

OBLIQUE DERIVATIVE BOUNDARY VALUE PROBLEMS ON FAMILIES OF PLANAR DOMAINS

ZIMING SHI

ABSTRACT. We consider second-order elliptic equations with oblique derivative boundary conditions, defined on a family of bounded domains in \mathbb{C} that depend smoothly on a real parameter $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. We derive sharp regularity properties of the solutions in all variables, including the parameter λ . More specifically we show that the solution and its derivatives are continuous in all variables, and the Hölder norms of the space variables are bounded uniformly in λ .

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Hölder spaces with parameter	3
3. A review of Vekua's theory on fixed domains	9
4. Families of simply-connected domains	17
5. Kernels with parameter	26
6. Families of multiply-connected domains	32
6.1. The $\mathcal{C}^{\nu^-, 0}$ estimate	34
6.2. The $\mathcal{C}^{\nu, 0}$ estimate	50
6.3. Differentiability in space variable: The $\mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu, 0}$ estimate	52
6.4. Differentiability in parameter: the $\mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu, j}$ estimate	54
7. Appendix	57
7.1. Estimates for the Cauchy-Green/ $\bar{\partial}$ operator	57
7.2. Estimates for Cauchy type operators	58
7.3. Theory of singular integral operators on curves	62
7.4. Some other results	63
References	66

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we study the domain dependence of solutions to the oblique boundary value problem on the plane. We consider the following problem on a family of “smoothly varying” bounded domains Ω^λ in \mathbb{C} that depend on some parameter $\lambda \in [0, 1]$:

$$(1.1) \quad \mathcal{L}^\lambda u^\lambda = f^\lambda \quad \text{in } \Omega^\lambda, \quad \frac{du^\lambda}{d\Upsilon^\lambda} = \gamma^\lambda \quad \text{on } b\Omega^\lambda.$$

Here \mathcal{L}^λ is a second-order elliptic operator defined by

$$(1.2) \quad \mathcal{L}^\lambda u^\lambda = a^\lambda(x, y)u_{xx}^\lambda + 2b^\lambda(x, y)u_{xy}^\lambda + c^\lambda(x, y)u_{yy}^\lambda + d^\lambda(x, y)u_x^\lambda + e^\lambda(x, y)u_y^\lambda,$$

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 30E25, 30G20, 35J25, 45E05.

Key words and phrases. oblique derivative boundary value problem, generalized Riemann-Hilbert problem, generalized analytic function, singular integral equation.

Supported in part by NSF grant DMS-1500162.

and Υ^λ is an arbitrary non-vanishing directional vector field along $b\Omega^\lambda$. We assume $a^\lambda > 0$ and the uniform ellipticity condition:

$$(1.3) \quad a^\lambda c^\lambda - (b^\lambda)^2 \geq \delta_0 > 0, \quad \forall \lambda \in [0, 1].$$

We show that if all the coefficient functions $a^\lambda, b^\lambda, c^\lambda, d^\lambda, e^\lambda, f^\lambda, \gamma^\lambda$ depend on the parameter λ “smoothly”. Then with certain suitable conditions to guarantee the existence and uniqueness of the problem (1.1), the family of solutions u^λ will also depend on the parameter “smoothly”.

We now make the concept of domain dependence precise. Let \mathbb{N} be the set of non-negative integers. Let Ω be a bounded domain in \mathbb{C} , and let $k, j \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfy $k \geq j$. Given a family of functions u^λ defined on Ω , we say that u^λ is in the space $C^{k+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega})$ if for every integer i with $0 \leq i \leq j$, $[\lambda \mapsto \partial_\lambda^i u^\lambda]$ is a continuous map from $[0, 1]$ to $C^{k-i}(\overline{\Omega})$ and a bounded map from $[0, 1]$ to $C^{k-i+\mu}(\overline{\Omega})$. Our main result is

Theorem 1.1. *Let k, j be in $\mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ with $k \geq j$, and let $0 < \mu < 1$. Let Ω be a bounded domain in \mathbb{C} with $C^{k+2+\mu}$ boundary. Let Γ^λ be a family of maps that embed Ω onto Ω^λ , with $\Gamma^\lambda \in C^{k+2+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega})$ and Γ^0 being the identity map. Suppose that $a^\lambda, b^\lambda, c^\lambda, d^\lambda, e^\lambda, f^\lambda$ are functions in Ω^λ , such that $a^\lambda \circ \Gamma^\lambda, b^\lambda \circ \Gamma^\lambda, c^\lambda \circ \Gamma^\lambda \in C^{k+1+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega})$, $d^\lambda \circ \Gamma^\lambda, e^\lambda \circ \Gamma^\lambda, f^\lambda \circ \Gamma^\lambda \in C^{k+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega})$, and suppose that $\Upsilon^\lambda, \gamma^\lambda$ are functions on $b\Omega^\lambda$ such that $\Upsilon^\lambda \circ \Gamma^\lambda, \gamma^\lambda \circ \Gamma^\lambda \in C^{k+1+\mu, j}(b\Omega)$. Suppose certain well-posedness conditions (see Proposition 3.8) are given so that (1.1) with (1.3) has a unique solution for each λ . Then $u^\lambda \circ \Gamma^\lambda \in C^{k+2+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega})$.*

The existence and uniqueness theory for fixed λ are classical results and we shall review them in Section 3.

In Bertrand-Gong [1] the analogous results were proved for the Dirichlet and Neumann problems for the Laplacian equation. As a corollary, they proved a parameter version of the Riemann mapping theorem, namely, for any family of simply connected domains Ω^λ given by the embeddings $\Gamma^\lambda : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow \overline{\Omega^\lambda}$ with $\Gamma^\lambda \in C^{k+1+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega})$, there exists a family of Riemann mappings $R^\lambda : \Omega^\lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ such that $R^\lambda \circ \Gamma^\lambda \in C^{k+1+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega})$, where \mathbb{D} is the unit disk. We shall use this result in our proof of Theorem 1.1 when the domains are simply-connected.

For fixed λ , we apply the classical theory of Vekua to solve equation (1.1). The idea is to first find an isothermal coordinates in which the problem takes the form

$$(1.4) \quad \Delta U + a(x, y)U_x + b(x, y)U_y = f(x, y), \quad \alpha U_x - \beta U_y = \gamma.$$

By setting $w = u + iv$ for $u = U_x$ and $v = -U_y$, (1.4) takes the form

$$(1.5) \quad \partial_{\bar{z}} w + Aw + B\bar{w} = F, \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

$$(1.6) \quad \text{Re}[\bar{l}w] = \gamma, \quad \text{on } b\Omega,$$

where we assume $l = \alpha + i\beta$ is nowhere vanishing on $b\Omega$. Problem (1.5)-(1.6) is called a *generalized Riemann-Hilbert problem*. (The classical Riemann-Hilbert problem is the special case when $A, B, F \equiv 0$.) Vekua tackled this problem by introducing the theory of generalized analytic functions. His idea is to find an integral representation formula for a solution w satisfying equation (1.5). The boundary condition (1.6) then translates into a singular integral equation on curves for which there is well-known theory.

For our problem on domains with parameter, we will first reduce the problem to the $\bar{\partial}$ form (1.5)-(1.6). If the domains are simply-connected, we can pull back the problem onto the fixed unit disk \mathbb{D} by using the parameter version of the Riemann mapping theorem proved in [1]. The solution is shown to satisfy a Fredholm integral equation on \mathbb{D} , and the smoothness in parameter follows from a standard compactness argument.

The problem becomes more difficult for families of multiply-connected domains. In this case one may also pull back the equations onto some fixed domain. However, now the pull back maps are no longer biholomorphic, so this procedure will destroy the $\bar{\partial}$ form (1.5). Thus we are forced to

deal with variable domains in this case. We use Vekua's idea to reduce the problem to a singular integral equation on $b\Omega^\lambda$, and then reduce it into a Fredholm equation in order to use compactness argument.

We mention that one could certainly obtain an estimate of the form

$$\|w^\lambda\|_{C^{k+1+\mu}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})} \leq C_\lambda \|f^\lambda\|_{C^{k+\mu}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})},$$

for each fixed λ , by solving the problem on each fixed domain. However this estimate is not useful since in general we do not have any information as to how the constant C_λ depends on λ .

Following Vekua, we will henceforth call (1.5)-(1.6) Problem A for $\bar{\partial}$ or simply Problem A. There is a vast literature on the oblique derivative boundary value problem. See for example Miranda [4, Chapter 3] and Hörmander [3, Chapter 10].

The paper is organized as follows:

In Section 2, we introduce the notations used in our paper. We review the definition of Hölder spaces with parameter as were used in [6] and [1], and we show some basic properties of these spaces. In particular, we prove a result (Proposition 2.3) which will be used repeatedly throughout the paper to simplify our arguments. Section 3 contains an exposition of Vekua's theory on the solvability and regularity of Problem A without parameter. The solvability properties are determined by the index of the problem (see Definition 3.1) and the number of connected components of the boundary $b\Omega$. All the results in this section can be found in [7]. In Section 4, we prove Theorem 1.1 for families of simply-connected domains Ω^λ . In Section 5 we examine how the kernel in Vekua's integral solution formula depends on λ . These results will be used in Section 6 to prove Theorem 1.1 for families of multiply-connected domains Ω^λ . For our proof we are able to avoid taking derivatives on the kernel as was done in [1].

In the end we attach an appendix, where we provide either complete proofs or precise references to the various claims used in earlier proofs. For the reader's convenience we also include a few of Vekua's results that we used frequently in the paper. For the constants appearing in our estimate, we use the notation $C_{1,0}$ (resp. $C_{k+\mu,j}$) to indicate that it depends on $\|\Gamma^\lambda\|_{C^{1,0}(\Omega)}$ (resp. $\|\Gamma^\lambda\|_{C^{k+\mu,j}(\Omega)}$). For a family of functions u^λ defined on Ω^λ , we shall write either $u^\lambda \in C^{k+\mu,j}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$ or $u^\lambda \circ \Gamma^\lambda \in C^{k+\mu,j}(\overline{\Omega})$. We shall write $|f|_{k+\mu}$ instead of $|f|_{C^{k+\mu}(\overline{\Omega})}$ whenever the domain Ω is clear from the context.

Acknowledgment. The author would like to express his deep gratitude to Professor Xianghong Gong and Professor Xiaojun Huang for providing innumerable inspiration, encouragement and guidance through many years, without which this project would never be completed. The author would also like to thank the anonymous referee for reading the paper carefully and for many valuable suggestions.

2. HÖLDER SPACES WITH PARAMETER

In this section we introduce Hölder spaces with parameter as in [1], which can be used to study boundary value problems on families of domains.

We denote by $C^r(\overline{\Omega})$, $r \geq 0$ the space of complex-valued functions which are Hölder continuous with exponent r on a bounded domain $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}$. When the domain Ω in question is clear, we also write $|f|_r$ in place of $|f|_{C^r(\overline{\Omega})}$. The space $C^{r-\varepsilon}(\overline{\Omega})$ consists of those functions that are in $C^{r-\varepsilon}(\overline{\Omega})$, for all $\varepsilon > 0$. We write \mathbb{D} for the unit disk in \mathbb{C} , and we write $dA(z) = \frac{i}{2} dz \wedge d\bar{z}$ for the area element in \mathbb{C} . The Cauchy-Green or $\bar{\partial}$ solution operator on a domain $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ is defined by

$$(2.1) \quad T_\Omega f(z) := -\frac{1}{\pi} \iint_\Omega \frac{f(\zeta)}{\zeta - z} dA(\zeta), \quad z \in \Omega.$$

For $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ and $\nu \in \mathbb{R}$, we denote by $L_{p,\nu}(\mathbb{C})$ the space of functions f satisfying

$$(2.2) \quad f \in L^p(\mathbb{D}), \quad f_\nu(z) := |z|^{-\nu} f\left(\frac{1}{z}\right) \in L^p(\mathbb{D}),$$

with the norm $|f|_{L_{p,\nu}(\mathbb{C})} = |f|_{L^p(\mathbb{D})} + |f_\nu|_{L^p(\mathbb{D})}$. The space $L_{p,\nu}(\mathbb{C})$ is a Banach space with this norm. Intuitively the lower index ν describes the rate of growth of f at ∞ , and we have $L_{p,\nu_1}(\mathbb{C}) \subset L_{p,\nu_2}(\mathbb{C})$, if $\nu_1 > \nu_2$. It is easy to see that $f_\nu \in L^p(\mathbb{D})$ if and only if

$$\int_{\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{D}} |u|^{\nu p - 4} |f(u)|^p dA(u) < \infty.$$

For $0 < \mu < 1$, we let $L_\mu^p(\Omega)$ denote the set of functions f that satisfy $f \in L^p(\Omega)$, $f \equiv 0$ outside Ω , and

$$B(f, \Omega, \mu, p) = \sup_{h \in \mathbb{C}} \frac{(\iint_\Omega |f(z+h) - f(z)|^p dA(z))^\frac{1}{p}}{|h|^\mu} < \infty.$$

Then $L_\mu^p(\Omega)$ is a Banach space with the norm:

$$(2.3) \quad |f|_{L_\mu^p(\Omega)} = |f|_{L^p(\Omega)} + B(f, \Omega, \mu, p).$$

We say that w is a solution to the equation

$$(2.4) \quad \partial_{\bar{z}} w + Aw + B\bar{w} = F, \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

if $w, \partial_{\bar{z}} w \in L^1(\Omega)$, and the above equation holds in the sense of distributions in Ω . We denote by $\mathcal{L}_p(A, B, F, \Omega)$ (resp. $\mathcal{L}_{p,2}(A, B, F)$) the set of $w \in L^1(\Omega)$ that satisfy (2.4) with $A, B, F \in L^p(\Omega)$ (resp. $L_{p,2}(\mathbb{C})$). If $F \equiv 0$, we write $\mathcal{L}_p(A, B, \Omega)$ (resp. $\mathcal{L}_{p,2}(A, B)$) for the spaces defined as above.

We adopt the following notations for differences of functions:

$$(2.5) \quad \delta_{z,\zeta}(f(\cdot, \lambda)) := f(z, \lambda) - f(\zeta, \lambda), \quad \delta^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2} f(z, \cdot) := f(z, \lambda_1) - f(z, \lambda_2).$$

We denote the difference quotient with respect to the parameter by

$$(2.6) \quad D^{\lambda, \lambda_0} f(\cdot) := \frac{f(\cdot, \lambda) - f(\cdot, \lambda_0)}{\lambda - \lambda_0}.$$

To study boundary value problems on families of domains, we use the Hölder space with parameter $\mathcal{C}^{k+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega}_\Gamma)$ from [1] (our space is the same as the \mathcal{B} space in [1]). First we define the spaces for a fixed domain:

Definition 2.1. Let k, j be in $\mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ with $k \geq j$, and let $0 < \mu < 1$. Let Ω be a bounded domain in \mathbb{C} with $C^{k+\mu}$ boundary, and let $\{u^\lambda\}_{\lambda \in [0,1]}$ be a family of functions on Ω . We say that $\{u^\lambda\}_{\lambda \in [0,1]}$ is in the class $\mathcal{C}_*^{k+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega})$, if for all $0 \leq i \leq j$, $|\partial_\lambda^i u^\lambda|_{k+\mu}$ are uniformly bounded in λ , and $\partial_\lambda^i u^\lambda$ is continuous in λ in the $C^k(\overline{\Omega})$ norm. The norm on $\mathcal{C}_*^{k+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega})$ is defined to be

$$(2.7) \quad |u^\lambda|_{k+\mu, j} := \sup_{0 \leq i \leq j, \lambda \in [0,1]} \{|\partial_\lambda^i u^\lambda|_{k+\mu}\}.$$

Similarly we define $\mathcal{C}_*^{k+\mu, j}(b\Omega)$ by replacing Ω with $b\Omega$ in the above expressions.

For our problem with parameter, we consider functions defined on a family of domains Ω^λ , for $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. We assume there is an embedding $\Gamma^\lambda : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega^\lambda$, where Γ^0 is the identity map from Ω to itself.

Now we make the following observation. Suppose for each $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, u^λ is defined on an open set V with $\cup_\lambda \Omega^\lambda \subset \subset V$. Let $\Gamma^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}_*^{k+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega})$, and $u^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}_*^{k+\mu, j}(V)$. But then $\tilde{u}^\lambda(z) := u^\lambda(\Gamma^\lambda(z))$ is not in the space $\mathcal{C}_*^{k+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega})$, since when one takes derivative in λ , by the chain rule one needs to take the space derivative of u^λ . Hence instead of $\mathcal{C}_*^{k+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega})$, we shall adopt the following definition in [1] for a family of functions defined on a family of domains:

Definition 2.2. Let k, j, μ be as in Theorem 1.1. Let $\{\Gamma^\lambda : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow \overline{\Omega^\lambda}\}_{\lambda \in [0,1]}$ be in the class $\mathcal{C}_*^{k+\mu,j}(\overline{\Omega})$. Let u^λ be a family of functions defined on Ω^λ , and put $\tilde{u}(z, \lambda) := u^\lambda(\Gamma^\lambda(z))$. We say that

$$u^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}_*^{k+\mu,j}(\overline{\Omega_\Gamma}) \quad \text{if } \tilde{u}(z, \lambda) \in \mathcal{C}_*^{k+\mu,j}(\overline{\Omega}), \quad u^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}_*^{k+\mu,j}(b\Omega_\Gamma) \quad \text{if } \tilde{u}(z, \lambda) \in \mathcal{C}_*^{k+\mu,j}(b\Omega).$$

For $0 \leq j \leq k$, define the spaces

$$\mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu,j}(\overline{\Omega_\Gamma}) := \bigcap_{i=0}^j \mathcal{C}_*^{k-i+\mu,i}(\overline{\Omega_\Gamma}), \quad \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu,j}(b\Omega_\Gamma) := \bigcap_{i=0}^j \mathcal{C}_*^{k-i+\mu,i}(b\Omega_\Gamma).$$

The space $\mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu,j}(\overline{\Omega_\Gamma})$ is a Banach space with the norm defined by $\|u^\lambda\|_{k+\mu,j} := \max_{0 \leq i \leq j} \{|\tilde{u}(z, \lambda)|_{k-i+\mu,i}\}$. In other words, we say that $u^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu,j}(\overline{\Omega_\Gamma})$ if $|\partial_\lambda^i \tilde{u}|_{k-i+\mu}$ is uniformly bounded in λ , and $\partial_\lambda^i \tilde{u}$ is continuous in the $C^{k-i}(\overline{\Omega})$ norm, for each i with $0 \leq i \leq j$. Since $|\partial_\lambda^{i'} u|_{k-i+\mu} \leq |\partial_\lambda^i u|_{k-i+\mu}$, for any $i', 0 \leq i' \leq i$, we have

$$\|u^\lambda\|_{k+\mu,j} = \max_{0 \leq i \leq j} \{|\partial_\lambda^i \tilde{u}(z, \lambda)|_{k-i+\mu}\}, \quad \tilde{u}(z, \lambda) := u^\lambda(\Gamma^\lambda(z)).$$

We denote the restriction of Γ^λ to $b\Omega$ by $\rho^\lambda(s)$, where s is the arclength element on $b\Omega$. Then $dt^\lambda = (\rho^\lambda)'(s)ds$.

Proposition 2.3. Let k be a non-negative integer and $0 < \mu < 1$. Let Ω be a bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^n .

(i) For any $0 < \mu' < \mu$, $C^{k+\mu'}(\overline{\Omega})$ is relatively compact in $C^{k+\mu}(\overline{\Omega})$.

(ii) Let $\{f^\lambda\}$ be a family of functions in the class $C^{k+\mu}(\overline{\Omega})$ such that $|f^\lambda|_{k+\mu}$ is uniformly bounded in λ , and f^λ is continuous in λ in the $|\cdot|_0$ -norm. Then f^λ is continuous in λ in the $|\cdot|_{k+\mu'}$ -norm, for any $0 < \mu' < \mu$.

Proof. (i) Taking $\varepsilon < \frac{\mu-\mu'}{\mu}$ (so that $\mu(1-\varepsilon) - \mu' > 0$), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|g_n\|_{k+\mu'} &= \sup_{x,y \in \Omega} \frac{|D^k g_n(x) - D^k g_n(y)|}{|x-y|^{\mu'}} \\ &\leq \sup_{x,y \in \Omega} \frac{|D^k g_n(x) - D^k g_n(y)|^{1-\varepsilon}}{|x-y|^{\mu'}} \sup_{x,y \in \Omega} |D^k g_n(x) - D^k g_n(y)|^\varepsilon \\ &\leq C (\|g_n\|_{k+\mu,0}) \sup_{x,y \in \Omega} |x-y|^{\mu(1-\varepsilon)-\mu'} |g_n|_k^\varepsilon \leq C (\|g_n\|_{k+\mu,0}) |g_n|_k^\varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where the constant C depends on $\Omega, \mu, \mu', \varepsilon$. By the Ascoli-Arzelà theorem, there exists a subsequence $\{g_{n_j}\}$ which converges uniformly to some function g_* in the $|\cdot|_k$ norm. Using the above estimates, the sequence $\{g_{n_j}\}$ is Cauchy in the $|\cdot|_{k+\mu'}$ norm, hence must converge to some $C^{k+\mu'}(\overline{\Omega})$ function, which is just g_* .

(ii) Seeking contradiction, suppose there exists some λ_0 and a sequence $\lambda_j \rightarrow \lambda_0$ such that $|f^{\lambda_j} - f^{\lambda_0}|_{k+\mu'} \geq \delta > 0$. By part (i) and passing to a subsequence if necessary, f^{λ_j} converges to some function \widehat{f} in the $|\cdot|_{k+\mu'}$ -norm, and thus

$$(2.8) \quad |\widehat{f} - f^{\lambda_0}|_{k+\mu'} \geq \delta > 0.$$

On the other hand, we have $|\widehat{f} - f^{\lambda_0}|_0 \leq |\widehat{f} - f^{\lambda_j}|_0 + |f^{\lambda_j} - f^{\lambda_0}|_0$. The right-hand side converges to 0 by assumption, so $\widehat{f} \equiv f^{\lambda_0}$, which contradicts (2.8). Hence f^λ is continuous in λ in the $|\cdot|_{k+\mu'}$ norm. \square

The following result shows that the definition $\mathcal{C}^{k+\mu,j}(\overline{\Omega_\Gamma})$ is independent of the embedding Γ^λ . For this reason we shall from now on write $\mathcal{C}^{k+\mu,j}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$ instead of $\mathcal{C}^{k+\mu,j}(\overline{\Omega_\Gamma})$.

Proposition 2.4 ([1, Lemma 2.2]). *Let k, j, μ be as in Theorem 1.1. Let $\overline{\Omega}$ be a bounded domain with $b\Omega \in C^{k+\mu, j} \cap C^1$. Let Γ_1^λ and Γ_2^λ be two embeddings from $\overline{\Omega}$ to $\overline{\Omega^\lambda}$. If $\Gamma_i^\lambda \in C^{k+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega}) \cap C^{1,0}(\overline{\Omega})$. Then $C^{k+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega}_{\Gamma_1}) = C^{k+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega}_{\Gamma_2})$.*

Lemma 2.5. *Let k, j, μ be as in Theorem 1.1. Let $\Omega, \Omega' \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, and $F : \overline{\Omega} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \overline{\Omega'} \times [0, 1]$ be a $C^{k+1+\mu, j}$ -mapping, defined by*

$$F(x, y, \lambda) = (f_1(x, y, \lambda), f_2(x, y, \lambda), \lambda) := (\xi, \eta, \tau).$$

Suppose that $f(\cdot, \cdot, \lambda) = (f_1(\cdot, \cdot, \lambda), f_2(\cdot, \cdot, \lambda))$ are bijections from $\overline{\Omega}$ to $\overline{\Omega'}$ for each fixed λ , and the Jacobian matrix DF has non-vanishing determinant in $\overline{\Omega} \times [0, 1]$. Then $F^{-1} \in C^{k+1+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega'} \times [0, 1])$.

The proof can be done by induction on k, j . The details are left to the reader.

Proposition 2.6 ([1, Corollary 9.4]). *Let k, j, μ be as in Theorem 1.1. Let Ω be a simply-connected domain in \mathbb{C} with $b\Omega \in C^{k+1+\mu}$, and let $\Gamma^\lambda : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow \overline{\Omega^\lambda}$ be in the class $C^{k+1+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega})$. Then there exists a family of Riemann mappings $R^\lambda : \Omega^\lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ such that $\tilde{R}(z, \lambda) := R^\lambda \circ \Gamma^\lambda(z) \in C^{k+1+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega})$.*

Proposition 2.7. *Keep the assumptions in the last theorem. Let R^λ be the family of Riemann mappings in Proposition 2.6. For each $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, let $(R^\lambda)^{-1} : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \Omega^\lambda$ be the inverse of R^λ . Then $(R^\lambda)^{-1} \in C^{k+1+\mu, j}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$.*

Proof. Define $F \in C^{k+1+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega} \times [0, 1]) : \overline{\Omega} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{D}} \times [0, 1]$ by

$$F(z, \lambda) = (\tilde{R}(z, \lambda), \lambda) := (R(\Gamma(z, \lambda), \lambda), \lambda).$$

Since $\Gamma(\cdot, \lambda)$ is an embedding from Ω to Ω^λ , and $R(\cdot, \lambda)$ is a Riemann mapping, the map \tilde{R} is a bijection for each fixed λ , and its Jacobian is invertible. It follows that the Jacobian of F is invertible (when $j \geq 0$.) By Lemma (2.5), F is invertible and the inverse F^{-1} is in $C^{k+1+\mu, j}(\overline{\mathbb{D}} \times [0, 1])$. F^{-1} is given by

$$F^{-1}(w, \tau) = (\tilde{R}^{-1}(w, \tau), \tau).$$

Write $R^{-1}(z, \lambda) = \Gamma(\tilde{R}^{-1}(z, \lambda), \lambda)$. Since $\Gamma \in C^{k+1+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega})$, and $\tilde{R}^{-1} \in C^{k+1+\mu, j}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$, we obtain $R^{-1} \in C^{k+1+\mu, j}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$. \square

In order to reduce our oblique derivative boundary value problem to Problem A for $\bar{\partial}$, we need to change coordinates to reduce the second-order terms in $\mathcal{L}u$ in the elliptic operator to Laplacian. This is the classical problem of finding isothermal coordinate on the plane. We state some of the results which are well-known.

Proposition 2.8. *Let Ω be a bounded domain in \mathbb{C} , and consider the following elliptic equation defined on Ω :*

$$(2.9) \quad a(x, y)u_{xx} + 2b(x, y)u_{xy} + c(x, y)u_{yy} + F(x, y, u, u_x, u_y) = 0,$$

where the derivatives are taken in the sense of distributions. We assume the following uniform ellipticity condition:

$$d = ac - b^2 \geq d_0 > 0 \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega.$$

(i) *Suppose Ω has Lipschitz boundary, and $a, b, c \in W^{1, p}(\Omega)$, for $2 < p < \infty$. Then there exists a 1-1 map $\psi : z = x + iy \mapsto w = \xi + i\eta$ on Ω such that $\psi \in W^{2, p}(\Omega) \subset C^{1+\alpha_p}(\overline{\Omega})$, for $\alpha_p := \frac{p-2}{p}$. Moreover, if we set $u(x, y) = \tilde{u}(\psi(x, y))$, then u is a solution to equation (2.9) if and only if \tilde{u} is a solution to the following equation*

$$\tilde{u}_{\xi\xi} + \tilde{u}_{\eta\eta} + F_1(\xi, \eta, \tilde{u}, \tilde{u}_\xi, \tilde{u}_\eta) = 0$$

on the domain $\psi(\Omega)$.

(ii) *For $k \geq 0$ and $0 < \mu < 1$, let Ω be a bounded domain in \mathbb{C} with $C^{k+1+\mu}$ boundary. Suppose*

$a, b, c \in C^{k+1+\mu}(\overline{\Omega})$. Then the coordinate map ψ constructed in (i) belongs to the class $C^{k+2+\mu}(\overline{\Omega})$.
(iii) The Jacobian of the map ψ is positive at each point of Ω :

$$J(z) = |\partial_z w|^2 - |\partial_{\bar{z}} w|^2 > 0, \quad z \in \Omega.$$

The reader can refer to [7] Theorems 2.5, 2.9 and 2.12 for the proofs of above statements.

Lemma 2.9. *Let Ω be a bounded domain in \mathbb{C} with C^1 boundary, and let ψ be the map from Proposition 2.8. In particular $\psi \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$. Then ψ defines a one-to-one onto homeomorphism from Ω to Ω' . Let I be a non-vanishing vector field along $b\Omega$, and $\psi_*(I)$ be the push-forward of I by ψ , so that ψ_* is a non-vanishing vector field along $b\Omega'$. Then*

$$[I]_{b\Omega} = [\psi_* I]_{b\Omega'},$$

where $[I]_{b\Omega}$ denotes the change in the argument of $I(z)$ as z moves along $b\Omega$ once in the positive direction.

The proof is left to the reader. We now prove a result on the parameter version of isothermal coordinates:

Proposition 2.10. *Let k, j, μ be as in Theorem 1.1. Let Ω be a bounded domain in \mathbb{C} with $C^{k+2+\mu}$ boundary, and $\Gamma^\lambda : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega^\lambda$ be a family of embeddings in the class $C^{k+2+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega})$, with Γ^0 being the identity map. Keep the assumptions in Theorem 1.1. Consider the second-order elliptic equation with oblique derivative boundary condition:*

$$(2.10) \quad \begin{aligned} a^\lambda(x, y)u_{xx}^\lambda + 2b^\lambda(x, y)u_{xy}^\lambda + c^\lambda(x, y)u_{yy}^\lambda + d^\lambda(x, y)u_x^\lambda + e^\lambda(x, y)u_y^\lambda &= f^\lambda(x, y), \text{ in } \Omega^\lambda. \\ \alpha^\lambda u_x^\lambda + \beta^\lambda u_y^\lambda &= \gamma^\lambda, \quad \text{on } b\Omega^\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose $a^\lambda, b^\lambda, c^\lambda \in C^{k+1+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$, $d^\lambda, e^\lambda, f^\lambda \in C^{k+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$, $\alpha^\lambda, \beta^\lambda, \gamma^\lambda \in C^{k+1+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$. Then for all $|\lambda| < \varepsilon_0$ for some small ε_0 , there exists a family of coordinate maps $\varphi^\lambda : \Omega^\lambda \rightarrow D^\lambda$ with $\varphi^\lambda \circ \Gamma^\lambda \in C^{k+1+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega})$, and the functions $\mathcal{U}^\lambda(\tau^\lambda) := u^\lambda((\varphi^\lambda)^{-1}(\tau^\lambda))$ ($\tau^\lambda = s^\lambda + it^\lambda$) satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \mathcal{U}^\lambda + p^\lambda(s^\lambda, t^\lambda) \mathcal{U}_{s^\lambda}^\lambda + q^\lambda(s^\lambda, t^\lambda) \mathcal{U}_{t^\lambda}^\lambda &= h^\lambda(s^\lambda, t^\lambda), \quad \text{in } D^\lambda, \\ \nu_1^\lambda \mathcal{U}_s^\lambda + \nu_2^\lambda \mathcal{U}_t^\lambda &= g^\lambda(s^\lambda, t^\lambda), \quad \text{on } bD^\lambda, \end{aligned}$$

where $p^\lambda, q^\lambda, h^\lambda \in C^{k+\mu, j}(\overline{D^\lambda})$, $\nu_1^\lambda, \nu_2^\lambda, g^\lambda \in C^{k+1+\mu, j}(\overline{D^\lambda})$. Moreover, the winding number of the vector field $\mathcal{U}^\lambda = (\alpha^\lambda, \beta^\lambda)$ along $b\Omega^\lambda$ is the same as the winding number of $\mathcal{U}_1^\lambda = (\nu_1^\lambda, \nu_2^\lambda)$ along bD^λ .

Proof. First we pull back (2.10) by the maps Γ^λ to the fixed domain Ω . Let $v^\lambda(\xi, \eta) := u^\lambda \circ \Gamma^\lambda(\xi, \eta)$. Then v^λ satisfies

$$(2.11) \quad \tilde{a}^\lambda(\xi, \eta)v_{\xi\xi}^\lambda + 2\tilde{b}^\lambda(\xi, \eta)v_{\xi\eta}^\lambda + \tilde{c}^\lambda(\xi, \eta)v_{\eta\eta}^\lambda + \tilde{d}^\lambda(\xi, \eta)v_\xi^\lambda + \tilde{e}^\lambda(\xi, \eta)v_\eta^\lambda = \tilde{f}^\lambda(\xi, \eta), \text{ in } \Omega.$$

$$(2.12) \quad \tilde{\alpha}^\lambda v_\xi^\lambda + \tilde{\beta}^\lambda v_\eta^\lambda = \tilde{\gamma}^\lambda, \quad \text{on } b\Omega.$$

The second-order coefficients $\tilde{a}^\lambda, \tilde{b}^\lambda, \tilde{c}^\lambda$ are given by

$$(2.13) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{a}^\lambda(\xi, \eta) &= (a^\lambda \circ \Gamma^\lambda)(\xi_x^\lambda)^2 + 2(b^\lambda \circ \Gamma^\lambda)\xi_x^\lambda \xi_y^\lambda + (c^\lambda \circ \Gamma^\lambda)(\xi_y^\lambda)^2, \\ \tilde{b}^\lambda(\xi, \eta) &= (a^\lambda \circ \Gamma^\lambda)\xi_x^\lambda \eta_x^\lambda + (b^\lambda \circ \Gamma^\lambda) \left(\xi_x^\lambda \eta_y^\lambda + \xi_y^\lambda \eta_x^\lambda \right) + (c^\lambda \circ \Gamma^\lambda)(\xi_y^\lambda \eta_y^\lambda), \\ \tilde{c}^\lambda(\xi, \eta) &= (a^\lambda \circ \Gamma^\lambda)(\eta_x^\lambda)^2 + 2(b^\lambda \circ \Gamma^\lambda)\eta_x^\lambda \eta_y^\lambda + (c^\lambda \circ \Gamma^\lambda)(\eta_y^\lambda)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\tilde{a}^\lambda, \tilde{b}^\lambda, \tilde{c}^\lambda \in C^{k+1+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega})$. The first-order coefficients $\tilde{d}^\lambda, \tilde{e}^\lambda$ are linear combinations of the products of $a^\lambda, b^\lambda, c^\lambda, d^\lambda, e^\lambda$ and the first and second derivatives of $(\Gamma^\lambda)^{-1}$, and hence $\tilde{d}^\lambda, \tilde{e}^\lambda \in C^{k+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega})$. Since $\tilde{f}^\lambda = f^\lambda \circ \Gamma^\lambda$, we have $\tilde{f}^\lambda \in C^{k+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega})$.

For the boundary coefficients, we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\alpha}^\lambda(\xi, \eta) \\ \tilde{\beta}^\lambda(\xi, \eta) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial(\Gamma^\lambda)^{-1}}{\partial x}(\Gamma^\lambda(\xi, \eta)) & \frac{\partial(\Gamma^\lambda)^{-1}}{\partial y}(\Gamma^\lambda(\xi, \eta)) \\ \frac{\partial(\Gamma^\lambda)^{-1}}{\partial x}(\Gamma^\lambda(\xi, \eta)) & \frac{\partial(\Gamma^\lambda)^{-1}}{\partial y}(\Gamma^\lambda(\xi, \eta)) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha^\lambda(\Gamma^\lambda(\xi, \eta)) \\ \beta^\lambda(\Gamma^\lambda(\xi, \eta)) \end{pmatrix},$$

or put it differently, $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}^\lambda = (\Gamma^\lambda)_*^{-1}(\mathcal{U}^\lambda)$. It follows that $\tilde{\alpha}^\lambda, \tilde{\beta}^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega})$, and $\tilde{\gamma}^\lambda = \gamma^\lambda \circ \Gamma^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega})$. Since Γ^0 is the identity map, the above matrix is close to the identity matrix (in matrix norm) when λ is close to 0. Consequently we observe that for $|\lambda|$ small, the winding number of the vector field $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}^\lambda(\tilde{\alpha}^\lambda, \tilde{\beta}^\lambda)$ along $b\Omega$ is the same as that of $(\alpha^\lambda, \beta^\lambda)$ along $b\Omega^\lambda$: $\frac{1}{2\pi}[\tilde{\mathcal{U}}^\lambda]_{b\Omega} = \frac{1}{2\pi}[\mathcal{U}^\lambda]_{b\Omega^\lambda} = \chi_0$. Since Γ^0 is the identity map, by (2.13) we have $\tilde{a}^0 = a^0$, $\tilde{b}^0 = b^0$ and $\tilde{c}^0 = c^0$. Therefore for $|\lambda| < \varepsilon$, we have $\tilde{d}^\lambda := \tilde{a}^\lambda \tilde{c}^\lambda - (\tilde{b}^\lambda)^2 \geq \varepsilon_0 > 0$, in other words equation (2.11) is uniformly elliptic for λ close to 0. Applying Proposition 2.8 for $\lambda = 0$, we get a map $\Psi_0 : \Omega = \Omega^0 \rightarrow D^0$, such that $\Psi_0 \in \mathcal{C}^{k+2+\mu}(\overline{\Omega_0})$. Writing $\Psi_0(\xi, \eta) = (\xi', \eta')$, one can transform equations (2.11) and (2.12) to

$$(2.14) \quad \Delta \mathcal{V}^\lambda + a_0^\lambda \mathcal{V}_{\xi' \xi'}^\lambda + 2b_0^\lambda \mathcal{V}_{\xi' \eta'}^\lambda + c_0^\lambda \mathcal{V}_{\eta' \eta'}^\lambda + d_0^\lambda \mathcal{V}_{\xi'}^\lambda + e_0^\lambda \mathcal{V}_{\eta'}^\lambda = f_0^\lambda, \quad \text{in } D^0;$$

$$(2.15) \quad \alpha_0^\lambda \mathcal{V}_{\xi'}^\lambda + \beta_0^\lambda \mathcal{V}_{\eta'}^\lambda = \gamma_0^\lambda, \quad \text{on } bD^0.$$

Here $\mathcal{V}(\xi', \eta') = v \circ \Psi_0^{-1}(\xi', \eta')$, $a_0^0 = b_0^0 = c_0^0 = 0$, and $|a_0^\lambda|, |b_0^\lambda|, |c_0^\lambda| < \varepsilon$ if $|\lambda| < \delta_0$ for some small positive δ_0 . By expressions similar to (2.13), we see that the second-order coefficients $a_0^\lambda, b_0^\lambda, c_0^\lambda$ are linear combinations of the products of $\tilde{a}^\lambda \circ \Psi_0^{-1}, \tilde{b}^\lambda \circ \Psi_0^{-1}, \tilde{c}^\lambda \circ \Psi_0^{-1}$ and the first space derivatives of Ψ_0 , and thus they are in the class $\mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu, j}(\overline{D_0})$. The first-order coefficients d_0^λ, e_0^λ are linear combinations of products of $\tilde{a}^\lambda \circ \Psi_0^{-1}, \tilde{b}^\lambda \circ \Psi_0^{-1}, \tilde{c}^\lambda \circ \Psi_0^{-1}, \tilde{d}^\lambda \circ \Psi_0^{-1}, \tilde{e}^\lambda \circ \Psi_0^{-1}$ and the first and second derivatives of Ψ_0 , so $d_0^\lambda, e_0^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+\mu, j}(\overline{D_0})$. In a similar way $f_0^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+\mu, j}(\overline{D_0})$ and $\alpha_0^\lambda, \beta_0^\lambda, \gamma_0^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu, j}(\overline{D_0})$.

Let $\mathcal{U}_0^\lambda = (\alpha_0^\lambda, \beta_0^\lambda)$. Then $\mathcal{U}_0^\lambda = (\Psi_0)_* \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^\lambda$. By Lemma 2.9, the winding number of $\mathcal{U}_0^\lambda = (\alpha_0^\lambda, \beta_0^\lambda)$ is the same as the winding number of $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}^\lambda$: $\frac{1}{2\pi}[\mathcal{U}_0^\lambda]_{bD^0} = \frac{1}{2\pi}[\tilde{\mathcal{U}}^\lambda]_{b\Omega} = \chi_0$. Rewrite equation (2.14) as

$$(2.16) \quad a_1^\lambda \mathcal{V}_{\xi' \xi'}^\lambda + 2b_0^\lambda \mathcal{V}_{\xi' \eta'}^\lambda + c_1^\lambda \mathcal{V}_{\eta' \eta'}^\lambda + d_0^\lambda \mathcal{V}_{\xi'}^\lambda + e_0^\lambda \mathcal{V}_{\eta'}^\lambda = f_0^\lambda, \quad \text{in } D^0,$$

where $a_1^\lambda = 1 + a_0^\lambda$ and $c_1^\lambda = 1 + c_0^\lambda$. For $|\lambda| < \delta_1$, the determinant for the above equation satisfies $d_0^\lambda = a_1^\lambda c_1^\lambda - 2b_0^\lambda \geq \varepsilon_1 > 0$. By above we have that $a_1^\lambda, b_0^\lambda, c_1^\lambda, d_0^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu, j}(D^0)$. Let $\psi^\lambda : \zeta' = \xi' + i\eta' \mapsto \tau^\lambda = s^\lambda + it^\lambda$ be a family of coordinate systems that satisfies:

$$\tau_{\zeta'}^\lambda + q^\lambda(\zeta')\tau_{\zeta'}^\lambda = 0, \quad q^\lambda = \frac{a_1^\lambda - \sqrt{d_0^\lambda - ib_0^\lambda}}{a_1^\lambda + \sqrt{d_0^\lambda + ib_0^\lambda}}.$$

Note that for $\lambda = 0$, the map ψ^0 is the identity map, $q^0 \equiv 0$, and the above equation is trivially satisfied.

By Lemma 2.9, $\psi^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+2+\mu, j}(\overline{D^0})$. Let $\psi^\lambda : D^0 \rightarrow D^\lambda$. Then (2.16) and (2.15) are transformed into

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \mathcal{U}^\lambda + p^\lambda(s^\lambda, t^\lambda) \mathcal{U}_{s^\lambda}^\lambda + q^\lambda(s^\lambda, t^\lambda) \mathcal{U}_{t^\lambda}^\lambda &= h^\lambda(s^\lambda, t^\lambda), \quad \text{in } D^\lambda; \\ \nu_1^\lambda \mathcal{U}_s^\lambda + \nu_2^\lambda \mathcal{U}_t^\lambda &= g^\lambda(s^\lambda, t^\lambda), \quad \text{on } bD^\lambda, \end{aligned}$$

where $h^\lambda(s^\lambda, t^\lambda) = \frac{J^\lambda f_0^\lambda}{4\sqrt{d_0^\lambda}}$, and

$$p^\lambda = \frac{J^\lambda}{4\sqrt{d_0^\lambda}} \left(1 + a_1^\lambda s_{\xi'\xi'}^\lambda + 2b_0^\lambda s_{\xi'\eta'}^\lambda + c_1^\lambda s_{\eta'\eta'}^\lambda + d_0^\lambda s_{\xi'}^\lambda + e_0^\lambda s_{\eta'}^\lambda \right),$$

$$q^\lambda = \frac{J^\lambda}{4\sqrt{d_0^\lambda}} \left(1 + a_1^\lambda t_{\xi'\xi'}^\lambda + 2b_0^\lambda t_{\xi'\eta'}^\lambda + c_1^\lambda t_{\eta'\eta'}^\lambda + d_0^\lambda t_{\xi'}^\lambda + e_0^\lambda t_{\eta'}^\lambda \right).$$

Hence $p^\lambda, q^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+\mu, j}(\overline{D^\lambda})$. Since $f_0^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+\mu, j}(\overline{D^0})$, we have $h^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+\mu, j}(\overline{D^\lambda})$. Similarly it is easy to see $\nu_1^\lambda, \nu_2^\lambda, g^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu, j}(\overline{D^\lambda})$. Let $\mathcal{U}_1^\lambda = (\nu_1^\lambda, \nu_2^\lambda)$. Then $\mathcal{U}_1^\lambda = \psi_*^\lambda(\mathcal{U}_0^\lambda)$. Since ψ_*^0 is the identity matrix, we see that the winding number of \mathcal{U}_1^λ is the same as that of \mathcal{U}_0^λ for $|\lambda|$ small: $\frac{1}{2\pi}[\mathcal{U}^\lambda]_{b\Omega^\lambda} = \frac{1}{2\pi}[\mathcal{U}_1^\lambda]_{bD^\lambda} = \chi_0$.

We now put together the series of transformation from earlier

$$\varphi^\lambda = \psi^\lambda \circ \Psi^0 \circ (\Gamma^\lambda)^{-1} : \Omega^\lambda \longrightarrow D^\lambda.$$

Since $\Gamma^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+2+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega})$, $\Psi^0 \in \mathcal{C}^{k+2+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega_0})$, and $\psi^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+2+\mu, j}(\overline{D_0})$, we have $\varphi^\lambda \circ \Gamma^\lambda : \Omega \rightarrow D^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+2+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega})$. \square

3. A REVIEW OF VEKUA'S THEORY ON FIXED DOMAINS

In this section we review Vekua's theory for solving oblique derivative boundary value problem. First we introduce Problem A (as in [7]) on a fixed domain.

Problem A (Generalized Riemann-Hilbert problem). Let Ω be a bounded domain in \mathbb{C} . Given functions A, B, F defined in Ω and α, β, γ defined on $b\Omega$. Find a solution $w(z) = u(z) + iv(z)$ of the equation

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_{A,B}(w) := \partial_{\bar{z}} w + A(z)w(z) + B(z)\overline{w(z)} = F(z) & \text{in } \Omega; \\ \alpha u + \beta v \equiv \operatorname{Re}[\overline{l(z)}w] = \gamma & \text{on } b\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $l := \alpha + i\beta$ and is assumed to have unit length.

Definition 3.1. The *index of Problem A*, denoted by n , is the winding number of l along $b\Omega$:

$$n := \frac{1}{2\pi}[l]_{b\Omega}.$$

Here we denote by $[l]_{b\Omega}$ the change in the argument of $l(t)$ as t loops around the boundary $b\Omega$ once counterclockwise.

For now let us assume that

$$(3.2) \quad b\Omega \in C^{1+\mu}, \quad A, B, F \in L^p(\Omega), \quad 2 < p < \infty; \quad l, \gamma \in C^\mu(\overline{\Omega}), \quad 0 < \mu < 1.$$

A priori, we seek a solution w in the class $C^0(\overline{\Omega})$.

First let us consider the case when Ω is simply-connected. By the Riemann-mapping theorem it suffices to assume $\Omega = \mathbb{D}$. In this case $n = \frac{1}{2\pi}[l]_{S^1}$, where S^1 is the boundary circle. We now reduce the problem to a simpler form. Set $q(t) = -\arg(l(t)) + n \arg(t)$. Then q is a well-defined function on S^1 and $q \in C^\mu(S^1)$. We have

$$\overline{l(z)} = e^{-i \arg(l(z))} = e^{p(z) + i(-\arg(l(z)) + n \arg(z))} e^{-p(z)} e^{-i(n \arg(z))} = e^{\chi(z)} e^{-p(z)} z^{-n}.$$

Here χ is the holomorphic function in \mathbb{D} taking the value $p + iq$ on S^1 . It is defined by the Schwarz integral:

$$(3.3) \quad \chi(z) := \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{S^1} q(t) \frac{t+z}{t-z} \frac{dt}{t}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

By Proposition 7.11, $\chi \in C^\mu(\overline{\Omega})$. Using the substitutions

$$(3.4) \quad \overline{l(z)} = z^{-n} e^{\chi(z)} e^{-p(z)}, \quad w_*(z) = e^{\chi(z)} w(z),$$

w_* is then a solution to the problem

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_{\bar{z}} w_* + A_* w_* + B_* \overline{w_*} = F_*, & \text{in } \mathbb{D}; \\ \operatorname{Re}[z^{-n} w_*] = \gamma_*, & \text{on } S^1, \end{cases}$$

where

$$(3.6) \quad A_* = A, \quad B_* = B e^{2i \operatorname{Im} \chi(z)}, \quad F_* = F e^{\chi(z)}, \quad \gamma_*(z) = \gamma(z) e^{p(z)} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{D}.$$

Conversely, given any solution w_* to the problem (3.5), a solution to the original problem (3.1) is given by $w(z) = e^{-\chi(z)} w_*(z)$. From now on we can assume the problem takes the form (3.5), and we write w, A, B, F, γ without the $*$.

By assumption $\partial_{\bar{z}} w \in L^1(\overline{\Omega})$ and Proposition 7.4, w satisfies the integral equation

$$(3.7) \quad w + T_{\mathbb{D}}(Aw + B\overline{w}) = \Phi + T_{\mathbb{D}}F, \quad \text{in } \mathbb{D},$$

where Φ is some function holomorphic in \mathbb{D} . Now in view of Proposition 7.2, any continuous solution w of the above equation satisfies $\mathcal{L}_{A,B}(w) = F(z)$. We would like to choose Φ in such a way that the solution to equation (3.7) also satisfies the boundary condition $\operatorname{Re}[z^{-n} w] = \gamma$ on S^1 , where n is the index of (3.1). Then such solution will solve the original Problem A.

First suppose $n \geq 0$. We write Φ in the form

$$(3.8) \quad \Phi(z) = \Phi_0(z) + \frac{z^{2n+1}}{\pi} \iint_{\mathbb{D}} \frac{\overline{A(\zeta)w(\zeta)} + \overline{B(\zeta)w(\zeta)}}{1 - \bar{\zeta}z} dA(\zeta) - \frac{z^{2n+1}}{\pi} \iint_{\mathbb{D}} \frac{\overline{F(\zeta)}}{1 - \bar{\zeta}z} dA(\zeta),$$

where Φ_0 is some function to be determined, and it is holomorphic in \mathbb{D} . Substituting (3.8) into equation (3.7), we obtain the following integral equation for w :

$$(3.9) \quad w(z) + P_n(Aw + B\overline{w}) = \Phi_0(z) + P_nF,$$

where P_n is the operator defined by:

$$(3.10) \quad P_n \varphi(z) := -\frac{1}{\pi} \iint_{\mathbb{D}} \left(\frac{\varphi(\zeta)}{\zeta - z} + \frac{z^{2n+1} \overline{\varphi(\zeta)}}{1 - \bar{\zeta}z} \right) dA(\zeta).$$

The integral equation (3.9) is of Fredholm type, which we now describe. Denoting by \mathbb{D}^c the exterior of the unit disk, we can write $P_n \varphi$ in the form

$$(3.11) \quad P_n \varphi(z) = T_{\mathbb{D}} \varphi(z) + z^{2n+1} T_{\mathbb{D}^c} \varphi_1(z), \quad \varphi_1(\zeta) = \zeta^{-1} (\bar{\zeta})^{-2} \overline{\varphi(\bar{\zeta}^{-1})}.$$

If $\varphi \in L^p(\mathbb{D})$, $2 < p \leq \infty$, φ_1 satisfies

$$\int_{\mathbb{D}} |\varphi_1(\zeta^{-1})|^p |\zeta|^{-2p} dA(\zeta) = \int_{\mathbb{D}} |\varphi(\zeta)|^p |\zeta|^{3p-2p} dA(\zeta) < \infty.$$

According to Proposition 7.5, $T_{\mathbb{D}^c} \varphi_1$ is α_p -Hölder continuous in the entire plane, for $\alpha_p = \frac{p-2}{p}$. By Proposition 7.3 the function $T_{\mathbb{D}} \varphi$ is α_p -Hölder continuous in the plane. Hence from (3.11) $P_n \varphi$ is α_p -Hölder continuous. It is easy to check that $\operatorname{Re}[z^{-n} P_n \varphi] = 0$ on S^1 . By assumption, $F \in L^p(\mathbb{D})$ for $2 < p < \infty$, so by letting F be the φ above, we see that $P_n F$ is Hölder continuous in the entire plane, and $\operatorname{Re}[z^{-n} P_n F(z)] = 0$ on S^1 . As we will see below, the solution w is Hölder continuous in $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$, and thus $Aw + B\overline{w} \in L^p(\mathbb{D})$, for $p > 2$ and $\operatorname{Re}[z^{-n} P_n(Aw + B\overline{w})] = 0$ on S^1 .

Now by (3.9), if the holomorphic function Φ_0 satisfies the boundary condition

$$(3.12) \quad \operatorname{Re}[z^{-n} \Phi_0(z)] = \gamma \quad \text{on } S^1,$$

then the solution of the integral equation (3.9) is a solution of the boundary value problem (3.5).

By Proposition 7.19, the general solution of the problem (3.12) is given by

$$\Phi_0(z) = \frac{z^n}{2\pi i} \int_{S^1} \gamma(t) \frac{t+z}{t-z} \frac{dt}{t} + \sum_{k=0}^{2n} c_k z^k,$$

where the c_k 's are complex numbers satisfying the relations

$$(3.13) \quad c_{2n-k} = -\overline{c_k}, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, n.$$

Thus for $n \geq 0$, the problem is reduced to the equivalent integral equation of Fredholm type:

$$(3.14) \quad w + Q_n w = P_n F + \frac{z^n}{2\pi i} \int_{S^1} \gamma(t) \frac{t+z}{t-z} \frac{dt}{t} + \sum_{k=0}^{2n} c_k z^k,$$

(see [7, p. 225, (1.10)]), where operator Q_n and c_k are defined by

$$(3.15) \quad Q_n w := P_n (A w + B \overline{w}),$$

$$(3.16) \quad \sum_{k=0}^{2n} c_k z^k = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} a_k (z^k - z^{2n-k}) + i b_k (z^k + z^{2n-k}) + i c_0 z^n,$$

with a_k, b_k, c_0 being arbitrary real constants. As shown earlier, $P_n F \in C^{\alpha_p}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$ for $\alpha_p = \frac{p-2}{p}$. The second term on the right-hand side of equation (3.14) can be written as $z^n \mathcal{S} \gamma$, where \mathcal{S} is the Schwarz integral operator. By Proposition 7.11 applied to $\gamma \in C^\mu(S^1)$, one has $\mathcal{S} \gamma \in C^\mu(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$. Hence the right-hand side of the equation lies in the class $C^\nu(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$, for $\nu := \min(\alpha_p, \mu)$.

It is shown in [7, p. 296] that equation (3.14) has a unique solution w in the class $L^q(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$, $\frac{p}{p-1} < q < \infty$, for any right-hand side function in the class $L^q(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$. By Theorem 1.25 in [7, p. 50], one has $Q_n w \in C^0(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$, and so it follows from equation (3.14) that $w \in C^0(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$. By Proposition 7.3 and Proposition 7.5 applied to expression (3.11) where we replace φ by w , we have $Q_n w \in C^{\alpha_p}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$. By equation (3.14) again we obtain that $w \in C^\nu(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$, $\nu := \min(\alpha_p, \mu)$.

Therefore when the index $n \geq 0$, the solution to the non-homogeneous Problem A exists for any boundary data, and the homogeneous Problem A ($F \equiv 0$, $\gamma \equiv 0$) admits $2n + 1$ \mathbb{R} -linearly independent solutions.

If $n < 0$. Referring to [7, p. 302], the solution to Problem A (see (3.1)) exists if and only if the following conditions are satisfied:

$$(3.17) \quad \frac{1}{2i} \int_{b\Omega} l(t) w'_i(t) \gamma(t) dt - \operatorname{Re} \iint_{\Omega} w'_i(z) F(z) dx dy = 0,$$

for $i = 1, \dots, 2k - 1$, $k = -n$, and $(w'_1), \dots, (w'_{2k-1})$ are linearly-independent solutions of the homogeneous adjoint problem A' :

$$(3.18) \quad \partial_{\overline{z}} w - A w - \overline{B w} = 0, \quad \text{in } \Omega; \quad \operatorname{Re}[l(z) z'(s) w(z)] = 0, \quad \text{on } b\Omega.$$

Here we write $z'(s) = \frac{dz(s)}{ds}$. In this case if the solution for Problem A (3.1) exists, then it is unique, and the solution can be expressed as the unique solution to the integral equation (see [7, p. 300]):

$$(3.19) \quad w + (Q_k^*) w = P_k^* F + \frac{1}{\pi i} \int_{b\Omega} \frac{\gamma(t) dt}{t^k (t-z)}, \quad k = -n,$$

where P_k^* and Q_k^* are defined to be

$$(3.20) \quad P_k^* f := -\frac{1}{\pi} \iint_{\Omega} \left(\frac{f(\zeta)}{\zeta - z} + \frac{\overline{\zeta}^{2k-1} \overline{f(\zeta)}}{1 - z\overline{\zeta}} \right) dA(\zeta), \quad (Q_k^*) f := P_k^*(B \overline{f}).$$

The above method of reducing the problem to a Fredholm integral equation on the domain no longer applies for multiply-connected domains. The geometry of the circle allows for the vanishing of the term $\operatorname{Re}[z^{-n} P_n \varphi]$ on S^1 . To deal with the general case, Vekua introduced the theory of

generalized analytic functions. We state here a few of his results without much elaborations. The reader can refer to [7] for details.

We say a function w belongs to the class $\mathcal{L}_{p,2}(A, B, \mathbb{C})$ if w satisfies $\mathcal{L}_{A,B}(w) = 0$ in the sense of distributions, for $A, B \in \mathcal{L}_{p,2}(\mathbb{C})$. (The latter is defined in (2.2).) In our application, A, B are defined only on Ω in which case we extend A, B trivially to \mathbb{C} by setting them to be 0 on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\Omega}$.

Following Vekua, we call such w a *generalized analytic function* of the class $\mathcal{L}_{p,2}(A, B, \mathbb{C})$. For fixed $t \in \mathbb{C}$, and $A, B \in L_{p,2}(\mathbb{C})$, consider the following integral equations ([7, p 167]):

$$(3.21) \quad X_i(z, t) - \frac{1}{\pi} \iint_{\mathbb{C}} \frac{A(\zeta)X_i(\zeta, t) + B(\zeta)\overline{X_i(\zeta, t)}}{\zeta - z} dA(\zeta) = g_i(z), \quad i = 1, 2,$$

where $g_1 = \frac{1}{2}(t - z)^{-1}$, $g_2 = \frac{1}{2i}(t - z)^{-1}$. It is proved in [7, p. 156] that equation (3.21) admits a unique solution in the class $L_{q,0}(\mathbb{C})$ if $A, B \in L_{p,2}(\mathbb{C})$ and the right-hand side lies in the class $L_{q,0}(\mathbb{C})$, for $q \geq \frac{p}{p-1} = p'$. Since $2 < p < \infty$, we have $1 < p' < 2$, and $\frac{1}{t-z} \in L_{q,0}(\mathbb{C})$, for any $p' \leq q < 2$. Equation (3.21) admits solution $X_i \in L_{q,0}(\mathbb{C})$ for any $q \in [p', 2)$. For $z \neq t$, X_i satisfies

$$\partial_{\bar{z}}X_i(z, t) + A(z)X_i(z, t) + B(z)\overline{X_i(z, t)} = 0, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Furthermore, we have the following representation for X_i :

$$(3.22) \quad X_1(z, t) = \frac{e^{\omega_1(z,t)}}{2(t-z)}, \quad X_2(z, t) = \frac{e^{\omega_2(z,t)}}{2i(t-z)},$$

where

$$(3.23) \quad \omega_i(z, t) = \frac{t-z}{\pi} \iint_{\mathbb{C}} \frac{1}{(\zeta-z)(t-\zeta)} \left[A(\zeta) + B(\zeta) \frac{\overline{X_i(\zeta, t)}}{X_i(\zeta, t)} \right] dA(\zeta);$$

$$(3.24) \quad |\omega_i(z_1, t) - \omega_i(z_2, t)| \leq C_p |z_1 - z_2|^{\alpha_p}, \quad \alpha_p = \frac{p-2}{p};$$

$$(3.25) \quad |\omega_i(z, t)| \leq C_p |z - t|^{\alpha_p}, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Hence by (3.22), $X_j(\cdot, t)$ is Hölder continuous everywhere in the plane except at $z = t$.

Define G_i , the *fundamental kernels of the class* $\mathcal{L}_{p,2}(A, B, \mathbb{C})$ as follows:

$$(3.26) \quad G_1(z, \zeta) = X_1(z, \zeta) + iX_2(z, \zeta), \quad G_2(z, \zeta) = X_1(z, \zeta) - iX_2(z, \zeta).$$

By (3.22) we have

$$(3.27) \quad G_1(z, \zeta) = \frac{e^{\omega_1(z,\zeta)} + e^{\omega_2(z,\zeta)}}{2(\zeta - z)}, \quad G_2(z, \zeta) = \frac{e^{\omega_1(z,\zeta)} - e^{\omega_2(z,\zeta)}}{2(\zeta - z)}.$$

The G'_i 's satisfy the relation:

$$(3.28) \quad \partial_{\bar{z}}G_i(z, \zeta) + A(z)G_i(z, \zeta) + B(z)\overline{G_i(z, \zeta)} = 0, \quad i = 1, 2,$$

for any $z, \zeta \in \mathbb{C}$, $z \neq \zeta$. In addition we have the estimates

$$(3.29) \quad G_1(z, \zeta) = \frac{1}{\zeta - z} + O(|z - \zeta|^{-\frac{2}{p}}), \quad G_2(z, \zeta) = O(|z - \zeta|^{-\frac{2}{p}}).$$

Hence G_1 behaves like the Cauchy kernel, modulo a mild singularity.

Denote by $G'_1(z, \zeta)$ and $G'_2(z, \zeta)$ the adjoint fundamental kernel of the adjoint equation $\mathcal{L}'(w') = \partial_{\bar{z}}w' - Aw' - \overline{Bw'} = F'$. The following relations hold: ([7, p.174])

$$(3.30) \quad G_1(z, \zeta) = -G'_1(\zeta, z), \quad G_2(z, \zeta) = -\overline{G'_2(\zeta, z)}.$$

We will denote by $G_1(z, t, \Omega)$ and $G_2(z, t, \Omega)$ the fundamental kernels of the class $\mathcal{L}_{p,2}(A, B, \mathbb{C})$, if $A \equiv B \equiv 0$ in $\Omega^c = \mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\Omega}$. Given $A, B \in L^p(\Omega)$, we let \tilde{A}, \tilde{B} be the trivial extensions which vanish outside Ω .

For the parameter problem, we need the following representation formula.

Proposition 3.2. [7, p. 176] *Suppose w is continuous in $\bar{\Omega}$ and satisfies the equation $\mathcal{L}_{A,B}(w) = F$ in Ω , where $A, B, F \in L^p(\Omega)$, $p > 2$. Then w has the representation formula:*

$$(3.31) \quad w(z) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{b\Omega} G_1(z, \zeta) w(\zeta) d\zeta - G_2(z, \zeta) \overline{w(\zeta)} \overline{d\zeta} \\ - \frac{1}{\pi} \iint_{\Omega} G_1(z, \zeta) F(\zeta) + G_2(z, \zeta) \overline{F(\zeta)} dA(\zeta), \quad z \in \Omega.$$

Remark 3.3. When $A \equiv B \equiv 0$, by formula (3.23) we have $\omega_1(z, t) \equiv \omega_2(z, t) \equiv 0$. Hence from (3.27) we get $G_1 = \frac{1}{\zeta - z}$ and $G_2 \equiv 0$, and (3.31) reduces to the Cauchy-Green formula.

Next we state some existence and uniqueness results for Problem A. For homogeneous boundary value problems, we call a finite set of linearly independent solutions which spans the solution space a *complete system*.

Proposition 3.4 ([7, p. 253] Theorem 4.10, Theorem 4.12.). *Consider Problem A on a multiply-connected domain Ω whose boundary $b\Omega$ has $m+1$ connected components. Let h, h' be the numbers of linearly-independent solutions to the homogeneous Problem A and the homogeneous adjoint Problem A' (3.18), respectively. Let n be the index of Problem A.*

(i) *Suppose that $n < 0$. Then*

$$h = 0, \quad h' = m - 2n - 1.$$

The non-homogeneous Problem A has a (unique) solution if and only if the following relations are satisfied:

$$(3.32) \quad \frac{1}{2i} \int_{b\Omega} l(t) w'_i(t) \gamma(t) dt - \operatorname{Re} \iint_{\Omega} w'_i F(z) dx dy = 0,$$

for $i = 1, \dots, m - 2n - 1$, and w'_1, \dots, w'_{m-2n-1} is a complete system of solutions of the adjoint homogeneous Problem A' (3.18).

(ii) *Suppose that $n > m - 1$. Then*

$$h = 2n + 1 - m, \quad h' = 0.$$

The non-homogeneous Problem A is always solvable and its general solution is given by:

$$(3.33) \quad w(z) = w_0(z) + \sum_{j=1}^{2n+1-m} c_j w_j, \quad c_j \text{ are real constant,}$$

where $\{w_1, \dots, w_{2n+1-m}\}$ is a complete system of solutions of the homogeneous problem A, and w_0 is a particular solution of the non-homogeneous problem A.

Remark 3.5. When the domain is simply-connected, we have $m = 0$, and the above theorem reduces to the results we obtained earlier. When $0 \leq n \leq m - 1$ ($m \geq 1$), the existence and uniqueness of solutions to Problem A are more subtle, and we refer the reader to [7, chapter 4, §5].

From now on we only consider the case $n > m - 1$. We can impose some additional conditions on the solution of Problem A to make it unique. This will be necessary when later on we add parameter since regularity in parameter depends on the uniqueness of these solutions.

Definition 3.6. Let Ω be a bounded domain in \mathbb{C} whose boundary $b\Omega$ contains $m + 1$ connected components, for m a non-negative integer. Let z_1, \dots, z_{N_0} and z'_1, \dots, z'_{N_1} be fixed points of Ω and its boundary $b\Omega$, respectively, satisfying the following conditions:

(i) The numbers N_0 and N_1 satisfy the relation:

$$2N_0 + N_1 = 2n + 1 - m.$$

(ii) There are m curves, e.g. $\Gamma_{i_1}, \dots, \Gamma_{i_m}$, among the $m + 1$ boundary curves $b\Omega_0, \dots, b\Omega_m$, on each of which an odd number of z'_s are situated.

Then we call $\{\{z_r\}_{r=1}^{N_0}, \{z'_s\}_{s=1}^{N_1}\}$ a *normally distributed set*, henceforth denoted by $(N_0, N_1, \overline{\Omega})$.

Remark 3.7. In our choice of N_0 and N_1 , two extreme cases are possible:

- (1) $N_0 = 0$ and $N_1 = 2n + 1 - m$.
- (2) $N_0 = n - m$ and $N_1 = m + 1$.

Consequently, we have $0 \leq N_0 \leq n - m$, $m + 1 \leq N_1 \leq 2n + 1 - m$. If $m = 0$, i.e. the domain is simply-connected, condition (i) becomes $2N_0 + N_1 = 2n + 1$, and thus in this case N_1 needs to be odd.

We can specify on $(N_0, N_1, \overline{\Omega})$ the values of the unknown solution of Problem A:

$$(3.34) \quad w(z_r) = a_r + ib_r, \quad r = 1, \dots, N_0; \quad w(z'_s) = l(z'_s)(\gamma(z'_s) + ic_s), \quad s = 1, \dots, N_1.$$

Proposition 3.8. *Let n be the index of Problem A on a domain Ω in \mathbb{C} , and let m be the number of connected components of $b\Omega$. Assume that on a normally distributed point set $(N_0, N_1, \overline{\Omega})$ conditions of the form (3.34) are given. Then for $n > m - 1$, Problem A has always a solution satisfying these conditions, and this solution is uniquely determined.*

The reader can refer to Vekua [7, p. 285 - 287] for the proof.

The following regularity result for simply-connected domains follows from the above construction of the solution by Vekua, though it is not explicitly stated in his book. For the reader's convenience we provide details of the proof here. Furthermore, the same estimates hold for multiply-connected domains and one can prove it using a trick of Vekua to reduce the simply-connected case (See [7, p. 228, p. 336].)

Proposition 3.9. *(i) Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a domain with $C^{1+\mu}$ boundary, for $0 < \mu < 1$. Let $2 < p < \infty$. Suppose $A, B, F \in L^p(\Omega)$, $l, \gamma \in C^\mu(b\Omega)$. Then the solution to Problem A (3.1), if it exists, belongs to the class $C^\nu(\overline{\Omega})$, for $\nu := \min\{\alpha_p, \mu\}$, $\alpha_p = \frac{p-2}{p}$, and there exists a constant C depending on the coefficients A, B, l, p , such that*

$$|w|_\nu \leq C(A, B, l, p) (|w|_0 + |F|_{L^p(\Omega)} + |\gamma|_\mu).$$

(ii) Let $k \geq 0$, and $0 < \mu < 1$. Let Ω be a domain in \mathbb{C} with $C^{k+1+\mu}$ boundary. Suppose $A, B, F \in C^{k+\mu}(\overline{\Omega})$, $l, \gamma \in C^{k+1+\mu}(b\Omega)$. Then the solution w of Problem A, if it exists, belongs to the class $C^{k+1+\mu}(\overline{\Omega})$, and there exists a constant C_k depending on the coefficients A, B, l such that

$$|w|_{k+1+\mu} \leq C_k(A, B, l) (|w|_0 + |F|_{k+\mu} + |\gamma|_{k+1+\mu}).$$

We remark that the regularity results are in [7, p. 228 and p. 336]. The main purpose of the following proof is to derive the above two estimates. The constants cannot be controlled since the proof uses the open mapping theorem.

Proof. We treat only the non-negative index case. The proof is similar if the index is negative.

(i) By the Riemann mapping theorem it suffices to take $\Omega = \mathbb{D}$. Moreover by the earlier remarks it suffices to assume that the Problem A has the form (3.5). Let $\nu = \min(\alpha_p, \mu)$, $\alpha_p = \frac{p-2}{p}$. In view of equation (3.14), any solution w has the form

$$(3.35) \quad w = w_* + \sum_{j=0}^{2n} d_j w_j$$

where d_j are complex constants and w_* is the (unique) solution to the integral equation

$$(3.36) \quad w_* + Q_n w_* = P_n F + \mathcal{S}(\gamma),$$

and for each $0 \leq j \leq 2n$, w_j is the (unique) solution to the integral equation

$$(3.37) \quad w_j + Q_n w_j = g_j, \quad 0 \leq j \leq 2n,$$

where the g_j -s are the set of $2n+1$ functions $\{z^k - z^{2n-k}, z^k + z^{2n-k}, z^n\}_{k=0}^{n-1}$ from expression (3.16).

First we estimate w_* . Since the operator $I + Q_n$ is a bijective bounded linear operator from the space $C^0(\overline{\Omega})$ to itself, by the open mapping theorem it has a bounded inverse $(I + Q_n)^{-1}$, whose operator norm depends only on A and B . Hence in view of Proposition 7.6 and Proposition 7.11 we have for $C_i = C_i(A, B)$

$$|w_*|_0 \leq C_1 |P_n F + \mathcal{S}(\gamma)|_0 \leq C_2 (|P_n F|_0 + |\mathcal{S}(\gamma)|_0) \leq C_3 (|F|_{L^p(\mathbb{D})} + |\gamma|_\mu).$$

Next we estimate the Hölder norm of w_* . From (3.36) we have

$$|w_*|_\nu \leq |Q_n w_*|_{\alpha_p} + |P_n F|_{\alpha_p} + |\mathcal{S}\gamma|_\mu.$$

By Proposition 7.6 we have

$$|Q_n w_*|_{\alpha_p} = |P_n(Aw_* + B\overline{w_*})|_0 \leq C(p) |Aw_* + B\overline{w_*}|_{L^p(\mathbb{D})} \leq C(A, B, p) |w_*|_0,$$

and $|P_n F|_{\alpha_p} \leq C(p) |F|_{L^p(\mathbb{D})}$. By Proposition 7.11 we have $|\mathcal{S}\gamma|_\mu \leq C|\gamma|_\mu$. Hence

$$(3.38) \quad |w_*|_\nu \leq C_0(A, B, p) (|w_*|_0 + |F|_{L^p(\mathbb{D})} + |\gamma|_\mu) \leq C_1(A, B, p) (|F|_{L^p(\mathbb{D})} + |\gamma|_\mu).$$

We now estimate w_j . Applying open mapping theorem to (3.37) we have

$$\begin{aligned} |w_j|_0 &\leq C_j(A, B), \quad 0 \leq j \leq 2n; \\ |w_j|_{\alpha_p} &\leq |Q_n w_j|_{\alpha_p} + |g_j|_{\alpha_p} \leq C(A, B, p) (|w_j|_0 + 1) \leq C_j(A, B, p). \end{aligned}$$

It remains to estimate the coefficients d_j in (3.35). By the remarks in [7, p. 286-288, equation (6.10)] (see also Proposition 4.4 below), they can be expressed as in the form $\frac{P}{Q}$, where $Q \neq 0$ and P and Q are linear combinations of the products of $w_j(z_r)$, $w_j(z'_s)$ with terms like $a_r, b_r, c_s, \gamma(z'_s), w_*(z_r), w_*(z'_s)$. Since $|(a_r, b_r, c_s)| \leq |w|_0$, we have

$$(3.39) \quad |d_j| \leq C_j(A, B) (|w|_0 + |\gamma|_0 + |w_*|_0) \leq C_j(A, B) (|w|_0 + |F|_{L^p(\mathbb{D})} + |\gamma|_\mu).$$

Hence by (3.35) and combining the above estimates we get

$$|w|_\nu \leq |w_*|_\nu + \sum_{j=0}^{2n} |d_j| |w_j|_{\alpha_p} \leq M(A, B, p) (|w|_0 + |F|_{L^p(\mathbb{D})} + |\gamma|_\mu).$$

Finally, let \tilde{w} be a solution to the original Problem A (3.1) on \mathbb{D} :

$$(3.40) \quad \begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_{\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}}(\tilde{w}) \equiv \partial_{\bar{z}} \tilde{w} + \tilde{A}(z) \tilde{w}(z) + \tilde{B}(z) \overline{\tilde{w}(z)} = \tilde{F}(z) & \text{in } \Omega; \\ \alpha u + \beta v \equiv \operatorname{Re}[\overline{l(z)} \tilde{w}] = \tilde{\gamma} & \text{on } b\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Then we have the following relations:

$$(3.41) \quad \begin{aligned} A(z) &= \tilde{A}(z), \quad B(z) = \tilde{B}e^{2i\chi(z)}, \quad F(z) = \tilde{F}(z)e^{\chi(z)}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}; \\ \tilde{w}(z) &= e^{-\chi(z)} w(z), \quad z \in D, \quad \gamma(\zeta) = \tilde{\gamma}(\zeta)e^{p(\zeta)}, \quad \zeta \in bS^1, \end{aligned}$$

where χ and $p = \operatorname{Re}(\chi)$ are related to l by formula (3.3). Hence

$$|\tilde{w}|_\nu \leq C(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, l, p) (|\tilde{w}|_0 + |\tilde{F}|_{L^p(\mathbb{D})} + |\tilde{\gamma}|_\mu).$$

(ii) Let us first consider Problem A in the reduced form (3.5). Write (3.36) as

$$(3.42) \quad w_* = -Q_n w_* + P_n F + \mathcal{S}(\gamma)$$

First let us prove the statement for $k = 0$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} |w_*|_{1+\mu} &\leq C (|Q_n w_*|_{1+\mu} + |P_n F|_{1+\mu} + |\mathcal{S}\gamma|_{1+\mu}) \\ &= (|P_n(Aw_* + B\bar{w}_*)|_{1+\mu} + |P_n F|_{1+\mu} + |\mathcal{S}\gamma|_{1+\mu}) \\ &\leq C (|Aw_* + B\bar{w}_*|_{\mu} + |F|_{\mu} + |\gamma|_{1+\mu}) \\ &\leq C \{(|A|_{\mu} + |B|_{\mu}) |w_*|_{\mu} + |F|_{\mu} + |\gamma|_{1+\mu}\}. \end{aligned}$$

By (3.38), we get $|w_*|_{\mu} \leq C(A, B) (|F|_{\mu} + |\gamma|_{\mu})$. Hence $|w_*|_{1+\mu} \leq C_0(A, B) (|F|_{\mu} + |\gamma|_{1+\mu})$.

For $k > 0$ we apply induction. By Propositions 7.7 and 7.11 applied to equation (3.42) one gets

$$\begin{aligned} |w_*|_{k+1+\mu} &\leq C (|Q_n w_*|_{k+1+\mu} + |P_n F|_{k+1+\mu} + |\mathcal{S}\gamma|_{k+1+\mu}) \\ &= (|P_n(Aw_* + B\bar{w}_*)|_{k+1+\mu} + |P_n F|_{k+1+\mu} + |\mathcal{S}\gamma|_{k+1+\mu}) \\ &\leq C' (|Aw_* + B\bar{w}_*|_{k+\mu} + |F|_{k+\mu} + |\gamma|_{k+1+\mu}) \\ &\leq C' \{(|A|_{k+\mu} + |B|_{k+\mu}) |w_*|_{k+\mu} + |F|_{k+\mu} + |\gamma|_{k+1+\mu}\}. \end{aligned}$$

By the induction hypothesis, we have $|w_*|_{k+\mu} \leq C_{k-1}(A, B) (|F|_{k-1+\mu} + |\gamma|_{k+\mu})$. Hence $|w_*|_{k+1+\mu} \leq C_k(A, B) (|F|_{k+\mu} + |\gamma|_{k+1+\mu})$.

Next we estimate w_j , $0 \leq j \leq 2n$. From equation (3.37) we have

$$(3.43) \quad w_j = -Q_n w_j + g_j.$$

First we prove for $k = 0$, so that $A, B \in C^\mu(\bar{\mathbb{D}})$. By part (i), we know that $w_s \in C^{\frac{p-2}{p}}(\bar{D})$ for any $2 < p < \infty$. Hence $w_s \in C^{1-}(\bar{\Omega})$. By Proposition 7.7 we have

$$\begin{aligned} |w_j|_{1+\mu} &\leq C (|Q_n w_j|_{1+\mu} + 1) = C (|P_n(Aw_j + B\bar{w}_j)|_{1+\mu} + 1) \\ &\leq C \{(|A|_{\mu} + |B|_{\mu}) |w_j|_{\mu} + 1\} \leq C(A, B). \end{aligned}$$

By (3.43) again and iterate the process we get $w_j \in C^{k+1+\mu}$ and $|w_j|_{k+1+\mu} \leq C_k(A, B)$. Now for the coefficients d_j we have estimate (3.39), $|d_j| \leq C_j(A, B) (|w|_0 + |F|_{\mu} + |\gamma|_{\mu})$. Finally putting together the estimates we get

$$|w|_{k+1+\mu} \leq |w_*|_{k+1+\mu} + \sum_{j=0}^{2n} |d_j| |w_j|_{k+1+\mu} \leq C_k(A, B) (|w|_0 + |F|_{k+\mu} + |\gamma|_{k+1+\mu}).$$

Finally we let \tilde{w} be the solution to the original Problem A (3.40) on \mathbb{D} . In view of the relations (3.41) we easily get $|\tilde{w}|_{k+1+\mu} \leq C_k(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, l) (|\tilde{w}|_0 + |\tilde{F}|_{k+\mu} + |\tilde{\gamma}|_{k+1+\mu})$. \square

Remark 3.10. In our study of the boundary value problems with parameter, the above estimates imply that for each fixed λ , the solution w^λ satisfies

$$|w^\lambda|_{k+1+\mu} \leq C(A, B, l, \lambda) (|w^\lambda|_0 + |F^\lambda|_{k+\mu} + |\gamma^\lambda|_{k+1+\mu})$$

on $b\Omega^\lambda$. However, this estimate is not useful since we do not know how the constant depends on λ .

We end this section by connecting the oblique derivative boundary value problem for the Laplacian elliptic operator (hereafter called Problem B) to Problem A.

Problem B Consider the following boundary value problem:

$$(3.44) \quad \begin{aligned} \Delta U + a(x, y)U_x + b(x, y)U_y &= f(x, y); \\ \alpha U_x + \beta U_y &= \gamma. \end{aligned}$$

To solve this problem we follow Vekua and reduce it to Problem A. Let

$$u = U_x, \quad v = -U_y, \quad w = u + iv.$$

The equation (3.44) reduces to the following specialized Problem A:

$$(3.45) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_{\bar{z}} w + \frac{1}{4}(a+ib)w + \frac{1}{4}(a-ib)\bar{w} &= \frac{1}{2}f, \quad \text{in } \Omega; \\ \operatorname{Re}[\bar{l}w] &= \gamma, \quad l = \alpha - i\beta, \quad \text{on } b\Omega. \end{aligned}$$

If w is the solution to (3.45), then the solution to Problem (3.44) is given by

$$(3.46) \quad U(x, y) = c_0 + \operatorname{Re} \int_{z_0}^z w(\zeta) d\zeta = c_0 + \int_{z_0}^z U_x(x, y) dx + U_y(x, y) dy.$$

Now, U is globally well-defined only if the closed form $U_x dx + U_y dy$ is exact. This occurs when the domain is simply-connected. Thus in the case of simply-connected domain, Problem B is completely equivalent to Problem A.

In the case $b\Omega$ has $m+1$ connected components, for $m > 0$, in order to guarantee the right-hand side of (3.46) is single-valued, it is necessary and sufficient to add m solubility conditions:

$$(3.47) \quad \operatorname{Re} \int_{\Gamma_j} w d\zeta = \int_{\Gamma_j} u dx - v dy = 0, \quad (j = 1, 2, \dots, m)$$

where $\Gamma_0, \Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_m$ are simple closed contours bounding the domain Ω , $\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_m$ being situated inside Γ_0 . Hence a solution w to (3.45) is a solution to the original Problem (3.44) if and only if it satisfies conditions (3.47).

4. FAMILIES OF SIMPLY-CONNECTED DOMAINS

In this section we prove Theorem 1.1 for families of simply-connected domains. First we need to define the index for oblique derivative boundary value problem:

Given the oblique derivative boundary value problem (1.1), we define its *index* \varkappa as the winding number of \bar{U}^λ :

$$(4.1) \quad \varkappa := \frac{1}{2\pi} \left[\bar{\Upsilon}^\lambda \right]_{b\Omega^\lambda} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \left[\xi^\lambda - i\eta^\lambda \right].$$

Note that since \varkappa is an integer, it is stable under small perturbation of λ .

We formulate our results in two parts depending on the sign of \varkappa . First we consider the case $\varkappa \geq 0$.

Theorem 4.1 (Simply-connected, non-negative index case).

Let k, j, μ be as in Theorem 1.1. Let Ω be a bounded, simply-connected domain in \mathbb{C} with $\mathcal{C}^{k+2+\mu}$ boundary. Let Γ^λ be a family of maps that embed Ω to Ω^λ , with $\Gamma^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+2+\mu, j}(\bar{\Omega})$. Consider problem (1.1) with $\varkappa \geq 0$, and where L^λ is given by (1.2). Suppose $a^\lambda, b^\lambda, c^\lambda, d^\lambda, e^\lambda, f^\lambda$ are functions in Ω^λ such that $a^\lambda, b^\lambda, c^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu, j}(\bar{\Omega}^\lambda)$, and $d^\lambda, e^\lambda, f^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+\mu, j}(\bar{\Omega}^\lambda)$. Suppose that $\Upsilon^\lambda, \gamma^\lambda$ are functions in $b\Omega^\lambda$ such that $\Upsilon^\lambda, \gamma^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu, j}(b\Omega^\lambda)$. For each $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, let $\{\{z_r^\lambda\}_{r=1}^{N_0}, (z_s^\lambda)'\}_{s=1}^{N_1}\}$ be a normally distributed set for Ω^λ , and let u^λ be the unique solution to (1.1) on Ω^λ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} u_x^\lambda(z_r^\lambda) - iu_y^\lambda(z_r^\lambda) &= a_r(\lambda) + ib_r(\lambda) \quad (r = 1, \dots, N_0); \\ u_x^\lambda((z_s^\lambda)') - iu_y^\lambda((z_s^\lambda)') &= l^\lambda((z_s^\lambda)')(\gamma^\lambda((z_s^\lambda)') + ic_s(\lambda)), \quad (s = 1, \dots, N_1), \\ u^\lambda(z_0^\lambda) &= g(\lambda), \quad z_0^\lambda \in \Omega^\lambda; \end{aligned}$$

for some functions $a_r, b_r, c_s, g \in \mathcal{C}^j([0, 1])$. Then $u^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+2+\mu, j}(\bar{\Omega}^\lambda)$.

By Proposition 2.10, we can reduce the problem to the following ‘‘canonical’’ form (Problem B) with the same index:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta U^\lambda + a^\lambda(x, y)U_x^\lambda + b^\lambda(x, y)U_y^\lambda &= f^\lambda(x, y), \quad \text{in } \Omega^\lambda; \\ \alpha^\lambda U_x^\lambda + \beta^\lambda U_y^\lambda &= \gamma^\lambda, \quad \text{on } b\Omega^\lambda, \end{aligned}$$

where $a^\lambda, b^\lambda, f^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$, $\alpha^\lambda, \beta^\lambda, \gamma^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$. Furthermore, by the remark in the last section (see (3)), if one sets $w^\lambda = U_x^\lambda - iU_y^\lambda$ then

$$(4.2) \quad U^\lambda(x, y) = c_0(\lambda) + \operatorname{Re} \int_{z_0}^z w^\lambda(\zeta) d\zeta.$$

Hence it suffices to consider the corresponding Problem A for w^λ :

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_{\bar{z}} w^\lambda + A^\lambda w^\lambda + B^\lambda \overline{w^\lambda} &= F^\lambda, \quad \text{in } \Omega^\lambda; \\ \operatorname{Re}[\overline{l^\lambda} w^\lambda] &= \gamma^\lambda, \quad l^\lambda = \alpha^\lambda - i\beta^\lambda, \quad \text{on } b\Omega^\lambda, \end{aligned}$$

with the corresponding index $n = \frac{1}{2\pi}[l^\lambda]_{b\Omega^\lambda} = \frac{1}{2\pi}[\overline{U^\lambda}]_{b\Omega^\lambda} = \varkappa \geq 0$, $A^\lambda, B^\lambda, F^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$, and $l^\lambda, \gamma^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$.

Our strategy is to use a smooth family of Riemann mappings proved in [1] to reduce the problem to one on a fixed domain, where only the coefficients and the right-hand side of the equation depend on the parameter.

Let us first consider the following homogeneous Problem A on a fixed domain:

$$(4.4) \quad \begin{cases} \mathcal{L}(w^\lambda) \equiv \partial_{\bar{z}} w^\lambda + A^\lambda(z) w^\lambda + B^\lambda(z) \overline{w^\lambda} = 0 & \text{in } \Omega; \\ \operatorname{Re}[\overline{l^\lambda(z)} w^\lambda] = 0 & \text{on } b\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Let w_s^λ , $1 \leq s \leq 2n+1$ be the solutions to the integral equation $w^\lambda + Q_n^\lambda w^\lambda = g_s$, where g_s is one of the functions:

$$(4.5) \quad z^\ell - z^{2n-\ell}, \quad i(z^\ell + z^{2n-\ell}), \quad iz^n, \quad \ell = 0, \dots, n-1.$$

By (3.14) and (3.16), $\{w_s^\lambda\}_{s=1}^{2n+1}$ forms a basis of \mathbb{R} linearly-independent solutions to Problem (4.4). We now prove regularity of w_s^λ with respect to λ .

Proposition 4.2. *Let k be a non-negative integer and let $0 < \mu < 1$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a simply connected domain with $C^{k+1+\mu}$ boundary. Let $w_1^\lambda, \dots, w_{2n+1}^\lambda$ be linearly-independent solutions to the homogeneous Problem A (4.4) with parameter as given above, with index $n \geq 0$. Suppose $A^\lambda, B^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+\mu, 0}(\overline{\Omega})$, $l^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu, 0}(\overline{\Omega})$. Then $w_s^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu, 0}(\overline{\Omega})$, for $s = 1, \dots, 2n+1$.*

Proof. First we reduce the problem to one on the unit disk. Since Ω is a simply-connected domain, there exists a biholomorphic map $\Gamma : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ which is $C^{k+1+\mu}$ up to the boundary. Define \tilde{w} on \mathbb{D} by $w(z) = \tilde{w} \circ \Gamma(z)$. Then $\tilde{w}(\zeta)$ is the solution to the problem:

$$(4.6) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_{\bar{\zeta}} \tilde{w}^\lambda + \tilde{A}^\lambda(\zeta) \tilde{w}^\lambda + \tilde{B}^\lambda(\zeta) \overline{\tilde{w}^\lambda} = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{D}; \\ \operatorname{Re}[\overline{\tilde{l}^\lambda(\zeta)} \tilde{w}^\lambda] = 0 & \text{on } S^1, \end{cases}$$

where $\tilde{A}^\lambda = A^\lambda D^{-1}$, $\tilde{B}^\lambda = B^\lambda D^{-1}$, $D(\zeta) = \overline{\partial_z \Gamma} \circ \Gamma^{-1}(\zeta) \neq 0$. Since $\Gamma \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu}(\overline{\Omega})$ and $\Gamma^{-1} \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$, we have $A^\lambda, B^\lambda, \in \mathcal{C}^{k+\mu, 0}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$, and $\tilde{l}^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu, 0}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$. Thus the problem is reduced to $\Omega = \mathbb{D}$.

By (3.5), it suffices to consider the reduced boundary value problem

$$(4.7) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_{\bar{z}} w^\lambda + A^\lambda w^\lambda + B^\lambda \overline{w^\lambda} = 0, & \text{in } \mathbb{D}; \\ \operatorname{Re}[z^{-n} w^\lambda] = 0, & \text{on } S^1, \end{cases}$$

where $w^\lambda(z) = e^{\chi^\lambda(z)} \tilde{w}^\lambda(z)$, $A^\lambda = \tilde{A}^\lambda$, $B^\lambda = \tilde{B}^\lambda e^{2i\operatorname{Im} \chi^\lambda(z)}$, and $\chi^\lambda(z)$ is defined in (3.3). By Proposition 7.11, we have $\chi^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu, 0}(\overline{\Omega})$, and hence $A^\lambda, B^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+\mu, 0}(\overline{\Omega})$. By (3.14), for $s = 1, 2, \dots, 2n+1$, w_s^λ is the unique solution satisfying the integral equation

$$(4.8) \quad w_s^\lambda + Q_n^\lambda w_s^\lambda = g_s,$$

where $Q_n^\lambda w_s^\lambda := P_n(A^\lambda w^\lambda + B^\lambda \overline{w^\lambda})$, and g_s are given by (4.5).

Let us first prove the statement for $k = 0$. We claim $|w_s^\lambda|_0$ is bounded uniformly in λ . Suppose this is not the case, that there exists some sequence $\lambda_j \in [0, 1]$ with $N_j = |w_s^{\lambda_j}|_0 \rightarrow \infty$. Since $[0, 1]$ is compact, passing to a subsequence if necessary we can assume that λ_j converges to some λ_0 . Dividing each side of the integral equation (4.8) by N_j , and writing $\widehat{w}_s^{\lambda_j} = w_s^{\lambda_j}/N_j$, we obtain

$$(4.9) \quad \widehat{w}_s^{\lambda_j} + Q_n^{\lambda_j} \widehat{w}_s^{\lambda_j} = N_j^{-1} g_s, \quad |\widehat{w}_s^{\lambda_j}|_0 = 1.$$

By Proposition 7.6, we have for any $0 < \tau < 1$

$$|Q_n^\lambda \widehat{w}_i^{\lambda_j}|_\tau \leq C \left(|A^\lambda|_0 + |B^\lambda|_0 \right) |\widehat{w}_i^{\lambda_j}|_0 \leq C'.$$

By Arzela-Ascoli theorem, and passing to a subsequence if necessary, we have $Q_n^{\lambda_j} \widehat{w}_s^{\lambda_j}$ converges to some function uniformly. It follows from equation (4.9) that $\widehat{w}_s^{\lambda_j}$ converges to some function \widehat{w}_s uniformly. We show that $Q_n^{\lambda_j} \widehat{w}_s^{\lambda_j}$ converges uniformly to $Q_n^{\lambda_0} \widehat{w}_s$. Recall that

$$Q_n^\lambda w^\lambda = P_n(A^\lambda w^\lambda + B^\lambda \overline{w^\lambda}),$$

where P_n is given by formula (3.10). Hence

$$\begin{aligned} Q_n^{\lambda_1} w^{\lambda_1} - Q_n^{\lambda_2} w^{\lambda_2} &= \left(Q_n^{\lambda_1} - Q_n^{\lambda_2} \right) w^{\lambda_1} + Q_n^{\lambda_2} (w^{\lambda_1} - w^{\lambda_2}) \\ &= P_n \left((A^{\lambda_1} - A^{\lambda_2}) w^{\lambda_1} \right) + P_n \left((B^{\lambda_1} - B^{\lambda_2}) \overline{w^{\lambda_1}} \right) \\ &\quad + P_n \left(A^{\lambda_2} (w^{\lambda_1} - w^{\lambda_2}) \right) + P_n \left(B^{\lambda_2} (w^{\lambda_1} - w^{\lambda_2}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 7.6, we have for any $0 < \tau < 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \left| Q_n^{\lambda_j} \widehat{w}_s^{\lambda_j} - Q_n^{\lambda_0} \widehat{w}_s \right|_\tau &\leq \left(|A^{\lambda_j} - A^{\lambda_0}|_0 + |B^{\lambda_j} - B^{\lambda_0}|_0 \right) |\widehat{w}_s^{\lambda_j}|_0 \\ &\quad + \left(|A^{\lambda_0}|_0 + |B^{\lambda_0}|_0 \right) \left| \widehat{w}_s^{\lambda_j} - \widehat{w}_s \right|_0. \end{aligned}$$

Since $A^\lambda, B^\lambda \in C^{\mu, 0}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$, we have A, B are continuous in λ in the sup norm. Hence by taking $\tau = 0$ in the above expression we get $\left| Q_n^{\lambda_j} \widehat{w}_s^{\lambda_j} - Q_n^{\lambda_0} \widehat{w}_s \right|_0 \rightarrow 0$. Letting $\lambda_j \rightarrow \lambda_0$ in (4.9) we get $\widehat{w}_s + Q_n^{\lambda_0} \widehat{w}_s = 0$. By Vekua [7, p. 296-298], there does not exist non-trivial continuous solutions for the above equation, thus $\widehat{w}_s = 0$. But we have $|\widehat{w}_s|_0 = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} |\widehat{w}_s^{\lambda_j}|_0 = 1$, which is a contradiction. Thus $|w_s^\lambda|_0$ is bounded by some constant C_0 uniform in λ . It follows then

$$|Q_n^\lambda w_s^\lambda|_\tau \leq C \left(|A^\lambda|_0 + |B^\lambda|_0 \right) |w_s^\lambda|_0 \leq C'_0,$$

for any $0 < \tau < 1$. By (4.8) we obtain $|w^\lambda|_\tau$ is bounded uniformly in λ by some constant C''_0 .

For $k > 0$ we apply induction. By (4.8) and Proposition 7.7 one has

$$\begin{aligned} |w_s^\lambda|_{k+1+\mu} &\leq |Q_n^\lambda w_s^\lambda|_{k+1+\mu} + C_k \\ &= |P_n(A^\lambda w_s^\lambda + B^\lambda \overline{w_s^\lambda})|_{k+1+\mu} + C'_k \\ &\leq C''_k \left(|A^\lambda|_{k+\mu} + |B^\lambda|_{k+\mu} \right) |w_s^\lambda|_{k+\mu} + C'''_k \leq C''''_k. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $|w_s^\lambda|_{k+1+\mu}$ is bounded uniformly in λ .

Finally we show that w_s^λ is continuous in the C^0 -norm. Suppose this is not the case, we can then find a sequence $\lambda_j \rightarrow \lambda_0$, $|w_s^{\lambda_j} - w_s^{\lambda_0}|_0 \geq \delta > 0$. Since $|w_s^{\lambda_j}|_{k+1+\mu}$ is bounded, passing to a subsequence if necessary, $w_s^{\lambda_j}$ converges to some function \widehat{w}_s in the C^{k+1} -norm. We have shown above that $Q_n^{\lambda_j} w_s^{\lambda_j}$ converges uniformly to $Q_n^{\lambda_0} \widehat{w}_s$. Letting $\lambda_j \rightarrow \infty$ in equation (4.8) we have

$$\widehat{w}_s + Q_n^{\lambda_0} \widehat{w}_s = g_s.$$

This equation has a unique solution $w_s^{\lambda_0}$, thus $\widehat{w}_s = w_s^{\lambda_0}$. But this contradicts the fact that $|\widehat{w}_s - w_s^{\lambda_0}|_0 \geq \delta > 0$. Thus we have proved that w_s^λ is continuous in λ in the $C^0(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$ -norm. The continuity of w_s^λ in the $C^{k+1}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$ -norm then follows from Proposition 2.3. \square

Next we show the smooth dependence in parameter for a particular solution of the non-homogenous Problem A.

Proposition 4.3. *Let k be a non-negative integer and let $0 < \mu < 1$. Consider Problem A with parameter on a simply-connected domain Ω :*

$$(4.10) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_{\bar{z}} w^\lambda + A^\lambda(z)w^\lambda + B^\lambda(z)\overline{w^\lambda} = F^\lambda & \text{in } \Omega; \\ \operatorname{Re}[\overline{l^\lambda(z)}w^\lambda] = \gamma^\lambda & \text{on } b\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where the index $n \geq 0$. Suppose $A^\lambda, B^\lambda, F^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+\mu,0}(\overline{\Omega})$, $l^\lambda, \gamma^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu,0}(b\Omega)$. Then there exists a solution w_0 in the class $\mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu,0}(\overline{\Omega})$. Moreover there exists some constant C independent of λ such that

$$(4.11) \quad \|w_0^\lambda\|_{0,0} := \sup_{\lambda \in [0,1]} |w_0^\lambda|_0 \leq C \left(\|F^\lambda\|_{0,0} + \|\gamma^\lambda\|_{\mu,0} \right),$$

$$(4.12) \quad \|w_0^\lambda\|_{k+1+\mu,0} \leq C \left(\|F^\lambda\|_{k+\mu,0} + \|\gamma^\lambda\|_{k+1+\mu,0} \right).$$

Proof. To prove estimate (4.11) (resp. (4.12)), it suffices to show that $\|w_0\|_{0,0} \leq C$ (resp. $\|w_0\|_{k+1+\mu,0} \leq C$) if each norm on the right-hand side is bounded by 1, since the equations are linear. As before we can assume the problem takes the form (4.7). In view of equation (3.14), we can take w_0^λ to be the unique solution in $C^0(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$ to the integral equation in \mathbb{D} :

$$(4.13) \quad w^\lambda + Q_n^\lambda w^\lambda = P_n F^\lambda + \frac{z^n}{2\pi i} \int_{S^1} \gamma^\lambda(t) \frac{t+z}{t-z} \frac{dt}{t},$$

where $P_n F^\lambda = T_{\mathbb{D}} F^\lambda + z^{2n+1} T_{\mathbb{D}^c} F_1^\lambda$, $Q_n^\lambda w^\lambda = P_n (A^\lambda w^\lambda + B^\lambda \overline{w^\lambda})$, and F_1^λ and F^λ are related by the second expression in (3.11).

The proof is identical to that of the previous theorem, once we show that the right-hand side of equation (4.13) belongs to $\mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu,0}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$. By Proposition 7.7,

$$|P_n F^\lambda|_{k+1+\mu} \leq C |F^\lambda|_{k+\mu}.$$

The second term is z^n times $\mathcal{S}\gamma^\lambda$, the Schwarz transform of γ^λ on \mathbb{D} . We have

$$|\mathcal{S}\gamma^\lambda|_{k+1+\mu} \leq C |\gamma^\lambda|_{k+1+\mu}$$

by Proposition 7.11. Thus $|P_n F^\lambda + z^n \mathcal{S}\gamma^\lambda|_{k+1+\mu}$ is bounded. Fix $\tau \in (0,1)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |P_n F^{\lambda_1} - P_n F^{\lambda_2}|_0 &\leq |P_n F^{\lambda_1} - P_n F^{\lambda_2}|_\tau \leq C |F^{\lambda_1} - F^{\lambda_2}|_0, \\ |\mathcal{S}\gamma^{\lambda_1} - \mathcal{S}\gamma^{\lambda_2}|_0 &\leq |\mathcal{S}\gamma^{\lambda_1} - \mathcal{S}\gamma^{\lambda_2}|_\tau \leq C |\gamma^{\lambda_1} - \gamma^{\lambda_2}|_\tau. \end{aligned}$$

By the above two inequalities and the assumptions, we see that $P_n F^\lambda + z^n \mathcal{S}\gamma^\lambda$ is continuous in the C^0 -norm. By Proposition 2.3, $P_n F^\lambda + \mathcal{S}\gamma^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu,0}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$. \square

We can now prove the following result for Problem A on fixed domain:

Proposition 4.4. *Let k be a non-negative integer and let $0 < \mu < 1$. Consider the non-homogeneous Problem A (4.10) on a simply-connected domain Ω , with index $n \geq 0$. Suppose $A, B, F \in \mathcal{C}^{k+\mu,0}(\overline{\Omega})$, $l, \gamma \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu,0}(b\Omega)$, $a_r, b_r, c_s \in C^0([0,1])$. Then for each λ there exists a unique solution w^λ satisfying the following conditions on a normally distributed set (see (3.6)).*

$$(4.14) \quad \begin{aligned} w^\lambda(z_r) &= a_r(\lambda) + ib_r(\lambda), & r &= 1, \dots, N_0; \\ w^\lambda(z'_s) &= l^\lambda(z'_s)(\gamma^\lambda(z'_s) + ic_s(\lambda)), & s &= 1, \dots, N_1 \end{aligned}$$

where $2N_0 + N_1 = 2n + 1$. The family w^λ belongs to the class $\mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu,0}(\overline{\Omega})$. Moreover there exists some constant C independent of λ so that

$$(4.15) \quad \|w^\lambda\|_{0,0} \leq C \left(\|F^\lambda\|_{0,0} + \|\gamma^\lambda\|_{\mu,0} + \sum_{r=1}^{N_0} (|a_r|_0 + |b_r|_0) + \sum_{s=1}^{N_1} |c_s|_0 \right),$$

$$(4.16) \quad \|w^\lambda\|_{k+1+\mu,0} \leq C \left(\|F^\lambda\|_{k+\mu,0} + \|\gamma^\lambda\|_{k+1+\mu,0} + \sum_{r=1}^{N_0} (|a_r|_0 + |b_r|_0) + \sum_{s=1}^{N_1} |c_s|_0 \right),$$

where we denote $|a_r|_0 := \sup_{\lambda \in [0,1]} |a_r(\lambda)|$ and similarly for $|b_r|_0$ and $|c_s|_0$.

Proof. Let w_0^λ be the particular solution to the non-homogeneous Problem A given in Proposition 4.3, and let w_ℓ^λ -s be the $2n + 1$ \mathbb{R} -linearly independent solution to the homogeneous Problem A given in Proposition 4.2. Then w^λ is given by the formula:

$$(4.17) \quad w^\lambda(z) = w_0^\lambda(z) + \sum_{\ell=1}^{2n+1} d_\ell(\lambda) w_\ell^\lambda(z),$$

where d_ℓ are real-valued functions on $[0, 1]$.

From (4.14), we have the following linear system of equations for the determination of the functions $d_s(\lambda)$:

$$(4.18) \quad \sum_{j=1}^{2n+1} d_\ell(\lambda) w_\ell^\lambda(z_r) = a_r(\lambda) + ib_r(\lambda) - w_0^\lambda(z_r) \quad r = 1, \dots, N_0,$$

$$(4.19) \quad \sum_{\ell=1}^{2n+1} d_\ell(\lambda) w_\ell^\lambda(z'_s) = l^\lambda(z'_s)(\gamma^\lambda(z'_s) + ic_s(\lambda)) - w_0^\lambda(z'_s) \quad s = 1, \dots, N_1.$$

We can write the above as $2N_0 + 2N_1$ real equations. However, there are in fact only $2N_0 + N_1 = 2n + 1$ equations, since the imaginary parts of equations (4.19) are obtained from the real parts of equation (4.19), by multiplying $-\frac{\alpha^\lambda(z'_s)}{\beta^\lambda(z'_s)}$ (assume that $\beta^\lambda(z'_s) \neq 0$.) Indeed, we have for $z'_s \in b\Omega$,

$$0 = \operatorname{Re}[\overline{l^\lambda} w_\ell^\lambda(z'_s)] = \alpha^\lambda(z'_s) \operatorname{Re}[w_\ell^\lambda(z'_s)] + \beta^\lambda(z'_s) \operatorname{Im}[w_\ell^\lambda(z'_s)], \quad 1 \leq \ell \leq 2n + 1,$$

$$\gamma^\lambda(z'_s) = \operatorname{Re}[\overline{l^\lambda} w_0^\lambda(z'_s)] = \alpha^\lambda(z'_s) \operatorname{Re}[w_0^\lambda(z'_s)] + \beta^\lambda(z'_s) \operatorname{Im}[w_0^\lambda(z'_s)],$$

where we set $l^\lambda(z'_s) = \alpha^\lambda(z'_s) + i\beta^\lambda(z'_s)$. Thus we can view the linear system (4.18)-(4.19) as:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \operatorname{Re}[w_1^\lambda(z_1)] & \dots & \operatorname{Re}[w_{2n+1}^\lambda(z_1)] \\ \operatorname{Im}[w_1^\lambda(z_1)] & \dots & \operatorname{Im}[w_{2n+1}^\lambda(z_1)] \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \operatorname{Re}[w_1^\lambda(z_{N_0})] & \dots & \operatorname{Re}[w_{2n+1}^\lambda(z_{N_0})] \\ \operatorname{Im}[w_1^\lambda(z_{N_0})] & \dots & \operatorname{Im}[w_{2n+1}^\lambda(z_{N_0})] \\ \operatorname{Re}[w_1^\lambda(z'_1)] & \dots & \operatorname{Re}[w_{2n+1}^\lambda(z'_1)] \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \operatorname{Re}[w_1^\lambda(z'_{N_1})] & \dots & \operatorname{Re}[w_{2n+1}^\lambda(z'_{N_1})] \end{pmatrix} \times \begin{pmatrix} d_1(\lambda) \\ \vdots \\ d_{2n+1}(\lambda) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \operatorname{Re}(h^\lambda(z_1)) \\ \operatorname{Im}(h^\lambda(z_1)) \\ \vdots \\ \operatorname{Re}(h^\lambda(z_{N_0})) \\ \operatorname{Im}(h^\lambda(z_{N_0})) \\ \vdots \\ \operatorname{Re}(e^\lambda(z'_{N_1})) \\ \vdots \\ \operatorname{Re}(e^\lambda(z'_{N_1})) \end{pmatrix}$$

where $h^\lambda(z_r)$ and $e^\lambda(z'_s)$ denote the right-hand side of (4.18) and (4.19), respectively. Write the above matrix equation as $Mx = \mathbf{v}$. By Vekua [7, p. 286-287], for fixed λ and a normally distributed

set $\{N_0, N_1, \overline{\Omega}\}$, M is invertible, thus we can write $d_s(\lambda)$ as $\frac{P}{Q}$, $Q \neq 0$, and P and Q are linear combination of products of

$$\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{Re}[w_\ell^\lambda(z_r)], \quad \operatorname{Im}[w_\ell^\lambda(z_r)], \quad \operatorname{Re}[w_\ell^\lambda(z'_s)], \quad \operatorname{Im}[w_\ell^\lambda(z'_s)], \\ & (\operatorname{Re}, \operatorname{Im})[a_r(\lambda) + ib_r(\lambda) - w_0^\lambda(z_r)], \quad \operatorname{Re}[l^\lambda(z'_s)(\gamma^\lambda(z'_s) + ic_j(\lambda)) - w_0^\lambda(z'_s)]. \end{aligned}$$

By the assumption, Proposition 4.2 and 4.3, for fixed z_r and z'_s the above functions are continuous in λ , thus d_ℓ -s are continuous functions of λ , and moreover by (4.11) we have

$$(4.20) \quad |d_\ell|_0 \leq C \left(\sum_{r=1}^{N_0} (|a_r|_0 + |b_r|_0) + \left(\sum_{s=1}^{N_1} |c_s|_0 \right) + \|F\|_{0,0} + \|\gamma\|_{\mu,0} \right).$$

Since $w_0^\lambda, w_\ell^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu,0}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$, it follow from (4.17) that $w^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu,0}(\overline{\Omega})$. Putting together estimates (4.11), (4.12) and (4.20) we get (4.15) and (4.16). \square

Remark 4.5. Since our proof uses a contradiction argument, the constant C in (4.15) and (4.16) is not explicit. In particular we do not know how it depends on the coefficient functions A^λ, B^λ and l^λ .

We now prove the analog of Proposition 4.4 when the index is negative.

Proposition 4.6. *Let k be a non-negative integer, and let $0 < \mu < 1$. Consider Problem A (4.10) with negative index. Suppose for each λ , conditions (3.17) is fulfilled. Suppose $A^\lambda, B^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+\mu,0}(\overline{\Omega})$, $l^\lambda, \gamma^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu,0}(b\Omega)$. Then for each λ there exists a unique solution w^λ on Ω . The family w^λ lies in the class $\mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu,0}(\overline{\Omega})$, and the following estimate hold*

$$\|w\|_{k+1+\mu,0} \leq C(A, B, l) (\|F\|_{k+\mu,0} + \|\gamma\|_{k+1+\mu,0}).$$

Proof. Reducing the problem to the canonical form (4.7). By Vekua [7, p. 300, (7.32), (7.33)], w^λ satisfies the integral equation (3.19)

$$(4.21) \quad w^\lambda + (Q_{n'}^*)^\lambda w^\lambda = P_k^* F^\lambda + \frac{1}{\pi i} \int_{S^1} \frac{\gamma^\lambda(t) dt}{t^k(t-z)}, \quad n' = -n,$$

where $Q_{n'}^* w = P_{n'}^*(A^\lambda w^\lambda + B^\lambda \overline{w^\lambda})$ and $P_{n'}^*$ is given by (3.20). Vekua proved that for fixed λ , the above equation is uniquely soluble for w^λ given any right-hand side in $L^q(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$, for $q \geq \frac{p}{p-1}$, and $Q_{n'}^*$ is a compact operator on $L^q(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$ satisfying the estimate

$$|(Q_{n'}^*)^\lambda f|_{k+1+\mu} \leq C|B^\lambda|_{k+\mu} |f|_{k+1+\mu}.$$

Following the same argument as for the positive index case, it suffices to show the right-hand side of (4.21) lies in the space $\mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu,0}(\overline{\mathbb{D}} \times [0, 1])$. For the first term we have the estimate

$$|P_k^* F^\lambda|_{k+1+\mu} \leq C|F^\lambda|_{k+\mu}, \quad |P_k^* F^{\lambda_1} - P_k^* F^{\lambda_2}| \leq C|F^{\lambda_1} - F^{\lambda_2}|_0.$$

The second term is the Cauchy transform of the function $g^\lambda = \gamma^\lambda/t^k$, and we have the estimate by Proposition 7.11:

$$|\mathfrak{C}g^\lambda|_{k+1+\mu} \leq C|\gamma^\lambda|_{k+1+\mu}, \quad |\mathfrak{C}g^{\lambda_1} - \mathfrak{C}g^{\lambda_2}|_0 \leq C|\gamma^{\lambda_1} - \gamma^{\lambda_2}|_1.$$

Since $F^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+\mu,0}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$ and $\gamma^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu,0}(S^1)$, then $P_{n'}^* F^\lambda$ and $\mathfrak{C}(g^\lambda)$ are in $\mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu,0}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$. \square

We now combine Proposition 4.4 and Proposition 2.6 to prove the following result for Problem A on families of simply-connected domains. We state and prove the theorem only for $n \geq 0$. When $n < 0$, the same conclusion holds if we assume conditions (3.17) hold. The proof can be done similarly as in Theorem 4.7 by using Proposition 4.6 and we leave the details to the reader.

Theorem 4.7. *Let k, j, μ be as in Theorem 1.1. Let Ω^λ be a $\mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu, j}$ family of bounded simply-connected domains. That is, there exists a family of maps $\Gamma^\lambda : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow \overline{\Omega^\lambda}$, with $\Gamma^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega})$. Suppose the index $n \geq 0$. Let $\{z_r \in \Omega, z'_s \in b\Omega\}$ be a normally distributed set in $\overline{\Omega}$ (Definition 3.6). Set $z_r^\lambda = \Gamma^\lambda(z_r)$, $(z'_s)^\lambda = \Gamma^\lambda(z'_s)$. Then $\{z_r^\lambda, (z'_s)^\lambda\}$ is a normally distributed set in $\overline{\Omega^\lambda}$. Let w^λ be the unique solution to Problem (4.3) satisfying the following:*

$$(4.22) \quad \begin{aligned} w^\lambda(z_r^\lambda) &= a_r(\lambda) + ib_r(\lambda), & (r = 1, \dots, N_0); \\ w^\lambda((z'_s)^\lambda) &= l^\lambda((z'_s)^\lambda)[\gamma^\lambda((z'_s)^\lambda) + ic_s(\lambda)], & (s = 1, \dots, N_1) \end{aligned}$$

where $2N_0 + N_1 = 2n + 1$.

(i) *Suppose $A^\lambda, B^\lambda, F^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+\mu, 0}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$, and $l^\lambda, \gamma^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu, 0}(b\Omega^\lambda)$, and $a_r, b_r, c_s \in C^0([0, 1])$. Then $w^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu, 0}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$, and there exists some constant C independent of λ such that*

$$(4.23) \quad \|w^\lambda\|_{0,0} \leq C \left(\|F^\lambda\|_{0,0} + \|\gamma^\lambda\|_{\mu,0} + \sum_{r=1}^{N_0} (|a_r|_0 + |b_r|_0) + \sum_{s=1}^{N_1} |c_s|_0 \right);$$

$$(4.24) \quad \|w^\lambda\|_{k+1+\mu,0} \leq C \left(\|F^\lambda\|_{k+\mu,0} + \|\gamma^\lambda\|_{k+1+\mu,0} + \sum_{r=1}^{N_0} (|a_r|_0 + |b_r|_0) + \sum_{s=1}^{N_1} |c_s|_0 \right).$$

(ii) *Suppose $A^\lambda, B^\lambda, F^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$, and $l^\lambda, \gamma^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu, j}(b\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$. Let w^λ be the solution to Problem (4.3) satisfying the condition (4.22), where $a_r, b_r, c_s \in C^j([0, 1])$. Then $w \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$.*

Proof. (i) By Proposition 2.6, there exists a family of Riemann mappings $R^\lambda : \Omega^\lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ with $\tilde{R}^\lambda(z) := R^\lambda(\Gamma^\lambda(z)) \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega})$. By Proposition 2.7, $(R^\lambda)^{-1} \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu, j}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$. i.e. $(R^\lambda)^{-1} : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \overline{\Omega^\lambda}$ is also a $\mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu, j}$ family of embeddings. Define $v^\lambda(\zeta) = w^\lambda \circ (R^\lambda)^{-1}(\zeta)$, $\zeta \in \mathbb{D}$, and write $z^\lambda = (R^\lambda)^{-1}(\zeta)$. Since $(R^\lambda)^{-1}$ is holomorphic, we have the boundary value problem for v^λ on \mathbb{D} :

$$(4.25) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_{\bar{\zeta}} v^\lambda(\zeta) + A_1^\lambda(\zeta) v^\lambda(\zeta) + B_1^\lambda(\zeta) \overline{v^\lambda(\zeta)} = F_1^\lambda(\zeta) & \text{in } \mathbb{D}; \\ \operatorname{Re}[l_1^\lambda(\zeta) v^\lambda(\zeta)] = \gamma_1^\lambda(\zeta) & \text{on } S^1, \end{cases}$$

where $l_1^\lambda := l^\lambda \circ (R^\lambda)^{-1}$, $\gamma_1^\lambda := \gamma^\lambda \circ (R^\lambda)^{-1}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} A_1^\lambda &= A^\lambda \circ (R^\lambda)^{-1}(\zeta) D^\lambda(\zeta), & B_1^\lambda &= B^\lambda \circ (R^\lambda)^{-1}(\zeta) D^\lambda(\zeta), \\ F_1^\lambda &= F^\lambda \circ (R^\lambda)^{-1}(\zeta) D^\lambda(\zeta), & D^\lambda &= \partial_{\bar{\zeta}} \overline{(R^\lambda)^{-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 2.4, $A_1^\lambda, B_1^\lambda, F_1^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+\mu, j}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$, and $l_1^\lambda, \gamma_1^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu, j}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$. Also $D^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+\mu, j}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$. Hence $A_1^\lambda, B_1^\lambda, F_1^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+\mu, j}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$. The index $n = \frac{1}{2\pi} [l^\lambda]_{b\Omega}$ is an integer independent of λ . Let

$$\zeta_r^\lambda := R^\lambda \circ \Gamma^\lambda(z_r), \quad (\zeta'_s)^\lambda := R^\lambda \circ \Gamma^\lambda(z'_s).$$

Then for each λ , $\{\zeta_r^\lambda, (\zeta'_s)^\lambda\}$ is a normally distributed set in Ω^λ . v^λ satisfies the condition

$$\begin{aligned} v^\lambda(\zeta_r^\lambda) &= w^\lambda(z_r^\lambda) = a_r(\lambda) + ib_r(\lambda), & r = 1, \dots, N_0; \\ v^\lambda((\zeta'_s)^\lambda) &= w^\lambda((z'_s)^\lambda) = l^\lambda((z'_s)^\lambda)[\gamma^\lambda((z'_s)^\lambda) + ic_s(\lambda)], & s = 1, \dots, N_1. \end{aligned}$$

Since $v^\lambda = v_0^\lambda + \sum_{\ell} d_\ell(\lambda) v_\ell^\lambda$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\ell=1}^{2n+1} d_\ell(\lambda) v_\ell^\lambda(\zeta_r^\lambda) &= a_r(\lambda) + ib_r(\lambda) - v_0^\lambda(\zeta_r^\lambda), \\ \sum_{\ell=1}^{2n+1} d_\ell(\lambda) v_\ell^\lambda((\zeta'_s)^\lambda) &= l^\lambda((z'_s)^\lambda)[\gamma^\lambda((z'_s)^\lambda) + ic_s(\lambda)] - v_0^\lambda((\zeta'_s)^\lambda), \end{aligned}$$

where v_0^λ is a particular solution to the non-homogeneous problem (4.25) as given in Proposition 4.3, and $v_1^\lambda, \dots, v_{2n+1}^\lambda$ are linearly independent solutions to the corresponding homogeneous problem as given in Proposition 4.2. We have $v_0^\lambda, v_1^\lambda, \dots, v_{2n+1}^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu,0}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$. Since ζ_r^λ and $(\zeta'_s)^\lambda$ depend on λ continuously, $v_0^\lambda(\zeta_r^\lambda), v_\ell^\lambda(\zeta_r^\lambda), v_0^\lambda((\zeta'_s)^\lambda), v_\ell^\lambda((\zeta'_s)^\lambda)$ depend on λ continuously. Same reasoning as in the proof of Proposition 4.4 then shows that $d_l \in C^0([0, 1])$, and consequently $v^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu,0}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$, and we have

$$\|v^\lambda\|_{k+1+\mu,0} \leq C \left(\|F_1^\lambda\|_{k+\mu,0} + \|\gamma_1^\lambda\|_{k+1+\mu,0} + \sum_{r=1}^{N_0} (|a_r|_0 + |b_r|_0) + \sum_{s=1}^{N_1} |c_s|_0 \right).$$

Now $w^\lambda := v^\lambda \circ R^\lambda$ is the unique solution to Problem (4.3), $w^\lambda \circ (R^\lambda)^{-1} \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu,0}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$, and w^λ satisfies the estimate (4.24). By Lemma 2.4, $w^\lambda \circ \Gamma^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu,0}(\overline{\Omega})$, or $w^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu,0}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$.

(ii) The $j = 0$ case is done in (i). Assume now that $j \geq 1$, and we use induction. We use the notation $D^{\lambda,\lambda_0}v(\zeta)$ from (2.6). In view of (4.25) $D^{\lambda,\lambda_0}v(\zeta)$ is a solution to

$$(4.26) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_{\bar{\zeta}}u + A_1^{\lambda_0}u + B_1^{\lambda_0}\bar{u} = F_*^{\lambda,\lambda_0} & \text{in } \mathbb{D}; \\ \text{Re}[\bar{l}^{\lambda_0}u] = \gamma_*^{\lambda,\lambda_0} & \text{on } S^1, \end{cases}$$

where $F_*^{\lambda,\lambda_0} := D^{\lambda,\lambda_0}F_1 - (D^{\lambda,\lambda_0}A_1)v^\lambda - (D^{\lambda,\lambda_0}B_1)\overline{v^\lambda}$ and $\gamma_*^{\lambda,\lambda_0} := D^{\lambda,\lambda_0}\tilde{\gamma} - \text{Re}[(D^{\lambda,\lambda_0}\tilde{l})v^\lambda]$. We also have

$$(4.27) \quad \begin{aligned} D^{\lambda,\lambda_0}v(\zeta_r) &= h_r^{\lambda,\lambda_0} := D^{\lambda,\lambda_0}a_r + iD^{\lambda,\lambda_0}b_r, \\ D^{\lambda,\lambda_0}v(\zeta'_s) &= g_s^{\lambda,\lambda_0} := D^{\lambda,\lambda_0} \{l^\bullet((\zeta'_s)^\bullet)[\gamma^\bullet((\zeta'_s)^\bullet) + ic_s(\bullet)]\}. \end{aligned}$$

For every λ_0 , denote by $\partial_\lambda v(\cdot, \lambda_0)$ the solution to the problem:

$$(4.28) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_{\bar{\zeta}}u + A_1^{\lambda_0}u + B_1^{\lambda_0}\bar{u} = F_*^{\lambda_0} & \text{in } \mathbb{D}; \\ \text{Re}[\bar{l}^{\lambda_0}u] = \gamma_*^{\lambda_0} & \text{on } S^1, \end{cases}$$

satisfying the condition

$$(4.29) \quad u^{\lambda_0}(\zeta_r) = h_r(\lambda_0), \quad u(\zeta'_s, \lambda_0) = g_s(\lambda_0),$$

where

$$(4.30) \quad F_*^{\lambda_0} := \partial_\lambda F_1(\cdot, \lambda_0) - \partial_\lambda A_1(\cdot, \lambda_0)v^{\lambda_0} - \partial_\lambda B_1(\cdot, \lambda_0)\overline{v^{\lambda_0}},$$

$$(4.31) \quad \gamma_*^{\lambda_0} := \partial_\lambda \tilde{\gamma}(\cdot, \lambda_0) - \text{Re}[(\partial_\lambda \tilde{l}(\cdot, \lambda_0)v^{\lambda_0})],$$

$$(4.32) \quad h_r(\lambda_0) = a'_r(\lambda_0) + ib'_r(\lambda_0), \quad g_s(\lambda_0) = \partial_{\lambda_0} \{ \tilde{l}^{\lambda_0}(\zeta'_s) [\tilde{\gamma}^{\lambda_0}(\zeta'_s) + ic_s(\lambda)] \}.$$

Note that the solution to (4.28) exists since the index $\frac{1}{2\pi}[\tilde{l}^{\lambda_0}]$ is non-negative.

By the induction hypothesis, we have $w^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+\mu,j-1}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$, and therefore $v^\lambda = w^\lambda \circ (R^\lambda)^{-1}(\zeta) \in \mathcal{C}^{k+\mu,j-1}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$. As shown in (i), $A_1, B_1, F_1 \in \mathcal{C}^{k+\mu,j}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$, thus $\partial_\lambda A_1, \partial_\lambda B_1, \partial_\lambda F_1 \in \mathcal{C}^{k-1+\mu,j-1}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$. From (4.30) we have $F_*^{\lambda_0} \in \mathcal{C}^{k-1+\mu,j-1}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$. On the other hand we have $\partial_\lambda \tilde{\gamma}, \partial_\lambda \tilde{l} \in \mathcal{C}^{k+\mu,j-1}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$, thus by (4.31), $\gamma_*^{\lambda_0} \in \mathcal{C}^{k+\mu,j-1}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$.

Since $a'_r, b'_r, c'_s \in C^{j-1}([0, 1])$, by (4.32) and (4.32), $h_r, g_s \in C^{j-1}([0, 1])$. Applying (i) to problem (4.28)-(4.29), we obtain $\partial_\lambda v(\cdot, \lambda_0) \in \mathcal{C}^{k+\mu,j-1}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$.

We now show that $\partial_\lambda v$ is indeed the λ -derivative of v^λ , namely $D^{\lambda,\lambda_0}v$ converges to $\partial_\lambda v(\cdot, \lambda_0)$ uniformly on \mathbb{D} , as $\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_0$.

Now $u^\lambda := D^{\lambda,\lambda_0}v - \partial_\lambda v(\cdot, \lambda_0)$ is the unique solution to

$$(4.33) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_{\bar{\zeta}}u^\lambda + A_1^{\lambda_0}u^\lambda + B_1^{\lambda_0}\overline{u^\lambda} = F_*^{\lambda,\lambda_0} - F_*^{\lambda_0} & \text{in } \mathbb{D}; \\ \text{Re}[\bar{l}^{\lambda_0}u^\lambda] = \gamma_*^{\lambda,\lambda_0} - \gamma_*^{\lambda_0} & \text{on } S^1, \end{cases}$$

which satisfies the condition: for $r = 1, \dots, N_0$ and $s = 1, \dots, N_1$,

$$(4.34) \quad u^\lambda(\zeta_r) = h_r^{\lambda, \lambda_0} - h_r(\lambda_0), \quad u^\lambda(\zeta'_s) = g_s^{\lambda, \lambda_0} - g_s(\lambda_0).$$

where the right-hand sides are defined by (4.27). We now show that $|u^\lambda|_0$ converges to 0 as $\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_0$. Reducing the problem as before to the form

$$(4.35) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_{\bar{\zeta}} \widehat{u}^\lambda + A_0^{\lambda_0} \widehat{u}^\lambda + B_0^{\lambda_0} \overline{\widehat{u}^\lambda} = F_0^{\lambda, \lambda_0} & \text{in } \mathbb{D}; \\ \text{Re}[\zeta^{-n} \widehat{u}^\lambda] = \gamma_0^{\lambda, \lambda_0} & \text{on } S^1 \end{cases}$$

satisfying the conditions:

$$(4.36) \quad \widehat{u}^\lambda(\zeta_r) = \widehat{h}_r(\lambda), \quad (r = 1, \dots, N_0); \quad \widehat{u}^\lambda(\zeta'_s) = \widehat{g}_s(\lambda), \quad (s = 1, \dots, N_1)$$

where

$$(4.37) \quad \begin{aligned} \widehat{u}^\lambda &= e^{\chi^{\lambda_0}} u^\lambda, & A_0^{\lambda_0} &= A_1^{\lambda_0}, & B_0^{\lambda_0} &= B_1^{\lambda_0} e^{2i \text{Im}(\chi^{\lambda_0})}, \\ F_0^{\lambda, \lambda_0} &= (F_*^{\lambda, \lambda_0} - F_*^{\lambda_0}) e^{\chi^{\lambda_0}}, & \gamma_0^{\lambda, \lambda_0} &= (\gamma_*^{\lambda, \lambda_0} - \gamma_*^{\lambda_0}) e^{p^{\lambda_0}}, \end{aligned}$$

$$(4.38) \quad \widehat{h}_r(\lambda) = h_r^{\lambda, \lambda_0} - h_r(\lambda_0), \quad \widehat{g}_s(\lambda) = g_s^{\lambda, \lambda_0} - g_s(\lambda_0),$$

where as before χ^{λ_0} is the holomorphic function in \mathbb{D} defined by (3.3). The solution to (4.35)-(4.36) is given by

$$(4.39) \quad \widehat{u}^\lambda = u_0^\lambda + \sum_{\ell=1}^{2n+1} d_\ell(\lambda) u_\ell^\lambda,$$

where u_0^λ is a particular solution which uniquely solves the integral equation:

$$u_0^\lambda + Q_n^{\lambda_0} u_0^\lambda = P_n(F_0^\lambda) + \frac{z^n}{2\pi i} \int_{b\mathbb{D}} \gamma_0^\lambda(t) \frac{t+z}{t-z} \frac{dt}{t}.$$

Here $Q_n^{\lambda_0}$ and $P_n^{\lambda_0}$ are the compact operators in the space $C^0(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$ defined by (3.15) and (3.11), respectively. Since $I + Q_n^{\lambda_0}$ is an injective (Vekua [7, p. 268]), by Fredholm alternative, it is also surjective. By the open mapping theorem, the inverse $(I - Q_n^{\lambda_0})^{-1}$ is continuous. Denoting its operator norm by M_0 , we get

$$|u_0^\lambda|_0 \leq M_0 \left(|F_0^{\lambda, \lambda_0}|_0 + |\gamma_0^{\lambda, \lambda_0}|_0 \right).$$

Since $v \in C^{0,0}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$ from part (i), we obtain from expressions (4.37) that the right-hand side of the above equation converges to 0 as $\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_0$. Hence $|u_0^\lambda|_0 \rightarrow 0$.

Finally we show $d_\ell(\lambda)$ converges to 0. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{h}_r(\lambda) &= \widehat{u}^\lambda(\zeta_r) = u_0^\lambda(\zeta_r) + \sum_{\ell=1}^{2n+1} d_\ell(\lambda) u_\ell^\lambda(\zeta_r), \quad r = 1, \dots, N_0; \\ \widehat{g}_s(\lambda) &= \widehat{u}^\lambda(\zeta'_s) = u_0^\lambda(\zeta'_s) + \sum_{\ell=1}^{2n+1} d_\ell(\lambda) u_\ell^\lambda(\zeta'_s), \quad s = 1, \dots, N_1. \end{aligned}$$

By (4.38), $\widehat{h}_r(\lambda)$, $\widehat{g}_s(\lambda)$ converge to 0 as $\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_0$. Also $u_0^\lambda(\zeta_r)$ and $u_0^\lambda(\zeta'_s)$ all converge to 0 as $\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_0$, and therefore same reasoning as before shows that $d_\ell(\lambda)$ converges to 0. By (4.39), $|\widehat{u}^\lambda|_0$ converges to 0, which implies $D^{\lambda, \lambda_0} v$ converges to $\partial_\lambda v(\cdot, \lambda_0) \in \mathcal{C}^{k+\mu, j-1}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$ in the sup-norm. This completes the induction and we obtain $v \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu, j}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$. Since $w^\lambda = v^\lambda \circ R^\lambda$, $w \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Proposition 4.7 gives a solution $w^\lambda \in C^{k+1+\mu,j}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$. To finish the proof we need to integrate w^λ (as in (4.2)) to get a solution U^λ for the original elliptic boundary value problem. Denote the resulting integration constant by $c_0(\lambda)$. Then by combining $w^\lambda \in C^{k+1+\mu,j}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$ and the condition $u^\lambda(z_0^\lambda) \in C^j([0, 1])$ in the statement of the theorem, we get $c_0 \in C^j[0, 1]$, and the proof of Theorem 4.1 is complete. \square

5. KERNELS WITH PARAMETER

Starting in this section we study the parameter problem on families of multiply-connected domains. As explained in the introduction, we can no longer fix the domain while preserving $\bar{\partial}$ in the highest order term, since there is no Riemann mapping theorem in this case. More significantly, unlike in the simply-connected case where the solutions satisfy certain Fredholm equation, the solutions on multiply-connected domains in general cannot be expressed as solutions of integral equations directly. Instead we will follow Vekua to represent solutions by integral formulas (3.31). In this section we show how the kernels G_1 and G_2 depend on λ .

For a function f^λ defined on the domain Ω^λ we will adopt the following notation:

$$f(z, \lambda) := f^\lambda \circ \Gamma^\lambda(z), \quad z \in \Omega, \quad \lambda \in [0, 1].$$

Lemma 5.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a bounded domain with C^1 boundary, and $\Gamma^\lambda : \bar{\Omega} \rightarrow \bar{\Omega}^\lambda$ be a $C^{1,0}$ -embedding. Let $1 \leq p \leq 2$. For each λ , suppose $f^\lambda \in L^p(\Omega^\lambda)$ and $|f(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\Omega)}$ is uniformly bounded in λ . Define*

$$T_{\Omega^\lambda} f(\cdot, \lambda) := \iint_{\Omega} \frac{f(\zeta, \lambda)}{\zeta^\lambda - z^\lambda} dA(\zeta^\lambda).$$

Then the following inequality hold:

$$(5.1) \quad |T_{\Omega^\lambda} f(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L_\beta^\gamma(\Omega)} \leq C_{1,0} C(p, \gamma, \Omega) |f(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\Omega)},$$

where γ is an arbitrary number satisfying the inequality $1 < \gamma < \frac{2p}{2-p}$, and $\beta = \frac{1}{\gamma} - \frac{2-p}{2p} > 0$. The constant $C(p, \gamma, \Omega)$ depends only on p, γ and Ω and does not depend on λ .

Proof. Recall definition (2.3) for the norm $|\cdot|_{L_\beta^\gamma}$, so we have

$$\begin{aligned} |T_{\Omega^\lambda} f^\lambda(\cdot)|_{L_\beta^\gamma(\Omega^\lambda)} &= \left(\int_{\Omega} \left| \frac{f(\zeta, \lambda)}{\zeta^\lambda - z^\lambda} \right|^\gamma a^\lambda(\zeta) dA(\zeta) \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} \\ &\quad + \sup_{h \in \mathbb{C}} \frac{1}{|h|^\beta} \left(\int_{\Omega} |f(\zeta + h, \lambda) - f(\zeta, \lambda)|^\gamma a^\lambda(\zeta) dA(\zeta) \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} \\ &\leq C_{1,0} \left\{ \left(\int_{\Omega} \left| \frac{f(\zeta, \lambda)}{\zeta - z} \right|^\gamma d|\zeta| \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} + \sup_{h \in \mathbb{C}} \frac{1}{|h|^\beta} \left(\int_{\Omega} |f(\zeta + h, \lambda) - f(\zeta, \lambda)|^\gamma dA(\zeta) \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} \right\} \\ &= C_{1,0} |T_{\Omega} f(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L_\beta^\gamma(\Omega)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $a^\lambda(\zeta) = |\det(\Gamma^\lambda)|$. By the result in [7, p. 47], for γ, β, p satisfying the above conditions, we have $|T_{\Omega} f^\lambda(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L_\beta^\gamma(\Omega)} \leq C(p, \gamma, \Omega) |f(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\Omega)}$, from which estimate (5.1) then follows. \square

Lemma 5.2. *Let $2 < p < \infty$. Suppose $\lambda \mapsto A(\cdot, \lambda), B(\cdot, \lambda)$ are continuous maps from $[0, 1]$ to $L^p(\mathbb{C})$, where for each $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, $A(\cdot, \lambda), B(\cdot, \lambda) \equiv 0$ outside Ω . For $j = 1, 2$, let*

$$(5.2) \quad \omega_j(z, t, \lambda) = \frac{t^\lambda - z^\lambda}{\pi} \iint_{\Omega} \frac{A(\zeta, \lambda) X_j(\zeta, t, \lambda) + B(\zeta, \lambda) \overline{X_j(\zeta, t, \lambda)}}{(\zeta^\lambda - z^\lambda)(t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda) X_j(\zeta, t, \lambda)} dA(\zeta^\lambda).$$

Then we have

$$(5.3) \quad |\omega_j(\cdot, t, \lambda)|_{\alpha_p} \leq C_{1,0} C(p, \Omega) (|A(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\Omega)} + |B(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\Omega)}), \quad \alpha_p = \frac{p-2}{p},$$

where the constants is uniform in λ and $t \in K$, for any compact subset K of \mathbb{C} . In particular, if $A^\lambda, B^\lambda \in C^{0,0}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$, then

$$|\omega_j(\cdot, t, \lambda)|_\tau \leq C_{1,0}C(\tau, \Omega) \left(\|A^\lambda\|_{0,0} + \|B^\lambda\|_{0,0} \right), \quad \text{for any } 0 < \tau < 1.$$

Proof. Let $a^\lambda(\zeta) = |\det \Gamma^\lambda(\zeta)|$. We can rewrite ω_j as

$$\omega_j(z, t, \lambda) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\Omega} \left[\frac{1}{\zeta^\lambda - z^\lambda} - \frac{1}{\zeta^\lambda - t^\lambda} \right] \left[A(\zeta, \lambda) + B(\zeta, \lambda) \frac{\overline{X_j(\zeta, t, \lambda)}}{X_j(\zeta, t, \lambda)} \right] a^\lambda(\zeta) dA(\zeta).$$

By Hölder's inequality and Proposition 7.3, we have for any $z, t \in \mathbb{C}$,

$$(5.4) \quad |\omega_j(z, t, \lambda)| \leq C_{1,0}C(p, \Omega) \left(|A(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\Omega)} + |B(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\Omega)} \right);$$

$$(5.5) \quad |\omega_j(z, t, \lambda)| \leq C_{1,0}C_p \left(|A(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\Omega)} + |B(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\Omega)} \right) |z - t|^{\alpha_p};$$

$$(5.6) \quad |\omega_j(z_1, t, \lambda) - \omega_j(z_2, t, \lambda)| \leq C_{1,0}C_p \left(|A(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\Omega)} + |B(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\Omega)} \right) |z_1 - z_2|^{\alpha_p}$$

for any $z_1, z_2, t \in \mathbb{C}$. □

Lemma 5.3. *Let Ω be a bounded domain in \mathbb{C} with C^1 boundary, and $\Gamma : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega^\lambda$ be a $C^{1,0}$ embedding. Let $2 < p < \infty$, and $p' = \frac{p}{p-1}$ be the conjugate of p , with $1 < p' < 2$. Suppose $\lambda \mapsto A(\cdot, \lambda), B(\cdot, \lambda)$ are continuous maps from $[0, 1]$ to $L^p(\mathbb{C})$, where for each $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, $A(\cdot, \lambda), B(\cdot, \lambda) \equiv 0$ outside Ω (In particular $A, B \in L_{p,2}(\mathbb{C})$, $p > 2$.) Let K be a compact subset of \mathbb{C} . For any q with $1 < p' \leq q < 2$, and for each $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, let $X_1(z, t, \lambda)$ and $X_2(z, t, \lambda)$ be the unique solution in $L_{q,0}(\mathbb{C})$ to the integral equations (see [7, p. 156]): for $i = 1, 2$,*

$$(5.7) \quad X_j(z, t, \lambda) - \frac{1}{\pi} \iint_{\Omega} \frac{A(\zeta, \lambda)X_j(\zeta, t, \lambda) + B(\zeta, \lambda)\overline{X_j(\zeta, t, \lambda)}}{\zeta^\lambda - z^\lambda} dA(\zeta^\lambda) = g_i(z, t, \lambda),$$

where $g_1(z, t, \lambda) = \frac{1}{2(t^\lambda - z^\lambda)}$ and $g_2(z, t, \lambda) = \frac{1}{2i(t^\lambda - z^\lambda)}$. Then the following statements hold:

(i) For each $t \in \mathbb{C}$, $\lambda \mapsto X_j(\cdot, t, \lambda)$ is a continuous map from $[0, 1]$ to $L^q(\Omega)$. Moreover, for all $t \in K$ we have

$$(5.8) \quad |X_j(\cdot, t, \lambda)|_{L^q(\Omega)} \leq C_{1,0}C(p, \Omega) \left(|A(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\Omega)} + |B(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\Omega)} \right),$$

where the constants on the right-hand side is uniform in λ and $t \in K$.

(ii)

$$\sup_{t \in K} |X_j(\cdot, t, \lambda_1) - X_j(\cdot, t, \lambda_2)|_{L^q(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2| \rightarrow 0.$$

(iii) For each $\varepsilon > 0$, let $E_\varepsilon(t) = \{z \in \Omega : |z - t| > \varepsilon\}$. Then we have

$$\sup_{t \in K} |X_j(\cdot, t, \lambda_1) - X_j(\cdot, t, \lambda_2)|_{C^0(E_\varepsilon(t))} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2| \rightarrow 0.$$

Proof. (i) We shall only prove the lemma for X_1 , as the proof for X_2 is identical. First, we show the L^q norm of X_j is uniformly bounded in λ and $t \in K$. Seeking a contradiction, suppose there exists a sequence $\lambda_j \in [0, 1]$ such that $N_j := |X_1(\cdot, t, \lambda_j)|_{L^q(\Omega)} \rightarrow \infty$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$. Since $[0, 1]$ is compact we can assume that $\lambda_j \rightarrow \lambda_0 \in [0, 1]$ for some λ_0 . Dividing both sides of equation (5.7) by N_j , and writing $\widehat{X}_1(\cdot, t, \lambda_j) = \frac{1}{N_j}X_1(\cdot, t, \lambda_j)$, we obtain

$$(5.9) \quad \widehat{X}_1(\cdot, t, \lambda_j) - P^{\lambda_j}\widehat{X}_1(\cdot, t, \lambda_j) = \frac{1}{2(t^{\lambda_j} - z^{\lambda_j})N_j},$$

where $|\widehat{X}_1(\cdot, t, \lambda_j)|_{L^q(\Omega)} = 1$ and we set

$$P^\lambda f(z, t, \lambda) = T_{\mathbb{C}}[A(\cdot, \lambda)f(\cdot, t, \lambda) + B(\cdot, \lambda)\overline{f(\cdot, t, \lambda)}](z, t, \lambda).$$

Setting $r = 1$ in Lemma 5.1 and applying Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| P^{\lambda_j} \widehat{X}_1(\cdot, t, \lambda_j) \right|_{L^{\frac{q}{\alpha}}(\Omega)} &\leq C(p, \gamma, \Omega) \left| (A + B)(\cdot, \lambda_j) \widehat{X}_1(\cdot, t, \lambda_j) \right|_{L^1(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C(p, \gamma, \Omega) \left(|A(\cdot, \lambda_j)|_{L^p(\Omega)} + |B(\cdot, \lambda_j)|_{L^p(\Omega)} \right) |\widehat{X}_1(\cdot, t, \lambda_j)|_{L^{p'}(\Omega)} \end{aligned}$$

for $1 < \gamma < \frac{2-1}{2-1} = 2$ and $\alpha = \frac{1}{\gamma} - \frac{1}{2} > 0$. In particular we can choose $\gamma = q$, since $1 < p' \leq q < 2$. By [7, Theorem 1.3] applied to the sequence $P^{\lambda_j} \widehat{X}_1(\cdot, t, \lambda_j)$, and passing to a subsequence if necessary, we can assume that $P^{\lambda_j} \widehat{X}_1(\cdot, t, \lambda_j)$ converges to some limit in $L^q(\Omega)$. Meanwhile the right-hand side of (5.9) converges to 0 in $L^q(\Omega)$. Therefore by (5.9) $\widehat{X}_1(\cdot, t, \lambda_j)$ converges to some $\widehat{X}_1(\cdot, t)$ in $L^q(\Omega)$.

We show that $|P^{\lambda_j} \widehat{X}_1(\cdot, t, \lambda_j) - P^{\lambda_0} \widehat{X}_1(\cdot, t)|_{L^q(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0$ as $\lambda_j \rightarrow \lambda_0$. In what follows we write $a^\lambda(\zeta)$ for $|\det D\Gamma^\lambda(\zeta)|$. Writing $D^{\lambda_j} \widehat{X}_1(\zeta, t) = \widehat{X}_1(\zeta, t, \lambda_j) - \widehat{X}_1(\zeta, t)$, we have

$$(5.10) \quad |P^{\lambda_j} \widehat{X}_1(\cdot, t, \lambda_j) - P^{\lambda_0} \widehat{X}_1(\cdot, t)|_{L^q(\Omega)} \leq D_1 + D_2 + D_3 + D_4,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} D_1 &= \left| \int_{\Omega} \frac{(\delta^{\lambda_j, \lambda_0} A) \widehat{X}_1(\zeta, t, \lambda_j) + A(\zeta, \lambda_0) (D^{\lambda_j} \widehat{X}_1(\zeta, t))}{\zeta^{\lambda_j} - z^{\lambda_j}} dA(\zeta^{\lambda_j}) \right|_{L^q(\Omega)}, \\ D_2 &= \left| \int_{\Omega} \frac{(\delta^{\lambda_j, \lambda_0} B) \widehat{X}_1(\zeta, t, \lambda_j) + B(\zeta, \lambda_0) \overline{D^{\lambda_j} \widehat{X}_1(\zeta, t)}}{\zeta^{\lambda_j} - z^{\lambda_j}} dA(\zeta^{\lambda_j}) \right|_{L^q(\Omega)}, \\ D_3 &= \left| \int_{\Omega} \frac{A(\zeta, \lambda_0) \widehat{X}_1(\zeta, t, \lambda_0) + B(\zeta, \lambda_0) \overline{\widehat{X}_1(\zeta, t, \lambda_0)}}{\zeta^{\lambda_j} - z^{\lambda_j}} \left\{ a^{\lambda_j}(\zeta) - a^{\lambda_0}(\zeta) \right\} dA(\zeta) \right|_{L^q(\Omega)}, \\ D_4 &= \left| \int_{\Omega} \left(A(\zeta, \lambda_0) \widehat{X}_1(\zeta, t, \lambda_0) + B(\zeta, \lambda_0) \overline{\widehat{X}_1(\zeta, t, \lambda_0)} \right) \left(\frac{1}{\zeta^{\lambda_j} - z^{\lambda_j}} - \frac{1}{\zeta^{\lambda_0} - z^{\lambda_0}} \right) dA(\zeta^{\lambda_0}) \right|_{L^q(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

By estimate (5.1) applied to $\gamma = q$ and $r = 1$ and Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_1 &\leq C_{1,0} C(q, \Omega) \left(|(\delta^{\lambda_j, \lambda_0} A) \widehat{X}_1(\cdot, t, \lambda)|_{L^1(\Omega)} + |A(\cdot, \lambda_0) (D^{\lambda_j} \widehat{X}_1(\cdot, t))|_{L^1(\Omega)} \right) \\ &\leq C_{1,0} C(q, \Omega) \left(|\delta^{\lambda_j, \lambda_0} A|_{L^p(\Omega)} |\widehat{X}_1(\cdot, t, \lambda)|_{L^q(\Omega)} + |A(\zeta, \lambda_0)|_{L^p(\Omega)} |D^{\lambda_j} \widehat{X}_1|_{L^q(\Omega)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $1 < p' \leq q < 2$. By assumption, this expression goes to 0. Similarly we can show that D_2 converges to 0, and also

$$\begin{aligned} D_3 &\leq C_{1,0} C(q, \Omega) \left| \Gamma^{\lambda_j} - \Gamma^{\lambda_0} \right|_1 \left\{ |A(\cdot, \lambda_0)|_{L^p(\Omega)} + |B(\cdot, \lambda_0)|_{L^p(\Omega)} \right\} |\widehat{X}_1(\cdot, t, \lambda_0)|_{L^q(\Omega)}, \\ D_4 &\leq \left| \int_{\Omega} \left(A(\zeta, \lambda_0) \widehat{X}_1(\zeta, t, \lambda_0) + B(\zeta, \lambda_0) \overline{\widehat{X}_1(\zeta, t, \lambda_0)} \right) \frac{\delta_{\zeta, z}(\Gamma^{\lambda_0} - \Gamma^{\lambda_j}) dA(\zeta^{\lambda_0})}{(\zeta^{\lambda_j} - z^{\lambda_j})(\zeta^{\lambda_0} - z^{\lambda_0})} \right|_{L^q(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C_{1,0} C(q, \Omega) \left| \Gamma^{\lambda_0} - \Gamma^{\lambda_j} \right|_1 \left\{ |A(\cdot, \lambda_0)|_{L^p(\Omega)} + |B(\cdot, \lambda_0)|_{L^p(\Omega)} \right\} |\widehat{X}_1(\cdot, t, \lambda_0)|_{L^q(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $D_3, D_4 \rightarrow 0$ as $|\lambda_j - \lambda_0| \rightarrow 0$. By (5.10), $|P^{\lambda_j} \widehat{X}_1(\cdot, t, \lambda_j) - P^{\lambda_0} \widehat{X}_1(\cdot, t)|_{L^q(\Omega)}$ tends to 0 as $|\lambda_j - \lambda_0| \rightarrow 0$.

Letting $j \rightarrow \infty$ in equation (5.9), we have

$$0 = \widehat{X}_1(z, t) - T_{\mathbb{C}}[A(\cdot, \lambda_0) \widehat{X}_1(\cdot, t) + B(\cdot, \lambda_0) \overline{\widehat{X}_1(\cdot, t)}](z, t)$$

holds in $L^q(\Omega)$. By the result in [7, p. 156], the equation has only the trivial solution, so $\widehat{X}_1 \equiv 0$. But $|\widehat{X}_1(\cdot, t)|_{L^q(\Omega)} = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} |\widehat{X}_1(\cdot, t, \lambda_j)|_{L^q(\Omega)} = 1$, which is a contradiction. Thus $|X_1(\cdot, t, \lambda)|_{L^q(\Omega)}$ is bounded, for any q with $1 < p' \leq q < 2$.

Next, we show that $X_1(\cdot, t, \lambda)$ is continuous in the $L^q(\Omega)$ -norm, for any q with $1 < p' \leq q < 2$. Otherwise there exists some sequence $\lambda_j \rightarrow \lambda_0$, such that $|X_1(\cdot, t, \lambda_j) - X_1(\cdot, t, \lambda_0)|_{L^q(\Omega)} \geq \delta > 0$. Since we have already shown that $|X_1(\cdot, t, \lambda)|_{L^q(\Omega)}$ is bounded uniformly in λ , by the computation above, $|P^{\lambda_j} X_1(\cdot, t, \lambda_j)|_{L^q(\Omega)}$ is bounded uniformly in λ . Passing to a subsequence if necessary, $P^{\lambda_j} X_1(\cdot, t, \lambda_j)$ converges to some function in $L^q(\Omega)$. The right-hand side of the integral equation (5.7) converges to $\frac{1}{t^{\lambda_0} - z^{\lambda_0}}$ in $L^q(\Omega)$. Indeed, we have

$$\left(\iint_{\Omega} \left| \frac{1}{t^{\lambda_j} - z^{\lambda_j}} - \frac{1}{t^{\lambda_0} - z^{\lambda_0}} \right|^q dA(z) \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq C_{1,0} |\Gamma^{\lambda_j} - \Gamma^{\lambda_0}|_1 \left(\iint_{\Omega} \frac{1}{|t - z|^q} dA(z) \right)^{\frac{1}{q}},$$

which converges to 0 as $|\lambda_j - \lambda_0| \rightarrow 0$, since $\Gamma \in C^{1,0}(\overline{\Omega})$. It follows from equation (5.7) that $X_1(z, t, \lambda_j)$ converges to some $X_1^*(z, t)$ in $L^q(\Omega)$. As before we can show that $|P^{\lambda_j} X_1(\cdot, t, \lambda_j) - P^{\lambda_0} X_1^*(\cdot, t)|_{L^q(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0$. Taking $j \rightarrow \infty$ in equation (5.7) we obtain

$$X_1^*(z, t) - P^{\lambda_0} X_1^*(z, t) = \frac{1}{2(t^{\lambda_0} - z^{\lambda_0})}, \quad \text{in } L^q(\Omega).$$

On the other hand, since $X_1(z, t, \lambda_0)$ satisfies the same equation. By uniqueness of solution we have $X_1(\cdot, t, \lambda_0) = X_1^*(\cdot, t)$ in $L^q(\Omega)$. But $|X_1^*(\cdot, t) - X_1(\cdot, t, \lambda_0)|_{L^q(\overline{\Omega})} \geq \delta > 0$, which is a contradiction. This shows that $X_1(\cdot, t, \lambda)$ is continuous in λ in the $L^q(\Omega)$ -norm.

Finally to obtain estimate (5.8) we write X_1 in the form (3.22):

$$(5.11) \quad X_1(z, t, \lambda) = \frac{e^{\omega_1(z, t, \lambda)}}{t\lambda - z\lambda}.$$

By (5.3), we have $|\omega_j(\cdot, t, \lambda)|_{C^{\alpha_p}(\overline{\Omega})} \leq C_{1,0} C(p, \Omega) (|A(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\Omega)} + |B(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\Omega)})$, where $\alpha_p = \frac{p-2}{p}$, and the constants are independent of λ and $t \in K$. Estimate (5.8) then readily follows. \square

(ii) As in part (i) we only need to prove the statements for X_1 . Let $D^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2} X_1 = X_1(z, t, \lambda_1) - X_1(z, t, \lambda_2)$. Then by (5.3), we see that $D^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2} X_1$ satisfies the following integral equation

$$D^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2} X_1(z, t) + P^{\lambda_2} (D^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2} X_1)(z, t) = \sum_{i=1}^4 R_i(z, t, \lambda_1),$$

where $P^{\lambda_2} f(z, t) = T_{\mathbb{C}} \left[A(\cdot, \lambda_2) f(\cdot, t) + B(\cdot, \lambda_2) \overline{f(\cdot, t)} \right]$ and

$$\begin{aligned} R_1(z, t, \lambda_1) &= \iint_{\Omega} \frac{(A(\cdot, \lambda_1) - A(\cdot, \lambda_2)) X_1(\cdot, t, \lambda_1)}{\zeta^{\lambda_1} - z^{\lambda_1}} dA(\zeta^{\lambda_1}), \\ R_2(z, t, \lambda_1) &= \iint_{\Omega} \frac{A(\cdot, \lambda_2) X(\cdot, t, \lambda_1) (a^{\lambda_1} - a^{\lambda_2})}{\zeta^{\lambda_1} - z^{\lambda_1}} dA(\zeta), \\ R_3(z, t, \lambda_1) &= \iint_{\Omega} A(\cdot, \lambda_2) X(\cdot, t, \lambda_1) \left(\frac{1}{\zeta^{\lambda_1} - z^{\lambda_1}} - \frac{1}{\zeta^{\lambda_2} - z^{\lambda_2}} \right) dA(\zeta^{\lambda_2}), \\ R_4(z, t, \lambda_1) &= \frac{1}{t^{\lambda_1} - z^{\lambda_1}} - \frac{1}{t^{\lambda_2} - z^{\lambda_2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $|X_1(\cdot, t, \lambda)|_{L^q(\Omega)}$ is bounded, we can show by the same proof as in (i) that $\sup_{t \in K} |R_i(z, t, \lambda_1)|_{L^q(\Omega)}$ converges to 0 as $|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2| \rightarrow 0$, $1 \leq i \leq 4$. Let $(I + P^{\lambda_2})^{-1} : L^q(\Omega) \rightarrow L^q(\Omega)$ be the inverse operator

of $I + P^{\lambda_2}$. By the open mapping theorem, $(I + P^{\lambda_2})^{-1}$ is continuous. Denoting its operator norm by M_{λ_2} , we have

$$\sup_{t \in K} |D^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2} X_1(\cdot, t)|_{L^q(\Omega)} \leq M_{\lambda_2} \sum_{i=1}^4 \sup_{t \in K} |R_i(z, t, \lambda_1)|_{L^q(\Omega)},$$

which converges to 0 as $|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2| \rightarrow 0$. \square

(iii) We write X_1 in the form (5.11), where ω_1 is given by expression (5.2). By Lemma 5.2, if $|A(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\Omega)}$, $|B(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\Omega)}$ are bounded uniformly in λ , then $|\omega_1(\cdot, t, \lambda)|_{C^{\alpha_p}(\overline{\Omega})}$ is bounded uniformly in $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ and $t \in K$, for $\alpha_p = \frac{p-2}{p}$. In view of (5.11), $|X_1(\cdot, t, \lambda)|_{C^{\alpha_p}(E_\varepsilon)}$ is bounded uniformly in λ and t . By part (ii), $\sup_{t \in K} |X_1(\cdot, t, \lambda_1) - X_1(\cdot, t, \lambda_2)|_{L^1(\Omega)}$ converges to 0 as $|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2| \rightarrow 0$. Applying Proposition 7.20 we get

$$\sup_{t \in K} |X_1(\cdot, t, \lambda_1) - X_1(\cdot, t, \lambda_2)|_{C^0(\Omega \cap E_\varepsilon)} \rightarrow 0. \quad \square$$

Lemma 5.4. *Let $2 < p < \infty$. Suppose $\lambda \mapsto A(\cdot, \lambda), B(\cdot, \lambda)$ are continuous maps from $[0, 1]$ to $L^p(\mathbb{C})$, where for each $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, $A(\cdot, \lambda), B(\cdot, \lambda) \equiv 0$ outside Ω . For $j = 1, 2$, let*

$$\omega_j(z, t, \lambda) = \frac{t^\lambda - z^\lambda}{\pi} \iint_{\Omega^\lambda} \frac{A(\zeta, \lambda) X_j(\zeta, t, \lambda) + B(\zeta, \lambda) \overline{X_j(\zeta, t, \lambda)}}{(\zeta^\lambda - z^\lambda)(t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda) X_j(\zeta, t, \lambda)} dA(\zeta^\lambda).$$

Then for each t , $\lambda \mapsto \omega_j(\cdot, t, \lambda) \in C^0(\overline{\Omega})$ is a continuous map from $[0, 1]$ to $C^0(\overline{\Omega})$. Moreover for any compact subset K in \mathbb{C} , we have

$$(5.12) \quad \sup_{t \in K} |\omega_j(\cdot, t, \lambda_1) - \omega_j(\cdot, t, \lambda_2)|_{C^0(\overline{\Omega})} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2| \rightarrow 0.$$

Proof. Rewrite ω_j as

$$\omega_j(z, t, \lambda) = \frac{1}{\pi} \iint_{\Omega} \left[\frac{1}{\zeta^\lambda - z^\lambda} - \frac{1}{\zeta^\lambda - t^\lambda} \right] \left[A(\zeta, \lambda) + B(\zeta, \lambda) \frac{\overline{X_j(\zeta, t, \lambda)}}{X_j(\zeta, t, \lambda)} \right] a(\zeta, \lambda) dA(\zeta),$$

where $a(\zeta, \lambda) = |(\det \Gamma^\lambda)(\zeta)|$. We have

$$(5.13) \quad |\omega_j(z, t, \lambda_1) - \omega_j(z, t, \lambda_2)| \leq D_1 + D_2 + D_3,$$

where

$$D_1 = \iint_{\mathbb{C}} \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{\zeta^{\lambda_1} - z^{\lambda_1}} - \frac{1}{\zeta^{\lambda_2} - z^{\lambda_2}} \right| + \left| \frac{1}{\zeta^{\lambda_1} - t^{\lambda_1}} - \frac{1}{\zeta^{\lambda_2} - t^{\lambda_2}} \right| \right\} \\ \times \left| A(\zeta, \lambda_1) + B(\zeta, \lambda_1) \frac{\overline{X_j(\zeta, t, \lambda_1)}}{X_j(\zeta, t, \lambda_1)} \right| dA(\zeta^{\lambda_1});$$

$$D_2 = \iint_{\mathbb{C}} \left| \frac{1}{\zeta^{\lambda_2} - z^{\lambda_2}} + \frac{1}{t^{\lambda_2} - \zeta^{\lambda_2}} \right| |(Aa)(\zeta, \lambda_1) - (Aa)(\zeta, \lambda_2)| dA(\zeta);$$

$$D_3 = \iint_{\mathbb{C}} \left| \frac{1}{\zeta^{\lambda_2} - z^{\lambda_2}} + \frac{1}{t^{\lambda_2} - \zeta^{\lambda_2}} \right| \left| (Ba)(\zeta, \lambda_1) \frac{\overline{X_j(\zeta, t, \lambda_1)}}{X_j(\zeta, t, \lambda_1)} - (Ba)(\zeta, \lambda_2) \frac{\overline{X_j(\zeta, t, \lambda_2)}}{X_j(\zeta, t, \lambda_2)} \right| dA(\zeta).$$

Let p' be the conjugate of p , with $1 < p' < 2$. By Hölder's inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_1 &\leq C_{1,0} |\Gamma^{\lambda_1} - \Gamma^{\lambda_2}|_1 \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{1}{|\zeta - z|} + \frac{1}{|\zeta - t|} \right) \left| A(\zeta, \lambda_1) + B(\zeta, \lambda_1) \frac{\overline{X_j(\zeta, t, \lambda_1)}}{X_j(\zeta, t, \lambda_1)} \right| dA(\zeta^{\lambda_1}) \\ &\leq C_{1,0} |\Gamma^{\lambda_1} - \Gamma^{\lambda_2}|_1 \left(\|(\zeta - z)^{-1}\|_{L^{p'}(\Omega)} + \|(\zeta - t)^{-1}\|_{L^{p'}(\Omega)} \right) (|A(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\Omega)} + |B(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\Omega)}) \\ &\leq C_{1,0} C_p |\Gamma^{\lambda_1} - \Gamma^{\lambda_2}|_1 (|A(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\Omega)} + |B(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\Omega)}), \end{aligned}$$

and similarly for D_2 :

$$D_2 \leq C_{1,0} C_p \left(|\delta^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2} A|_{L^p(\Omega)} + |A(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\Omega)} |\delta^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2} \Gamma|_1 \right).$$

Hence by our assumption, D_1 and D_2 converge to 0 and the convergence is uniform in $t \in K$. For D_3 we have $D_3 \leq D_{31} + D_{32}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} D_{31} &= \int_{\mathbb{C}} \left| \frac{1}{\zeta^{\lambda_2} - z^{\lambda_2}} + \frac{1}{t^{\lambda_2} - \zeta^{\lambda_2}} \right| \left| \delta^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2} (Ba) \right| \left| \frac{\overline{X_j(\zeta, t, \lambda_1)}}{X_j(\zeta, t, \lambda_1)} \right| dA(\zeta), \\ D_{32} &= \int_{\mathbb{C}} \left| \frac{(Ba)(\zeta, \lambda_2)}{\zeta^{\lambda_2} - z^{\lambda_2}} + \frac{(Ba)(\zeta, \lambda_2)}{t^{\lambda_2} - \zeta^{\lambda_2}} \right| \left| \frac{\overline{X_j(\zeta, t, \lambda_1)}}{X_j(\zeta, t, \lambda_1)} - \frac{\overline{X_j(\zeta, t, \lambda_2)}}{X_j(\zeta, t, \lambda_2)} \right| dA(\zeta). \end{aligned}$$

By Hölder's inequality, $D_{31} \leq C_{1,0} C_p |(Ba)(\cdot, \lambda_1) - (Ba)(\cdot, \lambda_2)|_{L^p(\Omega)}$, which by assumption goes to 0 as $|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2| \rightarrow 0$. On the other hand,

$$(5.14) \quad D_{32} \leq 2 \int_{\mathbb{C}} \left| \frac{(Ba)(\zeta, \lambda_2)}{\zeta^{\lambda_2} - z^{\lambda_2}} + \frac{(Ba)(\zeta, \lambda_2)}{t^{\lambda_2} - \zeta^{\lambda_2}} \right| \left| \frac{X_j(\zeta, t, \lambda_1) - X_j(\zeta, t, \lambda_2)}{X_j(\zeta, t, \lambda_1)} \right| dA(\zeta).$$

By (5.4), $|\omega_j(\zeta, t, \lambda)|$ is bounded uniformly for any $\zeta, t \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, and

$$X_1(\zeta, t, \lambda) = \frac{e^{\omega_1(\zeta, t, \lambda)}}{2(t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda)}, \quad X_2(\zeta, t, \lambda) = \frac{e^{\omega_2(\zeta, t, \lambda)}}{2i(t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda)}.$$

Hence $|X_j(\zeta, t, \lambda)| \geq \frac{C_{1,0}}{|\zeta - t|}$. In what follows we write $L_\zeta^1(\Omega)$ to indicate the integral is with respect to ζ . Using the above estimate in (5.14) we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_{32} &\leq C_{1,0} \left(\left| \frac{B(\zeta, \lambda_2)}{\zeta^{\lambda_2} - z^{\lambda_2}} \left[\delta^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2} X_j(\zeta, t) \right] \right|_{L_\zeta^1(\Omega)} + \left| B(\zeta, \lambda_2) \left[\delta^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2} X_j(\zeta, t) \right] \right|_{L_\zeta^1(\Omega)} \right) \\ &\leq C_{1,0} |B(\cdot, \lambda_2)|_{L^p(\overline{\Omega})} \left(\left| \frac{\delta^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2} X_j(\zeta, t)}{\zeta^{\lambda_2} - z^{\lambda_2}} \right|_{L_\zeta^{p'}(\overline{\Omega})} + \left| \delta^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2} X_j(\zeta, t) \right|_{L_\zeta^{p'}(\overline{\Omega})} \right) \\ &\leq C_{1,0} |B(\cdot, \lambda_2)|_{L^p(\overline{\Omega})} \left\{ \left(\int_{\{\zeta: |\zeta - z| < \delta'\}} \left| \frac{\delta^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2} X_j(\zeta, t)}{\zeta - z} \right|^{p'} dA(\zeta) \right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(\int_{\{\zeta: |\zeta - z| \geq \delta'\}} \left| \frac{\delta^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2} X_j(\zeta, t)}{\zeta - z} \right|^{p'} dA(\zeta) \right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} + \left| \delta^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2} X_j(\zeta, t) \right|_{L_\zeta^{p'}(\overline{\Omega})} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\delta' > 0$ is to be determined. By Lemma 5.3 (ii), $\sup_{t \in K} |\delta^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2} X_j(\cdot, t)|_{L^{p'}(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0$ as $|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2| \rightarrow 0$. So for fixed δ' the last two terms in the above bracket converge to 0. By estimate (5.5),

$$\begin{aligned} |\omega_j(z, t, \lambda_1) - \omega_j(z, t, \lambda_2)| &\leq |\omega_j(z, t, \lambda_1)| + |\omega_j(z, t, \lambda_2)| \\ &\leq C_{1,0} C_p \left(|A(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\overline{\Omega})} + |B(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\overline{\Omega})} \right) |z - t|^{\alpha_p}. \end{aligned}$$

For any $\varepsilon > 0$, we can pick $r > 0$ such that for any $z \in \overline{\Omega}$ and $t \in K$ with $|z - t| < r$, one has $|\omega_j(z, t, \lambda_1) - \omega_j(z, t, \lambda_2)| < \varepsilon$. Then it suffices to consider the points z for which $|z - t| \geq r$.

Now for this fixed r , we can let $\delta' = \frac{r}{2}$ be such that for any z with $|z - t| \geq r$ and $|\zeta - z| < \delta'$, we have $|\zeta - t| \geq |t - z| - |z - \zeta| \geq \delta' = \frac{r}{2}$, and so

$$\{\zeta : |\zeta - z| < \delta'\} \subset \{\zeta : |\zeta - t| \geq \delta'\}.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\int_{\{\zeta : |\zeta - z| < \delta'\}} \left| \frac{\delta^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2} X_j(\zeta, t)}{\zeta - z} \right|^{p'} dA(\zeta) \right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} &\leq \left(\int_{\{\zeta : |\zeta - t| \geq \delta'\}} \left| \frac{\delta^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2} X_j(\zeta, t)}{\zeta - z} \right|^{p'} dA(\zeta) \right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \\ &\leq C_{p'} \sup_{t \in K} |\delta^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2} X_j(\zeta, t)|_{C^0(\{\zeta : |\zeta - t| \geq \delta'\})}. \end{aligned}$$

The last expression goes to 0 as $|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2| \rightarrow 0$, by Lemma 5.3 (iii). This shows that D_{32} converges to 0 as $|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2| \rightarrow 0$ and the convergence is uniform in $t \in K$. The proof of (5.12) is now complete. \square

6. FAMILIES OF MULTIPLY-CONNECTED DOMAINS

In this section we prove Theorem 1.1 for families of bounded multiply-connected domains. We will first follow Vekua to reduce the problem to a singular integral equation. We then obtain regularities in all variables by transforming it into an equivalent Fredholm equation, so that a compactness argument can be used.

Just like in the simply-connected case, it suffices to consider the corresponding problem in the form (4.3).

Theorem 6.1 (Problem A on multiply-connected domains). *Let k, j, μ be as in Theorem 1.1. Let Ω be a bounded domain in \mathbb{C} whose boundary is $C^{1+\mu}$ and which has $m+1$ connected components. Let $\Gamma^\lambda : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega^\lambda$ be a family of embeddings of class $C^{1,0}(\Omega)$. Fix a normally distributed set (Definition 3.6) $\{\{z_r^\lambda\}_{r=1}^{N_0}, \{z_s^\lambda\}_{s=1}^{N_1}\}$ in Ω so that $\{z_r^\lambda = \Gamma^\lambda(z_r), z_a^\lambda = \Gamma^\lambda(z_s)\}$ forms a normally distributed set in Ω^λ . For each λ , let w^λ be the unique solution to*

$$(6.1) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_{\bar{z}} w^\lambda(z^\lambda) + A^\lambda(z^\lambda) w^\lambda(z^\lambda) + B^\lambda(z^\lambda) \overline{w^\lambda(z^\lambda)} = F^\lambda(z^\lambda) & \text{in } \Omega^\lambda; \\ \operatorname{Re}[\bar{l}^\lambda(z^\lambda) w^\lambda(z^\lambda)] = \gamma^\lambda(z^\lambda) & \text{on } b\Omega^\lambda, \end{cases}$$

where the index n (Definition 3.1) satisfies $n > m - 1$ and w^λ satisfies the additional conditions

$$(6.2) \quad \begin{aligned} w^\lambda(z_r^\lambda) &= a_r(\lambda) + ib_r(\lambda), & (r = 1, \dots, N_0); \\ w^\lambda((z'_s)^\lambda) &= l_j(z'_s, \lambda)(\gamma_j(z'_s, \lambda) + ic_s(\lambda)), & (s = 1, \dots, N_1). \end{aligned}$$

(i) Suppose for $2 < p < \infty$, $\lambda \rightarrow A^\lambda, B^\lambda, F^\lambda$ are continuous maps from $[0, 1]$ to $L^p(\Omega)$, and that $l^\lambda, \gamma^\lambda \in C^{\mu,0}(b\Omega^\lambda)$, $a_r, b_r, c_s \in C^0([0, 1])$. Then $w^\lambda \in C^{\nu,0}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$, where $\nu = \min(\alpha_p, \mu)$ and $\alpha_p = \frac{p-2}{p}$.

(ii) If $b\Omega \in C^{k+1+\mu}$, $\Gamma^\lambda \in C^{k+1+\mu,0}(\overline{\Omega})$, $A^\lambda, B^\lambda, F^\lambda \in C^{k+\mu,0}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$, $l^\lambda, \gamma^\lambda \in C^{k+1+\mu,0}(b\Omega^\lambda)$, then $w^\lambda \in C^{k+1+\mu,0}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$, and there exists some constant C independent of λ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|w^\lambda\|_{0,0} &\leq C \left(\|F^\lambda\|_{0,0} + \|\gamma^\lambda\|_{\mu,0} + \sum_{r=1}^{N_0} (|a_r|_0 + |b_r|_0) + \sum_{s=1}^{N_1} |c_s|_0 \right), \\ \|w^\lambda\|_{k+1+\mu,0} &\leq C \left(\|F^\lambda\|_{k+\mu,0} + \|\gamma^\lambda\|_{k+1+\mu,0} + \sum_{r=1}^{N_0} (|a_r|_0 + |b_r|_0) + \sum_{s=1}^{N_1} |c_s|_0 \right). \end{aligned}$$

(iii) If $b\Omega \in C^{k+1+\mu}$, $\Gamma^\lambda \in C^{k+1+\mu,j}(\overline{\Omega})$, $A^\lambda, B^\lambda, F^\lambda \in C^{k+\mu,j}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$, $l^\lambda, \gamma^\lambda \in C^{k+1+\mu,j}(b\Omega^\lambda)$, then $w^\lambda \in C^{k+1+\mu,j}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$, and there exists some constant C independent of λ such that

$$\|w^\lambda\|_{k+1+\mu,j} \leq C \left(\|F^\lambda\|_{k+\mu,j} + \|\gamma^\lambda\|_{k+1+\mu,j} + \sum_{r=1}^{N_0} (|a_r|_j + |b_r|_j) + \sum_{s=1}^{N_1} |c_s|_j \right).$$

As an immediate consequence of Theorem 6.1, we can now prove Theorem 1.1 for the case $\varkappa > m - 1$, where \varkappa is the index for the oblique derivative boundary value problem. (See Definition 4.1).

Theorem 6.2 (Multiply-connected domains, $\varkappa > m - 1$).

Let k, j, μ be as in Theorem 1.1. Let Ω be a bounded domain in \mathbb{C} with $C^{k+2+\mu}$ boundary. Let Γ^λ be a family of maps that embed Ω to Ω^λ , with $\Gamma^\lambda \in C^{k+2+\mu,j}(\overline{\Omega})$. Consider the following oblique derivative problem:

$$(6.3) \quad \begin{aligned} a^\lambda(x, y)u_{xx}^\lambda + 2b^\lambda(x, y)u_{xy}^\lambda + c^\lambda(x, y)u_{yy}^\lambda + d^\lambda(x, y)u_x^\lambda + e^\lambda(x, y)u_y^\lambda &= f^\lambda, \quad \text{in } \Omega^\lambda; \\ \frac{du^\lambda}{d\Upsilon^\lambda} &= \gamma^\lambda \quad \text{on } b\Omega^\lambda, \end{aligned}$$

with index $\varkappa > m - 1$. Here $\Upsilon^\lambda = \xi^\lambda + i\eta^\lambda$ is a non-vanishing vector field along $b\Omega^\lambda$. Suppose $a^\lambda, b^\lambda, c^\lambda, d^\lambda, e^\lambda, f^\lambda$ are functions in Ω^λ such that $a^\lambda, b^\lambda, c^\lambda \in C^{k+1+\mu,j}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$, and $d^\lambda, e^\lambda, f^\lambda \in C^{k+\mu,j}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$. Suppose further that $\Upsilon^\lambda, \gamma^\lambda$ are functions in $b\Omega^\lambda$ such that $\Upsilon^\lambda, \gamma^\lambda \in C^{k+1+\mu,j}(b\Omega^\lambda)$. For each $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, let $\{\{z_r^\lambda\}_{r=1}^{N_0}, \{z_s^\lambda\}_{s=1}^{N_1}\}$ be a normally distributed set for Ω^λ , and let u^λ be the unique solution to (6.3) on Ω^λ satisfying the conditions (see [7, Theorem 4.13])

$$(6.4) \quad \begin{aligned} u_x^\lambda(z_r^\lambda) - iu_y^\lambda(z_r^\lambda) &= a_r(\lambda) + ib_r(\lambda) \quad (r = 1, \dots, N_0); \\ u_x^\lambda((z'_s)^\lambda) - iu_y^\lambda((z'_s)^\lambda) &= l^\lambda((z'_s)^\lambda)(\gamma^\lambda((z'_s)^\lambda) + ic_s(\lambda)), \quad (s = 1, \dots, N_1); \\ u^\lambda(z_0^\lambda) &= e(\lambda), \quad z_0^\lambda \in \Omega^\lambda, \end{aligned}$$

where $a_r, b_r, c_s, e \in C^j([0, 1])$. Then $u^\lambda \in C^{k+2+\mu,j}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$.

Proof. Let φ^λ be the maps defined as in Proposition 2.10. Then $\mathcal{U}^\lambda := u^\lambda \circ (\varphi^\lambda)^{-1}$ is a solution to the following problem

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \mathcal{U}^\lambda + p^\lambda(\xi, \eta) \mathcal{U}_\xi^\lambda + q^\lambda(\xi, \eta) \mathcal{U}_\eta^\lambda &= h^\lambda(\xi, \eta), \quad \text{in } D^\lambda; \\ \nu_1^\lambda \mathcal{U}_\xi^\lambda + \nu_2^\lambda \mathcal{U}_\eta^\lambda &= g^\lambda(\xi, \eta), \quad \text{on } bD^\lambda, \end{aligned}$$

where $p^\lambda, q^\lambda, h^\lambda \in C^{k+\mu,j}(\overline{D^\lambda})$ and $\nu_1^\lambda, \nu_2^\lambda, g^\lambda \in C^{k+1+\mu,j}(\overline{D^\lambda})$. Furthermore \mathcal{U}^λ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}_\xi^\lambda(\zeta_r^\lambda) - i\mathcal{U}_\eta^\lambda(\zeta_r^\lambda) &= \tilde{a}_r(\lambda) + i\tilde{b}_r(\lambda) \quad (r = 1, \dots, N_0); \\ \mathcal{U}_\xi^\lambda((\zeta'_s)^\lambda) - i\mathcal{U}_\eta^\lambda((\zeta'_s)^\lambda) &= \tilde{c}_s(\lambda) + i\tilde{d}_s(\lambda), \quad (s = 1, \dots, N_1); \\ \mathcal{U}^\lambda(\zeta_0^\lambda) &= \tilde{e}(\lambda), \quad \zeta_0^\lambda \in \Omega^\lambda, \end{aligned}$$

where $\{\zeta_r^\lambda, (\zeta'_s)^\lambda\}$ is the image of $\{z_r^\lambda, (z'_s)^\lambda\}$ under the map φ^λ , and $\tilde{a}_r, \tilde{b}_r, \tilde{c}_s, \tilde{d}_s, \tilde{e} \in C^j([0, 1])$.

Let $w^\lambda = \mathcal{U}_\xi^\lambda - i\mathcal{U}_\eta^\lambda$ be the unique solution in $C^{k+1+\mu,j}(\overline{\Omega})$ to problem (6.1) as given in Theorem 6.1, where we take

$$A^\lambda = \frac{1}{4} (p^\lambda + iq^\lambda), \quad B^\lambda = \frac{1}{4} (p^\lambda - iq^\lambda), \quad F^\lambda = \frac{1}{2} h^\lambda, \quad l^\lambda = \nu_1^\lambda - i\nu_2^\lambda, \quad \gamma^\lambda = g^\lambda.$$

and w^λ satisfies

$$w^\lambda(\zeta_r^\lambda) = \tilde{a}_r(\lambda) + i\tilde{b}_r(\lambda), \quad w^\lambda((\zeta'_s)^\lambda) = \tilde{c}_s(\lambda) + i\tilde{d}_s(\lambda).$$

for $r = 1, \dots, N_0$ and $s = 1, \dots, N_1$. Set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}^\lambda(\zeta^\lambda) &= c_0(\lambda) + \operatorname{Re} \int_{\zeta_0^\lambda}^{z^\lambda} w^\lambda(\zeta) d\zeta^\lambda, \quad z^\lambda = x^\lambda + iy^\lambda \in \Omega^\lambda. \\ u^\lambda(z^\lambda) &= \mathcal{U}^\lambda(\varphi^\lambda(z^\lambda)) = c_0(\lambda) + \operatorname{Re} \int_{\zeta_0^\lambda}^{\varphi^\lambda(z^\lambda)} w^\lambda(\zeta) d\zeta^\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

By (6.4) and $e \in C^j([0, 1])$, we have $c_0 \in C^j([0, 1])$. Hence $u^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+2+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$. \square

For the rest of the section we prove Theorem 6.1. In §6.1 and §6.2 we prove part (i). We reduce problem A (6.1) to a singular integral equation with parameter. We then transform the singular integral equation into a Fredholm equation and derive all the relevant estimates. In the end we apply a standard compactness argument to show that the solution $w^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{\nu', 0}(b\Omega^\lambda)$, for any $0 < \nu' < \nu$, where $\nu = \min(\alpha_p, \mu)$, $\alpha_p = \frac{p-2}{p}$. We then use the $\mathcal{C}^{\nu-0}(b\Omega^\lambda)$ estimate to prove the $\mathcal{C}^{\nu, 0}(b\Omega^\lambda)$ estimate. For our proof we apply a trick of Vekua to reduce the problem to the case for families of simply-connected domains. In §6.3, we derive the $\mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu, 0}(b\Omega^\lambda)$ estimate for w^λ . In §6.4, we take the derivatives in λ and derive the $\mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu, j}(b\Omega^\lambda)$ estimate for w^λ . This completes the proof.

6.1. The $\mathcal{C}^{\nu-, 0}$ estimate.

Recall the notation: $f(z, \lambda) := f^\lambda(z^\lambda)$, for $(z, \lambda) \in \overline{\Omega} \times [0, 1]$.

Step 1: Setup of the singular integral equation.

For each λ , let w^λ be the unique solution to the boundary value problem (6.1) satisfying condition (6.2). Since $\operatorname{Re}[\overline{l(t, \lambda)}w(t, \lambda)] = \gamma(t, \lambda)$ on $b\Omega$, there exists a real-valued function η such that

$$(6.5) \quad w(t, \lambda) = l(t, \lambda)\gamma(t, \lambda) + il(t, \lambda)\eta(t, \lambda), \quad (t, \lambda) \in b\Omega \times [0, 1].$$

Then the solution w^λ can be represented by formula (3.31):

$$(6.6) \quad w(z, \lambda) = w_\gamma(z, \lambda) + w_\eta(z, \lambda) + w_F(z, \lambda), \quad z \in \Omega,$$

where

$$(6.7) \quad w_\gamma(z, \lambda) := \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{b\Omega} G_1(z, t, \lambda)l(t, \lambda)\gamma(t, \lambda) dt^\lambda - \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{b\Omega} G_2(z, t, \lambda)\overline{l(t, \lambda)}\gamma(t, \lambda) \overline{dt}^\lambda,$$

$$(6.8) \quad w_\eta(z, \lambda) := \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{b\Omega} G_1(z, t, \lambda)l(t, \lambda)\eta(t, \lambda) dt^\lambda - \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{b\Omega} G_2(z, t, \lambda)\overline{l(t, \lambda)}\eta(t, \lambda) \overline{dt}^\lambda,$$

$$(6.9) \quad w_F(z, \lambda) := -\frac{1}{\pi} \iint_{\Omega} G_1(z, \zeta, \lambda)F(\zeta, \lambda) dA(\zeta^\lambda) - \frac{1}{\pi} \iint_{\Omega} G_2(z, \zeta, \lambda)\overline{F(\zeta, \lambda)} dA(\zeta^\lambda).$$

Here $G_i(z, t, \lambda)$ is the fundamental kernel of the equation:

$$\partial_{\bar{z}}w + A(z, \lambda)w + B(z, \lambda)\overline{w} = 0, \quad z \in \mathbb{C},$$

where for $z \notin \Omega$, we take $A(z, \lambda) \equiv B(z, \lambda) \equiv 0$.

According to (3.27), $G_i(z, t, \lambda)$ has the representations:

$$G_1(z, t, \lambda) = \frac{e^{\omega_1(z, t, \lambda)} + e^{\omega_2(z, t, \lambda)}}{t^\lambda - z^\lambda}, \quad G_2(z, t, \lambda) = \frac{e^{\omega_1(z, t, \lambda)} - e^{\omega_2(z, t, \lambda)}}{t^\lambda - z^\lambda},$$

where $\omega_i(z, t, \lambda) - s$ are given by formula (5.2).

By (3.29), it can be shown easily that for fixed λ and $F(\cdot, \lambda) \in L^p(\Omega)$, $w_F(\cdot, \lambda)$ is continuous in \mathbb{C} .

Referring to [7, p. 234], η satisfies the singular integral equation

$$(6.10) \quad \mathcal{K}^\lambda \eta(\zeta, \lambda) = \int_{b\Omega} K(\zeta, t, \lambda) \eta(t, \lambda) ds = \gamma_0(\zeta, \lambda),$$

where

$$(6.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \gamma_0(\zeta, \lambda) &= \gamma(\zeta, \lambda) - \operatorname{Re}[\overline{l(\zeta, \lambda)} w_\gamma^+(\zeta, \lambda)] - \operatorname{Re}[\overline{l(\zeta, \lambda)} w_F(\zeta, \lambda)], \\ K(\zeta, t, \lambda) &= -\frac{1}{2\pi} \operatorname{Re} \left[l(t, \lambda) (\rho^\lambda)'(s) \left(G_1(\zeta, t, \lambda) \overline{l(\zeta, \lambda)} + \overline{G_2(\zeta, t, \lambda)} l(\zeta, \lambda) \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, η satisfies the following conditions:

$$(6.12) \quad \begin{aligned} w_\eta(z_r, \lambda) &= a_r(\lambda) + i b_r(\lambda) - w_\gamma(z_r, \lambda) - w_F(z_r, \lambda) \\ w_\eta^+(z'_s, \lambda) &= l(z'_s, \lambda) (\gamma(z'_s, \lambda) + i c_s(\lambda)) - w_\gamma^+(z'_s, \lambda) - w_F(z'_s, \lambda) \end{aligned}$$

where $\{z_r, z'_s\}$ for $r = 1, \dots, N_0$ and $s = 1, \dots, N_1$ is a normally distributed set on Ω . Here we use w_γ^+ (resp. w_η^+) to denote the limiting value of $w_\gamma(z, \lambda)$ (resp. $w_\eta(z, \lambda)$) as z approaches to $z'_s \in b\Omega$ from the interior of Ω . For fixed λ , $\eta(\cdot, \lambda) \in C^\nu(\overline{\Omega})$ by Proposition 3.9 (i), and thus according to Proposition 7.13, w_η^+ is given by (7.6).

Referring to [7, p. 235], the homogeneous integral equation $\mathcal{K}^\lambda \eta(\zeta, \lambda) = 0$ has $2n + 1$ linearly independent solutions. We apply the theory of one dimensional singular integrals. The reader can refer to the classic book of Muskhelishvili [5].

Step 2: Estimates for w_γ^λ and w_F^λ .

We first show that the right-hand side of (6.10) is in $C^{\nu,0}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$.

Lemma 6.3. *Let $\gamma^\lambda \in C^{\mu,0}(b\Omega^\lambda)$, and let w_γ be defined by formula (6.7), then $w_\gamma^\lambda \in C^{\mu,0}(b\Omega^\lambda)$.*

Proof. By equations (3.28) w_γ^λ satisfies the equation

$$\partial_{z^\lambda} w_\gamma + A(z, \lambda) w_\gamma(z, \lambda) + B(z, \lambda) \overline{w_\gamma(z, \lambda)} = 0.$$

By Proposition 7.14, w_γ^λ is the unique solution to the integral equation:

$$(6.13) \quad w_\gamma(z, \lambda) + P^\lambda w_\gamma(z, \lambda) = \Phi(z, \lambda), \quad z \in \Omega,$$

where

$$P^\lambda w_\gamma(z, \lambda) := T_{\Omega^\lambda}(A^\lambda w_\gamma^\lambda + B^\lambda \overline{w_\gamma^\lambda})(z^\lambda), \quad \Phi(z, \lambda) := \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{b\Omega} \frac{(l\gamma)(t, \lambda)}{t^\lambda - z^\lambda} dt^\lambda.$$

By Proposition 7.12 we know for fixed λ , $w_\gamma(\cdot, \lambda) \in C^\nu(\overline{\Omega})$, where $\nu = \min(\alpha_p, \mu)$, $\alpha_p = \frac{p-2}{p}$.

We make a few observations:

1) By Proposition 7.3, we have

$$(6.14) \quad \left| P^\lambda w_\gamma(\cdot, \lambda) \right|_{C^{\alpha_p}(\overline{\Omega})} \leq C_{1,0} C_p (|A(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\overline{\Omega})} + |B(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\overline{\Omega})}) |w_\gamma(\cdot, \lambda)|_{C^0(\overline{\Omega})}.$$

In other words, the operator P^λ is a compact operator for each fixed λ .

2) By standard estimates for Cauchy integral (or see [1, p. 176]), we have

$$(6.15) \quad \|\Phi\|_{0,0} \leq C_{1,0} \|l\gamma\|_{\mu,0}, \quad \|\Phi\|_{\mu,0} \leq C_{1+\mu,0} \|l\gamma\|_{\mu,0}.$$

3) The homogeneous integral equation

$$w_\gamma(z, \lambda) + T_{\Omega^\lambda}(A^\lambda w_\gamma^\lambda + B^\lambda \overline{w_\gamma^\lambda})(z^\lambda) = 0, \quad z \in \Omega$$

has only the trivial solution for each λ . For the existence and uniqueness, see the argument in the proof of Proposition 7.14.

First, we show that $|w_\gamma(\cdot, \lambda)|_0$ is bounded uniformly in λ . Seeking contradiction, suppose that for some sequence $\{\lambda_j\}$ converging to λ_0 , one has $N_j := |\gamma(\cdot, \lambda_j)|_0 \rightarrow \infty$. Dividing both sides of (6.13) by N_j , we have

$$(6.16) \quad \widehat{w}_\gamma(z, \lambda_j) + P^{\lambda_j} \widehat{w}_\gamma(z, \lambda_j) = \frac{1}{N_j} \Phi(z, \lambda_j), \quad z \in \Omega,$$

where $\widehat{w}_\gamma(z, \lambda_j) = \frac{1}{N_j} \widetilde{w}_\gamma(z, \lambda_j)$. By estimate (6.14), $|P^{\lambda_j} \widehat{w}_\gamma(\cdot, \lambda_j)|_{\alpha_p}$ is bounded by a constant uniform in λ . By Arzela-Ascoli theorem and passing to a subsequence if necessary, $P^{\lambda_j} \widehat{w}_\gamma$ converges uniformly to some function. The right-hand side of the above equation converges to 0 by (6.15), so in view of (6.16) \widehat{w}_γ converges uniformly to some function \widetilde{w} . One can check that $P^{\lambda_j} \widehat{w}_\gamma$ converges uniformly to $P^{\lambda_0} \widetilde{w}$, thus passing to the limit as $j \rightarrow \infty$ we get $\widetilde{w} + P^{\lambda_0} \widetilde{w} = 0$. By the above observation 3), $\widetilde{w} \equiv 0$ which contradicts the fact that $|\widetilde{w}|_0 = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} |\widehat{w}_\gamma(\cdot, \lambda_j)|_0 = 1$. Hence $|w_\gamma(\cdot, \lambda)|_0$ is bounded uniformly in λ . Applying estimate (6.14) we get

$$\|w_\gamma^\lambda\|_{\nu,0} \leq \|P^\lambda w_\gamma^\lambda\|_{\alpha_p,0} + \|\Phi^\lambda\|_{\mu,0} \leq C(\|w_\gamma^\lambda\|_{0,0} + \|l^\lambda \gamma^\lambda\|_{\mu,0}),$$

where C is some constant independent of λ .

Next we show $w_\gamma(\cdot, \lambda)$ is continuous in λ in the $C^0(b\Omega)$ -norm. Suppose this is not the case, then there exists some λ_0 and a sequence $\lambda_j \rightarrow \lambda_0$, such that $|w_\gamma(\cdot, \lambda_j) - w_\gamma(\cdot, \lambda_0)|_0 \geq \varepsilon > 0$. Since we have shown that $|w_\gamma^\lambda|_\nu$ is bounded uniformly in λ . Passing to a subsequence if necessary, we have that $w_\gamma^{\lambda_j}$ converges to some w_* in the $C^{\nu'}(b\Omega)$ -norm, for $0 < \nu' < \nu$. As before we can show that $|P^{\lambda_j} w_\gamma^{\lambda_j} - P^{\lambda_0} w_*|_0 \rightarrow 0$. Letting $|\lambda_j - \lambda_0| \rightarrow 0$ in (6.13) we get $w_*(z) + P^{\lambda_0} w_*(z, \lambda) = \Phi(z, \lambda_0)$ for $z \in \Omega$. Since we know that $w_\gamma^{\lambda_0}$ satisfies the same equation, again by the above observation 3) we must have $w_* = w_\gamma(\cdot, \lambda_0)$. But this contradicts the fact that $|w_\gamma(\cdot, \lambda_j) - w_\gamma(\cdot, \lambda_0)|_0 \geq \varepsilon > 0$. Hence $w_\gamma(\cdot, \lambda)$ is continuous in λ in the $C^0(b\Omega)$ norm. By Proposition 2.3, the results imply $w_\gamma^\lambda \in C^{\nu,0}(b\Omega^\lambda)$. \square

Next we show that $w_F^\lambda \in C^{\alpha_p,0}(b\Omega^\lambda)$.

Lemma 6.4. *Let $2 < p < \infty$ and $\alpha_p = \frac{p-2}{p}$. Suppose $\lambda \mapsto A(\cdot, \lambda), B(\cdot, \lambda), F(\cdot, \lambda)$ are continuous maps from $[0, 1]$ to $L^p(\Omega)$. For $z \in \Omega$, let w_F^λ be given by formula (6.9). Then for each λ , w_F^λ can be extended to a function in $C^{\alpha_p}(\overline{\Omega})$, and $w_F^\lambda \in C^{\alpha_p,0}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$. Moreover we have the following estimate*

$$\|w_F^\lambda\|_{\alpha_p,0} \leq C(p, \Omega) \left(\sup_{\lambda \in [0,1]} |A(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \sup_{\lambda \in [0,1]} |B(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\Omega)} \right),$$

where the constant depends only on p and Ω and is independent of λ .

Proof. By Hölder's inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} |w_F(z, \lambda)| &\leq C \left(|G_1(\zeta, \cdot, \lambda)|_{L^{p'}(\Omega)} + |G_2(\zeta, \cdot, \lambda)|_{L^{p'}(\Omega)} \right) |F(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C_{1,0} C_p (\sum_{i=1,2} \|\omega_i\|_{0,0}) |F(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\Omega)}, \quad 2 < p < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where $\|\omega_i\|_{0,0} = \sup_{\zeta \in \overline{\Omega}, \lambda \in [0,1]} |\omega_i(\cdot, \zeta, \lambda)|_0$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} &|w_F(z, \lambda) - w_F(z', \lambda)| \\ &\leq C \sum_{i=1,2} \iint_{\Omega} |G_i(z, \zeta, \lambda) - G_i(z', \zeta, \lambda)| |F(\zeta, \lambda)| dA(\zeta^\lambda) \\ &\leq C \iint_{\Omega} \frac{\sum_{i=1,2} |e^{\omega_i(z, \zeta, \lambda)} - e^{\omega_i(z', \zeta, \lambda)}|}{|\zeta^\lambda - z^\lambda|} |F(\zeta, \lambda)| dA(\zeta^\lambda) \\ &\quad + C \iint_{\Omega} \left(\sum_{i=1,2} |e^{\omega_i(z', \zeta, \lambda)}| \right) \left| \frac{1}{\zeta^\lambda - z^\lambda} - \frac{1}{\zeta^\lambda - (z')^\lambda} \right| |F(\zeta, \lambda)| dA(\zeta^\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

Denote the first integral above by I and the second integral by II . Applying Hölder's inequality for $p > 2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} I &\leq C_{1,0}(\Sigma_{i=1,2}\|\omega_i\|_{\alpha_p,0})|z-z'|^{\alpha_p}\iint_{\Omega}\frac{|F(\zeta,\lambda)|}{|z-\zeta|}dA(\zeta) \\ &\leq C_{1,0}C_p(\Sigma_{i=1,2}\|\omega_i\|_{\alpha_p,0})|F(\cdot,\lambda)|_{L^p(\Omega)}|z-z'|^{\alpha_p}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\|\omega_i\|_{\alpha_p,0} := \sup_{\zeta \in \bar{\Omega}, \lambda \in [0,1]} |\omega_i(\cdot, t, \lambda)|_{\alpha_p}$. Also

$$\begin{aligned} II &= \left\{ \iint_{|z-\zeta| < 2|z-z'|} + \iint_{|z-\zeta| \geq |z-z'|} \right\} \left(\Sigma_{i=1,2} \left| e^{\omega_i(z', \zeta, \lambda)} \right| \right) \left| \frac{1}{z^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} - \frac{1}{(z')^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} \right| |F(\zeta, \lambda)| dA(\zeta^\lambda) \\ &\leq C_{1,0}(\Sigma_{i=1,2}\|\omega_i\|_{0,0}) \left\{ \iint_{|z-\zeta| < 2|z-z'|} \frac{|F(\zeta, \lambda)|}{|z-\zeta|} dA(\zeta) + \iint_{|z'-\zeta| < 3|z-z'|} \frac{|F(\zeta, \lambda)|}{|z'-\zeta|} dA(\zeta) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \iint_{|z-\zeta| \geq 2|z-z'|} \left| \frac{1}{z^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} - \frac{1}{(z')^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} \right| |F(\zeta, \lambda)| dA(\zeta) \right\} \\ &\leq C_{1,0}(\Sigma_{i=1,2}\|\omega_i\|_{0,0}) \left\{ |F(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\bar{\Omega})} |z-z'|^{\alpha_p} + |z-z'| \iint_{|z-\zeta| \geq 2|z-z'|} \frac{|F(\zeta, \lambda)|}{|z-\zeta||z'-\zeta|} dA(\zeta) \right\} \\ &\leq C_{1,0}C_p(\Sigma_{i=1,2}\|\omega_i\|_{0,0})|F(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\bar{\Omega})} \left\{ |z-z'|^{\alpha_p} + |z-z'|(C + |z-z'|^{-\frac{2}{p}}) \right\} \\ &\leq C_{1,0}C_p(\Sigma_{i=1,2}\|\omega_i\|_{0,0})|F(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\bar{\Omega})}|z-z'|^{\alpha_p}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we obtain

$$(6.17) \quad |w_F(\cdot, \lambda)|_{\alpha_p} \leq C_{1,0}C_p(\Sigma_{i=1,2}\|\omega_i\|_{\alpha_p,0})|F(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C(|A(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\Omega)} + |B(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\Omega)}),$$

where we used (5.3), and the constant C depends only on p and Ω and is independent of λ .

Next we show w_F^λ is continuous in C^0 -norm. For simplicity we omit the constant $-\frac{1}{\pi}$. Set

$$dA(\zeta^\lambda) = a(\zeta, \lambda)dA(\zeta), \quad a(\zeta, \lambda) := |\det(D\Gamma^\lambda)|.$$

We have, using notation (2.5) for $\delta^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}$.

$$\begin{aligned} |w_F(z, \lambda_1) - w_F(z, \lambda_2)| &\leq \sum_{i=1,2} \left| \iint_{\Omega} \delta^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2} [G_i(z, \zeta) F(t) a(\zeta)] dA(\zeta) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1,2} \iint_{\Omega} [\delta^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2} G_i(z, t)] (Fa)(\zeta, \lambda_1) dA(\zeta) + \iint_{\Omega} G_i(z, \zeta, \lambda_2) [\delta^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2} (Fa)(t)] dA(\zeta) \\ &\leq \iint_{\Omega} \frac{\Sigma_{i=1,2} |e^{\omega_i(z, \zeta, \lambda_1)} - e^{\omega_i(z, \zeta, \lambda_2)}|}{|\zeta^{\lambda_1} - z^{\lambda_1}|} |(Fa)(\zeta, \lambda_1)| + \iint_{\Omega} \Sigma_i |e^{\omega_i(z, \zeta, \lambda_2)}| |(Fa)(\zeta, \lambda_1)| \\ &\quad \left| \frac{1}{\zeta^{\lambda_1} - z^{\lambda_1}} - \frac{1}{\zeta^{\lambda_2} - z^{\lambda_2}} \right| dA(\zeta) + \iint_{\Omega} \frac{\Sigma_i |e^{\omega_i(z, \zeta, \lambda_2)}|}{|\zeta^{\lambda_2} - z^{\lambda_2}|} |\delta^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2} (Fa)(t)| dA(\zeta). \end{aligned}$$

By Hölder's inequality, this is bounded by

$$C_{1,0}C_p \left\{ \Sigma_i \sup_{\zeta \in \bar{\Omega}} |\delta^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2} \omega_i(\cdot, \zeta)|_0 |F|_{L^p(\Omega)} + (\Sigma_i \|\omega_i\|_{0,0}) \left(|\Gamma^{\lambda_1} - \Gamma^{\lambda_2}|_1 |F|_{L^p(\Omega)} + |\delta^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2} F|_{L^p(\Omega)} \right) \right\},$$

where the constants are independent of λ . By Lemma 5.4 (iii), $\sup_{\zeta \in \bar{\Omega}} |\omega_i(z, \zeta, \lambda_1) - \omega_i(z, \zeta, \lambda_2)|_0 \rightarrow 0$, so the first term above goes to 0. Since $\Gamma^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{1,0}$, and $F(\cdot, \lambda)$ is continuous in λ in the $L^p(\Omega)$ -norm, the second and third terms above converge to 0 as $|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2| \rightarrow 0$. \square

Step 3: Reduction of the singular integral operator.

To estimate w_η^λ ((6.8)), we first need to estimate $\eta(\cdot, \lambda)$. Write

$$\mathcal{K}^\lambda \eta(\zeta, \lambda) = \mathcal{K}_1^\lambda \eta(\zeta, \lambda) + \mathcal{N}_1^\lambda \eta(\zeta, \lambda),$$

where $\mathcal{K}_1^\lambda \eta(\zeta, \lambda) := -\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{b\Omega} \operatorname{Re} \left[l(t, \lambda) \overline{l(\zeta, \lambda)} (\rho^\lambda)'(s) G_1(\zeta, t, \lambda) \right] \eta(t, \lambda) ds$, and

$$(6.18) \quad \mathcal{N}_1^\lambda \eta(\zeta, \lambda) := -\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{b\Omega} \operatorname{Re} \left[l(t, \lambda) l(\zeta, \lambda) (\rho^\lambda)'(s) \overline{G_2(\zeta, t, \lambda)} \right] \eta(t, \lambda) ds.$$

The operator \mathcal{N}_1^λ is compact, since by estimate (5.5),

$$\begin{aligned} |G_2(\zeta, t, \lambda)| &= \left| \frac{e^{\omega_1(\zeta, t, \lambda)} - e^{\omega_2(\zeta, t, \lambda)}}{2(t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda)} \right| \leq C \frac{|\omega_1(\zeta, t, \lambda) - \omega_2(\zeta, t, \lambda)|}{|t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda|} \\ &\leq C \frac{|\omega_1(\zeta, t, \lambda)| + |\omega_2(\zeta, t, \lambda)|}{t - \zeta} \leq C_{1,0} C_p (|A(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\Omega)} + |B(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\Omega)}) |t - \zeta|^{-\frac{2}{p}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $2 < p < \infty$. We shall call \mathcal{N}_1^λ a *Fredholm operator of the first kind*, using the same terminologies as in [5].

On the other hand, using that $w_j(t, t, \lambda) = 0$ for all t and estimate (5.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} G_1(\zeta, t, \lambda) - \frac{1}{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} &= \frac{e^{\omega_1(\zeta, t, \lambda)} + e^{\omega_2(\zeta, t, \lambda)}}{2(t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda)} - \frac{2}{2(t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda)} \\ &= \frac{e^{\omega_1(\zeta, t, \lambda)} - e^{\omega_1(t, t, \lambda)}}{2(t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda)} + \frac{e^{\omega_2(\zeta, t, \lambda)} - e^{\omega_2(t, t, \lambda)}}{2(t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda)} \\ &\leq C_{1,0} C_p (|A(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\Omega)} + |B(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\Omega)}) |\zeta - t|^{-\frac{2}{p}}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\mathcal{K}_1^\lambda \eta(\zeta, \lambda) = \mathcal{K}_2^\lambda \eta(\zeta, \lambda) + \mathcal{N}_2^\lambda \eta(\zeta, \lambda)$, where

$$(6.19) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_2^\lambda \eta(\zeta, \lambda) &:= -\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{b\Omega} \operatorname{Re} \left[\frac{l(t, \lambda) (\rho^\lambda)'(s) \overline{l(\zeta, \lambda)}}{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} \right] \eta(t, \lambda) ds; \\ \mathcal{N}_2^\lambda \eta(\zeta, \lambda) &:= -\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{b\Omega} \operatorname{Re} \left[l(t, \lambda) \overline{l(\zeta, \lambda)} (\rho^\lambda)'(s) \sum_{i=1,2} \frac{e^{\omega_i(\zeta, t, \lambda)} - e^{\omega_i(t, t, \lambda)}}{2(t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda)} \right] \eta(t, \lambda) ds. \end{aligned}$$

The operator \mathcal{N}_2^λ is compact, and

$$\mathcal{K}_2^\lambda \eta(\zeta, \lambda) = -\frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{b\Omega} \left[\frac{l(t, \lambda) (\rho^\lambda)'(s) \overline{l(\zeta, \lambda)}}{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} + \frac{\overline{l(t, \lambda)} (\rho^\lambda)'(s) l(\zeta, \lambda)}{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} \right] \eta(t, \lambda) ds.$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{ds}{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} &= \frac{(\rho^\lambda)'(s) dt^\lambda}{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} = (\rho^\lambda)'(s) d \log(\bar{t} - \bar{\zeta}^\lambda) \\ &= (\rho^\lambda)'(s) d \log(t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda) + (\rho^\lambda)'(s) d \log \frac{\overline{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda}}{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} \\ &= \frac{(\rho^\lambda)'(s) dt^\lambda}{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} + (\rho^\lambda)'(s) d \log \frac{\bar{t}^\lambda - \bar{\zeta}^\lambda}{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda}, \end{aligned}$$

we can rewrite $\mathcal{K}_2^\lambda \eta$ as $\mathcal{K}_2^\lambda \eta(\zeta, \lambda) = \mathcal{K}_3^\lambda \eta(\zeta, \lambda) + \mathcal{N}_3^\lambda \eta(\zeta, \lambda)$, with

$$(6.20) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_3^\lambda \eta(\zeta, \lambda) &:= -\frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{b\Omega} \frac{\left(l(t, \lambda) \overline{l(\zeta, \lambda)} + \overline{l(t, \lambda)} l(\zeta, \lambda) \right) \eta(t, \lambda)}{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} dt^\lambda \\ \mathcal{N}_3^\lambda \eta(\zeta, \lambda) &:= -\frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{b\Omega} \overline{l(t, \lambda)} l(\zeta, \lambda) \eta(t, \lambda) d \log \frac{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda}{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, \mathcal{N}_3^λ is a compact operator, and we can write $\mathcal{K}_3^\lambda \eta^\lambda$ in the form

$$\mathcal{K}_3^\lambda \eta(\zeta, \lambda) = A(\zeta, \lambda) \eta(\zeta, \lambda) + \frac{1}{\pi i} \int_{b\Omega} \frac{S(\zeta, t, \lambda) \eta(t, \lambda)}{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} dt^\lambda,$$

where $A(\zeta, \lambda) \equiv 0$, and

$$S(\zeta, t, \lambda) := -\frac{i}{4} \left(l(t, \lambda) \overline{l(\zeta, \lambda)} + \overline{l(t, \lambda)} l(\zeta, \lambda) \right).$$

In particular we have $S(t, t, \lambda) = -\frac{i}{2}$. Now, the integral equation (6.10) can be written as

$$(6.21) \quad \mathcal{K}^\lambda \eta(\zeta, \lambda) = \mathcal{K}_3^\lambda \eta(\zeta, \lambda) + \mathcal{N}_1^\lambda \eta(\zeta, \lambda) + \mathcal{N}_2^\lambda \eta(\zeta, \lambda) + \mathcal{N}_3^\lambda \eta(\zeta, \lambda) = \gamma_0(\zeta, \lambda),$$

where \mathcal{K}_3^λ is a singular integral operator and \mathcal{N}_j^λ -s are compact operators. Following [5, P. 118, (45.4)], the index of the singular integral operator \mathcal{K}_3^λ is defined to be

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \left[\arg \frac{A(t, \lambda) - S(t, t, \lambda)}{A(t, \lambda) + S(t, t, \lambda)} \right]_{b\Omega} = \frac{1}{2\pi} [\arg(-1)] = 0.$$

One can find a “reducing operator” \mathcal{M}^λ so that the composition $\mathcal{F}^\lambda = \mathcal{M}^\lambda \circ \mathcal{K}^\lambda$ is a Fredholm operator. Moreover by Vekua’s equivalence theorem [5, p. 149, case 1], if the index of \mathcal{K}_0^λ is nonnegative, one can choose \mathcal{M}^λ so that the equation $\mathcal{M}^\lambda \varphi = 0$ has only the trivial solution $\varphi \equiv 0$. Therefore η^λ is a solution to the Fredholm equation $\mathcal{F}^\lambda \eta^\lambda = \mathcal{M}^\lambda \gamma_0$ if and only if η^λ is a solution to the singular integral equation $\mathcal{K}^\lambda \eta^\lambda = \gamma_0$, in other words it suffices to consider the equation

$$\mathcal{F}^\lambda \eta^\lambda = \mathcal{M}^\lambda \gamma_0^\lambda.$$

There are many choices for such \mathcal{M}^λ , for example, one can take \mathcal{M}^λ to be the dominant part of the adjoint operator of \mathcal{K}_3^λ (See the remark after Definition 7.18). For an operator \mathcal{T} , we use the notation

$$\mathcal{T} \eta(\zeta, \lambda) := \mathcal{T}^\lambda \eta^\lambda(\zeta^\lambda).$$

We have

$$(6.22) \quad \mathcal{M} \eta(\zeta, \lambda) := -\frac{S(\zeta, \zeta, \lambda)}{\pi i} P.V. \int_{b\Omega} \frac{\eta(t, \lambda) dt^\lambda}{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} = \frac{1}{2\pi} P.V. \int_{b\Omega} \frac{\eta(t, \lambda) dt^\lambda}{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda}.$$

Since S is Hölder continuous in both ζ and t , we can apply formula (7.15) to get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}^\lambda \eta^\lambda(\zeta^\lambda) &= \mathcal{M} \mathcal{K}_3 \eta(\zeta, \lambda) \\ &= -[S(\zeta, \zeta, \lambda)]^2 \eta(\zeta, \lambda) - \frac{S(\zeta, \zeta, \lambda)}{(\pi i)^2} \int_{b\Omega} \left[\int_{b\Omega} \frac{S(t_1, t, \lambda)}{(t_1^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda)(t^\lambda - t_1^\lambda)} dt_1^\lambda \right] \eta(t, \lambda) dt^\lambda \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \eta(\zeta, \lambda) - \frac{i}{2\pi^2} \int_{b\Omega} \left[\int_{b\Omega} \frac{l(t, \lambda) \overline{l(t_1, \lambda)} + \overline{l(t, \lambda)} l(t_1, \lambda)}{(t_1^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda)(t^\lambda - t_1^\lambda)} dt_1^\lambda \right] \eta(t, \lambda) dt^\lambda, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $S(t, t, \lambda) = -\frac{i}{2}$. We have

$$(6.23) \quad \int_{b\Omega} \frac{l(t, \lambda) \overline{l(t_1, \lambda)}}{(t_1^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda)(t^\lambda - t_1^\lambda)} = \frac{l(t, \lambda)}{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} [v_0(\zeta, \lambda) - v_0(t, \lambda)],$$

where we set

$$v_0(\zeta, \lambda) = P.V. \int_{b\Omega} \frac{\overline{l(\tau, \lambda)}}{\tau^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} d\tau^\lambda = \int_{b\Omega} \frac{\overline{l(\tau, \lambda)} - \overline{l(\zeta, \lambda)}}{\tau^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} d\tau^\lambda + (\pi i) \overline{l(\zeta, \lambda)}.$$

By Lemma 7.9, $v_0 \in C^{\mu,0}(b\Omega^\lambda)$ and

$$(6.24) \quad \|v_0\|_{\mu,0} \leq C_{1,0} \|l\|_{\mu,0}.$$

In view of expression (6.23), we have

$$(6.25) \quad \mathcal{F}\eta(\zeta, \lambda) = \frac{1}{4}\eta(\zeta, \lambda) + \int_{b\Omega} \frac{k_0(\zeta, t, \lambda)}{\zeta^\lambda - t^\lambda} \eta(t, \lambda) dt^\lambda,$$

where $k_0(\zeta, t, \lambda)$ is given by

$$(6.26) \quad k_0(\zeta, t, \lambda) = l(t, \lambda) (v_0(\zeta, \lambda) - v_0(t, \lambda)).$$

In view of (6.24) we have

$$(6.27) \quad |k_0(\zeta, t, \lambda)| \leq A_0 |\zeta - t|^\mu,$$

where A_0 is some constant independent of $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ and $t \in b\Omega$.

Next, we compute the composition operators $\mathcal{M}^\lambda \mathcal{N}_1^\lambda \eta^\lambda$, $\mathcal{M}^\lambda \mathcal{N}_2^\lambda \eta^\lambda$, $\mathcal{M}^\lambda \mathcal{N}_3^\lambda \eta^\lambda$. All of them turn out to be Fredholm operators of the first kind. For simplicity, we will omit all the non-zero constants in the following computations. In view of (6.18), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}\mathcal{N}_1\eta(\zeta, \lambda) &= \int_{b\Omega} \frac{1}{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} \left[\int_{b\Omega} \operatorname{Re} \left[l(t_1, \lambda) l(t, \lambda) \overline{G_2(t, t_1, \lambda)} (\rho^\lambda)'(s_1) \right] \eta(t_1, \lambda) ds_1 \right] dt^\lambda \\ &= \int_{b\Omega} \left[\int_{b\Omega} \frac{1}{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} \operatorname{Re} \left(l(t_1, \lambda) l(t, \lambda) \overline{G_2(t, t_1, \lambda)} (\rho^\lambda)'(s_1) \right) dt^\lambda \right] \eta(t_1, \lambda) ds_1 \\ &= \int_{b\Omega} \left[\int_{b\Omega} \frac{1}{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} \left(l(t_1, \lambda) l(t, \lambda) \overline{G_2(t, t_1, \lambda)} (\rho^\lambda)'(s_1) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \overline{l(t_1, \lambda) l(t, \lambda)} (\rho^\lambda)'(s_1) \overline{G_2(t, t_1, \lambda)} \right) dt^\lambda \right] \eta(t_1, \lambda) ds_1, \end{aligned}$$

where we can easily justify the interchange of integrals. The inner integral can be expanded as

$$(6.28) \quad \begin{aligned} l(t_1, \lambda) (t_1^\lambda)'(s_1) \int_{b\Omega} \frac{l(t, \lambda) \left(e^{\omega_1(t, t_1, \lambda)} - e^{\omega_2(t, t_1, \lambda)} \right)}{(t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda) (t_1^\lambda - t^\lambda)} dt^\lambda \\ + \overline{l(t_1, \lambda)} \overline{(t_1^\lambda)'(s_1)} \int_{b\Omega} \frac{\overline{l(t, \lambda)} \left(e^{\omega_1(t, t_1, \lambda)} - e^{\omega_2(t, t_1, \lambda)} \right)}{(t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda) (t_1^\lambda - t^\lambda)} dt^\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

Denoting the first and second integrals in the above expression by I_1 and I_2 respectively, we have

$$(6.29) \quad \begin{aligned} I_1(\zeta, t_1, \lambda) &= \int_{b\Omega} \frac{l(t, \lambda) e^{2i \operatorname{arg}(t_1^\lambda - t^\lambda)}}{(t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda) (t_1^\lambda - t^\lambda)} \left[\overline{e^{\omega_1(t, t_1, \lambda)}} - \overline{e^{\omega_2(t, t_1, \lambda)}} \right] dt^\lambda \\ &= \frac{1}{t_1^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} \left\{ P.V. \int_{b\Omega} \frac{F(t, t_1, \lambda)}{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} dt^\lambda - P.V. \int_{b\Omega} \frac{F(t, t_1, \lambda)}{t^\lambda - t_1^\lambda} dt^\lambda \right\}. \\ &= \frac{1}{t_1^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} [v_1'(\zeta, t_1, \lambda) - v_1'(t_1, t_1, \lambda)], \end{aligned}$$

where we set

$$\begin{aligned} v_1'(\zeta, t_1, \lambda) &:= \int_{b\Omega} \frac{F(t, t_1, \lambda) - F(\zeta, t_1, \lambda)}{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} dt^\lambda + \pi i F(\zeta, t_1, \lambda), \\ v_1'(t_1, t_1, \lambda) &:= \int_{b\Omega} \frac{F(t, t_1, \lambda) - F(t_1, t_1, \lambda)}{t^\lambda - t_1^\lambda} dt^\lambda + \pi i F(t_1, t_1, \lambda), \\ F(t, t_1, \lambda) &:= l(t, \lambda) e^{2i \arg(t_1^\lambda - t^\lambda)} \left[\overline{e^{\omega_1(t, t_1, \lambda)}} - \overline{e^{\omega_2(t, t_1, \lambda)}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that since $\omega_1(t_1, t_1) = \omega_2(t_1, t_1) = 0$, we have $F(t_1, t_1, \lambda) \equiv 0$ on $b\Omega$. We show that $v_1'(\cdot, t_1, \lambda) \in C^{\nu, 0}(b\Omega^\lambda)$. By Lemma 7.9, it suffices to see that $F(\cdot, t, \lambda)$ is ν -Hölder continuous in the first argument, and this follows from Lemma 7.21, and estimate (5.3). In fact we have

$$|F(\cdot, t_1, \lambda)|_\nu \leq C_{1+\mu, 0} |l(\cdot, \lambda)|_\mu (\sum_{i=1,2} |\omega_i(\cdot, t_1, \lambda)|_{\alpha_p}), \quad \nu = \min(\alpha_p, \mu),$$

where the constant is uniform in λ and $t_1 \in b\Omega$. Hence by Lemma 7.9,

$$\|v_1'(\cdot, t_1, \lambda)\|_{\nu, 0} \leq C_{1,0} \|F(\cdot, t_1, \lambda)\|_{\nu, 0} \leq C_{1+\mu, 0} \|l\|_{\mu, 0} (\sum_{i=1,2} \|\omega_i\|_{\alpha_p, 0}).$$

In a similar way, we can show that

$$(6.30) \quad I_2(\zeta, t_1, \lambda) = \frac{1}{t_1^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} [v_1''(t_1, \zeta, \lambda) - v_1''(t_1, t_1, \lambda)],$$

where v_1'' satisfies $\|v_1''(\cdot, t_1, \lambda)\|_{\nu, 0} \leq C_{1+\mu, 0} \|l\|_{\mu, 0} (\sum_{i=1,2} \|\omega_i\|_{\alpha_p, 0})$.

Putting (6.29) and (6.30) in (6.28), we have

$$(6.31) \quad \mathcal{M}\mathcal{N}_1\eta(\zeta, \lambda) = \int_{b\Omega} \frac{k_1(\zeta, t_1, \lambda)}{t_1^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} \eta(t_1, \lambda) ds_1, \quad \nu = \min(\alpha_p, \mu)$$

where $k_1(\zeta, t_1, \lambda)$ is given by

$$(6.32) \quad \begin{aligned} k_1(\zeta, t_1, \lambda) &:= l(t_1, \lambda) (\rho^\lambda)'(s_1) [v_1'(\zeta, t_1, \lambda) - v_1'(t_1, t_1, \lambda)] \\ &\quad + \overline{l(t_1, \lambda) (\rho^\lambda)'(s_1)} [v_1''(\zeta, t_1, \lambda) - v_1''(t_1, t_1, \lambda)], \end{aligned}$$

and k_1 satisfies

$$(6.33) \quad |k_1(\zeta, t_1, \lambda)| \leq A_1 |\zeta - t_1|^\nu.$$

Here A_1 is some constant independent of $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ and $t_1 \in b\Omega$. By similar procedures applied to (6.19), we can show that the following holds (up to a nonzero constant)

$$(6.34) \quad \mathcal{M}\mathcal{N}_2\eta(\zeta, \lambda) = \int_{b\Omega} \frac{k_2(\zeta, t_1, \lambda)}{t_1^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} \eta(t_1, \lambda) ds_1, \quad \nu = \min(\alpha_p, \mu)$$

where $k_2(\zeta, t_1, \lambda)$ is given by

$$(6.35) \quad \begin{aligned} k_2(\zeta, t_1, \lambda) &:= l(t_1, \lambda) (\rho^\lambda)'(s_1) [v_2'(\zeta, t_1, \lambda) - v_2'(t_1, t_1, \lambda)] \\ &\quad + \overline{l(t_1, \lambda) (\rho^\lambda)'(s_1)} [v_2''(\zeta, t_1, \lambda) - v_2''(t_1, t_1, \lambda)], \end{aligned}$$

where v_2' and v_2'' satisfy the estimates

$$\|v_2'(\cdot, t_1, \lambda)\|_{\nu, 0}, \|v_2''(\cdot, t_1, \lambda)\|_{\nu, 0} \leq C_{1+\mu, 0} \|l\|_{\mu, 0} (\sum_{i=1,2} \|\omega_i\|_{\alpha_p, 0}).$$

Hence

$$(6.36) \quad |k_2(\zeta, t_1, \lambda)| \leq A_2 |\zeta - t_1|^\nu,$$

where A_2 is some constant independent of $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ and $t_1 \in b\Omega$. It remains to compute $\mathcal{M}^\lambda \mathcal{N}_3^\lambda \eta^\lambda$. From (6.20), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}_3 \eta(\zeta, \lambda) &= -\frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{b\Omega} \overline{l(t, \lambda)} l(\zeta, \lambda) \eta(t, \lambda) d \log \frac{\overline{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda}}{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} \\ &= -\frac{(-2i)}{4\pi} \int_{b\Omega} \overline{l(t, \lambda)} l(\zeta, \lambda) \eta(t, \lambda) d_{t^\lambda} \arg(t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda) \\ &= \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{b\Omega} \overline{l(t, \lambda)} l(\zeta, \lambda) \eta(t, \lambda) \partial_{\tau^\lambda(s)} \arg(t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda) ds, \end{aligned}$$

where τ^λ is the unit tangent vector of $b\Omega^\lambda$ at t^λ . Omitting the constant in the front, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{MN}_3 \eta(\zeta, \lambda) &= \int_{b\Omega} \frac{1}{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} \left[\int_{b\Omega} \overline{l(t_1, \lambda)} l(t, \lambda) [\partial_{\tau^\lambda(s_1)} \arg(t_1^\lambda - t^\lambda)] \eta(t_1, \lambda) ds_1 \right] dt^\lambda \\ &= \int_{b\Omega} \overline{l(t_1, \lambda)} \left[\int_{b\Omega} \frac{l(t, \lambda) [\partial_{\tau^\lambda(s_1)} \arg(t_1^\lambda - t^\lambda)] (t_1^\lambda - t^\lambda)}{(t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda)(t_1^\lambda - t^\lambda)} dt^\lambda \right] \eta(t_1, \lambda) ds_1. \end{aligned}$$

Denote $F(t, t_1, \lambda) = l(t, \lambda)(t_1^\lambda - t^\lambda) [\partial_{\tau^\lambda(s_1)} \arg(t_1^\lambda - t^\lambda)]$. As before we show that $|F(\cdot, t_1, \lambda)|_\mu$ is bounded uniformly in $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ and $t_1 \in b\Omega$. Since $l^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{\mu, 0}(b\Omega^\lambda)$, we only need to show the function

$$[\partial_{\tau^\lambda(s_1)} \arg(t_1^\lambda - t^\lambda)] (t_1^\lambda - t^\lambda)$$

is Hölder μ continuous in t , and the Hölder norm is uniformly bounded in λ and t_1 .

If $|t - t_1| < 2|t - \tilde{t}|$, then $|\tilde{t} - t_1| \leq |\tilde{t} - t| + |t - t_1| \leq 3|t - \tilde{t}|$, and we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| [\partial_{\tau^\lambda(s_1)} \arg(t_1^\lambda - t^\lambda)] (t_1^\lambda - t^\lambda) - \partial_{\tau^\lambda(s_1)} \arg(t_1^\lambda - \tilde{t}^\lambda) (t_1^\lambda - \tilde{t}^\lambda) \right| \\ &= \left| \partial_{s_1} \arg(\rho^\lambda(s_1) - t^\lambda) (t_1^\lambda - t^\lambda) - [\partial_{s_1} \arg(\rho^\lambda(s_1) - \tilde{t}^\lambda)] (t_1^\lambda - \tilde{t}^\lambda) \right| \\ &\leq \left| \partial_{s_1} \arg(\rho^\lambda(s_1) - t^\lambda) \right| |t_1^\lambda - t^\lambda| + \left| \partial_{s_1} \arg(\rho^\lambda(s_1) - \tilde{t}^\lambda) \right| |t_1^\lambda - \tilde{t}^\lambda|. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 7.21 (i), the above is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & C_{1+\mu, 0} (|t_1 - t|^{\mu-1} |t_1 - t| + |t_1 - \tilde{t}|^{\mu-1} |t_1 - \tilde{t}|) \\ &\leq C_{1+\mu, 0} (|t_1 - t|^\mu + |t_1 - \tilde{t}|^\mu) = C'_{1+\mu, 0} |t - \tilde{t}|^\mu. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand if $|t - t_1| \geq 2|t - \tilde{t}|$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| [\partial_{\tau^\lambda(s_1)} \arg(t_1^\lambda - t^\lambda)] (t_1^\lambda - t^\lambda) - \partial_{\tau^\lambda(s_1)} \arg(t_1^\lambda - \tilde{t}^\lambda) (t_1^\lambda - \tilde{t}^\lambda) \right| \\ &\leq \left| \left\{ \partial_{\tau^\lambda(s_1)} \arg(t_1^\lambda - t^\lambda) - \partial_{\tau^\lambda(s_1)} \arg(t_1^\lambda - \tilde{t}^\lambda) \right\} (t_1^\lambda - t^\lambda) \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \partial_{\tau^\lambda(s_1)} \arg(t_1^\lambda - \tilde{t}^\lambda) (t_1^\lambda - \tilde{t}^\lambda) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 7.21 (ii), since $|t - t_1| \geq 2|t - \tilde{t}|$, the above is bounded by

$$C_{1+\mu, 0} \left(\frac{|t - \tilde{t}|}{|t - t_1|^{2-\mu}} |t_1 - t| + |t_1 - t|^{\mu-1} |t - \tilde{t}| \right) \leq C'_{1+\mu, 0} |t - \tilde{t}|^\mu.$$

Now, by the same proof as that for $\mathcal{M}^\lambda \mathcal{N}_1^\lambda$ and $\mathcal{M}^\lambda \mathcal{N}_2^\lambda$, we can show that

$$(6.37) \quad \mathcal{MN}_3 \eta(\zeta, \lambda) = \int_{b\Omega} \frac{k_3(\zeta, t_1, \lambda)}{t_1^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} \eta(t_1, \lambda) ds_1,$$

where $k_3(\zeta, t_1, \lambda)$ is of the form

$$(6.38) \quad k_3(\zeta, t_1, \lambda) := \overline{l(t_1, \lambda)} (v_3(\zeta, t_1, \lambda) - v_3(t_1, t_1, \lambda)),$$

and v_3 satisfies the estimate $\|v_3(\cdot, t_1, \lambda)\|_{\mu, 0} \leq C_{1+\mu, 0} \|l\|_{\mu, 0}$. Hence

$$(6.39) \quad |k_3(\zeta, t_1, \lambda)| \leq A_3 |\zeta - t_1|^\mu,$$

where A_3 is some constant independent of $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ and $t_1 \in b\Omega$.

We now apply \mathcal{M} to both sides of integral equation (6.21). By (6.25), (6.31), (6.34), (6.37) we have

$$(6.40) \quad (I + \mathcal{N})\eta(\zeta, \lambda) := \eta(\zeta, \lambda) + \int_{b\Omega} \frac{k(\zeta, t, \lambda)}{\zeta^\lambda - t^\lambda} \eta(t, \lambda) dt^\lambda = \mathcal{M}\gamma_0(\zeta, \lambda),$$

where $k(\zeta, t, \lambda) := \sum_{i=0}^3 k_i(\zeta, t, \lambda)$. By (6.27), (6.33), (6.36) and (6.39), we have

$$|k(\zeta, t, \lambda)| \leq A |\zeta - t|^\nu, \quad \nu = \min(\mu, \alpha_p),$$

for some constant A independent of $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ and $t \in b\Omega$.

Step 4: Estimates for the right-hand side of the reduced equation.

We now prove $\mathcal{M}^\lambda \gamma_0^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{\nu', 0}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$, for any $0 < \nu' < \nu$ and $\nu = \min(\mu, \alpha_p)$. Recall that γ_0 is given by (6.11):

$$\gamma_0(\zeta, \lambda) = \gamma(\zeta, \lambda) - \operatorname{Re}[\overline{l(\zeta, \lambda)} w_\gamma^+(\zeta, \lambda)] - \operatorname{Re}[\overline{l(\zeta, \lambda)} w_F(\zeta, \lambda)].$$

Since for each λ , $l(\cdot, \lambda)$ and $\gamma(\cdot, \lambda)$ are Hölder continuous, we can apply the jump formula for generalized Cauchy integrals (Proposition 7.13) to get

$$\begin{aligned} w_\gamma^+(\zeta, \lambda) &= \frac{1}{2} l(\zeta, \lambda) \gamma(\zeta, \lambda) + \frac{1}{2\pi i} P.V. \int_{b\Omega} G_1(\zeta, t, \lambda) l(t, \lambda) \gamma(t, \lambda) dt^\lambda \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{b\Omega} G_2(\zeta, t, \lambda) \overline{l(t, \lambda)} \gamma(t, \lambda) \overline{dt^\lambda} \\ &:= P_1(\zeta, \lambda) + P_2(\zeta, \lambda) + P_3(\zeta, \lambda) + P_4(\zeta, \lambda), \end{aligned}$$

where we set

$$(6.41) \quad P_1(\zeta, \lambda) := \frac{1}{2} l(\zeta, \lambda) \gamma(\zeta, \lambda), \quad P_2(\zeta, \lambda) := \pi i [l(\zeta, \lambda) \gamma(\zeta, \lambda)],$$

$$(6.42) \quad \begin{aligned} P_3(\zeta, \lambda) &:= \int_{b\Omega} \frac{1}{2(t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda)} \left\{ \left(\sum_{i=1}^2 e^{\omega_i(\zeta, t, \lambda)} \right) [l(t, \lambda) \gamma(t, \lambda)] \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \left(\sum_{i=1}^2 e^{\omega_i(t, t, \lambda)} \right) [l(\zeta, \lambda) \gamma(\zeta, \lambda)] \right\} dt^\lambda, \end{aligned}$$

$$P_4(\zeta, \lambda) := -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{b\Omega} \frac{e^{\omega_1(\zeta, t, \lambda)} - e^{\omega_2(\zeta, t, \lambda)}}{2(t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda)} \overline{l(t, \lambda)} \gamma(t, \lambda) \overline{dt^\lambda}.$$

By assumption, $P_1^\lambda, P_2^\lambda \in C^{\mu, 0}(b\Omega^\lambda)$. Using (6.22), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}(\overline{l}P_1)(\zeta, \lambda) &= \frac{1}{2\pi} P.V. \int_{b\Omega} \frac{\overline{l}(\gamma)(t, \lambda)}{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} dt^\lambda = \frac{1}{2\pi} P.V. \int_{b\Omega} \frac{\gamma(t, \lambda)}{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} dt^\lambda \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \left\{ \int_{b\Omega} \frac{\gamma(t, \lambda) - \gamma(\zeta, \lambda)}{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} dt^\lambda + \pi i \gamma(\zeta, \lambda) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 7.9, we have

$$(6.43) \quad \|\mathcal{M}(\bar{l}P_1)\|_{\mu,0} \leq C_{1,0}\|\gamma\|_{\mu}, \quad \|\mathcal{M}(\bar{l}P_2)\|_{\mu,0} \leq C_{1,0}\|\gamma\|_{\mu}.$$

For P_3 , since $\omega_i(t, t, \lambda) = 0$, we have

$$(6.44) \quad \begin{aligned} P_3(\zeta, \lambda) &= \sum_{i=1,2} \int_{b\Omega} \frac{l(t, \lambda)\gamma(t, \lambda)}{2(t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda)} \left[e^{\omega_i(\zeta, t, \lambda)} - e^{\omega_i(t, t, \lambda)} \right] dt^\lambda \\ &\quad + \int_{b\Omega} \frac{1}{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} [l(t, \lambda)\gamma(t, \lambda) - l(\zeta, \lambda)\gamma(\zeta, \lambda)] dt^\lambda, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}(\bar{l}P_3)(\zeta, \lambda) &= \sum_{i=1,2} \int_{b\Omega} \frac{\overline{l(t, \lambda)}}{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} \left[\int_{b\Omega} \frac{l(t_1, \lambda)\gamma(t_1, \lambda)}{2(t_1^\lambda - t^\lambda)} \left[e^{\omega_i(t, t_1, \lambda)} - e^{\omega_i(t_1, t_1, \lambda)} \right] dt_1^\lambda \right] dt^\lambda \\ &\quad + \int_{b\Omega} \frac{\overline{l(t, \lambda)}}{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} \left[\int_{b\Omega} \frac{1}{t_1^\lambda - t^\lambda} [l(t_1, \lambda)\gamma(t_1, \lambda) - l(t, \lambda)\gamma(t, \lambda)] dt_1^\lambda \right] dt^\lambda \\ &= \sum_{i=1,2} \int_{b\Omega} l(t_1, \lambda)\gamma(t_1, \lambda) \left[\int_{b\Omega} \frac{f_i(t_1, t, \lambda)}{(t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda)(t_1^\lambda - t^\lambda)} dt^\lambda \right] dt_1^\lambda \\ &\quad + \int_{b\Omega} \left[\int_{b\Omega} \frac{g(t_1, t, \lambda)}{(t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda)(t_1^\lambda - t^\lambda)} dt^\lambda \right] dt_1^\lambda \\ &= \sum_{i=1,2} \int_{b\Omega} \frac{l(t_1, \lambda)\gamma(t_1, \lambda)}{t_1^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} \left[P.V. \int_{b\Omega} \frac{f_i(t_1, t, \lambda)}{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} dt^\lambda - \int_{b\Omega} \frac{f_i(t_1, t, \lambda)}{t^\lambda - t_1^\lambda} dt^\lambda \right] dt_1^\lambda \\ &\quad + \int_{b\Omega} \frac{1}{t_1^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} \left[P.V. \int_{b\Omega} \frac{g(t_1, t, \lambda)}{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} dt^\lambda - \int_{b\Omega} \frac{g(t_1, t, \lambda)}{t^\lambda - t_1^\lambda} dt^\lambda \right] dt_1^\lambda, \end{aligned}$$

where we denote $f_i(t_1, t, \lambda) := \overline{l(t, \lambda)} (e^{\omega_i(t, t_1, \lambda)} - e^{\omega_i(t_1, t_1, \lambda)})$ and

$$g(t_1, t, \lambda) := \overline{l(t, \lambda)} l(t_1, \lambda)\gamma(t_1, \lambda) - \gamma(t, \lambda).$$

We can write $\mathcal{M}(\bar{l}P_3)$ as

$$(6.45) \quad \mathcal{M}(\bar{l}P_3)(\zeta, \lambda) = \int_{b\Omega} \frac{k(\zeta, t_1, \lambda)}{t_1^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} dt_1^\lambda,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} k(\zeta, t_1, \lambda) &:= l(t_1, \lambda)\gamma(t_1, \lambda) \sum_{i=1}^2 (v_i(t_1, \zeta, \lambda) - v_i(t_1, t_1, \lambda)) + (w(t_1, \zeta, \lambda) - w(t_1, t_1, \lambda)), \\ v_i(t_1, \zeta, \lambda) &:= P.V. \int_{b\Omega} \frac{f_i(t_1, t, \lambda)}{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} dt^\lambda = \int_{b\Omega} \frac{f_i(t_1, t, \lambda) - f_i(t_1, \zeta, \lambda)}{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} dt^\lambda + \pi i f_i(t_1, \zeta, \lambda), \\ w(t_1, \zeta, \lambda) &:= P.V. \int_{b\Omega} \frac{g(t_1, t, \lambda)}{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} dt^\lambda = \int_{b\Omega} \frac{g(t_1, t, \lambda) - g(t_1, \zeta, \lambda)}{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} dt^\lambda + \pi i g(t_1, \zeta, \lambda). \end{aligned}$$

Let $\|\omega_i\|_{\alpha,0} := \sup_{t_1 \in b\Omega, \lambda \in [0,1]} |\omega_i(\cdot, t_1, \lambda)|_{\alpha_p}$. By Lemma 7.9 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_i(t_1, \cdot, \lambda)\|_{\nu,0} &\leq C_{1,0} \|f_i(t_1, \cdot, \lambda)\|_{\nu,0} \leq C_{1,0} \|\omega_i\|_{\alpha_p,0} |l(\cdot, \lambda)|_{\mu}, \\ \|w(t_1, \cdot, \lambda)\|_{\mu,0} &\leq C_{1,0} |g(t_1, \cdot, \lambda)|_{\mu} \leq C_{1,0} (|\gamma(\cdot, \lambda)|_0 |l(\cdot, \lambda)|_{\mu} + |\gamma(\cdot, \lambda)|_{\mu}), \end{aligned}$$

for $\nu = \min(\alpha_p, \mu)$, where the constants are uniform in $t_1 \in b\Omega$. It follows from (6.45) and Lemma 7.10 that given any $0 < \nu' < \nu$, one has

$$(6.46) \quad \|\mathcal{M}(\bar{l}P_3)\|_{\nu',0} \leq M_0,$$

for some M_0 independent of λ . Similarly we can show

$$(6.47) \quad \|\mathcal{M}(\bar{l}P_4)\|_{\nu',0} \leq M_1,$$

for some M_1 independent of λ . Combining (6.43), (6.46) and (6.47), we obtain

$$(6.48) \quad \|\mathcal{M}(Re[\bar{l}^\lambda(w_\gamma^\lambda)^+])\|_{\nu',0} \leq M, \quad 0 < \nu' < \nu,$$

where M depends only on ν' , $\|\omega_i\|_{\alpha_p,0}$, $\|l\|_{\mu,0}$ and $\|\gamma\|_{\nu,0}$.

Next, we show $\lambda \mapsto \left| \mathcal{M} \left(Re[\bar{l}^\lambda(w_\gamma^\lambda)^+] \right) \right|$ is a continuous map from $[0, 1]$ to $C^0(b\Omega)$. For simplicity, we omit the constant $\frac{1}{2\pi}$ in the operator \mathcal{M} .

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathcal{M} \left(Re \left[\bar{l}^{\lambda_1}(w_\gamma^{\lambda_1})^+ \right] \right) - \mathcal{M} \left(Re \left[\bar{l}^{\lambda_2}(w_\gamma^{\lambda_2})^+ \right] \right) \right| \\ &= \left| P.V. \int_{b\Omega} \frac{Re[(\bar{l}w_\gamma^+)(t, \lambda_1)]}{t^{\lambda_1} - \zeta^{\lambda_1}} dt^{\lambda_1} - P.V. \int_{b\Omega} \frac{Re[(\bar{l}w_\gamma^+)(t, \lambda_2)]}{t^{\lambda_2} - \zeta^{\lambda_2}} dt^{\lambda_2} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

We parametrize $b\Omega^\lambda$ by $\rho^\lambda(s)$ and set $\zeta^\lambda = \rho^\lambda(s_0)$. The above is bounded by

$$(6.49) \quad \begin{aligned} & |(\pi i) \{ Re[\bar{l}w_\gamma^+](\zeta, \lambda_1) - Re[\bar{l}w_\gamma^+](\zeta, \lambda_2) \}| + \left| \int_{b\Omega} \frac{Re[(\bar{l}w_\gamma^+)(t, \lambda_1)] - Re[(\bar{l}w_\gamma^+)(\zeta, \lambda_1)]}{t^{\lambda_1} - \zeta^{\lambda_1}} dt^{\lambda_1} \right. \\ & \left. - \int_{b\Omega} \frac{Re[(\bar{l}w_\gamma^+)(t, \lambda_2)] - Re[(\bar{l}w_\gamma^+)(\zeta, \lambda_2)]}{t^{\lambda_2} - \zeta^{\lambda_2}} dt^{\lambda_2} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

We can rewrite the above as

$$(6.50) \quad \begin{aligned} & \pi \left| \{ Re[\bar{l}w_\gamma^+](\zeta, \lambda_1) - Re[\bar{l}w_\gamma^+](\zeta, \lambda_2) \} \right| + \left| \int_{b\Omega} \frac{F^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}(s) - F^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}(s_0)}{t^{\lambda_1} - \zeta^{\lambda_1}} ds \right| \\ & + \int_{b\Omega} \left\{ Re[(\bar{l}w_\gamma^+)(t, \lambda_2)] - Re[(\bar{l}w_\gamma^+)(\zeta, \lambda_2)] \right\} \left(\frac{1}{t^{\lambda_1} - \zeta^{\lambda_1}} - \frac{1}{t^{\lambda_2} - \zeta^{\lambda_2}} \right) dt^{\lambda_2} \right|, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(6.51) \quad F^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}(s) = Re[\bar{l}w_\gamma^+](s, \lambda_1)(\rho^{\lambda_1})'(s) - Re[\bar{l}w_\gamma^+](s, \lambda_2)(\rho^{\lambda_2})'(s),$$

and we write $Re[\bar{l}w_\gamma^+](s, \lambda) := Re[\bar{l}^\lambda(w_\gamma^\lambda)^+](t^\lambda) = Re[\bar{l}^\lambda(w_\gamma^\lambda)^+](\rho^\lambda(s))$.

We claim that:

- (1) $w_\gamma^+ \in C^{\nu,0}(b\Omega^\lambda)$, that is,
 - (a) $|w_\gamma^+(\cdot, \lambda)|_\nu$ is uniformly bounded in λ .
 - (b) $|w_\gamma^+(\cdot, \lambda_1) - w_\gamma^+(\cdot, \lambda_2)|_0 \rightarrow 0$, as $|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2| \rightarrow 0$.
- (2) For any $0 < \nu' < \nu$, we have $|F^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}|_{\nu'} \rightarrow 0$ as $|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2| \rightarrow 0$.

Assuming the above for now, the expression (6.50) is then bounded by

$$\pi \left| \delta^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2} Re[\bar{l}w_\gamma^+] \right|_0 + C_{1,0} |F^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}|_{\nu'} \int_{b\Omega} \frac{ds}{|t - \zeta|^{1-\nu'}} + C_{1,0} \|lw_\gamma\|_{\nu,0} |\Gamma^{\lambda_1} - \Gamma^{\lambda_2}|_1 \int_{b\Omega} \frac{dt}{|t - \zeta|^{1-\nu}}$$

which converges to 0 uniformly in ζ as $|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2| \rightarrow 0$.

We now verify the claims. In view of (6.51) and our assumptions on l^λ and ρ^λ , to prove (2) it suffices to show that $|w_\gamma^+|_{\nu'} \rightarrow 0$.

By Proposition 2.3, it suffices to verify claim (1). By (6.41) we have

$$w_\gamma^+(\zeta, \lambda) := P_1(\zeta, \lambda) + P_2(\zeta, \lambda) + P_3(\zeta, \lambda) + P_4(\zeta, \lambda).$$

By assumption $P_1, P_2 \in C^{\nu,0}(b\Omega^\lambda)$, and

$$(6.52) \quad \|P_1\|_{\mu,0} \leq \|l\gamma\|_{\mu,0}, \quad \|P_2\|_{\mu,0} \leq \|l\gamma\|_{\mu,0}.$$

Applying Lemma 7.10 to the expression (6.44) for P_3 , we have for any $0 < \nu' < \nu$,

$$(6.53) \quad \|P_3(\cdot, \lambda)\|_{\nu', 0} \leq C_{\nu'} C_{1,0} \|l\gamma\|_{\mu, 0},$$

where the constants are independent of λ . In the same way we have

$$(6.54) \quad \|P_4\|_{\alpha', 0} \leq C_{\alpha'} C_{1,0} \|l\gamma\|_{0,0}$$

for any $0 < \alpha'_p < \alpha_p$. Putting together (6.52), (6.53) and (6.54), we obtain $\|w_\gamma^+\|_{\nu', 0} \leq A_{\nu'} C_{1,0} \|l\gamma\|_{\mu, 0}$ for any $0 < \nu' < \nu < 1$. This proves claim (1).

Next we show the continuity of w_γ^+ in the C^0 -norm.

$$(6.55) \quad |w_\gamma^+(\zeta, \lambda_1) - w_\gamma^+(\zeta, \lambda_2)| \leq \sum_{i=1}^4 |P_i(\zeta, \lambda_1) - P_i(\zeta, \lambda_2)|.$$

In view of (6.41), we have $|P_i(\zeta, \lambda_1) - P_i(\zeta, \lambda_2)| \leq C|l(\zeta, \lambda_1)\gamma(\zeta, \lambda_1) - l(\zeta, \lambda_2)\gamma(\zeta, \lambda_2)|$, for $i = 1, 2$, which converges to 0 as $|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2| \rightarrow 0$, since $l, \gamma \in C^{\mu, 0}(b\Omega^\lambda)$. By expression (6.44) for P_3 , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |P_3(\zeta, \lambda_1) - P_3(\zeta, \lambda_2)| &\leq \sum_{i=1,2} \int_{b\Omega} \frac{(l\gamma)(t, \lambda_1)}{2(t^{\lambda_1} - \zeta^{\lambda_1})} \left(e^{\omega_i(\zeta, t, \lambda_1)} - e^{\omega_i(t, t, \lambda_1)} \right) (\rho^{\lambda_1})'(s) ds \\ &\quad - \int_{b\Omega} \frac{(l\gamma)(t, \lambda_2)}{2(t^{\lambda_2} - \zeta^{\lambda_2})} \left(e^{\omega_i(\zeta, t, \lambda_2)} - e^{\omega_i(t, t, \lambda_2)} \right) (\rho^{\lambda_2})'(s) ds \\ &\quad + \int_{b\Omega} \frac{1}{t^{\lambda_1} - \zeta^{\lambda_1}} \{ (l\gamma)(t, \lambda_1) - (l\gamma)(\zeta, \lambda_1) \} (\rho^{\lambda_1})'(s) ds \\ &\quad - \int_{b\Omega} \frac{1}{t^{\lambda_2} - \zeta^{\lambda_2}} \{ (l\gamma)(t, \lambda_2) - (l\gamma)(\zeta, \lambda_2) \} (\rho^{\lambda_2})'(s) ds. \end{aligned}$$

The above expression can be bounded by a sum of the following terms:

$$(6.56) \quad \sum_{i=1,2} \int_{b\Omega} \{ (l\gamma\rho')(s, \lambda_1) - (l\gamma\rho')(s, \lambda_2) \} \frac{e^{\omega_i(\zeta, t, \lambda_1)} - e^{\omega_i(t, t, \lambda_1)}}{t^{\lambda_1} - \zeta^{\lambda_1}} ds,$$

$$(6.57) \quad \sum_{i=1,2} \int_{b\Omega} (l\gamma)(s, \lambda_2) \frac{F_i^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}(\zeta) - F_i^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}(t)}{t^{\lambda_1} - \zeta^{\lambda_1}} dt^{\lambda_2},$$

$$(6.58) \quad \sum_{i=1,2} \int_{b\Omega} (l\gamma)(s, \lambda_2) \left(e^{\omega_i(\zeta, t, \lambda_2)} - e^{\omega_i(t, t, \lambda_2)} \right) \left(\frac{1}{t^{\lambda_1} - \zeta^{\lambda_1}} - \frac{1}{t^{\lambda_2} - \zeta^{\lambda_2}} \right) dt^{\lambda_2},$$

$$(6.59) \quad \int_{b\Omega} \frac{\tilde{F}^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}(t) - \tilde{F}^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}(\zeta)}{t^{\lambda_1} - \zeta^{\lambda_1}} ds,$$

$$(6.60) \quad \int_{b\Omega} \{ (l\gamma)(t, \lambda_2) - (l\gamma)(\zeta, \lambda_2) \} \left(\frac{1}{t^{\lambda_1} - \zeta^{\lambda_1}} - \frac{1}{t^{\lambda_2} - \zeta^{\lambda_2}} \right) dt^{\lambda_2},$$

where we set

$$F_i^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}(\zeta) = e^{\omega_i(\zeta, t, \lambda_1)} - e^{\omega_i(\zeta, t, \lambda_2)}, \quad \tilde{F}^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}(\zeta) = (l\gamma\rho')(\zeta, \lambda_1) - (l\gamma\rho')(\zeta, \lambda_2).$$

As before we let $\|\omega_i\|_{\alpha_p, 0} = \sup_{\lambda \in [0, 1], t \in b\Omega} |\omega_i(\cdot, t, \lambda)|_{\alpha_p}$. Then expression (6.56) is bounded by

$$C_{1,0}(\sum_{i=1,2} \|\omega_i\|_{\alpha_p, 0}) |\delta^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}(l\gamma\rho')|_0 \int_{b\Omega} \frac{1}{|\zeta - t|^{1-\alpha_p}} ds, \quad \alpha_p = \frac{p-2}{p},$$

which converges to 0 as $|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2| \rightarrow 0$ by assumption. Also expression (6.58) is bounded by

$$C_{1,0}(\sum_{i=1,2} \|\omega_i\|_{\alpha_p, 0}) |\Gamma^{\lambda_1} - \Gamma^{\lambda_2}|_1 \int_{b\Omega} \frac{1}{|t - \zeta|^{1-\alpha_p}} dt,$$

which converges to 0 as $|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2| \rightarrow 0$, and expression (6.60) is bounded by

$$C_{1,0} \|l\gamma\|_{\mu,0} |\Gamma^{\lambda_1} - \Gamma^{\lambda_2}|_1 \int_{b\Omega} \frac{1}{|t - \zeta|^{1-\mu}} dt$$

which converges to 0 as $|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2| \rightarrow 0$. Finally in order to show (6.57) and (6.59) converges to 0 it suffices to see that some Hölder norms of $F_i^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}$ and $\tilde{F}^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}$ converge to 0. This follows from Lemma 2.3 and the following facts:

- (1) $|F_i^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}|_{\alpha_p} \leq C \|\omega_i\|_{\alpha_p, 0}$;
- (2) $|F_i^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}|_0 \rightarrow 0$ as $|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2| \rightarrow 0$, by Lemma 5.4;
- (3) $\Gamma^\lambda \in C^{1+\mu, 0}(\overline{\Omega})$, $l^\lambda, \gamma^\lambda \in C^{\mu, 0}(b\Omega^\lambda)$.

Hence we have shown that $\lambda \mapsto P_3(\cdot, \lambda)$ is a continuous map from $[0, 1]$ to $C^0(b\Omega)$. Same can be said for $P_4(\cdot, \lambda)$, of which the proof is similar and we leave it to the reader.

Now claim (1) (b) follows from (6.55). By earlier remarks this proves that the map $\lambda \mapsto \left| \mathcal{M}^\lambda \left(\text{Re}[\bar{l}^\lambda(w_\gamma^+)] \right) \right|$ is continuous from $[0, 1]$ to $C^0(b\Omega)$. Combining this with (6.48), we have shown that for any $0 < \nu' < \nu$, $\mathcal{M} \left(\text{Re}[\bar{l}^\lambda(w_\gamma^+)] \right) \in C^{\nu', 0}(b\Omega^\lambda)$. Next, we show that $\mathcal{M} \left(\text{Re}[\bar{l}w_F] \right) \in C^{\nu, 0}(b\Omega^\lambda)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}(\text{Re}[\bar{l}w_F])(\zeta, \lambda) &= \frac{1}{2\pi} P.V. \int_{b\Omega} \frac{\text{Re}[\bar{l}w_F]}{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} dt^\lambda \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \left\{ \int_{b\Omega} \frac{\text{Re}[\bar{l}w_F](t, \lambda) - \text{Re}[\bar{l}w_F](\zeta, \lambda)}{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} dt^\lambda + \pi i \text{Re}[\bar{l}w_F](\zeta, \lambda) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 7.9, we get

$$(6.61) \quad \|\mathcal{M}(\text{Re}[\bar{l}w_F])\|_{\nu, 0} \leq C_{1,0} \|lw_F\|_{\nu, 0} \leq C_{1,0} \|l\|_{\mu, 0} \|w_F\|_{\alpha_p, 0}.$$

Using estimate (6.17) in (6.61) we get

$$(6.62) \quad \|\mathcal{M}(\text{Re}[\bar{l}w_F])\|_{\nu, 0} \leq C_{1,0} C_p \|l\|_{\mu, 0} (\sum_{i=1,2} \|\omega_i\|_{\alpha_p, 0}) \sup_{\lambda \in [0,1]} |F(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\Omega)}.$$

On the other hand, as we have seen, in order to show that $\mathcal{M}(\text{Re}[\bar{l}w_F])$ is continuous in λ in the sup norm, it is sufficient to show $w_F^\lambda \in C^{\alpha_p, 0}(b\Omega^\lambda)$, which is given by Lemma 6.4. Thus we have proved that $\mathcal{M}(\text{Re}[\bar{l}w_F]) \in C^{\nu, 0}(b\Omega^\lambda)$, and it satisfies estimate (6.62). Combining with estimates (6.48) we obtain that for any $0 < \nu' < \nu$, $\|M^\lambda \gamma_0(\cdot, \lambda)\|_{\nu', 0} \leq M_1$, where M_1 is some positive constant depending on ν' , $\|\omega_i\|_{\alpha_p, 0}$, $\|l\|_{\mu, 0}$, $\|\gamma\|_{\mu, 0}$, and $\sup_{\lambda \in [0,1]} |F(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\Omega)}$.

Step 5: Estimates for η^λ

We are now ready to show that $\eta^\lambda \in C^{\nu, 0}(b\Omega^\lambda)$. Recall from (6.40) that $\eta(\cdot, \lambda)$ satisfies the reduced Fredholm integral equation:

$$(6.63) \quad (I + \mathcal{N})\eta(\zeta, \lambda) := \eta(\zeta, \lambda) + \int_{b\Omega} \frac{k(\zeta, t, \lambda)}{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} \eta(t, \lambda) dt^\lambda = \mathcal{M}\gamma_0(\zeta, \lambda),$$

where $k = \sum_{i=1}^4 k_i$, and the k_i -s are given by (6.26), (6.32), (6.35) and (6.38).

Let $w = w_\eta(z, \lambda) + w_\gamma(z, \lambda) + w_F(z, \lambda)$ where w_η^λ , w_γ^λ and w_F^λ are given by formulas (6.7) (6.8) and (6.9) respectively. For $(\zeta, \lambda) \in b\Omega \times [0, 1]$, we have $w(\zeta, \lambda) = l(\zeta, \lambda)\gamma(\zeta, \lambda) + il(\zeta, \lambda)\eta(\zeta, \lambda)$. Hence we have the relation: for $(\zeta, \lambda) \in b\Omega \times [0, 1]$

$$(6.64) \quad w_\eta(\zeta, \lambda) = l(\zeta, \lambda)\gamma(\zeta, \lambda) + il(\zeta, \lambda)\eta(\zeta, \lambda) - w_\gamma(\zeta, \lambda) - w_F(\zeta, \lambda).$$

Now, for each fixed λ we know by Proposition 3.9 that $\eta^\lambda \in C^\nu(b\Omega^\lambda)$, and we know that $w_\eta(\cdot, \lambda)$ is the solution to the following Problem A:

$$(6.65) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_{\bar{z}} w_\eta^\lambda(z) + A^\lambda(z) w_\eta(z) + B^\lambda(z) \overline{w_\eta^\lambda(z)} &= 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega^\lambda; \\ \operatorname{Re}[\overline{l^\lambda(\zeta)} w_\eta^\lambda(\zeta)] &= \gamma^\lambda(\zeta) - \operatorname{Re}[\overline{l^\lambda} w_\gamma^\lambda](\zeta) - \operatorname{Re}[\overline{l^\lambda} w_F^\lambda](\zeta) \quad \text{on } b\Omega^\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

In addition w_η^λ satisfies conditions (6.12).

We now prove that $\eta^\lambda \in C^{\nu,0}(b\Omega^\lambda)$. First, we show that $|\eta|_0$ is bounded in λ . Seeking contradiction, suppose that for some sequence $\{\lambda_j\}$ converging to λ_0 , such that $N_j := |\eta(\cdot, \lambda_j)|_0 \rightarrow \infty$. Let $\widehat{\eta}(\cdot, \lambda_j) = \frac{1}{N_j} \eta(\cdot, \lambda)$. Then $|\widehat{\eta}(\cdot, \lambda)|_0 = 1$. Dividing both sides of (6.63) by N_j , we have

$$(6.66) \quad (I + \mathcal{N})\widehat{\eta}(\zeta, \lambda_j) = N_j^{-1} \mathcal{M}\gamma_0.$$

The corresponding $w_{\widehat{\eta}}(\cdot, \lambda_j)$ is the solution to the following boundary value problem:

$$(6.67) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_{\bar{z}} w_{\widehat{\eta}}^{\lambda_j}(z) + A(z, \lambda_j) w_{\widehat{\eta}}(z, \lambda_j) + B(z, \lambda_j) \overline{w_{\widehat{\eta}}(z, \lambda_j)} &= 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega; \\ \operatorname{Re}[\overline{l(\zeta, \lambda_j)} w_{\widehat{\eta}}(\zeta, \lambda_j)] &= \frac{1}{N_j} \{ \gamma(\zeta, \lambda_j) - \operatorname{Re}[\overline{l} w_\gamma](\zeta, \lambda_j) - \operatorname{Re}[\overline{l} w_F](\zeta, \lambda_j) \} \quad \text{on } b\Omega, \end{aligned}$$

and in addition $w_{\widehat{\eta}}^{\lambda_j}$ satisfies the conditions: for $r = 1, \dots, N_0$ and $s = 1, \dots, N_1$,

$$(6.68) \quad w_{\widehat{\eta}}(z_r, \lambda_j) = \frac{1}{N_j} \{ a_r(\lambda_j) + i b_r(\lambda_j) - w_\gamma(z_r, \lambda_j) - w_F(z_r, \lambda_j) \},$$

$$(6.69) \quad w_{\widehat{\eta}}^+(z'_s, \lambda_j) = \frac{1}{N_j} \{ l(z'_s, \lambda_j)(\gamma(z'_s, \lambda_j) + i c_s(\lambda_j)) - w_\gamma^+(z'_s, \lambda_j) - w_F(z'_s, \lambda_j) \}.$$

By Lemma 7.5 and our earlier estimate for k , we have for any $0 < \nu' < \nu$, $|\mathcal{N}\widehat{\eta}(\cdot, \lambda_j)|_{\nu'}$ is uniformly bounded in λ . By Arzela-Ascoli theorem, and passing to subsequences if necessary, $\mathcal{N}\widehat{\eta}(\cdot, \lambda_j)$ converges to some function in the $C^\tau(b\Omega)$ norm, for any $0 < \tau < \nu$. It follows from equation (6.66) that $\widehat{\eta}(\cdot, \lambda_j)$ converges to some function $\widetilde{\eta}$ in $C^\tau(b\Omega)$.

Let

$$\begin{aligned} 2\pi w_{\widehat{\eta}}(z, \lambda_j) &= \int_{b\Omega} \left\{ G_1(z, t, \lambda_j) l(t, \lambda_j) \widehat{\eta}(t, \lambda_j) dt^{\lambda_j} - G_2(z, t, \lambda_j) \overline{l(t, \lambda_j)} \widehat{\eta}(t, \lambda_j) dt^{\lambda_j} \right\}, \\ w_{\widehat{\eta}}^{\lambda_0}(z) &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{b\Omega} G_1(z, t, \lambda_0) l(t, \lambda_0) \widetilde{\eta}(t) dt^{\lambda_0} - \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{b\Omega} G_2(z, t, \lambda_0) \overline{l(t, \lambda_0)} \widetilde{\eta}(t) dt^{\lambda_0}. \end{aligned}$$

From (6.66) we have $\widehat{\eta}(\zeta, \lambda_j) = -\mathcal{N}\widehat{\eta}(\zeta, \lambda_j) + \frac{1}{N_j} \mathcal{M}\gamma_0$. By Lemma 7.5, we have for any $0 < \nu' < \nu$ and some constants C independent of λ ,

$$(6.70) \quad |\widehat{\eta}(\cdot, \lambda_j)|_{\nu'} \leq C_{\nu'} C_{1,0} |\widehat{\eta}(\cdot, \lambda_j)|_0 + \frac{1}{N_j} \|\mathcal{M}\gamma_0\|_{\nu'} = C.$$

Let $\{\{z_r\}_{r=1}^{N_0}, \{z_s\}_{s=1}^{N_1}\}$ be a normally distributed set in Ω . Then it is easy to see that $w_{\widehat{\eta}}(z_r, \lambda_i)$ converges to $w_{\widehat{\eta}}^{\lambda_0}(z_r)$, since for $z_r \in \Omega$, the kernels G_1 and G_2 are uniformly bounded in absolute value by a constant.

On the other hand, for $z'_s \in b\Omega$, we apply the jump formula (7.6) to get

$$\begin{aligned} w_{\widehat{\eta}}^+(z'_s, \lambda) &= \frac{1}{2} l(z'_s, \lambda) \widehat{\eta}(z'_s) + P.V. \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{b\Omega} G_1(z'_s, t, \lambda) l(t, \lambda) \widehat{\eta}(t, \lambda) dt^\lambda \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{b\Omega} G_2(z'_s, t, \lambda) l(t, \lambda) \widehat{\eta}(t, \lambda) dt^\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

In the same way as we did earlier for w_γ^+ , together with (6.70), one can prove that

$$|w_{\widehat{\eta}}^+(z'_s, \lambda_j) - (w_{\widehat{\eta}}^{\lambda_0})^+(z'_s)| \rightarrow 0, \quad s = 1, \dots, N_2$$

as $|\lambda_j - \lambda_0| \rightarrow 0$. In fact same proof shows that $|w_{\tilde{\eta}}(\cdot, \lambda_j) - w_{\tilde{\eta}}^{\lambda_0}(\cdot)|_{C^0(\overline{\Omega})} \rightarrow 0$. Gathering the results and letting $|\lambda_j - \lambda_0| \rightarrow 0$ in (6.67), (6.68) and (6.69), we see that $w_{\tilde{\eta}}$ is the solution to

$$\begin{cases} \partial_{\bar{z}} w_{\tilde{\eta}}(z) + A^{\lambda_0}(z) w_{\tilde{\eta}}(z) + B^{\lambda_0}(z) \overline{w_{\tilde{\eta}}(z)} = 0 & \text{in } \Omega^{\lambda_0}; \\ \operatorname{Re}[l^{\lambda_0}(\zeta) w_{\tilde{\eta}}(\zeta)] = 0 & \text{on } b\Omega^{\lambda_0}, \end{cases}$$

satisfying the conditions

$$w_{\tilde{\eta}}^{\lambda_0}(z_r) = 0, \quad (w_{\tilde{\eta}}^{\lambda_0})^+(z'_s) = 0, \quad r = 1, \dots, N_1, \quad s = 1, \dots, N_2.$$

By Proposition 3.8, we have $w_{\tilde{\eta}}^{\lambda_0} \equiv 0$ in Ω^{λ_0} . By (6.64), we have

$$w_{\tilde{\eta}}(t, \lambda_j) + w_{\gamma}(t, \lambda_j) + w_F(t, \lambda_j) = l(t, \lambda_j) \gamma(t, \lambda_j) + il(t, \lambda_j) \tilde{\eta}(t, \lambda_j), \quad t \in b\Omega.$$

Dividing on both sides by N_j we get

$$w_{\tilde{\eta}}(t, \lambda_j) + \frac{1}{N_j} w_{\gamma}(t, \lambda_j) + \frac{1}{N_j} w_F(t, \lambda_j) = \frac{1}{N_j} l(t, \lambda_j) \gamma(t, \lambda_j) + il(t, \lambda_j) \tilde{\eta}(t, \lambda_j), \quad t \in b\Omega.$$

Letting $|\lambda_j - \lambda_0| \rightarrow 0$, the left-hand side converges uniformly to $w_{\tilde{\eta}}^{\lambda_0} \equiv 0$. Hence the right-hand side converges uniformly to 0. Since $|l(t, \lambda_j)|$ is bounded below by a positive constant uniform in t and λ , and $\tilde{\eta}(t, \lambda_j)$ converges uniformly to $\tilde{\eta}$, we conclude that $\tilde{\eta} \equiv 0$.

On the other hand we have $|\tilde{\eta}|_0 = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} |\tilde{\eta}(\cdot, \lambda_j)|_0 = 1$, which is a contradiction. This shows that $|\eta(\cdot, \lambda)|_0$ is bounded in λ . It then follows by (6.63), which can be written as $\eta^\lambda = -\mathcal{N}^\lambda \eta^\lambda + \mathcal{M}^\lambda \gamma_0^\lambda$, and Lemma 7.10 that for any $0 < \nu' < \nu$,

$$\|\eta\|_{\nu', 0} = \|\mathcal{N}\eta\|_{\nu', 0} + \|\mathcal{M}\gamma_0\|_{\nu, 0} \leq C_{\nu'} C_{1,0} \|\eta\|_{0,0}.$$

Next we show $\eta(\cdot, \lambda)$ is continuous in λ in the $C^0(b\Omega)$ -norm. Suppose this is not the case, then there exists some λ_0 and a sequence $\lambda_j \rightarrow \lambda_0$, such that $|\eta(\cdot, \lambda_j) - \eta(\cdot, \lambda_0)|_0 \geq \varepsilon > 0$. Since we have shown that $|\eta(\cdot, \lambda)|_{\nu'}$ is bounded for any $0 < \nu' < \nu$, passing to a subsequence if necessary, we have that $\eta(\cdot, \lambda_j)$ converges to some η^* in the $C^{\nu'}(b\Omega)$ -norm. As before we can show that $w_{\eta}(\zeta, \lambda_0)$ converges to $w_{\eta^*}(\zeta)$ uniformly on $b\Omega$. Letting $|\lambda_j - \lambda_0| \rightarrow 0$ in (6.65) and (6.12), we see that w_{η^*} is a solution to the following Problem A:

$$(6.71) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_{\bar{z}} w_{\eta^*}(z) + A^{\lambda_0}(z) w_{\eta^*}(z) + B^{\lambda_0}(z) \overline{w_{\eta^*}(z)} = 0, & \text{in } \Omega; \\ \operatorname{Re}[l^{\lambda_0}(\zeta) w_{\eta^*}(\zeta)] = \gamma(\zeta, \lambda_0) - \operatorname{Re}[l^{\lambda_0}(\zeta) w_{\gamma}^{\lambda_0}(\zeta)] - \operatorname{Re}[l^{\lambda_0}(\zeta) w_F^{\lambda_0}(\zeta)], & \text{on } b\Omega, \end{cases}$$

and in addition w_{η^*} satisfies the condition:

$$\begin{aligned} w_{\eta^*}(z_r^{\lambda_0}) &= a_r(\lambda_0) + ib_r(\lambda) - w_{\gamma}(z_r, \lambda_0) - w_F(z_r, \lambda_0), \quad r = 1, \dots, N_1; \\ w_{\eta^*}^+(z'_s)^{\lambda_0} &= l(z'_s, \lambda_0)(\gamma(z'_s, \lambda_0) + ic_s(\lambda_0)) - w_{\gamma}^+(z'_s, \lambda_0) - w_F(z'_s, \lambda_0), \quad s = 1, \dots, N_2. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have assumed that $\eta(\cdot, \lambda_0)$ is also a solution to (6.71) satisfying the above conditions. Hence by Proposition 3.8 we have $w_{\eta}(\cdot, \lambda_0) = w_{\eta^*}(\cdot)$. Now by (6.64), we have for $\zeta \in b\Omega$

$$(6.72) \quad w_{\eta}(\zeta, \lambda_0) = l(\zeta, \lambda_0) \gamma(\zeta, \lambda_0) + il(\zeta, \lambda_0) \eta(\zeta, \lambda_0) - w_{\gamma}(\zeta, \lambda_0) - w_F(\zeta, \lambda_0);$$

$$(6.73) \quad w_{\eta}(\zeta, \lambda_j) = l(\zeta, \lambda_j) \gamma(\zeta, \lambda_j) + il(\zeta, \lambda_j) \eta(\zeta, \lambda_j) - w_{\gamma}(\zeta, \lambda_j) - w_F(\zeta, \lambda_j).$$

By using the fact that $|\eta^\lambda|_{\nu'}$ ($\nu' > 0$) is uniformly bounded in λ , we see by the same argument as before that $w_{\eta}(\cdot, \lambda_j)$ converges uniformly to w_{η^*} on $b\Omega$, as $|\lambda_j - \lambda_0| \rightarrow 0$. Passing the limit in equation (6.73) we get

$$w_{\eta}(\zeta, \lambda_0) = w_{\eta^*}(\zeta) = l(\zeta, \lambda_0) \gamma(\zeta, \lambda_0) + il(\zeta, \lambda_0) \eta^*(\zeta) - w_{\gamma}(\zeta, \lambda_0) - w_F(\zeta, \lambda_0), \quad \zeta \in b\Omega.$$

Comparing this with equation (6.72), we get $\eta^*(\zeta) = \eta(\zeta, \lambda_0)$. But we also have $|\eta^*(\cdot) - \eta(\cdot, \lambda_0)|_0 \geq \varepsilon > 0$, which is impossible. Hence we conclude that $\eta(\cdot, \lambda)$ is continuous in λ in the $C^0(b\Omega)$ norm, and $\eta^\lambda \in C^{\nu', 0}(b\Omega^\lambda)$ for any $0 < \nu' < \nu$.

Now by the proof of Lemma 6.3 in Step 2 one can show that $w_\eta^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{\nu,0}(b\Omega^\lambda)$.

6.2. The $\mathcal{C}^{\nu,0}$ estimate. In this section we prove part (ii) of Theorem 6.1, namely we show that the solution $w^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{\nu,0}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$ found in part (i) is in fact in the class $\mathcal{C}^{\nu,0}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$.

First we make a reduction to the case $F^\lambda \equiv 0$. Recall that A^λ , B^λ and F^λ are taken to be zero outside Ω^λ . So we can write

$$(6.74) \quad w_F(z, \lambda) = -\frac{1}{\pi} \iint_{\mathbb{C}} G_1(z, \zeta, \lambda) F(\zeta, \lambda) dA(\zeta^\lambda) - \frac{1}{\pi} \iint_{\mathbb{C}} G_2(z, \zeta, \lambda) \overline{F(\zeta, \lambda)} dA(\zeta^\lambda).$$

By Lemma 6.4, $w_F^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha_p,0}(\mathbb{C})$. Furthermore, w_F^λ satisfies the equation

$$\partial_{\overline{z^\lambda}} w_F^\lambda(z^\lambda) + A^\lambda(z^\lambda) w_F^\lambda(z^\lambda) + B^\lambda(z^\lambda) \overline{w_F^\lambda(z^\lambda)} = F^\lambda(z^\lambda), \quad z \in \Omega.$$

Now let w_*^λ be the solution to the following boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_{\overline{z^\lambda}} w_*^\lambda(z^\lambda) + A^\lambda(z^\lambda) w_*^\lambda(z^\lambda) + B^\lambda(z^\lambda) \overline{w_*^\lambda(z^\lambda)} = 0 & z \in \Omega; \\ \operatorname{Re}[\overline{l^\lambda} w_*^\lambda](\zeta^\lambda) = \gamma^\lambda(\zeta^\lambda) - \operatorname{Re}[\overline{l^\lambda} w_F^\lambda](\zeta^\lambda) & \zeta \in b\Omega, \end{cases}$$

and in addition w_*^λ satisfies the conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} w_*(z_r, \lambda) &= a_r(\lambda) + ib_r(\lambda) - w_F(z_r, \lambda) \\ w_*^+(z'_s, \lambda) &= l(z'_s, \lambda)(\gamma(z'_s, \lambda) + ic_s(\lambda)) - w_F(z'_s, \lambda) \end{aligned}$$

on the normally distributed set $\{\{z_r\}_{r=1}^{N_0}, \{z'_s\}_{s=1}^{N_1}\}$. Then any solution to the original boundary value problem (6.1) satisfying condition (6.2) equal to $w_*^\lambda + w_F^\lambda$. Since $w_F^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha_p}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$, it suffices to consider the following boundary value problem for w_*^λ :

$$(6.75) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_{\overline{z^\lambda}} w_*^\lambda(z^\lambda) + A(z, \lambda) w_*^\lambda(z^\lambda) + B(z, \lambda) \overline{w_*^\lambda(z^\lambda)} = 0 & z \in \Omega; \\ \operatorname{Re}[\overline{l^\lambda} w_*^\lambda](\zeta^\lambda) = \gamma^\lambda(\zeta^\lambda) & \zeta \in b\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $\gamma^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{\nu,0}(b\Omega^\lambda)$, for $\nu = \min(\alpha_p, \mu)$.

We now use an idea of Vekua to reduce problem (6.75) to one on simply-connected domain. First we introduce some notations. For a bounded domain Ω whose boundary consists of $m+1$ connected component, we denote by $b\Omega_0$ the outer boundary of Ω , and we let Ω_0 be the bounded simply-connected domain interior to the contour $b\Omega_0$. We denote the boundary of the holes in the interior of Ω_0 by $b\Omega_j$, for $1 \leq j \leq m$, and we let Ω_j be the unbounded domain exterior to the contour $b\Omega_j$.

By (3.31), we can write the solution of problem (6.75) in the form

$$(6.76) \quad w_*(z, \lambda) = w_0(z, \lambda) + \cdots + w_m(z, \lambda), \quad z \in \Omega,$$

where for $0 \leq j \leq m$, we set

$$(6.77) \quad w_j(z, \lambda) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{b\Omega_j} G_1(z, t, \lambda) w_*(t, \lambda) dt^\lambda + G_2(z, t, \lambda) \overline{w_*(t, \lambda)} \overline{dt^\lambda}.$$

Fix j_0 with $0 \leq j_0 \leq m$, we claim that for all $j \neq j_0$, $w_j^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{\nu,0}(b\Omega_{j_0}^\lambda)$. Assuming this for now, then $w_{j_0}^\lambda$ is a solution to the boundary value problem

$$(6.78) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_{\overline{z^\lambda}} w_{j_0}^\lambda(z^\lambda) + A(z, \lambda) w_{j_0}^\lambda(z^\lambda) + B(z, \lambda) \overline{w_{j_0}^\lambda(z^\lambda)} &= 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega_{j_0}^\lambda; \\ \operatorname{Re}[\overline{l(z, \lambda)} w_{j_0}^\lambda(z^\lambda)] &= \gamma_{j_0}(z, \lambda) \quad \text{on } b\Omega_{j_0}^\lambda, \end{aligned}$$

where $\gamma_{j_0}^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{\nu,0}(b\Omega_{j_0}^\lambda)$ with $\gamma_{j_0}(z, \lambda) := \gamma(z, \lambda) - \sum_{j \neq j_0} \operatorname{Re}[\overline{l(z, \lambda)} w_j^\lambda(z^\lambda)]$.

If $j_0 = 0$, the above problem reduces to the earlier case on bounded simply-connected domain. For $j_0 \geq 1$, we need to invert the unbounded domain Ω_{j_0} . We fix some point a_{j_0} in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \Omega_{j_0}$ such

that $\text{dist}(a_{j_0}, b\Omega_{j_0}^\lambda) \geq c > 0$ for all λ . By a substitution $z^\lambda = \varphi(\zeta^\lambda) = \frac{1}{\zeta^\lambda - a_{j_0}}$, we have for each fixed $\lambda \in [0, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\zeta^\lambda} w_{j_0}^\lambda \left(\varphi(\zeta^\lambda) \right) &= \partial_{z^\lambda} w_{j_0}^\lambda(z^\lambda) \cdot \partial_{\zeta^\lambda} \overline{\varphi} \\ &= -\overline{\partial_{\zeta^\lambda} \varphi} A^\lambda(z^\lambda) w_{j_0}^\lambda(z^\lambda) - \overline{\partial_{\zeta^\lambda} \varphi} B^\lambda(z^\lambda) \overline{w_{j_0}^\lambda(z^\lambda)}. \end{aligned}$$

Set $\tilde{w}_{j_0}(\zeta, \lambda) = w_{j_0}^\lambda(\varphi(\zeta^\lambda))$, $\tilde{A}(\zeta, \lambda) = \overline{(\partial_{\zeta^\lambda} \varphi)} A^\lambda(\varphi^{-1}(\zeta^\lambda))$, $\tilde{B}(\zeta, \lambda) = \overline{(\partial_{\zeta^\lambda} \varphi)} B^\lambda(\varphi^{-1}(\zeta^\lambda))$, $\tilde{l}(\zeta, \lambda) = l^\lambda(\varphi(\zeta^\lambda))$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_j(\zeta, \lambda) = \gamma_j^\lambda(\varphi(\zeta^\lambda))$, where $\Gamma^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{1+\mu, 0}(\mathbb{C})$ is the extension of Γ^λ . Problem (6.78) then becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\zeta^\lambda} \tilde{w}_{j_0}(\zeta, \lambda) + \tilde{A}(\zeta, \lambda) \tilde{w}_{j_0}(\zeta, \lambda) + \tilde{B}(\zeta, \lambda) \overline{\tilde{w}_{j_0}(\zeta, \lambda)} &= 0, \quad \text{in } D_{j_0}^\lambda; \\ \text{Re} \left[\overline{\tilde{l}(\zeta, \lambda)} \tilde{w}_{j_0}(\zeta) \right] &= \tilde{\gamma}_{j_0}(\zeta, \lambda), \quad \text{on } bD_{j_0}^\lambda, \end{aligned}$$

where $D_{j_0}^\lambda$ (resp. $bD_{j_0}^\lambda$) is the image of $\Omega_{j_0}^\lambda$ (resp. $b\Omega_{j_0}^\lambda$), under the map $\varphi^{-1} : z^\lambda \mapsto \zeta^\lambda = \frac{1}{z^\lambda} + a$. Now, $\{D_{j_0}^\lambda\}$ is a family of bounded simply-connected domains in the class $\mathcal{C}^{1+\mu, 0}$. Note that since A^λ, B^λ vanish outside Ω^λ and in particular near infinity, we have $\tilde{A}^\lambda \equiv \tilde{B}^\lambda \equiv 0$ when ζ^λ is near a_{j_0} , and $\tilde{A}(\cdot, \lambda), \tilde{B}(\cdot, \lambda)$ satisfy the same assumptions as $A(\cdot, \lambda)$ and $B(\cdot, \lambda)$. It is clear that $\tilde{l}, \tilde{\gamma}_{j_0} \in \mathcal{C}^{\nu, 0}(bD_{j_0}^\lambda)$.

We can now apply Theorem 4.7 to the family of bounded simply-connected domains $D_{j_0}^\lambda$, and we get $\tilde{w}_{j_0} \in \mathcal{C}^{\nu, 0}(\overline{D_{j_0}^\lambda})$, for each $0 \leq j_0 \leq m$. (Note that the conditions on the normally distributed set are trivially satisfied since we already know from part (i) that $w_*^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{\nu^-, 0}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$, and hence by Proposition 7.12 one has $w_{j_0}^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{\nu^-, 0}(\overline{\Omega_{j_0}^\lambda})$.) Since $w_{j_0}^\lambda(z^\lambda) = \tilde{w}_{j_0}(\varphi^{-1}(z^\lambda))$, we have $w_{j_0}^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{\nu, 0}(\overline{\Omega_{j_0}^\lambda})$, for each $0 \leq j_0 \leq m$. In view of (6.76), we get $w_*^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{\nu, 0}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$.

It remains to prove for each j_0 and $j \neq j_0$, we have $w_j^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{\nu, 0}(b\Omega_{j_0}^\lambda)$. First we show that w_j^λ is continuous in the $C^0(b\Omega_{j_0})$ -norm. Let $d_\ell = \text{dist}(b\Omega_j, b\Omega_{j_0})$ and $dt^\lambda = a(s, \lambda) ds$. By (6.77), we have for $z \in b\Omega_{j_0}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &|w_j(z, \lambda_1) - w_j(z, \lambda_2)| \\ &\leq C \sum_{i=1, 2} \int_{b\Omega_j} |\delta^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2} G_i(z, \cdot)| |w_*(t, \lambda_1)| dt^{\lambda_1} + |G_i(z, t, \lambda_2)| |\delta^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}(w_*)(t)| ds \\ &\leq \|w_*\|_{0, 0} \int_{b\Omega_j} \frac{\sum_{i=1, 2} |e^{\omega_i(z, t, \lambda_1)} - e^{\omega_i(z, t, \lambda_2)}|}{|t^{\lambda_1} - z^{\lambda_1}|} dt^{\lambda_1} \\ &\quad + \|w_*\|_{0, 0} \int_{b\Omega_j} \sum_{i=1}^2 \left| e^{\omega_i(z, t, \lambda_2)} \right| \left| \frac{1}{|t^{\lambda_1} - z^{\lambda_1}|} - \frac{1}{|t^{\lambda_2} - z^{\lambda_2}|} \right| dt^{\lambda_1} \\ &\quad + \int_{b\Omega_j} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^2 |e^{\omega_i(z, t, \lambda_2)}|}{|t^{\lambda_2} - z^{\lambda_2}|} |\delta^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}(w_*)(s)| ds. \end{aligned}$$

For $z \in b\Omega_{j_0}$ and $t \in b\Omega_j'$, we have $|t^\lambda - z^\lambda|$ is bounded below by some constant uniform in λ . Hence the first term in the above sum is bounded by

$$C_{1,0} C_j \|w_*\|_{0,0} \sum_{i=1,2} \sup_{t \in b\Omega_j} |\omega_i(\cdot, t, \lambda_1) - \omega_i(\cdot, t, \lambda_2)|_{C^0(b\Omega_{j_0})}.$$

Similarly, the second term is bounded by $C_{1,0} C_j \|w_*\|_{0,0} (\sum_{i=1,2} \|\omega_i\|_{0,0}) |\Gamma^{\lambda_1} - \Gamma^{\lambda_2}|_1$, and the third term is bounded by

$$C_{1,0} C_j (\sum_{i=1,2} \|\omega_i\|_{0,0}) |\delta^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}(w_* a)|_{C^0(\overline{\Omega})},$$

for $\|w_*\|_{0,0} = \sup_{t \in b\Omega_j, \lambda \in [0,1]} |w_*(t, \lambda)|$, $\|\omega_i\|_{0,0} = \sup_{z \in b\Omega_{j_0}, t \in b\Omega_j, \lambda \in [0,1]} |\omega_i(z, t, \lambda)|$.

By part (i), we have $w_*^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{\nu^-,0}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$ so in particular $|w_*^{\lambda_1} - w_*^{\lambda_2}|_0 \rightarrow 0$ as $|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2| \rightarrow 0$. Together with (5.4), we readily see that the above expressions converge to 0 as $|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2| \rightarrow 0$. This shows that for any $j \neq j_0$, $w_j(\cdot, \lambda)$ is continuous in λ in the $C^0(b\Omega_{j_0})$ -norm.

Next, we show that $|w_j(\cdot, \lambda)|_{C^\nu(b\Omega_{j_0})}$ is bounded uniformly in λ . In fact we will show the boundedness of $|w_j(\cdot, \lambda)|_{C^{\alpha p}(b\Omega_{j_0})}$. Recall that w_j^λ is given by (6.77):

$$(6.79) \quad w_j(z, \lambda) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{b\Omega_j} G_1(z, t, \lambda) w_*(t, \lambda) dt^\lambda + G_2(z, t, \lambda) \overline{w_*(t, \lambda)} \overline{dt^\lambda},$$

for $z \in \Omega_j$, where G_1 and G_2 are given by

$$G_1(z, t, \lambda) = \frac{e^{\omega_1(z,t,\lambda)} + e^{\omega_1(z,t,\lambda)}}{t^\lambda - z^\lambda}, \quad G_2(z, t, \lambda) = \frac{e^{\omega_1(z,t,\lambda)} - e^{\omega_1(z,t,\lambda)}}{t^\lambda - z^\lambda},$$

and ω_i are given by formula (5.2). By the proof of Lemma 5.2, we can show that

$$\sup_{t \in b\Omega_j} |w_j(\cdot, t, \lambda)|_{\alpha p} \leq C_{1,0} C(p, \Omega) (|A(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\Omega)} + |B(\cdot, \lambda)|_{L^p(\Omega)}), \quad 2 < p < \infty.$$

Now for $z \in b\Omega_{j_0}$ and $t \in b\Omega_j$ where $j \neq j_0$, $|t^\lambda - z^\lambda|$ is bounded below by a positive constant c_j uniform in λ . Hence it follows by the above formula that $|G_i(\cdot, \lambda, \lambda)|_{C^{\alpha p}(b\Omega_0)}$ is bounded uniformly in $t \in b\Omega_j$ and $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. Since we know that $w_*^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{\nu^-,0}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$, in particular $|w_*(t, \lambda)|$ is bounded above uniformly in $t \in b\Omega_j$ and $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. (6.79) then implies that $|w_j(\cdot, \lambda)|_{C^\nu(b\Omega_{j_0})}$ is bounded uniformly in λ . This proves the earlier claim and the proof is now complete.

6.3. Differentiability in space variable: The $\mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu,0}$ estimate.

In this subsection we prove part (ii) of Theorem 6.1, namely the following:

Proposition 6.5. *Let Ω be a bounded domain in \mathbb{C} such that $b\Omega$ has $m+1$ connected components. Let k be a non-negative integer and $0 < \mu < 1$. Let $\Gamma^\lambda : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega^\lambda$ be a $\mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu,0}$ embedding. For each λ , let w^λ be the unique solution to Problem (6.1) on Ω^λ with index $n > m-1$, satisfying condition (6.2) on a normally distributed set $\{z_r^\lambda, z'_s\}$ in Ω . Suppose $A^\lambda, B^\lambda, F^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+\mu,0}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$, $l^\lambda, \gamma^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu,0}(b\Omega^\lambda)$, and $a_r, b_r, c_s \in C^0([0, 1])$. Then $w^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu,0}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$. Furthermore, there exists some constant C independent of λ such that*

$$(6.80) \quad \|w^\lambda\|_{0,0} \leq C \left(\|F^\lambda\|_{0,0} + \|\gamma^\lambda\|_{\mu,0} + \sum_{r=1}^{N_0} (|a_r|_0 + |b_r|_0) + \sum_{s=1}^{N_1} |c_s|_0 \right),$$

$$\|w^\lambda\|_{k+1+\mu,0} \leq C \left(\|F^\lambda\|_{k+\mu,0} + \|\gamma^\lambda\|_{k+1+\mu,0} + \sum_{r=1}^{N_0} (|a_r|_0 + |b_r|_0) + \sum_{s=1}^{N_1} |c_s|_0 \right).$$

Proof. As before we write $A(z, \lambda) := A^\lambda(z^\lambda)$, $B(z, \lambda) := B^\lambda(z^\lambda)$ and $F(z, \lambda) := F^\lambda(z^\lambda)$. Note for fixed λ , $w^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$ by Proposition 3.9. By Proposition 2.3, it suffices to show that $w(\cdot, \lambda)$ is continuous in λ in the $C^0(\overline{\Omega})$ norm and bounded uniformly in λ in the $\mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu}(\overline{\Omega})$ -norm.

Like before we can make a reduction to the case $F^\lambda \equiv 0$. Define w_{F^λ} by formula (6.74). For the reduction to work we need to show that $w_{F^\lambda}^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu,0}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$. Now $w_{F^\lambda}^\lambda$ satisfies the equation:

$$(6.81) \quad \partial_{\overline{z^\lambda}} w_{F^\lambda} + A^\lambda w_{F^\lambda} + B^\lambda \overline{w_{F^\lambda}} = F^\lambda \quad \text{in } \Omega^\lambda.$$

Since by assumption F^λ is at least Hölder continuous, Lemma 6.4 shows that $w_{F^\lambda} \in \mathcal{C}^{1^-,0}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$. It then follows from (6.81) that $\partial_{\overline{z^\lambda}} w_{F^\lambda}^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{\mu,0}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$. For each fixed λ , we apply Cauchy-Green formula

to w_F^λ on Ω^λ to get

$$w_F(z, \lambda) = T_{\Omega^\lambda}(\partial_{\bar{z}^\lambda} w_{F^\lambda}) + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{b\Omega} \frac{w_F(t, \lambda)}{t^\lambda - z^\lambda} dt^\lambda, \quad z \in \Omega$$

where we write $w_F(z, \lambda) = w_{F^\lambda}(z^\lambda)$. Taking ∂_{z^λ} on both sides, we have

$$(6.82) \quad \partial_{z^\lambda} w_{F^\lambda}(z^\lambda) = \Pi_{\Omega^\lambda}(\partial_{\bar{z}^\lambda} w_{F^\lambda}) + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{b\Omega} \frac{w_F(t, \lambda)}{(t^\lambda - z^\lambda)^2} dt^\lambda,$$

where $\Pi_{\Omega^\lambda} := \partial_z T_{\Omega^\lambda}$. Since $w_{F^\lambda} \in \mathcal{C}^{1-,0}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$, the second term is in $\mathcal{C}^{1-,0}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$. Now applying Lemma 7.8 to $\partial_{\bar{z}^\lambda} w_{F^\lambda} \in \mathcal{C}^{\mu,0}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$, we have $\Pi_{\Omega^\lambda}(\partial_{\bar{z}^\lambda} w_{F^\lambda}) \in \mathcal{C}^{\mu,0}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$. It then follows from (6.82) that $\partial_{z^\lambda} w_{F^\lambda}(z^\lambda) \in \mathcal{C}^{\mu,0}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$. This shows that $w_{F^\lambda} \in \mathcal{C}^{1+\mu,0}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$. We can iterate this argument by using (6.81) and (6.82) so that eventually we get $w_{F^\lambda} \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu,0}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$. This proves the reduction.

The problem now is reduced to showing that if w_*^λ solves (6.75), where $\gamma^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu,0}(b\Omega^\lambda)$, then $w_*^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu,0}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$. As in the proof of part (ii), we reduce the problem to one on simply-connected domain, and we use the same notation w_j and $b\Omega_j^\lambda$ as before.

Note also that by the assumptions and the result of part (ii), $w_*^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{\frac{p-2}{p},0}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$ for any $2 < p < \infty$. Hence $w_*^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{1-,0}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$.

In view of formula (3.31) with $F \equiv 0$, we can write the solution of problem (6.75) in the form $w_*(z, \lambda) = w_0(z, \lambda) + \dots + w_m(z, \lambda)$, $z \in \Omega$, where we set

$$w_j(z, \lambda) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{b\Omega_j} G_1(z, t, \lambda) w_*(t, \lambda) dt^\lambda + G_2(z, t, \lambda) \overline{w_*(t, \lambda)} \overline{dt^\lambda}.$$

Fix j_0 with $0 \leq j_0 \leq m$, we need to show that for all $j \neq j_0$, we have $w_j^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu,0}(b\Omega_{j_0}^\lambda)$. The rest of the argument follows the same as in part (ii).

That w_j^λ is continuous in the $C^0(b\Omega_{j_0}^\lambda)$ -norm is proved in part (ii), so we only need to show that $|w_j(\cdot, \lambda)|_{\mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu}(b\Omega_{j_0}^\lambda)}$ is bounded in λ . Recall that w_j^λ satisfies the equation:

$$\partial_{\bar{z}^\lambda} w_j^\lambda(z^\lambda) + A^\lambda(z^\lambda) w_j^\lambda(z^\lambda) + B^\lambda(z^\lambda) \overline{w_j^\lambda(z^\lambda)} = 0, \quad z^\lambda \in \Omega_j^\lambda.$$

By part (i), we have $w_*^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{1-,0}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$. In view of Proposition 7.12 and (6.77), $w_j^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{1-,0}(\overline{\Omega_j^\lambda})$. Fix an open set V_j so that $V_j \subset\subset (\Omega_j^\lambda \cap \Omega^\lambda)$ and $\text{dist}(b\Omega_{j_0}^\lambda, V_j) \geq \delta_0$ for all λ . Certainly w_j^λ satisfy the same equation on V_j :

$$(6.83) \quad \partial_{\bar{z}} w_j^\lambda(z) + A^\lambda(z) w_j^\lambda(z) + B^\lambda(z) \overline{w_j^\lambda(z)} = 0, \quad z \in V_j.$$

Here $A^\lambda, B^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+\mu,0}(\overline{V_j}) \subset \mathcal{C}^{\mu,0}(\overline{V_j})$ and $w_j^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{1-,0}(\overline{V_j})$, thus equation (6.83) implies that $\partial_{\bar{z}} w_j^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{\mu,0}(\overline{V_j})$.

Applying Cauchy-Green formula to V_j , we have for each fixed λ ,

$$w_j^\lambda(z) = T_{V_j}(\partial_{\bar{z}} w_j)(z) + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{bV_j} \frac{w_j^\lambda(\zeta)}{\zeta - z} d\zeta, \quad z \in V_j.$$

Taking ∂_z on both sides we get

$$(6.84) \quad \partial_z w_j^\lambda(z) = \partial_z T_{V_j}(\partial_{\bar{z}} w_j^\lambda)(z) + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{bV_j} \frac{w_j^\lambda(\zeta)}{(\zeta - z)^2} d\zeta, \quad z \in V_j.$$

Now, for $\zeta \in bV_j$ and $z \in b\Omega_{j_0}^\lambda$, $|\zeta - z|$ is bounded below by a positive constant independent of λ , so the second term above is bounded by $C|w_j^\lambda|_{\mathcal{C}^0(bV_j)}$ for some C independent of λ . On the other hand by Lemma 7.8, $|\partial_z T_{V_j}(\partial_{\bar{z}} w_j^\lambda)|_{\mathcal{C}^\mu(\overline{V_j})} \leq C|\partial_{\bar{z}} w_j^\lambda|_{\mathcal{C}^\mu(\overline{V_j})}$. Thus $|\partial_z w_j^\lambda|_{\mathcal{C}^\mu(\overline{V_j})} \leq C \left(|\partial_{\bar{z}} w_j^\lambda|_{\mathcal{C}^\mu(\overline{V_j})} + |w_j^\lambda|_{\mathcal{C}^0(\overline{V_j})} \right)$, where C is some constant independent of λ . Hence $|w_j^\lambda|_{\mathcal{C}^{1+\mu}(V_j)}$ is

uniformly bounded in λ . By repeating the argument using (6.83) and (6.84), we can show that $|w_j^\lambda|_{C^{k+1+\mu}(V_j)}$ is uniformly bounded in λ . Since $\Gamma^\lambda \in C^{k+1+\mu,0}(\overline{\Omega})$ and $b\Omega_{j_0} \subset V_j$, $|w_j^\lambda(z^\lambda)|_{C^{k+1+\mu}(b\Omega_{j_0})}$ is bounded uniformly in λ . This completes the proof of the claim and thus the theorem. \square

6.4. Differentiability in parameter: the $C^{k+1+\mu,j}$ estimate.

In this subsection we prove part (iii) of Theorem 6.1, namely the following:

Theorem 6.6. *Let k, j, μ be as in Theorem 1.1. Let Ω be a bounded domain in \mathbb{C} such that $b\Omega$ has $m+1$ connected component. Suppose $\Gamma^\lambda : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega^\lambda$ is a $C^{k+1+\mu,j}$ embedding. For each λ , let w^λ be the unique solution to Problem (6.1) on Ω^λ with index $n > m-1$, satisfying condition (6.2) on a normally distributed set $\{\zeta_r^\lambda, (\zeta'_s)^\lambda\}$ in Ω^λ . Suppose $A^\lambda, B^\lambda, F^\lambda \in C^{k+\mu,j}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$, $l^\lambda, \gamma^\lambda \in C^{k+1+\mu,j}(b\Omega^\lambda)$, and $a_r, b_r, c_s \in C^j([0,1])$. Then $w^\lambda \in C^{k+1+\mu,j}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$. Furthermore, there exists some constant C independent of λ such that*

$$(6.85) \quad \|w^\lambda\|_{k+1+\mu,j} \leq C \left(\|F^\lambda\|_{k+\mu,j} + \|\gamma^\lambda\|_{k+1+\mu,j} + \sum_{r=1}^{N_0} (|a_r|_j + |b_r|_j) + \sum_{s=1}^{N_1} |c_s|_j \right).$$

Proof. We proceed with induction on j . The $j=0$ case is proved in Theorem (6.1) part (ii). Suppose the statement has been proved for $j-1$. In particular we know that $w^\lambda \in C^{k+1+\mu,j-1}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$ for $k \geq j \geq 1$.

Let $\Psi^\lambda = (\Gamma^\lambda)^{-1}$ and $v^\lambda(\zeta) = w^\lambda \circ \Gamma^\lambda(\zeta)$. Then $w^\lambda = v^\lambda \circ \Psi^\lambda$, $\Psi^\lambda(z^\lambda) = \zeta$. For fixed λ , we have

$$\partial_{z^\lambda} w^\lambda = \frac{\partial \Psi^\lambda}{\partial z^\lambda}(\Gamma^\lambda(\zeta)) \partial_\zeta v^\lambda + \frac{\partial \overline{\Psi^\lambda}}{\partial z^\lambda}(\Gamma^\lambda(\zeta)) \partial_{\overline{\zeta}} v^\lambda = h^\lambda(\zeta) \left(\partial_{\overline{\zeta}} v^\lambda + e^\lambda(\zeta) \partial_\zeta v^\lambda \right),$$

where we denote

$$e^\lambda(\zeta) := \frac{\partial \Psi^\lambda}{\partial z^\lambda}(\Gamma^\lambda(\zeta)) \left(\frac{\partial \overline{\Psi^\lambda}}{\partial z^\lambda}(\Gamma^\lambda(\zeta)) \right)^{-1}, \quad h^\lambda(\zeta) := \frac{\partial \overline{\Psi^\lambda}}{\partial z^\lambda}(\Gamma^\lambda(\zeta)).$$

Note that since $\Psi^0 = \Gamma^0 = id$, we have $e^0 \equiv 0$ and $h^0 \equiv 1$ on Ω . Thus for $|\lambda|$ small, $|e^\lambda| < 1$. Now v^λ is the solution to

$$(6.86) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_{\overline{\zeta}} v^\lambda + e^\lambda(\zeta) \partial_\zeta v^\lambda + A_1^\lambda(\zeta) v^\lambda(\zeta) + B_1^\lambda(\zeta) \overline{v^\lambda(\zeta)} = F_1^\lambda(\zeta) & \text{in } \Omega; \\ \text{Re}[l_1^\lambda(\zeta) v^\lambda(\zeta)] = \gamma_1^\lambda(\zeta) & \text{on } b\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $A_1^\lambda(\zeta) = (h^\lambda)^{-1} A^\lambda(\Gamma^\lambda(\zeta))$, $B_1^\lambda(\zeta) = (h^\lambda)^{-1} B^\lambda(\Gamma^\lambda(\zeta))$, and

$$F_1^\lambda(\zeta) = (h^\lambda)^{-1} F^\lambda(\Gamma^\lambda(\zeta)), \quad l_1^\lambda(\zeta) = l^\lambda(\Gamma^\lambda(\zeta)), \quad \gamma_1^\lambda(\zeta) = \gamma^\lambda(\Gamma^\lambda(\zeta)).$$

By assumption, $e^\lambda, A_1^\lambda, B_1^\lambda, F_1^\lambda \in C^{k+\mu,j}(\Omega^\lambda)$, and $l_1^\lambda, \gamma_1^\lambda \in C^{k+1+\mu,j}(b\Omega^\lambda)$. Subtracting equation (6.86) by the same equation with λ replaced by λ_0 and dividing the resulting difference by $\lambda - \lambda_0$ we get respectively on Ω and $b\Omega$

$$(6.87) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_{\overline{\zeta}}(D^{\lambda,\lambda_0} v) + e^{\lambda_0} \partial_\zeta(D^{\lambda,\lambda_0} v^\lambda) + A_1^{\lambda_0} D^{\lambda,\lambda_0} v + B_1^{\lambda_0} \overline{D^{\lambda,\lambda_0} v} = F_2^{\lambda,\lambda_0}; \\ \text{Re}[l_1^{\lambda_0} D^{\lambda,\lambda_0} v] = \gamma_2^{\lambda,\lambda_0} \end{cases}$$

where we used the notation $D^{\lambda,\lambda_0} f := (f^\lambda - f^{\lambda_0})/(\lambda - \lambda_0)$, and

$$(6.88) \quad F_2^{\lambda,\lambda_0} := D^{\lambda,\lambda_0} F_1 - (D^{\lambda,\lambda_0} e) \partial_\zeta v^\lambda - (D^{\lambda,\lambda_0} A_1) v^\lambda - (D^{\lambda,\lambda_0} B_1) v^\lambda,$$

$$(6.89) \quad \gamma_2^{\lambda,\lambda_0} := D^{\lambda,\lambda_0} \gamma_1 - \text{Re}[\overline{(D^{\lambda,\lambda_0} l_1)} v^\lambda].$$

In addition, $D^{\lambda,\lambda_0} v$ satisfies the condition

$$(6.90) \quad \begin{aligned} D^{\lambda,\lambda_0} v(\zeta_r) &= D^{\lambda,\lambda_0} a_r + i D^{\lambda,\lambda_0} b_r, \quad r = 1, \dots, N_0; \\ D^{\lambda,\lambda_0} v(\zeta'_s) &= D^{\lambda,\lambda_0} \{l(\zeta'_s, \cdot)[\gamma(\zeta'_s, \cdot) + i c_s(\cdot)]\}, \quad s = 1, \dots, N_1. \end{aligned}$$

Consider the problem

$$(6.91) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_{\bar{z}} u^\lambda + e^\lambda \partial_\zeta u^\lambda + A_1^\lambda u^\lambda + B_1^\lambda \overline{u^\lambda} = F_2^\lambda & \text{in } \Omega; \\ \operatorname{Re}[\overline{l_1^\lambda} u^\lambda] = \gamma_2^\lambda & \text{on } b\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where

$$(6.92) \quad F_2^\lambda := (\partial_\lambda F_1^\lambda) - (\partial_\lambda e^\lambda) \partial_\zeta v^\lambda - (\partial_\lambda A_1^\lambda) v^\lambda - (\partial_\lambda B_1^\lambda) v^\lambda,$$

$$(6.93) \quad \gamma_2^\lambda := (\partial_\lambda \gamma_1^\lambda) - \operatorname{Re}[(\partial_\lambda l_1^\lambda) v^\lambda].$$

In addition, we require that u^λ satisfies the condition:

$$(6.94) \quad \begin{aligned} u^\lambda(\zeta_r) &= a'_r(\lambda) + i \partial b'_r(\lambda), \quad r = 1, \dots, N_0; \\ u^\lambda(\zeta'_s) &= \partial_\lambda \{ l(\zeta'_s, \lambda) [\gamma(\zeta'_s, \lambda) + i c_s(\lambda)] \}, \quad s = 1, \dots, N_1. \end{aligned}$$

By assumption, $\partial_\lambda e^\lambda, \partial_\lambda A_1^\lambda, \partial_\lambda B_1^\lambda, \partial_\lambda F_1^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k-1+\mu, j-1}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$, and $\partial_\lambda \gamma_1^\lambda, \partial_\lambda l_1^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+\mu, j-1}(b\Omega^\lambda)$. By the induction hypothesis, $v^\lambda = w^\lambda \circ \Gamma^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu, j-1}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$, and there exists some constant C independent of λ such that

$$(6.95) \quad \|v^\lambda\|_{\mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu, j-1}(\Omega)} \leq C \left(\|F^\lambda\|_{\mathcal{C}^{k+\mu, j-1}(\Omega^\lambda)} + \|\gamma^\lambda\|_{\mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu, j-1}(b\Omega^\lambda)} \right).$$

Thus in view of (6.92) and (6.93) we have $F_2^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k-1+\mu, j-1}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$, and $\gamma_2^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+\mu, j-1}(b\Omega^\lambda)$. To solve problem (6.91) we would like to make a change of coordinates $\psi^\lambda : \zeta \mapsto \zeta_1^\lambda$ so that

$$(6.96) \quad \partial_{\bar{z}} u^\lambda(\zeta) + e^\lambda(\zeta) \partial_\zeta u^\lambda(\zeta) = f_1^\lambda(\zeta_1^\lambda) \partial_{\bar{z}_1^\lambda} u_1^\lambda(\zeta_1^\lambda), \quad u_1^\lambda(\zeta_1^\lambda) = u^\lambda(\zeta),$$

for some function f_1^λ . We seek ψ^λ in the form $\zeta_1^\lambda = \psi^\lambda(\zeta) = \zeta + g^\lambda(\zeta)$, where $g^0 \equiv 0$. By (6.96) we obtain the following equations for g^λ :

$$(6.97) \quad \partial_{\bar{z}} g^\lambda(\zeta) + e^\lambda(\zeta) \partial_\zeta g^\lambda(\zeta) + e^\lambda(\zeta) = 0, \quad |e^\lambda|_0 < 1,$$

$$(6.98) \quad f_1^\lambda(\zeta_1^\lambda) = 1 + \partial_{\bar{z}} \overline{g^\lambda}(\zeta) + e^\lambda(\zeta) \partial_\zeta \overline{g^\lambda}(\zeta), \quad \zeta = (\psi^\lambda)^{-1}(\zeta_1^\lambda).$$

By Theorem 6.4 in [2], there exists a solution g^λ to the equation (6.97) in the class $\mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$. Hence $\psi^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$. In the following we write $D^\lambda = \psi^\lambda(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$. From equation (6.98) we get $f_1^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+\mu, j}(\overline{D^\lambda})$. Since $g^0 \equiv 0$, by (6.98) we see that $|f_1^\lambda|$ is nowhere vanishing on D^λ when λ is small. In view of (6.96) and (6.91) we then get

$$\begin{cases} \partial_{\bar{z}_1^\lambda} u_1^\lambda + A_2^\lambda(\zeta_1^\lambda) u_1^\lambda + B_2^\lambda(\zeta_1^\lambda) \overline{u_1^\lambda} = F_3^\lambda(\zeta_1^\lambda) & \text{in } D^\lambda; \\ \operatorname{Re}[\overline{l_2^\lambda}(\zeta_1^\lambda) u_1^\lambda(\zeta_1^\lambda)] = \gamma_3^\lambda(\zeta_1^\lambda) & \text{on } bD^\lambda, \end{cases}$$

where $D^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu, j}$, $A_2^\lambda, B_2^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+\mu, j}(\overline{D^\lambda})$, $F_3^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k-1+\mu, j-1}(\overline{D^\lambda})$, $l_2^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+\mu, j}(\overline{D^\lambda})$, $\gamma_3^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+\mu, j}(\overline{D^\lambda})$. The functions are given by

$$(6.99) \quad (A_2^\lambda(\zeta_1^\lambda), B_2^\lambda(\zeta_1^\lambda)) := \left[f_1^\lambda(\zeta_1^\lambda) \right]^{-1} \left(A_1^\lambda((\psi^\lambda)^{-1}(\zeta_1^\lambda)), B_1^\lambda((\psi^\lambda)^{-1}(\zeta_1^\lambda)) \right),$$

$$F_3^\lambda(\zeta_1^\lambda) := \left[f_1^\lambda(\zeta_1^\lambda) \right]^{-1} F_2^\lambda((\psi^\lambda)^{-1}(\zeta_1^\lambda)),$$

$$(6.100) \quad (l_2^\lambda(\zeta_1^\lambda), \gamma_3^\lambda(\zeta_1^\lambda)) := \left[f_1^\lambda(\zeta_1^\lambda) \right]^{-1} \left(l_1^\lambda((\psi^\lambda)^{-1}(\zeta_1^\lambda)), \gamma_2^\lambda((\psi^\lambda)^{-1}(\zeta_1^\lambda)) \right).$$

By (6.94), u_1^λ satisfies the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} u_1^\lambda(\psi^\lambda(\zeta_r)) &= a'_r(\lambda) + i b'_r(\lambda), \quad r = 1, \dots, N_0; \\ u_1^\lambda(\psi^\lambda(\zeta'_s)) &= \partial_\lambda \{ l(\zeta'_s, \lambda) [\gamma(\zeta'_s, \lambda) + i c_s(\lambda)] \}, \quad s = 1, \dots, N_1. \end{aligned}$$

By the induction hypothesis, $u_1^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+\mu, j-1}(\overline{D^\lambda})$. Then $u^\lambda(\zeta) = u_1^\lambda \circ \psi^\lambda(\zeta) \in \mathcal{C}^{k+\mu, j-1}(\overline{\Omega})$, and u^λ is the solution to (6.91). Furthermore, in view of (6.95) there exists some constant C independent of λ such that

$$(6.101) \quad \begin{aligned} \|u^\lambda\|_{\mathcal{C}^{k+\mu, j-1}(\overline{\Omega})} &\leq C \|u_1^\lambda\|_{\mathcal{C}^{k+\mu, j-1}(D^\lambda)} \\ &\leq C \left(\|F_3^\lambda\|_{\mathcal{C}^{k-1+\mu, j-1}(\overline{\Omega})} + \|\gamma_3^\lambda\|_{\mathcal{C}^{k+\mu, j-1}(b\Omega)} + \|(a, b, c)\|_{C^j} \right) \\ &\leq C \left(\|F^\lambda\|_{\mathcal{C}^{k+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})} + \|\gamma^\lambda\|_{\mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu, j}(b\Omega^\lambda)} + \|(a, b, c)\|_{C^j} \right). \end{aligned}$$

By the induction hypothesis applied for $j = 0$, v^λ satisfies

$$(6.102) \quad \|v^\lambda\|_{\mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu, 0}(\Omega)} \leq C \left(\|F^\lambda\|_{\mathcal{C}^{k+\mu, 0}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})} + \|\gamma^\lambda\|_{\mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu, 0}(b\Omega^\lambda)} + \|(a, b, c)\|_{C^0} \right).$$

The induction and thus the theorem will be proved if we show that u^{λ_0} is indeed the λ derivative of v^λ . Define $G^\lambda := D^{\lambda, \lambda_0} v - u^{\lambda_0}$. Then in view of (6.87) and (6.91), G^λ is the solution to the problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_{\bar{\zeta}} G^\lambda + e^{\lambda_0} \partial_{\zeta} G^\lambda + A_1^{\lambda_0} G^\lambda + B_1^{\lambda_0} \overline{G^\lambda} = E^\lambda & \text{in } \Omega; \\ \text{Re}[l_1^{\lambda_0} \overline{G^\lambda}] = \phi^\lambda & \text{on } b\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $E^\lambda(\zeta) := F_2^{\lambda, \lambda_0}(\zeta) - F_2^{\lambda_0}(\zeta)$, $\phi^\lambda(\zeta) := \gamma_2^{\lambda, \lambda_0}(\zeta) - \gamma_2^{\lambda_0}(\zeta)$. In addition, by (6.90) and (6.94), G^λ satisfies the conditions:

$$(6.103) \quad \begin{aligned} G^\lambda(\zeta_r) &= (D^{\lambda, \lambda_0} a_r - \partial_\lambda a_r) + i(D^{\lambda, \lambda_0} b_r - \partial_\lambda b_r); \\ G^\lambda(\zeta'_s) &= D^{\lambda, \lambda_0} \{l(\zeta'_s, \cdot)[\gamma(\zeta'_s, \cdot) + ic_s(\cdot)]\} - \partial_\lambda|_{\lambda=\lambda_0} \{l(\zeta'_s, \lambda) [\gamma(\zeta'_s, \lambda) + ic_s(\lambda)]\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $e^\lambda, A_1^\lambda, B_1^\lambda, F_1^\lambda, (f_1^\lambda)^{-1} \in \mathcal{C}^{k+\mu, j}(\overline{\Omega})$ and $k \geq j \geq 1$, then $\partial_\lambda e^\lambda, \partial_\lambda A_1^\lambda, \partial_\lambda B_1^\lambda, \partial_\lambda F_1^\lambda$ are in $\mathcal{C}^{\mu, 0}(\overline{\Omega})$. Since $\gamma^\lambda, l^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1+\mu, j}(b\Omega)$, then $\partial_\lambda \gamma^\lambda, \partial_\lambda l^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{1+\mu, 0}(b\Omega)$. By Proposition 2.3, we see that $|\partial_\lambda \gamma^\lambda(\lambda_1) - \partial_\lambda \gamma^\lambda(\lambda_2)|_\tau$ converges to 0 as $|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2| \rightarrow 0$, for any $0 < \tau < 1 + \mu$. It follows from (6.88), (6.89), (6.92) and (6.93) that

$$(6.104) \quad |E^\lambda|_0 \rightarrow 0, \quad |\phi^\lambda|_\tau \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } |\lambda - \lambda_0| \rightarrow 0.$$

As before we can do a change of coordinate $\psi^{\lambda_0} : \zeta \mapsto \zeta_1$ so that in the new coordinates, $G_1^\lambda(\zeta_1) := G^\lambda((\psi^{\lambda_0})^{-1}(\zeta_1))$ is the solution to the problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_{\bar{\zeta}} G_1^\lambda + A_2^{\lambda_0} G_1^\lambda + B_2^{\lambda_0} \overline{G_1^\lambda} = E_1^\lambda & \text{in } \Omega_1; \\ \text{Re}[l_2^{\lambda_0} \overline{G_1^\lambda}] = \phi_1^\lambda & \text{on } b\Omega_1, \end{cases}$$

where $A_2^{\lambda_0}, B_2^{\lambda_0}, l_2^{\lambda_0}$ are defined in the same way as expressions (6.99) and (6.100) with λ replaced by λ_0 , and

$$\begin{aligned} E_1^\lambda(\zeta_1) &= [f_1^{\lambda_0}(\zeta_1)]^{-1} E^\lambda((\psi^{\lambda_0})^{-1}(\zeta_1)), \quad \zeta_1 \in \Omega_1; \\ \phi_1^\lambda(\zeta_1) &= [f_1^{\lambda_0}(\zeta_1)]^{-1} \phi^\lambda((\psi^{\lambda_0})^{-1}(\zeta_1)), \quad \zeta_1 \in \Omega_1. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, if we set $\tilde{\zeta}_r = \psi^{\lambda_0}(\zeta_r)$ and $\tilde{\zeta}'_s = \psi^{\lambda_0}(\zeta'_s)$, then by (6.103) G_1^λ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} G_1^\lambda(\tilde{\zeta}_r) &= \left\{ (D^{\lambda, \lambda_0} a_r - \partial_\lambda a_r) + i(D^{\lambda, \lambda_0} b_r - \partial_\lambda b_r) \right\} \circ (\psi^{\lambda_0})^{-1}, \\ G^\lambda(\tilde{\zeta}'_s) &= D^{\lambda, \lambda_0} \{l(\zeta'_s, \cdot)[\gamma(\zeta'_s, \cdot) + ic_s(\cdot)]\} - \partial_\lambda|_{\lambda=\lambda_0} \{l(\zeta'_s, \lambda) [\gamma(\zeta'_s, \lambda) + ic_s(\lambda)]\} \circ (\psi^{\lambda_0})^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

In view of estimate (6.80), the solution G_1^λ satisfies

$$|G_1^\lambda|_0 \leq C \left(\sum_{r=1}^N G_1^\lambda(\tilde{\zeta}_r) + \sum_{s=1}^{N'} G_1^\lambda(\tilde{\zeta}'_s) + |\phi_1^\lambda|_\tau + |E_1^\lambda|_0 \right), \quad \tau > 0.$$

As $\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_0$, the right-hand side converges to 0. Hence $|G_1^\lambda|_{C^0(\overline{\Omega}_1)} \rightarrow 0$, and it follows that $|D^{\lambda, \lambda_0} v - u^{\lambda_0}|_{C^0(\overline{\Omega})} = |G^\lambda|_{C^0(\overline{\Omega})} = |G_1^\lambda|_{C^0(\overline{\Omega}_1)} \rightarrow 0$. Finally (6.101) and (6.102) together imply (6.85), so the proof is complete. \square

7. APPENDIX

7.1. Estimates for the Cauchy-Green/ $\bar{\partial}$ operator. Let Ω be a bounded domain in \mathbb{C} . Recall the operator T_Ω given by (2.1).

Proposition 7.1 ([7, Theorem 1.13]). *Let Ω be a bounded domain. If $f \in L^1(\Omega)$, then $T_\Omega f$ belong to $L^p(\tilde{\Omega})$, for any $1 \leq p < 2$ and for any bounded domain $\tilde{\Omega}$ in \mathbb{C} .*

Proposition 7.2 ([7, Theorem 1.14]). *If $f \in L^1(\Omega)$, then for any $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ (i.e. the class of compactly supported smooth functions in Ω), one has the following*

$$\iint_{\Omega} T f \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \bar{z}} dA(z) = - \iint_{\Omega} f \varphi dA(z).$$

In other words, the equation $\partial_{\bar{z}}(Tf) = f$ holds in the sense of distribution on Ω .

Proposition 7.3. *Let Ω be a bounded domain. Suppose $f \in L^p(\Omega)$, for $2 < p < \infty$. Then for $z, z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ the following estimates hold:*

$$\begin{aligned} |T_\Omega f(z)| &\leq C(p) |f|_{L^p(\Omega)}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}; \\ |T_\Omega f(z_1) - T_\Omega f(z_2)| &\leq C(p) |f|_{L^p(\Omega)} |z_1 - z_2|^{\alpha_p}, \quad \alpha_p = \frac{p-2}{p}. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 7.4 ([7, p. 34]). *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a bounded domain. Suppose $\partial_{\bar{z}} w \in L^1(\Omega)$. Then $w - T_\Omega(\partial_{\bar{z}} w) = \Phi(z)$, where Φ is some holomorphic function in Ω .*

Proposition 7.5 ([7, Theorem 1.23]). *Let $2 < p < \infty$. Suppose f satisfies*

$$M = \int_{\mathbb{D}} |f(\zeta^{-1})|^p |\zeta|^{-2p} dA(\zeta) < \infty.$$

Then for $z, z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{C}$, we have $|T_{\mathbb{D}^c} f(z)| \leq C(p)M$ and

$$|T_{\mathbb{D}^c} f(z_1) - T_{\mathbb{D}^c} f(z_2)| \leq C(p)M |z_1 - z_2|^{\alpha_p}, \quad \alpha_p = \frac{p-2}{p}.$$

Combining Proposition 7.4 and Proposition 7.5 one gets

Proposition 7.6. *Let \mathbb{D} be the unit disk in the complex plane, and suppose $f \in L^p(\mathbb{D})$ for $2 < p < \infty$. Let P_n be the operator defined by formula (3.11):*

$$(7.1) \quad P_n \varphi(z) = T_{\mathbb{D}} \varphi(z) + z^{2n+1} T_{\mathbb{D}^c} \varphi_1(z),$$

where φ_1 is given by the second formula in (3.11). Then $P_n \varphi \in C^{\alpha_p}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$ for $\alpha_p = \frac{p-2}{p}$, and $|P_n \varphi|_{\alpha_p} \leq C(p) |f|_{L^p(\mathbb{D})}$.

Proposition 7.7. *Let $\Omega \in C^{k+1+\mu}$, where k is a non-negative integer, and $0 < \mu < 1$. Let P_n be the operator given by formula (7.1). Then $|P_n \varphi|_{C^{k+1+\mu}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})} \leq C |\varphi|_{C^{k+\mu}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})}$.*

Proof. Let $\varphi_1(\zeta) = \overline{\varphi(1/\bar{\zeta})}/(\zeta\bar{\zeta}^2)$ and $T_{\mathbb{D}^c}\varphi_1(z) = -\frac{1}{\pi} \iint_{\mathbb{C}\setminus\mathbb{D}} \frac{\varphi_1(\zeta)}{\zeta-z} dA(\zeta)$. We have

$$(7.2) \quad P_n\varphi(z) = T_{\mathbb{D}}\varphi(z) + z^{2n+1}T_{\mathbb{D}^c}\varphi_1(z).$$

By Theorem 1.32 [7, p. 56], we have

$$(7.3) \quad \partial_{\bar{z}}T_{\mathbb{D}}\varphi(z) = \varphi(z), \quad \partial_zT_{\mathbb{D}}\varphi(z) = \Pi_{\mathbb{D}}\varphi(z),$$

and Π is bounded linear operator mapping $C^{k+\mu}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$ to itself. It follows from (7.3) that $T_{\mathbb{D}}$ is a bounded linear operator mapping $C^{k+\mu}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$ to $C^{k+1+\mu}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$. To estimate the second operator $T_{\mathbb{D}^c}\varphi_1$. We first extend φ_1 to a function in the class $C^{k+\mu}(\mathbb{C})$, by extending φ to a function in the class $C_0^{k+\mu}(\mathbb{C})$. φ_1 vanishes in some neighborhood of 0, and $\varphi_1 \in L^1(\mathbb{C})$. Write $T_{\mathbb{D}^c}\varphi_1 = T_{\mathbb{C}}\varphi_1(z) - T_{\mathbb{D}}\varphi_1(z)$. By [7, p. 63, Thm 1.34], $T_{\mathbb{C}}\varphi_1 \in C^{k+1+\mu}(\mathbb{C})$. Since $T_{\mathbb{D}}\varphi_1 \in C^{k+1+\mu}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$, we obtain from the above equation that $T_{\mathbb{D}^c}\varphi_1 \in C^{k+1+\mu}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$. The proposition follows from (7.2). \square

Proposition 7.8. *Let k be a non-negative integer and $0 < \beta < 1$. Let Ω be a domain in \mathbb{C} with $C^{k+1+\beta}$ boundary, and let $\Gamma^\lambda : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega^\lambda$ be a $C^{k+1+\beta,0}$ embedding. Let $f^\lambda \in C^{k+\beta,0}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$. Then $\partial_{z^\lambda}T_{\Omega^\lambda}f^\lambda$ is in $C^{k+\beta,0}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$, and there exists some constant C independent of λ so that $|\partial_{z^\lambda}T_{\Omega^\lambda}f^\lambda|_{k+\beta} \leq C|f^\lambda|_{k+\beta}$.*

The proof follows similarly as in [7, p. 56-61].

7.2. Estimates for Cauchy type operators.

Lemma 7.9. *Let Ω^λ be a family of bounded domains in \mathbb{C} in the class $\mathcal{C}^{1,0}$. That is there is a family of embedding $\Gamma^\lambda : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega^\lambda$ such that $\Gamma^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{1,0}(\overline{\Omega})$. For $0 < \beta < 1$, let $f^\lambda \in C^{\beta,0}(b\Omega)$, and let g be defined by*

$$g(\zeta, \lambda) := P.V. \int_{b\Omega} \frac{f(t, \lambda)}{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} dt^\lambda = \int_{b\Omega} \frac{f(t, \lambda) - f(\zeta, \lambda)}{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} dt^\lambda + (\pi i)f(\zeta, \lambda).$$

Then $g \in C^{\beta,0}(b\Omega^\lambda)$, and we have $\|g\|_{\beta,0} \leq C_{1,0}\|f\|_{\beta,0}$.

Proof. Let $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in b\Omega$. Then we have

$$(7.4) \quad \begin{aligned} |g(\zeta_1, \lambda) - g(\zeta_2, \lambda)| &\leq \int_{|s| < 2\delta} \frac{|f(t, \lambda) - f(\zeta_1, \lambda)|}{|t^\lambda - \zeta_1^\lambda|} + \frac{|f(t, \lambda) - f(\zeta_2, \lambda)|}{|t^\lambda - \zeta_2^\lambda|} dt^\lambda \\ &+ \left| \int_{|s| \geq 2\delta} \frac{\overline{f(t, \lambda)} - \overline{f(\zeta_1, \lambda)}}{t^\lambda - \zeta_1^\lambda} - \frac{\overline{f(t, \lambda)} - \overline{f(\zeta_2, \lambda)}}{t^\lambda - \zeta_2^\lambda} dt^\lambda \right| + \pi |f(\zeta_1, \lambda) - f(\zeta_2, \lambda)| \\ &\leq C_{1,0}\|f\|_{\beta,0} \delta^\beta + \left| \left(\overline{f(\zeta_2, \lambda)} - \overline{f(\zeta_1, \lambda)} \right) \int_{|s| \geq 2\delta} \frac{dt^\lambda}{t^\lambda - \zeta_1^\lambda} \right| \\ &+ \int_{|s| \geq 2\delta} \left(\overline{f(t, \lambda)} - \overline{f(\zeta_2, \lambda)} \right) \left(\frac{1}{t^\lambda - \zeta_1^\lambda} - \frac{1}{t^\lambda - \zeta_2^\lambda} \right) dt^\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

The first term is bounded by $C_{1,0}\|f\|_{\beta,0} \delta^\beta$. The second term is bounded by

$$C_{1,0}\|f\|_{\beta,0} \delta^\beta \left| \log \frac{\Gamma^\lambda(2\delta) - \Gamma^\lambda(0)}{\Gamma^\lambda(-2\delta) - \Gamma^\lambda(0)} \right|.$$

Since $\Gamma \in C^{1,0}(\overline{\Omega^\lambda})$, we have for positive constants $c_{1,0}$ and $C_{1,0}$,

$$c_{1,0} = c_{1,0} \frac{2\delta}{2\delta} \leq \left| \frac{\Gamma^\lambda(2\delta) - \Gamma^\lambda(0)}{\Gamma^\lambda(-2\delta) - \Gamma^\lambda(0)} \right| \leq C_{1,0} \frac{2\delta}{2\delta} \leq C_{1,0}.$$

Thus $\left| \log \frac{\Gamma^\lambda(2\delta) - \Gamma^\lambda(0)}{\Gamma^\lambda(-2\delta) - \Gamma^\lambda(0)} \right|$ is bounded uniformly in λ . Finally the last term in (7.4) is bounded by

$$C_{1,0} \|f\|_{\beta,0} \delta^\beta \int_{|s| \geq 2\delta} \frac{|t^\lambda - \zeta_2^\lambda|^\beta}{|t^\lambda - \zeta_1^\lambda| |t^\lambda - \zeta_2^\lambda|} dt^\lambda.$$

Since $|t - \zeta_2| \geq |t - \zeta_1| - |\zeta_1 - \zeta_2| \geq |t - \zeta_1| - c_0 |t - \zeta_1| \geq (1 - c_0) |t - \zeta_1|$, for some $c_0 > 0$, the above expression is bounded by

$$C_{1,0} \|f\|_{\beta,0} \delta^\beta \int_{|s| \geq 2\delta} |t^\lambda - \zeta_1^\lambda|^{\beta-2} dt^\lambda \leq C'_{1,0} \|f\|_{\beta,0} \delta^\beta \int_{|s| \geq 2\delta} |s|^{\beta-2} ds \leq C''_{1,0} \|f\|_{\beta,0} \delta^\beta.$$

Putting together the results we get $|v(\zeta_1, \lambda) - v(\zeta_2, \lambda)| \leq C_{1,0} \|f^\lambda\|_{\beta,0} |\zeta_1 - \zeta_2|^\beta$. \square

Lemma 7.10. *Let Ω^λ be a family of bounded domains in \mathbb{C} in the class $\mathcal{C}^{1,0}$. That is there is a bounded domain Ω of C^1 boundary, and a family of embedding $\Gamma^\lambda : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega^\lambda$ such that $\Gamma^\lambda \in C^{1,0}(\overline{\Omega})$. Let \mathcal{N} be the operator defined by*

$$\mathcal{N}f(\zeta, \lambda) = \int_{b\Omega} \frac{1}{t^\lambda - \zeta^\lambda} [v(\zeta, t, \lambda) - v(t, t, \lambda)] f(t, \lambda) dt^\lambda.$$

Suppose $v \in C^\beta(\overline{\Omega})$, for $0 < \beta < 1$, and $|v(\cdot, t, \lambda)|_\beta$ is bounded by some constant A_β uniformly in λ and $t \in b\Omega$. Then \mathcal{N} maps the space $C^{0,0}(b\Omega^\lambda)$ to the space $C^{\beta',0}(b\Omega^\lambda)$, for any $0 < \beta' < \beta$, and

$$(7.5) \quad \|\mathcal{N}f\|_{\beta',0} \leq C_{\beta'} C_{1,0} \|f\|_{0,0}.$$

Proof. First we estimate the sup norm:

$$|\mathcal{N}f(\zeta, \lambda)| \leq C_{1,0} A_\beta |f(\cdot, \lambda)|_{C^0(b\Omega)} \int_{b\Omega} \frac{1}{|t - \zeta|^{1-\beta}} dt \leq C_{1,0} A_\beta |f(\cdot, \lambda)|_{C^0(b\Omega)},$$

where the constants are independent of λ .

Next, we estimate the difference of $\mathcal{N}f$ at two points $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in b\Omega$. Let $n(\zeta, t, \lambda) = v(\zeta, t, \lambda) - v(t, t, \lambda)$. Then $|n(\zeta, t, \lambda)| \leq A_\beta |\zeta - t|^\beta$. Writing $\delta = |\zeta - \zeta'|$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{N}f(\zeta_1, \lambda) - \mathcal{N}f(\zeta_2, \lambda)| &= \left| \int_{b\Omega} \left[\frac{n(\zeta_1, t, \lambda)}{|\zeta_1^\lambda - t^\lambda|} - \frac{n(\zeta_2, t, \lambda)}{|\zeta_2^\lambda - t^\lambda|} \right] f(t, \lambda) dt^\lambda \right| \\ &\leq A_\beta |f(\cdot, \lambda)|_{C^0(b\Omega)} \left\{ \int_{|\zeta_1^\lambda - t^\lambda| < 2\delta} \frac{dt^\lambda}{|\zeta_1^\lambda - t^\lambda|^{1-\beta}} + \int_{|\zeta_1^\lambda - t^\lambda| < 2\delta} \frac{dt^\lambda}{|\zeta_2^\lambda - t^\lambda|^{1-\beta}} \right\} \\ &\quad + |f(\cdot, \lambda)|_{C^0(b\Omega)} \int_{|\zeta_1 - t| \geq 2\delta} \left| \frac{n(\zeta_1, t, \lambda)}{|\zeta_1^\lambda - t^\lambda|} - \frac{n(\zeta_2, t, \lambda)}{|\zeta_2^\lambda - t^\lambda|} \right| dt^\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

The first two integrals are bounded by $C_{1,0} A'_\beta |f(\cdot, \lambda)|_{C^0(b\Omega)} |\zeta_1 - \zeta_2|^\beta$. The last integral is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{|\zeta_1 - t| > 2\delta} \left\{ \frac{|n(\zeta_1, t, \lambda) - n(\zeta_2, t, \lambda)|}{|\zeta_1^\lambda - t^\lambda|} + |n(\zeta_2, t, \lambda)| \left[\frac{1}{|\zeta_1^\lambda - t^\lambda|} - \frac{1}{|\zeta_2^\lambda - t^\lambda|} \right] \right\} dt^\lambda \\ &\leq C_{1,0} \int_{|\zeta_1 - t| \geq 2\delta} \frac{|v(\zeta_1, t, \lambda) - v(\zeta_2, t, \lambda)|}{|\zeta_1 - t|} dt + C_{1,0} \int_{|\zeta_1 - t| > 2\delta} \frac{|\zeta_1 - \zeta_2| |\zeta_2 - t|^\beta}{|\zeta_1 - t| |\zeta_2 - t|} dt \\ &\leq C_{1,0} |\zeta_1 - \zeta_2|^\beta (\log |\zeta_1 - \zeta_2| + 1) + C_{1,0} |\zeta_1 - \zeta_2| \int_{|\zeta_1 - t| > 2\delta} \frac{1}{|\zeta_1 - t|^{2-\beta}} dt \\ &\leq C'_{1,0} |\zeta_1 - \zeta_2|^{\beta'} \end{aligned}$$

for any $0 < \beta' < \beta$. Combining the estimates we get (7.5). \square

Proposition 7.11. *Let $0 < \beta < 1$ and $k, l \geq 0$ be integers. Let Ω be a bounded domain in \mathbb{C} with $b\Omega \in C^1$. For $f \in L^1(b\Omega)$, define the Cauchy transform $\mathfrak{C}f$ on $\mathbb{C} \setminus b\Omega$ by $\mathfrak{C}f(z) := \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{b\Omega} \frac{f(\zeta)}{\zeta - z} d\zeta$. Suppose $f \in C^\beta(b\Omega)$. Then f extends to a function $\mathfrak{C}^+f \in C^\beta(\overline{\Omega})$. Moreover on $b\Omega$*

$$\mathfrak{C}^+f(z) = f(z) + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{b\Omega} \frac{f(z) - f(\zeta)}{z - \zeta} d\zeta.$$

(ii) *Suppose $b\Omega \in C^{k+1+\beta}$, and $f \in C^{l+\beta}(b\Omega)$ with $k+1 \geq l$. Then $\mathfrak{C}^+f \in C^{l+\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$.*

The proof is standard and the reader may refer to [1].

Proposition 7.12. *Let $A, B \in L_{p,2}(\mathbb{C})$. Let $w(z)$ be the generalized Cauchy integral with density φ , defined by*

$$w(z) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{b\Omega} G_1(z, t)\varphi(t) dt - G_2(z, t)\overline{\varphi(t)} \overline{dt},$$

where G_1 and G_2 are the fundamental kernels of the class $\mathcal{L}_{p,2}(A, B, \mathbb{C})$. Suppose $\varphi(t) \in C^\mu(b\Omega)$, then $w(z) \in C^\nu(\overline{\Omega})$, where $\nu = \min(\alpha_p, \mu)$, $\alpha_p = \frac{p}{p-2}$.

Proof. We write $G_1(z, t) = \frac{\sum_{i=1,2}[e^{\omega_i(z,t)} - e^{\omega_i(t,t)}]}{t-z} + \frac{2}{t-z}$ and $G_2(z, t) = \frac{e^{\omega_1(z,t)} - e^{\omega_2(z,t)}}{t-z}$. By (3.24) and (3.25) we have $|e^{\omega_i(z,t)} - e^{\omega_i(t,t)}| \leq C|z-t|^{\alpha_p}$ for $i = 1, 2$ and $|e^{\omega_1(z,t)} - e^{\omega_2(z,t)}| \leq C|z-t|^{\alpha_p}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} w(z) &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{\varphi(t) dt}{t-z} \\ &\quad + \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{\sum_{i=1,2}[e^{\omega_i(z,t)} - e^{\omega_i(t,t)}]}{t-z} \varphi(t) dt - \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{e^{\omega_1(z,t)} - e^{\omega_2(z,t)}}{t-z} \overline{\varphi(t)} \overline{dt} \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{\varphi(t) dt}{t-z} + \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{F(z, t)}{|t-z|^{1-\alpha_p}} \varphi(t) dt + \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{G(z, t)}{|t-z|^{1-\alpha_p}} \overline{\varphi(t)} \overline{dt}, \end{aligned}$$

where $|F(z, t)| \leq C|z-t|$ and $|G(z, t)| \leq C|z-t|$, for any $z \in \overline{\Omega}$ and $t \in \partial\Omega$. The result then follows from Proposition 7.11. \square

Proposition 7.13. *Let L be an arc of the class C^1 and let $0 < \beta < 1$. Define w to be the generalized Cauchy integral with density $\varphi \in C^\beta(L)$.*

$$w(z) := \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_L G_1(z, t)\varphi(t) dt - G_2(z, t)\overline{\varphi(t)} \overline{dt}, \quad z \notin L.$$

Then w extends to a continuous function from either side of the arc. Furthermore, let us denote by w^+ and w^- the limiting values of w from the region to the left and right of L when going in the positive direction. Then the following formulae hold:

$$(7.6) \quad w^+(\zeta) = \frac{1}{2}\varphi(\zeta) + w(\zeta), \quad w^-(\zeta) = -\frac{1}{2}\varphi(\zeta) + w(\zeta), \quad \zeta \in L,$$

where

$$w(\zeta) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} P.V. \int_L G_1(\zeta, t)\varphi(t) dt - G_2(\zeta, t)\overline{\varphi(t)} \overline{dt}, \quad \zeta \in L.$$

The first integral on the right-hand side is understood to be the Cauchy principal value, and the second integral converging in the ordinary sense.

Proof. See formula (14.2)-(14.3) from [7, p. 188]. The proof uses Plemelj's formula and estimate (3.29). \square

Proposition 7.14. *Let Ω be a domain in \mathbb{C} with C^1 and compact boundary. Suppose $A, B \in L^p(\Omega)$ and $A \equiv B \equiv 0$ in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \Omega$. Define*

$$w(z) := \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{b\Omega} G_1(z, t, \Omega)\varphi(t) dt - G_2(z, t, \Omega)\overline{\varphi(t)} \overline{dt},$$

where $\varphi \in C^\beta(b\Omega)$ for $0 < \beta < 1$, and G_i are defined by (3.26). Then w satisfies the following integral equation (in fact is the unique solution in $C^0(\overline{\Omega})$)

$$(7.7) \quad w(z) + T_\Omega(Aw + B\bar{w}) = \Phi(z),$$

where

$$(7.8) \quad \Phi(z) := \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{b\Omega} \frac{\varphi(t) dt}{t - z}.$$

Proof. We will follow some arguments in [7, p. 183-188]. By the well-known jump formula for Cauchy integral, we have

$$\varphi(\zeta) = \Phi^+(\zeta) - \Phi^-(\zeta), \quad \zeta \in b\Omega.$$

In addition, $\Phi \in C^\beta(\overline{\Omega})$. By (3.28), $\partial_{\bar{z}}G_i(z, \zeta, \Omega) = 0$ if $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \Omega$ and $\zeta \in \Omega$. By (3.30),

$$(7.9) \quad \partial_{\bar{z}}G_i(\zeta, z, \Omega) = 0, \quad \text{if } z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \Omega, \quad \zeta \in \Omega;$$

$$w(z) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{b\Omega} G_1(z, t, \Omega)(\Phi^+ - \Phi^-)(t) dt - G_2(z, t, \Omega)\overline{(\Phi^+ - \Phi^-)(t)} \overline{dt}.$$

By (7.9) and Cauchy's theorem, $\int_{b\Omega} G_1(z, t, \Omega)\Phi^-(t) dt - G_2(z, t, \Omega)\overline{\Phi^-(t)} \overline{dt} = 0$. Using this and applying Green's identity on the domain $\Omega_\varepsilon = \{\zeta \in \Omega : |\zeta - z| > \varepsilon\}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} w(z) &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{b\Omega} G_1(z, t, \Omega)\Phi^+(t) dt - G_2(z, t, \Omega)\overline{\Phi^+(t)} \overline{dt} \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \frac{1}{\pi} \iint_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \left(\partial_{\bar{\zeta}}G_1(z, \zeta, \Omega) \right) \Phi(\zeta) dA(\zeta) + \frac{1}{\pi} \iint_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \partial_{\bar{\zeta}}(G_2(z, \zeta, \Omega)) \overline{\Phi(\zeta)} dA(\zeta) \right\} \\ &\quad + \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|t-z|=\varepsilon} G_1(z, t, \Omega)\Phi(t) - \Omega_2(z, t, \Omega)\overline{\Phi(t)} \overline{dt} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that Φ is holomorphic.

Taking the limit as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, and taking into account estimate (3.29), we have

$$(7.10) \quad w(z) = \Phi(z) + \iint_{\Omega} R_1(z, \zeta, \Omega)\Phi(\zeta)dA(\zeta) + \iint_{\Omega} R_2(z, \zeta, \Omega)\overline{\Phi(\zeta)} dA(\zeta),$$

where $R_1(z, \zeta, \Omega) = \frac{1}{\pi}\partial_{\bar{\zeta}}G_1(z, \zeta, \Omega)$ and $R_2(z, \zeta, \Omega) = \frac{1}{\pi}\partial_{\bar{\zeta}}G_2(z, \zeta, \Omega)$.

We now show that expression (7.10) represents the unique solution to the integral equation:

$$(7.11) \quad w(z) - \frac{1}{\pi} \iint_{\Omega} \frac{A(\zeta)w(\zeta) + B(\zeta)\overline{w(\zeta)}}{\zeta - z} dA(\zeta) = \Phi(z), \quad z \in \Omega.$$

By Vekua [7, p. 156], there exists a unique solution w_0 in the class $L^q(\overline{\Omega})$, $q = \frac{p}{p-1}$. Our goal is to show that w defined by (7.10) is equal to w_0 .

Taking $\partial_{\bar{z}}$ on both sides we get $\mathcal{L}_{A,B}w = 0$ in Ω . Write (7.11) as

$$(7.12) \quad w_0 - P_\Omega w_0 = \Phi, \quad P_\Omega w_0 := -T_\Omega(Aw_0 + B\bar{w}_0) = T_\Omega(\partial_{\bar{z}}w_0).$$

By [7, p. 50], there exists an integer n so that $P^n w_0$ is in the class C^τ for some $\tau > 0$. Since $P(\Phi) \in C^{\frac{p}{p-2}}(\overline{\Omega})$ (Proposition 7.6) and

$$w_0 = P^n w_0 + P^{n-1}(\Phi) + P^{n-2}(\Phi) + \dots + \Phi,$$

we have that $w_0 \in C^0(\overline{\Omega})$. Since $A, B \in L^p(\Omega)$, we have $\partial_{\bar{z}}w_0 \in L^p(\Omega)$. Hence by the remark in [7, p.41] we have

$$(7.13) \quad w_0 - P_\Omega w_0 \equiv w_0 - T_\Omega(\partial_{\bar{z}}w_0) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{b\Omega} \frac{w_0(t) dt}{t - z}.$$

Now the left-hand sides of (7.12) and (7.13) are the same, so the right-hand side are the same as well and we get

$$\Phi(z) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{b\Omega} \frac{\varphi(t) dt}{t-z} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{b\Omega} \frac{w_0(t) dt}{t-z}, \quad z \in \Omega.$$

It follows then by the jump formula for Cauchy integral that $w_0(\zeta) = \Phi^+(\zeta) - \Phi^-(\zeta)$, for $\zeta \in b\Omega$. By Proposition 3.2, w_0 can be represented as

$$\begin{aligned} w_0(z) &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial\Omega} G_1(z, t, \Omega) w_0(t) dt - G_2(z, t, \Omega) \overline{w_0(t)} \overline{dt} \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial\Omega} G_1(z, t, \Omega) (\Phi^+ - \Phi^-)(t) dt - G_2(z, t, \Omega) \overline{(\Phi^+ - \Phi^-)(t)} \overline{dt} = w(z). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

7.3. Theory of singular integral operators on curves.

In the following we let L be a piece-wise, non-intersecting C^1 curve on the plane.

Definition 7.15. We call an operator \mathcal{N} a *Fredholm* operator if it takes the form $\mathcal{F}\varphi(t_0) = A(t_0)\varphi(t_0) + \mathcal{N}(\varphi)(t_0)$, where A is a function nowhere vanishing on L and \mathcal{N} is a compact operator on $C^0(L)$.

Definition 7.16. We call an operator defined by

$$\mathcal{K}\varphi(t_0) := A(t_0)\varphi(t_0) + \frac{1}{\pi i} P.V. \int_L \frac{K(t_0, t)\varphi(t) dt}{t-t_0}, \quad t_0 \in L$$

a *singular integral operator (with Cauchy type kernel)*.

The functions A and K are assumed to be Hölder continuous in their respective arguments. We can write $\mathcal{K}\varphi$ as

$$\mathcal{K}\varphi(t_0) = A(t_0)\varphi(t_0) + \frac{B(t_0)}{\pi i} P.V. \int_L \frac{\varphi(t) dt}{t-t_0} + \frac{1}{\pi i} \int_L k(t_0, t) dt,$$

where $B(t_0) = K(t_0, t_0)$ and $k(t_0, t) = \frac{K(t_0, t)\varphi(t) - K(t_0, t_0)\varphi(t_0)}{t-t_0}$. The operator \mathcal{K}^0 defined by

$$\mathcal{K}^0\varphi(t_0) = A(t_0)\varphi(t_0) + \frac{B(t_0)}{\pi i} P.V. \int_L \frac{\varphi(t) dt}{t-t_0}$$

will be called the *dominant part* of the operator \mathcal{K} .

We define the *adjoint operator* of \mathcal{K} by

$$\mathcal{K}'(\psi)(t_0) = A(t_0)\varphi(t_0) - \frac{1}{\pi i} P.V. \int_L \frac{K(t, t_0)\psi(t) dt}{t-t_0}.$$

The dominant part of \mathcal{K}' is $(\mathcal{K}')^0(\psi)(t_0) = A(t_0)\psi(t_0) - \frac{B(t_0)}{\pi i} P.V. \int_L \frac{\psi(t) dt}{t-t_0}$. For any two functions φ and ψ which are Hölder continuous on L , one has $\int_L (\mathcal{K}\varphi)\psi dt = \int_L \varphi(\mathcal{K}'\psi) dt$.

Lemma 7.17 (Composition of singular integral operators). *Let \mathcal{K}_1 and \mathcal{K}_2 be the two singular integral operators defined by*

$$(7.14) \quad \mathcal{K}_j(t_0) = A_j(t_0)\varphi(t_0) + \frac{1}{\pi i} \int_L \frac{K_j(t_0, t)\varphi(t) dt}{t-t_0}, \quad t_0 \in L, \quad j = 1, 2.$$

Then the composition or the product of \mathcal{K}_1 and \mathcal{K}_2 is

$$(7.15) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_1\mathcal{K}_2(t_0) &= [A_1(t_0)A_2(t_0) + B_1(t_0)B_2(t_0)]\varphi(t_0) \\ &+ \frac{1}{\pi i} \int_L \frac{A_1(t_0)K_2(t_0, t) + K_1(t_0, t)A_2(t)}{t-t_0} \varphi(t) dt \\ &+ \frac{1}{(\pi i)^2} \int_L \left[\int_L \frac{K_1(t_0, t_1)K_2(t_1, t)}{(t_1-t_0)(t-t_1)} dt_1 \right] \varphi(t) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. See formula (45.9) in [5, p. 119]. \square

Denote the double integral in expression (7.15) by $\mathcal{F}_{12}(\varphi)$. We claim that \mathcal{F}_{12} is a compact integral operator. Indeed, we have

$$I(t, t_0) = \int_L \frac{K_1(t_0, t_1)K_2(t_1, t)}{(t_1 - t_0)(t - t_1)} dt_1 = \frac{1}{t - t_0} [v(t_0, t) - v(t, t)]$$

where we set $F(t_1, t, t_0) = K_1(t_0, t_1)K_2(t_1, t)$, and

$$v(t_0, t) = P.V. \int_L \frac{F(t_1, t, t_0)}{t_1 - t_0} dt_1 = \int_L \frac{F(t_1, t, t_0) - F(t_0, t, t_0)}{t_1 - t_0} dt_1 + (\pi i)F(t_0, t, t_0),$$

$$v(t, t) = P.V. \int_L \frac{F(t_1, t, t_0)}{t_1 - t} dt_1 = \int_L \frac{F(t_1, t, t_0) - F(t, t, t_0)}{t_1 - t} dt_1 + (\pi i)F(t, t, t_0).$$

Then the double integral becomes $\int_L \frac{1}{t-t_0} [v(t_0, t) - v(t, t)] \varphi(t) dt$. By the proof of Lemma 7.9, we see that v is Hölder continuous in the first argument. It follows then by Lemma 7.10 that \mathcal{F} is a compact operator.

Denote the single integral in the above product $\mathcal{K}_1\mathcal{K}_2$ by $\mathcal{K}_{12}(\varphi)$. Then \mathcal{K}_{12} is a singular integral operator, and we can write it as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_{12}\varphi(t_0) &= \frac{A_1(t_0)B_2(t_0) + A_2(t_0)B_1(t_0)}{\pi i} P.V. \int_L \frac{\varphi(t)}{t - t_0} dt \\ &+ \int_L \frac{[A_1(t_0)K_2(t_0, t) + K_1(t_0, t)A_2(t)] - [A_1(t_0)K_2(t_0, t_0) + K_1(t_0, t_0)A_2(t_0)]}{t - t_0} \varphi(t) dt. \end{aligned}$$

The second integral above is clearly a compact integral operator. Then in view of (7.15) $\mathcal{K}_1\mathcal{K}_2$ will be a Fredholm operator if one has

$$(7.16) \quad 0 = A_1(t_0)B_2(t_0) + A_2(t_0)B_1(t_0), \quad t_0 \in L.$$

Definition 7.18. Let \mathcal{K}_2 be a singular integral operator defined on $C^\beta(L)$, for some $0 < \beta < 1$, and let \mathcal{K}_1 be another singular integral operator such that the composition $\mathcal{K}_1\mathcal{K}_2$ is a Fredholm operator. Then we call \mathcal{K}_1 a *reducing integral operator* of \mathcal{K}_2 .

Given an operator \mathcal{K}_2 with the corresponding A_2 and B_2 , one can choose another operator \mathcal{K}_1 whose corresponding A_1 and B_1 satisfy condition (7.16). In particular one can choose \mathcal{K}_1 to be the dominant part of the adjoint of \mathcal{K}_2 , since in this case $A_1(t_0) = A_2(t_0)$ and $B_1(t_0) = -B_2(t_0)$.

7.4. Some other results.

The following result is stated and used in Vekua's proof [7] and we shall provide the details.

Proposition 7.19. *Let w be a holomorphic function on the unit disk \mathbb{D} , continuous up to the boundary circle S^1 , and satisfying the following boundary condition:*

$$\operatorname{Re}(z^{-n}w) = \gamma(z), \quad n > 0, \quad \text{on } S^1,$$

where we assume $\gamma \in C^\beta(S^1)$, for $0 < \beta < 1$. Then $w = z^n \mathcal{S}\gamma + \sum_{k=0}^{2n} c_k z^k$ for $z \in \mathbb{D}$, where $\mathcal{S}\gamma$ is the Schwarz integral

$$\mathcal{S}\gamma(z) := \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{S^1} \gamma(t) \frac{t+z}{t-z} \frac{dt}{t}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Proof. Since w is holomorphic, one can write $w(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k z^k$. Then $z^{-n}w(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k z^{k-n} = \sum_{j=-n}^{-1} c_{n+j} z^j + \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_{n+j} z^j$. Thus on S^1 , one has

$$\operatorname{Re}\left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_{n+j} z^j\right) = \operatorname{Re}(z^{-n}w) - \operatorname{Re}\left(\sum_{j=-n}^{-1} c_{n+j} z^j\right) = \gamma(z) - \operatorname{Re}\left(\sum_{j=-n}^{-1} c_{n+j} z^j\right).$$

It is easy to see that $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_{n+j}z^j$ is holomorphic in \mathbb{D} , and in addition by the assumption the series is continuous up to S^1 . Hence it can be represented as the Schwarz integral of the real part of its boundary value:

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_{n+j}z^j = \mathcal{S}(\gamma)(z) - \mathcal{S}\left(\operatorname{Re} \sum_{j=-n}^{-1} c_{n+j}\zeta^j\right)(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Multiplying both sides by z^n we get

$$(7.17) \quad \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_{n+j}z^{n+j} = z^n \mathcal{S}(\gamma)(z) - z^n \mathcal{S}\left(\operatorname{Re} \sum_{j=-n}^{-1} c_{n+j}\zeta^j\right)(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

For $\zeta \in S^1$, one has $2\operatorname{Re} \sum_{j=-n}^{-1} c_{n+j}\zeta^j = \sum_{j=-n}^{-1} c_{n+j}\zeta^j + \sum_{j=-n}^{-1} \overline{c_{n+j}}\zeta^{-j} = \sum_{j=-n}^{-1} c_{n+j}\zeta^j + \sum_{j=1}^n \overline{c_{n-j}}\zeta^j$. Let

$$(7.18) \quad \varphi(z) = \mathcal{S}\left(\operatorname{Re} \sum_{j=-n}^{-1} c_{n+j}\zeta^j\right)(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{D},$$

in other words, φ is the holomorphic function in \mathbb{D} whose boundary value has real part equal to $\operatorname{Re} \left(\sum_{j=-n}^{-1} c_{n+j}\zeta^j \right)$. Then we claim that φ takes the form $\sum_{k=0}^n a_k z^k$. Indeed, since $\varphi(z)$ is holomorphic in \mathbb{D} , it has power series expansion $\varphi = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k z^k$, with

$$a_k = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|t|=1} \frac{\varphi(t)}{t^{k+1}} dt = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|t|=r} \frac{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=-n}^{-1} c_{n+j}t^j dt + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n \overline{c_{n-j}}t^j}{t^{k+1}} dt, \quad k \geq 0.$$

For $k > n$, we have $a_k = 0$, so the claim holds. Substituting (7.18) into (7.17) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_{n+j}z^{n+j} &= z^n \mathcal{S}(\gamma)(z) - z^n \mathcal{S}\left(\operatorname{Re} \sum_{j=-n}^{-1} c_{n+j}\zeta^j\right)(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{D} \\ &= z^n \mathcal{S}(\gamma)(z) - z^n \sum_{k=0}^n a_k z^k = z^n \mathcal{S}(\gamma)(z) - \sum_{k=n}^{2n} a'_k z^k. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, $w(z) = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} c_j z^j + \sum_{j=n}^{\infty} c_j z^j$ implies $w(z) = z^n \mathcal{S}(\gamma)(z) + \sum_{k=n}^{2n} c'_k z^k$, for some c'_k . \square

Proposition 7.20. *Let Ω be a bounded domain in \mathbb{C} , and $0 < \beta < 1$. Suppose $\{f_n\}$ is a sequence of functions in $C^\beta(\overline{\Omega})$ satisfying $|f_n|_{C^\beta(\overline{\Omega})} \leq C$ and $|f_n|_{L^1(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0$. Then $|f_n|_{C^0(\overline{\Omega})} \rightarrow 0$.*

Proof. Suppose $|f|_{C^0(\overline{\Omega})} > \varepsilon_1$. Then there exists $x_0 \in \Omega$ such that $f(x_0) > \varepsilon_1$. Since $|f(x) - f(x_0)| \leq |f|_\beta |x - x_0|^\beta$, we have $|f(x) - f(x_0)| < \frac{\varepsilon_1}{2}$ whenever $|x - x_0| < \delta = \left(\frac{\varepsilon_1}{2|f|_\beta}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}}$. Let $B(x_0, \delta)$ be the ball of radius δ centered at x_0 , then for all $x \in B(x_0, \delta)$, $|f(x)| > \frac{\varepsilon_1}{2}$. Consequently $|f|_{L^1(\Omega)} \geq \int_{B(x_0, \delta)} |f(x)| dx \geq \frac{\varepsilon_1}{2} \pi \delta^2 = C_\beta |f|_\beta^{-\frac{2}{\beta}} \varepsilon_1^{\frac{\beta+2}{\beta}}$, where $C_\beta = \pi 2^{-\frac{\beta+2}{\beta}}$. Note that if x_0 happen to be on the boundary $b\Omega$, then the above estimates hold with an extra constant.

Given ε_0 , we set $\varepsilon_1 = C'_\beta |f|_\beta^{\frac{2}{2+\beta}} \varepsilon_0^{\frac{\beta}{2+\beta}}$, where $C'_\beta = C_\beta^{-\frac{\beta}{2+\beta}}$. Then by above we see that whenever $|f|_{L^1(\Omega)} < \varepsilon_0$, we have $|f|_{C^0(\overline{\Omega})} \leq \varepsilon_1$. By taking $\varepsilon_0 \rightarrow 0$ we get the conclusion. \square

Lemma 7.21. *Let $\Gamma^\lambda : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega^\lambda$ be a $C^{1+\mu,0}$ embedding, where $0 < \mu < 1$. For $t, t_0 \in b\Omega^\lambda$, let $t^\lambda := \Gamma^\lambda(t)$ and $t_0^\lambda := \Gamma^\lambda(t_0)$. Define $K(t, t_0, \lambda) := \partial_{\tau_{t_0}^\lambda} \arg(t_0^\lambda - t^\lambda)$.*

(i) We have $|K(t, t_0, \lambda)| \leq C_{1+\mu,0}|t_0 - t|^{\mu-1}$.

(ii) For any $t_0, t_1, t_2 \in b\Omega$ with $|t_1 - t_0| \geq 2|t_1 - t_2|$, we have

$$|K(t_1, t_0, \lambda) - K(t_2, t_0, \lambda)| \leq C_{1+\mu,0} \frac{|t_1 - t_2|}{|t_0 - t_1|^{2-\mu}}.$$

Proof. (i) We parametrize $b\Omega$ by $\rho(s)$ such that ds is the arc-length element agreeing with the standard orientation of $b\Omega$. Then $\rho^\lambda(s) = \Gamma^\lambda \circ \rho$ gives a parametrization of $b\Omega^\lambda$. Let $t = \rho(s)$ and $t_0 = \rho(s_0)$. Then $t^\lambda = \rho^\lambda(s)$ and $t_0^\lambda = \rho^\lambda(s_0)$, and we can write K as $K(t, t_0, \lambda) = \partial_{\tau_{t_0^\lambda}} \arg(t_0^\lambda - t^\lambda) = |\partial_{s_0} \arg[\rho^\lambda(s_0) - \rho^\lambda(s)]|$. Denote by $\nu^\lambda(s_0)$ the outer unit normal vector to $b\Omega^\lambda$ at $t_0^\lambda = \rho^\lambda(s_0)$. Then we have

$$(7.19) \quad \partial_{s_0} \arg[\rho^\lambda(s_0) - \rho^\lambda(s)] = \frac{\nu^\lambda(s_0) \cdot (\rho^\lambda(s_0) - \rho^\lambda(s))}{|\rho^\lambda(s_0) - \rho^\lambda(s)|^2}.$$

Since $\nu^\lambda(s_0) \cdot (\rho^\lambda(s_0) - \rho^\lambda(s)) = \nu^\lambda(s_0) \cdot \int_s^{s_0} (\rho^\lambda)'(r) - (\rho^\lambda)'(s_0) dr$ and $\rho^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{1+\mu,0}$, the above expression is bounded by $C_{1+\mu,0}|s_0 - s|^{1+\mu}$. Since $\Gamma^\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^{1+\mu,0}$, we have $c_{1,0}|s_0 - s| \leq |\rho^\lambda(s_0) - \rho^\lambda(s)| \leq C_{1,0}|s_0 - s|$. Hence from (7.19) we obtain $|K(t, t_0, \lambda)| \leq C_{1+\mu,0} \frac{|s_0 - s|^{1+\mu}}{|s_0 - s|^2} \leq C_{1+\mu,0}|s_0 - s|^{\mu-1} \leq C'_{1+\mu,0}|t_0 - t|^{\mu-1}$.

(ii) Using formula (7.19) we have

$$\begin{aligned} |K(t_1, t_0, \lambda) - K(t_2, t_0, \lambda)| &= \left| \partial_{s_0} \arg[\rho^\lambda(s_0) - \rho^\lambda(s_1)] - \partial_{s_0} \arg[\rho^\lambda(s_0) - \rho^\lambda(s_2)] \right| \\ &= \left| \frac{\nu^\lambda(s_0) \cdot (\rho^\lambda(s_0) - \rho^\lambda(s_1))}{|\rho^\lambda(s_0) - \rho^\lambda(s_1)|^2} - \frac{\nu^\lambda(s_0) \cdot (\rho^\lambda(s_0) - \rho^\lambda(s_2))}{|\rho^\lambda(s_0) - \rho^\lambda(s_2)|^2} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

The above expression is bounded by the sum $K_1 + K_2$, where

$$\begin{aligned} K_1 &= \frac{1}{|\rho^\lambda(s_0) - \rho^\lambda(s_1)|^2} \left| \nu^\lambda(s_0) \cdot [\rho^\lambda(s_2) - \rho^\lambda(s_1)] \right|, \\ K_2 &= \left| \nu^\lambda(s_0) \cdot [\rho^\lambda(s_0) - \rho^\lambda(s_2)] \right| \left| \frac{1}{|\rho^\lambda(s_0) - \rho^\lambda(s_1)|^2} - \frac{1}{|\rho^\lambda(s_0) - \rho^\lambda(s_2)|^2} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

We estimate each K_i . For K_1 we have

$$\begin{aligned} K_1 &= \frac{1}{|\rho^\lambda(s_0) - \rho^\lambda(s_1)|^2} \left| \nu^\lambda(s_0) \cdot \int_{s_1}^{s_2} (\rho^\lambda)'(r) - (\rho^\lambda)'(s_0) dr \right| \\ &\leq C_{1+\mu,0} \frac{1}{|s_0 - s_1|^2} |s_1 - s_2|^{1+\mu} = C_{1+\mu,0} \frac{|s_1 - s_2|}{|s_0 - s_1|^{2-\mu}} \leq C'_{1+\mu,0} \frac{|t_1 - t_2|}{|t_0 - t_1|^{2-\mu}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used $|t_1 - t_0| \geq 2|t_1 - t_2|$. For K_2 , we have

$$\begin{aligned} K_2 &= \left| \nu^\lambda(s_0) \cdot [\rho^\lambda(s_0) - \rho^\lambda(s_2)] \right| \frac{||\rho^\lambda(s_0) - \rho^\lambda(s_2)|^2 - |\rho^\lambda(s_0) - \rho^\lambda(s_1)|^2|}{|\rho^\lambda(s_0) - \rho^\lambda(s_1)|^2 |\rho^\lambda(s_0) - \rho^\lambda(s_2)|^2} \\ &\leq \left| \nu^\lambda(s_0) \cdot [\rho^\lambda(s_0) - \rho^\lambda(s_2)] \right| \frac{|\rho^\lambda(s_1) - \rho^\lambda(s_2)| (|\rho^\lambda(s_0) - \rho^\lambda(s_2)| + |\rho^\lambda(s_0) - \rho^\lambda(s_1)|)}{|\rho^\lambda(s_0) - \rho^\lambda(s_1)|^2 |\rho^\lambda(s_0) - \rho^\lambda(s_2)|^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where the constant C_0 is uniform in λ . Since

$$\left| \nu^\lambda(s_0) \cdot [\rho^\lambda(s_0) - \rho^\lambda(s_2)] \right| = \left| \nu^\lambda(s_0) \cdot \int_{s_2}^{s_0} (\rho^\lambda)'(r) - (\rho^\lambda)'(s_0) dr \right| \leq C_{1+\mu,0}|s_0 - s_2|^{1+\mu},$$

we have $K_2 \leq C_{1+\mu,0}|s_0 - s_2|^{1+\mu}|s_1 - s_2| \left(\frac{1}{|s_0 - s_1|^2 |s_0 - s_2|} + \frac{1}{|s_0 - s_1| |s_0 - s_2|^2} \right)$. Since $|t_1 - t_0| \geq 2|t_1 - t_2|$, we have $|t_2 - t_0| \geq |t_1 - t_0| - |t_1 - t_2| \geq \frac{1}{2}|t_1 - t_0|$, and $|t_2 - t_0| \leq |t_1 - t_0| + |t_1 + t_2| \leq \frac{3}{2}|t_1 - t_0|$. Then $c_0|s_1 - s_0| \leq |s_2 - s_0| \leq C'_0|s_1 - s_0|$. Consequently, $K_2 \leq C'_{1+\mu,0}|s_1 - s_2| \frac{|s_0 - s_1|^{1+\mu}}{|s_0 - s_1|^3} = C'_{1+\mu,0} \frac{|s_1 - s_2|}{|s_0 - s_1|^{2-\mu}}$. Combining the bounds for K_1 and K_2 we get the desired estimate. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Florian Bertrand and Xianghong Gong. Dirichlet and Neumann problems for planar domains with parameter. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 366(1):159–217, 2014.
- [2] Florian Bertrand, Xianghong Gong, and Jean-Pierre Rosay. Common boundary values of holomorphic functions for two-sided complex structures. *Michigan Math. J.*, 63(2):293–332, 2014.
- [3] Lars Hörmander. *Linear partial differential operators*. Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 116. Academic Press, Inc., Publishers, New York; Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Göttingen-Heidelberg, 1963.
- [4] Carlo Miranda. *Partial differential equations of elliptic type*. Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete, Band 2. Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1970. Second revised edition. Translated from the Italian by Zane C. Motteler.
- [5] N. I. Muskhelishvili. *Singular integral equations*. Dover Publications, Inc., New York, 1992. Boundary problems of function theory and their application to mathematical physics, Translated from the second (1946) Russian edition and with a preface by J. R. M. Radok, Corrected reprint of the 1953 English translation.
- [6] Albert Nijenhuis and William B. Woolf. Some integration problems in almost-complex and complex manifolds. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 77:424–489, 1963.
- [7] I. N. Vekua. *Generalized analytic functions*. Pergamon Press, London-Paris-Frankfurt; Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., Reading, Mass., 1962.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, RUTGERS UNIVERSITY - NEW BRUNSWICK, PISCATAWAY, NJ 08854
Email address: zs327@math.rutgers.edu