

THE MONGE-AMPÈRE SYSTEM IN DIMENSION TWO IS FULLY FLEXIBLE IN CODIMENSION TWO

DOMINIK INAUEN AND MARTA LEWICKA

ABSTRACT. We prove that every $\mathcal{C}^1(\bar{\omega})$ -regular subsolution of the Monge-Ampère system posed on a 2-dimensional domain ω and with target codimension 2, can be uniformly approximated by its exact solutions with regularity $\mathcal{C}^{1,\alpha}(\bar{\omega})$ for any $\alpha < 1$. This result asserts flexibility of Poznyak's theorem for isometric immersions of 2d Riemannian manifolds into \mathbb{R}^4 , in the parallel setting of the Monge-Ampère system.

1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to prove the full flexibility of the Monge-Ampère system in dimension and codimension $d = k = 2$. For the introduction to the Monge-Ampère system with arbitrary $d, k \geq 1$ we refer to [9], while the history of the problem and the description of the recent results in which various convex integration techniques have been used to increase the flexibility exponent in function of $d = 2$ and $k > 1$, we refer to [10, 11, 7].

In our present setting, one seeks a 2d vector field v on a 2d domain ω , solving:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{Det} \nabla^2 v &= f \quad \text{in } \omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2, \\ \text{where } \mathfrak{Det} \nabla^2 v &= \langle \partial_{11} v, \partial_{22} v \rangle - |\partial_{12} v|^2 \quad \text{for } v : \omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2. \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

The closely related problem of finding an isometric immersions of a Riemann metric g on ω :

$$\begin{aligned} (\nabla u)^T \nabla u &= g \quad \text{in } \omega, \\ \text{for } u : \omega &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}^4, \end{aligned} \tag{1.2}$$

reduces to (1.1) upon taking a family of metrics $\{g_\epsilon = \text{Id}_2 + 2\epsilon^2 A\}_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0}$ each a small perturbation of Id_2 with $A : \omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}$ satisfying $-\text{curl curl } A = f$. Making an ansatz $u_\epsilon = \text{id}_2 + \epsilon v + \epsilon^2 w$ and gathering the lowest order terms in the ϵ -expansions, leads to the following system:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}(\nabla v)^T \nabla v + \text{sym} \nabla w &= A \quad \text{in } \omega, \\ \text{for } v, w : \omega &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2, \end{aligned} \tag{1.3}$$

which is a higher dimensional version of the "very weak Monge-Ampère equation" studied for $d = 2, k = 1$ in [12], and related to the von Kármán equations appearing in the theory of elasticity. On a simply connected ω , the system (1.3) is equivalent to: $\text{curl curl } (\frac{1}{2}(\nabla v)^T \nabla v) = \text{curl curl } A$, which is $\mathfrak{Det} \nabla^2 v = -\text{curl curl } A$. This brings us back to (1.1), reflecting the agreement of the Gaussian curvatures κ of g_ϵ and of surfaces $u_\epsilon(\omega)$, at their lowest order terms:

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa(g_\epsilon) &= -\epsilon^2 \text{curl curl } A + o(\epsilon^2), \\ \kappa((\nabla u_\epsilon)^T \nabla u_\epsilon) &= -\frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \text{curl curl } ((\nabla v)^T \nabla v + 2 \text{sym} \nabla w) + o(\epsilon^2) = \epsilon^2 \mathfrak{Det} \nabla^2 v + o(\epsilon^2). \end{aligned}$$

Date: April 7, 2025.

M.L. was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-2407293. AMS classification: 35J96, 53C42, 53A35.

Our main result pertaining to (1.3) states that a C^1 -regular pair (v, w) which is a subsolution, can be uniformly approximated by exact solutions $\{(v_n, w_n)\}_{n=1}^\infty$, as follows:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be an open, bounded domain. Given the fields $v, w \in C^1(\bar{\omega}, \mathbb{R}^2)$, and $A \in C^{0,\beta}(\bar{\omega}, \mathbb{R}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$, assume that:*

$$A > \left(\frac{1}{2}(\nabla v)^T \nabla v + \text{sym} \nabla w\right) \quad \text{on } \bar{\omega}, \quad (1.4)$$

in the sense of matrix inequalities. Then, for every exponent α with:

$$\alpha < \min \left\{ \frac{\beta}{2}, 1 \right\} \quad (1.5)$$

and for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\tilde{v}, \tilde{w} \in C^{1,\alpha}(\bar{\omega}, \mathbb{R}^2)$, such that the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{v} - v\|_0 &\leq \epsilon, & \|\tilde{w} - w\|_0 &\leq \epsilon, \\ A - \left(\frac{1}{2}(\nabla \tilde{v})^T \nabla \tilde{v} + \text{sym} \nabla \tilde{w}\right) &= 0 \quad \text{in } \bar{\omega}. \end{aligned}$$

As a byproduct, we obtain the density of solutions to (1.1) in the space of continuous functions. We also point out that, according to Poznyak's theorem [6, Chapter 2.3], any smooth 2d metric has a smooth local embedding in \mathbb{R}^4 , namely a solution of (1.2). Our density result, albeit only valid for Hölder continuous solutions, is stronger in the following sense: rather than yielding existence of a single solution, it implies that an arbitrary subsolution to (1.3) can be approximated by a $C^{1,\alpha}$ solution. We expect that, using the corrugation ansatz of [2], one can prove a similar result for the system (1.2) as well.

Corollary 1.2. *For any $f \in L^\infty(\omega, \mathbb{R})$ on an open, bounded, simply connected domain $\omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, the following holds. Fix an exponent α in the range (1.5). Then, the set of $C^{1,\alpha}(\bar{\omega}, \mathbb{R}^2)$ weak solutions to (1.1) is dense in $C^0(\bar{\omega}, \mathbb{R}^2)$. Namely, every $v \in C^0(\bar{\omega}, \mathbb{R}^2)$ is the uniform limit of some sequence $\{v_n \in C^{1,\alpha}(\bar{\omega}, \mathbb{R}^2)\}_{n=1}^\infty$, such that:*

$$\mathfrak{Det} \nabla^2 v_n = f \quad \text{on } \omega \quad \text{for all } n \geq 1.$$

In section 1.1 below, we give an overview of our approach and the new components of the proofs. The main technical contribution is the following "stage" construction, whose iteration via the Nash-Kuiper algorithm ultimately provides the proof of Theorem 1.1:

Theorem 1.3. *Let $\omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be an open, bounded, smooth planar domain. Fix two integers $N, K \geq 1$ and an exponent $\gamma \in (0, 1)$. Then, there exists $l_0 \in (0, 1)$ depending only on ω , and there exists $\sigma_0 \geq 1$ depending on ω, γ, N, K , such that the following holds. Given the fields $v, w \in C^2(\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_{2l}(0), \mathbb{R}^2)$, $A \in C^{0,\beta}(\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_{2l}(0), \mathbb{R}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ defined on the closed $2l$ -neighbourhood of ω , and given the positive constants l, λ, \mathcal{M} with the properties:*

$$l \leq l_0, \quad \lambda^{1-\gamma} l \geq \sigma_0, \quad \mathcal{M} \geq \max\{\|v\|_2, \|w\|_2, 1\}, \quad (1.6)$$

there exist $\tilde{v}, \tilde{w} \in C^2(\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_l(0), \mathbb{R}^2)$, such that, denoting the defects:

$$\mathcal{D} = A - \left(\frac{1}{2}(\nabla v)^T \nabla v + \text{sym} \nabla w\right), \quad \tilde{\mathcal{D}} = A - \left(\frac{1}{2}(\nabla \tilde{v})^T \nabla \tilde{v} + \text{sym} \nabla \tilde{w}\right), \quad (1.7)$$

the following bounds are valid:

$$\|\tilde{v} - v\|_1 \leq C\lambda^{\gamma/2}(\|\mathcal{D}\|_0^{1/2} + l\mathcal{M}), \quad (1.8)_1$$

$$\|\tilde{w} - w\|_1 \leq C\lambda^\gamma(\|\mathcal{D}\|_0^{1/2} + l\mathcal{M})(1 + \|\mathcal{D}\|_0^{1/2} + l\mathcal{M} + \|\nabla v\|_0),$$

$$\|\nabla^2 \tilde{v}\|_0 \leq C \frac{(\lambda l)^{K+N} \lambda^{\gamma/2}}{l} (\|\mathcal{D}\|_0^{1/2} + l\mathcal{M}), \quad (1.8)_2$$

$$\|\nabla^2 \tilde{w}\|_0 \leq C \frac{(\lambda l)^{K+N} \lambda^\gamma}{l} (\|\mathcal{D}\|_0^{1/2} + l\mathcal{M})(1 + \|\mathcal{D}\|_0^{1/2} + l\mathcal{M} + \|\nabla v\|_0),$$

$$\|\tilde{\mathcal{D}}\|_0 \leq C \left(l^\beta \|A\|_{0,\beta} + \frac{\|\mathcal{D}\|_0 + (l\mathcal{M})^2}{(\lambda l)^{KN}} \right). \quad (1.8)_3$$

Above, the norms of the maps v, w, A, \mathcal{D} and $\tilde{v}, \tilde{w}, \tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ in (1.8)₁ - (1.8)₃ are taken on the respective domains of the maps' definiteness. The constants C depend only on ω, γ, N, K .

By assigning N sufficiently large, we see that the quotient $r_{K,N}$ of the blow-up rate of $\|\nabla^2 \tilde{v}\|_0$ with respect to the rate of decay of $\|\tilde{\mathcal{D}}\|_0$, can be taken arbitrarily close to $1/K$, whereas this last quotient approaches 0 for large K :

$$\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} r_{K,N} = \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{K+N}{KN} = \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{K} = 0.$$

Since the Hölder regularity exponent deduced from iterating the “stage” as in Theorem 1.3 depends only on the aforementioned quotient of the blow-up / decay rates, and in fact it equals $\frac{1}{1+2r_{K,N}}$ (see section 6 and Theorem 6.1), this implies the range claimed in (1.5).

1.1. Overview of the strategy of proofs. For an extensive description and comparison of the different techniques used in proving the flexibility of the Monge-Ampère system, we refer to [7]. In the following, we only present the new contributions of the present work. As customary for $n = 2$ (see [5, 3, 10, 11, 7]), the new fields \tilde{v}, \tilde{w} in Theorem 1.3 are constructed from v, w by first diagonalizing the associated defect \mathcal{D} modulo a symmetric gradient:

$$\mathcal{D} + \text{sym} \nabla \Psi = a^2 \text{Id},$$

see the details of this decomposition in Lemma 2.2. Then two perturbations are introduced in the form of highly oscillatory corrugations, designed to replace, respectively, each of the two rank-one components of the diagonalized defect: $a^2 e_1 \otimes e_1$ and $a^2 e_2 \otimes e_2$, by lower order defects E^1 and E^2 . These perturbations are added to v in distinct codimensions, according to the ansatz, where the frequencies $\lambda \leq \mu$ and the secondary amplitude b are to be chosen appropriately, and where Γ is a suitable periodic function (see Lemma 2.3):

$$\tilde{v} = v + \frac{a}{\lambda} \Gamma(\lambda x_1) e_1 + \frac{b}{\mu} \Gamma(\mu x_2) e_2, \quad (1.9)$$

The matching perturbations added to w are as in [9]. We note that the ansatz (1.9) leads to an “unbalanced” map \tilde{v} , whose component \tilde{v}^1 oscillates rapidly in the x_1 direction and slowly x_2 , while the second component \tilde{v}^2 behaves conversely. This observation is a point of departure for the new construction in this paper, ultimately leading to Theorem 1.3, as we now explain.

Our first novel contribution is the observation, parallel to that in [2], that refining the ansatz for the perturbation in w enables a partial cancellation of the errors E^1 and E^2 . Specifically, all but one of the terms in E^1 take the form $\gamma(\lambda x_1)H$, where γ is a periodic function with zero mean, and H is a symmetric matrix field oscillating at a much lower frequency than λ .

Through an "integration by parts" argument (see Lemma 2.4, resp. [2, Proposition 2.4]) we express, up to an error of arbitrarily small size:

$$\gamma H \approx \text{sym } \nabla w_c + G e_2 \otimes e_2,$$

for a suitable vector field w_c . Subtracting w_c from the original ansatz on \tilde{w} thus cancels γH , up to a new error term $G e_2 \otimes e_2$, plus the lower order terms. The new error has the same size as γH , however, it can be canceled exactly by choosing the amplitude of the second perturbation to be $b = \sqrt{a^2 - G}$. This effectively allows for the removal of the first rank-one component $a^2 e_1 \otimes e_1$ in the original defect, with almost no extra error. The same procedure is then carried out for the second perturbation. All but one of the terms in E^2 take the form $\tilde{\gamma}(\lambda x_2) \tilde{H}$, where $\tilde{\gamma}$ and \tilde{H} follow analogous properties as γ and H . Again, we write:

$$\tilde{\gamma} \tilde{H} = \text{sym } \nabla \tilde{w}_c + \tilde{G} e_1 \otimes e_1. \quad (1.10)$$

Augmenting the ansatz for \tilde{w} with \tilde{w}_c cancels \tilde{H} up to the error term $\tilde{G} e_1 \otimes e_1$. Here, the second codimension plays a critical role: due to the unbalanced nature of \tilde{v} from equation (1.9), the magnitude of \tilde{G} is significantly smaller than that of \tilde{H} . Initially, when perturbations are added only once, this effect is not yet visible, as v satisfies balanced estimates and λ can be chosen arbitrarily close to the oscillation frequency of v (which makes the map $v + \frac{a}{\lambda} \Gamma(\lambda x_1) e_1$ still balanced). However, \tilde{v} now possesses unbalanced estimates, so upon iterating the described procedure starting from \tilde{v} , the corresponding \tilde{G} exhibits improved estimates.

Our second novel contribution, following the approach in [7], is that repeating the above procedure (whose single iteration is presented in Proposition 4.1), for the total of K times and across K pairs of codimensions, yields the rapid improvement of the estimates in the "stage" Theorem 1.3. Along the way, we observe that one error term in E^1 remains inaccessible to the integration by parts argument, namely a term of the form $\gamma^2 H$, since its oscillating factor does not have zero mean over a period. This term is handled by decomposing it as:

$$\gamma^2 H = \left(\gamma^2 - \int \gamma^2 dt \right) H + \int \gamma^2 dt H.$$

The first term in the right hand side above can be managed again via the "integration by parts" argument, while the second term is absorbed into the decomposition in Lemma 3.1, using a simplified version of Källén's iteration.

1.2. Organization of the paper and notation. In section 2 we present the preparatory lemmas on the mollification and commutator estimates, the basic Kuiper corrugation step construction, and the integration by parts decomposition statements. Section 3 contains a simple version of the Källén's iteration, written for the general scaled defect fields. The iteration counter equals N as in the statement of Theorem 1.3. Section 4 is devoted to our new "step" construction in which we utilize the two codimensions to reduce the defect via the two aforementioned decomposition techniques. In section 5 we iterate such steps towards a "stage" for a total of K times, going over K pairs of codimensions and proving Theorem 1.3. Finally, section 6 recalls the Nash-Kuiper iteration scheme and provides the proof of Theorem 1.1.

By $\mathbb{R}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}$ we denote the space of symmetric 2×2 matrices. The space of Hölder continuous vector fields $\mathcal{C}^{m, \alpha}(\bar{\omega}, \mathbb{R}^k)$ consists of restrictions of all $f \in \mathcal{C}^{m, \alpha}(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^k)$ to the closure of an open, bounded domain $\omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. The $\mathcal{C}^m(\bar{\omega}, \mathbb{R}^k)$ norm of this restriction is denoted by $\|f\|_m$, while its Hölder norm in $\mathcal{C}^{m, \gamma}(\bar{\omega}, \mathbb{R}^k)$ is $\|f\|_{m, \gamma}$. By C we denote a universal constant that may change from line to line, but it depends only on the specified parameters.

2. PREPARATORY STATEMENTS

In this section, we exhibit the basic preliminary statements that will be used in the course of our convex integration constructions. The first lemma below gathers the convolution estimates and the commutator estimate from [4]:

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R})$ be a standard mollifier that is nonnegative, radially symmetric, supported on the unit ball $B(0, 1) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ and such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \phi \, dx = 1$. Denote:*

$$\phi_l(x) = \frac{1}{l^d} \phi\left(\frac{x}{l}\right) \quad \text{for all } l \in (0, 1], x \in \mathbb{R}^2.$$

Then, for every $f, g \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R})$ and every $m \geq 0$ and $\beta \in (0, 1]$ there holds:

$$\|\nabla^{(m)}(f * \phi_l)\|_0 \leq \frac{C}{l^m} \|f\|_0, \quad (2.1)_1$$

$$\|f - f * \phi_l\|_0 \leq C \min \{l^2 \|\nabla^2 f\|_0, l \|\nabla f\|_0, l^\beta \|f\|_{0, \beta}\}, \quad (2.1)_2$$

$$\|\nabla^{(m)}((fg) * \phi_l - (f * \phi_l)(g * \phi_l))\|_0 \leq Cl^{2-m} \|\nabla f\|_0 \|\nabla g\|_0, \quad (2.1)_3$$

with a constant $C > 0$ depending only on the differentiability exponent m .

The next auxiliary result is specific to dimension $d = 2$. We reformulate [3, Proposition 3.1], see also [10, Lemma 2.3], which provides the defect decomposition with the necessary equidistributed elliptic estimates on the decomposition components:

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be an open, bounded, Lipschitz set. There exist maps:*

$$\bar{\Psi} : L^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}) \rightarrow W^{1,2}(\omega, \mathbb{R}^2), \quad \bar{a} : L^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}) \rightarrow L^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}),$$

which are linear, continuous, and such that:

(i) for all $H \in L^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ there holds: $H + \text{sym} \nabla(\bar{\Psi}(H)) = \bar{a}(H) \text{Id}_2$,

(ii) $\bar{\Psi}(\text{Id}_2) \equiv 0$ and $\bar{a}(\text{Id}_2) \equiv 1$ in ω ,

(iii) for all $m \geq 0$ and $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, if ω is $\mathcal{C}^{m+2, \gamma}$ regular then the maps $\bar{\Psi}$ and \bar{a} are continuous from $\mathcal{C}^{m, \gamma}(\bar{\omega}, \mathbb{R}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ to $\mathcal{C}^{m+1, \gamma}(\bar{\omega}, \mathbb{R}^2)$ and to $\mathcal{C}^{m, \gamma}(\bar{\omega}, \mathbb{R})$, respectively, so that:

$$\|\bar{\Psi}(H)\|_{m+1, \gamma} \leq C \|H\|_{m, \gamma} \text{ and } \|\bar{a}(H)\|_{m, \gamma} \leq C \|H\|_{m, \gamma} \quad \text{for all } H \in L^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}). \quad (2.2)$$

The constants C above depend on ω, m, γ but not on H . Also, there exists $l_0 > 0$ depending only on ω , such that (2.2) are uniform on the closed l -neighbourhoods $\{\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_l(0)\}_{l \in (0, l_0)}$ of ω .

As the next preparatory result, we recall the ‘‘step’’ construction from [9, Lemma 2.1], in which a single codimension is used to cancel one rank-one defect of the form $a(x)^2 e_i \otimes e_i$ for $i = 1 \dots 2$:

Lemma 2.3. *Let $v, w \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2)$, $\lambda > 0$ and $a \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R})$ be given. Denote:*

$$\Gamma(t) = 2 \sin t, \quad \bar{\Gamma}(t) = \frac{1}{2} \cos(2t), \quad \bar{\bar{\Gamma}}(t) = -\frac{1}{2} \sin(2t), \quad \bar{\bar{\bar{\Gamma}}}(t) = 1 - \frac{1}{2} \cos(2t),$$

and for a fixed $i, k = 1, 2$ define:

$$\tilde{v} = v + \frac{a(x)}{\lambda} \Gamma(\lambda x_i) e_k, \quad \tilde{w} = w - \frac{a(x)}{\lambda} \Gamma(\lambda x_i) \nabla v^k + \frac{a(x)}{\lambda^2} \bar{\Gamma}(\lambda x_i) \nabla a(x) + \frac{a(x)^2}{\lambda} \bar{\bar{\bar{\Gamma}}}(\lambda x_i) e_i. \quad (2.3)$$

Then, the following identity is valid on \mathbb{R}^2 :

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{1}{2} (\nabla \tilde{v})^T \nabla \tilde{v} + \text{sym} \nabla \tilde{w} \right) - \left(\frac{1}{2} (\nabla v)^T \nabla v + \text{sym} \nabla w \right) - a(x)^2 e_i \otimes e_i \\ &= -\frac{a}{\lambda} \Gamma(\lambda x_i) \nabla^2 v^k + \frac{a}{\lambda^2} \bar{\Gamma}(\lambda x_i) \nabla^2 a + \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \bar{\bar{\bar{\Gamma}}}(\lambda x_i) \nabla a \otimes \nabla a. \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

Finally, the following result is a more explicit version of the integration by parts decomposition of [2], and provides a new ingredient of the proofs, with respect to our prior observations in [9, 10, 11, 7]. More precisely, it yields a new defect's decomposition, complementary to that in Lemma 2.2, which, through removing a further symmetric gradient from the given oscillatory component of a defect at hand, reduces it to a defect of higher order in the frequency, plus another term that agrees in the frequency yet has a lower rank.

Lemma 2.4. *Given $H \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1}(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2})$, $\lambda > 0$, and $\Gamma_0 \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$, we have the decomposition:*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Gamma_0(\lambda x_1)}{\lambda} H &= (-1)^{k+1} \frac{\Gamma_{k+1}(\lambda x_1)}{\lambda^{k+2}} \text{sym} \nabla L_k \\ &+ \text{sym} \nabla \left(\sum_{i=0}^k (-1)^i \frac{\Gamma_{i+1}(\lambda x_1)}{\lambda^{i+2}} L_i \right) + \left(\sum_{i=0}^k (-1)^i \frac{\Gamma_i(\lambda x_1)}{\lambda^{i+1}} P_i \right) e_2 \otimes e_2 \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

where the functions $\Gamma_i \in \mathcal{C}^i(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ satisfy the recursive definition:

$$\Gamma'_{i+1} = \Gamma_i \quad \text{for all } i = 0 \dots k, \quad (2.6)$$

while $L_i \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1-i}(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2)$ and $P_i \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1-i}(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R})$ are given in:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} L_0 &= (H_{11}, 2H_{12}), & P_0 &= H_{22}, \\ L_i &= (\partial_1^{(i)} H_{11}, 2\partial_1^{(i)} H_{12} + i\partial_1^{(i-1)} \partial_2 H_{11}), \\ P_i &= 2\partial_1^{(i-1)} \partial_2 H_{12} + (i-1)\partial_1^{(i-2)} \partial_2^{(2)} H_{11} \end{aligned} \right\} \quad \text{for all } i = 1 \dots k. \quad (2.7)$$

In particular, there holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sym} \nabla L_k &= \partial_1^{(k+1)} H_{11} e_1 \otimes e_1 + (2\partial_1^{(k+1)} H_{12} + (k+1)\partial_1^{(k)} \partial_2 H_{11}) \text{sym}(e_1 \otimes e_2) \\ &+ (2\partial_1^{(k)} \partial_2 H_{12} + k\partial_1^{(k-1)} \partial_2^{(2)} H_{11}) e_2 \otimes e_2. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. 1. We start by checking that for all $i = 0 \dots k-1$ there holds:

$$\text{sym} \nabla L_i = \text{sym}(L_{i+1} \otimes e_1) + P_{i+1} e_2 \otimes e_2. \quad (2.8)$$

At $i = 0$ we have $L_{i+1} = L_1 = (\partial_1 H_{11}, 2\partial_1 H_{12} + \partial_2 H_{11})$ and $P_{i+1} = P_1 = 2\partial_2 H_{12}$, hence:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sym} \nabla L_0 &= \partial_1 H_{11} e_1 \otimes e_1 + (2\partial_1 H_{12} + \partial_2 H_{11}) \text{sym}(e_1 \otimes e_2) + 2\partial_2 H_{12} e_2 \otimes e_2 \\ &= \text{sym}(L_1 \otimes e_1) + P_1 e_2 \otimes e_2. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, for $i \geq 1$ it follows that:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sym} \nabla L_i &= \partial_1^{(i+1)} H_{11} e_1 \otimes e_1 + (2\partial_1^{(i+1)} H_{12} + (i+1)\partial_1^{(i)} \partial_2 H_{11}) \text{sym}(e_1 \otimes e_2) \\ &+ (2\partial_1^{(i)} \partial_2 H_{12} + i\partial_1^{(i-1)} \partial_2^{(2)} H_{11}) e_2 \otimes e_2 \\ &= \text{sym}(L_{i+1} \otimes e_1) + P_{i+1} e_2 \otimes e_2. \end{aligned}$$

This validates (2.8). Observe also that (2.6) yields:

$$\frac{\Gamma_i(\lambda x_1)}{\lambda^{i+1}} \text{sym}(L_i \otimes e_1) = -\frac{\Gamma_{i+1}(\lambda x_1)}{\lambda^{i+2}} \text{sym} \nabla L_i + \text{sym} \nabla \left(\frac{\Gamma_{i+1}(\lambda x_1)}{\lambda^{i+2}} L_i \right). \quad (2.9)$$

2. The proof of (2.5) is carried out by induction on k . At $k = 0$, we use (2.9) together with the obvious decomposition $H = \text{sym}(L_0 \otimes e_1) + P_0 e_2 \otimes e_2$, to get:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Gamma_0(\lambda x_1)}{\lambda} H &= \frac{\Gamma_0(\lambda x_1)}{\lambda} \text{sym}(L_0 \otimes e_1) + \frac{\Gamma_0(\lambda x_1)}{\lambda} P_0 e_2 \otimes e_2 \\ &= -\frac{\Gamma_1(\lambda x_1)}{\lambda^2} \text{sym} \nabla L_0 + \text{sym} \nabla \left(\frac{\Gamma_1(\lambda x_1)}{\lambda^2} L_0 \right) + \frac{\Gamma_0(\lambda x_1)}{\lambda^1} P_0 e_2 \otimes e_2 \end{aligned}$$

Assume that (2.5) holds at some $k \geq 0$. The first term in its right hand side can be rewritten in virtue of (2.8) and (2.9) as:

$$\begin{aligned} &(-1)^{k+1} \frac{\Gamma_{k+1}(\lambda x_1)}{\lambda^{k+2}} \text{sym} \nabla L_k \\ &= (-1)^{k+1} \frac{\Gamma_{k+1}(\lambda x_1)}{\lambda^{k+2}} \text{sym}(L_{k+1} \otimes e_1) + (-1)^{k+1} \frac{\Gamma_{k+1}(\lambda x_1)}{\lambda^{k+2}} P_{k+1} e_2 \otimes e_2 \\ &= (-1)^{k+2} \frac{\Gamma_{k+2}(\lambda x_1)}{\lambda^{k+3}} \text{sym} \nabla L_{k+1} + (-1)^{k+1} \text{sym} \nabla \left(\frac{\Gamma_{k+2}(\lambda x_1)}{\lambda^{k+3}} L_{k+1} \right) \\ &\quad + (-1)^{k+1} \frac{\Gamma_{k+1}(\lambda x_1)}{\lambda^{k+2}} P_{k+1} e_2 \otimes e_2. \end{aligned}$$

Summing with the other two terms of (2.5), the identity follows at $k + 1$ as claimed. \blacksquare

A symmetric decomposition holds with respect to x_2 rather than x_1 :

Corollary 2.5. *Let H , λ , Γ_0 be as in Lemma 2.4 and $\{\Gamma_i \in \mathcal{C}^i(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})\}_{i=1}^{k+1}$ as in (2.6). Then:*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Gamma_0(\lambda x_2)}{\lambda} H &= (-1)^{k+1} \frac{\Gamma_{k+1}(\lambda x_2)}{\lambda^{k+2}} \text{sym} \nabla \tilde{L}_k \\ &\quad + \text{sym} \nabla \left(\sum_{i=0}^k (-1)^i \frac{\Gamma_{i+1}(\lambda x_2)}{\lambda^{i+2}} \tilde{L}_i \right) + \left(\sum_{i=0}^k (-1)^i \frac{\Gamma_i(\lambda x_2)}{\lambda^{i+1}} \tilde{P}_i \right) e_1 \otimes e_1, \end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

with $\tilde{L}_i \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1-i}(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2)$, $\tilde{P}_i \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1-i}(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R})$ given in:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \tilde{L}_0 &= (2H_{12}, H_{22}), & \tilde{P}_0 &= H_{11}, \\ \tilde{L}_i &= (2\partial_2^{(i)} H_{12} + i\partial_1 \partial_2^{(i-1)} H_{22}, \partial_2^{(i)} H_{22}), \\ \tilde{P}_i &= 2\partial_1 \partial_2^{(i-1)} H_{12} + (i-1)\partial_1^{(2)} \partial_2^{(i-2)} H_{22} \end{aligned} \right\} \text{ for all } i = 1 \dots k. \tag{2.11}$$

In particular, there holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sym} \nabla \tilde{L}_k &= (2\partial_1 \partial_2^{(k)} H_{12} + k\partial_1^{(2)} \partial_2^{(k-1)} H_{22}) e_1 \otimes e_1 \\ &\quad + (2\partial_2^{(k+1)} H_{12} + (k+1)\partial_1 \partial_2^{(k)} H_{22}) \text{sym}(e_1 \otimes e_2) + \partial_2^{(k+1)} H_{22} e_2 \otimes e_2. \end{aligned}$$

We remark that if Γ_0 has the general form $\alpha \sin(\beta t)$ or $\alpha \cos(\beta t)$, as is the case for the zero-mean periodic profiles Γ , $\bar{\Gamma}$ or $\bar{\bar{\Gamma}} - 1$ in Lemma 2.3, then the primitives Γ_i are of the same form $\frac{\alpha}{\beta^i} \sin(\beta t)$ or $\frac{\alpha}{\beta^i} \cos(\beta t)$. All their derivatives are then bounded, which allows the uniformity of estimates in Proposition 4.1, and is the reason why we work with $\bar{\bar{\Gamma}} - 1$ instead of $\bar{\bar{\Gamma}}$.

3. THE KÄLLÉN ITERATION

In this section, we carry out a simple version of Källén's iteration, with the purpose of canceling the non-oscillatory portion of the last defect term in the right hand side of (2.4), corresponding to $\frac{1}{\lambda^2} \nabla a \otimes \nabla a$. The remaining portion $\frac{1}{\lambda^2} (\bar{\Gamma}(\lambda x_1) - 1) \nabla a \otimes \nabla a$ will be canceled (in the leading order terms) via an application of Lemma 2.4. The matrix field H in the statement below should be thought of as the scaled defect \mathcal{D} in the proof of Theorem 1.3.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be open, bounded, smooth and let $N \geq 1$ and $\gamma \in (0, 1)$. Then, there exists $l_0 \in (0, 1)$ depending only on ω and $\sigma_0 \geq 2$ depending on ω, γ, N such that the following holds. Given the constants $l > 0$, $\mu, \bar{\lambda} > 1$ and an integer M , satisfying:*

$$l \leq l_0, \quad \bar{\lambda}^{1-\gamma} \geq \mu \sigma_0, \quad M \geq 0, \quad (3.1)$$

and given the field $H \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_l(0), \mathbb{R}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ with the property:

$$\|\nabla^{(m)} H\|_0 \leq \mu^m \quad \text{for all } m = 0 \dots M + 2N, \quad (3.2)$$

there exist $a \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_l(0), \mathbb{R})$ and $\Psi \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_l(0), \mathbb{R}^2)$ such that, denoting:

$$\mathcal{F} = a^2 \text{Id}_2 + \text{sym} \nabla \Psi - H + \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \nabla a \otimes \nabla a,$$

there hold the estimates:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \frac{\bar{C}}{2} \mu^\gamma &\leq a^2 \leq \frac{3\bar{C}}{2} \mu^\gamma & \text{and} & \quad \frac{\bar{C}^{1/2}}{2} \mu^{\gamma/2} \leq a \leq \frac{3\bar{C}^{1/2}}{2} \mu^{\gamma/2}, \\ \|\Psi\|_1 &\leq C \mu^\gamma & \text{and} & \quad \|\nabla^2 \Psi\|_0 \leq C \mu^\gamma \mu, \\ \|\nabla^{(m)} a^2\|_0 &\leq C \mu^\gamma \mu^m & \text{and} & \quad \|\nabla^{(m)} a\|_0 \leq C \mu^{\gamma/2} \mu^m \\ \|\nabla^{(m)} \mathcal{F}\|_0 &\leq C \frac{\mu^m}{(\bar{\lambda}/\mu)^N} \end{aligned} \right\} \quad \text{for all } m = 0 \dots M. \quad (3.3)$$

The constant \bar{C} depends only on ω, γ , while C depends on ω, γ, N, M .

Proof. 1. (Iteration set-up) With the help of Lemma 2.2, we will inductively define scalar fields $\{a_i \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_l(0), \mathbb{R})\}_{i=1}^N$ and vector fields $\{\Psi_i \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_l(0), \mathbb{R}^2)\}_{i=1}^N$ such that:

$$a_i^2 \text{Id}_2 + \text{sym} \nabla \Psi_i = H - \mathcal{E}_{i-1} \quad \text{for all } i = 1 \dots N, \quad (3.4)$$

$$\text{where } \mathcal{E}_i = \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \nabla a_i \otimes \nabla a_i \quad \text{for all } i = 0 \dots N,$$

where we have set $a_0 = 0$. Declaring:

$$a = a_N, \quad \Psi = \Psi_N, \quad \text{so that } \mathcal{F} = \mathcal{E}_N - \mathcal{E}_{N-1},$$

the bounds (3.3) will be implied by the following estimate, that we prove below for $i = 1 \dots N$:

$$\frac{\tilde{C}}{2} \mu^\gamma \leq a_i^2 \leq \frac{3\tilde{C}}{2} \mu^\gamma \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\tilde{C}^{1/2}}{2} \mu^{\gamma/2} \leq a_i \leq \frac{3\tilde{C}^{1/2}}{2} \mu^{\gamma/2}, \quad (3.5)_1$$

$$\|\nabla^{(m)} a_i^2\|_0 \leq C \mu^\gamma \mu^m \quad \text{and} \quad \|\nabla^{(m)} a_i\|_0 \leq C \mu^{\gamma/2} \mu^m \quad \text{for all } m = 1 \dots M, \quad (3.5)_2$$

$$\|\Psi_i\|_1 \leq C \mu^\gamma \quad \text{and} \quad \|\nabla^2 \Psi_i\|_0 \leq C \mu^\gamma \mu, \quad (3.5)_3$$

$$\|\nabla^{(m)} (\mathcal{E}_i - \mathcal{E}_{i-1})\|_0 \leq C \mu^{\gamma i} \frac{\mu^m}{(\bar{\lambda}/\mu)^{2i}} \quad \text{for all } m = 0 \dots M. \quad (3.5)_4$$

The constant \tilde{C} in (3.5)₁ will be shown to depend only on ω, γ . Other constants C depend: in (3.5)₂ on ω, γ, n, M and only $M + 2(i - 1) + 1$ derivatives of H ; in (3.5)₃ on ω, γ, i and only

$2 + 2(i - 1)$ derivatives of H ; in (3.5)₄ on ω, γ, N, M necessitating the full condition (3.2). The last bound in (3.3) follows from (3.5)₄ and the second condition in (3.1), because:

$$\|\nabla^{(m)} \mathcal{F}\|_0 = \|\nabla^{(m)} (\mathcal{E}_N - \mathcal{E}_{N-1})\|_0 \leq C \mu^{\gamma N} \frac{\mu^m}{(\bar{\lambda}/\mu)^{2N}} \leq C \left(\frac{\bar{\lambda}^\gamma}{\bar{\lambda}/\mu} \right)^N \frac{\mu^m}{(\bar{\lambda}/\mu)^N} \leq C \frac{\mu^m}{(\bar{\lambda}/\mu)^N}.$$

We start by observing that the second bound in (3.5)₁ is implied by the first one, because:

$$\left| \frac{a_i(x)}{\bar{C}^{1/2} \mu^{\gamma/2}} - 1 \right| \leq \left| \frac{a_i(x)^2}{\bar{C} \mu^\gamma} - 1 \right| \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Likewise, the second bound in (3.5)₂ follows from the first one in view of (3.5)₁, in virtue of the Faà di Bruno formula:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla^{(m)} a_i\|_0 &\leq C \left\| \sum_{p_1+2p_2+\dots+mp_m=m} a_i^{2(1/2-p_1-\dots-p_m)} \prod_{z=1}^m |\nabla^{(z)} a_i^2|^{p_z} \right\|_0 \\ &\leq C \|a_i\|_0 \sum_{p_1+2p_2+\dots+mp_m=m} \prod_{z=1}^m \left(\frac{\|\nabla^{(z)} a_i^2\|_0}{\bar{C} \mu^\gamma} \right)^{p_z} \leq C \mu^{\gamma/2} \mu^m, \end{aligned}$$

necessitating the same number of derivatives bounds in condition (3.2). Applying Faà di Bruno's formula to the inverse rather than the square root, (3.5)₂ yields:

$$\|\nabla^{(m)} \left(\frac{1}{a_{i+1} + a_i} \right)\|_0 \leq \frac{C}{\mu^{\gamma/2}} \sum_{p_1+2p_2+\dots+mp_m=m} \prod_{z=1}^m \left(\frac{\|\nabla^{(z)} (a_{i+1} + a_i)\|_0}{\bar{C}^{1/2} \mu^{\gamma/2}} \right)^{p_z} \leq \frac{C}{\mu^{\gamma/2}} \mu^m, \quad (3.6)$$

with the the same dependence of constants and using the same number of derivatives of H as in the corresponding bounds on a_i and a_{i+1} .

2. (Induction base $i = 1$ and definition of \bar{C}) Let the linear maps $\bar{a}, \bar{\Psi}$ be as in Lemma 2.2, applied with the specified γ . From the bound on $\|H\|_1$ in (3.2), we obtain:

$$\|\bar{a}(H)\|_0 \leq C \|H\|_{0,\gamma} \leq C (\|H\|_0 + \|H\|_0^{1-\gamma} \|\nabla H\|_0^\gamma) \leq C \mu^\gamma$$

where C depends on ω, γ . We declare \bar{C} to be four times the final constant above, leading to:

$$\|\bar{a}(H)\|_0 \leq \frac{\bar{C}}{4} \mu^\gamma. \quad (3.7)$$

This results in the validity of the first bound in (3.5)₁, where we set:

$$a_1^2 = \bar{C} \mu^\gamma + \bar{a}(H), \quad \Psi_1 = \bar{\Psi}(H) - \bar{C} \mu^\gamma id_2, \quad (3.8)$$

while the identity (3.4) holds because $\mathcal{E}_0 = 0$ and:

$$\begin{aligned} H &= \bar{a}(H) Id_2 + \text{sym} \nabla (\bar{\Psi}(H)) \\ &= (a_1^2 Id_2 - \bar{C} \mu^\gamma Id_2) + (\text{sym} \nabla \Psi_1 + \bar{C} \mu^\gamma Id_2) = a_1^2 Id_2 + \text{sym} \nabla \Psi_1. \end{aligned}$$

Further, using the bound on $\|H\|_{M+1}$ in (3.2), we obtain for all $m = 1 \dots M$:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla^{(m)} a_1^2\|_0 &\leq C \|H\|_{m,\gamma} \leq C (\|H\|_m + \|\nabla^{(m)} H\|_0^{1-\gamma} \|\nabla^{(m+1)} H\|_0^\gamma) \\ &\leq C (\mu^m + \mu^{m(1-\gamma)} \mu^{(m+1)\gamma}) \leq C \mu^\gamma \mu^m, \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

where C depends on ω, γ, M . The above implies the first bound in (3.5)₂. Towards (3.5)₄, we apply (3.9) and use (3.2) up to $\|H\|_{M+2}$ in:

$$\|\nabla^{(m)} \mathcal{E}_1\|_0 \leq C \sum_{p+q=m} \bar{\lambda}^{-2} \|\nabla^{(p+1)} a_1\|_0 \|\nabla^{(q+1)} a_1\|_0 \leq C \sum_{p+q=m} \bar{\lambda}^{-2} \mu^\gamma \mu^{p+q+2} \leq C \mu^\gamma \frac{\mu^m}{(\bar{\lambda}/\mu)^2},$$

valid for $m \leq M$, with C depending on ω, γ, M . The above is precisely (3.5)₄ since $\mathcal{E}_0 = 0$.

3. (Induction step: bounds (3.5)₁, (3.5)₂) Assume that (3.5)₁, (3.5)₂, (3.5)₄ hold up to some $1 \leq i \leq N - 1$, necessitating (3.2) to estimate derivatives of H only up to $M + 2i$. We will prove the validity of the same bounds at $i + 1$, necessitating (3.2) to estimate $\|H\|_{M+2i+1}$. We start by noting that, as a consequence of (3.5)₄, for all $j = 1 \dots i$ and $m = 0 \dots M$ we have:

$$\|\nabla^{(m)}(\mathcal{E}_j - \mathcal{E}_{j-1})\|_{0,\gamma} \leq C\mu^{\gamma(j+1)} \frac{\mu^m}{(\bar{\lambda}/\mu)^{2j}} = C\mu^\gamma \mu^m \left(\frac{\mu^\gamma}{(\bar{\lambda}/\mu)^2} \right)^j, \quad (3.10)$$

necessitating the bounds on $\|H\|_{M+2i+1}$ and with C depending on ω, γ, i, M . This yields:

$$\|\nabla^{(m)}\mathcal{E}_i\|_{0,\gamma} \leq C\mu^\gamma \mu^m \sum_{j=1}^i \left(\frac{\mu^\gamma}{(\bar{\lambda}/\mu)^2} \right)^j \leq C\mu^\gamma \mu^m \frac{\mu^\gamma/(\bar{\lambda}/\mu)^2}{1 - \mu^\gamma/(\bar{\lambda}/\mu)^2} \leq C\mu^{2\gamma} \frac{\mu^m}{(\bar{\lambda}/\mu)^2} \quad (3.11)$$

as $\mu^\gamma/(\bar{\lambda}/\mu)^2 \leq \bar{\lambda}^\gamma/(\bar{\lambda}/\mu) \leq 1/\sigma_0 \leq 1/2$ from the second assumption in (3.1). In particular:

$$\|\bar{a}(\mathcal{E}_i)\|_0 \leq C\|\mathcal{E}_i\|_{0,\gamma} \leq C \frac{\mu^{2\gamma}}{(\bar{\lambda}/\mu)^2} \leq \frac{\bar{C}}{4}\mu^\gamma$$

provided that σ_0 is large enough, in function of ω, γ, i . Recalling (3.7), the above yields the well definiteness of a_{i+1}^2 together with the first bound in (3.5)₁, upon defining:

$$a_{i+1}^2 = \bar{C}\mu^\gamma + \bar{a}(H - \mathcal{E}_i), \quad \Psi_{i+1} = \bar{\Psi}(H - \mathcal{E}_i) - \bar{C}\mu^\gamma id_2. \quad (3.12)$$

The identity (3.4) clearly holds from Lemma 2.2 (i). Towards proving (3.5)₂, we apply (3.11) and the bound on $\|H\|_{m,\gamma}$ in (3.9), to get:

$$\|\nabla^{(m)}a_{i+1}^2\|_0 \leq C\|H - \mathcal{E}_i\|_{m,\gamma} \leq C\mu^\gamma \mu^m \left(1 + \frac{\mu^\gamma}{(\bar{\lambda}/\mu)^2} \right) \leq C\mu^\gamma \mu^m$$

for all $m = 1 \dots M$. Above the constant C depends on ω, γ, i, M and condition (3.2) has been used only up to $M + 2i + 1$ derivatives of H .

4. (Induction step: the bound (3.5)₄) We continue the inductive step argument and show (3.5)₄ at $i + 1$, necessitating (3.2) to estimate derivatives of H up to $M + 2(i + 1)$. From the definitions (3.8) and (3.12), it follows that:

$$a_{i+1}^2 - a_i^2 = -\bar{a}(\mathcal{E}_i - \mathcal{E}_{i-1}).$$

Consequently, recalling (3.10) we get:

$$\|\nabla^{(m)}(a_{i+1}^2 - a_i^2)\|_0 \leq C\|\mathcal{E}_i - \mathcal{E}_{i-1}\|_{m,\gamma} \leq C\mu^\gamma \mu^m \left(\frac{\mu^\gamma}{(\bar{\lambda}/\mu)^{2i}} \right),$$

which together with (3.6) implies:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla^{(m)}(a_{i+1} - a_i)\|_0 &\leq C \sum_{p+q=m} \|\nabla^{(p)}(a_{i+1}^2 - a_i^2)\|_0 \|\nabla^{(q)}\left(\frac{1}{a_{i+1} + a_i}\right)\|_0 \\ &\leq C\mu^{\gamma/2} \mu^m \frac{\mu^{\gamma i}}{(\bar{\lambda}/\mu)^{2i}} \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

for all $m = 0 \dots M$, with C depending on ω, γ, i, M and where we used bounds in (3.2) on the derivatives of H up to $M + 2i + 1$. Towards proving (3.5)₄, we use the identity:

$$\nabla a_{i+1} \otimes \nabla a_{i+1} - \nabla a_i \otimes \nabla a_i = \nabla(a_{i+1} - a_i) \otimes \nabla(a_{i+1} - a_i) + 2 \text{sym}(\nabla(a_{i+1} - a_i) \otimes \nabla a_i)$$

and estimate, using (3.13), the already established bounds (3.5)₂, (3.5)₂:

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\nabla^{(m)}(\mathcal{E}_{i+1} - \mathcal{E}_i)\|_0 \\ & \leq C \sum_{p+q=m} \bar{\lambda}^{-2} \|\nabla^{(p+1)}(a_{i+1} - a_i)\|_0 (\|\nabla^{(q+1)}a_{i+1}\|_0 + \|\nabla^{(q+1)}a_i\|_0) \\ & \leq C \frac{\mu^{m+2}}{\bar{\lambda}^2} \frac{\mu^{\gamma/2} \mu^{\gamma i}}{(\bar{\lambda}/\mu)^{2i}} \mu^{\gamma/2} \leq C \mu^{\gamma(i+1)} \frac{\mu^m}{(\bar{\lambda}/\mu)^{2(i+1)}}, \end{aligned}$$

which is exactly (3.5)₄ at $i + 1$, with the right dependence of constants and order of used derivatives of H (up to $M + 2i + 2$), as claimed.

5. (The bound (3.5)₃) From the definitions (3.8), (3.12) we obtain, for all $i = 1 \dots N$ in virtue of Lemma 2.2 (iii) and (3.11):

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Psi_i\|_1 & \leq C(\mu^\gamma + \|H\|_{0,\gamma} + \|\mathcal{E}_{i-1}\|_{0,\gamma}) \leq C\mu^\gamma, \\ \|\nabla^2\Psi_i\|_0 & \leq C(\|H\|_{1,\gamma} + \|\mathcal{E}_{i-1}\|_{1,\gamma}) \leq C\mu^\gamma \left(\mu + \frac{\mu\mu^\gamma}{(\bar{\lambda}/\mu)^2}\right) \leq C\mu^\gamma\mu, \end{aligned}$$

with C depending on ω, γ, i and where we used the bounds in (3.2) on the derivatives of H up to $2 + 2(i - 1)$. This ends the proof of Proposition 3.1. \blacksquare

4. THE QUADRUPLE STEP CONSTRUCTION IN TWO CODIMENSIONS

In preparation for the recursive construction of the “stage” in the proof of Theorem 1.3, we first present its main building block, whose bounds we index using the eventual recursion counter $j = 0 \dots K$. The given quantities are referred to through the subscript j while the derived quantities carry the consecutive subscript $j + 1$. Namely, we have:

Proposition 4.1. *Let $\omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be open, bounded, smooth and let $N \geq 1$, $\gamma \in (0, 1)$. There exists $l_0 \in (0, 1)$ depending on ω , and $\sigma_0 \geq 1$ depending on ω, γ, N such that the following holds. Given are the following quantities:*

- a constant $l > 0$, an integer M , and frequencies $\mu_{j-1}, \lambda_j, \mu_j, \lambda_{j+1}, \mu_{j+1}$, satisfying:

$$\begin{aligned} l & \leq l_0, & \lambda_{j+1}^{1-\gamma} & \geq \mu_j \sigma_0, & M & \geq 1, \\ 1 & < \mu_{j-1} & \leq \lambda_j & \leq \mu_j & \leq \lambda_{j+1} & \leq \mu_{j+1}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

- two positive auxiliary constants B_j and \tilde{C}_j , satisfying:

$$(B_j/\tilde{C}_j)^{1/2} \leq \min \left\{ \frac{\mu_j}{\lambda_j}, \frac{\mu_{j+1}}{\lambda_{j+1}} \right\}, \tag{4.2}$$

- the vector and matrix fields $v_j, w_j \in C^\infty(\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_l(0), \mathbb{R}^2)$, $A_0 \in C^\infty(\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_l(0), \mathbb{R}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$, such that together with the derived field $\mathcal{D}_j = A_0 - (\frac{1}{2}(\nabla v_j)^T \nabla v_j + \text{sym} \nabla w_j)$, they obey:

$$\|\nabla^{(m)} \mathcal{D}_j\|_0 \leq \tilde{C}_j \mu_j^m \quad \text{for all } m = 0 \dots M + 3N + 4, \quad (4.3)_1$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \|\partial_1^{(t)} \partial_2^{(s)} \partial_{11} v_j^1\|_0 \leq B_j^{1/2} \mu_{j-1}^{\gamma/2} \lambda_j^{t+1} \mu_{j-1}^s, \quad \|\partial_1^{(t)} \partial_2^{(s)} \partial_{12} v_j^1\|_0 \leq B_j^{1/2} \mu_{j-1}^{\gamma/2} \lambda_j^t \mu_{j-1}^{s+1}, \\ \|\partial_1^{(t)} \partial_2^{(s)} \partial_{22} v_j^1\|_0 \leq B_j^{1/2} \mu_{j-1}^{\gamma/2} \lambda_j^{t-1} \mu_{j-1}^{s+2}, \\ \|\partial_1^{(t)} \partial_2^{(s)} \partial_{11} v_j^2\|_0 \leq B_j^{1/2} \mu_{j-1}^{\gamma/2} \lambda_j^{t+2} \mu_j^{s-1} \quad \|\partial_1^{(t)} \partial_2^{(s)} \partial_{12} v_j^2\|_0 \leq B_j^{1/2} \mu_{j-1}^{\gamma/2} \lambda_j^{t+1} \mu_j^s \\ \|\partial_1^{(t)} \partial_2^{(s)} \partial_{22} v_j^2\|_0 \leq B_j^{1/2} \mu_{j-1}^{\gamma/2} \lambda_j^t \mu_j^{s+1} \end{array} \right. \quad \text{for all } t + s = 0 \dots M + N + 2. \quad (4.3)_2$$

Then, there exist $v_{j+1}, w_{j+1} \in C^\infty(\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_l(0), \mathbb{R}^2)$, such that denoting the new derived field $\mathcal{D}_{j+1} = A_0 - (\frac{1}{2}(\nabla v_{j+1})^T \nabla v_{j+1} + \text{sym} \nabla w_{j+1})$, there hold the estimates:

- the counterparts of (4.3)₁ and (4.3)₂ at the new counter $j + 1$:

$$\|\nabla^{(m)} \mathcal{D}_{j+1}\|_0 \leq C \tilde{C}_j \mu_{j+1}^m \left(\frac{1}{(\lambda_{j+1}/\mu_j)^N} + \frac{1}{(\mu_{j+1}/\lambda_{j+1})^2} + \frac{1}{(\mu_j/\lambda_j)^2} \right) \quad (4.3)_1$$

for all $m = 0 \dots M$,

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \|\partial_1^{(t)} \partial_2^{(s)} \partial_{11} v_{j+1}^1\|_0 \leq C \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2} \lambda_{j+1}^{t+1} \mu_j^s, \\ \|\partial_1^{(t)} \partial_2^{(s)} \partial_{12} v_{j+1}^1\|_0 \leq C \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2} \lambda_{j+1}^t \mu_j^{s+1}, \\ \|\partial_1^{(t)} \partial_2^{(s)} \partial_{22} v_{j+1}^1\|_0 \leq C \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2} \lambda_{j+1}^{t-1} \mu_j^{s+2} \left(\frac{1}{(\lambda_j/\mu_{j-1})^2 (\mu_j/\lambda_{j+1})} + 1 \right), \\ \|\partial_1^{(t)} \partial_2^{(s)} \partial_{11} v_{j+1}^2\|_0 \leq C \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2} \lambda_{j+1}^{t+2} \mu_{j+1}^{s-1} \left(\frac{1}{(\lambda_{j+1}/\lambda_j) (\lambda_{j+1}/\mu_{j+1})} + 1 \right), \\ \|\partial_1^{(t)} \partial_2^{(s)} \partial_{12} v_{j+1}^2\|_0 \leq C \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2} \lambda_{j+1}^{t+1} \mu_{j+1}^s, \\ \|\partial_1^{(t)} \partial_2^{(s)} \partial_{22} v_{j+1}^2\|_0 \leq C \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2} \lambda_{j+1}^t \mu_{j+1}^{s+1}, \end{array} \right. \quad \text{for all } t + s = 0 \dots M, \quad (4.3)_2$$

with constants C depending on ω, γ, N, M ,

- bounds on lower derivative orders on displacements in v and w :

$$\|v_{j+1} - v_j\|_1 \leq C \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2}, \quad (4.4)_1$$

$$\|w_{j+1} - w_j\|_1 \leq C \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2} (\|\nabla v_j\|_0 + \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2}), \quad (4.4)_2$$

$$\|\nabla^2(w_{j+1} - w_j)\|_0 \leq C \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2} (\|\nabla v_j\|_0 + \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2}) \mu_{j+1},$$

with C depending on ω, γ, N .

Proof. 1. (Applying Proposition 3.1 and adding the first corrugation) We apply Proposition 3.1 on the set ω with parameters γ, N, l_0, σ_0 , and l, M , and:

$$\mu = \mu_j, \quad \bar{\lambda} = \lambda_{j+1}, \quad H = \frac{1}{\tilde{C}_j} \mathcal{D}_j,$$

upon validating (3.1) by (4.1), and (3.2) by (4.3)₁. Having thus obtained the fields a, Ψ, \mathcal{F} , we define $a_{j+1} \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_l(0), \mathbb{R})$, $\Psi_{j+1} \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_l(0), \mathbb{R}^2)$, $\mathcal{F}_{j+1} \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_l(0), \mathbb{R}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ by:

$$a_{j+1} = \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} a, \quad \Psi_{j+1} = \tilde{C}_j \Psi, \quad \mathcal{F}_{j+1} = \tilde{C}_j \mathcal{F}.$$

The field \mathcal{F}_{j+1} is the first of the four error fields to be constructed in the proof, given by:

$$\mathcal{F}_{j+1} = a_{j+1}^2 \text{Id}_2 + \text{sym} \nabla \Psi_{j+1} - \mathcal{D}_j + \frac{1}{\lambda_{j+1}^2} \nabla a_{j+1} \otimes \nabla a_{j+1}. \quad (4.5)$$

Properties (3.3) yield the following:

$$\frac{\bar{C} \tilde{C}_j}{2} \mu_j^\gamma \leq a_{j+1}^2 \leq \frac{3\bar{C} \tilde{C}_j}{2} \mu_j^\gamma \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\bar{C}^{1/2} \tilde{C}_j^{1/2}}{2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2} \leq a_{j+1} \leq \frac{3\bar{C}^{1/2} \tilde{C}_j^{1/2}}{2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2}, \quad (4.6)_1$$

$$\|\nabla^{(m)} a_{j+1}^2\|_0 \leq C \tilde{C}_j \mu_j^\gamma \mu_j^m \quad \text{and} \quad \|\nabla^{(m)} a_{j+1}\|_0 \leq C \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2} \mu_j^m \quad \text{for } m = 0 \dots M + N + 4, \quad (4.6)_2$$

$$\|\nabla^{(m)} \mathcal{F}_{j+1}\|_0 \leq C \tilde{C}_j \frac{\mu_j^m}{(\lambda_{j+1}/\mu_j)^N} \quad \text{for all } m = 0 \dots M, \quad (4.6)_3$$

$$\|\Psi_{j+1}\|_1 \leq C \tilde{C}_j \mu_j^\gamma, \quad \|\nabla^2 \Psi_{j+1}\|_0 \leq C \tilde{C}_j \mu_j^\gamma. \quad (4.6)_4$$

where the constant \bar{C} depends only on ω, γ , while constants C depend on: in (4.6)₄ on ω, γ, N and in (4.6)₂, (4.6)₃ on ω, γ, N, M . We now define the first of the four pairs of the intermediate fields $V_1, W_1 \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_l(0), \mathbb{R}^2)$, by setting, in accordance with Lemma 2.3 at $i, k = 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} V_1 &= v_j + \frac{a_{j+1}}{\lambda_{j+1}} \Gamma(\lambda_{j+1} x_1) e_1, \\ W_1 &= w_j - \frac{a_{j+1}}{\lambda_{j+1}} \Gamma(\lambda_{j+1} x_1) \nabla v_j^1 + \frac{a_{j+1}}{\lambda_{j+1}^2} \bar{\Gamma}(\lambda_{j+1} x_1) \nabla a_{j+1} + \frac{a_{j+1}^2}{\lambda_{j+1}} \bar{\bar{\Gamma}}(\lambda_{j+1} x_1) e_1 + \Psi_{j+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

Consequently, recalling (4.5) and (2.4) we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}(V_1, W_1) &\doteq A_0 - \left(\frac{1}{2} (\nabla V_1)^T \nabla V_1 + \text{sym} \nabla W_1 \right) \\ &= \mathcal{D}_j - \left(\left(\frac{1}{2} (\nabla V_1)^T \nabla V_1 + \text{sym} \nabla W_1 \right) - \left(\frac{1}{2} (\nabla v_j)^T \nabla v_j + \text{sym} \nabla w_j \right) \right) \\ &= a_{j+1}^2 \text{Id}_2 + \text{sym} \nabla \Psi_{j+1} + \frac{1}{\lambda_{j+1}^2} \nabla a_{j+1} \otimes \nabla a_{j+1} - \mathcal{F}_{j+1} \\ &\quad - \left(a_{j+1}^2 e_1 \otimes e_1 - \frac{a_{j+1}}{\lambda_{j+1}} \Gamma(\lambda_{j+1} x_1) \nabla^2 v_j^1 + \frac{a_{j+1}}{\lambda_{j+1}^2} \bar{\Gamma}(\lambda_{j+1} x_1) \nabla^2 a_{j+1} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{\lambda_{j+1}^2} \bar{\bar{\Gamma}}(\lambda_{j+1} x_1) \nabla a_{j+1} \otimes \nabla a_{j+1} + \text{sym} \nabla \Psi_{j+1} \right). \\ &= a_{j+1}^2 e_2 \otimes e_2 - \mathcal{F}_{j+1} + \left(\frac{a_{j+1}}{\lambda_{j+1}} \Gamma(\lambda_{j+1} x_1) \nabla^2 v_j^1 - \frac{a_{j+1}}{\lambda_{j+1}^2} \bar{\Gamma}(\lambda_{j+1} x_1) \nabla^2 a_{j+1} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{\lambda_{j+1}^2} (\bar{\bar{\Gamma}} - 1) (\lambda_{j+1} x_1) \nabla a_{j+1} \otimes \nabla a_{j+1} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

2. (Applying Lemma 2.4) We now apply the formula (2.5) with $k = N$ to H being each of the matrix fields $a_{j+1} \nabla v_j^1$ and $a_{j+1} \nabla^2 a_{j+1}$ and $\nabla a_{j+1} \otimes \nabla a_{j+1}$, to the frequency $\lambda = \lambda_{j+1}$,

and to the profile Γ_0 being each of: Γ , $\bar{\Gamma}$ and $\bar{\bar{\Gamma}} - 1$, respectively. Define:

$$\begin{aligned} V_2 &= V_1, \\ W_2 &= W_1 + \sum_{i=0}^N (-1)^i \frac{\Gamma_{i+1}(\lambda_{j+1}x_1)}{\lambda_{j+1}^{i+2}} L_i(a_{j+1} \nabla^2 v_j^1) \\ &\quad - \sum_{i=0}^N (-1)^i \frac{\bar{\Gamma}_{i+1}(\lambda_{j+1}x_1)}{\lambda_{j+1}^{i+3}} L_i(a_{j+1} \nabla^2 a_{j+1}) \\ &\quad - \sum_{i=0}^N (-1)^i \frac{(\bar{\bar{\Gamma}} - 1)_{i+1}(\lambda_{j+1}x_1)}{\lambda_{j+1}^{i+3}} L_i(\nabla a_{j+1} \otimes \nabla a_{j+1}), \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

where we recall the definition of $\{L_i\}_{i=0}^N$ in (2.7) and note that the recursive formula for taking the antiderivatives in (2.6) returns periodic functions $\{\Gamma_i, \bar{\Gamma}_i, (\bar{\bar{\Gamma}} - 1)_i\}_{i=0}^{N+1}$ whose all derivatives are bounded. By Lemma 2.4 and (4.8) we write:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}(V_2, W_2) &\doteq A_0 - \left(\frac{1}{2} (\nabla V_2)^T \nabla V_2 + \text{sym} \nabla W_2 \right) = \mathcal{D}(V_1, W_1) - \text{sym} \nabla (W_2 - W_1) \\ &= -\mathcal{F}_{j+1} + \mathcal{G}_{j+1} + (a_{j+1}^2 + G) e_2 \otimes e_2, \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

where the second error field $\mathcal{G}_{j+1} \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_l(0), \mathbb{R}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_{j+1} &= (-1)^{N+1} \frac{\Gamma_{N+1}(\lambda_{j+1}x_1)}{\lambda_{j+1}^{N+2}} \text{sym} \nabla L_N(a_{j+1} \nabla^2 v_j^1) \\ &\quad - (-1)^{N+1} \frac{\bar{\Gamma}_{N+1}(\lambda_{j+1}x_1)}{\lambda_{j+1}^{N+3}} \text{sym} \nabla L_N(a_{j+1} \nabla^2 a_{j+1}) \\ &\quad - (-1)^{N+1} \frac{(\bar{\bar{\Gamma}} - 1)_{N+1}(\lambda_{j+1}x_1)}{\lambda_{j+1}^{N+3}} \text{sym} \nabla L_N(\nabla a_{j+1} \otimes \nabla a_{j+1}), \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

together with the corrector function $G \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_l(0), \mathbb{R})$ in:

$$\begin{aligned} G &= \sum_{i=0}^N (-1)^i \frac{\Gamma_i(\lambda_{j+1}x_1)}{\lambda_{j+1}^{i+1}} P_i(a_{j+1} \nabla^2 v_j^1) - \sum_{i=0}^N (-1)^i \frac{\bar{\Gamma}_i(\lambda_{j+1}x_1)}{\lambda_{j+1}^{i+2}} P_i(a_{j+1} \nabla^2 a_{j+1}) \\ &\quad - \sum_{i=0}^N (-1)^i \frac{(\bar{\bar{\Gamma}} - 1)_i(\lambda_{j+1}x_1)}{\lambda_{j+1}^{i+2}} P_i(\nabla a_{j+1} \otimes \nabla a_{j+1}) \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

where P_i are given by the formula (2.7). In the next two steps of our proof, we will show that:

$$\|\nabla^{(m)} \mathcal{G}_{j+1}\|_0 \leq C \tilde{C}_j \frac{\lambda_{j+1}^m}{(\lambda_{j+1}/\mu_j)^N} \quad \text{for all } m = 0 \dots M, \quad (4.13)$$

which is similar to the bound on the first error term \mathcal{F}_{j+1} in (4.6)₃, and that:

$$\|\nabla^{(m)} G\|_0 \leq C \tilde{C}_j \frac{\mu_j^\gamma}{\lambda_{j+1}/\mu_j} \lambda_{j+1}^m. \quad \text{for all } m = 0 \dots M + 2, \quad (4.14)$$

which is lower order than the bound on a_{j+1}^2 in (4.6)₂. The constants C depend on ω, γ, N, M .

3. (Proof of the estimate (4.13)) By (2.7) we observe that the right hand side of (4.11) consists of three types of terms:

$$\begin{aligned} I_{N+1} &= \frac{\Gamma_{N+1}(\lambda_{j+1}x_1)}{\lambda_{j+1}^{N+2}} \nabla^{(N+1)}(a_{j+1} \nabla^2 v_j^1), & II_{N+1} &= \frac{\bar{\Gamma}_{N+1}(\lambda_{j+1}x_1)}{\lambda_{j+1}^{N+3}} \nabla^{(N+1)}(a_{j+1} \nabla^2 a_{j+1}), \\ III_{N+1} &= \frac{(\bar{\bar{\Gamma}} - 1)_{N+1}(\lambda_{j+1}x_1)}{\lambda_{j+1}^{N+3}} \nabla^{(N+1)}(\nabla a_{j+1} \otimes \nabla a_{j+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Using the bounds for $\nabla^2 v_j^1$ in (4.3)₂ and for a_{j+1} in (4.6)₂, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla^{(m)} I_{N+1}\|_0 &\leq C \sum_{p+q=m} \lambda_{j+1}^{p-N-2} \|\nabla^{(q+N+1)}(a_{j+1} \nabla^2 v_j^1)\|_0 \\ &\leq C \sum_{\substack{p+q=m \\ u+z=q+N+1}} \lambda_{j+1}^{p-N-2} \|\nabla^{(u)} a_{j+1}\|_0 \|\nabla^{(z+2)} v_j^1\|_0 \leq C \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} B_j^{1/2} \mu_j^\gamma \sum_{\substack{p+q=m \\ u+z=q+N+1}} \lambda_{j+1}^{p-N-2} \mu_j^u \lambda_j^{z+1} \\ &\leq C \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} B_j^{1/2} \mu_j^\gamma \sum_{p+q=m} \lambda_{j+1}^{p-N-2} \mu_j^{q+N+1} \lambda_j \leq C \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} B_j^{1/2} \mu_j^\gamma \frac{\lambda_{j+1}^m}{(\lambda_{j+1}/\mu_j)^{N+1} (\lambda_{j+1}/\lambda_j)} \\ &\leq C \tilde{C}_j \lambda_{j+1}^m \frac{(B_j/\tilde{C}_j)^{1/2}}{(\lambda_{j+1}/\mu_j)^N (\lambda_{j+1}/\lambda_j)} \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows by the second assumption in (4.1) and with the constant C depending on ω, γ, N, M . Similarly, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\nabla^{(m)} II_{N+1}\|_0 + \|\nabla^{(m)} III_{N+1}\|_0 \\ &\leq C \sum_{\substack{p+q=m \\ u+z=q+N+1}} \lambda_{j+1}^{p-N-3} (\|\nabla^{(u)} a_{j+1}\|_0 \|\nabla^{(z+2)} a_{j+1}\|_0 + \|\nabla^{(u+1)} a_{j+1}\|_0 \|\nabla^{(z+1)} a_{j+1}\|_0) \\ &\leq C \tilde{C}_j \mu_j^\gamma \sum_{\substack{p+q=m \\ u+z=q+N+1}} \lambda_{j+1}^{p-N-3} \mu_j^{u+z+2} \leq C \tilde{C}_j \mu_j^\gamma \sum_{p+q=m} \lambda_{j+1}^{p-N-3} \mu_j^{q+N+3} \\ &\leq C \tilde{C}_j \mu_j^\gamma \frac{\lambda_{j+1}^m}{(\lambda_{j+1}/\mu_j)^{N+3}} \leq C \tilde{C}_j \frac{\lambda_{j+1}^m}{(\lambda_{j+1}/\mu_j)^{N+2}}. \end{aligned}$$

In conclusion, (4.13) follow in view of (4.2) and above obtained bound:

$$\|\nabla^{(m)} \mathcal{G}_{j+1}\|_0 \leq C \tilde{C}_j \frac{\lambda_{j+1}^m}{(\lambda_{j+1}/\mu_j)^N} \left(\frac{(B_j/\tilde{C}_j)^{1/2}}{\lambda_{j+1}/\lambda_j} + 1 \right).$$

4. (Proof of the estimate (4.14)) As before, formulas (2.7) imply that the right hand side of (4.12) consists of the following types of terms:

$$\begin{aligned} IV_0 &= \frac{\Gamma(\lambda_{j+1}x_1)}{\lambda_{j+1}} a_{j+1} \partial_{22} v_j^1, & IV_i &= \frac{\Gamma_i(\lambda_{j+1}x_1)}{\lambda_{j+1}^{i+1}} \partial_1^{(i-1)} \partial_2 (a_{j+1} \partial_{12} v_j^1) \quad \text{for } i = 1 \dots N, \\ V_i &= \frac{\Gamma_i(\lambda_{j+1}x_1)}{\lambda_{j+1}^{i+1}} \partial_1^{(i-2)} \partial_2^{(2)} (a_{j+1} \partial_{11} v_j^1) \quad \text{for } i = 2 \dots N, \\ II_i &= \frac{\bar{\Gamma}_i(\lambda_{j+1}x_1)}{\lambda_{j+1}^{i+2}} \nabla^{(i)}(a_{j+1} \nabla^2 a_{j+1}), & III_i &= \frac{(\bar{\bar{\Gamma}} - 1)_i(\lambda_{j+1}x_1)}{\lambda_{j+1}^{i+2}} \nabla^{(i)}(\nabla a_{j+1}^{\otimes 2}) \quad \text{for } i = 0 \dots N. \end{aligned}$$

By exactly the same argument as in the previous step, we obtain the bound:

$$\|\nabla^{(m)} II_i\|_0 + \|\nabla^{(m)} III_i\|_0 \leq C\tilde{C}_j \frac{\lambda_{j+1}^m}{(\lambda_{j+1}/\mu_j)^{i+1}} \quad \text{for all } i = 0 \dots N.$$

The finer bounds on IV_0 , IV_i and V_i follow from (4.3)₁ and (4.6)₂:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_1^{(t)} \partial_2^{(s)} IV_0\|_0 &\leq C \sum_{p_1+q_1=t} \lambda_{j+1}^{p_1-1} \|\partial_1^{(q_1)} \partial_2^{(s)} (a_{j+1} \partial_{22} v_j^1)\|_0 \\ &\leq C \sum_{\substack{p_1+q_1=t \\ u_1+z_1=q_1 \\ u_2+z_2=s}} \lambda_{j+1}^{p_1-1} \|\partial_1^{(u_1)} \partial_2^{(u_2)} a_{j+1}\|_0 \|\partial_1^{(z_1)} \partial_2^{(z_2+2)} v_j^1\|_0 \\ &\leq C\tilde{C}_j^{1/2} B_j^{1/2} \mu_j^\gamma \sum_{\substack{p_1+q_1=t \\ u_1+z_1=q_1 \\ u_2+z_2=s}} \lambda_{j+1}^{p_1-1} \mu_j^{u_1+u_2} \lambda_j^{z_1-1} \mu_{j-1}^{z_2+2} \leq C\tilde{C}_j^{1/2} B_j^{1/2} \mu_j^\gamma \sum_{p_1+q_1=t} \lambda_{j+1}^{p_1-1} \mu_j^{q_1+s} \lambda_j^{-1} \mu_{j-1}^2 \\ &\leq C\tilde{C}_j^{1/2} B_j^{1/2} \mu_j^\gamma \frac{\lambda_{j+1}^t \mu_j^s}{\lambda_{j+1} \lambda_j / \mu_{j-1}^2} = C\tilde{C}_j \lambda_{j+1}^t \mu_j^s \mu_j^\gamma \frac{(B_j/\tilde{C}_j)^{1/2}}{(\mu_j/\lambda_j)(\lambda_j/\mu_{j-1})^2} \cdot \frac{1}{\lambda_{j+1}/\mu_j}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for all $i = 1 \dots N$ and with C depending on ω, γ, N, M , we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_1^{(t)} \partial_2^{(s)} IV_i\|_0 &\leq C \sum_{p_1+q_1=t} \lambda_{j+1}^{p_1-i-1} \|\partial_1^{(q_1+i-1)} \partial_2^{(s+1)} (a_{j+1} \partial_{12} v_j^1)\|_0 \\ &\leq C \sum_{\substack{p_1+q_1=t \\ u_1+z_1=q_1+i-1 \\ u_2+z_2=s+1}} \lambda_{j+1}^{p_1-i-1} \|\partial_1^{(u_1)} \partial_2^{(u_2)} a_{j+1}\|_0 \|\partial_1^{(z_1+1)} \partial_2^{(z_2+1)} v_j^1\|_0 \\ &\leq C\tilde{C}_j^{1/2} B_j^{1/2} \mu_j^\gamma \sum_{\substack{p_1+q_1=t \\ u_1+z_1=q_1+i-1 \\ u_2+z_2=s+1}} \lambda_{j+1}^{p_1-i-1} \mu_j^{u_1+u_2} \lambda_j^{z_1} \mu_{j-1}^{z_2-1} \leq C\tilde{C}_j^{1/2} B_j^{1/2} \mu_j^\gamma \sum_{p_1+q_1=t} \lambda_{j+1}^{p_1-i-1} \mu_j^{q_1+i+s} \mu_{j-1}^{-1} \\ &\leq C\tilde{C}_j^{1/2} B_j^{1/2} \mu_j^\gamma \frac{\lambda_{j+1}^t \mu_j^s}{(\lambda_{j+1}/\mu_j)^i (\lambda_{j+1}/\mu_{j-1})} \leq C\tilde{C}_j^{1/2} B_j^{1/2} \mu_j^\gamma \frac{\lambda_{j+1}^t \mu_j^s}{(\lambda_{j+1}/\mu_j)^2 (\mu_j/\mu_{j-1})} \\ &= C\tilde{C}_j \lambda_{j+1}^t \mu_j^s \mu_j^\gamma \frac{(B_j/\tilde{C}_j)^{1/2}}{(\mu_j/\lambda_j)(\lambda_{j+1}/\mu_j)(\lambda_j/\mu_{j-1})} \cdot \frac{1}{\lambda_{j+1}/\mu_j}, \end{aligned}$$

and also, for all $i = 2 \dots N$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\partial_1^{(t)} \partial_2^{(s)} V_i\|_0 &\leq C \sum_{p_1+q_1=t} \lambda_{j+1}^{p_1-i-1} \|\partial_1^{(q_1+i-2)} \partial_2^{(s+2)} (a_{j+1} \partial_{11} v_j^1)\|_0 \\
&\leq C \sum_{\substack{p_1+q_1=t \\ u_1+z_1=q_1+i-2 \\ u_2+z_2=s+2}} \lambda_{j+1}^{p_1-i-1} \|\partial_1^{(u_1)} \partial_2^{(u_2)} a_{j+1}\|_0 \|\partial_1^{(z_1+2)} \partial_2^{(z_2)} v_j^1\|_0 \\
&\leq C \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} B_j^{1/2} \mu_j^\gamma \sum_{\substack{p_1+q_1=t \\ u_1+z_1=q_1+i-2 \\ u_2+z_2=s+2}} \lambda_{j+1}^{p_1-i-1} \mu_j^{u_1+u_2} \lambda_j^{z_1+1} \mu_j^{z_2} \leq C \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} B_j^{1/2} \mu_j^\gamma \sum_{p_1+q_1=t} \lambda_{j+1}^{p_1-i-1} \mu_j^{q_1+i+s} \lambda_j \\
&\leq C \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} B_j^{1/2} \mu_j^\gamma \frac{\lambda_{j+1}^t \mu_j^s}{(\lambda_{j+1}/\mu_j)^i (\lambda_{j+1}/\lambda_j)} \leq C \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} B_j^{1/2} \mu_j^\gamma \frac{\lambda_{j+1}^t \mu_j^s}{(\lambda_{j+1}/\mu_j)^2 (\lambda_{j+1}/\lambda_j)} \\
&= C \tilde{C}_j \lambda_{j+1}^t \mu_j^s \mu_j^\gamma \frac{(B_j/\tilde{C}_j)^{1/2}}{(\mu_j/\lambda_j) (\lambda_{j+1}/\mu_j)^2} \cdot \frac{1}{\lambda_{j+1}/\mu_j}.
\end{aligned}$$

Gathering the three above displayed formulas, we arrive at:

$$\|\partial_1^{(t)} \partial_2^{(s)} G\|_0 \leq C \tilde{C}_j \lambda_{j+1}^t \mu_j^s \mu_j^\gamma \frac{(B_j/\tilde{C}_j)^{1/2}}{(\mu_j/\lambda_j)} \cdot \frac{1}{\lambda_{j+1}/\mu_j},$$

which implies the bound (4.14) in view of the assumptions (4.2).

5. (Adding the second corrugation) We define the third pair of intermediate fields $V_3, W_3 \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_l(0), \mathbb{R}^2)$, using (2.3) with $i, k = 2$ and the amplitude dictated by (4.10):

$$\begin{aligned}
V_3 &= V_2 + \frac{b_{j+1}}{\mu_{j+1}} \Gamma(\mu_{j+1} x_2) e_2, \\
W_3 &= W_2 - \frac{b_{j+1}}{\mu_{j+1}} \Gamma(\mu_{j+1} x_2) \nabla v_j^2 + \frac{b_{j+1}}{\mu_{j+1}^2} \bar{\Gamma}(\mu_{j+1} x_2) \nabla b_{j+1} + \frac{b_{j+1}^2}{\mu_{j+1}} \bar{\Gamma}(\mu_{j+1} x_2) e_2, \tag{4.15}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\text{where } b_{j+1}^2 = a_{j+1}^2 + G.$$

Firstly, we argue that $b_{j+1} \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_l(0), \mathbb{R})$ is well defined and it satisfies:

$$\frac{\bar{C} \tilde{C}_j}{4} \mu_j^\gamma \leq b_{j+1}^2 \leq 2 \bar{C} \tilde{C}_j \mu_j^\gamma \quad \text{and so} \quad \|b_{j+1}\|_0 \leq C \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2}, \tag{4.16}_1$$

$$\|\nabla^{(m)} b_{j+1}\|_0 \leq C \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2} \frac{\lambda_{j+1}^m}{\lambda_{j+1}/\mu_j} \quad \text{for all } m = 1 \dots M+2, \tag{4.16}_2$$

where C in (4.16)₁ depends on ω, γ, N , and in (4.16)₂ on ω, γ, N, M . Indeed, by (4.14) we have:

$$\|G\|_0 \leq \tilde{C}_j \mu_j^\gamma \frac{C}{\lambda_{j+1}/\mu_j},$$

so taking λ_{j+1}/μ_j sufficiently large by assigning large σ_0 in the second condition of (4.1), in function of the pre-fixed ω, γ, N , there follows (4.16)₁ through (4.6)₁. From the same estimates:

$$\|\nabla^{(m)} b_{j+1}^2\|_0 \leq C \tilde{C}_j \mu_j^\gamma \frac{\lambda_{j+1}^m}{\lambda_{j+1}/\mu_j} \quad \text{for all } m = 1 \dots M+2,$$

which implies (4.16)₂ by an application of the Faà di Bruno formula:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla^{(m)}b_{j+1}\|_0 &\leq C \left\| \sum_{p_1+2p_2+\dots+mp_m=m} b_{j+1}^{2(1/2-p_1-\dots-p_m)} \prod_{z=1}^m |\nabla^{(z)}b_{j+1}^2|^{p_z} \right\|_0 \\ &\leq C \|b_{j+1}\|_0 \sum_{p_1+2p_2+\dots+mp_s=m} \prod_{z=1}^m \left(\frac{\|\nabla^{(z)}b_{j+1}^2\|_0}{\tilde{C}\tilde{C}_j\mu^\gamma} \right)^{p_z} \leq C \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2} \frac{\lambda_{j+1}^m}{\lambda_{j+1}/\mu_j}. \end{aligned}$$

Secondly, recalling (4.10) and Lemma 2.3, we note that:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}(V_3, W_3) &\doteq A_0 - \left(\frac{1}{2}(\nabla V_3)^T \nabla V_3 + \text{sym} \nabla W_3 \right) \\ &= \mathcal{D}(V_2, W_2) - \left(\left(\frac{1}{2}(\nabla V_3)^T \nabla V_3 + \text{sym} \nabla W_3 \right) - \left(\frac{1}{2}(\nabla V_2)^T \nabla V_2 + \text{sym} \nabla W_2 \right) \right) \\ &= -\mathcal{F}_{j+1} + \mathcal{G}_{j+1} + \frac{b_{j+1}}{\mu_{j+1}} \Gamma(\mu_{j+1}x_2) \nabla^2 v_j^2 - \mathcal{H}_{j+1} \end{aligned} \quad (4.17)$$

with the third error field $\mathcal{H}_{j+1} \in C^\infty(\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_l(0), \mathbb{R}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ given by:

$$\mathcal{H}_{j+1} = \frac{b_{j+1}}{\mu_{j+1}^2} \bar{\Gamma}(\mu_{j+1}x_2) \nabla^2 b_{j+1} + \frac{1}{\mu_{j+1}^2} \bar{\bar{\Gamma}}(\mu_{j+1}x_2) \nabla b_{j+1} \otimes \nabla b_{j+1}. \quad (4.18)$$

We estimate, using (4.16)₁ and (4.16)₂:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla^{(m)}\mathcal{H}_{j+1}\|_0 &\leq C \sum_{p+q=m} \mu_{j+1}^{p-2} \left(\|\nabla^{(q)}(b_{j+1} \nabla^2 b_{j+1})\|_0 + \|\nabla^{(q)}(\nabla b_{j+1} \otimes \nabla b_{j+1})\|_0 \right) \\ &\leq C \sum_{\substack{p+q=m \\ u+z=q}} \mu_{j+1}^{p-2} \left(\|\nabla^{(u)}b_{j+1}\|_0 \|\nabla^{(z+2)}b_{j+1}\|_0 + \|\nabla^{(u+1)}b_{j+1}\|_0 \|\nabla^{(z+1)}b_{j+1}\|_0 \right) \\ &\leq C \tilde{C}_j \mu_j^\gamma \sum_{p+q=m} \mu_{j+1}^{p-2} \frac{\lambda_{j+1}^{t+q+2}}{\lambda_{j+1}/\mu_j} \leq C \tilde{C}_j \frac{\mu_{j+1}^m}{(\mu_{j+1}/\lambda_{j+1})^2} \cdot \frac{\mu_j^\gamma}{\lambda_{j+1}/\mu_j} \\ &\leq C \tilde{C}_j \frac{\mu_{j+1}^m}{(\mu_{j+1}/\lambda_{j+1})^2} \quad \text{for all } m = 0 \dots M, \end{aligned} \quad (4.19)$$

with C depending on ω, γ, N, M .

6. (Applying Corollary 2.5) We now apply (2.10) with $k = 1$ to $H = b_{j+1} \nabla^2 v_j^2$ the frequency $\lambda = \mu_{j+1}$, and the profile $\Gamma_0 = \Gamma$, and define the final fields:

$$\begin{aligned} v_{j+1} &= V_3, \\ w_{j+1} &= W_3 + \sum_{i=0}^1 (-1)^i \frac{\Gamma_{i+1}(\mu_{j+1}x_2)}{\mu_{j+1}^{i+2}} \tilde{L}_i(b_{j+1} \nabla^2 v_j^2), \end{aligned} \quad (4.20)$$

where we recall the definition of $\{\tilde{L}_i\}_{i=0}^1$ in (2.11) and the recursive formula of taking the antiderivatives in (2.6). By Corollary 2.5 and (4.17) we obtain:

$$\mathcal{D}_{j+1} = \mathcal{D}(V_3, W_3) - \text{sym} \nabla(w_{j+1} - W_3) = -\mathcal{F}_{j+1} + \mathcal{G}_{j+1} - \mathcal{H}_{j+1} + \mathcal{I}_{j+1} \quad (4.21)$$

where the final, fourth error field $\mathcal{I}_{j+1} \in C^\infty(\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_l(0), \mathbb{R}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ is given by:

$$\mathcal{I}_{j+1} = \frac{\Gamma_2(\mu_{j+1}x_2)}{\mu_{j+1}^3} \text{sym} \nabla \tilde{L}_1(b_{j+1} \nabla^2 v_j^2) + \sum_{i=0}^1 (-1)^i \frac{\Gamma_i(\mu_{j+1}x_2)}{\mu_{j+1}^{i+1}} \tilde{P}_i(b_{j+1} \nabla^2 v_j^2) e_1 \otimes e_1, \quad (4.22)$$

and can be estimated as follows, using the bounds on $\nabla^2 v_j^2$ in (4.3)₂ together with (4.16)₂:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\partial_1^{(t)} \partial_2^{(s)} \mathcal{I}_{j+1}\|_0 &\leq C \sum_{p+q=s} \mu_{j+1}^{p-3} \|\nabla^{(t+q+2)} (b_{j+1} \nabla^2 v_j^2)\|_0 \\
&\quad + C \sum_{p+q=s} \mu_{j+1}^{p-1} \|\partial_1^{(t)} \partial_2^{(q)} (b_{j+1} \partial_{11} v_j^2)\|_0 + C \sum_{p+q=s} \mu_{j+1}^{p-2} \|\partial_1^{(t+1)} \partial_2^{(q)} (b_{j+1} \partial_{12} v_j^2)\|_0 \\
&\leq C \sum_{\substack{p+q=s \\ u+z=t+q+2}} \mu_{j+1}^{p-3} \|\nabla^{(u)} b_{j+1}\|_0 \|\nabla^{(z+2)} v_j^2\|_0 + C \sum_{\substack{p+q=s \\ u_1+z_1=t \\ u_2+z_2=q}} \mu_{j+1}^{p-1} \|\nabla^{(u_1+u_2)} b_{j+1}\|_0 \|\partial_1^{(z_1+2)} \partial_2^{(z_2)} v_j^2\|_0 \\
&\quad + C \sum_{\substack{p+q=s \\ u_1+z_1=t+1 \\ u_2+z_2=q}} \mu_{j+1}^{p-2} \|\nabla^{(u_1+u_2)} b_{j+1}\|_0 \|\partial_1^{(z_1+1)} \partial_2^{(z_2+1)} v_j^2\|_0 \\
&\leq C \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} B_j^{1/2} \mu_j^\gamma \left(\sum_{\substack{p+q=s \\ u+z=t+q+2}} \mu_{j+1}^{p-3} \lambda_{j+1}^u \mu_j^{z+1} + \sum_{\substack{p+q=s \\ u_1+z_1=t \\ u_2+z_2=q}} \mu_{j+1}^{p-1} \lambda_{j+1}^{u_1+u_2} \lambda_j^{z_1+2} \mu_j^{z_2-1} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \sum_{\substack{p+q=s \\ u_1+z_1=t+1 \\ u_2+z_2=q}} \mu_{j+1}^{p-2} \lambda_{j+1}^{u_1+u_2} \lambda_j^{z_1+1} \mu_j^{z_2} \right) \\
&\leq C \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} B_j^{1/2} \mu_j^\gamma \left(\sum_{p+q=s} \mu_{j+1}^{p-3} \lambda_{j+1}^{t+q+2} \mu_j + \sum_{p+q=s} \mu_{j+1}^{p-1} \lambda_{j+1}^{t+q} \lambda_j^2 \mu_j^{-1} + \sum_{p+q=s} \mu_{j+1}^{p-2} \lambda_{j+1}^{t+q+1} \lambda_j \right) \\
&\leq C \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} B_j^{1/2} \frac{\lambda_{j+1}^t \mu_{j+1}^s \mu_j^\gamma}{\lambda_{j+1} / \mu_j} \left(\frac{1}{(\mu_{j+1} / \lambda_{j+1})^3} + \frac{1}{(\mu_{j+1} / \lambda_{j+1})(\mu_j / \lambda_j)^2} + \frac{1}{(\mu_{j+1} / \lambda_{j+1})^2 (\mu_j / \lambda_j)} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

In conclusion, the second assumption in (4.1) and (4.2) yield:

$$\|\nabla^{(m)} \mathcal{I}_{j+1}\|_0 \leq C \tilde{C}_j \mu_{j+1}^m \left(\frac{1}{(\mu_{j+1} / \lambda_{j+1})^2} + \frac{1}{(\mu_j / \lambda_j)^2} \right) \quad \text{for all } m = 0 \dots M. \quad (4.23)$$

7. (Proofs of (4.3)₁ – (4.4)₁) We deduce (4.3)₁ directly, by the decomposition (4.21), in view of the four error estimates (4.6)₃, (4.13), (4.19) and (4.23). To show (4.3)₂ note that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\partial_1^{(t)} \partial_2^{(s)} (v_{j+1}^1 - v_j^1)\|_0 &\leq C \sum_{p+q=t} \lambda_{j+1}^{p-1} \|\nabla^{(q+s)} a_{j+1}\|_0 \leq C \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2} \sum_{p+q=t} \lambda_{j+1}^{p-1} \mu_j^{q+s} \\
&\leq C C_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2} \lambda_{j+1}^{t-1} \mu_j^s, \\
\|\partial_1^{(t)} \partial_2^{(s)} (v_{j+1}^2 - v_j^2)\|_0 &\leq C \sum_{p+q=s} \mu_{j+1}^{p-1} \|\nabla^{(q+t)} b_{j+1}\|_0 \leq C \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2} \sum_{p+q=s} \mu_{j+1}^{p-1} \lambda_{j+1}^{q+t} \\
&\leq C C_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2} \lambda_{j+1}^t \mu_{j+1}^{s-1},
\end{aligned}$$

in virtue of definitions (4.7), (4.15) and the bounds (4.6)₂, (4.16)₁, (4.16)₂. In particular, the above also implies (4.4)₁. Further, combined with the assumption (4.3)₂, we get, for all

$t + s = 0 \dots M$ and with C depending on ω, γ, N, M :

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\partial_1^{(t)} \partial_2^{(s)} \partial_{11} v_{j+1}^1\|_0 &\leq C \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2} \lambda_{j+1}^{t+1} \mu_j^s \left(\frac{(B_j/\tilde{C}_j)^{1/2}}{\lambda_{j+1}/\lambda_j} + 1 \right), \\
\|\partial_1^{(t)} \partial_2^{(s)} \partial_{12} v_{j+1}^1\|_0 &\leq C \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2} \lambda_{j+1}^t \mu_j^{s+1} \left(\frac{(B_j/\tilde{C}_j)^{1/2}}{\mu_j/\mu_{j-1}} + 1 \right), \\
\|\partial_1^{(t)} \partial_2^{(s)} \partial_{22} v_{j+1}^1\|_0 &\leq C \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2} \lambda_{j+1}^{t-1} \mu_j^{s+2} \left(\frac{(B_j/\tilde{C}_j)^{1/2}}{(\mu_j/\mu_{j-1})^2 (\lambda_j/\lambda_{j+1})} + 1 \right), \\
\|\partial_1^{(t)} \partial_2^{(s)} \partial_{11} v_{j+1}^2\|_0 &\leq C \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2} \lambda_{j+1}^{t+2} \mu_j^{s-1} \left(\frac{(B_j/\tilde{C}_j)^{1/2}}{(\lambda_{j+1}/\lambda_j)^2 (\mu_j/\mu_{j+1})} + 1 \right), \\
\|\partial_1^{(t)} \partial_2^{(s)} \partial_{12} v_{j+1}^2\|_0 &\leq C \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2} \lambda_{j+1}^{t+1} \mu_j^s \left(\frac{(B_j/\tilde{C}_j)^{1/2}}{\lambda_{j+1}/\lambda_j} + 1 \right), \\
\|\partial_1^{(t)} \partial_2^{(s)} \partial_{22} v_{j+1}^2\|_0 &\leq C \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2} \lambda_{j+1}^t \mu_j^{s+1} \left(\frac{(B_j/\tilde{C}_j)^{1/2}}{\mu_{j+1}/\mu_j} + 1 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

This yields (4.3)₂ recalling the assumption (4.2).

8. (Proof of (4.4)₂ - corrugations bounds) Recall the decomposition:

$$w_{j+1} - w_j = (W_1 - w_j) + (W_2 - W_1) + (W_3 - W_2) + (w_{j+1} - W_3). \quad (4.24)$$

By (4.7), (4.6)₂, (4.6)₄, (4.3)₂ and the assumption (4.2) we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|W_1 - w_j\|_1 &\leq C \left(\|\Psi_{j+1}\|_1 + \|a_{j+1}\|_0 \|\nabla v_j^1\|_0 + \|a_{j+1}\|_0^2 \right. \\
&\quad + \frac{\|\nabla a_{j+1}\|_0 \|\nabla v_j^1\|_0 + \|a_{j+1}\|_0 \|\nabla^2 v_j^1\|_0 + \|a_{j+1}\|_0 \|\nabla a_{j+1}\|_0}{\lambda_{j+1}} \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{\|a_{j+1}\|_0 \|\nabla^2 a_{j+1}\|_0 + \|\nabla a_{j+1}\|_0^2}{\lambda_{j+1}^2} \right) \\
&\leq C \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2} \left(\|\nabla v_j^1\|_0 + \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2} + \frac{B_j^{1/2} \mu_{j-1}^{\gamma/2}}{\lambda_{j+1}/\lambda_j} \right) \leq C \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2} (\|\nabla v_j^1\|_0 + \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2}),
\end{aligned}$$

with constants C depending on ω, γ, N . Similarly:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla^2(W_1 - w_j)\|_0 &\leq C \left(\|\nabla^2 \Psi_{j+1}\|_0 + \lambda_{j+1} (\|a_{j+1}\|_0 \|\nabla v_j^1\|_0 + \|a_{j+1}\|_0^2) \right. \\
&\quad + (\|\nabla a_{j+1}\|_0 \|\nabla v_j^1\|_0 + \|a_{j+1}\|_0 \|\nabla^2 v_j^1\|_0 + \|a_{j+1}\|_0 \|\nabla a_{j+1}\|_0) \\
&\quad + \frac{\|\nabla^2 a_{j+1}\|_0 \|\nabla v_j^1\|_0 + \|\nabla a_{j+1}\|_0 \|\nabla^2 v_j^1\|_0 + \|a_{j+1}\|_0 \|\nabla^3 v_j^1\|_0}{\lambda_{j+1}} \\
&\quad + \frac{\|a_{j+1}\|_0 \|\nabla^2 a_{j+1}\|_0 + \|\nabla a_{j+1}\|_0^2}{\lambda_{j+1}} \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{\|a_{j+1}\|_0 \|\nabla^3 a_{j+1}\|_0 + \|\nabla a_{j+1}\|_0 \|\nabla^2 a_{j+1}\|_0}{\lambda_{j+1}^2} \right) \\
&\leq C \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2} (\|\nabla v_j^1\|_0 + \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2}) \lambda_{j+1}.
\end{aligned}$$

For the bounds of the difference of W_3 and W_2 , we use (4.15), (4.16)₁, (4.16)₂ and (4.3)₂, (4.2):

$$\begin{aligned}
\|W_3 - W_2\|_1 &\leq C \left(\|b_{j+1}\|_0 \|\nabla v_j^2\|_0 + \|b_{j+1}\|_0^2 \right. \\
&\quad + \frac{\|\nabla b_{j+1}\|_0 \|\nabla v_j^2\|_0 + \|b_{j+1}\|_0 \|\nabla^2 v_j^2\|_0 + \|b_{j+1}\|_0 \|\nabla b_{j+1}\|_0}{\mu_{j+1}} \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{\|b_{j+1}\|_0 \|\nabla^2 b_{j+1}\|_0 + \|\nabla b_{j+1}\|_0^2}{\mu_{j+1}^2} \right) \\
&\leq C \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2} \left(\|\nabla v_j^2\|_0 + \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2} + \frac{B_j^{1/2} \mu_{j-1}^{\gamma/2}}{\mu_{j+1}/\mu_j} \right) \\
&\leq C \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2} (\|\nabla v_j^1\|_0 + \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2}), \\
\|\nabla^2(W_3 - W_2)\|_0 &\leq C \left(\mu_{j+1} (\|b_{j+1}\|_0 \|\nabla v_j^2\|_0 + \|b_{j+1}\|_0^2) \right. \\
&\quad + (\|\nabla b_{j+1}\|_0 \|\nabla v_j^2\|_0 + \|b_{j+1}\|_0 \|\nabla^2 v_j^2\|_0 + \|b_{j+1}\|_0 \|\nabla b_{j+1}\|_0) \\
&\quad + \frac{\|\nabla^2 b_{j+1}\|_0 \|\nabla v_j^2\|_0 + \|\nabla b_{j+1}\|_0 \|\nabla^2 v_j^2\|_0 + \|b_{j+1}\|_0 \|\nabla^3 v_j^2\|_0}{\mu_{j+1}} \\
&\quad + \frac{\|b_{j+1}\|_0 \|\nabla^2 b_{j+1}\|_0 + \|\nabla b_{j+1}\|_0^2}{\mu_{j+1}} \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{\|b_{j+1}\|_0 \|\nabla^3 b_{j+1}\|_0 + \|\nabla b_{j+1}\|_0 \|\nabla^2 b_{j+1}\|_0}{\mu_{j+1}^2} \right) \\
&\leq C \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2} (\|\nabla v_j^2\|_0 + \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2}) \mu_{j+1}
\end{aligned}$$

9. (Proof of (4.4)₂ - decomposition bounds) Pertaining to the application of Lemma 2.4 and Corollary 2.5, we estimate the difference of W_2 and W_1 using (4.9), (4.6)₂, (4.3)₂, (4.2):

$$\begin{aligned}
\|W_2 - W_1\|_1 &\leq C \sum_{i=0}^{N+1} \frac{\|\nabla^{(i)}(a_{j+1} \nabla^2 v_j^1)\|_0}{\lambda_{j+1}^{i+1}} + C \sum_{i=0}^{N+1} \frac{\|\nabla^{(i)}(a_{j+1} \nabla^2 a_{j+1})\|_0 + \|\nabla^{(i)}(\nabla a_{j+1}^{\otimes 2})\|_0}{\lambda_{j+1}^{i+2}} \\
&\leq C \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2} \sum_{i=1}^{N+1} \left(\frac{B_j^{1/2} \mu_{j-1}^{\gamma/2}}{(\lambda_{j+1}/\lambda_j)^{i+1}} + \frac{\tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2}}{(\lambda_{j+1}/\mu_j)^{i+2}} \right) \leq C \tilde{C}_j \mu_j^\gamma.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the second derivatives' difference satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla^2(W_2 - W_1)\|_0 &\leq C \sum_{i=0}^{N+2} \left(\frac{\|\nabla^{(i)}(a_{j+1} \nabla^2 v_j^1)\|_0}{\lambda_{j+1}^i} + \frac{\|\nabla^{(i)}(a_{j+1} \nabla^2 a_{j+1})\|_0 + \|\nabla^{(i)}(\nabla a_{j+1}^{\otimes 2})\|_0}{\lambda_{j+1}^{i+1}} \right) \\
&\leq C \tilde{C}_j \mu_j^\gamma \lambda_{j+1},
\end{aligned}$$

whereas to estimate the difference of w_{j+1} and W_3 we additionally use (4.20), (4.16)₁, (4.16)₂:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|w_{j+1} - W_3\|_1 &\leq C \sum_{i=0}^2 \frac{\|\nabla^{(i)}(b_{j+1} \nabla^2 v_j^2)\|_0}{\mu_{j+1}^{i+1}} \leq C \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2} \sum_{i=0}^2 \frac{B_j^{1/2} \mu_{j-1}^{\gamma/2}}{(\mu_{j+1}/\lambda_{j+1})^{i+1}} \leq C \tilde{C}_j \mu_j^\gamma, \\
\|\nabla^2(w_{j+1} - W_3)\|_0 &\leq C \sum_{i=0}^3 \frac{\|\nabla^{(i)}(b_{j+1} \nabla^2 v_j^2)\|_0}{\mu_{j+1}^i} \leq C \tilde{C}_j \mu_j^\gamma \mu_{j+1},
\end{aligned}$$

with constants C depending on ω, γ, N . Combining the bounds of steps 8 and 9 for the four quantities appearing in (4.24), we arrive at (4.4)₂. The proof of Proposition 4.1 is done. \blacksquare

5. THE STAGE CONSTRUCTION AND A PROOF OF THEOREM 1.3

We are now ready to complete the “stage” in the present version of the convex integration algorithm. It requires a given number K of iterations of the quadruple step construction put forward in Proposition 4.1. Since the first two iterations do not satisfy assumptions (4.2) and (4.3)₂, they have to be considered separately, with the same components of the proof of Proposition 4.1 carried out in steps 2-5 of the proof below. As we argue in the proof, the natural choice for the progression of frequencies is as depicted in Figure 1.




FIGURE 1. Progression of frequencies and consecutive defects’ magnitudes in the proof of Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.3.

1. (Setting the initial quantities) For the given double iteration numerals $N, K \geq 1$ and the regularity exponent $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, we take l_0 and σ_0 as in Proposition 4.1. Let v, w be as in the statement of the theorem, together with the positive constants l, λ, \mathcal{M} , where we denote:

$$\sigma = \lambda l$$

and assume the following version of (1.6):

$$l \leq l_0, \quad \sigma l^\gamma \geq \sigma^{K(1+N/2)\gamma} \sigma_0, \quad \mathcal{M} \geq \max\{\|v\|_0, \|w\|_0, 1\}. \quad (5.1)$$

Resolving (5.1) against (1.6) will be the content of step 8 below. We now observe that the second assumption in (5.1) implies that $\lambda_{j+1}^{1-\gamma} \geq \mu_j \sigma_0$ for all $j = 0 \dots K-1$, upon defining:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_0 &= \frac{1}{l}, & \mu_j &= \frac{\sigma^{j+(j+1)N/2}}{l} & \text{for all } j = 1 \dots K, \\ \lambda_j &= \frac{\sigma^{j(1+N/2)}}{l} & & & \text{for all } 0 = 1 \dots K, \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

because then indeed:

$$\frac{\lambda_{j+1}^{1-\gamma}}{\mu_j} = \sigma^{1-(j+1)(1+N/2)\gamma} l^\gamma \geq \sigma^{1-K(1+N/2)\gamma} l^\gamma \geq \sigma_0 \quad \text{for all } j = 0 \dots K.$$

We first construct the fields $v_0, w_0 \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_l(0), \mathbb{R}^2)$, $A_0 \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_l(0), \mathbb{R}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ by using the mollification kernel as in Lemma 2.1:

$$v_0 = v * \phi_l, \quad w_0 = w * \phi_l, \quad A_0 = A * \phi_l, \quad \mathcal{D}_0 = A_0 - \left(\frac{1}{2}(\nabla v_0)^T \nabla v_0 + \text{sym} \nabla w_0\right).$$

From Lemma 2.1, we deduce the initial bounds, where constants C depend only on ω, m, N, K :

$$\|v_0 - v\|_1 + \|w_0 - w\|_1 \leq C l \mathcal{M}, \quad (5.3)_1$$

$$\|A_0 - A\|_0 \leq C l^\beta \|A\|_{0,\beta}, \quad (5.3)_2$$

$$\|\nabla^{(m)} \nabla^2 v_0\|_0 + \|\nabla^{(m)} \nabla^2 w_0\|_0 \leq \frac{C}{l^m} \mathcal{M} \quad \text{for all } m = 0 \dots K(3N + 4), \quad (5.3)_3$$

$$\|\nabla^{(m)} \mathcal{D}_0\|_0 \leq \frac{C}{l^m} (\|\mathcal{D}\|_0 + (l\mathcal{M})^2) \quad \text{for all } m = 0 \dots K(3N + 4). \quad (5.3)_4$$

Indeed, (5.3)₁, (5.3)₂ follow from (2.1)₂ and in view of the lower bound on \mathcal{M} . Similarly, (5.3)₃ follows by applying (2.1)₁ to $\nabla^2 v$ and $\nabla^2 w$ with the differentiability exponent $m - 1$. Since:

$$\mathcal{D}_0 = \mathcal{D} * \phi_l - \frac{1}{2} ((\nabla v_0)^T \nabla v_0 - ((\nabla v)^T \nabla v) * \phi_l),$$

we get (5.3)₄ by applying (2.1)₁ to \mathcal{D} , and (2.1)₃ to ∇v .

2. (The first iteration: from $j = 0$ to 1; the defect bound) We follow the proof of Proposition 4.1 starting with v_0, w_0, \mathcal{D}_0 and parameters consistent with (5.3)₄, (5.3)₃, (5.2):

$$\tilde{C}_0 = C(\|\mathcal{D}\|_0 + (l\mathcal{M})^2), \quad B_0 = \tilde{C}_0, \quad \lambda_0 = \mu_0 = \frac{1}{l}, \quad \lambda = \lambda_1 < \mu_1.$$

Recall that $\lambda_1^{1-\gamma} \geq \mu_0 \sigma_0$ by the second assumption in (5.1). Thus Proposition 3.1 yields the fields $a_1 \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_l(0), \mathbb{R})$, $\Psi_1 \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_l(0), \mathbb{R}^2)$ and $\mathcal{F}_1 \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_l(0), \mathbb{R}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ which satisfy same bounds as in (4.6)₁-(4.6)₄:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\bar{C}^{1/2} \tilde{C}_0^{1/2}}{2} \mu_0^{\gamma/2} \leq a_1 \leq \frac{3\bar{C}^{1/2} \tilde{C}_0^{1/2}}{2} \mu_0^{\gamma/2} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\nabla^{(m)} a_1\|_0 \leq C \tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_0^{\gamma/2} \mu_0^m, \\ \|\nabla^{(m)} \mathcal{F}_1\|_0 \leq C \tilde{C}_0 \frac{\mu_0^m}{(\lambda_1/\mu_0)^N}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

$$\|\Psi_1\|_1 \leq C \tilde{C}_0 \mu_0^\gamma, \quad \|\nabla^2 \Psi_1\|_0 \leq C \tilde{C}_0 \mu_0^\gamma \mu_0.$$

Bounds (4.13) and (4.14) likewise remain the same:

$$\|\nabla^{(m)} \mathcal{G}_1\|_0 \leq C \tilde{C}_0 \frac{\lambda_1^m}{(\lambda_1/\mu_0)^N}, \quad \|\nabla^{(m)} G_1\|_0 \leq C \tilde{C}_0 \frac{\mu_0^\gamma}{\lambda_1/\mu_0} \lambda_1^m. \quad (5.5)$$

which together with (5.4) implies that $b_1 = (a_1^2 + G_1)^{1/2} \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_l(0), \mathbb{R})$ is well defined and satisfies, as in (4.16)₁ and (4.16)₂:

$$\|b_1\|_0 \leq C \tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_0^{\gamma/2} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\nabla^{(m)} b_1\|_0 \leq C \tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_0^{\gamma/2} \frac{\lambda_1^m}{\lambda_1/\mu_0} \quad \text{for } m \geq 1. \quad (5.6)$$

Consequently, the bound as in (4.19) is still the same, namely:

$$\|\nabla^{(m)} \mathcal{H}_1\|_0 \leq C \tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \frac{\mu_1^m}{(\mu_1/\lambda_1)^2}. \quad (5.7)$$

Now the fourth error term \mathcal{I}_1 , defined in (4.21), enjoys the worse bound than that in (4.23):

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_1^{(t)} \partial_2^{(s)} \mathcal{I}_1\|_0 &\leq C \sum_{i=0}^2 \sum_{p+q=s} \mu_1^{p-i-1} \|\nabla^{(i+q+t)} (b_1 \nabla^2 v_0^2)\|_0 \\ &\leq C \tilde{C}_0 \mu_0^{\gamma/2} \sum_{i=0}^2 \sum_{p+q=s} \mu_1^{p-i-1} \lambda_1^{i+q+t} \mu_0 \leq C \tilde{C}_0 \mu_0^{\gamma/2} \frac{\lambda_1^t \mu_1^s}{\mu_1/\mu_0} \leq C \tilde{C}_0 \frac{\lambda_1^t \mu_1^s}{\mu_1/\lambda_1}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

because although (5.3)₃ is as before, derivatives of the different components of $\nabla^2 v_0$ have the same bound in (5.6). Combining (5.4), (5.5), (5.7), (5.8) we obtain the principal bound:

$$\|\nabla^{(m)} \mathcal{D}_1\| \leq C \tilde{C}_0 \mu_1^m \left(\frac{1}{(\lambda_1/\mu_0)^N} + \frac{1}{\mu_1/\lambda_1} \right) \leq C \tilde{C}_0 \frac{\mu_1^m}{\mu_1/\lambda_1} \quad (5.9)$$

for all $m = 0 \dots (K-1)(3N+4)$,

which corresponds to (4.3)₁, by setting according to (5.2):

$$\mu_1/\lambda_1 = (\lambda_1/\mu_0)^N = \sigma^N. \quad (5.10)$$

3. (The first iteration: from $j = 0$ to 1; the remaining bounds) Recalling (4.7), (4.15) and using (5.4), (5.6) there follows:

$$\|v_1 - v_0\|_1 \leq C \tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_0^{\gamma/2}, \quad (5.11)$$

together with the bounds on $\nabla^2 v_1$, corresponding yet inferior to (4.3)₂, valid with uniform constants C depending only on ω, γ, N, K for all $t + s = 0 \dots (K-1)(3N+4)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_1^{(t)} \partial_2^{(s)} \partial_{11} v_1^1\|_0 &\leq \tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_0^{t+s+1} + C \tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_0^{\gamma/2} \lambda_1^{t+1} \mu_0^s \leq C \tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_0^{\gamma/2} \lambda_1^{t+1} \mu_0^s, \\ \|\partial_1^{(t)} \partial_2^{(s)} \partial_{12} v_1^1\|_0 &\leq \tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_0^{t+s+1} + C \tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_0^{\gamma/2} \lambda_1^t \mu_0^{s+1} \leq C \tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_0^{\gamma/2} \lambda_1^t \mu_0^{s+1}, \\ \|\partial_1^{(t)} \partial_2^{(s)} \partial_{22} v_1^1\|_0 &\leq \tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_0^{t+s+1} + C \tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_0^{\gamma/2} \lambda_1^{t-1} \mu_0^{s+2} \leq C \tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_0^{\gamma/2} \lambda_1^t \mu_0^{s+1}, \\ \|\partial_1^{(t)} \partial_2^{(s)} \partial_{11} v_1^2\|_0 &\leq \tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_0^{t+s+1} + C \tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_0^{\gamma/2} \lambda_1^{t+2} \mu_1^{s-1} \leq C \tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_0^{\gamma/2} \lambda_1^{t+1} \mu_1^s, \\ \|\partial_1^{(t)} \partial_2^{(s)} \partial_{12} v_1^2\|_0 &\leq \tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_0^{t+s+1} + C \tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_0^{\gamma/2} \lambda_1^{t+1} \mu_1^s \leq C \tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_0^{\gamma/2} \lambda_1^{t+1} \mu_1^s, \\ \|\partial_1^{(t)} \partial_2^{(s)} \partial_{22} v_1^2\|_0 &\leq \tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_0^{t+s+1} + C \tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_0^{\gamma/2} \lambda_1^t \mu_1^{s+1} \leq C \tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_0^{\gamma/2} \lambda_1^t \mu_1^{s+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.12)$$

Carrying out the remaining bounds as in steps 8 and 9 of the proof of Proposition 4.1, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_1 - w_0\|_1 &\leq C \tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_0^{\gamma/2} (\|\nabla v_0\|_0 + \tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_0^{\gamma/2}) \\ &\leq C \tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_0^{\gamma/2} (\|\nabla v\|_0 + l\mathcal{M} + \tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_0^{\gamma/2}) \leq C \tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_0^\gamma (\|\nabla v\|_0 + \tilde{C}_0^{1/2}), \quad (5.13) \\ \|\nabla^2(w_1 - w_0)\|_0 &\leq C \tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_0^\gamma (\|\nabla v\|_0 + \tilde{C}_0^{1/2}) \mu_1, \end{aligned}$$

in view of (5.3)₁, (5.3)₃, (5.4) and (5.6).

4. (The second iteration: from $j = 1$ to 2; the defect bound) We follow the proof of Proposition 4.1 starting with v_1, w_1, \mathcal{D}_1 and parameters consistent with (5.9), (5.12) and (5.2):

$$\tilde{C}_1 = C \frac{\tilde{C}_0}{\mu_1/\lambda_1}, \quad B_1 = \tilde{C}_0, \quad \mu_1 \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_0} = \mu_1 \sigma = \lambda_2 < \mu_2,$$

so that $\|\nabla^{(m)} \mathcal{D}_1\|_0 \leq \tilde{C}_1 \mu_1^m$ and that (5.12) is valid with $C \tilde{C}_0^{1/2}$ in its right hand side replaced by $\tilde{B}_1^{1/2}$. Recall from (5.1) that $\lambda_2^{1-\gamma} \geq \mu_1 \sigma_0$, allowing for the application of Proposition 3.1 which yields $a_2 \in C^\infty(\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_l(0), \mathbb{R})$, $\Psi_2 \in C^\infty(\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_l(0), \mathbb{R}^2)$ and $\mathcal{F}_2 \in C^\infty(\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_l(0), \mathbb{R}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$. These satisfy, as in (4.6)₁-(4.6)₄:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\bar{C}_1^{1/2} \tilde{C}_1^{1/2}}{2} \mu_1^{\gamma/2} &\leq a_2 \leq \frac{3\bar{C}_1^{1/2} \tilde{C}_1^{1/2}}{2} \mu_1^{\gamma/2} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\nabla^{(m)} a_2\|_0 \leq C \bar{C}_1^{1/2} \mu_1^{\gamma/2} \mu_1^m, \\ \|\nabla^{(m)} \mathcal{F}_2\|_0 &\leq C \tilde{C}_1 \frac{\mu_1^m}{(\lambda_2/\mu_1)^N}, \\ \|\Psi_1\|_1 &\leq C \tilde{C}_1 \mu_1^\gamma, \quad \|\nabla^2 \Psi_2\|_0 \leq C \tilde{C}_1 \mu_1^\gamma \mu_1. \end{aligned} \quad (5.14)$$

The bound (4.13) likewise remains the same, as $(\tilde{C}_0/\tilde{C}_1)^{1/2} \leq (\mu_1/\lambda_1)^{1/2} \leq \lambda_2/\lambda_1$, and then:

$$\|\nabla^{(m)}\mathcal{G}_2\|_0 \leq C\tilde{C}_1 \frac{\lambda_2^m}{(\lambda_2/\mu_1)^N}. \quad (5.15)$$

Regarding (4.14), we only need to estimate derivatives of $IV_0 = \frac{\Gamma(\lambda_2 x_1)}{\lambda_2} a_2 \partial_{22} v_1^1$ as in step 4 of the proof of Proposition 4.1, using (5.12) and (5.14):

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_1^{(t)} \partial_2^{(s)} IV_0\|_0 &\leq C \sum_{p+q=t} \lambda_2^{p-1} \|\partial_1^{(q)} \partial_2^{(s)} (a_2 \partial_{22} v_1^1)\|_0 \\ &\leq C \sum_{\substack{p+q=t \\ u_1+z_1=q \\ u_2+z_2=s}} \lambda_2^{p-1} \|\partial_1^{(u_1)} \partial_2^{(u_2)} a_2\|_0 \|\partial_1^{(z_1)} \partial_2^{(z_2+2)} v_1^1\|_0 \\ &\leq C\tilde{C}_1^{1/2} \tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_1^\gamma \sum_{\substack{p+q=t \\ u_1+z_1=q \\ u_2+z_2=s}} \lambda_2^{p-1} \mu_1^{u_1+u_2} \lambda_1^{z_1} \mu_0^{z_2+1} \leq C\tilde{C}_1^{1/2} \tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_1^\gamma \sum_{p+q=t} \lambda_2^{p-1} \mu_1^{q+s} \mu_0 \\ &\leq C\tilde{C}_1^{1/2} \tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_1^\gamma \frac{\lambda_2^t \mu_1^s}{\lambda_2/\mu_0} = C\tilde{C}_1 \lambda_2^t \mu_1^s \mu_1^\gamma \frac{(\tilde{C}_0/\tilde{C}_1)^{1/2}}{\lambda_2/\mu_0}, \end{aligned}$$

resulting in, in view of (1.6) and (5.9):

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla^{(m)} G_2\|_0 &\leq C\tilde{C}_1 \lambda_2^m \frac{\mu_1^\gamma}{\lambda_2/\mu_1} \cdot \frac{(\tilde{C}_0/\tilde{C}_1)^{1/2}}{(\mu_1/\lambda_1) \min\{\lambda_1/\mu_0, (\lambda_2/\mu_1)(\lambda_1/\mu_0), (\lambda_2/\mu_1)^2\}} \\ &\quad + C\tilde{C}_1 \frac{\lambda_2^m}{\lambda_2/\mu_1} \leq C\tilde{C}_1 \frac{\lambda_2^m}{\lambda_2/\mu_1}. \end{aligned}$$

Together with (5.14) the above implies that $b_2 = (a_2^2 + G_2)^{1/2} \in C^\infty(\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_l(0), \mathbb{R})$ is well defined and satisfies, as in (4.16)₁ and (4.16)₂:

$$\|b_2\|_0 \leq C\tilde{C}_1^{1/2} \mu_1^{\gamma/2} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\nabla^{(m)} b_2\|_0 \leq C\tilde{C}_1^{1/2} \mu_1^{\gamma/2} \frac{\lambda_2^m}{\lambda_2/\mu_1} \quad \text{for } m \geq 1. \quad (5.16)$$

Consequently, the bound as in (4.19) is still the same, namely:

$$\|\nabla^{(m)} \mathcal{H}_2\|_0 \leq C\tilde{C}_1^{1/2} \frac{\mu_2^m}{(\mu_2/\lambda_2)^2}. \quad (5.17)$$

Towards estimating the fourth error term \mathcal{I}_2 in (4.21), we proceed as in step 6 of the proof of Proposition 4.1, noting the new estimate in view of the inferior bound on $\partial_{11} v_1^2$ in (5.12):

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{p+q=s} \mu_2^{p-1} \|\partial_1^{(t)} \partial_2^{(q)} (b_2 \partial_{11} v_1^2)\|_0 &\leq C \sum_{\substack{p+q=s \\ u_1+z_1=t \\ u_2+z_2=q}} \mu_2^{p-1} \|\partial_1^{(u_1)} \partial_2^{(u_2)} b_2\|_0 \|\partial_1^{(z_1+2)} \partial_2^{(z_2)} v_1^2\|_0 \\ &\leq C\tilde{C}_1^{1/2} \tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_1^\gamma \sum_{\substack{p+q=s \\ u_1+z_1=t \\ u_2+z_2=q}} \mu_2^{p-1} \lambda_2^{u_1+u_2} \lambda_1^{z_1+1} \mu_1^{z_2} \leq C\tilde{C}_1^{1/2} \tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_1^\gamma \sum_{p+q=s} \mu_2^{p-1} \lambda_2^{q+t} \lambda_1 \\ &\leq C\tilde{C}_1^{1/2} \tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_1^\gamma \frac{\lambda_2^t \mu_2^s}{\mu_2/\lambda_1} \leq C\tilde{C}_1 \lambda_2^t \mu_2^s \frac{(\tilde{C}_0/\tilde{C}_1)^{1/2}}{(\mu_2/\lambda_1)(\mu_1/\lambda_1)}, \end{aligned}$$

and concluding the bound corresponding to (4.23):

$$\|\nabla^{(m)}\mathcal{I}_2\|_0 \leq C\tilde{C}_1\mu_2^m \frac{(\tilde{C}_0/\tilde{C}_1)^{1/2}}{(\mu_2/\lambda_2) \min\{(\mu_2/\lambda_2)^2, \mu_1/\lambda_1, (\mu_2/\lambda_2)(\mu_1/\lambda_1)\}}. \quad (5.18)$$

Together with (5.14), (5.15), (5.17), the above implies the second principal bound:

$$\|\nabla^{(m)}\mathcal{D}_2\| \leq C\tilde{C}_1\mu_2^m \left(\frac{1}{(\lambda_2/\mu_1)^N} + \frac{1}{(\mu_2/\lambda_2)^2} \right) \leq C\tilde{C}_1 \frac{\mu_1^m}{(\mu_2/\lambda_2)^2} \quad (5.19)$$

for all $m = 0 \dots (K-2)(3N+4)$,

which corresponds to (4.3)₁, by setting in accordance with (5.2):

$$\mu_2/\lambda_2 = (\mu_1/\lambda_1)^{1/2} = (\lambda_2/\mu_1)^{N/2} = \sigma^{N/2}. \quad (5.20)$$

5. (The second iteration: from $j = 1$ to 2; the remaining bounds) Recalling (4.7), (4.15) and using (5.14), (5.16), there follows:

$$\|v_2 - v_1\|_1 \leq C\tilde{C}_1^{1/2} \mu_1^{\gamma/2}, \quad (5.21)$$

together with the bounds on $\nabla^2 v_2$, valid for all $t + s = 0 \dots (K-2)(3N+4)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_1^{(t)} \partial_2^{(s)} \partial_{11} v_2^1\|_0 &\leq C\tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_0^{\gamma/2} \lambda_1^{t+1} \mu_0^s + C\tilde{C}_1^{1/2} \mu_1^{\gamma/2} \lambda_2^{t+1} \mu_1^s \leq C\tilde{C}_1^{1/2} \mu_1^{\gamma/2} \lambda_2^{t+1} \mu_1^s, \\ \|\partial_1^{(t)} \partial_2^{(s)} \partial_{12} v_2^1\|_0 &\leq C\tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_0^{\gamma/2} \lambda_1^t \mu_0^{s+1} + C\tilde{C}_1^{1/2} \mu_1^{\gamma/2} \lambda_2^t \mu_1^{s+1} \leq C\tilde{C}_1^{1/2} \mu_1^{\gamma/2} \lambda_2^t \mu_1^{s+1}, \\ \|\partial_1^{(t)} \partial_2^{(s)} \partial_{22} v_2^1\|_0 &\leq C\tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_0^{\gamma/2} \lambda_1^t \mu_0^{s+1} + C\tilde{C}_1^{1/2} \mu_1^{\gamma/2} \lambda_2^{t-1} \mu_1^{s+2} \leq C\tilde{C}_1^{1/2} \mu_1^{\gamma/2} \lambda_2^{t-1} \mu_1^{s+2}, \\ \|\partial_1^{(t)} \partial_2^{(s)} \partial_{11} v_2^2\|_0 &\leq C\tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_0^{\gamma/2} \lambda_1^{t+1} \mu_1^s + C\tilde{C}_1^{1/2} \mu_1^{\gamma/2} \lambda_2^{t+2} \mu_2^{s-1} \leq C\tilde{C}_1^{1/2} \mu_1^{\gamma/2} \lambda_2^{t+2} \mu_2^{s-1}, \\ \|\partial_1^{(t)} \partial_2^{(s)} \partial_{12} v_2^2\|_0 &\leq C\tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_0^{\gamma/2} \lambda_1^{t+1} \mu_1^s + C\tilde{C}_1^{1/2} \mu_1^{\gamma/2} \lambda_2^{t+1} \mu_2^s \leq C\tilde{C}_1^{1/2} \mu_1^{\gamma/2} \lambda_2^{t+1} \mu_2^s, \\ \|\partial_1^{(t)} \partial_2^{(s)} \partial_{22} v_2^2\|_0 &\leq C\tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_0^{\gamma/2} \lambda_1^t \mu_1^{s+1} + C\tilde{C}_1^{1/2} \mu_1^{\gamma/2} \lambda_2^t \mu_2^{s+1} \leq C\tilde{C}_1^{1/2} \mu_1^{\gamma/2} \lambda_2^t \mu_2^{s+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.22)$$

Above, we used the following fact resulting from (5.20):

$$\left(\frac{\tilde{C}_0}{\tilde{C}_1}\right)^{1/2} \leq \left(\frac{\mu_1}{\lambda_1}\right)^{1/2} \leq \min\left\{\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1}, \frac{\mu_1}{\mu_0}, \frac{\mu_1^2}{\lambda_2\mu_0}, \frac{\lambda_2^2}{\lambda_1\mu_2}, \frac{\mu_2}{\mu_1}\right\}.$$

Indeed, comparison with λ_2/λ_2 , μ_1/μ_0 and μ_2/μ_1 is direct, whereas:

$$\frac{\mu_1^2}{\lambda_2\mu_0} = \frac{\mu_1}{\lambda_1} \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_0} \frac{\mu_1}{\lambda_2} = \frac{\mu_1}{\lambda_1} \geq \left(\frac{\mu_1}{\lambda_1}\right)^{1/2}, \quad \frac{\lambda_2^2}{\lambda_1\mu_2} = \frac{\lambda_2}{\mu_1} \frac{\mu_1}{\lambda_1} \frac{\lambda_2}{\mu_2} = \frac{\lambda_2}{\mu_1} \left(\frac{\mu_1}{\lambda_1}\right)^{1/2} \geq \left(\frac{\mu_1}{\lambda_1}\right)^{1/2}.$$

Carrying out the remaining bounds as in steps 8 and 9 of the proof of Proposition 4.1 yields:

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_2 - w_1\|_1 &\leq C\tilde{C}_1^{1/2} \mu_1^{\gamma/2} (\|\nabla v_1\|_0 + \tilde{C}_1^{1/2} \mu_1^{\gamma/2}) \\ &\leq C\tilde{C}_1^{1/2} \mu_1^{\gamma/2} (\|\nabla v_0\|_0 + \tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_0^{\gamma/2}) \leq C\tilde{C}_1^{1/2} \mu_1^{\gamma} (\|\nabla v\|_0 + \tilde{C}_0^{1/2}), \\ \|\nabla^2(w_2 - w_1)\|_0 &\leq C\tilde{C}_1^{1/2} \mu_1^{\gamma} (\|\nabla v\|_0 + \tilde{C}_0^{1/2}) \mu_2, \end{aligned} \quad (5.23)$$

in view of (5.14), (5.6), (5.12) and (5.11).

6. (Iterations from j to $j+1$ with $j = 2 \dots K-1$) Assume that we carried out the construction of $v_j, w_j \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_l(0), \mathbb{R}^2)$ and that, after setting the following quantities:

$$\tilde{C}_j = C \frac{\tilde{C}_{j-1}}{(\mu_j/\lambda_j)^2}, \quad B_j = C\tilde{C}_{j-1}, \quad \mu_j\sigma = \lambda_{j+1} < \mu_{j+1},$$

we get $\|\nabla^{(m)}\mathcal{D}_j\|_0 \leq \tilde{C}_j \mu_j^m$ and (4.3)₂, valid for all $m, t + s = 0 \dots (K - j)(3N + 4)$. All these clearly holds at $j = 2$, by (5.19) and (5.22). Observe that other assumptions of Proposition 4.1 are likewise valid, since $\lambda_{j+1}^{1-\gamma} \geq \mu_j \sigma_0$ in virtue of (5.1), while (4.2) follows from:

$$\frac{B_j}{\tilde{C}_j} = \left(\frac{\mu_j}{\lambda_j}\right)^2 = \left(\frac{\mu_{j+1}}{\lambda_{j+1}}\right)^2 = \left(\frac{\lambda_{j+1}}{\mu_j}\right)^N = \sigma^N.$$

Consequently, we obtain $v_{j+1}, w_{j+1} \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_l(0), \mathbb{R}^2)$ such that, in virtue of (4.3)₁:

$$\|\nabla^{(m)}\mathcal{D}_{j+1}\|_0 \leq C \mu_{j+1}^m \frac{\tilde{C}_j}{(\mu_{j+1}/\lambda_{j+1})^2} \quad \text{for all } m = 0 \dots (K - j + 1)(3N + 4). \quad (5.24)$$

Also, (4.3)₂ implies that (4.3)₂ holds at $j + 1$, for all $t + s = 0 \dots (K - j + 1)(3N + 4)$, with $B_{j+1} = C\tilde{C}_j$, because the extra factors in the third and fourth bounds there become:

$$\frac{1}{(\lambda_j/\mu_{j-1})^2(\mu_j/\lambda_{j+1})} = \frac{1}{\sigma} \leq 1, \quad \frac{1}{(\lambda_{j+1}/\lambda_j)(\lambda_{j+1}/\mu_{j+1})} = \frac{1}{\sigma^{N/2}} \leq 1,$$

once we have set the frequencies through (5.2). Further, (4.4)₁ and (4.4)₂ imply:

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_{j+1} - v_j\|_1 &\leq C\tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{\gamma/2} \leq C\tilde{C}_0 \mu_j^{\gamma/2}, \\ \|w_{j+1} - w_j\|_1 &\leq C\tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_j^\gamma (\|\nabla v\|_0 + \tilde{C}_0^{1/2}), \\ \|\nabla^2(w_{j+1} - w_j)\|_0 &\leq C\tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_j^\gamma (\|\nabla v\|_0 + \tilde{C}_0^{1/2}) \mu_{j+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.25)$$

7. (Proof of the final bounds) After the total of K steps, we declare:

$$\tilde{v} = v_K, \quad \tilde{w} = w_K.$$

Using (5.3)₁, together with (5.11), (5.13), (5.21), (5.23) and (5.25) we arrive at the following version of the estimates, claimed in (1.8)₁:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{v} - v\|_1 &\leq \|v - v_0\|_1 + \sum_{j=1}^{K-1} \|v_{j+1} - v_j\|_1 \leq C(l\mathcal{M} + \tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_K^{\gamma/2}) \leq C\mu_K^{\gamma/2} (\|\mathcal{D}\|_0^{1/2} + l\mathcal{M}), \\ \|\tilde{w} - w\|_1 &\leq \|w - w_0\|_1 + \sum_{j=1}^{K-1} \|w_{j+1} - w_j\|_1 \leq Cl\mathcal{M} + C\tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_K^{\gamma/2} (\|\nabla v\|_0 + \tilde{C}_0^{1/2}) \\ &\leq C\mu_K^{\gamma/2} (\|\mathcal{D}\|_0^{1/2} + l\mathcal{M}) (1 + \|\mathcal{D}\|_0^{1/2} + l\mathcal{M} + \|\nabla v\|_0). \end{aligned}$$

Further, from (5.9), (5.19) and (5.24):

$$\|\mathcal{D}_j\|_0 \leq \tilde{C}_j = C \frac{\tilde{C}_0}{\sigma^{jN}} \quad \text{for all } j = 0 \dots K, \quad (5.26)$$

so that, recalling (5.2) we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_{j+1} &= C \frac{\tilde{C}_0^{1/2}}{\sigma^{jN/2}} \sigma^{j+1+(j+2)N/2} \mu_0 = C\tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \sigma^{j+1+N} \mu_0 \\ &\leq C\tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \sigma^{K+N} \mu_0 \quad \text{for all } j = \dots K - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, taking into account (4.3)₂ at $j + 1 = K$, we get a version of the first bound in (1.8)₂:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla^2 \tilde{v}\|_0 &\leq \mu_K^{\gamma/2} B_K^{1/2} \mu_K = C\tilde{C}_{K-1}^{1/2} \mu_K^{\gamma/2} \mu_K \\ &= C\tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_K^{\gamma/2} \sigma^{K+N} \mu_0 \leq C\mu_K^{\gamma/2} \frac{(\lambda)^{K+N}}{l} (\|\mathcal{D}\|_0^{1/2} + l\mathcal{M}), \end{aligned}$$

while the second bound follows through (5.13), 5.23) and (5.25):

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla^2 \tilde{w}\|_0 &\leq \|\nabla^2 w_0\|_0 + \sum_{j=0}^{K-1} \|\nabla^2(w_{j+1} - w_j)\|_0 \leq C l \mathcal{M} \mu_0 + \mu_K^\gamma (\|\nabla v\|_0 + \tilde{C}_0^{1/2}) \sum_{j=0}^{K-1} \tilde{C}_j^{1/2} \mu_{j+1} \\ &\leq C \tilde{C}_0^{1/2} \mu_K^\gamma \sigma^{K+N} \mu_0 (1 + \|\mathcal{D}\|_0^{1/2} + l \mathcal{M} + \|\nabla v\|_0) \\ &\leq C \mu_K^\gamma \frac{(\lambda l)^{K+N}}{l} (\|\mathcal{D}\|_0^{1/2} + l \mathcal{M}) (1 + \|\mathcal{D}\|_0^{1/2} + l \mathcal{M} + \|\nabla v\|_0). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, (1.8)₃ results from (5.3)₂ and (5.26):

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\mathcal{D}}\|_0 &\leq \|A - A_0\|_0 + \|\mathcal{D}_K\|_0 \leq C l^\beta \|A\|_{0,\beta} + \tilde{C}_K \leq C \left(l^\beta \|A\|_{0,\beta} + \frac{\tilde{C}_0}{\sigma^{KN}} \right) \\ &\leq C \left(l^\beta \|A\|_{0,\beta} + \frac{\|\mathcal{D}\|_0 + (l \mathcal{M})^2}{(\lambda l)^{KN}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

8. (Reparametrizing γ) The final bounds that we proved in step 7, carry the following factor in their right hand sides, in virtue of (5.2):

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_K^\gamma &= \left(\frac{\sigma^{K+(K+1)N/2}}{l} \right)^\gamma = \lambda^{K(1+N/2)\gamma + \gamma} l^{K(1+N/2)\gamma} \leq \lambda^{K(1+N/2)\gamma + \gamma} = \lambda^{\bar{\gamma}}, \\ \text{where } \bar{\gamma} &= (K(1 + N/2) + 1)\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

We also note that the second condition in (5.1) is equivalently written as:

$$\lambda^{1 - \frac{\gamma}{1 - K(1+N/2)\gamma + \gamma}} l \geq \sigma_0^{\frac{1}{1 - K(1+N/2)\gamma + \gamma}},$$

which, using the notation of $\bar{\gamma}$, becomes:

$$\lambda^{1 - \frac{\bar{\gamma}}{(K(1+N/2)+1)(1-\bar{\gamma}+2\gamma)}} l \geq \sigma_0^{\frac{1}{1-\bar{\gamma}+2\gamma}}. \quad (5.27)$$

The exponent on λ in the left hand side above is greater than $1 - \bar{\gamma}$, if we assume:

$$\bar{\gamma} \leq \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda^{1-\bar{\gamma}} l \geq \sigma_0^2. \quad (5.28)$$

We then validate (5.27) through (5.28), because:

$$\lambda^{1 - \frac{\bar{\gamma}}{(K(1+N/2)+1)(1-\bar{\gamma}+2\gamma)}} l \geq \lambda^{1-\bar{\gamma}} l \geq \sigma_0^2 \geq \sigma_0^{\frac{1}{1-\bar{\gamma}}} \geq \sigma_0^{\frac{1}{1-\bar{\gamma}+2\gamma}}.$$

In summary, we treat λ in the statement of Theorem 1.3 as the given $\bar{\lambda}$ which, without loss of generality we decrease below $1/2$. We then define σ_0 to be the square of σ_0 from Proposition 4.1, whereas the second assumption in (1.6) is exactly the second condition in (5.28), implying the second condition in (5.1). This yields all the bounds in step 7. Replacing in their right hand side the factor μ_K^γ by its majorant $\lambda^{\bar{\gamma}}$, we obtain the claimed formulas (1.8)₁–(1.8)₃, with the stated dependence of constants and parameters. The proof is done. \blacksquare

6. THE NASH-KUIPER SCHEME AND A PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

The proof of Theorem 1.1 relies on iterating Theorem 1.3 according to the Nash-Kuiper scheme. We quote the main recursion result given in [10, 11], which is similar to [4, section 6], but now involving the Hölder norms, as is necessary in view of the decomposition Lemma 2.2.

Theorem 6.1. [10, Theorem 1.4] [11, Lemma 5.2] *Let $\omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be an open, bounded and smooth domain, and let $k, J, S \geq 1$. Assume that there exists $l_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that the following holds for every $l \in (0, l_0]$. Given $v \in \mathcal{C}^2(\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_{2l}(0), \mathbb{R}^k)$, $w \in \mathcal{C}^2(\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_{2l}(0), \mathbb{R}^d)$, $A \in \mathcal{C}^{0,\beta}(\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_{2l}(0), \mathbb{R}_{\text{sym}}^{d \times d})$, and $\gamma, \lambda, \mathcal{M}$ which satisfy, together with $\sigma_0 \geq 1$ that depends on ω, k, S, J, γ :*

$$\gamma \in (0, 1), \quad \lambda^{1-\gamma} l > \sigma_0, \quad \mathcal{M} \geq \max\{\|v\|_2, \|w\|_2, 1\}, \quad (6.1)$$

there exist $\tilde{v} \in \mathcal{C}^2(\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_l(0), \mathbb{R}^k)$, $\tilde{w} \in \mathcal{C}^2(\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_l(0), \mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{v} - v\|_1 &\leq C\lambda^{\gamma/2}(\|\mathcal{D}\|_0^{1/2} + l\mathcal{M}), \\ \|\tilde{w} - w\|_1 &\leq C\lambda^\gamma(\|\mathcal{D}\|_0^{1/2} + l\mathcal{M})(1 + \|\mathcal{D}\|_0^{1/2} + l\mathcal{M} + \|\nabla v\|_0), \\ \|\nabla^2 \tilde{v}\|_0 &\leq C\frac{(\lambda l)^J}{l}\lambda^{\gamma/2}(\|\mathcal{D}\|_0^{1/2} + l\mathcal{M}), \\ \|\nabla^2 \tilde{w}\|_0 &\leq C\frac{(\lambda l)^J}{l}\lambda^\gamma(\|\mathcal{D}\|_0^{1/2} + l\mathcal{M})(1 + \|\mathcal{D}\|_0^{1/2} + l\mathcal{M} + \|\nabla v\|_0), \\ \|\tilde{\mathcal{D}}\|_0 &\leq C\left(l^\beta \|A\|_{0,\beta} + \frac{\lambda^\gamma}{(\lambda l)^S}(\|\mathcal{D}\|_0 + (l\mathcal{M})^2)\right). \end{aligned}$$

with constants C depending only on ω, k, J, S, γ , and with the defects, as usual, denoted by:

$$\mathcal{D} = A - \left(\frac{1}{2}(\nabla v)^T \nabla v + \text{sym} \nabla w\right), \quad \tilde{\mathcal{D}} = A - \left(\frac{1}{2}(\nabla \tilde{v})^T \nabla \tilde{v} + \text{sym} \nabla \tilde{w}\right).$$

Then, for every triple of fields v, w, A as above, which additionally satisfy the defect smallness condition $0 < \|\mathcal{D}\|_0 \leq 1$, and for every exponent α in the range:

$$0 < \alpha < \min\left\{\frac{\beta}{2}, \frac{S}{S+2J}\right\}, \quad (6.2)$$

there exist $\bar{v} \in \mathcal{C}^{1,\alpha}(\bar{\omega}, \mathbb{R}^k)$ and $\bar{w} \in \mathcal{C}^{1,\alpha}(\bar{\omega}, \mathbb{R}^d)$ with the following properties:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{v} - v\|_1 &\leq C(1 + \|\nabla v\|_0)^2 \|\mathcal{D}\|_0^{1/4}, \quad \|\bar{w} - w\|_1 \leq C(1 + \|\nabla v\|_0)^3 \|\mathcal{D}\|_0^{1/4}, \\ A - \left(\frac{1}{2}(\nabla \bar{v})^T \nabla \bar{v} + \text{sym} \nabla \bar{w}\right) &= 0 \quad \text{in } \bar{\omega}. \end{aligned}$$

The constants C above depend only on ω, k, A and α .

Clearly, Theorem 6.1 and Theorem 1.3 yield together the following result below, because:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{S}{S+2J} &= \frac{KN}{KN+2(K+N)} \rightarrow \frac{N}{N+2} \quad \text{as } K \rightarrow \infty \\ &\rightarrow 1 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Corollary 6.2. *Let $\omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be an open, bounded and smooth domain. Fix any α as in (1.5). Then, there exists $l_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that, for every $l \in (0, l_0]$, and for every $v \in \mathcal{C}^2(\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_{2l}(0), \mathbb{R}^3)$, $w \in \mathcal{C}^2(\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_{2l}(0), \mathbb{R}^2)$, $A \in \mathcal{C}^{0,\beta}(\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_{2l}(0), \mathbb{R}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ such that:*

$$\mathcal{D} = A - \left(\frac{1}{2}(\nabla v)^T \nabla v + \text{sym} \nabla w\right) \quad \text{satisfies} \quad 0 < \|\mathcal{D}\|_0 \leq 1,$$

there exist $\tilde{v} \in \mathcal{C}^{1,\alpha}(\bar{\omega}, \mathbb{R}^3)$, $\tilde{w} \in \mathcal{C}^{1,\alpha}(\bar{\omega}, \mathbb{R}^2)$ with the following properties:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{v} - v\|_1 &\leq C(1 + \|\nabla v\|_0)^2 \|\mathcal{D}\|_0^{1/4}, \quad \|\tilde{w} - w\|_1 \leq C(1 + \|\nabla v\|_0)^3 \|\mathcal{D}\|_0^{1/4}, \\ A - \left(\frac{1}{2}(\nabla \tilde{v})^T \nabla \tilde{v} + \text{sym} \nabla \tilde{w}\right) &= 0 \quad \text{in } \bar{\omega}. \end{aligned}$$

The norms in the left hand side above are taken on $\bar{\omega}$, and in the right hand side on $\bar{\omega} + \bar{B}_{2l}(0)$. The constants C depend only on ω , A and α .

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is consequently the same as the proof of Theorem 1.1 in [10], in section 5 there. We replace ω by its smooth superset, and apply the basic stage construction in order to first decrease $\|\mathcal{D}\|_0$ below 1. Then, Corollary 6.2 yields the final result. ■

REFERENCES

- [1] CAO, W., HIRSCH, J. AND INAUEN, D., $C^{1,1/3-}$ very weak solutions to the two dimensional Monge-Ampère equation, arXiv:2310.06693.
- [2] CAO, W., HIRSCH, J. AND INAUEN, D., A Nash-Kuiper theorem for isometric immersions beyond Borisov's exponent, arXiv:2503.13867 .
- [3] CAO, W. AND SZÉKELYHIDI JR., L., Very weak solutions to the two-dimensional Monge-Ampère equation, Science China Mathematics, **62(6)**, pp. 1041–1056, (2019).
- [4] CONTI, S., DE LELLIS, C. AND SZÉKELYHIDI JR., L., h -principle and rigidity for $C^{1,\alpha}$ isometric embeddings, Proceedings of the Abel Symposium, in: Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations, pp. 83–116, (2010).
- [5] DE LELLIS, C., INAUEN, D. AND SZÉKELYHIDI JR., L., A Nash-Kuiper theorem for $C^{1,\frac{1}{5}-\delta}$ immersions of surfaces in 3 dimensions, Revista Matematica Iberoamericana, **34(3)**, pp. 1119–1152, (2018).
- [6] HAN, Q. AND HONG, J.X., *Isometric Embedding of Riemannian Manifolds in Euclidean Spaces*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, Volume 130, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, (2006).
- [7] INAUEN, D. AND LEWICKA, M., *The Monge-Ampère system in dimension two and codimension three*, arXiv:2501.12474.
- [8] KÄLLÉN, A., *Isometric embedding of a smooth compact manifold with a metric of low regularity*, Ark. Mat. **16(1)**, pp. 29–50, (1978).
- [9] LEWICKA, M., *The Monge-Ampère system: convex integration in arbitrary dimension and codimension*, SIAM J. Math. Analysis, **57(1)**, pp. 601–636, (2025).
- [10] LEWICKA, M., *The Monge-Ampère system: convex integration with improved regularity in dimension two and arbitrary codimension*, Diff. Int. Equations, **38(3/4)**, pp. 141–174, (2025).
- [11] LEWICKA, M., *The Monge-Ampère system in dimension two: a further regularity improvement*, arXiv:2405.00231.
- [12] LEWICKA, M. AND PAKZAD, M., *Convex integration for the Monge-Ampère equation in two dimensions*, Analysis and PDE, **10(3)**, pp. 695–727, (2017).
- [13] NASH, J., *The imbedding problem for Riemannian manifolds*, Ann. Math., **63**, pp. 20–63, (1956).
- [14] NASH, J., *C^1 isometric imbeddings*, Ann. Math., **60**, pp. 383–396, (1954).

D.I.: INSTITUT FÜR MATHEMATIK, UNIVERSITÄT LEIPZIG, D-04109, LEIPZIG, GERMANY

M.L.: UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, 139 UNIVERSITY PLACE, PITTSBURGH, PA 15260

Email address: dominik.inauen@math.uni-leipzig.de, lewicka@pitt.edu