

1 Hestenes Operator

1.1 Construction

We construct the Hestenes operator for domains $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with C^m boundary mainly following paragraphs 6.2, 6.3 of [?]. First we consider a simple case where Ω is a C^m half strip.

Lemma 1. Let $l, n, m \in \mathbb{N}, m \geq l, 1 \leq p \leq \infty$ and $W = \prod_{i=1}^{n-1}]a_i, b_i[$ be an open cuboid of \mathbb{R}^{n-1} . Moreover define

$$S = W \times \mathbb{R}$$

$$\Omega = \{(\bar{x}, x_n) | \bar{x} \in W, x_n < \phi(\bar{x})\}$$

where $\phi \in C^m(\overline{W}), m \geq l$, and $\|D^\alpha \phi\| \leq M < \infty$ for every $1 \leq |\alpha| \leq l$. Then there exists a bounded extension operator T from $W^{l,p}(\Omega)$ to $W^{l,p}(S)$.

To prove Lemma 1 we prove first the case $\phi \equiv 0$ in the following result, that is a generalization of Lemma 9.2 in [?].

Lemma 2. Let $l, n \in \mathbb{N}, 1 \leq p \leq \infty$ and $W = \prod_{i=1}^{n-1}]a_i, b_i[$ be an open cuboid of \mathbb{R}^{n-1} . There exists a bounded extension operator

$$T : W^{l,p}(S^-) \rightarrow W^{l,p}(S)$$

where

$$S = W \times \mathbb{R}$$

$$S^- = W \times \mathbb{R}^-.$$

Proof. Let $f \in W^{l,p}(S^-)$. We define

$$Tf(\bar{x}, x_n) = \begin{cases} f(x), & \text{if } x_n < 0, \\ \sum_{k=1}^l \alpha_k f(\bar{x}, -\beta_k x_n), & \text{if } x_n > 0, \end{cases}$$

where α_k, β_k are real numbers that satisfy $\beta_k > 0$ and

$$\sum_{k=1}^l \alpha_k (-\beta_k)^s = 1 \tag{1}$$

for every $s = 0, \dots, l-1$. Notice that given $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_l > 0$ pairwise distinct, we can always find $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_l$ that satisfy the condition by solving a Vandermonde square system of linear equations. First we prove that $Tf \in W^{l,p}(S)$. We take any $\phi \in C_c^\infty(S)$ and consider the integral

$$\int_S Tf(x)D^\alpha \phi(x)dx = \int_{S^+} Tf(x)D^\alpha \phi(x)dx + \int_{S^-} Tf(x)D^\alpha \phi(x)dx$$

where $S^+ = \{(\bar{x}, x_n) \mid \bar{x} \in W, x_n > 0\}$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n, 1 \leq |\alpha| \leq l$. Let's write $\alpha = (\bar{\alpha}, \alpha_n)$, with $\bar{\alpha} \in \mathbb{N}_0^{n-1}$ and $\alpha_n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. By changing variables in the integrals we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_S Tf(x)D^\alpha \phi(x)dx &= \int_{S^+} \sum_{k=1}^l \alpha_k f(\bar{x}, -\beta_k x_n) D^\alpha \phi(x)dx + \int_{S^-} f(x)D^\alpha \phi(x)dx \\ &= \int_{S^-} f(\bar{y}, y_n) D^\alpha \psi(\bar{y}, y_n) dy \end{aligned} \quad (*)$$

where $\psi(\bar{x}, x_n) = \sum_{k=1}^l -\alpha_k (-\beta_k)^{\alpha_n-1} \phi(\bar{x}, -x_n/\beta_k) + \phi(\bar{x}, x_n)$. Note that ψ belongs to $C^\infty(S^-)$ but does not have compact support in S^- . To bypass this problem we use an auxiliary function $\nu \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ that satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \nu(x) = 0, & \text{if } x > -1/2, \\ \nu(x) = 1, & \text{if } x < -1, \end{cases}$$

and we define the functions $\nu_k(t) = \nu(kt)$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. It's clear that $\psi(x)\nu_k(x_n) \in C_c^\infty(S^-)$, hence we can integrate by parts

$$\int_{S^-} f(x)D^\alpha (\psi(x)\nu_k(x_n))dx = (-1)^{|\alpha|} \int_{S^-} D_w^\alpha f(x)\psi(x)\nu_k(x_n)dx \quad (2)$$

By the Leibniz rule

$$\begin{aligned} D^\alpha (\psi(x)\nu_k(x_n)) &= \frac{\partial^{\alpha_n}}{\partial x_n^{\alpha_n}} D^{\bar{\alpha}} (\psi(x)\nu_k(x_n)) \\ &= \nu(kx_n)D^\alpha \psi(x) + \sum_{i=1}^{\alpha_n} \binom{\alpha_n}{i} k^i \nu^{(i)}(kx_n) \frac{\partial^{\alpha_n-i}}{\partial x_n^{\alpha_n-i}} D^{\bar{\alpha}} \psi(x). \end{aligned}$$

By the Dominated Convergence Theorem

$$\int_{S^-} f(x)\nu(kx_n)D^\alpha \psi(x)dx \rightarrow \int_{S^-} f(x)D^\alpha \psi(x)dx \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty,$$

because $f \in L^1(S^- \cap \text{supp } \psi)$ since $\text{supp } \psi$ is bounded. Next, we claim that for every $i = 1, \dots, \alpha_n$

$$\int_{S^-} f(x) k^i \nu^{(i)}(kx_n) \frac{\partial^{\alpha_n-i}}{\partial x_n^{\alpha_n-i}} D^{\bar{\alpha}} \psi(x) dx \rightarrow 0 \quad (3)$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$. To prove this first we notice that since α_k, β_k satisfies (1) we have that

$$\frac{\partial^j}{\partial x_n^j} D^{\bar{\alpha}} \psi(\bar{x}, 0) = 0 ; j = 0, \dots, \alpha_n - 1,$$

hence by Taylor formula

$$\left| \frac{\partial^{\alpha_n-i}}{\partial x_n^{\alpha_n-i}} D^{\bar{\alpha}} \psi(\bar{x}, x_n) \right| \leq \frac{C |x_n|^i}{i!},$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, \alpha_n$, where $C = \sup_{x \in S^-} |D^{\alpha} \psi(x)|$. Therefore we get the following estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{S^-} \left| f(x) k^i \nu^{(i)}(kx_n) \frac{\partial^{\alpha_n-i}}{\partial x_n^{\alpha_n-i}} D^{\bar{\alpha}} \psi(x) \right| dx &\leq \frac{\tilde{C} C}{i!} \int_{\{x \in S^- \cap \text{supp } f, -1/k < x_n < 0\}} |f(x)| k^i |x_n|^i dx \\ &\leq \frac{\tilde{C} C}{i!} \int_{\{x \in S^- \cap \text{supp } f, -1 < x_n < 0\}} |f(x)| dx \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{C} = \sup_{\mathbb{R}} |\nu^{(i)}|$. The second inequality comes from the fact that $\nu^{(i)}(x) = 0$ for $x < -1$ and $i \geq 1$. Hence we get (3) by Dominated Convergence Theorem. Passing to the limit in (2) we obtain

$$\int_{S^-} f(x) D^{\alpha} \psi(x) dx = (-1)^{|\alpha|} \int_{S^-} D_w^{\alpha} f(x) \psi(x) dx.$$

which, combined with (*), implies

$$\int_S T f(x) D^{\alpha} \phi(x) dx = \int_{S^-} f(x) D^{\alpha} \psi(x) dx = (-1)^{|\alpha|} \int_{S^-} D_w^{\alpha} f(x) \psi(x) dx.$$

Finally going back to the original coordinates and using the definition of ψ we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_S T f(x) D^{\alpha} \phi(x) dx &= (-1)^{|\alpha|} \int_{S^-} D_w^{\alpha} f(x) \left[\sum_{k=1}^l -\alpha_k (-\beta_k)^{\alpha_n-1} \phi\left(\bar{x}, -\frac{x_n}{\beta_k}\right) + \phi(\bar{x}, x_n) \right] dx = \\ &= (-1)^{|\alpha|} \int_{S^+} \sum_{k=1}^l \alpha_k (-\beta_k)^{\alpha_n} D_w^{\alpha} f(\bar{y}, -\beta_k y_n) \phi(y) dy + (-1)^{|\alpha|} \int_{S^-} D_w^{\alpha} f(y) \phi(y) dy \end{aligned}$$

that implies that $D_w^\alpha T f$ exists and

$$D_w^\alpha T f(x) = \begin{cases} D_w^\alpha f(x), & \text{if } x \in S^-, \\ \sum_{k=1}^l \alpha_k (-\beta_k)^{\alpha_n} D_w^\alpha f(\bar{x}, -\beta_k x_n) \phi(x), & \text{if } x \in S^+. \end{cases}$$

It remains to prove the boundedness of T . It's immediate to verify that

$$\|T f\|_{L^p(S^+)} \leq \sum_{i=1}^l |\alpha_k| \beta_k^{-1/p} \|f\|_{L^p(S^-)}$$

and that we have similar bounds for the norm of the weak derivatives of $T f$. Hence there exists a constant C depending only on β_k, α_k, l such that $\|T f\|_{W^{l,p}(S^+)} \leq C \|f\|_{W^{l,p}(S^-)}$. Observing that $\|T f\|_{W^{l,p}(S)}^p = \|T f\|_{W^{l,p}(S^+)}^p + \|f\|_{W^{l,p}(S^-)}^p$ the proof is concluded. \square

Lemma 3. Let $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and Ω be a domain in \mathbb{R}^n . Suppose that $f \in L_{loc}^1(\Omega)$ admits all the weak derivatives up to order l and that $g : \Omega' \rightarrow \Omega$ is a diffeomorphism of class C^l with bounded derivatives $|D^\alpha g_k| \leq M$ for all $1 \leq |\alpha| \leq l$. Then $f \circ g$ admits weak derivative up to order l . Moreover for every $1 \leq |\alpha| \leq l$ we have to following bounds

$$|D^\alpha (f \circ g)(x)| \leq C \sum_{1 \leq |\beta| \leq |\alpha|} |D^\beta f(g(x))|$$

where C depends only on M and l .

Proof. We prove the statement by induction on l . For $l = 1$ we know that exists a sequence of functions $\{f_k\}_k \in C^\infty(\Omega)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} f_k &\rightarrow f & \text{in } L_{loc}^1(\Omega) \\ \frac{\partial f_k}{\partial x_i} &\rightarrow \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} & \text{in } L_{loc}^1(\Omega). \end{aligned}$$

Take $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega')$ and integrate by parts

$$\int_{\Omega'} f_k(g(x)) \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x_i}(x) dx = - \int_{\Omega'} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial f_k}{\partial x_j}(g(x)) \frac{\partial g_j}{\partial x_i}(x) \right) \phi(x) dx.$$

Since $\phi(g^{-1}) \in C_c^l(\Omega)$ and the derivatives of g and g^{-1} are bounded, we can pass to the limit in the above equation

$$\int_{\Omega'} f(g(x)) \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x_i}(x) dx = - \int_{\Omega'} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}(g(x)) \frac{\partial g_j}{\partial x_i}(x) \right) \phi(x) dx.$$

Hence the case $l = 1$ is proved. Now suppose that the statement is true for l . We prove the case $l + 1$, so we suppose that f admits weak derivatives up to order $l + 1$ and that g is of class C^{l+1} . From the case $l = 1$ we know that $\frac{\partial(f \circ g)}{\partial x_i}$ exists and that

$$\frac{\partial(f \circ g)}{\partial x_i} = \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j} \circ g \right) \frac{\partial g_j}{\partial x_i}$$

Since $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}$ admits weak derivatives up to order l , by induction hypothesis the functions $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j} \circ g$ admit weak derivatives up to order l . Moreover $\frac{\partial g_j}{\partial x_i}$ is of class C^l , thus by the Leibniz rule the functions $(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j} \circ g) \frac{\partial g_j}{\partial x_i}$ admits weak derivatives of order l . In conclusion $\frac{\partial(f \circ g)}{\partial x_i}$ admits derivatives up to order l and this conclude the proof of the case $l + 1$.

To prove the bounds we notice that the weak derivatives $D^\alpha(f \circ g)$ can be computed using the chain rule for usual derivatives. Such formula can be found in [?, formula B]:

$$D_w^\alpha(f(g))(x) = \sum_{1 \leq |\beta| \leq |\alpha|} D_w^\beta(f(g(x))) Q_{\alpha, \beta}(g, x)$$

In this formula $Q_{\alpha, \beta}(g, x)$ are homogeneous polynomials of degree $|\beta| \leq l$ in the derivatives of order less than l of the components of g . Moreover the coefficients of these polynomials depend only on α, l, n . Hence there exists a constant C depending only on l, n, M such that $|Q_{\alpha, \beta}(g, x)| \leq C$ uniformly on x . This concludes the proof. \square

Proof of Lemma 1 . Let $f \in W^{l,p}(\Omega)$. Consider the function g from S^- onto Ω defined by

$$g(\bar{x}, x_n) = (\bar{x}, x_n + \phi(\bar{x}))$$

for all $(\bar{x}, x_n) \in S^-$ and its inverse g^{-1}

$$g^{-1}(\bar{x}, x_n) = (\bar{x}, x_n - \phi(\bar{x}))$$

where $S^- = W \times \mathbb{R}^-$. For all $f \in W^{l,p}(\Omega)$ we set

$$Gf = f \circ g$$

Since g is a diffeomorphism between S^- and Ω of class C^m , Lemma 3 guarantees that Gf admits weak derivatives up to order l . We claim that G defines a bounded operator from $W^{l,p}(\Omega)$ to $W^{l,p}(S^-)$, with bounded inverse. To prove this, first we compute the Jacobian matrix of g^{-1}

$$Jg^{-1}(x) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & & & \ddots \\ -\frac{\partial \phi(\bar{x})}{\partial x_1} & -\frac{\partial \phi(\bar{x})}{\partial x_2} & \dots & \dots & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

from which $|\det(Jg^{-1}(x))| \equiv 1$. Moreover, again by Lemma 3, we have

$$|D_w^\alpha(f(g))| \leq C(l, M) \sum_{1 \leq |\beta| \leq |\alpha|} |D_w^\beta f(g)|$$

where $C(l, M)$ depends only on l and M , with $M = \sup_{1 \leq |\alpha| \leq l} \|D^\alpha \phi\|$. Next by the change of variable formula and Minkowski's inequality we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\int_{S^-} |D_w^\alpha(f(g))(x)|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} &\leq \sum_{1 \leq |\beta| \leq |\alpha|} C(l, M) \left(\int_{S^-} |D_w^\beta f(g(x))|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq |\beta| \leq |\alpha|} C(l, M) \left(\int_{\Omega} |D_w^\beta f(y)|^p |\det Jg^{-1}|_{g(y)} dy \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq |\beta| \leq |\alpha|} C(l, M) \|D_w^\beta f\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \end{aligned}$$

Thus, using the estimates for the intermediate derivatives, that

$$\|Gf\|_{W^{l,p}(S^-)} = \|f(g)\|_{W^{l,p}(S^-)} \leq C \|f\|_{W^{l,p}(\Omega)}$$

for a constant C independent of f . In a similar way we can also prove that

$$\|G^{-1}f\|_{W^{l,p}(\Omega)} = \|f(g^{-1})\|_{W^{l,p}(\Omega)} \leq D \|f\|_{W^{l,p}(S)}.$$

Now we can just define the operator T as

$$T = G^{-1} \circ \bar{T} \circ G$$

where \bar{T} is the extension operator from $W^{l,p}(S^-)$ to $W^{l,p}(S)$ defined in Lemma 2. Therefore T is bounded as composition of bounded operators. An explicit for T is

$$Tf(x) = \begin{cases} f(x), & \text{if } x \in \Omega, \\ \sum_{i=1}^l \alpha_i f(\bar{x}, \phi(\bar{x}) - \beta_i(x_n - \phi(\bar{x}))), & \text{if } x \in S \setminus \bar{\Omega}. \end{cases}$$

□

We are now ready to define the Hestenes operator for a general domain Ω with C^m boundary. First we write the precise definition for this kind of domains.

Definition 1. Let $0 < d \leq D < \infty, M > 0, \varkappa > 0$. We say that an open set Ω in \mathbb{R}^n has a resolved boundary with parameters d, D, \varkappa if there exists a family of open cuboids $V_i, i = 1, \dots, s$ (where $s \in \mathbb{N}$ if Ω is bounded and $s = \infty$ otherwise) such that

1. $(V_i)_d \cap \Omega \neq \emptyset$
2. $\Omega \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^s (V_j)_d$
3. The multiplicity of the cover $\{V_i\}_{i=1}^s$ is less than \varkappa .
4. There exist isometries λ_i of \mathbb{R}^n such that

$$\lambda_j(V_j) = \prod_{i=1}^n]a_{ij}, b_{ij}[$$

and, if $\partial V_j \cap \Omega \neq \emptyset$,

$$\lambda_j(V_j \cap \Omega) = \{(\bar{x}, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n | \bar{x} \in W_j, a_{nj} + d < x_n < \phi_j(\bar{x})\}$$

where $W_j = \prod_{i=1}^{n-1}]a_{ij}, b_{ij}[$ and $\phi_j : W_j \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

Moreover

- if $\phi_j \in C^m(\overline{W}_i)$ with $\|D^\alpha \phi_j\| \leq M < \infty$, for every $1 \leq |\alpha| \leq m$, we say that Ω has a resolved C^m boundary with parameters d, D, \varkappa, M .
- if $\phi_j \in \text{Lip}(\overline{W}_i)$ with $\text{Lip}(\phi) = M$, we say that Ω has a resolved Lipschitz boundary with parameters d, D, \varkappa, M .

Finally we will say that a domain Ω has a resolved C^m (or Lipschitz) boundary if there exist parameters d, D, \varkappa, M for which Ω has a C^m (or Lipschitz) boundary.

Remark 1. In the notation of Lemma 1, let $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $a < \phi(\bar{x}) < b$ for every $\bar{x} \in W$. We define $S^{a,b} = W \times (a, b)$, $\Omega_a = \Omega \cap (W \times (a, \infty))$ and $\widehat{W}^{l,p}(\Omega_a) = \{f \in W^{l,p}(\Omega_a) \mid \text{supp } f \subset S\}$. Then exists a bounded extension operator

$$T : \widehat{W}^{l,p}(\Omega_a) \rightarrow W^{l,p}(S^{a,b}).$$

To see this we can just extend $f \in \widehat{W}^{l,p}(\Omega_a)$ naturally by 0 to $f_0 \in W^{l,p}(\Omega)$ and then define

$$Tf = (\tilde{T}f_0)|_{S^{a,b}}$$

where \tilde{T} is the operator of the previous Lemmma .

Theorem 1. Let $m, l \in \mathbb{N}, l \leq m$ and $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. If Ω is a domain in \mathbb{R}^n has a C^m resolved boundary then there exists a bounded extension operator

$$T : W^{l,p}(\Omega) \rightarrow W^{l,p}(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

Proof Sketch. Let $f \in W^{l,p}(\Omega)$. Let $\{V_i\}_{i=1}^s$ be the covering of cuboids for Ω as in Definition 1. It's possible to construct functions $\{\psi_i\}_{i=1}^s \subset C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that the functions $\{\psi_i^2\}_{i=1}^s$ form a partition of the unity corresponding to the covering $\{V_i\}_{i=1}^s$ and satisfying $\|D^\alpha \psi_i\|_{L^\infty} \leq M_1$ with M_1 depending only on n, l, d . If $\partial\Omega \cap V_i \neq \emptyset$ by Remark 1 there exists a bounded operator

$$T_i : \widehat{W}^{l,p}(\lambda_i(\Omega \cap V_i)) \rightarrow W^{l,p}(\lambda_i(V_i))$$

where $\widehat{W}^{l,p}(\lambda_i(V_i \cap \Omega)) = \{f \in W^{l,p}(V_i \cap \Omega) \mid \text{supp } f \subset \lambda_i(V_i)\}$. If $V_i \subset \Omega$ the operator T_i is defined to be just the identity. We set

$$Tf = \sum_{i=1}^s \psi_i T_i(\psi_i f(\lambda_i^{-1}))(\lambda_i).$$

assuming $(\psi_i T_i(\psi_i f(\lambda_i^{-1})))(\lambda_i) = 0$ outside V_i . The functions $\psi_i f \in W^{l,p}(V_i \cap \Omega)$ are such that $\text{supp } \psi_i f \subset \bar{\Omega} \cap V_i$, hence $\psi_i f(\lambda_i) \in \widehat{W}^{l,p}(\lambda_i(V_i \cap \Omega))$ and so T is well defined. To see that T is an extension operator, take $x \in \Omega$: if $x \in \text{supp } \psi_i$ then $\psi_i(x) T_i(\psi_i f(\lambda_i^{-1}))(\lambda_i(x)) = \psi_i(x)^2 f(x)$; if $x \notin \text{supp } \psi_i$ then $0 = \psi_i(x) T_i(\psi_i f(\lambda_i^{-1}))(\lambda_i(x)) = \psi_i(x)^2 f(x)$. So $Tf(x) = \sum_{i=1}^s \psi_i^2(x) f(x) = f(x)$.

We omit the proof of the boundedness of T , the details of which can be found in the proofs of Lemma 13-14 in [?]. \square

1.2 Hestenes operator on Morrey spaces

Definition 2. Let $1 \leq p < \infty$, ϕ a function from \mathbb{R}^+ to \mathbb{R}^+ and Ω be a domain in \mathbb{R}^n . For a function $f \in L_{loc}^p(\Omega)$ we define the Morrey space as

$$M_p^\phi(\Omega) = \{f \in L_{loc}^p(\Omega) \mid \|f\|_{M_p^\phi(\Omega)} < \infty\}$$

where

$$\|f\|_{M_p^\phi(\Omega)} := \sup_{B_r(x), x \in \Omega, r > 0} \left(\frac{1}{\phi(r)} \int_{B_r(x) \cap \Omega} |f(y)|^p dy \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Lemma 4. Let $k \geq 1$ and Ω be set in \mathbb{R}^n with diameter $D > 0$. Then there exists an integer $C_{n,k}$ depending only on k and n such that Ω can be covered by a collection of open balls B_1, \dots, B_h centered in Ω with radius D/k and $h \leq C_{k,n}$.

Proof. We start by claiming that if S is a set of points in \mathbb{R}^n satisfying

- i) $S \subset \Omega$,
- ii) $\|z_1 - z_2\| \geq D/k$ for every $z_1, z_2 \in S$ with $z_1 \neq z_2$,

then $|S| \leq C_{n,k}$ where $C_{k,n}$ is an integer depending only on k and n . To see this, first note that Ω is contained in some closed cube Q of side $2D$. Then we choose $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $2^{m-1} > \sqrt{n}k$. Next we cover Q with $(2^m)^n$ small closed cubes of side $2D/2^m$. The diagonal of a small cube measures $2D/2^m \cdot \sqrt{n} < D/k$. Thus each of these cubes can contain at most one point of S , so $|S| \leq (2^m)^n$. Therefore it's enough to choose $C_{n,k} = 2^{mn}$. Set $r := D/k$, we'll prove that we can cover Ω with a collection of balls B_1, \dots, B_h centered in Ω of radius r and such that $h \leq C_{n,k}$. Choose $x_1 \in \Omega$ and take

$B_1 = B_r(x_1)$, the ball centered in x_1 of radius r . If $\Omega \subset B_1$ we are done, if not there exists $x_2 \in \Omega \setminus B_1$ and we take $B_2 = B_r(x_2)$. Again, if $\Omega \subset (B_1 \cup B_2)$ we stop, else we can pick $x_3 \in \Omega \setminus (B_1 \cup B_2)$ and take $B_3 = B_r(x_3)$. We iterate this procedure : given B_1, \dots, B_i balls, if $\Omega \subset (B_1 \cup \dots \cup B_i)$ we stop, else we can choose $x_{i+1} \in \Omega \setminus (B_1 \cup \dots \cup B_i)$ and take $B_{i+1} = B_r(x_{i+1})$. We claim that this procedure stops with $i \leq C_{n,k}$. Suppose it doesn't, then we can find $B_1, \dots, B_{C_{n,k}+1}$ balls centered respectively at $x_1, \dots, x_{C_{n,k}+1}$. Setting $S = \{x_1, \dots, x_{C_{n,k}+1}\}$, it's immediate to see that S satisfies i) and ii), but $|S| = C_{n,k} + 1$, that is a contradiction. \square

Lemma 5. Let $W \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ be open connected and define

$$\Omega = \{(\bar{x}, x_n) \mid \bar{x} \in W, x_n \leq \phi(\bar{x})\}$$

$$\Omega^+ = \{(\bar{x}, x_n) \mid \bar{x} \in W, x_n > \phi(\bar{x})\}$$

where $\phi \in \text{Lip}(\overline{W})$. Let $\beta > 0$ and consider the function A_β from $W \times \mathbb{R}$ to Ω defined by

$$A_\beta(\bar{x}, x_n) = \begin{cases} (\bar{x}, \phi(\bar{x}) - \beta(x_n - \phi(\bar{x}))), & \text{if } (\bar{x}, x_n) \in \Omega^+, \\ (\bar{x}, x_n), & \text{if } (\bar{x}, x_n) \in \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Then for every $x_0 \in W \times \mathbb{R}$ and $r > 0$

$$A(B_r(x_0) \cap \Omega^+) \subset B_{cr}(A(x_0)) \cap \Omega$$

where $c \geq 1$ is a constant depending only on $\text{Lip } \phi$ and β .

Proof. Notice that it is sufficient to prove that for every $x, y \in W \times \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$\|A(x) - A(y)\| \leq c\|x - y\|. \quad (4)$$

Set $M = \text{Lip } \phi$. We distinguish three cases: 1. $x, y \in \Omega$: in this case $A(x) = x$ and $A(y) = y$, so $\|x - y\| = \|A(x) - A(y)\|$ and there is nothing to prove.

2. $x, y \in \Omega^+$: we have

$$\begin{aligned} |A(x)_n - A(y)_n| &= |\phi(\bar{x}) - \beta(x_n - \phi(\bar{x})) - \phi(\bar{y}) + \beta(y_n - \phi(\bar{y}))| \\ &\leq (1 + \beta)|\phi(\bar{x}) - \phi(\bar{y})| + \beta|x_n - y_n| \\ &\leq M(1 + \beta)\|\bar{x} - \bar{y}\| + \beta|x_n - y_n| \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\|A(x) - A(y)\|^2 &= \|\overline{A(x)} - \overline{A(y)}\|^2 + |A(x)_n - A(y)_n|^2 \\
&\leq \|\bar{x} - \bar{y}\|^2 + [M(1 + \beta)\|\bar{x} - \bar{y}\| + \beta|x_n - y_n|]^2 \\
&\leq (1 + 2M^2(1 + \beta)^2)\|\bar{x} - \bar{y}\|^2 + 2\beta^2|x_n - y_n|^2 \\
&\leq c_1^2(M, \beta)\|x - y\|^2
\end{aligned}$$

for some constant $c_1(M, \beta)$.

3. $x \in \Omega^+, y \in \Omega$: first notice that, since $\phi(\bar{x}) < x_n$, then $x_n - y_n > \phi(\bar{x}) - y_n$. Moreover $\phi(\bar{y}) > y_n$, hence $M\|\bar{x} - \bar{y}\| \geq \phi(\bar{y}) - \phi(\bar{x}) > y_n - \phi(\bar{x})$. This implies

$$|\phi(\bar{x}) - y_n| < |x_n - y_n| + M\|\bar{x} - \bar{y}\|.$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned}
|A(x)_n - A(y)_n| &= |\phi(\bar{x}) - \beta(x_n - \phi(\bar{x})) - y_n| \\
&= |(1 + \beta)(\phi(\bar{x}) - y_n) + \beta(y_n - x_n)| \\
&\leq M(1 + \beta)\|\bar{x} - \bar{y}\| + (1 + 2\beta)|x_n - y_n|
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\|A(x) - A(y)\|^2 &= \|\overline{A(x)} - \overline{A(y)}\|^2 + |A(x)_n - A(y)_n|^2 \\
&\leq \|\bar{x} - \bar{y}\|^2 + [M(1 + \beta)\|\bar{x} - \bar{y}\| + (1 + 2\beta)|x_n - y_n|]^2 \\
&\leq (1 + 2M^2(1 + \beta)^2)\|\bar{x} - \bar{y}\|^2 + 2(1 + 2\beta)^2|x_n - y_n|^2 \\
&\leq c_2^2(M, \beta)\|x - y\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

for some constant $c_2(M, \beta)$. Then (4) by taking $c = \max(\sqrt{c_1}, \sqrt{c_2}, 1)$. \square

Lemma 6. Let $l, n, m \in \mathbb{N}, m \geq l, 1 \leq p \leq \infty$, $W = \prod_{i=1}^{n-1}]a_i, b_i[$ be an open cuboid of \mathbb{R}^{n-1} and ϕ a function from \mathbb{R}^+ to \mathbb{R}^+ . Moreover define

$$S = W \times \mathbb{R}$$

$$\Omega = \{(\bar{x}, x_n) | \bar{x} \in W, x_n < \phi(\bar{x})\}$$

where $\phi \in C^m(\overline{W})$ and $\|D^\alpha \phi\| \leq M < \infty$ for every $1 \leq |\alpha| \leq l$. Then for every $f \in W^{l,p}(\Omega)$

$$\text{i)} \quad \|Tf\|_{M_p^\phi(S)} \leq C\|f\|_{M_p^\phi(\Omega)}$$

$$\text{ii)} \quad \|D_w^\alpha Tf\|_{M_p^\phi(S)} \leq C \sum_{1 \leq |\beta| \leq |\alpha|} \|D_w^\beta f\|_{M_p^\phi(\Omega)}, \quad 1 \leq |\alpha| \leq l$$

where T is the Hestenes operator defined in Lemma 1 and C is a constant independent of f .

Proof. Define $\Omega^+ = \{(\bar{x}, x_n) \mid \bar{x} \in W, x_n > \phi(\bar{x})\}$. We recall the definition of T

$$Tf(x) = \begin{cases} f(x) & x \in \Omega \\ \sum_{i=1}^l \alpha_k f(\bar{x}, \phi(\bar{x}) - \beta_k(x_n - \phi(\bar{x}))) & x \in \Omega^+ \end{cases}$$

and observe that we can rewrite it as

$$Tf(x) = \begin{cases} f(x), & \text{if } x \in \Omega, \\ \sum_{i=1}^l \alpha_k f(G_k(x)), & \text{if } x \in \Omega^+, \end{cases}$$

where $G_k(\bar{x}, x_n) = (\bar{x}, \phi(\bar{x}) - \beta_k(x_n - \phi(\bar{x})))$. Note that $G_k : \Omega^+ \rightarrow \Omega$ defines a diffeomorphism from Ω^+ to Ω of class C^m and satisfying $|\det JG_k^{-1}| \equiv 1/\beta_k$. First we prove ii). Let's fix $x_0 \in S$ and a radius $r > 0$. We want to estimate the quantity

$$I = \left(\frac{1}{\phi(r)} \int_{B_r(x_0) \cap S} |D_w^\alpha Tf(x)|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

for $1 \leq |\alpha| \leq l$. To do this we estimate the integral as follows

$$I \leq \underbrace{\left(\frac{1}{\phi(r)} \int_{B_r(x_0) \cap \Omega^+} |D_w^\alpha Tf(x)|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}}_{I_1} + \underbrace{\left(\frac{1}{\phi(r)} \int_{B_r(x_0) \cap \Omega} |D_w^\alpha Tf(x)|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}}_{I_2}.$$

Since $Tf(x) = f(x)$ when $x \in \Omega$, we have immediately

$$I_2 \leq \|D_w^\alpha f\|_{M_p^\phi(\Omega)}.$$

It remains to estimate I_1 . We start by observing that from Lemma 3 there exists a constant C_k depending only on G_k and l such that

$$|D_w^\alpha(f \circ G_k)| \leq C_k \sum_{1 \leq |\beta| \leq |\alpha|} |D_w^\beta f(G_k)|.$$

By the previous inequality and Lemma 5 we are able to produce the following bound

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\|D_w^\alpha(f \circ G_k)\|_{L^p(B_r(x_0) \cap \Omega^+)}}{\phi(r)^{\frac{1}{p}}} &\leq C_k \sum_{1 \leq |\beta| \leq |\alpha|} \left(\phi(r)^{-1} \int_{G_k(B_r(x_0) \cap \Omega^+)} |D_w^\beta f(y)|^p |\det JG_k^{-1}|_{G_k(y)} dy \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\leq C_k \beta_k^{-\frac{1}{p}} \sum_{1 \leq |\beta| \leq |\alpha|} \left(\phi(r)^{-1} \int_{B_{c_k r}(A_{\beta_k}(x_0)) \cap \Omega} |D_w^\beta f(y)|^p dy \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \end{aligned}$$

where A_{α_k} is defined as in Lemma 5 and c_k depends only on β_k and M . By Lemma 4 the set $B_{c_k r}(A_{\beta_k}(x_0)) \cap \Omega$ can be covered with a collection of open balls B_1, \dots, B_h centered in Ω with radius r and $h \leq m_k$, where m_k depends only on c_k . Hence we get

$$\frac{\|D_w^\alpha(f \circ G_k)\|_{L^p(B_r(x_0) \cap \Omega^+)}}{\phi(r)^{\frac{1}{p}}} \leq C_k \beta_k^{-\frac{1}{p}} m_k \sum_{1 \leq |\beta| \leq |\alpha|} \|D_w^\beta f\|_{M_p^\phi(\Omega)}$$

Next we estimate I_1 :

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \phi(r)^{-\frac{1}{p}} \|D_w^\alpha T f\|_{L^p(B_r(x_0) \cap \Omega^+)} \leq \phi(r)^{-\frac{1}{p}} \sum_{k=1}^l \alpha_k \|D_w^\alpha f(G_k)\|_{L^p(B_r(x_0) \cap \Omega^+)} \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^l \alpha_k C_k \beta_k^{-\frac{1}{p}} m_k \left(\sum_{1 \leq |\beta| \leq |\alpha|} \|D_w^\beta f\|_{M_p^\phi(\Omega)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Finally putting the estimates of I_1, I_2 together

$$\begin{aligned} \|D_w^\alpha T f\|_{M_p^\phi(S)} &= \sup_{x_0 \in S, r > 0} \left(\frac{1}{\phi(r)} \int_{B_r(x_0) \cap S} |D_w^\alpha T f(x)|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\leq \|D_w^\alpha f\|_{M_p^\phi(\Omega)} + \sum_{k=1}^l \alpha_k C_k \beta_k^{-\frac{1}{p}} m_k \left(\sum_{1 \leq |\beta| \leq |\alpha|} \|D_w^\beta f\|_{M_p^\phi(\Omega)} \right) \\ &\leq \tilde{C} \sum_{1 \leq |\beta| \leq |\alpha|} \|D_w^\beta f\|_{M_p^\phi(\Omega)} \end{aligned}$$

where \tilde{C} depends only on $\{b_k\}_k, \{\alpha_k\}_k, l, M, p$. This proves ii). The proof of i) is exactly analogous to the proof of ii). \square

Theorem 2. Let $m, l \in \mathbb{N}, l \leq m, 1 \leq p \leq \infty$, ϕ a function from \mathbb{R}^+ to \mathbb{R}^+ and Ω a domain in \mathbb{R}^n with C^m resolved boundary. Then for every $f \in W^{l,p}(\Omega)$

$$\text{i) } \|Tf\|_{M_p^\phi(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C\|f\|_{M_p^\phi(\Omega)}$$

$$\text{ii) } \|D_w^\alpha Tf\|_{M_p^\phi(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C \sum_{1 \leq |\beta| \leq |\alpha|} \|D_w^\beta f\|_{M_p^\phi(\Omega)}, \quad 1 \leq |\alpha| \leq l$$

where T is the Hestenes operator defined in Theorem 1 and C doesn't depend on f .

Proof. Let $f \in W^{l,p}(\Omega)$ and $\{V_i\}_{i=1}^s$ be the covering of cuboids for Ω as in the definition of set with resolved boundary. We recall the definition of T :

$$Tf = \sum_{i=1}^s \psi_i T_i(\psi_i f(\lambda_i^{-1}))(\lambda_i)$$

where $\{\psi_i^2\}_{i=1}^s$ form a partition of the unity corresponding to the covering $\{V_i\}_{i=1}^s$ and satisfying $\|D^\alpha \psi_i\|_{L^\infty} \leq M_1$, with $|\alpha| \leq l$ and M_1 depending only on n, l, d . To make the notation simpler we will rewrite T as

$$Tf = \sum_{i=1}^s \psi_i \tilde{T}_i(\psi_i f)$$

where the operator \tilde{T}_i is defined as $\tilde{T}_i f = T_i(f(\lambda_i^{-1}))(\lambda_i)$. Before starting the proof we remark some facts that will be justified at the end of the proof:

a) Let C_i the constant such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_i g\|_{M_p^\phi(\lambda_i(V_i))} &\leq C_i \|g\|_{M_p^\phi(\lambda_i(\Omega \cap V_i))} \\ \|D_w^\alpha T_i g\|_{M_p^\phi(\lambda_i(V_i))} &\leq C_i \sum_{1 \leq |\beta| \leq |\alpha|} \|D_w^\beta g\|_{M_p^\phi(\lambda_i(\Omega \cap V_i))} \end{aligned}$$

for $1 \leq |\alpha| \leq l$ and $g \in \widehat{W}^{l,p}(\lambda_i(\Omega \cap V_i))$. Then $\sup_{i=1,\dots,s} C_i \leq M_2$, where M_2 depends only on Ω, l, n .

b) We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{T}_i g\|_{M_p^\phi(V_i)} &\leq C_i \|g\|_{M_p^\phi(\Omega \cap V_i)} \\ \|D_w^\alpha \tilde{T}_i g\|_{M_p^\phi(V_i)} &\leq M_3 C_i \sum_{1 \leq |\beta| \leq |\alpha|} \|D_w^\beta g\|_{M_p^\phi(\Omega \cap V_i)} \end{aligned}$$

for $1 \leq |\alpha| \leq l$ and $g \in \widehat{W}^{l,p}(\Omega \cap V_i)$ and where M_3 doesn't depend on i .

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{1}{\phi(r)} |Tf(x)|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} &\leq \left(\frac{1}{\phi(r)} \int_B \left| \sum_{i=1}^s \psi_i \tilde{T}_i(f(\psi_i))(x) \right|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in J} \left(\frac{1}{\phi(r)} \int_{B \cap V_i} |\tilde{T}_i(f(\psi_i))(x)|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \end{aligned}$$

Let's now prove a),b),c),d),e).

a) Ω has a resolved C^m boundary with parameters \varkappa, d, D, M . Hence, if ϕ_i are the C^m functions of Definition 1, we have $\|D^\alpha \phi_i\| \leq M$ for every i and for every $1 \leq |\alpha| \leq l$. Therefore by the proof of Lemma 6 we deduce that C_i depends only on l, n, M and on the choice of the constants α_k, β_k , which can be chosen to be the same for every T_i . b) We notice that since λ_i are isometries, they are smooth and their derivatives are uniformly bounded with a bound depending only on n . Then the result follows from a straightforward computation using a change of variable and the Leibniz rule for derivatives. c) We have that

$$\sum_k |f|^p \mathbb{1}_{X_k} \leq \delta |f|^p.$$

Then it's enough to integrate on X and raise to the power $1/p$. d) A proof can be found in [?, Lemma 13]. e) For every $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and every $t \in T$ we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^N a_n(t) \leq \sum_{n=1}^N \sup_{t \in T} a_n(t),$$

which letting $N \rightarrow \infty$ gives

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n(t) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sup_{t \in T} a_n(t).$$

Applying the sup on the left-hand side we obtain the result. □