boundary value problem:

$$\mathcal{L}U_\varepsilon = f + f_\varepsilon \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \theta^\varepsilon, \quad \frac{\partial U_\varepsilon}{\partial \nu} + (\varepsilon^{-1}\eta^{-1} + \mu_2)U_\varepsilon = \varphi_R^\varepsilon \quad \text{on } \partial\theta^\varepsilon,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} f_\varepsilon(x) &= f_{\varepsilon,0}(x) - 2 \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial f_{\varepsilon,j}}{\partial x_j}(x), \\ f_{\varepsilon,0}(x) &:= \varepsilon\eta^{n-1}\mu_2 Y_2\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right)(-\mathcal{L} + 2)u_0(x), \quad f_{\varepsilon,j}(x) := \varepsilon\eta^{n-1}\mu_2 Y_2\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) \frac{\partial u_0}{\partial x_j}(x), \\ \varphi_R^\varepsilon(x) &:= \varepsilon\eta^{n-1}Y_2\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} + \mu_2(\varepsilon)\right)u_0(x) + \varepsilon\eta^{n-1}u_0(x) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} + \varepsilon^{-1}\eta^{-1}\right)Y_3\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) \\ &\quad + \mu_2(\varepsilon)(u_\varepsilon^{(0)}(x) - u_0(x)), \\ Y_3(\zeta) &:= \frac{1}{n-1}(Y_0(\zeta) + \eta^{-n+2}), \quad n \geq 3, \quad Y_3(\zeta) := Y_2(\zeta), \quad n = 2. \end{aligned}$$

Writing then a problem for  $U_\varepsilon - u_0$  and an associated integral identity with  $U_\varepsilon - u_0$  as the test function and using (3.8), we obtain an analogue of inequality (5.63):

$$\|U_\varepsilon - u_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \theta^\varepsilon)} \leq C \left( \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}\eta^{\frac{1}{2}}\kappa^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\varphi_R^\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\partial\theta^\varepsilon)} + \sum_{j=0}^n \|f_{\varepsilon,j}\|_{L_2(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \theta^\varepsilon)} \right), \quad (5.70)$$

where  $C$  is some constant independent of  $\varepsilon$ ,  $\varphi_R^\varepsilon$  and  $f_{\varepsilon,j}$ ,  $j = 0, \dots, n$ . Using (3.8), (3.16), the asymptotics for  $Y_0$  in (5.60) and the definition of the function  $Y_3$ , we find:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varphi_R^\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\partial\theta^\varepsilon)} &\leq C((\varepsilon\eta\kappa\mu_2 + \eta^{n-1})\|u_0\|_{L_2(\partial\theta^\varepsilon)} + \varepsilon\eta\kappa\|\nabla u_0\|_{L_2(\partial\theta^\varepsilon)} + \mu_2\|u_\varepsilon^{(0)} - u_0\|_{L_2(\partial\theta^\varepsilon)}) \\ &\leq C(\varepsilon\eta\kappa)^{\frac{1}{2}}((\varepsilon\eta\kappa\mu_2 + \varepsilon\eta\kappa)\|f\|_{L_2(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \mu_2\|u_\varepsilon^{(0)} - u_0\|_{W_2^1(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \theta^\varepsilon)}), \end{aligned} \quad (5.71)$$

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

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

where  $C$  is some constant independent of  $\varepsilon$  and  $u_0$ . This estimate and (5.71), (5.70) yield:

$$\|U_\varepsilon - u_\varepsilon\|_{W_2^1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \theta^\varepsilon)} \leq C((\varepsilon\eta\kappa\mu_2(\varepsilon\eta\kappa + \eta^{n-2} + \varrho) + \varepsilon^2\eta^2\kappa^2)\|u_0\|_{C^2(\text{supp } u_0)} + \varepsilon\eta\kappa\mu_2\|u_\varepsilon^{(0)} - u_0\|_{W_2^1(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \theta^\varepsilon)}), \quad (5.72)$$

where  $C$  is some constant independent of  $\varepsilon$ ,  $u_0$ ,  $u_\varepsilon^{(0)}$ . At the same time, it follows from definition (5.69) of  $U_\varepsilon$  that provided  $|u_0|$  is uniformly separated from zero on some fixed ball, the estimate

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

holds with some fixed constant  $C$  independent of  $\varepsilon$ , where we have also assumed that  $\eta^{\frac{n}{2}-1}\varepsilon^{-1}\kappa^{-\frac{1}{2}} = 1$ . This estimate, (5.72) and (2.22) for  $\|u_\varepsilon^{(0)} - u_0\|_{W_2^1(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \theta^\varepsilon)}$  prove (5.68) and hence, the term  $\varepsilon\eta\kappa\mu_2$  is order sharp in (2.22).

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

In this section we discuss the convergence postulated in Assumption A3. As a main tool of checking Assumption A3, we propose the following way. We introduce one more space of multipliers  $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}$ , which consists of the functions  $F$  defined on  $\Omega$  such that for each  $u \in \tilde{W}_2^1(\Omega)$  the function  $Fu$  is a continuous antilinear functional on  $\tilde{W}_2^1(\Omega)$ . The norm in  $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}$  is introduced as

$$\|F\|_{\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}} = \sup_{u, v \in \tilde{W}_2^1(\Omega)} \frac{|\langle Fu, v \rangle|}{\|u\|_{W_2^1(\Omega)} \|v\|_{W_2^1(\Omega)}}.$$

It is clear that  $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}} \subset \mathfrak{M}$  and

$$\|F\|_{\mathfrak{M}} \leq \|F\|_{\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}}. \quad (6.1)$$

Having this inequality in mind, instead of convergence in the space  $\mathfrak{M}$  as it is postulated in Assumption A3, we propose to check the convergence in the space  $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}$ .

The convergence in the sense of the norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}}$ -norm was studied in details in [9] and a simple criterion was established. Namely, we choose an arbitrary lattice  $\Gamma$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with a periodicity cell  $\square$ . Given a function  $\rho_1 = \rho_1(\varepsilon)$ , we denote

$$\Gamma_{\rho_1} := \{z \in \Gamma : \rho_1 z + \rho_1 \square \subset \Omega\}. \quad (6.2)$$

The mentioned criterion reads as follows: the function  $\beta_\varepsilon$  converges to some function  $\beta$  in  $\|\cdot\|_{\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}}$ -norm if and only if there exist functions  $\rho_1 = \rho_1(\varepsilon)$ ,  $\rho_2 = \rho_2(\varepsilon)$  such that

$$\sup_{z \in \Gamma_{\rho_1(\varepsilon)}} \frac{1}{\rho_1^n(\varepsilon)} \left| \int_{\rho_1(\varepsilon)z + \rho_1(\varepsilon)\square} (\beta_\varepsilon(x) - \beta(x)) dx \right| \leq \rho_2(\varepsilon), \quad \rho_1(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0, \quad \rho_2(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0, \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow +0. \quad (6.3)$$

Therefore, Assumption A3 can be guaranteed by condition (6.3), which is very explicit. If condition (6.3) is satisfied, by Theorem 2.4 from [9] we obtain the estimate

$$\|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}} \leq C(\rho_2 + \rho_1); \quad (6.4)$$

hereinafter in this section by  $C$  we denote various constants independent of  $\varepsilon$  and spatial variables.

In paper [9], a way for explicit calculation of function  $\beta$  for a given  $\beta_\varepsilon$  was provided. Namely, let  $\omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be a fixed domain and assume that the function

$$\beta(x) := \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow +0} \frac{1}{\rho_3(\varepsilon) \text{mes}_n \omega} \int_{x + \rho_3(\varepsilon)\omega} \beta_\varepsilon(y) dy$$

is well-defined in  $\Omega$ . If the limit in the above formula is uniform in  $x$ , namely,

$$\sup_x \left| \beta(x) - \frac{1}{\rho_3(\varepsilon) \text{mes}_n \omega} \int_{x + \rho_3(\varepsilon)\omega} \beta_\varepsilon(y) dy \right| \leq \rho_4(\varepsilon), \quad \rho_4(\varepsilon) \rightarrow +0, \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow +0,$$

where  $\rho_3(\varepsilon)$ ,  $\rho_4(\varepsilon)$  are some functions independent of  $x$  and the supremum is taken over  $x \in \Omega$  such  $x + \rho_3(\varepsilon)\omega \subset \Omega$ , then condition (6.3) is satisfied and

$$\|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}} \leq C(\rho_4 + \rho_3^{\frac{1}{2}}).$$

Paper [9] provides many particular examples of possible functions obeying condition (6.3) and all of them can be adapted also for our particular function  $\beta_\varepsilon$ . We do not reproduce here all these examples but instead we discuss a few close examples.

The first example is a sparsely distributed perforation. Here we assume that there exists a function  $\rho_5 = \rho_5(\varepsilon)$  such that

$$\varepsilon \rho_5^{-1}(\varepsilon) \rightarrow +0, \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow +0, \quad B_{\rho_5}(M_k^\varepsilon) \cap B_{\rho_5}(M_j^\varepsilon) = \emptyset, \quad k \neq j. \quad (6.5)$$

Then according to the example discussed in Section 3.2 in [9], condition (6.3) is satisfied with  $\beta = 0$  and

$$\|\beta_\varepsilon\|_{\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}} \leq C(\varepsilon^n \rho_5^{-n} + \rho_5^{\frac{1}{2}}).$$

This estimate can be even improved for our particular case as the following lemma shows.

**Lemma 6.1.** *Suppose that condition (6.5) holds. Then*

$$\|\beta_\varepsilon\|_{\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}} \leq C(\varepsilon^n \rho_5^{-n} + \varepsilon^2), \quad n \geq 3, \quad \|\beta_\varepsilon\|_{\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}} \leq C(\varepsilon^n \rho_5^{-n} + \varepsilon^2 |\ln \varepsilon|), \quad n = 2,$$



*Proof.* Given an arbitrary function  $u \in W_2^1(B_{\rho_5}(M_k^\varepsilon))$ , by Lemma 3.2 with  $\omega_k^\varepsilon = \emptyset$  and  $(\varepsilon, \eta)$  replaced by  $(\rho_5, \varepsilon\rho_5^{-1})$  we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon))}^2 &\leq C(\varepsilon^n \rho_5^{-n} + \varepsilon^2) \|u\|_{W_2^1(B_{\rho_5}(M_k^\varepsilon))}^2, & n \geq 3, \\ \|u\|_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon))}^2 &\leq C(\varepsilon^n \rho_5^{-n} + \varepsilon^2 |\ln \varepsilon|) \|u\|_{W_2^1(B_{\rho_5}(M_k^\varepsilon))}^2, & n = 2, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C$  is a constant independent of  $\varepsilon$ ,  $u$  and  $k$ . Hence, by the uniform boundedness of  $\beta_\varepsilon$  stated in Lemma 4.8,

$$|(\beta_\varepsilon u, v)_{L_2(B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon))}| \leq C(\varepsilon^n \rho_5^{-n} + \varepsilon^2) \|u\|_{W_2^1(B_{\rho_5}(M_k^\varepsilon))}^2,$$

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

The proven lemma says that if the distances between the cavities are much larger than  $\varepsilon$ , then Assumption A3 holds with  $\beta = 0$ . In particular, this is the case when we deal with cavities separated by finite distances.

The second situation describes a perforation, which can be regarded as a general perturbation of a periodically distributed perforations. We choose a fixed lattice  $\Gamma$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with a periodicity cell  $\square$ . Then we define the set  $\Gamma_\varepsilon$  by formula (6.2) with  $\rho_1(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon$  and in each rescaled cell  $\varepsilon k + \varepsilon \square$ ,  $k \in \Gamma_\varepsilon$ , we choose a point  $M_k^\varepsilon$  such that  $B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon) \subset \varepsilon k + \varepsilon \square$ ,  $k \in \Gamma_\varepsilon$ . Then we arbitrary choose the corresponding cavities  $\omega_{k,\varepsilon}$  and in the case  $n \geq 3$  we additionally assume that the constants  $K_{k,\varepsilon}$  satisfy the identity

$$(2-n)K_{k,\varepsilon} = \Psi_\varepsilon(M_k^\varepsilon). \quad (6.6)$$

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

$$\rho_6(\varepsilon) := \max_{x \in \overline{\Omega}} |\Psi_\varepsilon(x) - \Psi_0(x)| \rightarrow +0, \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow +0, \quad (6.7)$$

where  $\Psi_0 \in L_\infty(\Omega) \cap C(\overline{\Omega})$  is some uniformly continuous in  $\overline{\Omega}$  function, namely,

$$\rho_7(\varepsilon) := \max_{k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon} \max_{x, y \in \varepsilon \square + \varepsilon k} |\psi_0(x) - \psi_0(y)| \rightarrow +0, \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow +0. \quad (6.8)$$

We stress that condition (6.6) is imposed only on the constants  $K_{k,\varepsilon}$  and not on the shapes of the corresponding cavities. This means that the cavities corresponding to different  $k$  are not necessarily of the same shapes even if the constants  $K_{k,\varepsilon}$  coincide. In the case  $n = 2$  we let  $\Psi_\varepsilon(x) := \Psi_0(x) \equiv 1$ . These conditions ensure (6.3) with  $\rho_1(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon$  and

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

Indeed,

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

The right hand side of the above identity can be estimated by means of the functions  $\rho_6, \rho_7$  introduced in (6.7), (6.8) and this yields

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon^n} \left| \int_{\varepsilon \square + \varepsilon k} (\beta_\varepsilon - \beta) dx \right| \leq \rho_6 + \rho_7.$$

This is exactly condition (6.3) for our case and by (6.4) we obtain

$$\|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\overline{\Omega}} \leq C(\varepsilon + \rho_6 + \rho_7), \quad n \geq 3, \quad \|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\overline{\Omega}} \leq C\varepsilon, \quad n = 2.$$

Our next step is to show how to generate new perforations obeying Assumption A3 if we are given one already obeying this assumption. The first way is provided by the following lemma.

**Lemma 6.2.** *Let a perforation described by the points  $M_k^\varepsilon$  and cavities  $\omega_{k,\varepsilon}$  obey Assumption A3. Let  $\tilde{M}_k^\varepsilon$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon$ , be another set of points satisfying Assumption A1 with the same constants  $R_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, 4$ , as for  $M_k^\varepsilon$ , such that*

$$|M_k^\varepsilon - \tilde{M}_k^\varepsilon| \leq C\varepsilon$$

with some constant  $C$  independent of  $k$  and  $\varepsilon$ . Then the function  $\tilde{\beta}_\varepsilon$  corresponding to the perforation described by the points  $\tilde{M}_k^\varepsilon$  and the same cavities  $\omega_{k,\varepsilon}$  also obeys Assumption A3 with the same function  $\beta$  and the estimate holds:

$$\|\tilde{\beta}_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}} \leq \|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}} + C\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where  $C$  is a constant independent of  $\varepsilon$ .

*Proof.* It is clear that

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

and this is why it is sufficient to estimate just the second term in the right hand of this inequality. We are going to do this by means of condition (6.3). Namely, we let  $\rho_1(\varepsilon) := \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . Then the integral in (6.3) can be rewritten as a sum of the integrals over the balls  $B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)$  and  $B_{\varepsilon R_3}(\tilde{M}_k^\varepsilon)$ . If for some  $k$  both these balls are contained in the cell  $\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}z + \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}\square$ , then their contributions to the total integral cancel out just due to the definitions of the points  $\tilde{M}_k^\varepsilon$  and of the function  $\tilde{\beta}_\varepsilon$ . Hence, only the balls  $B_{\varepsilon R_3}(M_k^\varepsilon)$  and  $B_{\varepsilon R_3}(\tilde{M}_k^\varepsilon)$  intersecting with the boundary  $\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}z + \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}\partial\square$  contribute to the considered integral. Then the total number of such balls is proportional to the measure of this boundary, which is of order  $\sim \varepsilon^{\frac{n-1}{2}}$  and the total measure of such balls is obviously estimated by  $C\varepsilon^{\frac{n+1}{2}}$  with some fixed constant  $C$ . Since the functions  $\beta_\varepsilon$  and  $\tilde{\beta}_\varepsilon$  are uniformly bounded, see Lemma 4.8, we then get the estimate

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{\frac{n}{2}}} \left| \int_{\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}z + \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}\square} (\beta_\varepsilon(x) - \beta(x)) dx \right| \leq C\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

and we arrive at (6.3) with  $\rho_2(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . Employing then estimate (6.4) for  $\|\beta_\varepsilon - \tilde{\beta}_\varepsilon\|_{\mathfrak{M}}$  and (6.1), we complete the proof.  $\square$

The proven lemma shows that given a perforation obeying Assumption A3, we can shift the points  $M_k^\varepsilon$  by the distance of order  $O(\varepsilon)$  provided the new points satisfy Assumption A1. This gives an easy way to generate many new non-periodic perforations from a given one keeping Assumption A3 satisfied.

The second way of generating new perforations obeying Assumption A3 is as follows. Suppose that we are given two perforations described by  $M_k^\varepsilon, \omega_{k,\varepsilon}, k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon$ , and  $\tilde{M}_k^\varepsilon, \tilde{\omega}_{k,\varepsilon}, k \in \tilde{\mathbb{M}}^\varepsilon$ . Let these perforations satisfy Assumption A3 respectively with the functions  $\beta_\varepsilon, \beta$  and  $\hat{\beta}_\varepsilon, \hat{\beta}$ . Consider then the union of these perforations formed by the unions of the points and cavities  $M_k^\varepsilon \cup \tilde{M}_j^\varepsilon, \omega_{k,\varepsilon}, \omega_{j,\varepsilon}, k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon, j \in \tilde{\mathbb{M}}^\varepsilon$ , and let this union of the perforations satisfy Assumption A1. Then function (2.17) corresponding to this union of the perforations is  $\beta_\varepsilon + \hat{\beta}_\varepsilon$  and it satisfies Assumption A3 with the limiting function  $\beta + \hat{\beta}$  thanks to the following simple estimate:

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

It is also possible to remove some cavities from a given perforation keeping at the same time Assumption A3 and this is our third way of producing new perforations. Namely, given a perforation described by the points and cavities  $M_k^\varepsilon, \omega_{k,\varepsilon}, k \in \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon$  and obeying Assumption A3, suppose that there is a subset  $\hat{\mathbb{M}}^\varepsilon \subset \mathbb{M}^\varepsilon$  such that the corresponding perforation satisfies Assumption A3 with  $\beta = 0$ ; the associated function (2.17) is denoted by  $\hat{\beta}_\varepsilon$ . Then we consider a difference of perforations corresponding to  $\mathbb{M}^\varepsilon \setminus \hat{\mathbb{M}}^\varepsilon$  and we see that its function (2.17) is  $\beta_\varepsilon - \hat{\beta}_\varepsilon$ . Hence,

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

and the introduced difference of perforations also satisfies Assumption A3 with the same function  $\beta$ .

The fourth way of producing new perforations is to vary the shapes of the cavities. In the dimension  $n = 2$  the function  $\beta_\varepsilon$  is independent on the shapes of the cavities and we therefore have a very rich freedom in choosing the shapes of the cavities. As  $n \geq 3$ , the shapes of the cavities are reflected in the constants  $K_{k,\varepsilon}$ . Then, given a perforation obeying Assumption A3 with functions  $\beta_\varepsilon$  and  $\beta$ , one can deform slightly the shapes of the cavities so that new constants  $\hat{K}_{k,\varepsilon}$  differ from  $K_{k,\varepsilon}$  by a small quantity, namely,  $|\hat{K}_{k,\varepsilon} - K_{k,\varepsilon}| \leq \rho_8(\varepsilon)$ , where  $\rho_8(\varepsilon) \rightarrow +0$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow +0$ . Then it is clear that the new function  $\hat{\beta}_\varepsilon$  corresponding to the constants  $\hat{K}_{k,\varepsilon}$  satisfies the estimate

$$\|\hat{\beta}_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}} \leq \|\beta_\varepsilon - \beta\|_{\mathfrak{M}} + \rho_8(\varepsilon),$$

which means that Assumption A3 holds also for modified perforation.

## Acknowledgment

The author thanks A.I. Nazarov for a valuable discussion on the regularity of solutions to elliptic boundary value problems. The authors is grateful to the referee for useful remarks.

## Funding

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

## Conflict of interest

The author declares that he has no conflicts of interest.

## Data availability

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

## References

- [1] Agmon S., Duglis A., Nirenberg L.: Estimates near the boundary for solutions of elliptic partial differential equations satisfying general boundary conditions. I. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **12**:4, 623–727 (1959).
- [2] Anné, C., Post, O.: Wildly perturbed manifolds: norm resolvent and spectral convergence. *J. Spectr. Theory* **11**:1, 229–279 (2021).
- [3] Borisov, D.I., Kříž, J.: Operator estimates for non-periodically perforated domains with Dirichlet and nonlinear Robin conditions: vanishing limit. Preprint: arXiv 2204.04829 (2022).
- [4] Borisov, D.I., Mukhametrakhimova, A.I.: Uniform convergence and asymptotics for problems in domains finely perforated along a prescribed manifold in the case of the homogenized Dirichlet condition. *Sb. Math.* **212**:8, 1068–1121 (2021).
- [5] Borisov, D.I., Mukhametrakhimova, A.I.: Norm convergence for problems with perforation along a given manifold with nonlinear Robin condition on boundaries of cavities. Preprint: arXiv:2202.10767 (2022).
- [6] Borisov, D.I., Mukhametrakhimova, A.I.: On norm resolvent convergence for elliptic operators in multi-dimensional domains with small holes. *J. Math. Sci.* **232**:3, 283–298 (2018).
- [7] Borisov, D.I.: On operator estimates for planar domains with non-regular curving of boundary: Dirichlet and Neumann condition. *J. Math. Sci.* (2022), **264**:5, 562–580 (2022).
- [8] Borisov, D., Cardone, G., Durante, T.: Homogenization and uniform resolvent convergence for elliptic operators in a strip perforated along a curve. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh. Sec. A. Math.* **146**:6, 1115–1158 (2016).
- [9] Borisov, D.: D.I. Borisov. Homogenization for operators with arbitrary perturbations of coefficients. Preprint: arXiv:2206.09331, 2022.
- [10] Cherednichenko K., Dondl P., and Rösler F.: Norm-resolvent convergence in perforated domains. *Asymp. Anal.* **110**:3-4, 163–184 (2018).
- [11] Díaz, J. I., Gómez-Castro, D., Shaposhnikova, T. A.: Nonlinear reaction-diffusion processes for nanocomposites: anomalous improved homogenization. De Gruyter, Berlin, 2021.
- [12] Gilbard D., Trudinger N.: Elliptic partial differential equations of second order. Springer, Berlin (1983).
- [13] Jikov, V.V., Kozlov, S.M., Oleinik, O.A.: Homogenization of differential operators. *Fiziko-Matematicheskaya Literatura*, Moscow (1993). (in Russian).
- [14] Khrabustovskiy, A., Plum, M.: Operator estimates for homogenization of the Robin Laplacian in a perforated domain. Preprint: arXiv:2106.10216 (2021).
- [15] Khrabustovskiy, A., Post, O.: Operator estimates for the crushed ice problem. *Asymp. Anal.* **110**(3-4), 137–161 (2018).
- [16] Ladyzhenskaya O.A. and Ural'tseva N.N.: Linear and quasilinear elliptic equations. Academic Press, New York (1968).
- [17] Marchenko, V.A., Khruslov, E.Ya.: Boundary value problems in domains with a fine-grained boundary, *Naukova Dumka*, Kiev, (1974). (in Russian).
- [18] Marchenko, V.A., Khruslov, E.Ya.: Homogenization of partial differential equations. Birkhäuser, Boston (2006).
- [19] Mikhailov V.P.: Partial differential equations. Mir Publ., Moscow (1978).

- [20] Oleinik, O.A., Iosifyan, G.A., Shamaev, A.S.: Mathematical problems in elasticity and homogenization. North- Holland, Amsterdam (1992).
- [21] Pastukhova, S.E.: Resolvent approximations in  $L_2$ -norm for elliptic operators acting in a perforated space. Contem. Math. Fund. Direct. **66**:2, 314–334 (2020). (in Russian).
- [22] Pastukhova S.E.: Homogenization estimates for singularly perturbed operators. J. Math. Sci. **251**:5, 724–747 (2020).
- [23] Pastukhova S.E.:  $L_2$ -approximation of resolvents in homogenization of higher order elliptic operators. J. Math. Sci. **251**:6, 902–925 (2020).
- [24] Pastukhova S.E.:  $L_2$ -approximation of resolvents in homogenization of fourth-order elliptic operators. Sb. Math. **212**:1, 111–134 (2020).
- [25] Senik N.N.: Homogenization for non-self-adjoint periodic elliptic operators on an infinite cylinder. SIAM J. Math. Anal. 49:2, 874–898 (2017).
- [26] Senik N.N.: Homogenization for locally periodic elliptic operators. J. Math. Anal. Appl. **505**:2, id 125581 (2021).
- [27] Suslina, T.A.: Spectral approach to homogenization of elliptic operators in a perforated space. Rev. Math. Phys. **30**:08, 1840016 (2018).
- [28] Zhikov, V.V.: Spectral method in homogenization theory. Proc. Steklov Inst. Math. **250**, 85–94 (2005).