

ON REGULARITY OF $\bar{\partial}$ -SOLUTIONS ON a_q DOMAINS WITH C^2
BOUNDARY IN COMPLEX MANIFOLDS

XIANGHONG GONG[†]

ABSTRACT. We study regularity of solutions u to $\bar{\partial}u = f$ on a relatively compact C^2 domain D in a complex manifold of dimension n , where f is a $(0, q)$ form. Assume that there are either $(q + 1)$ negative or $(n - q)$ positive Levi eigenvalues at each point of boundary ∂D . Under the necessary condition that a locally L^2 solution exists on the domain, we show the existence of the solutions on the closure of the domain that gain $1/2$ derivative when $q = 1$ and f is in the Hölder-Zygmund space $\Lambda^r(\bar{D})$ with $r > 1$. For $q > 1$, the same regularity for the solutions is achieved when ∂D is either sufficiently smooth or of $(n - q)$ positive Levi eigenvalues everywhere on ∂D .

1. INTRODUCTION

Let D be a relatively compact domain in a complex manifold X of dimension n . We say that D satisfies the condition a_q if $\partial D \in C^2$ and its Levi form has either $(q + 1)$ negative or $(n - q)$ positive eigenvalues at each point on ∂D . We are interested in the regularity of solutions u to the $\bar{\partial}$ -equation $\bar{\partial}u = f$ on D . We will study the case where f is a V -valued $(0, q)$ form for a holomorphic vector bundle V on X . Denote by $\Lambda_{(0,q)}^r(D, V)$ the space of V -valued $(0, q)$ forms whose coefficients are in Hölder-Zygmund space $\Lambda^r(D)$ (see definition in Section 5). To ensure the existence of solutions, we impose a minimum requirement that there is an L_{loc}^2 solution u_0 on D and seek a solution of better regularity.

Our main results are the following.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $r \in (1, \infty)$ and $q \geq 1$. Let D be a relatively compact domain with C^3 boundary in a complex manifold X satisfying the condition a_q . Let V be a holomorphic vector bundle on X . Then there exists a bounded linear $\bar{\partial}$ -solution operator $H_q: \Lambda_{(0,q)}^r(D, V) \cap \bar{\partial}L_{loc}^2(D) \rightarrow \Lambda_{(0,q-1)}^{r+1/2}(D, V)$, provided (a) $q = 1$ or ∂D has $(n - q)$ positive Levi eigenvalues at each point on ∂D ; or (b) $\partial D \in \Lambda^{r+\frac{5}{2}}$.*

Note that H_q is independent of r and it provides a smooth (C^∞) linear $\bar{\partial}$ -solution operator for smooth forms in the two cases. When $\partial D \in C^2$, Theorem 1.1 (a) provides a satisfactory regularity result for $\bar{\partial}$ -solutions in the Hölder-Zygmund spaces for $q = 1$. For $q > 1$, we have the following.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $q \geq 2$ and keep notations in Theorem 1.1 with $\partial D \in C^2$. Suppose $4 \leq r < \infty$. Then there exists a bounded linear $\bar{\partial}$ -solution operator*

Date: May 25, 2022.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 32F10, 32A26, 32W05.

Key words and phrases. Homotopy formulas, a_q domains, Hölder-Zygmund spaces, $\bar{\partial}$ -solutions.

[†]Partially supported by Simons Foundation grant (award number: 505027) and NSF grant DMS-2054989.

$H_q^r: \Lambda_{(0,q)}^r(\overline{D}, V) \cap \overline{\partial}L_{loc}^2(D) \rightarrow \Lambda_{(0,q-1)}^{r-3}(\overline{D})$. Furthermore, H_q^r maps $C_{(0,q)}^\infty(\overline{D}, V) \cap \overline{\partial}L_{loc}^2(D)$ into $C_{(0,q-1)}^\infty(\overline{D})$

We first state some closely related results on $\overline{\partial}$ -solutions u to $\overline{\partial}u = f$ on strictly pseudoconvex domains D in \mathbf{C}^n : After work of Lieb-Grauert [19] and Kerzman [31], Henkin-Romanov [24] achieved the sharp $C^{1/2}$ solutions for $f \in L^\infty$ by integral formulas. The $C^{k+1/2}$ solutions for $f \in C^k$ ($k \in \mathbf{N}$) was obtained by Siu [54] for $(0, 1)$ forms and by Lieb-Range [40] for forms with $q \geq 1$ when ∂D is sufficiently smooth boundary. For $\partial D \in C^2$, Theorem 1.1 and analogous result for a homotopy formula were proved in [17] through the construction of a homotopy formula. These results were extended by Shi [51] to a weighted Sobolev spaces with a gain less than $1/2$ derivative and by Shi-Yao [52, 53] to $H^{s+1/2,p}$ space gaining $1/2$ derivative for $s > 1/p$ when $\partial D \in C^2$ and for $s \in \mathbf{R}$ when ∂D is sufficiently smooth. It is worthy to point out that Shi-Yao achieved the first regularity result for negative order s . Furthermore, Gong-Lanzani [17] obtained $\Lambda^{r+1/2}$ (with $r > 1$) regularity gaining $1/2$ derivative on strongly \mathbf{C} -linear convex $C^{1,1}$ domains D .

Next, we mention results on $\overline{\partial}$ solutions on a_q domains in complex manifolds: The basic estimates for the Cauchy-Riemann operator were proved by Morrey [45] for $(0, 1)$ -forms and by Kohn [33, 34] for forms of any type on strongly pseudoconvex manifolds with smooth boundary. These results lead to the regularity of the $\overline{\partial}$ -Neumann operator for strictly pseudoconvex manifolds and more general for compact manifolds whose boundary satisfies property $Z(q)$. Kohn proved that property $Z(q)$ is satisfied by strongly pseudoconvex manifolds with smooth boundary and Hörmander proved that the $Z(q)$ condition is satisfied by the condition a_q on D when $\partial D \in C^3$. When $\partial D \in C^\infty$, sharp regularity results for $\overline{\partial}$ solutions were obtained by Greiner-Stein [21] for $(0, 1)$ forms and Beals-Greiner-Stanton [7] for $(0, q)$ forms under condition $Z(q)$ through the study of the regularity of $\overline{\partial}$ -Neumann operator in $L^{k,p}$ and Λ^r spaces. Condition a_q also ensures the stability of the solvability of the $\overline{\partial}$ -equation on $(0, q)$ forms; namely if $f = \overline{\partial}u_0 + \tilde{f}$ on D while \tilde{f} is a $\overline{\partial}$ -closed form on a larger domain and u_0 has the regularity in the sought-after class, then $\tilde{f} = \overline{\partial}\tilde{u}$ for some L^2 form \tilde{u} . This stability is useful to obtain regularity for $\overline{\partial}$ solutions as shown by Kerzman [31]; first one seeks regularity for u_0 without solving the $\overline{\partial}$ -equation. Then $u_0 + \tilde{u}$ provides a desired solution based on regularity of u_0 and the interior regularity of \tilde{u} from the elliptic theory on systems of partial differential equations.

To prove our results, we will use integral formulas to obtain local solutions near each boundary point of D . We then use the Grauert bumping method as in [31] to construct \tilde{f} . To provide background for our results, let us mention regularity results for $\overline{\partial}$ -solutions on the transversal intersection of domains in \mathbf{C}^n . Range-Siu [48] obtained $C^{1/2-\epsilon}$ estimate with any positive ϵ for a real transversal intersection of sufficiently smooth strictly pseudoconvex domains. For higher order derivatives, J. Michel [41] obtained $C^{k+1/2-\epsilon}$ estimate for $\overline{\partial}$ solutions on a certain intersection of smooth strictly pseudoconvex domains. J. Michel and Perotti [42] extended the result to real transversal intersection of strictly pseudoconvex domains with sufficiently smooth boundary. We should also mention that the local version of Theorem 1.1 was proved by Laureate-Thiébaud and Leiterer [37] when $\partial D \in C^\infty$ and $k \in \mathbf{N}$. Ricard [49] obtained regularity for concave wedge with C^{k+2} boundary and convex wedges with C^2 boundary. The reader is referred to Barkatou [5] and

Barkatou-Khidr [6] for further results in this direction. However, all existing integral formulas for $\bar{\partial}$ solutions, including ours, require boundary to be sufficiently smooth when concavity is present. On the other hand, it is well-known that concavity of the domains is useful; the classical Hartogs' theorem says that a holomorphic function on a 1-concave domain extends to a holomorphic function across the boundary. Therefore, on a 1-concave domain in a complex manifold, all $\bar{\partial}$ -solutions for $(0, 1)$ forms must have the same regularity regardless the smoothness of the boundary of the domain. In Section 7 we will successfully implement this idea to prove Theorem 1.1 (i) with $q = 1$.

When $q > 1$, not all $\bar{\partial}$ solutions have the same regularity. To prove Theorem 1.2, we first derive an estimate for the solution operator when ∂D is sufficiently smooth. Then we apply the Nash-Moser iteration methods by solving the $\bar{\partial}$ -equation on the subdomains $D_k \subset D_{k+1}$ that have smooth boundary and in the limit, we obtain a desired solution on the closure of $D = \cup D_k$.

We organize the paper as follows.

In Section 2, we formulate an approximate local homotopy formula on a suitable neighborhood of a boundary point $\zeta_0 \in \partial\Omega$. In Sections 3 and 4, we derive (genuine) local homotopy formulas for $\bar{\partial}$ -closed $(0, q)$ forms near $(n - q)$ convex and $(q + 1)$ concave boundary points of an a_q domain. There we follow approaches developed in Lieb-Range [40] and Henkin-Leiterer [23]. While a homotopy formula for forms that are not necessary $\bar{\partial}$ -closed can be derived for $(n - q)$ convex points without extra conditions, such a formula on the concave side of the boundary turns out to be subtle. We will need an extra negative Levi eigenvalues, i.e. $(q + 2)$ negative Levi eigenvalues. It is not clear if a local homotopy formula exists without this stronger negativity condition. Such phenomena already occurs to strictly pseudoconvex hypersurfaces of dimension 5 in work of Webster [58] on the local CR embeddings and concave compact CR manifolds in work of Polykov [47] on global CR embeddings.

Section 5 contains some elementary facts on Hölder-Zygmund spaces, where we derive an equivalence characterization on the Hölder-Zygmund norms solely relying on a version of Hardy-Littlewood lemma. This allows us to simplify previous work.

Section 6 contains the main local estimates for the homotopy operator that appear in the local homotopy formula. One of main purposes of the section is to derive precise estimates that reflex the convexity of the Hölder-Zygmund norms; see (6.1) for strictly $(n - q)$ convex C^2 domains and (6.16) for strictly $(q + 1)$ -concave domains. We emphasize that the estimates do not require the forms to be $\bar{\partial}$ -closed; in fact, the estimates hold for $(q + 1)$ concave boundary points, although we don't know if a homotopy formula exists. These estimates immediately give us the desired regularity stated in Theorem 1.1 for local solutions.

In Section 7 we show how Hartogs' extension can be used to study the regularity of $\bar{\partial}$ solutions for $(0, 1)$ forms. A local version of Theorem 1.1 (a) for $q = 1$ is proved in this section.

In Section 8 we show the existence of global solutions with the desired regularity by using local solutions in Sections 6 and 7 and the interior regularity of elliptic systems. We also derive a global estimate for $\bar{\partial}$ -solutions. Using this global estimate, we employ the Nash-Moser smoothing operator to prove a detailed version of Theorem 1.2 in Section 9.

The paper has two appendices. In Appendix A, we recall the existing regularity on the signed distance function near a C^2 hypersurface in a Riemannian manifold. In Appendix B, we describe a stability result of solvability of $\bar{\partial}$ -equation on a_q domains with C^2 boundary using results in Hörmander [26].

2. A LOCAL APPROXIMATE HOMOTOPY FORMULA

Let X be a complex manifold of dimension n . Let D be a relatively compact domain in X defined by $\rho < 0$, where ρ is a C^2 defining function with $d\rho(\zeta) \neq 0$ when $\rho(\zeta) = 0$. Following Henkin-Leiterer [23], we say that ∂D is *strictly q -convex* at $\zeta \in \partial D$, if the Levi-form $L_\zeta \rho$, i.e. the restriction of the complex Hessian $H_\zeta \rho$ on $T_\zeta^{1,0}(\partial D)$, has at least q positive eigenvalues. We say that ∂D is *strictly q -concave* at $\zeta \in \partial D$, if $L_\zeta \rho$ has at least q negative eigenvalues. Thus a domain is strictly pseudoconvex if and only if it is strictly $(n-1)$ -convex. Following Hörmander [26], we say that D satisfies the *condition a_q* if the Levi-form $L_\zeta \rho$ has at least either $(q+1)$ negative eigenvalues or $(n-q)$ positive eigenvalues for every $\zeta \in \partial D$.

To see a domain satisfying the condition a_q , let \mathbf{P}^n be the complex project space. Let $B_q^r \subset \mathbf{P}^n$ be defined by

$$(2.1) \quad B_q^r: |z^q|^2 + \cdots + |z^n|^2 < r|z^0|^2 + \cdots + r|z^{q-1}|^2$$

with $1 \leq q \leq n$ and $r > 0$. Then B_q^r is both strictly $(n-q)$ -convex and $(q-1)$ -concave. In general, when ∂D is Levi non-degenerate, the condition a_q for ∂D is equivalent to the number of negative Levi eigenvalue not being q at every point $\zeta \in \partial D$. Thus $B_{q_1}^{r_2} \setminus \overline{B_{q_2}^{r_1}}$ satisfies the condition a_q if $r_2 > r_1$, $q_2 \geq q_1$, and

$$(2.2) \quad q \neq q_1 - 1, q_2 - 1.$$

Definition 2.1. Let $k \geq 1$ and $r > 1$. A relatively compact domain D in a C^k manifold X is *piecewise smooth* of class C^k (resp. Λ^r), if for each $\zeta \in \partial D$, there are C^k (resp. Λ^r) functions ρ_1, \dots, ρ_ℓ defined on a neighborhood U of ζ such that $D \cap U = \{z \in U: \rho_j(z) < 0, j = 1, \dots, \ell\}$, $\rho_j(\zeta) = 0$ for all j , and

$$d\rho_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge d\rho_\ell \neq 0.$$

The main purpose of this section is to construct an approximate homotopy formula on a subdomain D' of D , where $\partial D'$ and ∂D share a piece of boundary containing a given point $\zeta_0 \in \partial D$. The D' will have the form $D^{12} = D^1 \cap D^2$ where $D^1 = D$ and D^2 is a ball in suitable coordinates for ∂D . Since the construction of D' is local, we assume that D is contained in \mathbf{C}^n .

We will need Leray maps, following notation in [23].

Definition 2.2. Let D be a domain in \mathbf{C}^n . Let $S \subset \mathbf{C}^n \setminus D$ be a C^1 submanifold or an open subset in \mathbf{C}^n . We say that $g(z, \zeta)$ is a *Leray map* on $D \times S$ if $g \in C^1(D \times S)$ and

$$(2.3) \quad g(z, \zeta) \cdot (\zeta - z) \neq 0, \quad \zeta \in S, \quad z \in D.$$

Throughout the paper, we use

$$(2.4) \quad g_0(z, \zeta) = \bar{\zeta} - \bar{z}.$$

Let $g^j : D \times S^j \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^n$ be C^1 Leray mappings for $j = 1, \dots, \ell$. Let $w = \zeta - z$. Define

$$\begin{aligned}\omega^i &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \frac{g^i \cdot dw}{g^i \cdot w}, & \Omega^i &= \omega^i \wedge (\bar{\partial}\omega^i)^{n-1}, \\ \Omega^{01} &= \omega^0 \wedge \omega^1 \wedge \sum_{\alpha+\beta=n-2} (\bar{\partial}\omega^0)^\alpha \wedge (\bar{\partial}\omega^1)^\beta.\end{aligned}$$

Here both differentials d and $\bar{\partial}$ are in z, ζ variables. In general, define

$$\Omega^{1 \cdots \ell} = \omega^{g^1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \omega^{g^\ell} \wedge \sum_{\alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_\ell = n - \ell} (\bar{\partial}\omega^{g^1})^{\alpha_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge (\bar{\partial}\omega^{g^\ell})^{\alpha_\ell}.$$

Decompose $\Omega^\bullet = \sum \Omega_{0,q}^\bullet$, where $\Omega_{0,q}^\bullet$ has type $(0, q)$ in z . Hence $\Omega_{0,q}^{i_1, \dots, i_\ell}$ has type $(n, n - \ell - q)$ in ζ . Set $\Omega_{0,-1}^\bullet = 0$. The Koppelman lemma says that

$$\bar{\partial}_z \Omega_{0,q-1}^{1 \cdots \ell} + \bar{\partial}_\zeta \Omega_{0,q}^{1 \cdots \ell} = \sum (-1)^j \Omega_{0,q}^{1 \cdots \hat{j} \cdots \ell}.$$

See Chen-Shaw [8, p. 263] for a proof. We will use special cases

$$(2.5) \quad \bar{\partial}_\zeta \Omega_{0,q}^1 + \bar{\partial}_z \Omega_{0,q-1}^1 = 0,$$

$$(2.6) \quad \bar{\partial}_\zeta \Omega_{0,q}^{01} + \bar{\partial}_z \Omega_{0,q-1}^{01} = -\Omega_{0,q}^1 + \Omega_{0,q}^0,$$

$$(2.7) \quad \bar{\partial}_\zeta \Omega_{0,q}^{012} + \bar{\partial}_z \Omega_{0,q-1}^{012} = -\Omega_{0,q}^{12} + \Omega_{0,q}^{02} - \Omega_{0,q}^{01}.$$

Here each identity holds in the sense of distributions on the set where the kernels are non-singular.

To integrate on submanifolds of \mathbf{C}^n , let us see how a sign changes when an exterior differentiation interchanges with integration. Following [8, p. 263], define

$$\int_{y \in M} u(x, y) dy^J \wedge dx^I = \left\{ \int_{y \in M} u(x, y) dy^J \right\} dx^I$$

for a function u on a manifold M with boundary. For the exterior differential d_x , we have

$$(2.8) \quad d_x \int_{y \in M} \phi(x, y) = (-1)^{\dim M} \int_{y \in M} d_x \phi(x, y).$$

Stokes' formula has the form

$$(2.9) \quad \int_{y \in \partial M} \phi(x, y) \wedge \psi(y) = \int_{y \in M} \left\{ d_y \phi(x, y) \wedge \psi(y) + (-1)^{\deg \phi} \phi(x, y) \wedge d\psi(y) \right\},$$

where $\deg \phi$ is the total degree of ϕ in (x, y) . Throughout the paper, we use notation

$$D^{1 \cdots \ell} := D^1 \cap \cdots \cap D^\ell,$$

which is a relatively compact piecewise C^1 domain by Definition 2.1. We choose orientations so that

$$\int_{D^{1 \cdots \ell}} df = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \int_{\overline{D^{1 \cdots \ell}} \cap \partial D^i} f.$$

Then we define

$$(2.10) \quad \partial D^{12} = S^1 \cup S^2, \quad S^i = \overline{D^{12}} \cap \partial D^i, \quad \partial S^1 = S^{12}, \quad \partial S^2 = S^{21}.$$

Thus Stokes' formula has the following special cases

$$\int_{D^1 \cap D^2} df = \int_{S^1} f + \int_{S^2} f, \quad \int_{S^1} df = \int_{S^{12}} f, \quad \int_{S^2} df = \int_{S^{21}} f.$$

We introduce integrals on domains and lower-dimensional sets:

$$(2.11) \quad R_{D,q}^{i_1 \dots i_\ell} f(z) = \int_D \Omega_{0,q}^{i_1 \dots i_\ell}(z, \zeta) \wedge f(\zeta), \quad L_{i_1 \dots i_\mu, q}^{j_1 \dots j_\nu} f = \int_{S^{i_1 \dots i_\mu}} \Omega_{0,q}^{j_1 \dots j_\nu} \wedge f.$$

When f is said to have type $(0, q)$, we write $R_{D,q} f$, $L_{\bullet, q} f$ as $R_D f$, $L_{\bullet} f$, respectively.

Let $E_D: C^0(\overline{D}) \rightarrow C_0^0(\mathbf{C}^n)$ be the Stein extension operator such that

$$(2.12) \quad |Eu|_{\mathbf{C}^n, r} \leq C_r(D) |u|_{D, r}$$

where the Hölder-Zygmund norm is defined in Section 5. Note that the extension exists for any bounded Lipschitz domain D . See [15] for a proof of the extension property and references therein.

The main purpose of this section is to derive the following approximate homotopy formula on a piecewise C^2 domain.

Proposition 2.3. *Let $D^{12} \subset \mathbf{C}^n$ be a bounded piecewise C^2 domain. Let S^1, S^2 be given by (2.10). Let $U^1 \subset \mathbf{C}^n \setminus D^1$ be a bounded piecewise C^1 domain such that $\partial U^1 = S^1 \cup S_+^1$ with $S_+^1 = \partial U^1 \setminus S^1$. Suppose that $g^1(z, \zeta)$ is a C^1 Leray map on $D^{12} \times \overline{U^1}$ and g^2 is a C^1 Leray map on $D^{12} \times S^2$. Let f be a $(0, q)$ -form such that f and $\bar{\partial} f$ are in $C^1(\overline{D^{12}})$. Then on D^{12} we have*

$$(2.13) \quad f = L_{1,q}^1 f + L_{2,q}^2 f + L_{12,q}^{12} f + \bar{\partial} H_q f + H_{q+1} \bar{\partial} f, \quad \text{if } q \geq 1,$$

$$(2.14) \quad f = L_{1,0}^1 f + L_{2,0}^2 f + L_{12,0}^{12} f + H_1 \bar{\partial} f, \quad \text{if } q = 0$$

where

$$(2.15) \quad H_q f := H_q^{(1)} f + H_q^{(2)} f,$$

$$(2.16) \quad H_q^{(1)} f := R_{U^1 \cup D^{12}, q-1}^0 E f + R_{U^1, q-1}^{01} [\bar{\partial}, E] f, \quad q > 0,$$

$$(2.17) \quad H_q^{(2)} f := -R_{U^1, q-1}^1 E f + L_{1^+, q-1}^{01} E f + L_{2, q-1}^{02} f + L_{12, q-1}^{012} f,$$

$$(2.18) \quad L_{1^+, q-1}^{01} E f := \int_{S_+^1} \Omega_{0, q-1}^{01} \wedge E f,$$

$$(2.19) \quad H_0 f := \int_{\partial D^{12}} \Omega_{0,0}^1 f - \int_{U^1} \Omega_{0,0}^1 \wedge E \bar{\partial} f = \int_{U^1} \Omega_{0,0}^1 \wedge [\bar{\partial}, E] f.$$

Remark 2.4. Formula (2.13) is called an *approximate homotopy formula* due to the presence of the boundary integrals $L_1^1, L_2^2, L_{12}^{12}$. We will get rid of these boundary integrals under further conditions on the Levi-form of ∂D^1 .

Proof. We first consider case $q \geq 1$. We recall the Bochner-Martinelli-Koppelman formula [8, p. 273] and a version for piecewise C^1 domains [23, Thm 3.12, p. 53]:

$$(2.20) \quad f(z) = \bar{\partial}_z \int_{D^{12}} \Omega_{0, q-1}^0(z, \zeta) \wedge f(\zeta) + \int_{D^{12}} \Omega_{0, q}^0(z, \zeta) \wedge \bar{\partial} f \\ + \int_{\partial D^{12}} \Omega_{0, q}^0(z, \zeta) \wedge f(\zeta).$$

Here and in what follows, we assume $z \in D^{12}$. To apply Stokes' formula for piecewise smooth set ∂D^{12} , we use notation in (2.5)-(2.7) and rewrite the last term as

$$\int_{\partial D^{12}} \Omega_{0,q}^0(z, \zeta) \wedge f(\zeta) = \int_{S^1} \Omega_{0,q}^0(z, \zeta) \wedge f(\zeta) + \int_{S^2} \Omega_{0,q}^0(z, \zeta) \wedge f(\zeta).$$

Using Koppelman's lemma and Stokes' formula for S^1 with $\partial S^1 = S^{12}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{S^1} \Omega_{0,q}^0(z, \zeta) \wedge f(\zeta) &= L_1^1 f(z) + \int_{S^1} \left(\bar{\partial}_\zeta \Omega_{(0,q)}^{01}(z, \zeta) + \bar{\partial}_z \Omega_{0,q-1}^{01} \right) \wedge f(\zeta) \\ &= L_1^1 f(z) + L_{12}^{01} f(z) - \int_{S^1} \Omega_{(0,q-1)}^{01}(z, \zeta) \wedge \bar{\partial}_\zeta f(\zeta) - \bar{\partial}_z \int_{S^1} \Omega_{(0,q-1)}^{01}(z, \zeta) \wedge f(\zeta). \end{aligned}$$

Analogously, we get

$$L_2^0 f = L_2^2 f + L_{21}^{01} f - L_2^{02} \bar{\partial} f - \bar{\partial}_z L_2^{02} f.$$

Using $L_{21}^{02} f = -L_{12}^{02} f$, we get

$$L_{12}^{01} f + L_{21}^{02} f = -L_{12}^{12} f + \int_{S^{12}} \bar{\partial}_z \Omega_{0,q-1}^{012} \wedge f + \int_{S^{12}} \bar{\partial}_\zeta \Omega_{0,q}^{012} \wedge f.$$

Applying Stokes' theorem to last term and using $\partial(S^1 \cap S^2) = \emptyset$, we obtain from (2.9)

$$L_{12}^{01} f + L_{21}^{02} f = -L_{12}^{12} f + \bar{\partial} L_{12}^{012} f + L_{12}^{012} \bar{\partial} f.$$

This shows that

$$\begin{aligned} (2.21) \quad f(z) &= -\bar{\partial}_z \int_{S^1} \Omega_{0,q-1}^{01}(z, \zeta) \wedge f(\zeta) + \bar{\partial}_z \int_{D^{12}} \Omega_{0,q-1}^0(z, \zeta) \wedge f(\zeta) \\ &\quad - \int_{S^1} \Omega_{0,q}^{01}(z, \zeta) \wedge \bar{\partial}_\zeta f(\zeta) + \int_{D^{12}} \Omega_{0,q}^0(z, \zeta) \wedge \bar{\partial} f \\ &\quad - L_{12}^{12} f + \bar{\partial} L_{12}^{012} f + L_{12}^{012} \bar{\partial} f - L_2^{02} \bar{\partial} f - \bar{\partial} L_2^{02} f. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we transform both integrals on S^1 into volume integrals using Stokes' formula. Here we need to modify the methods in Lieb-Range [40] and [15], since S^1 is not boundary free.

With orientations, we have $\partial U_+ = S_+^1 - S^1$. By Stokes' formula and [15, (2.12)], we have

$$\begin{aligned} (2.22) \quad - \int_{\zeta \in S^1} \Omega_{(0,q-1)}^{01}(z, \zeta) \wedge f(\zeta) + L_{1+}^{01} E f(z) &= \\ &\quad \int_{U_1} \Omega_{(0,q-1)}^{01}(z, \zeta) \wedge \bar{\partial} E f(\zeta) + \int_{U_1} \Omega_{0,q-1}^0(z, \zeta) \wedge E f(\zeta) \\ &\quad - \int_{U_1} \Omega_{0,q-1}^1(z, \zeta) \wedge E f(\zeta) + \int_{U_1} \bar{\partial}_z \Omega_{(0,q-2)}^{01}(z, \zeta) \wedge E f(\zeta). \end{aligned}$$

This shows that

$$\begin{aligned} (2.23) \quad R_{D^{12}}^0 f - L_1^{01} f &= -L_{1+}^{01} E f(z) + R_{U_1}^{01} \bar{\partial} E f \\ &\quad + R_{U_1 \cup D^{12}}^0 E f - R_{U_1}^1 E f + \bar{\partial} R_{U_1}^{01} E f. \end{aligned}$$

After applying $\bar{\partial}$, the last term will be dropped. This shows that

$$\begin{aligned} (2.24) \quad \bar{\partial} R_{D^{12}}^0 f - \bar{\partial} L_1^{01} f &= -\bar{\partial} L_{1+}^{01} E f - \bar{\partial} R_{U_1}^1 E f \\ &\quad + \bar{\partial} R_{U_1}^{01} \bar{\partial} E f + \bar{\partial} R_{U_1 \cup D^{12}}^0 E f(\zeta). \end{aligned}$$

We apply (2.23) in which f is replaced by $\bar{\partial}f = E\bar{\partial}f$ to obtain

$$(2.25) \quad R_{D^{12}}^0 \bar{\partial}f - L_1^{01} \bar{\partial}f = -L_{1+}^{01} E \bar{\partial}f + R_{U_1}^{01} \bar{\partial} E \bar{\partial}f + R_{U_1 \cup D^{12}}^0 E \bar{\partial}f \\ - R_{U_1}^1 E \bar{\partial}f + \bar{\partial} R_{U_1}^{01} E \bar{\partial}f(\zeta).$$

We can pair the last term with the second last term in (2.24) to form the desired commutator $[E, \bar{\partial}]f$. Finally, we write $\bar{\partial} E \bar{\partial}f = [E, \bar{\partial}] \bar{\partial}f$. This completes the proof of (2.13). The above proof is still valid for (2.14) (case $q = 0$), as the Koppelman lemma holds with $\Omega_{0,-1} = 0$.

Strictly speaking, the above computation is only valid when $\partial D \in C^3$, since the Koppelman lemma can be verified easily when all Leray maps $W_j \in C^2$. When $\partial D^i \in C^2$, one can still verify the integral formula on the domain $D^1 \cap D^2$ by smoothing g^j . For instance, see [15, 17] for details. \square

3. A LOCAL HOMOTOPY FORMULA FOR $(n - q)$ CONVEX CONFIGURATION

The main purpose of this section is to construct a local homotopy formula near a boundary point of strictly $(n - q)$ convex.

In Proposition 2.3, we have derived a local approximate homotopy formula (2.13) for a $(0, q)$ form f :

$$f = L_1^1 f + L_2^2 f + L_{12}^{12} f + \bar{\partial} H_q f + H_{q+1} \bar{\partial} f.$$

To obtain a genuine local homotopy formula, we will show that the boundary integrals $L_1^1 f, L_2^2 f, L_{12}^{12} f$ vanish when the boundary is $(n - q)$ convex and the Leray mappings g^1, g^2 are chosen appropriately.

The constructions in this section and the next are inspired by Henkin-Leiterer [23].

Throughout the paper let $B_r = \{z \in \mathbf{C}^n : |z| < r\}$ be the ball of radius r . We first transform a $(n - q)$ -convex domain D into a new form D^1 .

Lemma 3.1. *Let $D \subset U$ be a domain defined by a C^2 function $\rho^0 < 0$ satisfying $\nabla \rho^0 \neq 0$ at each point of $U \cap \partial D$. Suppose that ∂D is $(n - q)$ -convex at $\zeta \in U$.*

(a) *There is a local biholomorphic mapping ψ defined in an open set U containing ζ such that $\psi(\zeta) = 0$ while $D^1 := \psi(U \cap D)$ is defined by*

$$(3.1) \quad \rho^1(z) = -y_n + \lambda_1 |z_1|^2 + \cdots + \lambda_{q-1} |z_{q-1}|^2 + |z_q|^2 + \cdots + |z_n|^2 + R(z) < 0,$$

where $|\lambda_j| \leq 1$ and $R(z) = o(|z|^2)$. There exists $r_1 > 0$ such that the boundary $\partial \psi(U \cap D)$ intersects the sphere ∂B_r transversally when $0 < r < r_1$. Furthermore, the function R in (3.1) is in $C^a(B_{r_1})$ (resp. $\Lambda^a(B_{r_1})$), when $\rho^0 \in C^a(U)$ with $a \geq 2$ (resp. $\Lambda^a(U)$ with $a > 2$).

(b) *Let ψ be as above. There exists $\delta(D) > 0$ such that if \tilde{D} is defined by $\tilde{\rho}^0 < 0$ and $\|\tilde{\rho}^0 - \rho^0\|_2 < \delta(D)$, then $\psi(U \cap \tilde{D})$ is given by*

$$(3.2) \quad \tilde{\rho}^1(z) = -y_n + \lambda_1 |z_1|^2 + \cdots + \lambda_{q-1} |z_{q-1}|^2 + |z_q|^2 + \cdots + |z_n|^2 + \tilde{R}(z) < 0$$

with $|\tilde{R} - R|_{B_{r_1}, a} \leq C_a \|\tilde{\rho}^0 - \rho^0\|_{U, a}$ for $a > 2$ and $\|\tilde{R} - R\|_{B_{r_1}, a} \leq C_a \|\tilde{\rho}^0 - \rho^0\|_{U, a}$ for $a \geq 2$. There exists $r_1 > 0$ such that the boundary $\partial \psi(U \cap \tilde{D})$ intersects the sphere ∂B_{r_2} transversally when $r_1/2 < r_2 < r_1$.

Here $\delta(D)$ depends on the modulus of continuity of $\partial^2 \rho^0$.

Remark 3.2. For the rest of paper, we will refer to $(\tilde{D}^1, \tilde{\rho}^1)$ as (D^1, ρ^1) indicating the various estimates are *uniform* in $\tilde{\rho}$ or *stable* under small C^2 perturbations of ∂D .

We refer to B_{r_2} as $D_{r_2}^2$ or D^2 and set $\rho^2 = |\zeta|^2 - r_2^2$ with restriction $r_1 > r_2 > r_1/2$. We still refer to $\psi(U)$ as U .

Proof. (a) Let D be defined by $\rho^0 < 0$. We may assume that $\zeta = 0$. Permuting coordinates yields $\rho_{z_n}^0 \neq 0$. Let $\tilde{z}_n = 2\rho_\zeta^0 \cdot (\zeta - z) - \sum \rho_{\zeta_j \zeta_k}^0 (\zeta_j - z_j)(z_k - \zeta_k)$ and $\tilde{z}' = z'$. Then $\rho^0(z) = \rho_1(\tilde{z})$, where the new domain has a defining function

$$\rho_1(z) = -y_n + \sum a_{j\bar{k}} z_j \bar{z}_k + o(|z|^2).$$

Choose a nonsingular matrix U so that with $U\tilde{z} = z$ and $\tilde{z}_n = z_n$. The new defining function $\rho_2(\tilde{z}) = \rho_1(z)$ has the form

$$\rho_2(z) = -y_n + \sum_{j < q} \lambda_j |z_j|^2 + \sum_{j=q}^{n-1} |z_j|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^n \operatorname{Re}\{a_j z_j \bar{z}_n\} + o(|z|^2),$$

where a_n is a real constant. Setting $\rho_3 = \rho_2 + \mu\rho_2^2$ with $\mu = a_n + 1$, we get

$$\rho_3(z) = -y_n + \sum_{j < q} \lambda_j |z_j|^2 + \sum_{j=q}^n |z_j|^2 + \operatorname{Re}\left\{\mu z_n^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} a_j z_j \bar{z}_n\right\} + o(|z|^2).$$

Using new coordinates $\tilde{z}_n = z_n - i\mu z_n^2 + iz_n \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} a_j$ and $\tilde{z}' = z'$, we get

$$\rho_4(z) = -y_n + \lambda_1 |z_1|^2 + \cdots + \lambda_{q-1} |z_{q-1}|^2 + |z_q|^2 + \cdots + |z_n|^2 + y_n \operatorname{Re}\left\{\sum_{j=1}^n b_j z_j\right\} + o(|z|^2).$$

We get $|\lambda_j| < 1$ after a dilation. Then $\rho_4 + \rho_4 \operatorname{Re}\{\sum b_j z_j\}$, renamed as ρ^1 , has the form (3.1). As usual, the implicit function theorem can be proved by using the inverse mapping theorem [50, pp. 224-225]. Then the inverse mapping theorem for Zygmund spaces [13] yields the desired smoothness of R . The details are left to the reader. The transversality of ∂D^1 and $\partial D_{r_2}^2$ also follows from the computation below.

(b) The above construction of ψ is explicit in ρ^0 with the exception of the linear change of coordinates $z \rightarrow Uz$ that is fixed for all small perturbations $\tilde{\rho}^0$ of ρ^0 . Thus, it is easily to check that $\|\tilde{R} - R\|_a \leq C_a \|\tilde{\rho}^0 - \rho^0\|_a$ for $a \geq 2$ and $|\tilde{R} - R|_a \leq C_a |\tilde{\rho}^0 - \rho^0|_a$ for $a > 2$.

We want to show that $\nabla \tilde{\rho}^1$ is not proportional to $\nabla \rho^2$ on the common zero set of $\tilde{\rho}^1, \rho^2$. Suppose that $\nabla \rho^2 = \mu \nabla \tilde{\rho}^1$ when $\tilde{\rho}^1(z) = \rho^2(z) = 0$. We get $2y_n = \mu(-1 + 2y_n + \tilde{R}_{y_n})$. When $r < 1/4$ and $\delta(D)$ are sufficient small, by $|z| = r$ we obtain $|-1 + 2y_n + \tilde{R}_{y_n}| < 1/2$. Hence $-\mu^{-1}y_n \in (1/4, 3/4)$ as

$$(3.3) \quad \|\tilde{R}\|_2 < 1/C.$$

For $j < n$, we have $2y_j = 2\mu \tilde{\rho}_{y_j}$. This shows that $|y_j| \leq C|y_n|$. Also, $|x_k| \leq C|y_n|$. Thus $\tilde{\rho}^1(z) = 0$ implies $|y_n| \leq C'|y_n|^2 + |\tilde{R}(z)|$. In view of $C'|y_n| < 1/2$, we get

$$|z| \leq C\|R\|_2 |z|^2 + C\delta(D).$$

By choosing $\delta(D)$ depending on r_1 , we get $|z| < r_1^2/C$. The latter contradicts the vanishing of $\rho^2(z) = r^2 - |z|^2$ since $r > r_1/2$. \square

Recall that our original domain D is normalized as D^1 . We now fix notation. Let (D^1, U, ϕ, ρ^1) be as in Lemma 3.1. Thus ρ^1 is given by (3.1) (or (3.2)). Recall that

$$(3.4) \quad \rho^2 = |z|^2 - r_2^2$$

where $0 < r_2 < r_1$ and $r_1/2 < r_2 < r_1$ for Lemma 3.1 (a), (b). Let us define

$$(3.5) \quad D^1: \rho^1 < 0, \quad D^2: \rho^2 < 0, \quad D^{12} = D^1 \cap D^2,$$

$$(3.6) \quad \partial D^{12} = S^1 \cup S^2, \quad S^i \subset \partial D^i,$$

$$(3.7) \quad g^2(z, \zeta) = \partial_\zeta \rho^2 = \bar{\zeta}.$$

It is well-known that

$$(3.8) \quad |g^2(z, \zeta) \cdot (\zeta - z)| > 0, \quad (z, \zeta) \in D^2 \times \partial D^2.$$

Lemma 3.3. *Let (D^1, U, ϕ, ρ^1) be as in Lemma 3.1. Define*

$$(3.9) \quad g_j^1(z, \zeta) = \begin{cases} \frac{\partial \rho^1}{\partial \zeta_j}, & q \leq j \leq n, \\ \frac{\partial \rho^1}{\partial \zeta_j} + (\bar{\zeta}_j - \bar{z}_j), & 1 \leq j < q. \end{cases}$$

Then for $\zeta, z \in U$ and by shrinking U if necessary, we have

$$(3.10) \quad 2 \operatorname{Re}\{g^1(z, \zeta) \cdot (\zeta - z)\} \geq \rho^1(\zeta) - \rho^1(z) + \frac{1}{2}|\zeta - z|^2,$$

$$(3.11) \quad |g^1(z, \zeta) \cdot (\zeta - z)| \geq 1/C_*, \quad \forall \zeta \in S^{12}, |z| < \delta_0(D).$$

Proof. We have $\operatorname{Re}\{g^1(z, \zeta) \cdot (\zeta - z)\} = \operatorname{Re}\{\rho^1(z, \zeta) \cdot (\zeta - z)\} + \sum_{j < q} |\zeta_j - z_j|^2$. By Taylor theorem, we have

$$(3.12) \quad \rho^1(z) - \rho^1(\zeta) = 2 \operatorname{Re}\{\rho_\zeta^1 \cdot (z - \zeta)\} + H_\zeta \rho^1(z - \zeta) + \operatorname{Re}\{\rho_{\zeta_j \zeta_k}^1 (z_j - \zeta_j)(z_k - \zeta_k)\} + R(z, \zeta).$$

Note that $H_\zeta \rho$, restricted to (z_q, \dots, z_n) , is a positive definite quadratic form. Also, $\rho_{\zeta_j \zeta_k}$ and second-order derivatives of R are small. We can show that

$$\rho^1(z) - \rho^1(\zeta) \geq 2 \operatorname{Re}\{\rho_\zeta^1 \cdot (z - \zeta)\} + \sum_{j \geq q} |\zeta_j - z_j|^2 - c|\zeta - z|^2$$

where $c < 1/2$. Now (3.10) follows from (3.1). By (3.12) and (3.10) for case (3.1), we also get (3.10) for the $\tilde{\rho}^1$ in (3.2) when $\|\tilde{\rho}^1 - \rho^1\|_2 \leq C\delta(D)$ is small. Note that (3.11) follows from (3.10). \square

Definition 3.4. (a) As in [23], the $(U, D^1, \psi, \rho^1, \rho^2)$ in Lemma 3.1 (a) and (3.4) is called an $(n - q)$ -convex configuration. Lemma 3.1 (b) is referred to as the *stability* of the configuration. In brevity, we call $(D^1, D_{r_2}^2)$ an $(n - q)$ -convex configuration.

(b) The g^1, g^2 given by (3.7) and (3.9) are called the *canonical Leray maps* for the $(n - q)$ -convex configuration $(D^1, D_{r_2}^2)$.

Note that $g^2(z, \zeta)$ is holomorphic in z and $g^1(z, \zeta)$ is anti-holomorphic in merely $q - 1$ variables of z . Checking the types, we have

$$(3.13) \quad \Omega_{0,k}^2(z, \zeta) = 0, \quad k \geq 1, \quad \bar{\partial}_z \Omega_{0,0}^2(z, \zeta) = 0;$$

$$(3.14) \quad \Omega_{0,k}^1(z, \zeta) = 0, \quad k \geq q; \quad \bar{\partial}_z \Omega_{0,q-1}^1(z, \zeta) = 0;$$

$$(3.15) \quad \Omega_{0,k}^{12}(z, \zeta) = 0; \quad k \geq q; \quad \bar{\partial}_z \Omega_{0,q-1}^{12}(z, \zeta) = 0.$$

By (3.13)-(3.15), we have

$$(3.16) \quad L_i^i f(z) = \int_{S^i} \Omega_{0,q}^i(z, \zeta) \wedge f(\zeta) = 0, \quad i = 1, 2; \quad L_{12}^{12} f = 0;$$

$$(3.17) \quad \bar{\partial}_z \int_{U_1} \Omega_{0,q-1}^1(z, \zeta) \wedge E f = 0, \quad \int_{U_1} \Omega_{0,q}^1(z, \zeta) \wedge E \bar{\partial} f = 0.$$

This shows that given by (2.17), the $H_q^{(2)}$ can be written as

$$(3.18) \quad H_q^{(2)} f = L_{1+}^{01} E f + L_2^{02} f + L_{12}^{012} f.$$

Therefore, we have obtained the following local homotopy formula.

Theorem 3.5. *Let $0 < q \leq n$. Let $(D^1, D_{r_2}^2)$ be a $(n - q)$ -convex configuration with Leray maps (3.7)-(3.9). Suppose that $U^1 \subset \mathbf{C}^n \setminus \overline{D^1}$, $\partial U^1 = S^1 \cup S_+^1$ and $S_+^1 \cap D^{12} = \emptyset$. Suppose that f is a $(0, q)$ form such that f and $\bar{\partial} f$ are in $C^1(\overline{D^{12}})$. Then on D^{12}*

$$(3.19) \quad f = \bar{\partial} H_q f + H_{q+1} \bar{\partial} f$$

with $H_q = H_q^{(1)} + H_q^{(2)}$. Here $H_q^{(1)}$ is defined by (2.16) and

$$(3.20) \quad H_q^{(2)} f := \int_{S_+^1} \Omega_{0,q}^{01} \wedge E f + \int_{S^2} \Omega_{0,q-1}^{02} \wedge f + \int_{S^1 \cap S^2} \Omega_{0,q}^{012} \wedge f.$$

To be used later we remark that the integral kernel in $H_q^{(2)}$ is smooth, since S_+^1, S^2 and S^{12} do not intersect small neighborhoods of the origin in ∂D^1 . Therefore, terms in $H_q^{(2)}$ can be estimated easily, while the main term $H_q^{(1)}$ in H_q will be estimated in section 7.

4. A LOCAL $\bar{\partial}$ SOLUTION OPERATOR FOR $(q + 1)$ -CONCAVE CONFIGURATION

We recall again from Proposition 2.3 the approximate local homotopy formula for a $(0, q)$ form f :

$$(4.1) \quad f = L_1^1 f + L_2^2 f + L_{12}^{12} f + \bar{\partial} H_q f + H_{q+1} \bar{\partial} f.$$

As the strictly $(n - q)$ -convex case, we will show that $L_1^1 f, L_2^2 f$ vanish when the boundary is $(q + 1)$ -concave and the Leray mappings g_1, g_2 are chosen appropriately. However, the boundary integral $L_{12}^{12} f$ may not vanish. We will show that this term is $\bar{\partial}$ -closed for a $\bar{\partial}$ -closed f , and this allows us to use a third Leray mapping to transform it into a genuine $\bar{\partial}$ solution operator $f = \bar{\partial} H_q f$ for possibly different H_q . Thus, the $(q + 1)$ concavity is sufficiently to construct a $\bar{\partial}$ solution operator.

The presence of $L_{12}^{12} f$ will lead to a subtlety. For a local homotopy formula for forms which are not necessarily $\bar{\partial}$ -closed, we however need an *extra* negative Levi eigenvalue, which will be assumed at the end of the section.

The following is a restatement of Lemma 3.1, by considering the complement $(D^1)^c$ and $-\rho_0$ where ρ_0 defines D^1 . We include the last assertion on D_*^1 , which holds obviously. The D_*^1 has C^∞ boundary and it will be useful to obtain a sharp regularity for $\bar{\partial} u = f$ when f are $(0, 1)$ forms and ∂D is merely C^2 .

Lemma 4.1. *Let $D \subset U$ be a C^2 domain. Suppose that $U \cap \partial D$ is strictly $(q + 1)$ -concave at $\zeta \in U \cap \partial D$. Let D, \tilde{D} be domains in U defined by $\rho^0 < 0, \tilde{\rho}^0 < 0$*

respectively. There is a biholomorphic mapping ψ with $\psi(\zeta) = 0$ such that $D^1 = \psi(D \cap U)$ and $\tilde{D}^1 = \psi(\tilde{D} \cap U)$ are defined by $\rho^1 < 0$ and $\tilde{\rho}^1 < 0$ with

$$(4.2) \quad \rho^1(z) = -y_{q+2} - |z_1|^2 - \cdots - |z_{q+2}|^2 + \lambda_{q+3}|z_{q+3}|^2 + \cdots + \lambda_n|z_n|^2 + R(z),$$

$$(4.3) \quad \tilde{\rho}^1(z) = -y_{q+2} - |z_1|^2 - \cdots - |z_{q+2}|^2 + \lambda_{q+3}|z_{q+3}|^2 + \cdots + \lambda_n|z_n|^2 + \tilde{R}(z).$$

Here $|\lambda_j| < 1$ for $j > q + 2$. Also assertions (a), (b) in Lemma 3.1 are valid. Furthermore, $D^1 \subset \psi(U): \rho^1 < 0$ contains $D_*^1 \subset B_r: \rho_*^1 < 0$ for

$$(4.4) \quad \rho_*^1 = -y_{q+2} - \frac{1}{2}|z_1|^2 - \cdots - \frac{1}{2}|z_{q+2}|^2 + 2|z_{q+3}|^2 + \cdots + 2|z_n|^2.$$

As in Lemma 3.1, we rename $\psi(U)$ as U .

When ρ^1 has the form (4.2), as in [23] define

$$(4.5) \quad g_j^1(z, \zeta) = \begin{cases} \frac{\partial \rho^1}{\partial z_j}, & 1 \leq j \leq q + 2, \\ \frac{\partial \rho^1}{\partial z_j} + \bar{z}_j - \bar{\zeta}_j, & q + 3 \leq j \leq n. \end{cases}$$

Note that this kind of Leray mapping was first used by Hortmann [28, 29] for strictly concave domains. Then we have

$$(4.6) \quad -2 \operatorname{Re}\{g^1(z, \zeta) \cdot (\zeta - z)\} \geq \rho(\zeta) - \rho(z) + |\zeta - z|^2/C.$$

An essential difference between the q -convex and $(q + 1)$ concave cases is that $g^1(z, \zeta)$ is no longer C^∞ in z when ∂D is only finitely smooth. A useful feature is that $g^1(z, \zeta)$ is holomorphic in $\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{q+2}$.

As $(n - q)$ -convex case, we use $D_{r_2}^2: \rho^2(z) := |z|^2 - r_2^2 < 0$. We still take Leray maps $g^0(z, \zeta) = \bar{\zeta} - \bar{z}$ and $g^2 = (\frac{\partial \rho^2}{\partial \zeta_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial \rho^2}{\partial \zeta_n}) = \bar{\zeta}$. Denote by \deg_ζ the degree of a form in ζ . We get

$$(4.7) \quad \deg_\zeta \Omega_{0,*}^1 \leq 2n - q - 2.$$

Therefore, we still have (3.16). Thus (4.1) becomes

$$(4.8) \quad f = L_{12}^{12}f + \bar{\partial}H_q f + H_{q+1}\bar{\partial}f.$$

However, unlike the $(n - q)$ convex case, $L_{12}^{12}f = \int_{S^{12}} \Omega_{0,q}^{12} \wedge f$ may not be identically zero. Let us try to transform this integral via Stokes' formula. We intersect $D^1 \cap D^2$ with a third domain

$$(4.9) \quad D^3: \rho^3 < 0, \quad 0 \in D^3$$

where

$$(4.10) \quad \rho^3 = -y_{q+2} + \sum_{j=q+3}^n 3|z_j|^2 - r_3^2$$

with $r_3 > 0$. Define

$$(4.11) \quad g_j^3(z, \zeta) = \begin{cases} 0, & 1 \leq j < q + 2, \\ \frac{i}{2}, & j = q + 2, \\ 3(\bar{\zeta}_j + \bar{z}_j), & q + 3 \leq j \leq n. \end{cases}$$

We can verify

$$(4.12) \quad \operatorname{Re}\{g^3(z, \zeta) \cdot (\zeta - z)\} = \rho^3(\zeta) - \rho^3(z).$$

Then we have the following.

Lemma 4.2. *Let ρ^i, g^i be defined by (4.2), (4.5), (3.4), (3.7), (4.10), (4.11) for $i = 1, 2, 3$.*

- (a) *There exists $r_1 \in (0, 1/6)$ such that $\partial D^1, \partial D_{r_2}^2, \partial D_{r_3}^3$ are pairwise in the transversal position when $0 < C_n r_3 < r_2 < r_1$ and $r_1 < 2r_2$.*
- (b) *Let $\tilde{\rho}^0, \tilde{\rho}^1$ be as in Lemma 4.2. If $\delta(D)$ is sufficiently small, $\|\tilde{\rho}^0 - \rho^0\|_2 < \delta(D)$, and $1/C'_n < C_n r_3 < r_2 < r_1$ and $r_2 < r_1/2$, then $\partial \tilde{D}^1, \partial D_{r_2}^2, \partial D_{r_3}^3$ are also pairwise in general position.*
- (c) *Let r_1, r_2, r_3 be as in (b). Then*

$$(4.13) \quad \partial \tilde{D}^1 \cap \partial D_{r_2}^2 \cap D_{r_3}^3 = \emptyset, \quad \partial \tilde{D}^1 \cap \partial D_{r_3}^3 \cap \partial D_{r_2}^2 = \emptyset,$$

$$(4.14) \quad |g^i(z, \zeta) \cdot (\zeta - z)| \geq 1/C, \quad \forall (z, \zeta) \in B_{r_4} \times \overline{D_{r_2}^2} \setminus \overline{(D^1 \cup D_{r_3}^3)}, \quad i = 0, 1, 2, 3,$$

$$(4.15) \quad S^{12} \subset \overline{D_{r_2}^2} \setminus \overline{(D^1 \cup D_{r_3}^3)}.$$

Proof. (a) Suppose $\nabla \rho^1(z) = \mu \nabla \rho^3(z)$, and $\rho^1(z) = \rho^3(z) = 0$. We have $-1 + R_{y_{q+2}} = \mu$. This shows that $-3/4 < \mu < -1/2$. We also have $z_j + o(|z|) = 0$ for $j = 1, \dots, q+1$, $x_{q+2} + o(|z|) = 0$, and $\lambda_j z_j + o(|z|) = 3\mu z_j$ for $j > q+2$. The latter implies that $|z_j| = o(|z|)$ since $|3\mu| - |\lambda_j| > 1/4$. Hence, $\rho^1(z) = 0$ yields $y_{q+2} = o(|z|)$. This shows that $z = 0$, which contradicts $\rho^3 = r_3 > 0$.

To show $\partial D_{r_2}^2$ and $\partial D_{r_3}^3$ intersect transversally, suppose that at an intersection point z we have $\nabla \rho^2 = \mu \nabla \rho^3$. We first get $2y_{q+2} = \mu(-1 + R_{y_{q+2}})$. Hence $1/4 < -\mu^{-1}y_{q+2} < 3/4$ and $|\mu| < 4|y_{q+2}|$. Then $\nabla \rho^2 = \mu \nabla \rho^3$ implies that $|z| \leq C_n |y_{q+2}|$. We get $|y_{q+2}| \geq r_2/C_n$ and $|y_{q+2}| \leq r_3 + |z|^2 \leq r_3 + C_n^2 |y_{q+2}|^2$. Then $2r_3 \geq |y_{q+2}| \geq r_2/C_n$, a contradiction to the assumption $r_3 < r_2/C$. That $\partial D_r^1, \partial D_{r_2}^2$ intersect transversally is proved in Lemma 3.1.

(b) We leave the details to the reader.

(c) Suppose $\rho^1(z) = 0$ and $\rho^3(z) < 0$. Then we have

$$|z_1|^2 + \dots + |z_{q+2}|^2 + \sum_{j>q+2} (\lambda_j + 3)|z_j|^2 - \tilde{R}(z) < r_3^2.$$

This shows that $|z| < 2r_3$. We obtain the first identity in (4.13). The proof of the second identity in (4.13) is similar.

We now verify (4.14). The cases for $i = 0, 2$ are trivial. Case $i = 1$ is proved in (3.11). To verify (4.6) for case $i = 3$, by (4.12) we have

$$\operatorname{Re}\{g^3(\zeta, z) \cdot (\zeta - z)\} = \rho^3(\zeta) - \rho^3(z).$$

Note that D^3 is defined by $\rho^3 < 0$. Thus for $\zeta \notin D_{r_3}^3$ and $z \in D_{r_3}^3$, we have $r^3(\zeta) - r^3(z) > 0$. When $r_4 < r_3/C$, B_{r_4} is contained in $D_{r_3}^3$. This shows that when $z \in B_{r_4}$ and $\zeta \notin D_{r_3}^3$ we have $\rho^3(\zeta) - \rho^3(z) > 1/C$. Now it is easy to see that $\operatorname{Re}(g^3(\zeta, z) \cdot (\zeta - z)) > 1/C$ when $|z| < 1/C$.

Finally, (4.15) follows from (4.13). \square

Definition 4.3. The (D^1, U, ϕ, ρ^1) in Lemma 4.1 (a) is called a $(q+1)$ -concave configuration, while Lemma 4.1 (b) is referred as the *stability* of the configuration. In brevity, we call $(D^1, D_{r_2}^2, D_{r_3}^3)$ in Lemma 4.1, a $(q+1)$ -concave configuration, in which $\partial D^1, \partial D_{r_2}^2, \partial D_{r_3}^3$ intersect pairwise transversally when $1/C'_n < C_n r_3 < r_2 < r_1$ and $r_2 < r_1/2$. The g^1, g^2, g^3 in (4.5), (3.7) and (4.11) are called the *standard Leray maps* of the configuration.

So far, we have been following Henkin-Leiterer [23]. We could derive a homotopy formula on $D^1 \cap D_{r_2}^2 \cap D_{r_3}^3$ as in [23]. However, since we only need a local homotopy

formula near a boundary point, we now departure from the approach in [23]. Let us still use the approximate homotopy formula on $D^1 \cap D_{r_2}^2$. Modify it only for $z \in D^1 \cap D_{r_2}^2 \cap B_{r_4}$ using mainly (4.13)-(4.14) to derive a homotopy formula on this smaller domain. Thus our starting point is still the approximate homotopy formula (4.1). We will however use Koppelman's lemma for g^1, g^2, g^3 on the set S^{12} .

Note that the anti-holomorphic differentials $d\bar{\zeta}_j, d\bar{z}_k$ appear in Ω^3 as a wedge product in some of

$$d(\bar{\zeta}_j + \bar{z}_j), \quad q+3 \leq j \leq n.$$

Consequently, $d\bar{z}_j$ and $d\bar{\zeta}_j$, having the *same* index, cannot appear in $\Omega_{0,q}^3$ simultaneously. Therefore

$$(4.16) \quad \deg_{\zeta} \Omega_{0,\ell}^3(z, \zeta) \leq n + ([n - (q+3) + 1] - \ell) = 2n - q - \ell - 2, \quad \forall \ell.$$

We now derive a result analogous to [23, p. 122, Lemma 13.6 (iii)] but for different boundary integrals L_{12}^* .

Lemma 4.4. *Let $0 < q \leq n - 2$. Let $(D^1, D_{r_2}^2, D_{r_3}^3)$ be a $(q+1)$ concave configuration with Leray maps (g^1, g^2, g^3) . Then*

$$(4.17) \quad \Omega_{0,\ell}^{13}(z, \zeta) = 0, \quad \ell < q; \quad \bar{\partial}_{\zeta} \Omega_{0,q}^{13}(z, \zeta) = 0.$$

(a) *Suppose that f is $\bar{\partial}$ -closed $(0, q)$ form on D_1 and f is in $C^1(\bar{D}_1)$. Then on $D^1 \cap D_{r_2}^2 \cap D_{r_3}^3$,*

$$(4.18) \quad L_{12}^{13} f(z) = 0,$$

$$(4.19) \quad L_{12}^{12} f = -L_{12}^{23} f + \bar{\partial} L_{12}^{123} f + L_{12}^{123} \bar{\partial} f.$$

(b) *If $(D^1, D_{r_2}^2, D_{r_3}^3)$ is a $(q+2)$ -concave configuration and $0 < q \leq n - 3$, then (4.18) and (4.19) are valid for any $(0, q)$ forms $f \in C^1(\bar{D}_1)$.*

Proof. To verify (4.17), we note that $\Omega_{0,q}^{13}(z, \zeta)$ has type $(0, q)$ in z . It has type $(n, n - 2 - q)$ in ζ and it is holomorphic in $\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{q+2}$. After taking $\bar{\partial}_{\zeta}$, it has type $(n, n - q - 1)$ in ζ for anti-holomorphic variables $\zeta_{q+3}, \dots, \zeta_n$. However, the number of these anti-holomorphic variables is $< n - (q+3) + 2 = n - q - 1$. We have verified (4.17).

(a) To verify (4.18), we need an approximation theorem by Henkin-Leiterer [23, Lemma 12.5 (iii), p. 122]. Fix $z \in B_{r_4}$. By (4.14), we know that Ω^{13} is a continuous $(n, n - q - 2)$ in $\zeta \in K := D^2 \setminus (D^1 \cup D^3)$. Consequently, we can find a sequence ω_z^{ν} of $\bar{\partial}_{\zeta}$ -closed continuous $(n, n - q - 2)$ -forms on $U \supset D^2$ such that ω_z^{ν} is a sequence of $\bar{\partial}$ -closed $(n, n - q - 2)$ forms on U converges to $\Omega^{13}(z, \cdot)$ uniformly on K . Using a standard smoothing, we may assume that ω_z^{ν} are C^1 in $\zeta \in D^2$, $\bar{\partial}$ -closed and approximate $\Omega^{13}(z, \cdot)$ uniformly on K . By (4.15), S^{12} is contained in K . Applying Stokes' formula for ω_z^{ν} contained in K and we obtain for $z \in D^1 \cap D^2 \cap B_{r_4}$,

$$L_{12}^{13} f = \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \int_{S^{12}} \omega_z^{\nu} \wedge f = \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \int_{S^1} \omega_z^{\nu} \wedge \bar{\partial}_{\zeta} f = 0.$$

Now (4.19) follows from Koppelman's lemma:

$$\Omega_{0,q}^{12} = \Omega_{0,q}^{13} - \Omega_{0,q}^{23} + \bar{\partial}_{\zeta} \Omega_{0,q}^{123} + \bar{\partial}_z \Omega_{0,q-1}^{123}.$$

(b) Note that when (D^1, D^2, D^3) is a $(q+2)$ concave configuration. We have $L_{12}^{13} f = 0$ for any $(0, q)$ forms f that are not necessarily $\bar{\partial}$ -closed by (4.17) that now holds for $\ell < q + 1$. We get the desired conclusion immediately. \square

Remark 4.5. *In the proof for case (i), we do not have any control on ω^ν outside $\overline{D_{r_2}^2} \setminus (D^1 \cup D_{r_3}^3)$ other than the uniform convergence. Therefore, in (a) it is crucial that f is $\bar{\partial}$ -closed.*

We recall the homotopy formula

$$f = \bar{\partial}T_{q, B_{r_4}}f + T_{q+1, B_{r_4}}\bar{\partial}f$$

on the ball B_δ centered at the origin with radius δ . We now transform $L_{12}^{23}f$ in (4.19).

The following is analogous to [23, Lemma 13.7, p. 125] for L_{23}^{23} .

Lemma 4.6. *Let $1 \leq q \leq n - 2$. Let $(D^1, D_{r_2}^2, D_{r_3}^3)$ be a $(q + 1)$ -concave configuration. Let L_\bullet^{23} be defined by (2.11). For a $(0, q)$ form f , we have*

$$(4.20) \quad \bar{\partial}L_{12}^{23}f = \int_{S^{12}} \Omega_{0, q+1}^{23} \wedge \bar{\partial}f,$$

$$(4.21) \quad L_{12}^{23}f = \bar{\partial}T_{B_{r_4}, q}L_{12}^{23}f + T_{B_{r_4}, q+1}L_{12}^{23}\bar{\partial}f, \quad \text{on } B_{r_4},$$

$$(4.22) \quad L_{12}^{23}: Z_{0, q}(C^0(\overline{D})) \rightarrow Z_{0, q}(C^0(\overline{D}^2 \cap \overline{D}^3)) \cap C^\infty(D^2 \cap D^3).$$

Proof. By (4.14) the form Ω^{23} is smooth in $z \in B_{r_4}$ and $\zeta \in S^{12}$. We have

$$\bar{\partial}_\zeta \Omega_{0, q+1}^{23} + \bar{\partial}_z \Omega_{0, q}^{23} = \Omega_{0, q+1}^2 - \Omega_{0, q+1}^3.$$

By (3.13), $\Omega_{0, q+1}^2 = 0$. Thus $\int_{S^{12}} \Omega_{0, q+1}^2(z, \zeta) \wedge f = 0$. By (4.16), the degree of $f(\zeta) \wedge \Omega_{0, q+1}^3(z, \zeta)$ is less than $2n - 3$, which is less than $\dim(S^1 \cap S^2)$. This shows that

$$(4.23) \quad \int_{S^{12}} \Omega_{q+1}^3(z, \zeta) \wedge f(\zeta) = 0, \quad q > 0.$$

By Stokes' formula and $\partial(S^{12}) = \emptyset$, we obtain

$$\bar{\partial}L_{12}^{23}f = - \int_{S^{12}} \bar{\partial}_\zeta \Omega_{0, q+1}^{23} \wedge f = \int_{S^{12}} \Omega_{0, q+1}^{23} \wedge \bar{\partial}f. \quad \square$$

In summary, we have the following local $\bar{\partial}$ -solution operator for the concave case.

Theorem 4.7. *Let $1 \leq q \leq n - 2$. Let $(D^1, D_{r_2}^2, D_{r_3}^3)$ be a $(q + 1)$ -concave configuration. Let f be a $\bar{\partial}$ -closed $(0, q)$ form on D^{12} . On $D^{12} \cap B_{r_4}$, we have*

$$(4.24) \quad f = \bar{\partial}H_q f$$

with $H_q = H_q^{(1)} + H_q^{(2)} + H_q^{(3)}$. Here $H_q^{(1)}$ and $H_q^{(2)}$ are given by (2.16), (3.18) and

$$(4.25) \quad H_q^{(3)}f = L_{12}^{123}f + T_{B_{r_4}, q}L_{12}^{23}f.$$

Although it is not used in this paper, for potential applications, it is worthy to state the following local homotopy formula if we have an extra negative Levi eigenvalue: if ∂D^1 is strictly $(q + 2)$ concave, then $L_{12}^{23}f = 0$ by (4.17) for a $(0, q)$ -form f . Therefore, we have the following.

Theorem 4.8. *Let $1 \leq q \leq n - 3$. Let $(D^1, D_{r_2}^2, D_{r_3}^3)$ be a $(q + 2)$ -concave configuration. Let $D^{12} = D^1 \cap D_{r_2}^2$. Let f be a $(0, q)$ form on D^{12} . On $D^{12} \cap B_{r_4}$, we have*

$$(4.26) \quad f = \bar{\partial}H_q f + H_{q+1}\bar{\partial}f$$

with $H_q = H_q^{(1)} + H_q^{(2)} + H_q^{(3)}$. Here $H_q^{(1)}$ and $H_q^{(2)}$ are given by (2.16), (3.18) and

$$(4.27) \quad H_q^{(3)} f = L_{12}^{123} f + T_{B_{r_4}, q} L_{12}^{23} f.$$

As in the convex case, the integral kernels in $H_q^{(2)}, H_q^{(3)}$ have smooth kernels, since S_+^1, S^2, S^{12} do not intersect small neighborhood of the origin in ∂D^1 . There is another main difference between the convex and concave cases. The kernel for the latter is only Λ^{m-1} away from the singularity when $\partial D \in \Lambda^m$. Anyway $H_q^{(1)}$ is the main term to be estimated.

5. HÖLDER-ZYGMUND SPACES AND A HARDY-LITTLEWOOD LEMMA

In this section, we recall the Hölder-Zygmund norms and indicate how a Hardy-Littlewood lemma can be used to derive the estimates. This version of Hardy-Littlewood lemma allows us to simplify some estimation in [15].

Let Ω be a domain in \mathbf{R}^n . Denote by $\|u\|_{D, a}$ the Hölder norm on a domain D for $a \geq 0$. Define $\Delta_h f(x) = f(x+h) - f(x)$ and $\Delta_h^2 f(x) = f(x+2h) + f(x) - 2f(x+h)$. Following [56, Defn. 1.120, p. 76], define the space $\Lambda^r(\Omega)$ for $r > 0$, to be the set of functions f with finite norm

$$(5.1) \quad |f|_{\Lambda^r(\Omega)} = \sup_{x, x-h, x+h \in \Omega, h \neq 0; |\alpha| < r} \left\{ |D^\alpha f(x)| + \frac{|\Delta_h^2 D^\alpha f(x)|}{|h|^{r-|\alpha|}} \right\}.$$

Denote by $\Lambda_{loc}^r(\Omega)$ the space of functions f such that $f \in \Lambda^r(\Omega')$ for any relatively compact subdomains Ω' of Ω .

Lemma 5.1. *Let $0 \leq \beta < 1$. Let $D \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ be a bounded and connected Lipschitz domain. Suppose that f is in $C_{loc}^2(D)$ and*

$$|\partial^2 f(x)| \leq A \text{dist}(x, \partial D)^{\beta-1}.$$

Fix $x_0 \in D$. Then $|f|_{D; 1+\beta} \leq C_0(|f(x_0)| + |\nabla f(x_0)|) + C_\beta A$, where constants C_0, C_β depend on a finite set of Lipschitz graph defining functions of ∂D .

Proof. The proof is standard for $0 < \beta < 1$. Suppose $\beta = 0$. The assumption implies that the second-order derivatives of f is bounded on each compact subset of D and it suffices to estimate $\Delta_h^2 f(x)$ when x is close to the boundary and $h \in \mathbf{R}^n$ is small. Take a boundary point of ∂D . We may assume that $x_0 = 0$. By definition, we may assume that D is defined by $x_n > g(x')$ where g is a Lipschitz function satisfying $|g(\tilde{x}') - g(x')| \leq L|\tilde{x}' - x'|$ with $L > 1$. Then

$$\text{dist}(y, \partial D) \geq (y_n - g(x'))/L.$$

Suppose that $x, x-h, x+h$ are in D and close to the origin. We first consider the special case when x, h satisfy

$$(5.2) \quad x + th \in D, \quad \text{dist}(x + th, \partial D) \geq |h|/L, \quad \forall t \in [0, 2].$$

Set $u(s) = f(x+h+sh) + f(x+h-sh) - 2f(x+h)$. Thus $u(0) = u'(0) = 0$ and $|u''(s)| \leq C_n L A |h|$. This shows that $|u(1)| \leq C_n L A |h|$.

For the general case, set $\tilde{h} = (0', 3L|h|)$. When $y \in D$ is close to the origin and $t \in [0, 2]$, we have

$$(5.3) \quad y + t\tilde{h} \in D, \quad y + \tilde{h} + th \in D,$$

$$(5.4) \quad \text{dist}(y + \tilde{h} + th, \partial D) \geq |h|.$$

Decompose

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.5) \quad & f(x+2h) + f(x) - 2f(x+h) \\
&= 2f(x+2h+\tilde{h}) + 2f(x+\tilde{h}) - 4f(x+h+\tilde{h}) \\
&\quad - f(x+2\tilde{h}) - f(x+2h+2\tilde{h}) + 2f(x+h+2\tilde{h}) \\
&\quad + f(x) + f(x+2\tilde{h}) - 2f(x+\tilde{h}) \\
&\quad + f(x+2h) + f(x+2h+2\tilde{h}) - 2f(x+2h+\tilde{h}) \\
&\quad - 2f(x+h) - 2f(x+h+2\tilde{h}) + 4f(x+h+\tilde{h}).
\end{aligned}$$

We estimate each row on the right-hand side of (5.5). Let us denote by $[a, b]$ the line segment connecting two points a, b in \mathbf{R}^n . By (5.3) and (5.4), we have

$$[x+\tilde{h}, x+\tilde{h}+2h] \subset D, \quad \text{dist}(x+\tilde{h}+th, \partial D) \geq |h|,$$

for $t \in [0, 2]$. Therefore, we can estimate the first row using the estimation for the special case (5.2) in which x is replaced by $x+\tilde{h}$. The second row is estimated similarly. For the third row, by (5.4) and $x \in D$, we get

$$\text{dist}(x+\tilde{h}+s\tilde{h}, \partial D) \geq (1+s)|h| \geq (1-|s|)|h|, \quad s \in [-1, 1].$$

Take $u(s) = f(x+\tilde{h}+s\tilde{h}) + f(x+\tilde{h}-s\tilde{h}) - 2f(x+\tilde{h})$. This yields $|u''(s)| \leq C_n AL|h|/(1-s)$ for $s \in [0, 1]$ and $|u(1)| \leq C_n AL|h|$ by $u(1) = \int_0^1 (1-s)u''(s) ds$. This gives us the desired estimate for the third row. The last two rows in (5.5) can be estimated similarly. \square

We remark that the decomposition (5.5) shows the following.

Proposition 5.2. *Let D be a bounded Lipschitz-graph domain in \mathbf{R}^n . Set*

$$D_h = \{x \in D : [x, x+2h] \subset D\}, \quad \forall h \in \mathbf{R}^n.$$

The norm (5.1) is equivalent to

$$|f|_{\tilde{\Lambda}^r(D)} = \sup_{x \in D} |f(x)| + \sum_{|\alpha| < r} \sup_{h \in \mathbf{R}^n \setminus \{0\}} \sup_{x \in D_{h,2}} \frac{|\Delta_h^2 D^\alpha f(x)|}{|h|^{r-|\alpha|}}.$$

In other words, $c|f|_{\tilde{\Lambda}^r(D)} \leq |f|_{\Lambda^r(D)} \leq C|f|_{\tilde{\Lambda}^r(D)}$. Here one can take $c = 1$ and C a constant depending on finitely many graph Lipschitz functions defining ∂D .

There are other equivalent norms for Λ^r . For other equivalent norms of Λ^r , see [30, Thm. 1] and [15].

6. $\frac{1}{2}$ -GAIN ESTIMATES FOR LOCAL HOMOTOPY OPERATORS

In this section, we derive the estimates for homotopy operators. We will give precise estimates which are potentially useful for applications. We remark that the local estimates do not require the forms to be $\bar{\partial}$ closed.

We first consider the $(n-q)$ convex case. In this case the result is essentially in [15]. We simplified proof by using Lemma 5.1 which is applicable for C^2 domains.

Theorem 6.1. *Let $r \in (1, \infty)$ and $1 \leq q \leq n-1$. Let (D^1, D^2) be a $(n-q)$ -convex configuration. The homotopy operator H_q in Theorem 3.5 satisfies*

$$(6.1) \quad |H_q \varphi|_{D^1 \cap D_{r_3}^2, r+1/2} \leq C(\partial \rho^1, \partial^2 \rho^1) |\varphi|_{D^{12}, r}, \quad r_1/2 < r_3 < 3r_2/4.$$

Proof. We now derive our main estimate. We will also simplify the proof in [15] by using Lemma 5.1. Recall the homotopy operator

$$H_q\varphi = (H_q^{(1)} + H_q^{(2)})\varphi$$

with

$$H_q^{(1)}\varphi = R_{U_1 \cup D^{12}}^0 E\varphi + R_{U_1}^{01} [\bar{\partial}, E]\varphi.$$

Near the origin, each term in $H_q^{(2)}\varphi$ given by (3.20) is a linear combination of integrals of the form

$$Kf(z) := \int_{S^I} \frac{A(\partial\rho_\zeta^1, \partial_\zeta^2\rho^1, \zeta, z)f(\zeta)}{(g^1 \cdot (\zeta - z))^a (g^2 \cdot (\zeta - z))^b |\zeta - z|^{2c}} dV$$

where f is the coefficients of φ , a, b, c are integers. Note that S^I is one of S_+^1, S^{12}, S^2 . Therefore, the kernel of K is smooth for z close to the origin. We have $|Kf|_{r+1/2} \leq C_r \|f\|_0$. Here and in what follows C_r denotes a constant depending on $\rho, \partial\rho, \partial^2\rho$.

We now estimate the main term $H^{(1)}\varphi$. Decompose it as

$$(6.2) \quad H^{(1)}\varphi = \int_{D^{12} \cup U^1} \Omega_{0,q}^0(z, \zeta) \wedge E\varphi(\zeta) + \int_{U \setminus D} \Omega_{0,q}^{01}(z, \zeta) \wedge [\bar{\partial}, E]\varphi(\zeta).$$

Denote the first integral by $K_1\varphi$. By estimates on Newtonian potential [57], we have

$$|K_1\varphi|_{r+1/2} \leq C|\varphi|_{r-1/2}.$$

Note that the above is proved in [57] when r is not an integer. When it is an integer, the estimate follows the interpolation for the Zygmund spaces. The last integral in (6.18) can be written as a linear combination of

$$(6.3) \quad K_2f := \int_{U \setminus D} f(\zeta) \frac{A(\partial\rho_\zeta^1, \partial_\zeta^2\rho^1, \zeta, z)N_1(\zeta - z)}{\Phi^{n-j}(z, \zeta)|\zeta - z|^{2j}} dV(\zeta), \quad 1 \leq j < n,$$

$$(6.4) \quad \Phi(z, \zeta) = g^1(z, \zeta) \cdot (\zeta - z)$$

where f is a coefficient of the form $[\bar{\partial}, E]\varphi$ and hence

$$(6.5) \quad |f|_{r-1} \leq C|\varphi|_r.$$

Here and in what follows, $N_m(\zeta)$ denotes a monomial of ζ with degree $m \geq 0$. Note that f vanishes on \bar{D} .

Fix $\zeta_0 \in \partial D_1$. We first choose local coordinates such that $s_1(\zeta), s_t(\zeta), t(\zeta) = (t_3, \dots, t_{2n})(\zeta)$ vanishing at ζ_0 , D^1 is defined by $s_1 < 0$, and

$$(6.6) \quad |\Phi(z, \zeta)| \geq c_*(d(z) + s_1(\zeta) + |s_2(\zeta)| + |t(\zeta)|^2),$$

$$(6.7) \quad |\Phi(z, \zeta)| \geq c_*|\zeta - z|^2, \quad |\zeta - z| \geq c_*|t(\zeta)|.$$

Let $r = k + \alpha$ with integer $k \geq 1$ and $0 < \alpha \leq 1$.

Consider first the case that $0 < \alpha < 1/2$. By fundamental theorem of calculus, we have $|f(\zeta)| \leq C|f|_r \text{dist}(\zeta, \partial D_1)^{r-1}$. We have $|\partial^{k+1}Kf(z)| \leq C_r|f|_{r-1}I(z)$, where

$$(6.8) \quad I(z) := \int_{[0,1] \times [-1,1]^{2n-1}} \frac{s_1^{r-1} ds_1 ds_2 dt}{(d(z) + s_1 + |s_2| + |t|^2)^{(n-j)+a} (s_1 + |s_2| + |t|)^{2j+b-1}}$$

with $a + b = k + 1$ and $1 \leq j < 2n$. The worst term occurs when $j = n - 1$ and $a = k + 1$. Therefore, using polar coordinates for $t(\zeta)$ we obtain $I(z) \leq C\tilde{I}(z)$ for

$$\tilde{I}(z) := \int_{[0,1]^3} \frac{s_1^{r-1} ds_1 ds_2 dt}{(d(z) + s_1 + s_2 + t^2)^{k+2}}.$$

We have $\tilde{I}(z) \leq \hat{I}_\alpha(z)$ for

$$(6.9) \quad \hat{I}_\alpha(z) := \int_{t=0}^1 \int_{s_1=0}^1 \int_{s_2=0}^1 \frac{s_1^{\alpha-1} ds_1 ds_2 dt}{(d(z) + s_1 + s_2 + t^2)^2} \leq Cd(z)^{(\alpha+1/2)-1}$$

because $\alpha - 1/2 < 0$. Here we leave the proof of last inequality to the reader, or see similar arguments in the proof of Lemma 6.2 below.

When $\alpha + 1/2 \geq 1$, we use $|\partial^{k+2} Kf(z)| \leq |f|_{r-1} I(z)$ defined by (6.8) in which $a + b = k + 2$. Then $I(z) \leq C\hat{I}_1(z)$ for

$$(6.10) \quad \hat{I}_1(z) := \int \frac{s_1^{r-1} ds_1 ds_2 dt}{(d(z) + s_1(\zeta) + |s_2(\zeta)| + |t(\zeta)|^2)^{k+3}}.$$

We now have $\tilde{I}_1(z) \leq \hat{I}_{\alpha-1}(z) \leq d(z)^{(\alpha+1/2)-2}$ because $(\alpha + 1/2) < 2$. \square

Lemma 6.2. *Let $\beta, \mu_1 \in [0, \infty)$, $\lambda \in \mathbf{R}$, and $0 < \delta < 1$. Suppose*

$$(6.11) \quad \beta' := \beta - \lambda + 1 + \min\{0, (\lambda - \mu_1 + 1)/2 - \epsilon\} < 0$$

and $\epsilon > 0$. Then

$$(6.12) \quad \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \int_{t \in [0,1]^m} \frac{s_1^\beta (\delta + s_1 + s_2 + |t|^2)^{-1-\mu_1}}{(\delta + s_1 + s_2 + |t|)^{m-1+\lambda-\mu_1}} ds_1 ds_2 dt < \begin{cases} C\delta^{\beta'}, & \beta' < 0; \\ C, & \beta' > 0. \end{cases}$$

Proof. We consider the integral in the following regions.

(i) $s_2 > \max\{s_1, \delta, |t|\}$. On this region the integral is less than

$$\int_{s_2 > \delta} \int_{0 < s_1 < s_2} \int_{|t| < s_2} \frac{s_1^\beta}{s_2^{m+\lambda}} dt ds_1 ds_2 \leq C\delta^{\beta-\lambda+2}$$

if $\beta < \lambda - 2$. Also the integral bounded by a constant if $\beta > \lambda - 2$. The same bounds can be obtained for the integral on regions (ii) $s_1 > \max\{\delta, s_2, |t|\}$ and (iii) $\delta > \max\{s_1, s_2, |t|\}$.

(iv). $|t|^2 > \min\{\delta, s_1, s_2\}$. On this region, the integral is less than

$$\int_{\rho > \sqrt{\delta}} \int_{s_1 < \rho^2} \int_{s_2 < \rho^2} \frac{s_1^\beta ds_1 ds_2 d\rho}{\rho^{2(1+\mu_1)+\lambda-\mu_1}} \leq \int_{\rho > \sqrt{\delta}} \rho^{2\beta-\mu_1-\lambda} d\rho < C\delta^{\beta-(\mu_1+\lambda-1)/2}.$$

(v). $|t|^2 < \delta + s_1 + s_2 < |t|$. On this region, the integral is less than

$$(6.13) \quad \int_{(s_1, s_2) \in [0,1]^2} \int_{\delta+s_1+s_2}^{\sqrt{\delta+s_1+s_2}} \frac{s_1^\beta d\rho ds_1 ds_2}{(\delta + s_1 + s_2)^{1+\mu_1} \rho^{\lambda-\mu_1}}.$$

Suppose $\lambda - \mu_1 > 1$. The latter is less than

$$\int_{(s_1, s_2) \in [0,1]^2} \frac{s_1^\beta ds_1 ds_2}{(\delta + s_1 + s_2)^\lambda} < C\delta^{\beta-\lambda+1},$$

for $\beta - \lambda + 1 < 0$. When $\beta - \lambda + 1 \geq 0$, the integral (6.13) is less than

$$\int_{(s_1, s_2) \in [0,1]^2} \frac{s_1^\beta (|\ln(\delta + s_1 + s_2)| + (\delta + s_1 + s_2)^{\frac{\mu_1-\lambda+1}{2}})}{(\delta + s_1 + s_2)^{1+\mu_1}} ds_1 ds_2,$$

which is less than $C_\epsilon \delta^{\beta - (\mu_1 + \lambda - 3)/2 - \epsilon}$ if

$$\beta - (\mu_1 + \lambda - 3)/2 - \epsilon < 0.$$

Thus we can take $\beta' = \min\{\beta - \lambda + 1, \beta - (\mu_1 + \lambda - 3)/2 - \epsilon\}$, which is (6.11). We left the reader to check that when $\beta' > 0$ the integral (6.12) is bounded above by a constant. \square

We need the following

$$(6.14) \quad |uv|_a \leq C(|u|_a \|v\|_0 + \|u\|_0 |v|_a), \quad a \in (0, \infty);$$

$$(6.15) \quad \|u\|_{a+b} \|v\|_{c+d} \leq C_{a,b,c,d} (\|u\|_{a+b+d} \|v\|_d + \|u\|_a \|v\|_{c+b+d})$$

for $a, b, c, d \in [0, \infty)$. For (6.14), see [2, Thm 2.86, p. 104]; for (6.15), see [18].

Theorem 6.3. *Let $r \in (1, \infty)$ and $1 \leq q \leq n - 2$. Let (D^1, D^2, D^3) be a $(q + 1)$ -concave configuration. The homotopy operators H_q in Theorems 4.7 and 4.8 satisfy*

$$(6.16) \quad |H_q \varphi|_{D^1 \cap D_{r_4}^2, r+1/2} \leq C_r (\partial \rho, \partial^2 \rho) (|\rho^1|_{r+5/2} \|\varphi\|_1 + |\varphi|_{D^{12}, r})$$

for $r_1/2 < r_4 < 3r_3/4$. Moreover, $C_r(\partial \rho, \partial^2 \rho)$ is upper-stable under a small C^2 perturbation of ρ

Proof. We now derive our main estimates. Recall the homotopy operator

$$H_q \varphi = (H_q^{(1)} + H_q^{(2)} + H_q^{(3)}) \varphi$$

where φ has type $(0, q)$ and

$$H_q^{(1)} \varphi = R_{U_1 \cup D^{12}}^0 E \varphi + R_{U_1}^{01} [\bar{\partial}, E] \varphi.$$

Near the origin, each term in $H_q^{(2)} \varphi, H_q^{(3)} \varphi$ is a linear combination of integrals of the form

$$K_0 f_0(z) = A(\partial_z^2 \rho^1) \tilde{K}_0 f_0$$

with f_0 being a coefficient of φ , and $A(\partial_z^2 \rho)$ being a polynomial in derivatives of ρ of order at most two. Here \tilde{K}_0 , which involves only $\partial \rho^1$, is defined by

$$\tilde{K}_0 f_0(z) := \int_{S^I} f_0(\zeta) (g^1 \cdot (\zeta - z))^a (g^2 \cdot (\zeta - z))^b (g^3 \cdot (\zeta - z))^c |\zeta - z|^{2d} (\operatorname{Re} \zeta, \operatorname{Im} \zeta)^e dV$$

where a, b, c, d are negative integers and S^I is one of S_+^1, S^{12}, S^2 . Therefore, for the g^i that appear in the kernel, we have

$$|g^i \cdot (\zeta - z)| \geq c_0$$

when $|z|$ is sufficiently small and $\zeta \in S^I$. By (6.14), we have $|\tilde{K}_0 f_0|_{r+1/2} \leq C_r |\rho^1|_{r+3/2} \|f_0\|_0$ and

$$(6.17) \quad |K_0 f_0|_{r+1/2} \leq C |\rho^1|_{r+5/2} \|\tilde{K}_0 f_0\|_0 + C |\tilde{K}_0 f_0|_{r+1/2}.$$

Here and in what follows C_r denotes a constant depending on $\rho, \partial \rho, \partial^2 \rho$. Therefore, we have

$$|K_0 f_0|_{r+1/2} \leq C_r |\rho^1|_{r+5/2} \|f\|_0.$$

We now estimate the main term $H^{(1)} \varphi$. Decompose it as

$$(6.18) \quad H^{(1)} \varphi = \int_{D^{12} \cup U^1} \Omega_{0,q}^0(z, \zeta) \wedge E \varphi(\zeta) + \int_{U \setminus D} \Omega_{0,q}^{01}(z, \zeta) \wedge [\bar{\partial}, E] \varphi(\zeta).$$

Denote the first integral by $K_1 \varphi$. By estimates on Newtonian potential, we have

$$|K_1 \varphi|_{r+1/2} \leq C |\varphi|_{r-1/2}.$$

The last integral in (6.18) can be written as a linear combination of

$$(6.19) \quad K_2 f(z) := \partial_z^2 \rho^1 \tilde{K}_2 f$$

where f is a coefficient of the form $[\bar{\partial}, E]\varphi$ and hence

$$(6.20) \quad |f|_{r-1} \leq C|\varphi|_r.$$

Also $\partial^2 \rho^1$ indicates a derivative of order at most two; and

$$(6.21) \quad \tilde{K}_2 f := \int_{\mathcal{U} \setminus D} f(\zeta) \frac{A(z, \zeta) N_1(\zeta - z)}{\Phi^{n-j}(z, \zeta) |\zeta - z|^{2j}} dV(\zeta), \quad 1 \leq j < n,$$

$$(6.22) \quad \Phi(z, \zeta) = g^1(z, \zeta) \cdot (\zeta - z).$$

Here and in what follows, $N_m(\zeta)$ denotes a monomial of ζ with degree $m \geq 0$. Also, $A(z, \zeta)$ is a monomial in z, ζ . Note that f vanishes on \bar{D} .

We have

$$|K_2 f|_{r+1/2} \leq C_r (|\rho^1|_{r+5/2} \|\tilde{K}_2 f\|_0 + |\tilde{K}_2 f|_{r+1/2}).$$

We have $\|\tilde{K}_2 f\|_{1/2} \leq C\|f\|_0$, by the estimate in Theorem 6.1. For later purpose we note that this also gives us

$$(6.23) \quad \|K_2 f\|_0 \leq C\|f\|_0.$$

The rest of the proof is devoted to the proof of

$$(6.24) \quad |\tilde{K}_2 f|_{r+1/2} \leq C_r (\|\rho^1\|_{r+2} \|f\|_0 + |f|_{r-1}), \quad r > 1.$$

Then combining above estimates yields the proof for (6.16).

A technical difficulty to prove (6.24) is that we do not have a version of (6.15) for Zygmund norms. Therefore, we must use (6.15) as a substitute to treat Zygmund norms. The computation is tedious and our main observation is that the kernel of \tilde{K} involves only $\partial^1 \rho$ instead of $\partial^2 \rho$. Therefore, (6.15) is still good enough to derive (6.24) which is a crude estimate.

Let $r = k + \alpha$ with integer $k \geq 1$ and $0 < \alpha \leq 1$. In the following cases, we will apply Lemma 6.2 several times. For clarity, we will call values (β, β', λ) as $(\beta_i, \beta'_i, \lambda_i)$ when we use the lemma.

(i) $0 < \alpha < 1/2$. Recall that the kernel of K_2 involves only first-order derivatives of ρ^1 in z -variables and it does not involve ζ -derivatives of ρ^1 . The expansion of Φ^1 contains some $\zeta_j - z_j$. Since $\rho^1 \in \Lambda^{k+\alpha+5/2} \subset C^{k+2}$, we therefore express $\partial_z^{k+1} \tilde{K}_2 f$ as a sum of

$$(6.25) \quad K_{\mu, \nu}^{(k+1)} f := \partial_z^{1+\nu'_1} \rho^1 \cdots \partial_z^{1+\nu'_{\mu_1}} \rho^1 K_\mu f$$

with

$$(6.26) \quad K_\mu f(z) := \int_{U^1} \frac{f(\zeta) N_{1-\mu_0+\mu_1-\nu''_1-\cdots-\nu''_{\mu_1}+\mu_2}(\zeta - z)}{(\Phi^1(z, \zeta))^{n-j+\mu_1} |\zeta - z|^{2j+2\mu_2}} dV.$$

Here $1 \leq j < n$, $\nu''_i = 0, 1$, and

$$(6.27) \quad \mu_0 + \mu_1 + \mu_2 + \sum (\nu'_i + \nu''_i) \leq k + 1.$$

To estimate (6.25), we use the facts that $z \in D$ and $\zeta \in U$ and

$$C|\zeta - z| \geq |\Phi^1(\zeta, z)| \geq \text{dist}(z, \partial D) + \text{dist}(\zeta, \partial D) + |\text{Im} \Phi^1(\zeta, z)| + |\zeta - z|^2.$$

Consequently, the worst term for $K_\mu f$ occurs when $j = n - 1$, which we now assume.

We want to show that

$$(6.28) \quad |K_\mu f(z)| \leq |f|_{\beta_1} \text{dist}(z)^{\beta'_1}, \quad \beta'_1 := \alpha - 1/2$$

where $\beta_1 \geq 0$ is to be specified. The case all $\nu'_i = 0, 1$ can be estimated as in Theorem 6.1, for $\beta_1 = \mu_0 + \mu_1 + \mu_2 - 1 + \alpha \leq r - 1$. Thus we may assume that all $\nu'_i \geq 2$ for $1 \leq i \leq \mu'_1$, $\nu'_i = 0, 1$ for $i > \mu'_1$, and $\mu'_1 > 0$. Define

$$(6.29) \quad \lambda := \mu_0 + \mu_2 + \sum \nu''_i.$$

We have $\mu_1 \geq \mu'_1 \geq 1$. By Lemma 6.2 with $\beta'_1 = \alpha - 1/2 < 0$, we need to find $\beta_1 \geq 0$ satisfying

$$(6.30) \quad \beta'_1 \leq \beta_1 - \lambda + 1 + \min\{0, (\lambda - \mu_1 + 1)/2 - \epsilon\} < 0.$$

Thus we take

$$(6.31) \quad \beta_1 = \max\{0, \alpha - 3/2 + \lambda - \min\{0, (\lambda - \mu_1 + 1)/2 - \epsilon\}\}.$$

We obtain

$$|K_{\mu, \nu}^{(k+1)} f(z)| \leq C \|\rho^1\|_{1+\nu_1} \cdots \|\rho^1\|_{1+\nu_{\mu_1}} \|f\|_{\beta_1} \text{dist}(z, \partial\Omega)^{\alpha-1/2}.$$

For $i > \mu'_1$, we use $\|\rho^1\|_{1+\nu'_i} \leq \|\rho^1\|_2$.

By (6.15), we have

$$(6.32) \quad \|\rho^1\|_{1+\nu'_1} \cdots \|\rho^1\|_{1+\nu'_{\mu'_1}} \|f\|_{\beta_1} \leq C(\|\rho^1\|_2) \{\|\rho^1\|_{s_1+2} \|f\|_0 + \|f\|_{s_1}\}$$

for $s_1 := \beta_1 + \sum_{i \leq \mu'_1} (\nu'_i - 1) = \beta_1 - \mu'_1 + \sum \nu'_i$. Recall that $\mu_1 \geq \mu'_1 \geq 1$. We have

$$(6.33) \quad s_1 = \beta_1 - \mu'_1 + \sum \nu'_i \leq k + 1 + \beta_1 - \mu'_1 - \mu_1.$$

Thus $s_1 < r - 1$ when $\beta_1 = 0$. Suppose $\beta_1 > 0$. Then $s_1 = \alpha - 3/2 + \lambda - \mu'_1 + \sum \nu'_i - \min\{0, (\lambda - \mu_1 + 1)/2 - \epsilon\}$. When $\lambda > \mu_1 - 1$, we have

$$(6.34) \quad s_1 \leq \alpha - 3/2 + \lambda - \mu'_1 + \sum_{i \leq \mu'_1} \nu'_i < r - 1.$$

When $0 \leq \lambda \leq \mu_1 - 1$, in view of $\mu_1 \geq \mu'_1 \geq 1$ we get

$$(6.35) \quad \begin{aligned} s_1 &\leq \alpha - 3/2 + \lambda - \mu'_1 - (\lambda - \mu_1 + 1)/2 + \sum \nu'_i + \epsilon \\ &\leq r - \mu'_1 - \mu_1/2 - \lambda/2 + \epsilon < r - 1. \end{aligned}$$

(iii) $1/2 < \alpha \leq 1$. In this case we can take an extra derivative since $\rho^1 \in \Lambda^{k+\alpha+5/2} \subset C^{k+3}$. Write $\partial_z^{k+2} \tilde{K}_2 f$ as a sum of

$$K_{\mu, \nu}^{(k+2)} f := \partial_z^{1+\nu'_1} \rho^1 \cdots \partial_z^{1+\nu'_{\mu'_1}} \rho^1 K_\mu f$$

where $K_\mu f$ is defined by (6.28) with $1 \leq j < n$ and

$$(6.36) \quad \mu_0 + \mu_1 + \mu_2 + \sum (\nu'_i + \nu''_i) \leq k + 2.$$

As before, the worst term occurs for $j = n - 1$ in K_μ , which is assumed now. We need to show that

$$(6.37) \quad |K_{\mu, \nu}^{(k+2)} f(z)| \leq C |f|_{\beta_2} \text{dist}(z, \partial\Omega)^{\beta'_2}, \quad \beta'_2 = \alpha - 3/2$$

for β_2 to be specified. The case that all $\nu'_i \leq 1$ can be estimated as in the proof of Theorem 6.1, for $\beta_2 = r - 1$. Suppose now $\nu'_i \geq 2$ for $i \leq \mu'_1$ with $\mu'_1 \geq 1$, and $\nu'_i > 0$ for $i > \mu'_1$. Recall that λ is defined by (6.29). In particular, $\lambda \leq k + 1$.

With $\beta'_2 = \alpha - 3/2$, we take

$$(6.38) \quad \beta_2 = \max\{0, \alpha - 5/2 + \lambda - \min\{0, (\lambda - \mu_1 + 1)/2 - \epsilon\}\}.$$

Set $s_2 := \beta_2 - 1 + \sum_{i \leq \mu'_1} (\nu'_i - 1)$. When $\beta_2 = 0$, we have $s_2 < r - 1$ by analogue of (6.33). Suppose $\beta_2 > 0$. We have $s_2 = \alpha - 7/2 + \lambda - \mu_1 - \min\{0, (\lambda - \mu_1 + 1)/2 - \epsilon\} + \sum_{i \leq \mu'_1} \nu'_i$. Using $\mu_1 \geq \mu'_1 \geq 1$, we can verify (6.32) where s_1 is replaced by $s_2 < r - 1$.

(iii) $\alpha = 1/2$. We need to estimate $|K_1 f|_{r+1/2}$ with $r + 1/2 = k + 1$. Recall that $\rho^1 \in \Lambda^{k+3}$. We write $\partial^k K_1 f$ as a sum of $K_{\mu, \nu}^{(k)} f$ defined by (6.28) with $1 \leq j < n$ and

$$(6.39) \quad \mu_0 + \mu_1 + \mu_2 + \sum (\nu'_i + \nu''_i) \leq k.$$

As before, the worst term occurs for $j = n - 1$ in K_{μ} , which is assumed now.

Consider case $\mu_1 \geq 1$. Then $\lambda \leq k - 1$. By (6.14), we have

$$(6.40) \quad |K_{\mu, \nu}^{(k)} f|_1 \leq |\partial^{1+\nu'_1} \rho^1 \dots \partial^{1+\nu'_{\mu'_1}} \rho^1|_1 \|K_{\mu} f\|_0 \\ + \|\partial^{1+\nu'_1} \rho^1 \dots \partial^{1+\nu'_{\mu'_1}} \rho^1\|_0 |K_{\mu} f|_1 =: I + II.$$

We first estimate I . We have $\|K_{\mu} f\|_0 \leq \|K_{\mu} f\|_{\beta'_3} \leq C \|f\|_{\beta_3}$ for $\beta'_3 = \epsilon$, $\beta_3 \geq 0$ and

$$\beta'_3 \leq \beta_3 - \lambda + 1 + \min\{0, (\lambda - \mu_1 + 1)/2 - \epsilon\} > 0.$$

We take

$$\beta_3 = \max\{0, \lambda - 1 - \min\{0, (\lambda - \mu_1 + 1)/2 + \epsilon\} + \epsilon\}.$$

We have $\|\partial^{1+\nu'_1} \rho^1 \dots \partial^{1+\nu'_{\mu'_1}} \rho^1\|_1 \|f\|_{\beta_3} \leq C \|\rho^1\|_{s_3+2} \|f\|_0 + C \|f\|_{s_3}$ with

$$s_3 := \beta_3 - \mu'_1 + \sum_{i \leq \mu'_1} \nu'_i.$$

By analogue of (6.33), we have $s_3 < r - 1$ when $\beta_3 = 0$. Suppose $\beta_3 > 0$. Then

$$s_3 = \lambda - 1 - \mu'_1 + \sum \nu'_i - \min\{0, (\lambda - \mu_1 + 1)/2 - \epsilon\} + \epsilon < r - 1,$$

which is verified by analogue of (6.34)-(6.35). To estimate II , by Lemma 6.2, we have $|K_{\mu} f|_1 \leq \|f\|_{\beta_4}$ for $\beta_4 \geq 0$ and

$$-1 \leq \beta_4 - \lambda + 1 + \min\{0, (\lambda - \mu_1 + 1)/2\}.$$

Then $\beta_4 = \max\{0, \lambda - 2 - \min\{0, (\lambda - \mu_1 + 1)/2 - \epsilon\}\}$. We obtain

$$\|\partial^{1+\nu'_1} \rho^1 \dots \partial^{1+\nu'_{\mu'_1}} \rho^1\|_1 \|f\|_{\beta_4} \leq \|\rho^1\|_{s_4+2} \|f\|_0 + \|f\|_{s_4}$$

with $s_4 := \beta_4 - \mu'_1 + \sum_{i \leq \mu'_1} \nu'_i + \epsilon$. When $\beta_4 = 0$, we get $s_4 < r - 1$. Suppose $\beta_4 > 0$. Then

$$s_4 = \lambda - 2 - \min\{0, (\lambda - \mu_1 + 1)/2 - \epsilon\} - \mu'_1 + \sum_{i \leq \mu'_1} \nu'_i + \epsilon.$$

We can verify that $s_4 < r - 1$ when $\lambda < \mu_1 - 1$. When $\lambda \geq \mu_1 - 1$, we also have

$$s_4 = \lambda - 2 - (\lambda - \mu_1 + 1)/2 - \mu'_1 + \sum_{i \leq \mu'_1} \nu'_i + 2\epsilon \leq k - 5/2 - \mu_1/2 - \mu'_1 + 2\epsilon < r - 1.$$

Consider the case $\mu_1 = 0$. Write $\partial_z^2 K_{\mu} f$ as a sum of

$$\partial_z^3 \rho^1 K_{\bar{\mu}+\mu} f, \quad \partial^2 \rho^1 K_{\bar{\mu}+\mu} f.$$

For the last term, by interpolation, we have

$$|K_{\tilde{\mu}+\mu}f(z)| \leq |f|_{r-1}d(z)^{-1}.$$

This gives us the estimate for $\partial^2\rho^1 K_{\tilde{\mu}+\mu}f$.

For the first term, Lemma 6.2 implies that $|K_{\tilde{\mu}+\mu}f(z)| \leq C\|f\|_{\beta_5}d(z)^{-1}$ for $\beta_5 \geq 0$ and

$$\beta_5 := \max\{0, (\lambda + \tilde{\lambda}) + \tilde{\mu}_2 - 2 - \min\{0, (\lambda + \tilde{\lambda} - \mu_1 - \tilde{\mu}_1 + 1)/2 + \epsilon\}\}.$$

We have $\tilde{\mu}_1 = 1$, $\tilde{\mu}_0 = \tilde{\mu}_2 = \tilde{\nu}_1'' = 0$, $\tilde{\lambda} = 0$. Thus $\beta_5 = \max\{0, \lambda - 2 - \min\{0, \lambda/2 - \epsilon\}\}$. When $\beta_5 = 0$, we obtain $|\partial_z^3\rho^1 K_{\tilde{\mu}+\mu}(z)| \leq C\|\rho^1\|_3\|f\|_0d(z)^{-1}$, while $\|\rho^1\|_3\|f\|_0 \leq C|\rho^1|_{r+5/2}\|f\|_0$. When $\beta_5 > 0$, we have $\lambda > 2$ and $\beta_5 \leq \lambda - 2 \leq k - 2 < r - 5/2 + \epsilon'$ for a small $\epsilon' > 0$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho^1\|_3\|f\|_{r-5/2+\epsilon'} &\leq C\|\rho^1\|_{r+1/2+\epsilon'}\|f\|_0 + C\|\rho^1\|_2\|f\|_{r-3/2+\epsilon'} \\ &\leq C|\rho^1|_{r+5/2}\|f\|_0 + C|f|_{r-1}. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

7. AN ESTIMATE OF $\bar{\partial}$ SOLUTION FOR $(0, 1)$ FORMS VIA HARTOGS'S THEOREM

In this section we obtain the regularity of functional $\bar{\partial}$ -solutions for $(0, 1)$ -forms can be achieved via Hartogs' theorem for concavity domains that require merely C^2 boundary. Here we need 2-concavity. We will only prove the regularity for local solutions.

Let $D \subset U$ be defined by $\rho < 0$. Suppose that $U \cap \partial D$ is strictly 2-concave. For each $\zeta \in \partial D$, we can apply local biholomorphic map ψ_ζ such that $\rho \circ \psi_\zeta = a_\zeta\rho_\zeta$ has the form

$$(7.1) \quad \rho_\zeta(z) = -y_n - 3|z_1|^2 - 3|z_2|^2 + \sum_{j>2} \lambda_j|z_j|^2 + o(|z|^2).$$

Then $D_\zeta := \psi_\zeta(D)$ contains $D_\epsilon = \{z \in \Delta_\epsilon^n : \tilde{\rho}(z) < 0\}$, where

$$(7.2) \quad \tilde{\rho}(z) = -y_n - 2|z_1|^2 - 2|z_2|^2 + 2\sum_{j=3}^n |z_j|^2.$$

Both D_ζ, D_ϵ share a Hartogs's subdomain $H_\epsilon = \{z \in \Delta_\epsilon^n : \hat{\rho}(z) < 0\}$, where

$$\hat{\rho} = -y_n - |z_1|^2 + \sum_{j=2}^n (1 + \lambda_j)|z_j|^2.$$

Note that $\partial D \cap \partial H_\epsilon = \{0\}$. We want to show that if $f \in \Lambda_r(\bar{D})$, any solution u to $\bar{\partial}u = f$ on D is in $\Lambda_{r+1/2}$ on $D \cap B_\epsilon(\zeta)$ for $\zeta \in \partial D$ and small ϵ .

We remark that the $C^{1/2}$ estimate in [23, Thm. 14.1] seems to require $\partial D \in C^{5/2}$ to repeat the proof of [23, Thm. 9.1], while the latter needs $\rho \in C^2$ for the estimates. Let us first produce a solution $u_0 \in C^0(\bar{D})$ for $\partial D \in C^2$. For instance, we can take the solution in [23, Thm. 13.10, p. 127] or our solutions with the C^0 estimate for C^2 boundary given by (6.23).

Since $\partial\tilde{D}_\epsilon$ is smooth, we have a solution u on \tilde{D}_ϵ such that $\bar{\partial}u = f$ and $u \in \Lambda_{r+1/2}$. Then $u_0 - u$ admits a holomorphic extension h to

$$(7.3) \quad \hat{D}_\epsilon := D_\epsilon \cup \Delta_\delta^n.$$

On D_ϵ , we now know that $u_0 \in \Lambda^{r+1/2}(D_\epsilon)$. We can write

$$\partial_{x_j}u_0 = \partial_{x_j}u + \partial_{x_j}h.$$

We have C^0 estimates for u_0, u and h . By Cauchy formula, we have

$$h(z) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{|\zeta_1|=1} \frac{h(\zeta_1, z')}{\zeta_1 - z_1} d\zeta_1.$$

This gives estimate for higher order derivatives of $\partial_{z_1}^k h$. Similarly, we can obtain higher order derivatives of $\partial_v h$ for any directions v that are small perturbations of the unit vector $(1, 0, \dots, 0)$. Now these small perturbations span all unit vectors. Therefore, we can get the desired estimates for partial derivatives of order $m < r + 1/2$, where $m = [r + 1/2]$ if $r + 1/2$ is not an integer, or $m = r - 1/2$. Thus $\alpha = r + 1/2 - m \in (0, 1]$.

Next we need to estimate the Λ^α norms of m -th derivatives of u_0 . Set $v = \partial^m u_0$. It remains to estimate $v(z+w) + v(z-w) - 2v(z)$ when $z, z \pm w \in D$.

We may assume that z is sufficiently close to the origin and $|w|$ is small. Let $z^* \in \partial D$ be the closed point to z . Suppose $\delta = |w|$ is small. Let $\tilde{w} = \delta(z - z^*)/|z - z^*|$. Since ∂D_{z^*} is tangent to ∂D at z^* , then $z + t\tilde{w}$ and $z \pm w + t'\tilde{w} \in D_{z^*}$ for $t \in (0, 2)$ and $t' \in [1, 2]$. We now use decomposition (5.5) and get

$$\begin{aligned} (7.4) \quad & v(z+w) + v(z-w) - 2v(z) \\ &= 2v(z+w+\tilde{w}) + 2v(z-w+\tilde{w}) - 4v(z+w+\tilde{w}) \\ &\quad - v(z-w+2\tilde{w}) - v(z+w+2\tilde{w}) + 2v(z+2\tilde{w}) \\ &\quad + v(z-w) + v(z-w+2\tilde{w}) - 2v(z-w+\tilde{w}) \\ &\quad + v(z+w) + v(z+w+2\tilde{w}) - 2v(z+w+\tilde{w}) \\ &\quad - 2v(z) - 2v(z+2\tilde{w}) + 4v(z+\tilde{w}). \end{aligned}$$

We can estimate each row because the triple points in each row are in some smooth domain D_ζ for some ζ . We have obtained the Hölder ratio estimate for v . This finishes the proof of Theorem 1.1 (a) for its local version.

8. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1 VIA CANONICAL SOLUTIONS

The proof of regularity of the solutions from local to global uses some standard approaches. See Kerzman [31] for the case when D is a domain in \mathbf{C}^n . We will also derive an global estimate reflecting the norm convexity and this estimate will be used in the next section to prove Theorem 1.2.

We start with the following.

Lemma 8.1. *Let $D \subset X$ be a domain defined by a C^2 function $\rho < 0$ and let D_a be defined by $\rho < a$. Let $\rho_t = S_t \rho$, where S_t is the Moser smoothing operator. Suppose that ∂D is an q_q domain. Let D_a^t be defined by $\rho_t < a$. There exists $t_0 = t_0(\partial^2 \rho) > 0$ and $C > 1 > c > 0$ such that if $0 \leq t < t_0$, then*

$$(8.1) \quad \partial D_{-t}^t \subset D_{-ct} \setminus D_{-Ct} \quad \partial D_t^t \subset D_{Ct} \setminus D_{ct}$$

while D_b and D_b^t still satisfy the condition a_q for $b \in (-t_0, t_0)$.

Proof. Let $\rho_t = S_t \rho$. We have $\|\rho_t - \rho\|_0 \leq Ct^2 \|\rho\|_2$. This shows that

$$(8.2) \quad \text{dist}(\partial D_s^t, \partial D_s) < C_2 t^2.$$

When $|s|, |s'|$ are sufficiently small and $s' > s$, we also have

$$c_1(s' - s) \leq \text{dist}(D_s, \partial D_{s'}) \leq C_1(s' - s), \quad c_1(s' - s) \leq \text{dist}(D_s^t, \partial D_{s'}^t) \leq C_1(s' - s).$$

Thus (8.2) implies that

$$(8.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{dist}(\partial D_t^t, D) &\geq \text{dist}(\partial D_t, D) - \text{dist}(\partial D_t^t, \partial D_t) \\ &\geq c_1 t - C_2 t^2 > c_1 t/2. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose $L_\zeta \rho$ has $(q+1)$ negative Levi eigenvalues bounded above by $-\lambda$ or $(n-q)$ positive Levi eigenvalues bounded below by λ for $\zeta \in U$, where U is neighborhood of ∂D and λ is positive number. We have $\|\rho_t - \rho\|_{C^2(U)} \leq \epsilon$ when $t < t_0$ and $\zeta \in U$. We find a subspace W of $T_\zeta^{1,0} \partial D$ dimension $q+1$ such $L\rho(\zeta, v) \leq -\lambda$ for v in the unit sphere of W . Projecting W onto $\tilde{W} \subset T_{\tilde{\zeta}}^{(1,0)} \partial D_a^t$ when $\tilde{\zeta} \in \partial D_a^t$ is sufficiently close to ζ and t is close to zero. Then $\dim W \geq q+1$ and $L\rho(\tilde{\zeta}, v) \leq -\lambda/2$ for \tilde{v} in the unit sphere of \tilde{W} . One can also verify that if $L_\zeta \rho$ has at least $(n-q)$ positive eigenvalues, so is $L_{\tilde{\zeta}} \rho^t$ when $\tilde{\zeta}$ is sufficiently close to ζ . Therefore, D_a^t still satisfies the condition a_q . \square

We now formulate the main result of this paper in details.

Theorem 8.2. *Let $r \in (0, \infty]$ and $q \geq 1$. Let $D: \rho < 0$ be a relatively compact domain with C^2 boundary in a complex manifold X satisfying the condition a_q . Let V be a holomorphic vector bundle of finite rank over X . Then there exists a linear $\bar{\partial}$ solution operator $H_q: \Lambda_{(0,q)}^r(D, V) \cap \bar{\partial} L_{loc}^2(D, V) \rightarrow \Lambda_{(0,q-1)}^{r'}(D, V)$ satisfying the following*

- (i) *When $q = 1$ or ∂D is strictly $(n-q)$ convex, we have $|H_q f|_{r+1/2} \leq C_r(\rho, \partial\rho, \partial^2\rho) |f|_r$*
 - (ii) *When $q > 1$ and $r' = r + 1/2$ and $\partial D \in \Lambda^{r+\frac{5}{2}}$, we have*
- $$(8.4) \quad |H_q f|_{r+1/2} \leq C_r(\rho, \partial\rho, \partial^2\rho) (|\rho|_{r+5/2} \|f\|_1 + |f|_r).$$

- (iii) *In both cases, $H_q f \in C^\infty(\bar{D})$ when $f \in C^\infty(\bar{D})$.*

Furthermore, the constant $C_r(\rho, \partial\rho, \partial^2\rho)$ is upper-stable under small C^2 perturbations of ρ ; more precisely there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that if $\|\tilde{\rho} - \rho\|_2 < \epsilon$, then

$$(8.5) \quad C_r(\tilde{\rho}, \partial\tilde{\rho}, \partial^2\tilde{\rho}) < C_r C_r(\rho, \partial\rho, \partial^2\rho).$$

We emphasize that $C_r(\rho, \partial\rho, \partial^2\rho)$ involves an unknown constant that is C_* from Theorem B.10.

Remark 8.3. The stability of estimates on $\bar{\partial}$ solutions has been discussed extensively in literature; see Greene-Krantz [20] for strictly pseudoconvex domains in \mathbf{C}^n , Lieb-Michel [39] strictly pseudoconvex domains with smooth boundary in a complex manifold. The stability in terms (8.5) is called upper-stability in Gan-Gong [13] where the reader can find a version of lower stability and its use.

Proof. The proof is a combination of the following: the local regularity results obtained, Grauert's bumping method, the stability of solvability of the $\bar{\partial}$ -equation after the bumping is applied [26, Thm. 3.4.1] (see Theorem B.10 for the vector bundle version), and the interior estimates of $\bar{\partial}$ -solutions on Kohn's canonical solution.

We will complete the proof in three steps.

Step 1. Reduction to interior regularity. Let D be a relatively compact subset of \mathcal{U} , defined by $\rho < 0$ in \mathcal{U} in \mathbf{C}^n with $|\rho|_{C^{5/2}(\mathcal{U})} < \infty$ and $\nabla\rho \neq 0$ on ∂D . For each

$p \in \partial D$, we have a configuration $(D, U_p, \psi_p, \rho_p^1)$. Consider the domain

$$(8.6) \quad \omega'_p := \psi_p^{-1}(D_p^1 \cap D_{r_2/2}^2).$$

Let $\chi \geq 0$ be a smooth cut-off function with compact support in B_{r_2} such that χ equals 1 on $B_{r_2/2}$. Thus $\omega'_p \cap D$ is contained in $\psi_p^{-1}(D_p^{12})$. On $D_p^1 \cap D_{r_2}^2$, we solve the $\bar{\partial}$ equation $\bar{\partial}u = (\psi_p^{-1})^* f$ with $u \in \Lambda^r(D_p^1)$. Then $f_1 = f - \psi_p^* \bar{\partial}(\chi u_p)$ is still in Λ^r as

$$(\psi_p^{-1})^* f - \bar{\partial}(\chi u_p) = (1 - \chi)(\psi_p^{-1})^* f - \bar{\partial}\chi \wedge u_p.$$

In fact, setting $f_1 = 0$ on $X \setminus D$, we have $f_1 \in \Lambda^r(D \cup \tilde{B}_{r_2/2}(p))$ for $\tilde{B}_{r_2/2}(p) = \psi_p^{-1}(B_{r_2/2})$. Let D_p be defined by $\rho_p := \rho - \epsilon \chi \circ \psi_p < 0$. When ϵ is sufficiently small, D_p satisfies the condition a_q , while

$$D \cup \omega_p \subset D_p \subset D \cup \tilde{B}_{r_2/2}(p).$$

Here ω_p is an open set containing p . Note that the size of ω_p can be chosen uniformly in $\tilde{\rho}^0$ when $\|\tilde{\rho}^0 - \rho^0\|_2 < \delta$, which depends on the modulus of continuity of $\partial^2 \rho^0$ and the ϵ .

As in [16, 39], we find finitely many $p_1, \dots, p_m \in \partial D$ so that $\{\omega_{p_1}, \dots, \omega_{p_m}\}$ covers $\partial\Omega$ and $\sum \chi \circ \psi_{p_j} > 0$ on $\partial\Omega$. With $\rho_0 = \rho$, $D_0 = D$ and $\epsilon > 0$, set

$$(8.7) \quad \rho_j = \rho_{j-1} - \epsilon \chi \circ \psi_{p_j}$$

and $D_j := (D_{j-1})_{p_j}$: $\rho_j < 0$ for $j \geq 1$. We have $D_j \setminus D_{j-1} \subset \tilde{B}_{r_2}(p_j)$. Also, D_j contains $D \cup \omega_{p_j}$ and $D_j \subset D_{j+1}$. Hence D_m contains \bar{D} . Finally, we should choose a small ϵ that $\|\rho_j - \rho\|_2$ are sufficiently small for $j = 1, \dots, m$ in order to apply the stability results in Lemmas 3.1 and 4.1. Using the $\bar{\partial}$ -solution operator T_j for the configuration $(\psi_{p_j} D_j, D_j^2)$ with $\bar{\partial}T_j(\psi_{p_j}^{-1})^* f_j = f_j$, we define

$$f_{j+1} = f_j - \bar{\partial}\{\psi_{p_j}^*(\chi(T_j \psi_{p_j}^{-1})^* f_j)\}.$$

Then $f_m \in \Lambda^r(D_m)$ is $\bar{\partial}$ closed on D_m . We remark that $f \mapsto u_m$ is a linear operator $\mathcal{G}_D: \Lambda^r(D) \cap \ker \bar{\partial} \rightarrow \Lambda^r(D_m) \cap \ker \bar{\partial}$, and \mathcal{G}_D is independent of r .

We write

$$(8.8) \quad f = \bar{\partial}u_m + f_m, \quad u_m = \sum \psi_{p_j}^*(\chi(T_j \psi_{p_j}^{-1})^* f_j).$$

Therefore, we focus on the $\bar{\partial}$ equation for a *fixed* a_q domain Ω such that

$$(8.9) \quad \Omega_{-c_*} \subset \tilde{D} \subset \Omega = D_{c_*} \subset \tilde{D}_m$$

where \tilde{D} is any small C^2 perturbations of D depending on c_* which is a small positive number. We will apply Theorem B.10 to this domain Ω with c_* being as in Theorem B.10. In what follows, \tilde{D}, \tilde{D}_m is denoted by D, D_m respectively.

We also need to estimate the norms for f_m . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_{j+1}\|_0 &\leq C(D_j)\|f_j\|_0, \\ |u_{j+1}|_{r+1/2} &\leq C(D_j)(\|f_j\|_r + |\rho_j|_{r+5/2}\|f_j\|_1), \\ |f_{j+1}|_r &\leq C(D_j)(\|f_j\|_r + |\rho_j|_{r+5/2}\|f_j\|_1). \end{aligned}$$

By (8.7), we have $|\rho|_{r+5/2} \leq C_{j,r}(1 + |\rho|_{r+5/2}) \leq 2C_{j,r}|\rho|_{r+5/2}$. Thus,

$$(8.10) \quad \|f_m\|_0 \leq C\|f\|_0, \quad |f_m|_r \leq C(D)|f|_r + C(D_j)|\rho|_{r+5/2}\|f\|_1,$$

$$(8.11) \quad \|u_m\|_0 \leq \|f\|_0, \quad |u_m|_r \leq C(D)|f|_r + C(D_j)|\rho|_{r+5/2}\|f\|_1.$$

Step 2. Smoothing for interior regularity. To obtain the interior regularity, we will use regularity in Sobolev spaces. We need to avoid the loss in Hölder exponent from the Sobolev embedding. To this end, we will again use a partition of unity to overcome the loss. We can make f_m to be C^∞ on any relatively compact subdomain U' of U via local solutions as follows. Fix $x_0 \in D$. We solve $\bar{\partial}u = f_m$ on an open set D containing x_0 . Let χ be a smooth function with compact support in ω such that $\chi = 1$ on a neighborhood ω' of x_0 . Then $\tilde{f} = f_m - \bar{\partial}(\chi u) = (1 - \chi)f_m + \bar{\partial}\chi \wedge u$ is still in Λ^r , while $\tilde{f} = 0$ on ω' . In particular, $\tilde{f} \in C^\infty(\omega')$. Repeating this finitely many times, we can find $\tilde{u} \in \Lambda^{r+1}(D)$ with compact support in D such that

$$(8.12) \quad \tilde{f} = f_m - \bar{\partial}\tilde{u} \in C^\infty(D').$$

We can also obtain

$$\|\tilde{f}\|_{\Lambda^{r'}(D')} \leq C_r \|f_m\|_{\Lambda^r}, \quad \|\tilde{u}\|_{\Lambda^{r+1}(D')} \leq C_{r'} \|f_m\|_{\Lambda^r}$$

for any relatively compact subset D' of D and any $r' > r$. We may assume that D' is a smooth domain satisfying the condition a_q . Furthermore, the defining function ρ' of D' satisfies $\|\rho'\|_a \leq C_a \|\rho\|_2$. Rename D', ρ' as D, ρ .

Step 3. Interior regularity with estimates. Let $\varphi = e^{\tau\rho}$, where $\rho = -\text{dist}_{\partial\Omega}$. Let $L_{p,q}(\Omega, V, \varphi)$ be the space of V -valued (p, q) forms f on Ω such that

$$\|f\|_\varphi^2 := \int_\Omega |f(x)|^2 e^{-\varphi(x)} dv(x) < \infty,$$

where dv is a volume form on X . Write $\|f\|_\varphi$ as $\|f\|$ when $\varphi = 0$.

As mentioned early, we want to apply [26, Thm. 3.4.6], and in fact Theorem B.10 for the vector bundle version to $\Omega = D_{c_*}$. Then φ satisfies condition a_q on $\Omega_{c_*} \setminus \Omega_{-c_*}$. Let $\varphi_k = \chi_k(\varphi)$. Fix k to be sufficiently large and let $\tilde{\varphi} = \varphi_k$. We now consider $T_q = \bar{\partial}$ as densely defined from $L^2_{(0,q-1)}(\Omega, \tilde{\varphi})$ into $L^2_{(0,q)}(\Omega, \tilde{\varphi})$ and T_q^* its adjoint. Let f_m be the $(0, q)$ form derived in Step 1. By Theorem B.10, we find a solution u_0 satisfying $\bar{\partial}u_0 = f_m$ on Ω and

$$\|u_0\|_{\varphi_{k_*}} \leq C_* \|f_m\|_{\varphi_{k_*}}.$$

For the estimate, we need Kohn's canonical solutions. By [26, Thm. 1.1.1], $R_{T_q^*}$ is also closed and $R_{T_q^*} = N_{T_q}^\perp$. We now apply the decomposition

$$(8.13) \quad u_0 = u + h, \quad u \in N_{T_q}^\perp, \quad h \in N_{T_q}.$$

Thus, $u = (T_q^\varphi)^*v$ and

$$(8.14) \quad \|u\|_{\varphi_{k_*}} \leq \|u_0\|_{\varphi_{k_*}} \leq C_* \|f_m\|_{\varphi_{k_*}}.$$

In particular, in the sense of distributions, we have $\vartheta_q^\varphi v = u$ on D . Here ϑ_q^φ is the formal adjoint (acting on test forms) of $\bar{\partial}_q$ in the L^2 spaces with weight φ . Since $\vartheta_{q-1}^\varphi \vartheta_q^\varphi = 0$, we get in the sense of distributions

$$(8.15) \quad \theta_{q-1}^\varphi u = 0.$$

We now use the system of elliptic equations for u to derive the *interior* estimates, using (8.14).

Let $\|\cdot\| := \|\cdot\|_{\Omega; k, p}$ denote the norm for space $W^{k, p}(\Omega)$. In local holomorphic coordinates z , we have for $u = \sum u_J d\bar{z}^J$

$$(8.16) \quad \bar{\partial}u = \sum \frac{\partial u_J}{\partial \bar{z}_k} d\bar{z}_k \wedge d\bar{z}^J, \quad \vartheta_{q-1}^\varphi u = - \sum \left(\frac{\partial u_{jK}}{\partial z_j} + c_{jJK}(\partial\varphi)u_J \right) d\bar{z}^K.$$

Write ϑ^φ as ϑ when $\varphi = 0$. Let χ be a smooth function with support in a ball B_R of radius R centered at a point in $x_0 \in \Omega$. Let $\tilde{u} = \chi u$. By [27, Lemma 4.2.3, p. 86], we obtain

$$\|\bar{\partial}\tilde{u}\|_{0,2} + \|\vartheta\tilde{u}\|_{0,2} \leq C(\|f\|_{0,2} + \|u\|_{0,2}) \leq 2C'C_*\|f\|_{0,2}.$$

This shows that for any relatively compact subset Ω' of Ω , we have

$$\|u\|_{\Omega'; 1,2} \leq C(\Omega', \Omega)C_*\|f\|_{0,2}.$$

Recall the Sobolev compact embedding of L_q^j in L_p^{j+1} for $q = \frac{p}{1-\frac{p}{2n}}$ when $1 \leq p < 2n$. For the following, we take $p_0 = 2$ and fix any $2 < q < \infty$. We then fix p_1, \dots, p_{n^*} such that $p_{n^*-1} < 2n$, $p_{j+1} \leq \frac{p_j}{1-\frac{p_j}{2n}}$ and $p_{n^*} > q$.

Let $\square_{\tilde{\varphi}} = \bar{\partial}_{q-1}\vartheta_{q-1}^\varphi + \vartheta_q^\varphi\bar{\partial}_q$. Here $\Delta_g = -\sum g^{jk}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^j\partial \bar{z}^k}$ has smooth coefficients and it independent of φ . The principal part Δ_g of $\square_{\tilde{\varphi}}$ is diagonal and elliptic, where g is the smooth hermitian metric M (see [32, pp. 154, 160]). In the sense of distribution, we have

$$(8.17) \quad \Delta_g u = b(\partial\tilde{\varphi})\partial f + c_1(\partial\tilde{\varphi})\partial u + c_0(\partial^2\tilde{\varphi})u.$$

Let χ be a smooth function with support in B_R of radius R centered at a point in $x_0 \in \Omega$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $x_0 = 0$. Let $\tilde{u} = \chi u$. Then as a weak solution, \tilde{u} satisfies

$$(8.18) \quad \Delta_g \tilde{u} = \tilde{f}, \quad \tilde{f} := \chi f + \chi b(\partial\tilde{\varphi})\partial f + (\chi c_1(\partial\tilde{\varphi}) + \chi_1)\partial u + (\chi c_0(\partial^2\tilde{\varphi}) + \chi_0)u.$$

Here we recall two interior estimates on systems of elliptic equations from Morrey [46, Thm 6.4.4., p. 246]:

$$(8.19) \quad \|\tilde{u}\|_{k+2,p} \leq C\|\Delta_g \tilde{u}\|_{k,q} + C_R\|\tilde{u}\|_{0,1}, \quad 1 < p < \infty;$$

$$(8.20) \quad \|\tilde{u}\|_{k+2+\alpha} \leq C\|\Delta_g \tilde{u}\|_{k+\alpha} + C_R\|\tilde{u}\|_{Lip}, \quad \text{supp } \tilde{u} \subset B_R$$

provided the right-hand sides are finite.

By Sobolev inequality, $\|\tilde{u}\|_{1,p_1} \leq C_1\|\tilde{u}\|_{2,2} \leq C_2\|f\|_{1,2} \leq C_3\|f\|_{1,p_1}$. Repeating this bootstrapping argument, we can show that for any $q < \infty$, we have $\|\tilde{u}\|_{\Omega'; 1,q} \leq \|f\|_{1,q}$. By (8.19), we get $\|\tilde{u}\|_{\Omega'; 2,q} \leq C\|f\|_{1,q}$.

Recall Sobolev inequality $C^{k,\alpha} \subset L^{k+1,q}$ for $\alpha = 1 - \frac{2n}{q} > 0$. Thus we have

$$(8.21) \quad \|\tilde{u}\|_{\Omega'; 1+\alpha} \leq C(\Omega', \Omega)\|f\|_{\Omega; 1}$$

for any $\alpha < 1$. Using (8.20), we get

$$(8.22) \quad \|\tilde{u}\|_{\Omega'; k+2+\alpha} \leq CC_*(\|\tilde{f}\|_{\Omega'; k+\alpha} + \|f\|_{\Omega; 0,2}).$$

Next, we prove by induction that

$$(8.23) \quad \|u\|_{\Omega'; k+1+\alpha} \leq CC_*(\|\varphi\|_{k+1+\alpha}\|f\|_0 + \|f\|_{k+\alpha}).$$

By (8.21), the above holds for $k = 1$. Suppose the above hold and we want to verify it when k is replaced by $k + 1$. We have for \tilde{f} in (8.18)

$$\|\tilde{f}\|_{\Omega'; k+\alpha} \leq C\|f\|_{\Omega'; k+1+\alpha} + CC_*(\|\varphi\|_{\Omega'; k+2+\alpha}(\|f\|_{\Omega'; 0} + \|u\|_{\Omega'; 0}) + C\|u\|_{\Omega'; k+1+\alpha}).$$

By (8.23), we get $\|\tilde{f}\|_{\Omega';k+\alpha} \leq C\|f\|_{\Omega';k+1+\alpha} + C\|\varphi\|_{\Omega';k+2+\alpha}\|f\|_{\Omega';0}$. Then (8.23) yields

$$\|\tilde{u}\|_{\Omega';k+2+\alpha} \leq CC_*\|\varphi\|_{k+2+\alpha}\|f\|_0 + C\|f\|_{k+1+\alpha}.$$

This gives us (8.23) with k, Ω' being replaced by $k+1$ and any open set Ω'' on which $\chi = 1$. \square

We conclude this section with an isomorphism theorem on cohomology groups with bounds. Let $Z_{(0,q)}^r(\Omega, V)$ be the space of $\bar{\partial}$ -closed forms on Ω of class Λ^r . Define $B_{(0,q)}^{r,r'}(\Omega, V) = \Lambda_{(0,q)}^r(\Omega, V) \cap \bar{\partial}\Lambda_{(0,q-1)}^{r'}(\Omega, V)$ and $B_{(0,q)}^{r,loc}(\Omega, V) = \Lambda_{(0,q)}^r(\Omega, V) \cap \bar{\partial}L_{loc}^2(\Omega, V)$. Define $\bar{H}_{(0,q)}^{r,r'}(\Omega, V) = Z_{(0,q)}^r(\Omega, V)/B_{(0,q)}^{r,r'}(\Omega, V)$ and $\bar{H}_{(0,q)}^{r,loc}(\Omega, V) = Z_{(0,q)}^r(\Omega, V)/B_{(0,q)}^{r,loc}(\Omega, V)$.

Theorem 8.4. *Let Ω be relatively compact a_q domain in X and let V be a holomorphic vector bundle on X . There exists $c > 0$ such that the restriction $\bar{H}_{(0,q)}^{r,r'}(\Omega, V) \rightarrow \bar{H}_{(0,q)}^{r,loc}(\Omega_c, V)$ is an isomorphism for the following cases.*

- (i) $r \in (1, \infty)$, $r' = r + 1/2$ and $q = 1$.
- (ii) $r = r' = \infty$.
- (iii) $r \in (1, \infty)$, $r' = r + 1/2$ and $\partial\Omega$ is strictly $(n - q)$ convex.
- (iv) $\partial\Omega \in \Lambda^{r+5/2}$, $r > 1$ and $r' = r + 1/2$.
- (v) $\partial D \in \Lambda^s$ with $s \geq 7/2$, $r > s + 5/2$, and $r' = r + 1/50$.

Proof. The injectivity follows from the stability result proved in the appendix and our regularity results including Theorem 9.1 (iii) below for case (v). The surjectivity can be obtained by the Grauert bumping method which is valid as $r' \geq r$ and the same regularity results. \square

We remark that the isomorphism of the restriction $\bar{H}_{(0,q)}^{0,1/2}(\Omega, V) \rightarrow \bar{H}_{(0,q)}^{0,0}(\Omega_c, V)$ is proved in [23, Thm. 12.14, Thm. 15.12], provided Ω is either $(n - q)$ strictly convex with $\partial\Omega \in C^2$ or it is $(q + 1)$ concave with $\partial\Omega$ in $C^{5/2}$.

9. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2 VIA A NASH-MOSER METHOD

In this section, we will prove Theorem 1.2 for $q \geq 2$ when the domains have negative Levi eigenvalues by using the Nash-Moser smoothing operators. Our approach was inspired by a method of Dufresnoy [11] for the $\bar{\partial}$ -equation on a compact set that can be approximated from outside by strictly pseudoconvex domains of which the Levi eigenvalues are well controlled. It is interesting that V. Michel [44] showed that if the number of *non-negative* Levi eigenvalues of $\partial\Omega$ is *exact* $n - q'$ near $z_0 \in \partial\Omega$, then $\bar{\partial}u = f_{0,q}$ has a solution in $C^\infty(U \cap \Omega)$ when $\partial\Omega \in C^2$ for all $q \geq q'$. When $\partial\Omega \in C^4$, there is (a possibly different) solution u in $C^\infty(\bar{\Omega} \cap U)$. For pseudoconvex domains with C^2 boundary in \mathbf{C}^n , the C^∞ regularity of $\bar{\partial}$ solutions under suitable assumptions on the Levi-form has been proved by Zampieri [60, 61] and Baracco-Zampieri [3, 4]. The reader is referred to the thesis of Yie [59] for the global regularity of $\bar{\partial}$ solutions with $\partial D \in C^4$. When $\partial D \in C^\infty$ additionally, the existence of u was proved by Kohn [35]. Michel-Shaw [43] obtained smooth regularity of the $\bar{\partial}$ solutions on annulus domain $D_1 \setminus \bar{D}_2$ where D_1 is a pseudoconvex domain with piecewise smooth boundary and D_2 is the intersection of bounded pseudoconvex domains. The H^s solutions was proved by Harrington [22] for pseudoconvex domains D with $\partial D \in C^{k-1,1}$, $k > s + 1/2$, $k \geq 2$, and $s \geq 0$.

As observed in [15], to the author's best knowledge it remains an open problem if $C^\infty(\bar{D})$ solutions u to $\bar{\partial}u = f$ exist on a bounded pseudoconvex domain D in \mathbf{C}^n with C^2 boundary.

We now state a detailed version of Theorem 1.2.

Theorem 9.1. *Let $q > 1$. Let D be a relatively compact domain with C^s boundary in a complex manifold X satisfying the condition a_q . Let V be a holomorphic vector bundle on X . Suppose $r > s + 5/2$. Define \hat{r} as follows.*

- (i) *When $s = 2$ and $r > 26/7$, set $\hat{r} > r - 19/7$.*
- (ii) *When $2 < s < 7/2$, set*

$$\hat{r} = r + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{r}{r-1} \frac{r+5/2-s}{(s-1)r-5/2}.$$

- (iii) *When $s \geq 7/2$, set*

$$\hat{r} = r + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{s-1} \cdot \frac{1}{1 - \frac{5}{2(s-1)r}} \geq r + \frac{1}{50}.$$

For $r' < \hat{r}$, there exists a linear $\bar{\partial}$ solution operator

$$H_q^{r,r'} : \Lambda_{(p,q)}^r(D, V) \cap \bar{\partial}L_{loc}^2(D, V) \rightarrow \Lambda_{(p,q-1)}^{r'}(D, V)$$

satisfying $|H_q^{r,r'} f|_{r'} \leq C_{r,r'}(D)|f|_r$. Furthermore, $C_{r,r'}(D)$ is stable under small C^2 perturbations of D , and $H_q^{r,r'} f \in C^\infty(\bar{D})$ if $f \in \Lambda_{(p,q)}^\infty(D, V) \cap \bar{\partial}L_{loc}^2(D, V)$ additionally.

Proof. It suffices to prove the theorem when $r, r+1/2, r', r'+1/2$ are not integers, by replacing r by a smaller number and r' by a larger number. This allows us to identify the Zygmund spaces with the Hölder spaces for these orders. This also allows us to use the Taylor theorem and the global estimates for smooth domains.

Let D be a $(q+1)$ concave domain with C^2 boundary. Suppose that $f \in C^r$. Using Moser smoothing operator S_t , we define

$$(9.1) \quad \tilde{S}_t u = S_t E_{D^\epsilon} u.$$

Since t_1 is larger than ϵ_1 , in what follows we will identify f with Ef to define $S_{t_1} f$. We have

$$(9.2) \quad \|\tilde{S}_t u - u\|_{D^{\epsilon,a}} = \|S_t E_{D^\epsilon} u - E_{D^\epsilon} u\|_{D^{\epsilon,a}} \leq C_{a,b} t^{b-a} \|u\|_{D^{\epsilon,b}},$$

$$(9.3) \quad |\tilde{S}_t u|_b \leq C_{a,b} t^{a-b} \|u\|_{D^{\epsilon,a}}.$$

Assume that $\partial\Omega \in C^s$ with

$$s \geq 2, \quad r \in (s + 5/2, \infty).$$

As in Yie [59], we apply the above to the defining function ρ of D by setting

$$\rho_{t_1} = \rho * \chi_{t_1}, \quad t_1 = c_* \epsilon_1^{1/s}, \quad \tilde{D}^{\epsilon_1} = \{\rho_{t_1} < -\epsilon_1\}.$$

We now have

$$(9.4) \quad \|\rho_{t_i} - \rho\|_0 \leq C_s t_i^s \|\rho\|_s,$$

$$(9.5) \quad \|\rho_{t_i} - \rho\|_2 \leq \epsilon_* t_i^{s-2} \|\rho\|_2, \quad t_i < t^*(\partial^s \rho),$$

$$(9.6) \quad \|\rho_{t_i}\|_b \leq C_{b,s} t_i^{s-b} \|\rho\|_s, \quad b \geq s.$$

We also have $t_1^s = c_*^s \epsilon_1$. When c_* is sufficiently small, we have by (9.4)

$$c\epsilon_1 < \text{dist}(D^{\epsilon_1}, \partial D) < c'\epsilon_1, \quad c' < 1,$$

where c, c' are independent of c_* . We emphasize that $t^*(\partial^2 \rho)$ in (9.5) depends on the *modulus of continuity* of $\partial^2 \rho$. This however does not cause any difficulty for domains satisfying the condition a_q , because the Levi eigenvalues do not decay towards the boundary. This is decisive for the Nash-Moser iteration to succeed in our proof for C^2 domains.

By (9.6), we have a solution operator satisfying

$$|H_q \varphi|_{D^1 \cap D_{\rho_4}^2, r+1/2} \leq C_r (\partial \rho, \partial^2 \rho) (|\varphi|_{D^{12}, r} + |\rho^1|_{r+5/2} \|\varphi\|_1).$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$(9.7) \quad |v_1|_{D^{\epsilon_1}, r+1/2} \leq C_j |f_1|_{D^{\epsilon_1}, r} + C_r t_1^{-\frac{1}{2}-r} \|f_1\|_{D^{\epsilon_1}, 1}, \quad r \in (1, \infty).$$

Smoothing with a different parameter ϵ , we define $w_1 = S_{\epsilon_1} \tilde{v}_1$ on \mathbf{C}^n . On D define

$$f_2 = f_1 - \bar{\partial} w_1.$$

We iterate this. Set $\epsilon_i = \epsilon_{i-1}^d$ with $d > 1$. We also find a solution u_i on D^{ϵ_i} so that

$$f_i = \bar{\partial} v_i, \quad \text{on } D^{\epsilon_i}.$$

Define $\tilde{v}_i = E_{D^{\epsilon_i}} v_i$, $w_i = S_{t_i} \tilde{v}_i$ and $f_{i+1} = f_i - \bar{\partial} w_i$. Then $u := \sum w_i$ is the desired solution to $\bar{\partial} u = f_1$ on D , provided f_j tends to zero on D as $j \rightarrow \infty$.

We have

$$\bar{\partial} v_2 = f_1 - \bar{\partial} w_1, \quad \text{on } D^{\epsilon_2}.$$

On D^{ϵ_1} , $\tilde{v}_1 = E_{D^{\epsilon_1}} v_1 = v_1$ and hence $\bar{\partial} v_1 = \bar{\partial} \tilde{v}_1$. Therefore

$$f_2 = f_1 - \bar{\partial} w_1 = \bar{\partial}(\tilde{v}_1 - w_1) = \bar{\partial}(\tilde{v}_1 - S_{\epsilon_1} \tilde{v}_1), \quad \text{on } D^{\epsilon_1}.$$

We have

$$(9.8) \quad \|w_1 - \tilde{v}_1\|_{D^{\epsilon_1}, a} = \|S_{\epsilon_1} \tilde{v}_1 - \tilde{v}_1\|_{D^{\epsilon_1}, a} \leq C_{b,a} \epsilon_1^{b-a} \|\tilde{v}_1\|_b.$$

Hence by Taylor's theorem, we get

$$(9.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \|f_2\|_{D, 1} &\leq C_j \sum_{k=1}^{[b]-1} \epsilon_1^{k-1} \|f_2\|_{D^{\epsilon_1}, k} + C_j \epsilon_1^{b-1} \|f_2\|_{D, b} \\ &= C_j \sum_{k=1}^{[b]-1} \epsilon_1^{k-1} \|\bar{\partial} \tilde{v}_1 - \bar{\partial} w_1\|_{D^{\epsilon_1}, k} + C_b \epsilon_1^{b-1} \|f_2\|_{D, b} \\ &\leq C_j \sum_{k=1}^{[b]-1} \epsilon_1^{k-1} \epsilon_1^{b-k-\frac{1}{2}} \|v_1\|_{D^{\epsilon_1}, b+\frac{1}{2}} + C_b \epsilon_1^{b-1} \|f_2\|_{D, [b]} \\ &= C'_b \epsilon_1^{b-\frac{3}{2}} \|v_1\|_{D^{\epsilon_1}, b+\frac{1}{2}} + C_b \epsilon_1^{b-1} \|f_2\|_{D, b}. \end{aligned}$$

By analogy of (9.7) and (9.9), we have

$$(9.10) \quad \|v_i\|_{D^{\epsilon_i}, r+1/2} \leq C_r \|f_i\|_{D^{\epsilon_i}, r} + C_r t_i^{s-\frac{5}{2}-r} \|f_i\|_{D^{\epsilon_i}, 1}, \quad r \in (1, \infty)$$

$$(9.11) \quad \|f_{i+1}\|_{D, 1} \leq C_r \epsilon_i^{r-\frac{3}{2}} \|v_i\|_{D^{\epsilon_i}, r+\frac{1}{2}} + C_r \epsilon_i^{r-1} \|f_{i+1}\|_{D, r}.$$

Thus the r -norm is estimated by

$$(9.12) \quad \|f_{i+1}\|_r \leq \|f_i\|_r + C_r \|\tilde{v}_i\|_{r+1} \leq \|f_i\|_r + C_r \epsilon_i^{-1/2} \|v_i\|_{r+1/2}.$$

Therefore, by (9.10), we obtain

$$(9.13) \quad \|f_{i+1}\|_r \leq 2C_r \epsilon_i^{-1/2} (\|f_i\|_{D^{\epsilon_i, r}} + t_i^{s-\frac{5}{2}-r} \|f_i\|_{D^{\epsilon_i, 1}}), \quad r \in (1, \infty)^*.$$

Here $(1, \infty)^* = (1, \infty) \setminus (\mathbf{N} \cup \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{N})$. We now define

$$(9.14) \quad B_{i+1} = \hat{C}_r^2 t_i^{-s/2} B_i,$$

where B_0 is fixed, depending on r , so that

$$(9.15) \quad \max \left\{ \|f_0\|_r, t_0^{s-5/2-r} \|f_0\|_1, \|v_0\|_{r+1/2} \right\} \leq B_0.$$

By induction, let us show that when $r \in (1, \infty)^*$,

$$(9.16) \quad \|f_i\|_r \leq B_i,$$

$$(9.17) \quad t_i^{s-5/2-r} \|f_i\|_1 \leq \hat{C}_r B_i,$$

$$(9.18) \quad \|v_i\|_{r+\frac{1}{2}} \leq \hat{C}_r^2 B_i.$$

Suppose that the three inequalities hold. We want to verify them when i is replaced by $i+1$. Clearly, $(9.16)_{i+1}$ follows from (9.13), (9.14), (9.16), and $\hat{C}_r \geq 4C_r$. By (9.11), (9.18) and $(9.16)_{i+1}$, we obtain

$$(9.19) \quad \begin{aligned} t_{i+1}^{s-5/2-r} \|f_{i+1}\|_1 &\leq C_r t_{i+1}^{s-5/2-r} \epsilon_i^{r-\frac{3}{2}} \|v_i\|_{r+\frac{1}{2}} + C_r t_{i+1}^{s-5/2-r} \epsilon_i^{r-1} \|f_{i+1}\|_r \\ &\leq C_r'' t_{i+1}^{s-5/2-r} t_i^{sr-\frac{3s}{2}} \hat{C}_r^2 B_i + C_r t_{i+1}^{s-5/2-r} \epsilon_i^{r-1} B_{i+1} \\ &= C_r' c_*^{-2r} t_{i+1}^{s-5/2-r} t_i^{sr-s} B_{i+1} + C_r c_*^{-2r} t_{i+1}^{s-5/2-r} t_i^{sr-s} B_{i+1}, \end{aligned}$$

which gives us $(9.17)_{i+1}$, provided $\hat{C}_r > (C_r' + C_r) c_*^{-2r}$ and

$$(9.20) \quad -d(r+5/2-s) + sr - s \geq 0.$$

The latter is assumed now. Then $(9.18)_{i+1}$ follows from $(9.10)_{i+1}$, $(9.16)_{i+1}$ and $(9.17)_{i+1}$ and $\hat{C}_r > 2C_r$.

By interpolation, we get

$$|f_i|_{1-\theta+\theta r} \leq C_{r,\theta} |f_i|_1^{1-\theta} |f_i|_r^\theta \leq C_{r,\theta} t_i^{(1-\theta)(r+5/2-s)} B_i.$$

We have

$$t_i = t_1^{d^{i-1}}, \quad B_i = \hat{C}_r^{i-1} (t_1 \cdots t_{i-1}) B_1 = \hat{C}_r^{i-1} t_1^{-\frac{d^{i-1}-1}{d-1}} B_1 \leq \hat{C}_r^{i-1} t_i^{-\frac{1}{d-1}} B_1.$$

Therefore, $|f_i|_{1-\theta+\theta r} \leq C_r^{i-1} B_1 t_i^\lambda$ converges rapidly if (9.20) holds and

$$(9.21) \quad \lambda := (1-\theta)(r+5/2-s) - \frac{1}{d-1} > 0.$$

By (9.10), we have for $\theta r \in (0, \infty)^*$

$$(9.22) \quad \begin{aligned} |v_i|_{D^{\epsilon_i, 3/2-\theta+\theta r}} &\leq C_r |f_i|_{D^{\epsilon_i, 1-\theta+\theta r}} + C_r t_i^{s-7/2+\theta-\theta r} |f_i|_{D^{\epsilon_i, 1}} \\ &\leq B_1 C_r \hat{C}_r^{i-1} t_i^\lambda + C_r \hat{C}_r^i t_i^{r-1+\theta-\theta r-\frac{1}{d-1}} B_1. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that $|v_j|_{\frac{3}{2}-\theta+\theta r} \leq \hat{C}_r^i t_i^\lambda$ converges rapidly if

$$(9.23) \quad \lambda_* := (1-\theta)r_* - \frac{1}{d-1} > 0, \quad r_* := r-1 + \min\{0, 7/2-s\}.$$

We want to maximize θr or θ . Now, $\lambda_* > 0$ implies that

$$\theta < 1 - \frac{1}{(d-1)r_*}.$$

The latter is an increasing function of d . Assume

$$(9.24) \quad 1 - \frac{1}{(d-1)r_*} > 0.$$

We now specify the parameters. Note that (9.20) and (9.24) are equivalent to

$$(9.25) \quad 1 + \frac{1}{r_*} < d < d_*, \quad d_* := \frac{s(r-1)}{r+5/2-s}.$$

Under the above restriction on d , $\frac{3}{2} - \theta + \theta r$ has maximum value

$$(9.26) \quad \hat{r} = r + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{r}{(d_*-1)r_*}.$$

Then $|v_i|_{r'} < C_{r'}^i t_i^{\lambda'}$ with $\lambda' > 0$ where λ' depends on r' and $r' < \hat{r}$. Consequently the solution $u = \sum S_{t_i} E_{D^{\epsilon_i}} v_i$ to $\bar{\partial}u = f$ is also in $\Lambda^{r'}(\bar{D})$.

We now compute the value of \hat{r} . When $2 \leq s < 7/2$, we have $r_* = r-1$ and there exists d satisfying (9.25). We have

$$\hat{r} = r + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{r}{r-1} \frac{r+5/2-s}{(s-1)r-5/2}.$$

For $s=2$ and $r > s+5/2$, we get $\hat{r} > r - \frac{19}{7}$.

When $s \geq 7/2$ and $r > s+5/2 \geq 6$, we have $r_* = r-s+5/2$. One can check that (9.25) is satisfied. Then

$$\hat{r} = r + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{s-1} \frac{1}{1 - \frac{5}{2(s-1)r}} \geq r + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{\frac{5}{2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{r}\right)} > r + \frac{1}{50}.$$

Finally, we show that if $f \in C^\infty$, then there is a solution $u \in C^\infty$ on $\omega \cap \bar{D}$. For notations, we fix r, r' and rename them as r_0, r'_0 . Thus we have found solutions $\sum w_i$ with

$$|w_i|_0 \leq t_i^{r_0 + \frac{1}{2}} B_i, \quad i = 0, 1, \dots$$

Here we have fixed $d \in (1, 2), \theta, t_0$ so that

$$(1 - \theta_0)r_0 - \frac{1}{d-1} > 0, \quad -d(r_0 + \frac{1}{2}) + 2r_0 \geq 0, \quad r_0 - \frac{1}{d-1} \geq 0.$$

For any $r > r_0$ satisfying $r, r + \frac{1}{2} \notin \mathbf{N}$, we choose B_0 which depends on r so that (9.16)-(9.18) hold for $i=0$. We define B_{i+1} by (9.14). For the above choice of \hat{C}_m , the proof shows that (9.16)-(9.18) hold for all i since (9.20) and (9.23)-(9.24) hold for the fixed θ, d (depending on r_0, r'_0) and the r . This shows that $|v_i|_{1-\theta+\theta r+1/2}$ converges rapidly. Therefore, $u := \sum w_i \in \Lambda^{1-\theta+\theta r+1/2}$. We concluded that $u \in C^\infty(\bar{D})$. \square

APPENDIX A. DISTANCE FUNCTION TO C^2 BOUNDARY

To relax the boundary condition $\partial\Omega \in C^3$ to $\partial\Omega \in C^2$, we need regularity for the distance functions to the boundary of the domains. The following is proved in Li-Nirenberg [38] for $\partial\Omega \in C^{k,\alpha}$ for $k \geq 2$ and $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ and stated in Spruck [55] for C^2 case and proved in Crasta-Malusa [9] for C^2 boundary. We provide a proof here, including a stability property for our purpose. See Gilbarg-Trudinger [14] and Krantz-Park [36] when domains are in \mathbf{R}^N .

Proposition A.1 (Li-Nirenberg [38], Spruck [55]). *Let $s \in [2, \infty]$. Let M be a smooth Riemannian manifold M . Let $\Omega \subset M$ be a bounded domain with C^s (resp. Λ^s with $s > 2$) boundary. Let ρ be the signed distance function of $\partial\Omega$. There is $\delta = \delta(\Omega) > 0$ so that $\rho \in C^s$ (resp. Λ^s with $s > 2$) in $B_\delta(\partial\Omega) = \{x \in M : \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) < \delta\}$. Furthermore, $\delta(\Omega)$ is upper-stable under small C^2 perturbations of $\partial\Omega$.*

Proof. We are given a smooth Riemannian metric on M . Let N be a subset of M . Let $\gamma_p : [0, d] \rightarrow M$ be a geodesic connecting $\gamma(0) = p \in M \setminus \overline{N}$ and $p^* = \gamma(d) \in \overline{N}$. Suppose that γ is normal, i.e. $|\gamma'_p| = 1$ and length $|\gamma_p|$ of γ_p equals $\text{dist}(p, N)$. Then

$$|\gamma_p([t, t'])| = t' - t, \quad \text{dist}(\gamma_p(t), N) = d - t.$$

Thus if N is a C^1 hypersurface near $p^* \in M$, then γ_p is orthogonal to N at p^* .

We recall some facts about geodesic balls; see [10, Chap. 3, Sect. 4]:

a) For $p \in M$, there is $0 < r(p) \leq \infty$ so that the geodesic ball $B := B_r(p)$, centered at p with radius r , is strictly geodesic convex for $0 < r < r(p)$. Specifically, any two points $p_0, p_1 \in B$ are connected by a unique shortest normal geodesic in M and the geodesic is contained in B . Here the uniqueness is up to a reparameterization $t \rightarrow \pm t + c$.

b) ∂B is a smooth compact hypersurface.

Let K be a compact set in M . By a), we have $r(K) := \inf_{p \in K} r(p) > 0$. We can cover K by finitely many open sets U_i and choose coordinate chart x_i on U_i such that if a normal geodesic γ is contained in K then $|(x_i \circ \gamma)^{(j)}(t)| \leq C_j(K)$ wherever $x_i \circ \gamma(t)$ is defined. This implies that if $p \in N$, and $N \cap B$ is closed in B , then any point $q \in B_{r/2}(p)$ is connected to a point $q^* \in N \cap B$ via a geodesic γ_q in B with length $\text{dist}(q, N)$. However, q^* may not be unique.

Let us use the above facts for $N = \partial\Omega$. Set $r_0 = r(\partial\Omega)$. Let ν be the unit inward normal of $\partial\Omega$ with respect to the Riemann metric and choose sign so that $\rho < 0$ in Ω . Then ν is C^{s-1} on $\partial\Omega$. Let $\gamma(t, p)$ be the geodesic through $p \in \partial\Omega$ with $\partial_t \gamma(0, p) = \nu(p)$ and $|t| < r_0$. Then γ is C^{s-1} on $(-r_0, r_0) \times \partial\Omega$. Since $s \geq 2$, $\partial_t \gamma(0, p)$ is non zero, normal to $\partial\Omega$, and γ fixes $\{0\} \times \partial\Omega$ pointwise, then the Jacobian of γ is non-singular. By the inverse mapping theorem, there exists a unique solution $(\tilde{\rho}, P) \in \mathbf{R} \times \partial\Omega$ satisfying

$$(A.1) \quad \gamma(\tilde{\rho}(x), P(x)) = x, \quad |\tilde{\rho}(x)| < r_1$$

for $x \in B_{r_2}(\partial\Omega)$. Here $0 < r_2 < r_1 < r_0$ and r_1, r_2 are sufficiently small. Furthermore, $\tilde{\rho}, P$ are in $C^{s-1}(B_{r_2}(\partial\Omega))$.

We want to show that $\tilde{\rho} = \rho$ on $B_{r_2}(\partial\Omega)$. Fix $x \in B_{r_2}(\partial\Omega)$ and take $x^* \in \partial\Omega$ with $\text{dist}(x, x^*) = \rho(x) (= \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega))$. Since $r_2 < r(\partial\Omega)$, then x is connected to the center x^* by a geodesic $\tilde{\gamma}$ in the geodesic ball $B_{r_2}(x^*)$. Since $\text{dist}(x, x^*) = \rho(x)$, then $\tilde{\gamma}$ is orthogonal to $\partial\Omega$ at x^* . Then $\tilde{\gamma}$ must be contained in the normal geodesic

$\gamma(\cdot, x^*)$ with tangent vector $\nu(x^*)$. Next we choose the parametrization of $\tilde{\gamma}$ so that $\tilde{\gamma}'(0) = \nu(x^*)$. We get

$$\gamma(\rho(x), x^*) = \tilde{\gamma}(\rho(x)) = x, \quad \tilde{\gamma}(0) = x^* = \gamma(0, x^*), \quad |\rho(x)| = \text{dist}(x, x^*) < r_2.$$

By the uniqueness of solution to (A.1), we conclude that $\tilde{\rho}(x) = \rho(x)$ (and $x^* = P(x)$, $|\tilde{\rho}(x)| < r_2$).

Next we verify $\rho \in C^s$. Recall that the vector field $X_1(x) := \partial_t \gamma(\rho(x), P(x))$ is C^{s-1} in $x = \gamma(\rho(x), P(x))$. Fix $x_0 \in B_{r_2}(\partial\Omega)$. In a small neighborhood U of x_0 in $B_{r_2}(\partial\Omega)$, we use Gram-Schmidt orthogonalization to find pointwise linearly independent vector fields X_2, \dots, X_n of class C^{s-1} that are orthogonal to X_1 . We already know that $\rho = \tilde{\rho} \in C^{s-1} \subset C^1$. This allows us to compute a directional derivative of ρ via any C^1 curve that is tangent to the direction. Since γ is normal, then $X_1\rho = 1$. Let $j > 1$ and we want to show that $X_j\rho = 0$. At $x \in U \setminus \partial\Omega$, Gauss lemma says that X_2, \dots, X_n are tangent to the smooth geodesic sphere $\partial B_{|\rho(x)|}(P(x))$. We have $|\rho(x)| = \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) > 0$ and

$$|\rho(q)| = \text{dist}(q, \partial\Omega) \leq \text{dist}(q, P(x)) = |\rho(x)|, \quad \forall q \in \partial B_{|\rho(x)|}(P(x)).$$

Hence on this geodesic sphere, the C^{s-1} function ρ attains a local extreme at x . This shows that $X_j\rho = 0$ on $U \setminus \partial\Omega$. By continuity, $X_j\rho(x) = 0$ on U . Therefore all $X_i\rho$ are C^∞ functions on U . As observed by Spruck [38], since all X_i are C^{s-1} , then $\rho \in C^s(U)$. Therefore, $\rho \in C^s(B_{r_2}(\partial\Omega))$.

Finally, the stability of $\text{dist}(\cdot, \partial\Omega)$ near $\partial\Omega$ is a consequence of the geodesic equations of the second-order ODE system. We leave the details to the reader. \square

APPENDIX B. STABILITY OF L^2 SOLUTIONS ON PSEUDOCONVEX MANIFOLDS WITH C^2 BOUNDARY SATISFYING CONDITION a_q

Let Ω be a relatively compact domain in a complex manifold X . Let V be a holomorphic vector bundle on X . Let f be a V -valued $(0, q)$ form on Ω . Suppose that $\bar{\partial}u = f$ can be solved on Ω for some $u \in L^2_{loc}(\Omega)$ and $f = \tilde{f} + \bar{\partial}v$ for $v \in L^2_{loc}(\Omega)$ and \tilde{f} is a $\bar{\partial}$ closed form on a larger domain Ω' containing $\bar{\Omega}$. We want to know if there exists a neighborhood $\tilde{\Omega}$ of $\bar{\Omega}$, that is independent of f such that $\tilde{f} = \bar{\partial}\tilde{u}$ for some $\tilde{u} \in L^2_{loc}(\tilde{\Omega})$. If such a domain $\tilde{\Omega}$ exists, we say the solvability of the $\bar{\partial}$ -equation on Ω is *stable*. This stability is proved by Hörmander [26] when Ω is an a_q domain and V is the trivial bundle and by Andreotti-Vesentini [1, Lemma 29, p. 122] for vector bundles on domains that are strictly $(n - q)$ convex with smooth boundary. For completeness, we sketch a proof for the case of vector bundle. We also take this opportunity to relax the boundary condition $\partial\Omega \in C^3$ to the minimum C^2 smoothness and we also formulate a stability for the L^2 bounds of the $\bar{\partial}$ equation on a_q domains. For the reader's convenience, we will give our statements for the vector bundle case the references in [26] for a reader to locate them easily.

We fix smooth hermitian metrics on X and V . Cover $\bar{\Omega}$ by finitely open sets U_j of X . We assume that each U_j is biholomorphic to the unit ball in \mathbf{C}^n by a coordinate map z_j which is biholomorphic on \bar{U}_j . In what follows, we will denote by U one of U_j 's or their subdomains.

Let $\{e_1, \dots, e_m\}$ be a smooth unitary basis of V on U . Let $u = \sum u^\mu e_\mu \in C^1_{(0, q-1)}(\Omega, V, loc)$. We have

$$(B.1) \quad \bar{\partial}u = Au + Ru, \quad A(u^\nu e_\nu) = (\bar{\partial}u^\nu) e_\nu,$$

where $Au^\nu = \bar{\partial}u^\nu$ is as in [26] for the scalar case, and Ru involves no derivatives of u , i.e. Ru is of *order zero* in u with smooth coefficients. Therefore, the principal part A of $\bar{\partial}$ is locally *diagonal*. This is an important property so that the proofs for the scalar case can be carried out to the vector bundles case without difficulty.

Let $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n$ be unitary smooth $(1, 0)$ forms on X . For a V -valued (p, q) -forms $f = \sum f^\nu e_\nu$, define

$$\left| \sum f^\nu e_\nu(x) \right| = \sum_\nu \sum'_{I,J} |f_{I,J}^\nu(x)|^2, \quad f^\nu = \sum'_{I,J} f_{I,J}^\nu \omega^I \wedge \bar{\omega}^J.$$

We take the volume form on X as

$$dv = (\sqrt{-1})^n \omega^1 \wedge \dots \wedge \omega^n \wedge \bar{\omega}^1 \wedge \dots \wedge \bar{\omega}^n.$$

For $q \geq 0$, let $L^2_{(p,q)}(\Omega, V, loc)$ and $\Lambda^r_{(p,q)}(\Omega, V)$ be the spaces of V -valued (p, q) forms of which the coefficients on U are in $L^2_{loc}(\Omega \cap U)$, $\Lambda^r(\Omega \cap U)$, respectively. Let $\mathcal{D}^{(p,q)}(\Omega, V)$ be the space of smooth V -valued (p, q) forms of which the coefficients are in $\mathcal{D}(\Omega)$, i.e. smooth functions with compact support. Let $\mathcal{D}'_{(p,q)}(\Omega, V)$ be the space of V -valued (p, q) forms of which the coefficients are distributions in Ω .

If φ is a real L^∞ function in Ω , let $L^2_{(p,q)}(\Omega, V, \varphi)$ be the space of sections of V -valued (p, q) forms satisfying

$$\|f\|_\varphi^2 = \int_\Omega |f(x)|^2 e^{-\varphi(x)} dv(x) < \infty.$$

We will write $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\varphi$ the induced hermitian product and $\|\cdot\|_\varphi$ the norm on $L^2_{(p,q)}(\Omega, V, \varphi)$. The latter is independent of φ as sets, and the norms are equivalent for all weights $\varphi \in L^\infty$.

Throughout the appendix, we assume $q \geq 1$. The operator $\bar{\partial}$ defines a linear, closed, densely defined operator

$$T: L^2_{(p,q-1)}(\Omega, V, \varphi) \rightarrow L^2_{(p,q)}(\Omega, V, \varphi)$$

while $Tu = f$ holds if $\bar{\partial}u = f$ in the sense of distributions. We abbreviate $T = T_q, S = T_{q+1}$. We will write T_q for T if needed. Note that the domain D_T and range R_T are independent of $\varphi \in L^\infty$. For $f \in L^2_{0,q}(\Omega, V, \varphi)$, write $v = T^*f$ if $\langle u, v \rangle_\varphi = \langle \bar{\partial}u, f \rangle_\varphi$ for all $u \in D_T$.

Throughout the section, we assume that $\partial\Omega \in C^2$. By Proposition A.1, Ω has a C^2 defining function ρ in X satisfying

$$(B.2) \quad 2|\bar{\partial}\rho| = 1 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega.$$

We also assume that $\varphi \in Lip(\Omega)$. Then D_{T^*} is independent of φ , while R_{T^*} depends on φ .

Remark B.1. As in [26], $|T^*f|_\psi$ is *always* referred to as the dual with respect to ψ , where ψ will be chosen appropriately. For clarity, we write T^*_ψ for T^* when ψ needs to be specified.

Using integration by parts, we can verify that if $f \in C^1_{(p,q)}(\bar{\Omega}, V)$ has compact support in $U \cap \bar{\Omega}$, then $f \in D_{T^*}$ if and only if

$$(B.3) \quad \sum_{j=1}^n f_{I,jK}^\nu \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial \omega^j} = 0, \quad \text{on } U \cap \partial\Omega, \quad \nu = 1, \dots, m.$$

Define $\mathcal{D}_{T^*}^1(\overline{\Omega}) := C^1(\overline{\Omega}, V) \cap D_{T^*}$. We have from [26, p. 148]

$$T^*f = Bf + R^*f, \quad Bf := (Bf^\nu)e_\nu, \quad \text{on } U$$

with

$$Bf^\nu = - \sum_j \sum_{J,K} \delta_j f_{I,jK}^\nu \omega^I \wedge \overline{\omega}^K.$$

Thus R^* , independent of φ , is an operator of the zero-th order with smooth coefficients, and the B is *diagonal* and its principle part is also independent of φ . Thus the boundary condition is principle and zero-th order.

In summary, we have

Proposition B.2. *Let Ω be a relatively compact C^2 domain in X and let $\varphi \in \text{Lip}(\Omega)$. Then D_{T^*} is independent of φ . Let $\psi \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ be a real function.*

(i) *For all $f = \sum f^\nu e_\nu \in C_{(p,q)}^1(U \cap \overline{\Omega}, V)$,*

$$(B.4) \quad \left| \|Sf\|_\psi^2 - \|Af\|_\psi^2 \right| \leq C(\Omega) \|f\|_\psi^2.$$

(ii) *For all $f = \sum f^\nu e_\nu \in C_{(p,q)}^1(\overline{\Omega}, V) \cap D_{T^*}$ which have compact support in $U \cap \overline{\Omega}$,*

$$(B.5) \quad \left| \|T^*f\|_\psi^2 - \|Bf\|_\psi^2 \right| \leq C(\Omega) \|f\|_\psi^2.$$

(iii) *$\mathcal{D}_{T^*}^1(\overline{\Omega})$ is dense in $D_{T^*} \cap D_S$ w.r.t. the graph norm $f \rightarrow |f|_\psi + |Sf|_\psi + |T^*f|_\psi$.*

Furthermore, the constants $C(\Omega)$, independent of φ, ψ , depend only on the diameter of Ω .

Here the last assertion follows from [26, p. 121]. We also have

Proposition B.3 ([26, eq. (3.1.9)]). *Let Ω be a relatively compact C^2 domain in X . Let ρ be the signed distance function of $\partial\Omega$. Let $\varphi \in C^{1,1}(\Omega)$. For all $f \in C_{p,q}^1(\overline{\Omega}, V)$ with compact support in $U \cap \overline{\Omega}$, we have*

$$(B.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \|Af\|_\varphi^2 + \|Bf\|_\varphi^2 &= \sum_{\nu=1}^m \|Af^\nu\|_\varphi^2 + \|Bf^\nu\|_\varphi^2 \\ &= \sum_{\nu=1}^m (Q_1 + Q_2 + t_1 + t_2 + t_3 + t_4)(f^\nu, f^\nu) \\ &=: (Q_1 + Q_2 + t_1 + t_2 + t_3 + t_4)(f, f), \end{aligned}$$

$$(B.7) \quad Q_1(f, f) := \sum_{I,J} \sum_j \int_{U \cap \Omega} \left| \frac{\partial f_{I,J}}{\partial \overline{\omega}^j} \right|^2 e^{-\varphi} dv,$$

$$(B.8) \quad Q_2(f, f) := \sum_{I,K} \sum_{k,j} \int_{U \cap \Omega} \varphi_{j\bar{k}} f_{I,jK} \overline{f_{I,kK}} e^{-\varphi} dv,$$

$$(B.9) \quad t_1(f, f) := \sum_{I,K} \sum_{k,j} \int_{U \cap \partial\Omega} \left(f_{I,jK} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial \omega^j} \overline{\delta_k f_{I,kK}} - f_{I,jK} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial \bar{\omega}^k} \overline{\frac{\partial f_{I,kK}}{\partial \bar{\omega}^j}} \right) e^{-\varphi} d\sigma,$$

$$(B.10) \quad t_2(f, f) := \sum_{I,K} \sum_{k,j} \int_{U \cap \Omega} \left(f_{I,jK} \bar{\sigma}_j \overline{\delta_k f_{I,kK}} - f_{I,jK} \sigma_k \overline{\frac{\partial f_{I,kK}}{\partial \bar{\omega}^j}} \right) e^{-\varphi} dv,$$

$$(B.11) \quad t_3(f, f) := \sum_{I,K} \sum_{i,j,k} \int_{U \cap \Omega} f_{I,jK} \bar{c}_{jk}^i \overline{\delta_i f_{I,kK}} dv,$$

$$(B.12) \quad t_4(f, f) := - \sum_{I,K} \sum_{i,j,k} \int_{U \cap \partial\Omega} f_{I,jK} c_{jk}^i \overline{\delta_i f_{I,kK}} dv.$$

Proof. The proof for $f \in C^2$ and $\varphi \in C^2$ is in [26]. The case for $f \in C^1$ can be obtained by C^1 approximation of C^2 forms as in [26, p. 101]. We remark that computation from C^2 forms does not require the forms to be in D_{T^*} and this allows us to apply the formulas or estimates to C^1 forms that are in the domain of T^* . \square

Let φ be a C^2 real function defined in a neighborhood of $z_0 \in X$. Let $1 \leq q < n$. Recall from [26, Def. 3.3.4] that φ satisfies *the condition* a_q at z_0 , if

$$(B.13) \quad \nabla\varphi(z_0) \neq 0$$

and the Levi-form $L_{z_0}\varphi$, the restriction of $H_{z_0}\varphi(t) := \sum \frac{\partial^2 \varphi}{\partial \omega_j \bar{\omega}_k}(z_0) t_j \bar{t}_k$ on $T'_{z_0}\varphi := \{t \in \mathbf{C}^n : \sum t_j \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \omega_j}(z_0) = 0\}$, has at least $q+1$ negative or at least $n-q$ positive eigenvalues. Let $\mu_1(z) \leq \mu_2(z) \leq \dots \leq \mu_{n-1}(z)$ be the eigenvalues of the Levi form $L_{z_0}\varphi$ and let $\lambda_1(z) \leq \lambda_2(z) \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n(z)$ be the eigenvalue of the hermitian form $H_\zeta\varphi(t) := \sum \frac{\partial^2 \varphi}{\partial \omega_j \bar{\omega}_k} t_j \bar{t}_k$. Recall that the minimum-maximum principle for the eigenvalues says that

$$\lambda_j(z) = \min_{\dim V=j} \max_{v \in V, |v|=1} \{H_z\varphi(v)\}.$$

Thus $\lambda_1(z) \leq \mu_1(z) \leq \dots \leq \mu_{n-1}(z) \leq \lambda_n(z)$. Let $r^- = \max(-r, 0)$ for a real r . Then at z_0 , condition a_q is valid if and only if

$$\mu_1 + \dots + \mu_q + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \mu_j^- > 0.$$

If $\psi < \psi(z_0)$ is strictly pseudoconvex at z_0 then ψ satisfies the a_q condition for $q = 0, \dots, n-1$. Recall from [26, Def. 3.3.2] that ψ satisfies *the condition* A_q at z_0 , if (B.13) holds and

$$\lambda_1(z_0) + \dots + \lambda_q(z_0) + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \mu_j^-(z_0) > 0.$$

When needed, we denote the above eigenvalues λ_j, μ_k by $\lambda_j(z_0, \varphi), \mu_k(z_0, \varphi)$. Let us prove the following estimate for *weighted* eigenvalues.

Lemma B.4 ([26, Lem. 3.3.3]). *Suppose that φ satisfies the condition a_q at ζ . Then $e^{\tau\varphi}$ satisfies the condition A_q . More specifically, there exists $c(\varphi) > 0$ and $\tau_0(\varphi)$ such that for $\tau > \tau_0$*

$$(B.14) \quad e^{-\tau\varphi(\zeta)} \left\{ \lambda_1(\zeta, e^{\tau\varphi}) + \dots + \lambda_q(\zeta, e^{\tau\varphi}) + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \mu_j^-(\zeta, e^{\tau\varphi}) \right\} > c(\varphi)\tau.$$

Furthermore, $c(\varphi), \tau_0(\varphi)$ are stable under small C^2 perturbation of φ .

Proof. The proof in [26] uses a proof-by-contradiction argument. For stability, we need a direct proof. We have

$$\lambda_1(z_0) + \cdots + \lambda_q(z_0) + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \mu_j^-(z_0) \geq \lambda_1(z_0) + \cdots + \lambda_q(z_0) + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \mu_j^-(z_0).$$

For t , decompose $t \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta} = t' + t''$ where t' is in the complex tangent space $T'_\zeta \varphi$ and t'' is in its orthogonal complement. We have

$$\tilde{H}_\zeta^\tau(t) := \tau^{-1} e^{-\tau \varphi} H e^{\tau \varphi}(t) = H_\zeta \varphi(t) + \tau |\partial \varphi(\zeta)|^2 |t''|^2.$$

Restricted on T'_ζ , the above is still the Levi form $L_\zeta \varphi$ of which the eigenvalues are $\mu_1 \leq \cdots \leq \mu_{n-1}$. Let $\lambda_1(\tau), \dots, \lambda_n(\tau)$ be the eigenvalues of the above quadratic form. We still have $\lambda(\tau) \leq \mu_1 \leq \cdots \leq \mu_n \leq \lambda_n(\tau)$. For any $\delta > 0$, we choose τ_0 so that

$$\tau |\partial \varphi(\zeta)|^2 \delta^2 > \lambda_n(0) + 1, \quad \forall \tau > \tau_0.$$

Then $\lambda_1(\tau) \geq H_\zeta^\tau \varphi(t) \geq \mu_1 - \epsilon$ when δ is sufficiently small. Analogously, we get $\lambda_j(\tau) \geq \mu_j - \epsilon$ for $j = 1, \dots, n-1$ when δ is sufficiently small. We can choose ϵ depending on $\mu_1 + \cdots + \mu_q + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \mu_j^-$ and modulus of continuity of $\partial^2 \varphi$ to obtain (B.14). \square

Theorem B.5 ([26, Thm. 3.3.1]). *Let Ω be a relatively compact C^2 domain in X . Let $z_0 \in \Omega$. Suppose that $\varphi \in C^2(\bar{\Omega})$. Then*

$$(B.15) \quad \tau \|f\|_{\tau \varphi}^2 \leq C_\varphi^* \{ \|T_{\tau \varphi}^* f\|_{\tau \varphi}^2 + \|Sf\|_{\tau \varphi}^2 + |f|_{\tau \varphi}^2 \}$$

holds for some neighborhood $U \subset \Omega$ of z_0 , some C_φ, τ_φ , and all $\tau > \tau_\varphi$ and all $f \in C_{(p,q)}^1(\bar{\Omega}, V)$ with compact support in $U \cap \bar{\Omega}$, if and only if the hermitian form $\sum \varphi_{jk}(z_0) t_j \bar{t}_k$ on \mathbf{C}^n has either at least $q+1$ negative or at least $n-q+1$ positive eigenvalues. Furthermore, we can take

$$C_\varphi^* = \frac{C(\Omega)}{\min_{z_0 \in \Omega \setminus \Omega_c} (\sum_1^{n-1} \mu_j^-(z_0, \varphi) + \sum_{j=1}^q \mu_j(z_0, \varphi))}$$

where $\mu_1(z_0, \varphi) \leq \cdots \leq \mu_{n-1}(z_0, \varphi)$ are eigenvalues of $L_{z_0} \varphi$ with respect the hermitian metric on X , while U depends on the modulus of continuity of $\partial^2 \varphi$. The constants $C_\varphi^*, \tau_\varphi$ are stable under C^2 perturbation of $\partial \Omega$.

Proof. Take any $g \in C_{(p,q)}^1(\bar{\Omega}) \cap D_{T^*}$ with compact support in $U \cap \bar{\Omega}$. Apply (B.15) to $f = ge_1$, which is actually proved in [26] for the g ; see (3.3.4), (3.3.5), (3.3.6) in [26]. By (B.4) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \tau \|g\|_{\tau \varphi}^2 &\leq C_\varphi (\|T^*(ge_1)\|_{\tau \varphi}^2 + \|\bar{\partial}(ge_1)\|_{\tau \varphi}^2) \\ &\leq C_\varphi (\|T^*g\|_{\tau \varphi}^2 + \|\bar{\partial}g\|_{\tau \varphi}^2 + C_1 \|g\|_{\tau \varphi}^2), \end{aligned}$$

where C_φ depends on the eigenvalues of φ and C_1 is independent of τ and φ . Assume further that $\tau > 2C_\varphi C_1$. Then we get (B.15) in which f, C_φ are replaced by $g, 2C_0$. Note that the constant C in (B.4) is independent of τ . By [26, Thm 3.3.1], we get the eigenvalue condition. Assume that the eigenvalue condition holds. Then (B.15) holds when f is replaced by f^ν for each ν . By (B.4) again, we get (B.15) by adjusting τ_0 and C_0 . \square

Theorem B.6 ([26], Thm. 3.3.5). *Let Ω be a relatively compact C^2 domain in X . Let φ satisfy condition A_q at $z_0 \in \overline{\Omega}$. If $z_0 \in \partial\Omega$ assume further that $\varphi < \varphi|_{\partial\Omega} = \varphi(z_0)$ in Ω . Then there are a neighborhood U of z_0 and a constant C_φ^* such that for all convex increasing function C^2 function χ in \mathbf{R} we have*

$$(B.16) \quad \int \chi'(\varphi)|f|^2 e^{-\chi(\varphi)} dv \leq C_\varphi^*(\|T^*f\|_{\chi(\varphi)}^2 + \|\bar{\partial}f\|_{\chi(\varphi)}^2 + \|f\|_{\chi(\varphi)}^2)$$

for all $f \in C_{(p,q+1)}^1(\overline{\Omega}, V) \cap D_{T^*}$ with compact support in $U \cap \overline{\Omega}$.

Proof. We apply the scalar version of the result as in the proof of Theorem B.5. The proof in [26] is valid via C^1 density. \square

By partition of unity, the above yields the following.

Proposition B.7 ([26, Prop. 3.4.4]). *Let Ω be a relatively compact C^2 domain in X . Let $\varphi < 0$ in Ω and vanish in $\partial\Omega$ with $\varphi \in C^2(\overline{\Omega})$. Let $\Omega_a = \{z \in \Omega: \varphi(z) < a\}$. Suppose that φ satisfies condition A_q in $\overline{\Omega} \setminus \Omega_{-c}$ for some $c > 0$. Then there are a compact subset K of Ω_{-c} and a constant C_φ^* such that for all convex increasing function $\chi \in C^2(\mathbf{R})$*

$$(B.17) \quad \int_{\Omega \setminus K} \chi'(\varphi)|f|^2 e^{-\chi(\varphi)} dv \leq C_\varphi^*(\|T^*f\|_{\chi(\varphi)}^2 + \|Sf\|_{\chi(\varphi)}^2 + \|f\|_{\chi(\varphi)}^2)$$

holds for all $f \in C_{(p,q)}^1(\overline{\Omega}, V) \cap D_{T^*}$.

Theorem B.8 ([26, Thm. 3.4.1]). *Let Ω be a relatively compact C^2 domain in X . Suppose that $\partial\Omega$ satisfies the condition a_q . Fix C^2 defining function ρ of Ω such that ρ is the signed distance function to $\partial\Omega$ and fix $\varphi = e^{\lambda\rho}$ with λ sufficiently large. Then there exist compact subset K of Ω and constant τ_φ such that if $\tau > \tau_\varphi$ and $f \in D_S \cap D_{T^*} \cap L_{p,q}^2(\Omega, V)$ we have*

$$(B.18) \quad \int_{\Omega \setminus K} |f|^2 e^{-\tau\varphi} \leq \|T^*f\|_{\tau\varphi}^2 + \|Sf\|_{\tau\varphi}^2 + \int_K |f|^2 e^{-\tau\varphi} dv.$$

The latter implies that R_T is closed and finite codimensional in N_S .

Proof. Here we need to go through the proof of [26, Thm. 3.4.1]. There is a compact set K in Ω such that

$$(B.19) \quad \tau \int_{\Omega \setminus K} |f|^2 e^{-\tau\varphi} dv \leq C_\varphi^*(\|T^*f\|_{\tau\varphi}^2 + \|Sf\|_{\tau\varphi}^2 + \|f\|_{\tau\varphi}^2),$$

where C_φ^* is independent of τ . The above is proved in [26, Thm. 3.4.1] when V is trivial. Thus it also holds for any V by (B.4) and (B.5). We get (B.18) for $f \in C^1(\overline{\Omega}, V) \cap D_{T^*}$ when $\tau > 2C_\varphi^*$. By the density theorem, it holds for $f \in D_{T^*} \cap D_S$. The proof for the other direction in [26, Thm. 3.4.1] is valid without any change. \square

So far, all the constants in the estimates are stable under C^2 perturbations of the domain Ω and these constants are explicit to some extent. The next constant is however not explicit since it comes from a proof by contradiction. Nevertheless, it leads no essential difficulty in our applications.

Fix $\gamma > 2C_\varphi^*$, where C_φ^* is in (B.18). Let $\chi_k \in C^2$ be an increasing sequence of convex increasing functions such that

$$(B.20) \quad \chi_k(\tau) = \gamma\tau, \quad \text{when } \tau < c; \quad \chi_k'(\tau) \rightarrow \infty, \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty, \tau > c.$$

Set $\varphi_k = \chi_k(\varphi)$. Note that $\varphi_k \in C^2(\overline{\Omega})$. We have the following.

Proposition B.9 ([26, Prop. 3.4.5]). *Let $\Omega, \Omega_{-c}, \varphi$ satisfy the hypotheses in Proposition B.7. In particular, φ satisfies condition A_q in $\overline{\Omega} \setminus \Omega_{-c}$. There exist constants C_* and k_* , depending on φ, c, γ , and the sequence χ_k such that for $k > k_*$*

$$(B.21) \quad \|f\|_{\varphi_k}^2 \leq C_*(\|T^*f\|_{\varphi_k}^2 + \|Sf\|_{\varphi_k}^2)$$

provided $f \in D_{T^*} \cap D_S \cap L^2_{(p,q)}(\Omega, V)$ with $q \geq 1$ and

$$(B.22) \quad \int_{\Omega_{-c}} \langle f, g \rangle e^{-\gamma\varphi} dv = 0, \quad \forall g \in N_{(p,q)}(\Omega_{-c}, V, \gamma\varphi).$$

Furthermore, k_*, c, C_* are stable under C^2 perturbation of $\partial\Omega$ in the sense defined in Theorem B.10 (ii) below.

Proof. Fix $\gamma > 2C_\varphi^*$ for the constant C_φ^* in (B.17). Define

$$(B.23) \quad N_{(p,q)}(\Omega_{-c}, V, \gamma\varphi) := N_{S_c} \cap N_{T_c^*},$$

where T_c^* is the adjoint of $T_c = \bar{\partial}: L^2_{(p,q-1)}(\Omega_{-c}, V, \gamma\varphi) \rightarrow L^2_{(p,q)}(\Omega_{-c}, V, \gamma\varphi)$, while S_c is the operator $\bar{\partial}: L^2_{(p,q)}(\Omega_{-c}, V, \gamma\varphi) \rightarrow L^2_{(p,q+1)}(\Omega_{-c}, V, \gamma\varphi)$.

Assume that estimate (B.21) is false. Then we can find $f_k \in D_{T^*} \cap D_S$ such that

$$(B.24) \quad \|f_k\|_{\varphi_k} = 1, \quad \|T^*f_k\|_{\varphi_k} + \|Sf_k\|_{\varphi_k} < 1/k,$$

$$(B.25) \quad \int_{\Omega_{-c}} \langle f_k, g \rangle e^{-\gamma\varphi} dv = 0, \quad \forall g \in N_{(p,q)}(\Omega_{-c}, V, \gamma\varphi).$$

By the density theorem, we may assume that $f_k \in C^1_{(p,q)}(\overline{\Omega}, V) \cap D_{T^*}$, while (B.24) still holds and (B.25) is, however, weakened to

$$(B.26) \quad \left| \int_{\Omega_{-c}} \langle f_k, g \rangle e^{-\gamma\varphi} dv \right| < 1/k, \quad \forall g \in N_{(p,q)}(\Omega_{-c}, V, \gamma\varphi), \quad |g|_{\Omega_{-c}, \gamma\varphi} \leq 1.$$

(Compare (B.24) and (B.26) with [26, eq. (3.4.5)].) Here we used $\varphi_k = \gamma\varphi$ on Ω_{-c} and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$\left| \int_{\Omega_{-c}} \langle f_k, g \rangle e^{-\gamma\varphi} dv \right| = \left| \int_{\Omega_{-c}} \langle f_k - f, g \rangle e^{-\gamma\varphi} dv \right| \leq C \left\{ \int_{\Omega} |f_k - f|^2 e^{-\varphi_k} dv \right\}^{1/2}.$$

The rest of proof in [26] was stated for $f_k \in C^2$. However the arguments are valid for $f_k \in C^1$ without any change. We will not repeat here. \square

Theorem B.10 ([26, Thm. 3.4.6]). *Let Ω be a relatively compact C^2 domain in X . Let $\Omega_{-c}, \varphi, k, \varphi_k$ be as in Proposition B.7. Let V be a holomorphic vector bundle in X . Assume that φ satisfies the condition a_q in $\overline{\Omega} \setminus \Omega_{-c}$. There exist k_* and C_* satisfying the following.*

(i) *If $f \in L^2_{(p,q)}(\Omega, V)$ and the equation $\bar{\partial}u_0 = f$ has a solution u_0 in $L^2(\Omega_{-c}, V)$, then it has a solution u in $L^2_{(p,q-1)}(\Omega, V)$. In other words, the restriction $\overline{H}_{(p,q)}(\Omega, V) \rightarrow \overline{H}_{(p,q)}(\Omega_{-c}, V)$ is injective. Moreover,*

$$(B.27) \quad \|u\|_{\varphi_k} \leq C_* \|f\|_{\varphi_k}, \quad k \geq k_*.$$

where C_*, c, k_* are the constants in (B.21).

- (ii) Furthermore, C_*, c, k_* are stable under C^2 perturbations of $\partial\Omega$ in the following sense: Fix $c_* := c$. If $\Omega, \tilde{\Omega}$ have C^2 defining functions $\rho, \tilde{\rho}$ such that $\|\tilde{\rho} - \rho\|_2 < \delta$, then we have

$$(B.28) \quad \Omega_{-c_*} \subset \tilde{\Omega}_{-c_*/2} \subset \Omega$$

for some $c_* > 0$. If $\bar{\partial}u = f$ with $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ admits a solution $u_0 \in L^2_{loc}(\tilde{\Omega}_{-c_*/2})$ then there is a solution $u \in L^2(\Omega_{c_*})$ such that $\bar{\partial}u = f$ on $\tilde{\Omega}$. Furthermore,

$$|u|_{\Omega, \varphi_k} \leq C_k^* |f|_{\Omega_{c_*}, \varphi_k}, \quad k \geq k_*.$$

Therefore, C_k^*, c_*, k_* are independent of $\tilde{\Omega}$ and $\tilde{\rho}$, and δ depends on c_* and φ .

Proof. The proof is identical to that of [26, Thm. 3.4.6], using Proposition B.9. \square

We should mention that there is a detailed study in Lieb-Michel [39, Chapt. VIII, Sect. 8] on the stability of estimates for the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann operator on Ω_c , when Ω is a strictly pseudoconvex manifold with smooth boundary. In our case, we must treat a slightly more general situation where $\tilde{\Omega}$ can be any C^2 perturbations of Ω . We emphasize that we do not know if C_k^*, k_* are stable under C^2 perturbations in the sense of (8.5). Nevertheless, using Grauert's bumping method for a_q domains, Theorem B.10 suffices our purposes.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Andreotti and E. Vesentini, *Carleman estimates for the Laplace-Beltrami equation on complex manifolds*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. **25** (1965), 81–130. MR0175148
- [2] H. Bahouri, J.-Y. Chemin, and R. Danchin, *Fourier analysis and nonlinear partial differential equations*, Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], vol. 343, Springer, Heidelberg, 2011. MR2768550
- [3] L. Baracco and G. Zampieri, *Regularity at the boundary for $\bar{\partial}$ on Q -pseudoconvex domains*, J. Anal. Math. **95** (2005), 45–61. MR2145559
- [4] ———, *Boundary regularity for $\bar{\partial}$ on q -pseudoconvex wedges of \mathbb{C}^N* , J. Math. Anal. Appl. **313** (2006), no. 1, 262–272. MR2178735
- [5] M.-Y. Barkatou, *C^k estimates for $\bar{\partial}$ on q -convex wedges*, Math. Z. **239** (2002), no. 2, 335–352. MR1888228
- [6] M.-Y. Barkatou and S. Khidr, *Global solution with C^k -estimates for $\bar{\partial}$ -equation on q -convex intersections*, Math. Nachr. **284** (2011), no. 16, 2024–2031. MR2844676
- [7] R. Beals, P. C. Greiner, and N. K. Stanton, *L^p and Lipschitz estimates for the $\bar{\partial}$ -equation and the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem*, Math. Ann. **277** (1987), no. 2, 185–196. MR886418
- [8] S.-C. Chen and M.-C. Shaw, *Partial differential equations in several complex variables*, AMS/IP Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 19, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI; International Press, Boston, MA, 2001. MR1800297
- [9] G. Crasta and A. Malusa, *The distance function from the boundary in a Minkowski space*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **359** (2007), no. 12, 5725–5759. MR2336304
- [10] M. P. do Carmo, *Riemannian geometry*, Mathematics: Theory & Applications, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1992. Translated from the second Portuguese edition by Francis Flaherty. MR1138207
- [11] A. Dufresnoy, *Sur l'opérateur d'' et les fonctions différentiables au sens de Whitney*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **29** (1979), no. 1, xvi, 229–238. MR526786
- [12] L. C. Evans, *Partial differential equations*, Second, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 19, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2010. MR2597943
- [13] C. Gan and X. Gong, *Global newlander-nirenberg theorem for domains with C^2 boundary*, submitted (2020), 41 pages. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2005.07679>.
- [14] D. Gilbarg and N.S. Trudinger, *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*, Classics in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001. Reprint of the 1998 edition. MR1814364

- [15] X. Gong, *Hölder estimates for homotopy operators on strictly pseudoconvex domains with C^2 boundary*, Math. Ann. **374** (2019), no. 1-2, 841–880. doi:10.1007/s00208-018-1693-9. MR3961327
- [16] X. Gong and K.-T. Kim, *The $\bar{\partial}$ -equation on variable strictly pseudoconvex domains*, Math. Z. **290** (2018), no. 1-2, 111–144. doi:10.1007/s00209-017-2011-z. MR3848426
- [17] X. Gong and L. Lanzani, *Regularity of a $\bar{\partial}$ -solution operator for strongly \mathbf{C} -linearly convex domains with minimal smoothness*, J. Geom. Anal. **31** (2021), no. 7, 6796–6818. MR4289246
- [18] X. Gong and S. M. Webster, *Regularity for the CR vector bundle problem II*, Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5) **10** (2011), no. 1, 129–191. MR2829316
- [19] Hans Grauert and I. Lieb, *Das Ramirezsche Integral und die Lösung der Gleichung $\bar{\partial}f = \alpha$ im Bereich der beschränkten Formen*, Rice Univ. Stud. **56** (1970), no. 2, 29–50 (1971). MR273057
- [20] R. E. Greene and S. G. Krantz, *Deformation of complex structures, estimates for the $\bar{\partial}$ equation, and stability of the Bergman kernel*, Adv. in Math. **43** (1982), no. 1, 1–86. MR644667
- [21] P. C. Greiner and E. M. Stein, *Estimates for the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem*, Mathematical Notes, No. 19, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1977. MR0499319
- [22] P. S. Harrington, *Sobolev estimates for the Cauchy-Riemann complex on C^1 pseudoconvex domains*, Math. Z. **262** (2009), no. 1, 199–217. MR2491606
- [23] G. M. Henkin and J. Leiterer, *Andreotti-Grauert theory by integral formulas*, Progress in Mathematics, vol. 74, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1988. MR986248
- [24] G. M. Henkin and A. V. Romanov, *Exact Hölder estimates of the solutions of the $\bar{\partial}$ -equation*, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat. **35** (1971), 1171–1183. MR0293121
- [25] L. Hörmander, *Linear partial differential operators*, Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 116, Academic Press, Inc., Publishers, New York; Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Göttingen-Heidelberg, 1963. MR0161012
- [26] L. Hörmander, *L^2 estimates and existence theorems for the $\bar{\partial}$ operator*, Acta Math. **113** (1965), 89–152. MR0179443
- [27] ———, *An introduction to complex analysis in several variables*, Third, North-Holland Mathematical Library, vol. 7, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1990. MR1045639
- [28] M. Hortmann, *Über die Lösbarkeit der $\bar{\partial}$ -Gleichung auf Ringgebieten mit Hilfe von L^p -, C^k - und \mathcal{D} -stetigen Integraloperatoren*, Math. Ann. **223** (1976), no. 2, 139–156. MR422688
- [29] ———, *Globale holomorphe Kerne zur Lösung der Cauchy-Riemannschen Differentialgleichungen*, Recent developments in several complex variables (Proc. Conf., Princeton Univ., Princeton, N. J., 1979), 1981, pp. 199–226. MR627759
- [30] H. John and K. Scherer, *On the equivalence of the K -functional and moduli of continuity and some applications* (1977), 119–140. Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 571. MR0487423
- [31] N. Kerzman, *Hölder and L^p estimates for solutions of $\bar{\partial}u = f$ in strongly pseudoconvex domains*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **24** (1971), 301–379. MR0281944
- [32] K. Kodaira, *Complex manifolds and deformation of complex structures*, English, Classics in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2005. Translated from the 1981 Japanese original by Kazuo Akao. MR2109686
- [33] J. J. Kohn, *Harmonic integrals on strongly pseudo-convex manifolds. I*, Ann. of Math. (2) **78** (1963), 112–148. MR0153030
- [34] ———, *Harmonic integrals on strongly pseudo-convex manifolds. II*, Ann. of Math. (2) **79** (1964), 450–472. MR0208200
- [35] ———, *Global regularity for $\bar{\partial}$ on weakly pseudo-convex manifolds*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **181** (1973), 273–292. MR344703
- [36] S. G. Krantz and H. R. Parks, *Distance to C^k hypersurfaces*, J. Differential Equations **40** (1981), no. 1, 116–120. MR614221
- [37] C. Laurent-Thiébaud and J. Leiterer, *The Andreotti-Vesentini separation theorem with C^k estimates and extension of CR-forms*, Several complex variables (Stockholm, 1987/1988), 1993, pp. 416–439. MR1207871
- [38] Y. Li and L. Nirenberg, *Regularity of the distance function to the boundary*, Rend. Accad. Naz. Sci. XL Mem. Mat. Appl. (5) **29** (2005), 257–264. MR2305073
- [39] I. Lieb and J. Michel, *The Cauchy-Riemann complex*, Aspects of Mathematics, E34, Friedr. Vieweg & Sohn, Braunschweig, 2002. Integral formulae and Neumann problem. MR1900133
- [40] I. Lieb and R. M. Range, *Lösungsoperatoren für den Cauchy-Riemann-Komplex mit C^k -Abschätzungen*, Math. Ann. **253** (1980), no. 2, 145–164. MR597825

- [41] J. Michel, *Randregularität des $\bar{\partial}$ -Problems für stückweise streng pseudokonvexe Gebiete in \mathbf{C}^n* , Math. Ann. **280** (1988), no. 1, 45–68. MR928297
- [42] J. Michel and A. Perotti, *C^k -regularity for the $\bar{\partial}$ -equation on strictly pseudoconvex domains with piecewise smooth boundaries*, Math. Z. **203** (1990), no. 3, 415–427. MR1038709
- [43] J. Michel and M.-C. Shaw, *The $\bar{\partial}$ problem on domains with piecewise smooth boundaries with applications*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **351** (1999), no. 11, 4365–4380. MR1675218
- [44] V. Michel, *Sur la régularité C^∞ du $\bar{\partial}$ au bord d'un domaine de \mathbf{C}^n dont la forme de Levi a exactement s valeurs propres strictement négatives*, Math. Ann. **295** (1993), no. 1, 135–161. MR1198845
- [45] C. B. Morrey Jr., *The analytic embedding of abstract real-analytic manifolds*, Ann. of Math. (2) **68** (1958), 159–201. MR0099060
- [46] ———, *Multiple integrals in the calculus of variations*, Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 130, Springer-Verlag New York, Inc., New York, 1966. MR0202511
- [47] Peter L. Polyakov, *Versal embeddings of compact 3-pseudoconcave CR submanifolds*, Math. Z. **248** (2004), no. 2, 267–312. MR2088929
- [48] R. M. Range and Y.-T. Siu, *Uniform estimates for the $\bar{\partial}$ -equation on domains with piecewise smooth strictly pseudoconvex boundaries*, Math. Ann. **206** (1973), 325–354. MR338450
- [49] H. Ricard, *Estimations C^k pour l'opérateur de Cauchy-Riemann sur des domaines à coins q -convexes et q -concaves*, Math. Z. **244** (2003), no. 2, 349–398. MR1992543
- [50] W. Rudin, *Principles of mathematical analysis*, Third, International Series in Pure and Applied Mathematics, McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York-Auckland-Düsseldorf, 1976. MR0385023
- [51] Z. Shi, *Weighted Sobolev L^p estimates for homotopy operators on strictly pseudoconvex domains with C^2 boundary*, J. Geom. Anal. **31** (2021), no. 5, 4398–4446. MR4244873
- [52] Z. Shi and L. Yao, *Existence of solutions for $\bar{\partial}$ equation in sobolev spaces of negative index*, arXiv, 2021.
- [53] ———, *Sobolev $\frac{1}{2}$ estimates for $\bar{\partial}$ equations on strictly pseudoconvex domains with c^2 boundary*, arXiv, 2021.
- [54] Y.-T. Siu, *The $\bar{\partial}$ problem with uniform bounds on derivatives*, Math. Ann. **207** (1974), 163–176. MR330515
- [55] J. Spruck, *Interior gradient estimates and existence theorems for constant mean curvature graphs in $M^n \times \mathbf{R}$* , Pure Appl. Math. Q. **3** (2007), no. 3, Special Issue: In honor of Leon Simon. Part 2, 785–800. MR2351645
- [56] H. Triebel, *Theory of function spaces. III*, Monographs in Mathematics, vol. 100, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2006. MR2250142
- [57] S. M. Webster, *A new proof of the Newlander-Nirenberg theorem*, Math. Z. **201** (1989), no. 3, 303–316. MR999729
- [58] ———, *On the proof of Kuranishi's embedding theorem*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **6** (1989), no. 3, 183–207. MR995504
- [59] S. L. Yie, *Solutions of Cauchy-Riemann equations on pseudoconvex domain with non-smooth boundary*, ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 1995. Thesis (Ph.D.)—Purdue University. MR2693230
- [60] G. Zampieri, *q -pseudoconvexity and regularity at the boundary for solutions of the $\bar{\partial}$ -problem*, Compositio Math. **121** (2000), no. 2, 155–162. MR1757879
- [61] ———, *Solvability of the $\bar{\partial}$ problem with C^∞ regularity up to the boundary on wedges of \mathbf{C}^N* , Israel J. Math. **115** (2000), 321–331. MR1749685

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON, MADISON, WI 53706
 Email address: gong@math.wisc.edu