STRESS CONCENTRATION BETWEEN TWO ADJACENT RIGID INCLUSIONS FOR THE STOKES FLOW IN 2D AND 3D
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Abstract. To study the field enhancements in the narrow region between two inclusions is vital important in material sciences and fluid mechanics. Complex fluids including particle suspensions usually result in complicated flow behavior. In this paper we establish the pointwise upper bounds of the gradient estimates for the Stokes flow when two rigid particles are closely spaced suspending in an open bounded domain and away from the boundary in dimensions two and three. Moreover, the lower bounds at the narrowest place of the neck region show the optimality of these blow-up rates. These results are valid for inclusions with arbitrary shape.

1. Introduction

1.1. Problem Formulation and Background. We consider the stress concentration for the Stokes flow between two adjacent rigid particles when the distance tends to zero. Let $D$ be a bounded open set in $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 2$, that contains two disjoint subdomains $D_1$ and $D_2$, with $\varepsilon$ apart and far away from $\partial D$, that is,

$$D_1, D_2 \subset D, \quad \varepsilon := \text{dist}(D_1, D_2) > 0, \quad \text{dist}(D_1 \cup D_2, \partial D) > \kappa_0 > 0,$$

where $\kappa_0$ is a constant independent of $\varepsilon$. We assume that $D_1$ and $D_2$ are of class $C^{2, \gamma}$, $0 < \gamma < 1$, and their $C^{2, \gamma}$ norms are bounded by another positive constant $\kappa_1$, independent of $\varepsilon$. Denote the linear space of rigid displacements in $\mathbb{R}^d$:

$$\Psi := \left\{ \psi \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d) \mid e(\psi) := \frac{1}{2}(\nabla \psi + (\nabla \psi)^T) = 0 \right\},$$

with a basis $\{e_i, x_k e_j - x_j e_k \mid 1 \leq i \leq d, 1 \leq j < k \leq d\}$, where $e_1, \ldots, e_d$ is the standard basis of $\mathbb{R}^d$. Let us consider the following Stokes flow containing two adjacent rigid particles:

$$\begin{align*}
\mu \Delta u &= \nabla p, \quad \nabla \cdot u = 0, \quad &\text{in } \Omega := D \setminus (D_1 \cup D_2), \\
\left| u \right|_+ &= \left| u \right|_-, &\text{on } \partial D_i, \ i = 1, 2, \\
\left| \int_{\partial D_i} \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} \right|_+ &\cdot \psi_\alpha - \int_{\partial D_i} p \psi_\alpha \cdot \nu = 0, &\text{in } D_i, \ i = 1, 2, \\
u &= \varphi, &\text{on } \partial D,
\end{align*}$$

(1.1)

where $\mu > 0$, $\psi_\alpha \in \Psi$, $\alpha = 1, 2, \ldots, \frac{d(d+1)}{2}$, $\left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} \right|_+ := \mu(\nabla u + (\nabla u)^T)\nu$, and $\nu$ is the unit outer normal vector of $D_i$, $i = 1, 2$. Here and throughout this paper the subscript $\pm$ indicates the limit from outside and inside the domain, respectively.
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Since $D$ is bounded, from $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0$ and Gauss theorem, it follows that the prescribed velocity field $\varphi$ must satisfy the compatibility condition:

$$\int_{\partial D} \varphi \cdot \nu = 0,$$

(1.2)

to achieve the existence and uniqueness of the solutions. For the Stokes flow in a bounded domain, following the work of Ladyzhenskaya [33], it is simple to show the existence and uniqueness of a generalized solution by an integral variational formulation and Riesz representation theorem. It is well known that since the Stokes flow is elliptic in the sense of Douglis-Nirenberg, see [51], the regularity along with appropriate estimates can be obtained directly from the general theory of Agmon, Douglis and Nirenberg [2] and Solonnikov [50].

In practice, complex fluids including particle suspensions usually result in complicated flow behavior and characteristic rheological properties. Many applied mathematicians and physicists made important progress in this field. By the beginning of the twentieth century, hydrodynamic lubrication theory was well advanced, based on the work of Navier and Stokes [24]. The Reynolds equation [46] had been widely validated for continuous liquid films acting under restricted conditions [45]. It is proved that the fluid film is thick enough to prevent physical or direct contact between the friction-coupled elements. Elastohydrodynamic lubrication was further developed by Dowson and Higginson [20] and by Winer and Cheng [18] in the latter half of the twentieth century, which takes into account the elastic deflection of solid contacting surfaces. Due to very high pressures at the contact interface, the increase in viscosity ensures continuity of the fluid film in a bearing contact.

In this paper we assume that the Reynolds number is low to ignore the nonlinear inertial force, whereas at high Reynolds number the boundary layers problem of is another very important topic. Beginning with Reynolds famous paper in 1883, the stability and transition to turbulence of laminar flows at high Reynolds number has been an active field in fluid mechanics [52]. In fluid lubrication theory, thin layers of fluid can prevent solid bodies from contact, and so a solid body close to a solid plane or two nearly parallel surface are also often considered [19]. For instance, by using spherical polars, one can calculate the force exerted by a sphere immersed in unbounded fluid which is at rest at infinity [34, 35]. For the simply-connected exterior domain, Odqvist [34, 14] proved that a solution can be written as suitable potentials of double-layer. However, when two spheres are very closely spaced and may even touch, it is a question of particular interest whether the stresses remain uniformly bounded. Actually, it was an analogous question concerning linear elasticity problem posed by Ivo Babuska [9] that initially piqued our interest in this problem area.

The main purpose of this paper is to investigate the interaction between two adjacent particles in a viscous incompressible fluid, modelled by (1.1), when the distance $\varepsilon$ tends to zero. Indeed, even though in numerical simulation the hydrodynamic interactions among particles is not easy to treat. So in the previous studies the interparticle distance is usually assumed not relatively small to avoid the singularity caused by the interaction [3, 13, 22]. However, in densely packed suspensions such singularity between multiple bodies play a significant role in liquid-solid model where the small interparticle distance occurs. Therefore, the investigation of the
Estimates for stress concentration of the Stokes flow is an essentially important issue in the analysis of complex fluids. There are also wide applications in engineering, fluid mechanics, and material sciences, see e.g. [23, 47, 49].

In material sciences, we would like to point out its connection to the field enhancement in composites in the electro-static case and in the elasto-static case. Babuška et al [9] numerically studied the initiation and growth of damage in composite materials and observed that the stress still remains bounded even if the distance $\varepsilon$ between inclusions tends to zero. Stimulated by [9], there has been significant progress in the understanding of the field enhancement or the stress concentration in the last two decades in partial differential equations theory and numerical analysis. The numerical observation in [9] was rigorously proved by Bonnetier and Vogelius [15], Li and Vogelius [43], Li and Nirenberg [42] that the gradient of the solution is uniform bounded with respect to $\varepsilon$. These bounded estimates in [15, 42, 43] of course depend on the ellipticity of the coefficients. In order to investigate the enhancement caused by the smallness of the interparticules, the coefficients occupying in the inclusions are mathematically assumed to degenerate to infinity, then the situation becomes quite different. In the context of the Lamé system, the blow-up rate of the stress in between two stiff inclusions is $\varepsilon^{-1/2}$ in dimension two [10, 30], $(\varepsilon |\ln \varepsilon|)^{-1}$ in dimension three [11, 36, 39]. Similar results have been known before for the scaler case, describing the electrical field enhancement by the perfect conductivity problem in the electro-static case, see, for example, [6–8, 12, 14, 16, 27, 41, 42, 43, 54].

We follow the iteration approach developed in [10, 11, 38] to handle the Stokes problem (1.1). The advantage of this approach is that it does not rely on maximum principle and is therefore applicable to systems of equations. However, there are several difficulties need to overcome in applying the iteration framework to the Stokes system, although it is known that when the Lamé constant $\lambda$ goes to infinity while $\mu$ is fixed, the Lamé system approaches to a modified Stokes problem $\mu \Delta u + \nabla p = 0$ with $p = \lambda \nabla \cdot u$ bounded. First, since the flow is incompressible, that is, the divergence of the velocity vector in Stokes flow is confined to be zero, it becomes more interesting and challenging to prove whether the stress blows up or not in the case of Stokes flow and how large it is if it actually occurs. Here we should mention a very recent interesting result on this topic by Ammari et al [6] where $D_1$ and $D_2$ are assumed to be two adjacent disks in the two-dimensional steady Stokes system, they first derived an asymptotic representation formula for the stress and completely captured the singular behavior of the stress by using the bipolar coordinates and showed the blow-up rate is $\varepsilon^{-1/2}$ in dimension two, the same as the linear elasticity case. However, as far as we know it is difficult to extend to study the 3D problem, even for the inclusions of general shape in 2D. These problems are all still open so far.

In this paper, we mainly consider the problem in dimensions three and two. By taking advantage of $\epsilon(u) = 0$ in $D_1$ and $D_2$ and the continuity of the transmission condition, we first decompose the problem at the cost of introducing twelve free constants and thirteen Dirichlet boundary problems. For these Dirichlet boundary problems, we focus only on the neck region between two particles and construct a family of auxiliary functions with divergence free by making use of the Keller-type function to fit the boundary conditions, although its divergence obviously does not vanish. To the authors knowledge there are no papers that manage to tackle
this difficulty caused by the divergence free condition. This is the first novelty and difference. Besides, the appearance of the pressure term $p$ turns out to be another essential difficulty. In order to apply an adapted version of energy iteration approach, it is probably the hardest issue to prove the boundedness of the global energy and to obtain appropriate estimates of the local energy for their differences of the solutions and auxiliary functions. Hence, the selection of auxiliary functions for $p$ is also a portion of our constructions. We overcome this difficulty by choosing certain $p$ to make the right hand side of the equations as small as possible. This is quite different, and much more complicated than the standard outcome in the case of Lamé system. More detailed description is presented in Section 2 below. We would like to point out that our method works well for the inclusions with arbitrary shape and in all dimensions. However, for the sake of clarity, this paper focuses only on dimensions $d = 2, 3$, two physically relevant dimensions.

Before we state our main results precisely, we fix our domain and notation. Let $D^0_1$ and $D^0_2$ be a pair of (touching at the origin) convex subdomains of $D$, far away from $\partial D$, and satisfy

$$D^0_1 \subset \{(x',x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_d > 0\}, \quad D^0_2 \subset \{(x',x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_d < 0\},$$

(1.3)

with $\{x_d = 0\}$ being their common tangent plane, after a rotation of coordinates if necessary. This means that the axes $x_1, \ldots, x_{d-1}$ are in the tangent plane. Here and throughout this paper, we use superscripts prime to denote the $(d-1)$-dimensional variables and domains, such as $x'$ and $B'$. Translate $D^0_i (i = 1, 2)$ by $\pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ along $x_d$-axis in the following way

$$D^\varepsilon_i := D^0_i + (0', \frac{\varepsilon}{2}), \quad \text{and} \quad D^\varepsilon := D^0_1 + (0', \frac{\varepsilon}{2}) \cup D^0_2 + (0', -\frac{\varepsilon}{2}).$$

So the distance between $D_1$ and $D_2$ is $\varepsilon$. For simplicity of notation, we drop the superscript $\varepsilon$ and denote

$$D_i := D^\varepsilon_i (i = 1, 2), \quad \Omega := D \setminus \overline{D_1 \cup D_2}.$$

Denote by $P_1 := (0', \frac{\varepsilon}{2}), \; P_2 := (0', -\frac{\varepsilon}{2})$ the two nearest points between $\partial D_1$ and $\partial D_2$ such that $\varepsilon = \text{dist}(P_1, P_2) = \text{dist}(\partial D_1, \partial D_2)$.

For the regularity of $u$, we would like to point out that near $\partial D$, the coefficient of (1.1) is constant, and the boundary, as well as the boundary data $\varphi$, is appropriately smooth, so standard elliptic boundary regularity results immediately imply that $u$ is $C^{1,\gamma}$ there. Indeed, since the Stokes system is elliptic in the sense of Douglis-Nirenberg, away from the origin (where the two particles may touch) standard elliptic regularity results (for operators with constant coefficients) can be obtained, as a particular case, from the work of Agmon, Douglis and Nirenberg [2] and Solonnikov [50], and immediately imply that $|\nabla u|$ is bounded. The origin (especially when $\varepsilon = 0$), however, presents a serious problem. As mentioned before, a question of particular interest is whether the stresses remain uniformly bounded, even when inclusions touch or nearly touch. Therefore, the main purpose of this paper is to investigate the dependence of $|\nabla u|$ on the distance $\varepsilon$ when $\varepsilon$ tends to zero. To this aim, we give more specific information of our domain. Since we assume that $\partial D_1$ and $\partial D_2$ are of $C^{2,\gamma}$, $0 < \gamma < 1$, then near the origin there exists a constant $R$, independent of $\varepsilon$, such that the portions of $\partial D_1$ and $\partial D_2$ are represented, respectively, by graphs

$$x_d = \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + h_1(x') \quad \text{and} \quad x_d = -\frac{\varepsilon}{2} - h_2(x'), \quad \text{for} \; |x'| \leq 2R,$$

(1.4)
where \( h_1, h_2 \in C^{2,\gamma}(B_{2R}(0')) \) and satisfy

\[
-\frac{\varepsilon}{2} - h_2(x') < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + h_1(x'), \quad \text{for } |x'| \leq 2R, \tag{1.5}
\]
\[
h_1(0') = h_2(0') = 0, \quad \nabla_x h_1(0') = \nabla_x h_2(0') = 0, \tag{1.6}
\]
\[
h_1(x') = h_2(x') = \frac{\kappa_2}{2} |x'|^2 + O(|x'|^{2+\gamma}), \quad \text{for } |x'| < 2R, \tag{1.7}
\]

where the constant \( \kappa_2 > 0 \). For \( 0 \leq r < 2R \), let us define the neck region between \( D_1 \) and \( D_2 \) by

\[
\Omega_r := \left\{ (x', x_d) \in \Omega : -\frac{\varepsilon}{2} - h_2(x') < x_d < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + h_1(x'), |x'| < r \right\}.
\]

Throughout this paper, we say a constant is universal if it depends only on \( d, \mu, \kappa_0, \kappa_1, \kappa_2 \), and the upper bounds of the \( C^{2,\gamma} \) norm of \( \partial D, \partial D_1 \) and \( \partial D_2 \), but independent of \( \varepsilon \).

### 1.2. Main Result in 3D: Upper Bounds of \(|\nabla u|\) and \(|p|\)

Let \((u,p)\) be a pair of solution to (1.10). We introduce the Cauchy stress tensor

\[
\sigma[u,p] = 2\mu e(u) - p\mathbb{I},
\]

where \( \mathbb{I} \) is the identity matrix. Then we reformulate (1.1) as

\[
\begin{cases}
\nabla \cdot \sigma[u,p] = 0, \quad \nabla \cdot u = 0, & \text{in } \Omega, \\
u|_+ = u|_-, & \text{on } \partial D_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \\
e(u) = 0, & \text{in } D_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \\
\int_{\partial D_i} \sigma[u,p] \cdot \nu_\alpha = 0, & \quad i = 1, 2, \alpha = 1, \ldots, \frac{d(d+1)}{2}, \\
\end{cases}
\tag{1.8}
\]

Even though there are some technical connections between this paper and previous work on the Lamé system, most of the material here is essentially new. Our main result in dimension three is as follows:

**Theorem 1.1. (Upper Bound)** Assume that \( D_1, D_2, D, \Omega \) and \( \varepsilon \) are defined as above, and \( \varphi \in C^{1,\alpha}(\partial D; \mathbb{R}^3) \) for some \( 0 < \alpha < 1 \). Let \( u \in H^1(D; \mathbb{R}^3) \cap C^{1}(\bar{\Omega}; \mathbb{R}^3) \) and \( p \in L^2(D) \cap C^0(\bar{\Omega}; \mathbb{R}) \) be the solution to (1.8) and (1.2). Then for sufficiently small \( 0 < \varepsilon < 1/2 \), we have

\[
|\nabla u(x)| \leq C(1 + |\ln \varepsilon| |x'|) \frac{1}{|\ln \varepsilon| |x'|^2} \|\varphi\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\partial D; \mathbb{R}^3)}, \quad x \in \Omega_R, \tag{1.9}
\]

\[
\inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \|p + c\|_{C^0(\Omega_R)} \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{3/2} \ln \varepsilon} \|\varphi\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\partial D; \mathbb{R}^3)}, \tag{1.10}
\]

and

\[
\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \setminus \Omega_R)} + \|p\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \setminus \Omega_R)} \leq C\|\varphi\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\partial D; \mathbb{R}^3)},
\]

where \( C \) is a universal constant, independently of \( \varepsilon \).

In particular,

\[
\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{3/2} \ln \varepsilon} \|\varphi\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\partial D; \mathbb{R}^3)}.
\]

Our strategy to establish the gradient estimates for the solution of Stokes system (1.8) in spirit follows [11]. However, the proof is more technical and involved. It is unfortunately rather long, because it requires to overcome new difficulties caused in the constructions of auxiliary functions and during adopting the iteration approach.
We carry it out through two stages: (i) Section 2 for the framework, and (ii) Section 3 for detailed procedure.

Remark 1.2. If \( \varphi = 0 \), then the solution to \( (1.1) \) is \( u \equiv 0 \). Theorem 1.1 is trivial in this case. So we only need to prove them for \( \| \varphi \|_{C^{1,0}(\partial D; \mathbb{R}^3)} = 1 \), by considering \( u/\| \varphi \|_{C^{1,0}(\partial D; \mathbb{R}^3)} \).

Remark 1.3. We would like to point out that our method can be directly applied to deal with the \( m \)-convex inclusions case, say, \( h_1 = h_2(x') = \kappa_m |x'|^{2m} + O(|x'|^{2m+1}) \), \( m \geq 1 \), and establish a relationship between the blow-up rates of gradient and the order of the relative convexity of inclusions, similarly as the Lamé system case in [20]. The details are left to the interested readers.

1.3. Main Result in 2D: Upper Bounds of \( |\nabla u| \) and \( |p| \). Our approach works equally well for the problem in two dimensions. Theorem 1.4 below extends the analogous result in [6] for the circular inclusion case to more general inclusions with arbitrary shape. The methodology used in the present paper is completely different from those employed in [6]. Compared with [6], here we set up our problem in an open bounded domain and establish the point-wise upper bound estimates and the corresponding lower bound. We present the main differences from the 3D case in Section 4 of [6]. The desired estimate then follows directly, since the proof is similar.

Theorem 1.4. (Upper Bound) Assume that \( D_1, D_2, D, \Omega, \) and \( \varepsilon \) are defined as in Subsection 1.1 for \( d = 2 \), and \( \varphi \in C^{1,0}(\partial D; \mathbb{R}^2) \) for some \( 0 < \alpha < 1 \). Let \( u \in H^1(D; \mathbb{R}^2) \cap C^1(\bar{\Omega}; \mathbb{R}^2) \) and \( p \in L^2(D) \cap C^0(\bar{\Omega}) \) be the solution to \( (1.3) \) and \( (1.2) \). Then for sufficiently small \( 0 < \varepsilon < 1 \), we have

\[
|\nabla u(x)| \leq C \frac{\sqrt{\varepsilon} + |x_1|}{\varepsilon + |x_1|^2} \| \varphi \|_{C^{1,0}(\partial D; \mathbb{R}^2)}, \quad x \in \Omega \cap D_1. 
\]

\[
\inf_{\varepsilon > 0} \frac{p + c}{c} \leq C \| \varphi \|_{C^{1,0}(\partial D; \mathbb{R}^2)},
\]

and

\[
\| \nabla u \|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap D_1)} + \| p \|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap D_1)} \leq C \| \varphi \|_{C^{1,0}(\partial D; \mathbb{R}^2)},
\]

where \( C \) is a universal constant, independently of \( \varepsilon \). In particular,

\[
\| \nabla u \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C \frac{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}{\varepsilon} \| \varphi \|_{C^{1,0}(\partial D; \mathbb{R}^2)}, \quad \text{in } \Omega.
\]

1.4. Lower Bounds of \( |\nabla u| \) in 2D and 3D. To show that the above blow-up rates are optimal, we shall provide a lower bound of \( |\nabla u(x)| \) on the segment \( P_1, P_2 \), with the same blow-up rate above, under some additional symmetric assumptions on the domain and the given boundary data, for simplicity. Suppose that

\( (S_1) \) : \( D_1 \cup D_2 \) and \( D \) are symmetric with respect to each coordinate axis \( x_i \), and the coordinate plane \( \{ x_d = 0 \} \); and

\( (S_2) \) : \( \varphi^i(x) = -\varphi^i(-x), \quad i = 1, \ldots, d. \)

Let \( \varepsilon = 0 \), and recall (1.3),

\[
D_1^0 := \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid x + P_1 \in D_1 \}, \quad D_2^0 := \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid x - P_2 \in D_2 \},
\]
and set $\Omega^0 := D \setminus \overline{D_1^0 \cup D_2^0}$. Let us define a linear and continuous functional of $\varphi$:

$$b_j^{\alpha}[\varphi] := \int_{\partial D_j^0} \nu \cdot \sigma[u^*, p^*] \nu, \quad \alpha = 1, \ldots, d(d + 1)/2,$$  \hspace{1cm} (1.11)

where $(u^*, p^*)$ verify

$$\begin{align*}
\nabla \cdot \sigma[u^*, p^*] &= 0, \quad \nabla \cdot u^* = 0, & \text{in } \Omega^0, \\
u = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{d(d+1)/2} C_{\alpha} \varphi, & \text{on } \partial D_1^0 \cup \partial D_2^0, \\
\int_{\partial D_j^0} \varphi \cdot \sigma[u^*, p^*] \nu + \int_{\partial D_j^0} \varphi \cdot \sigma[u^*, p^*] \nu = 0, & \alpha = 1, \ldots, d(d + 1)/2, \\
u^* &= \varphi, & \text{on } \partial D,
\end{align*}$$

(1.12)

where the constants $C_{\alpha}, \alpha = 1, \ldots, d(d + 1)/2$, are uniquely determined by the solution $(u^*, p^*)$. We obtain a lower bound of $|\nabla u|$ on the segment $P_1P_2$.

**Theorem 1.5. (Lower Bound)** Assume that $D_1, D_2, D, \Omega$, and $\varepsilon$ are defined as above, and $\varphi \in C^{1,\alpha}(\partial D; \mathbb{R}^d)$ for some $0 < \alpha < 1$. Let $u \in H^1(D; \mathbb{R}^d) \cap C^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $p \in L^2(D) \cap C^0(\Omega)$ be a solution to (1.8) and (1.2). Then if $b_1^{\alpha_0}[\varphi] \neq 0$ for some $\alpha_0 < d$, then there exists a sufficiently small $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, such that for $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$,

$$|\nabla u(0, x_2)| \geq \frac{|b_1^{\alpha_0}[\varphi]|}{C \sqrt{\varepsilon}} \|\varphi\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\partial D; \mathbb{R}^2)}, \quad |x_2| \leq \varepsilon, \quad \text{for } d = 2;$$

and

$$|\nabla u(0', x_3)| \geq \frac{|b_1^{\alpha_0}[\varphi]|}{C \varepsilon \ln \varepsilon} \|\varphi\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\partial D; \mathbb{R}^3)}, \quad |x_3| \leq \varepsilon, \quad \text{for } d = 3.$$

**Remark 1.6.** For example, suppose that $D_1 = B_1(0', 1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2})$, $D_2 = B_1(0', -1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2})$ are two adjacent balls, contained in a bigger ball $D = B_1(0)$. Obviously, they satisfy the symmetry condition (S_I). If we take $\varphi = (0', x_3)^T$, clearly satisfying (S_\varphi), then through numerical simulation it is not difficult to check that $|b_1^{\alpha}[\varphi]| \neq 0$. To further consider the effect from boundary data, we study the boundary estimates when particles are close to boundary in our forthcoming paper [40], where new difficulties need to overcome because $h_1(x') \neq h_2(x')$ there.

Finally, as a corollary of Theorem 1.5, 1.4, 1.5 under the symmetric assumptions on the domain and boundary data, we have the following estimates for the Cauchy stress tensor $\sigma[u, p]$.

**Corollary 1.7. (Stress estimates)** Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.5, let $u \in H^1(D; \mathbb{R}^d) \cap C^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $p \in L^2(D) \cap C^0(\Omega)$ be a solution to (1.8) and (1.2). Then, up to a constant,

$$\|\sigma[u, p]\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_R)} \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon}, \|\varphi\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\partial D; \mathbb{R}^d)}, \quad \text{for } d = 2;$$

(1.13)

and

$$\|\sigma[u, p]\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_R)} \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon \ln \varepsilon}, \|\varphi\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\partial D; \mathbb{R}^d)}, \quad \text{for } d = 3.$$

(1.14)

Moreover, at segment $P_1P_2$, if $b_1^{\alpha}[\varphi] \neq 0$ in dimension two, then

$$|\sigma[u, p]|(0, x_2) \geq \frac{1}{C \sqrt{\varepsilon}}, \quad |x_2| \leq \varepsilon, \quad \text{for } d = 2;$$
and if \( \tilde{b}_{13}^{3}[\phi] \neq 0 \) in dimension three, then
\[
|\sigma[u, p]|(0', x_3) \geq \frac{1}{C\varepsilon}, \quad |x_3| \leq \varepsilon, \quad \text{for } d = 3.
\]

**Remark 1.8.** Here we show that the blow up rates of \(|\sigma[u, p]|, \varepsilon^{-1/2}\) in dimension two, and \(\varepsilon^{-1}\) in dimension three, are optimal.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: In Section 2 we present our main idea to establish the gradient estimates for the solution of Stokes system (1.8). We explain the main difficulties needed to overcome in the course of adapting the iteration approach and list the ingredients to prove Theorem 1.1. A sketched proof is given in the end of Section 2. To prepare for proving the estimates listed in Section 2 some basic results for the Stokes equations are contained in Section 3. We recall the \(W^{m, p}\) estimates for the Stokes equations with partial zero boundary condition that allow us to combine with the bootstrap argument and scaling argument to establish a general \(W^{1,\infty}\) estimate in the narrow region. Meanwhile, we give a Caccioppoli-type inequality here, which is a starting point to build our iteration formula. In Section 4 for each auxiliary function \(v_i^\alpha\), we calculate the concrete estimates required for the iteration process, then prove the estimates for \(u_i^\alpha\) listed in Section 2. More precisely, for \(\alpha = 1, 2, 4\), we use Lemma 3.7 to prove that the global energy of \(w_i^\alpha\) is bounded, then make use of the iteration technique and \(W^{1,\infty}\) estimate to prove Proposition 2.1. However, for \(\alpha = 3, 5, 6\), although the constructed \(v_i^\alpha\) are divergence free, they do not satisfy the assumptions of Lemma 3.7. By observations, we rewrite the terms \(\mu\Delta v_i^\alpha - \nabla p_i^\alpha\) as polynomials of \(x_3\) and then using the integration by parts with respect to \(x_3\) to prove the analogous conclusion as Lemma 3.7. Section 5 is devoted to proving Theorem 1.4 for 2D case. Following the method outlined in Section 2 the construction of the auxiliary functions and the main ingredients of the proof are presented there. Finally, we prove Theorem 1.5 for the lower bounds of \(|\nabla u|\) in 2D and 3D, and show Corollary 1.7 in Section 6.

2. Main Ideas of the Proof and Main Ingredients in 3D

2.1. Decomposition of the Solution. Recall that a basis of \(\Psi\) in dimension three is
\[
\psi_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \psi_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \psi_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \psi_4 = \begin{pmatrix} x_2 \\ -x_1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \psi_5 = \begin{pmatrix} x_3 \\ 0 \\ -x_1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \psi_6 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ x_3 \\ -x_2 \end{pmatrix}.
\]
First, it is important to note that problem (1.8) has free boundary value feature. Although the third line in (1.8), \(\epsilon(u) = 0\) in \(D_i\), implies \(u\) is linear combination of \(\psi_\alpha\),
\[
u = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{6} C_i^\alpha \psi_\alpha, \quad \text{in } D_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \tag{2.1}
\]
these twelve \(C_i^\alpha\) are free constants, to be dealt with. By continuity of the transmission condition on \(\partial D_i\), we decompose the solution of (1.8) in \(\Omega\) as follows:
\[
u(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{2} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{6} C_i^\alpha u_i^\alpha(x) + u_0(x), \quad \text{and } p(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{2} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{6} C_i^\alpha p_i^\alpha(x) + p_0(x), \tag{2.2}
\]
where \( \mathbf{u}^0, \mathbf{u}_0 \in C^{2,\gamma}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \), \( p_i^0, p_0 \in C^{1,\gamma}(\Omega) \), respectively, satisfy

\[
\begin{aligned}
\nabla \cdot \sigma(\mathbf{u}^0_i, p_i^0) &= 0, \quad \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}^0_i = 0, & \text{in } \Omega, \\
\mathbf{u}^0_i &= \psi_i, & \text{on } \partial D_i, \\
\mathbf{u}^0_i &= 0, & \text{on } \partial D_j \cup \partial D, \ j \neq i,
\end{aligned}
\]

and

\[
\begin{aligned}
\nabla \cdot \sigma(\mathbf{u}_0, p_0) &= 0, \quad \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}_0 = 0, & \text{in } \Omega, \\
\mathbf{u}_0 &= 0, & \text{on } \partial D_1 \cup \partial D_2, \\
\mathbf{u}_0 &= \varphi, & \text{on } \partial D.
\end{aligned}
\]

Therefore, the major difficulty in analyzing the stress concentration of this problem consists in establishing the gradient estimates of theses \( \mathbf{u}^0_i \) and determining these free constants \( C_i^\alpha \).

The philosophy of the above decomposition is as follows: Although these \( C_i^\alpha \) are free constants, determined to be later, each \( \mathbf{u}^0_i \) is the unique solution to a Dirichlet boundary problem. After the study of \( \mathbf{u}^0_i \), we in turn use the properties of \( \mathbf{u}^0_i \) to solve \( C_i^\alpha \). However, the appearance of small distance \( \varepsilon \) results in previous theories not providing the bounds that we desire. Intuitively, for these \( \mathbf{u}^0_i \), because the boundary data on \( \partial D_1 \) is different with that on \( \partial D_2 \), \( |\nabla \mathbf{u}| \) will be singular when \( \varepsilon \) tends to zero. It turns out to be true. In fact, we want to know the asymptotic behavior of each \( |\nabla \mathbf{u}| \) near the origin. To this aim, we will construct a family of auxiliary functions \( \mathbf{v}_i^0 \) with the same boundary condition as \( \mathbf{u}^0_i \). These constructions of the auxiliary functions will play a vital role in the establishment of gradient estimates of the solution to Stokes system. Here we need them to satisfy divergence free condition, at least in \( \Omega_R \). This is one of the main differences with the linear elasticity case [11], which also causes new difficulties. To identify these auxiliary functions capturing the main singular terms of \( |\nabla \mathbf{u}^0_i| \) and \( p_i^0 \), let us study a general boundary value problem below, which the differences \( (\mathbf{u}^0_i - \mathbf{v}^0_i, p_i^0 - p_0^0) \) verify. As mentioned before, since the Stokes system is elliptic in the sense of Douglis-Nirenberg, the regularity and estimates can be obtained from [2][5][9] provided the global energy is bounded. So that in the sequel we only focus on the establishment of the estimates in the narrow region \( \Omega_R \), except the boundedness of the global energy in \( \Omega \), which is fundamental important.

Compared with Lamé system case, there are several differences on the constructions. We explicate them one by one in the following process of constructions.

### 2.2. Construction of Auxiliary Functions and Main Estimates

In what follows, let us denote

\[
\delta(x') := \varepsilon + h_1(x') + h_2(x'), \quad \text{for } |x'| \leq 2R.
\]

In order to express our idea clearly and avoid unnecessary difficulties from computation, we assume for simplicity that \( h_1 \) and \( h_2 \) are quadratic and symmetric with respect to the plane \( \{x_3 = 0\} \), say, \( h_1(x') = h_2(x') = \frac{1}{2} |x'|^2 \) for \( |x'| \leq 2R \), (see discussions after the proof of Proposition 2.1 in Subsection 1.1). We introduce the Keller-type function \( k(x) \in C^{2,\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^3) \), satisfying \( k(x) = \frac{1}{2} \) on \( \partial D_1 \), \( k(x) = -\frac{1}{2} \) on \( \partial D_2 \), \( k(x) = 0 \) on \( \partial D \), especially,

\[
k(x) = \frac{x_3}{\delta(x')}, \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}.
\]
and

\[ \|k(x)\|_{C^{2,\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Omega_R)} \leq C. \]

Clearly,

\[ \partial_x j k(x) = -\frac{2x_j}{\delta(x')} k(x), \quad j = 1, 2, \quad \partial_{x_3} k(x) = \frac{1}{\delta(x')}, \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}. \]

We begin by estimating \( \nabla u^\alpha_1 \), \( \alpha = 1, 2 \). We use the Keller-type function (2.6) to construct an auxiliary function \( v^\alpha_1 \in C^{2,\gamma}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \), such that \( v^\alpha_1 = u^\alpha_1 = \psi_\alpha \) on \( \partial D_1 \) and \( v^\alpha_1 = u^\alpha_1 = 0 \) on \( \partial D_2 \cup \partial D \), and specifically,

\[ v^\alpha_1 = \psi_\alpha \left( k(x) + \frac{1}{2} \right) + \psi_3 x_\alpha \left( k^2(x) - \frac{1}{4} \right), \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}, \tag{2.7} \]

and

\[ \|v^\alpha_1\|_{C^{2,\gamma}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C. \quad \tag{2.8} \]

Clearly, by a direct calculation, it is easy to check that such \( v^\alpha_1 \) satisfy

\[ \nabla \cdot v^\alpha_1 = 0, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}. \quad \tag{2.9} \]

This is one of the key points of our constructions. Compared with [11], here we use the additional terms \( \psi_3 x_\alpha (k^2(x) - \frac{1}{2}) \) to modify \( \psi_\alpha (k(x) + \frac{1}{2}) \) so that the modified functions \( v^\alpha_1 \) become divergence free. This turns out to be a new difficulty here and in the subsequent constructions. However, this is only the first step. By a calculation, the first derivatives of \( v^\alpha_1 \) show the singularity of order \( \frac{1}{\delta(x')} \), that is,

\[ \frac{1}{C\delta(x')} \leq |\nabla v^\alpha_1|(x) \leq \frac{C}{\delta(x')} \quad \tag{2.10} \]

In the process of employing the energy iteration approach developed in [11, 13, 38] to prove (2.10), we can capture all the singular terms of \( |\nabla u^\alpha_1| \), we have to find an appropriate \( \bar{p}^\alpha_1 \) to make \( |\mu \Delta v^\alpha_1 - \nabla \bar{p}^\alpha_1| \) as small as possible in \( \Omega_{2R} \). This is another crucial issue. Indeed, their differences

\[ w^\alpha_1 := u^\alpha_1 - v^\alpha_1, \quad \text{and} \quad q^\alpha_1 := p^\alpha_1 - \bar{p}^\alpha_1, \]

verify the following general boundary value problem

\[ \begin{cases} -\mu \Delta w + \nabla q = f := \mu \Delta v - \nabla \bar{p}, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \nabla \cdot w = 0, & \text{in } \Omega_{2R}, \\ \nabla \cdot w = -\nabla \cdot v, & \text{in } \Omega \setminus \Omega_R, \\ w = 0, & \text{on } \partial \Omega. \end{cases} \quad \tag{2.11} \]

By an observation, we choose \( \bar{p}^\alpha_1 \in C^{1,\gamma}(\Omega) \) such that

\[ \bar{p}^\alpha_1 = \frac{2\mu x_\alpha}{\delta(x')} k(x), \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}, \]

and \( \|\bar{p}^\alpha_1\|_{C^{1,\gamma}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C. \) It turns out that \( |\mu \Delta v^\alpha_1 - \nabla \bar{p}^\alpha_1| \) is exactly smaller than \( |\mu \Delta v^\alpha_1| \) itself. This choice of \( \bar{p}^\alpha_1 \) enables us to adapt the iteration approach in [11] to work for the Stokes flow, and to prove that such \( \nabla v^\alpha_1 \) and \( \bar{p}^\alpha_1 \) are the main singular terms of \( \nabla u^\alpha_1 \) and \( p^\alpha_1 \). This is an essential difference with that in [11]. We would like to remark that here the choice of \( \bar{p}^\alpha_1 \) were inspired by the recent paper [6], where the authors also established the estimates of \( p \) in dimension two for circular inclusions \( D_1 \) and \( D_2 \).
It is easy to calculate that
\[|\tilde{p}_i^a| \leq C|x'| \frac{1}{\delta(x')}, \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_{x_3}(v_1^a) = \frac{1}{\delta(x')}, \quad \text{in} \ \Omega_{2R},\]
while, the other terms of the first order derivatives of \(v_1^a\) can be controlled by \(C(1 + \frac{|x'|}{\delta(x')}\). By appropriate energy estimates of \(f\) and \(w\), such as Lemma 4.3 and Lemma 4.3, the former for the boundedness of the global energy of \(w\) and the latter for the estimates of its local energy in \(\Omega_{\delta}\) obtained by using the iteration technique, we can prove that the differences \(|\nabla(u_i^a - v_i^a)|\), \(i = 1, 2\), are of order \(O(1)\), see Proposition 2.1 below.

Similarly, for \(i = 2\), we only need to replace \(k(x) = \frac{s x}{\delta(x')}\) by \(\tilde{k}(x) = \frac{-s x}{\delta(x')}\) in \(\Omega_{2R}\), which satisfies \(\tilde{k}(x) + \frac{3}{2} = 1\) on \(\partial D_2\) and \(\tilde{k}(x) + \frac{1}{2} = 0\) on \(\partial D_1\), then use \(k\) to construct the corresponding \(\nu_2^a\) and \(\tilde{p}_2^a\). So, in the sequel, the assertions hold for both \(i = 1\) and \(i = 2\), but we only prove the case for \(i = 1\), and omit the case for \(i = 2\).

Let us denote
\[\Omega_3(x') := \left\{(y', y_d) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} - h_2(y') < y_d < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + h_1(y'), |y' - x'| < \delta \right\},\]
for \(|x'| \leq R\), where \(\delta := \delta(x')\) is defined by (2.5), and
\[(q_i^a)_{\delta; x'} = \frac{1}{|\Omega_3(x')|} \int_{\Omega_3(x')} q_i^a(y)dy.\]

The following estimates hold:

**Proposition 2.1.** Let \(u_i^a \in C^{2, \gamma}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)\), \(p_i^a \in C^{1, \gamma}(\Omega)\) be the solution to (2.3), \(\alpha = 1, 2\). Then there holds
\[\|\nabla(u_i^a - v_i^a)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{4/2}(x'))} + \|q_i^a - (q_i^a)_{\delta; x'}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{4/2}(x'))} \leq C, \ x \in \Omega_R.\]

Consequently, in view of (2.4),
\[\frac{1}{C\delta(x')} \leq |\nabla u_i^a(x)| \leq \frac{C}{\delta(x')}, \ \alpha = 1, 2, \ x \in \Omega_R;\]
and
\[\|p_i^a - (q_i^a)_{\delta; x'}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{4/2}(x'))} \leq C \left(\frac{|x'|}{\delta(x')} + 1\right), \ \alpha = 1, 2, \ x \in \Omega_R.\]

**Remark 2.2.** Indeed, compared with the analogues established in [10,11], to prove Proposition 2.1 there are three new difficulties to overcome: (i) To construct \(\nu_i^a\) satisfying the divergence free condition; (ii) To choose \(\tilde{p}_i^a\) such that \(|\mu \Delta v_i^a - \nabla \tilde{p}_i^a|\) to be as small as possible; (iii) To prove the global energy of \(w_i^a\) is bounded. We emphasize that the boundedness of the global energy is a vital important step to our method. The proofs of the above three aspects are more involved and new techniques are needed, but especially for the cases that \(\alpha = 3, 5, 6\) in the sequel.

For \(\alpha = 3\), we seek \(v_1^3 \in C^{2, \gamma}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)\) satisfying, in \(\Omega_{2R},\)
\[v_1^3 = \psi_3 \left(k(x) + \frac{1}{2}\right) + \frac{3}{\delta(x')} \left(\sum_{\alpha=1}^2 x_\alpha \psi_\alpha + 2x_3 \psi_3 \left(\frac{|x'|^2}{\delta(x')} - \frac{1}{3}\right) \right) \left(k^2(x) - \frac{1}{4}\right),\]
(2.13)
and $\|v_1^3\|_{C^{2,\gamma}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C$. This construction looks a little more complicated than that for $v_1^3$ in (2.7). It is trivial to check that $\nabla \cdot v_1^3 = 0$ in $\Omega_{2R}$, and

$$|\nabla v_1^3| \leq C \left( \frac{1}{\delta(x')} + \frac{|x'|}{\delta^2(x')} \right), \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R},$$

and

$$|\nabla v_1^3(0', x_3)| \geq \frac{1}{C \delta(x')}, \quad \text{if } |x_3| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \quad (2.15)$$

However, by observing the listed first derivatives of $v_1^3$ in Subsection 4.2, there is a very large (or “bad”) term in fact is from

$$|\partial_{x_3}(v_1^3)(\alpha)| = \frac{6x_3 x_3}{\delta^3(x')} \leq \frac{C|x_3|}{\delta^2(x')}, \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}.$$ 

For this reason, we choose a $\bar{p}_1^3 \in C^{1,\gamma}(\Omega)$ such that

$$\bar{p}_1^3 = -\frac{3}{2} \frac{\mu}{\delta^2(x')} + \frac{18 \mu}{\delta(x')} \left( \frac{|x'|^2}{\delta(x')} - \frac{1}{3} \right) k^2(x), \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R},$$

and $\|\bar{p}_1^3\|_{C^{1,\gamma}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C$, to make $|\mu \Delta v_1^3 - \nabla \bar{p}_1^3|$ be as small as possible, and prove Proposition 2.3 below. It turns out that the estimate for $|\nabla u_1^3|$ is the hardest term to control among all estimates of $|\nabla u_i^3|$, because the term $\frac{|x'|}{\delta^2(x')}$ is of order $\varepsilon^{-3/2}$, which is obviously larger than other cases of $\alpha$.

**Proposition 2.3.** Let $u_i^3 \in C^{2,\gamma}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^3)$, $p_i^3 \in C^{1,\gamma}(\Omega)$ be the solution to (2.8), then we have

$$\|\nabla (u_i^3 - v_i^3)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{3/2}(x'))} + \|q_i^3 - (q_i^3)_{\delta; x'}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{3/2}(x'))} \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{\delta(x')}} \quad x \in \Omega_{R}.$$ 

Consequently, from (2.14) and (2.15),

$$\frac{1}{C \delta(x')} \leq |\nabla u_i^3(x)| \leq C \left( \frac{1}{\delta(x')} + \frac{|x'|}{\delta^2(x')} \right), \quad x \in \Omega_{R};$$

and

$$\|p_i^3 - (q_i^3)_{\delta; x'}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{3/2}(x'))} \leq \frac{C}{\delta^2(x')}, \quad x \in \Omega_{R}. $$

Following the above idea, we can establish the estimates of $u_i^3$, $\alpha = 4, 5, 6$. Here we would like to remark that the construction of $v_1^3$ is easy, while for the cases $\alpha = 5, 6$, it is even more complicated than that of $v_1^3$, due to the appearance of $x_3$ in $\psi_5$ and $\psi_6$. For example, we here present $v_1^5 \in C^{2,\gamma}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^3)$, such that, in $\Omega_{2R},$

$$v_1^5 = \psi_5 \left( k(x) + \frac{1}{2} \right) + \frac{3}{5} \left( \begin{array}{c} 1 - \frac{4x_3^2}{\delta(x')} \frac{25}{3} x_3 k(x) \\ -4x_3 \frac{x_3}{\delta(x')} \end{array} \right) \left( \frac{1}{4} \right),$$

and $\|v_1^5\|_{C^{2,\gamma}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C$. We choose $\bar{p}_1^5 \in C^{1,\gamma}(\Omega)$ such that

$$\bar{p}_1^5 = \frac{6 \mu}{5} \frac{x_1}{\delta^2(x')} + \frac{72 \mu}{5} \frac{x_1^3}{\delta(x')} \left( \frac{2}{3} - \frac{|x'|^2}{\delta(x')} \right) k^2(x), \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R},$$

and $|\nabla v_1^5(0', x_3)| \geq \frac{1}{C \delta(x')}, \quad \text{if } |x_3| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \quad (2.15)$$
and \( \|p_i\|_{C^{1,\gamma}(\Omega;\mathbb{R})} \leq C \). By a straightforward calculation, it is not difficult to check the divergence free condition. However, more new techniques are needed to prove the boundedness of the global energy of \( u_i^2 - v_i^2 \). More details can be found in Section 4. The estimates of \( |\nabla u_i^2| \), \( \alpha = 4, 5, 6 \), are obtained as follows:

**Proposition 2.4.** Let \( u_i^\alpha \in C^{2,\gamma}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^3) \), \( p_i^\alpha \in C^{1,\gamma}(\Omega) \) be the solution to (2.2), \( \alpha = 4, 5, 6 \), then we have

\[
\|\nabla (u_i^\alpha - v_i^\alpha)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C, \quad x \in \Omega_R.
\]

Consequently,

\[
|\nabla u_i^\alpha(x)| \leq C \left( \frac{|x'|}{\delta(x')} + 1 \right), \quad \text{and} \quad |\nabla u_i^\alpha(x)| \leq \frac{C}{\delta(x')}, \quad \alpha = 5, 6, \quad \text{in} \ \Omega_R,
\]

and

\[
\|p_i^4 - (q_i^4)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C, \quad \|p_i^2 - (q_i^2)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \frac{C}{\delta(x')}, \quad \alpha = 5, 6.
\]

Since \( u_0 = 0 \) on \( \partial D_1 \cup \partial D_2 \) and \( u_0^2 + u_2^2 = \psi_n \) on \( \partial D_1 \cup \partial D_2 \), the result in 3.8 for elliptic systems assures the boundedness of their gradients (indeed, theorem 1.1 there applies directly to \( u_0 \) and \( u_0^2 + u_2^2 \)). The proof is immediate and so is omitted. We list the assertion here for convenience.

**Proposition 2.5.** Let \( u_i^\alpha, u_0 \in C^{2,\gamma}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^3) \), \( p_i^\alpha, p_0 \in C^{1,\gamma}(\Omega) \) be the solution to (2.3) and (2.4), respectively. Then, up to a constant, we have

\[
\|\nabla u_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|p_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C,
\]

and

\[
\|\nabla (u_i^\alpha + u_0^\alpha)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|p_i^\alpha + p_0^\alpha\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C, \quad \alpha = 1, \ldots, d(d+1)/2.
\]

Based on the above estimates of \( \nabla u_i^\alpha \), we try to make use of them to solve the twelve free constants \( C_i^\alpha \) introduced in 2.1. From the forth line of (1.8) the decompositions (2.2), let us study the following linear system of \( C_i^\alpha \):

\[
\sum_{i=1}^2 \sum_{\alpha=1}^6 C_i^\alpha \int_{\partial D_j} \sigma[\psi_\beta \cdot \sigma[u_i^\alpha, p_i^\alpha] \nu + \int_{\partial D_j} \psi_\beta \cdot \sigma[u_0, p_0] \nu = 0, \quad \beta = 1, \ldots, 6, \quad (2.17)
\]

where \( j = 1, 2 \). The difficulty is mainly from that the coefficients are completely determined by the boundary integrations involving \( u_i^\alpha \) and \( p_i^\alpha \). First of all, the trace theorem can ensure the boundedness of \( C_i^\alpha \). However, the differences of \( |C_1^\alpha - C_2^\alpha| \) may be some infinitesimal quantities, see Proposition 2.6 below. As a matter of fact, whether they can be solved or estimated depends entirely on how good estimates of \( |\nabla u_i^\alpha| \) can be obtained above, including both the upper and the lower bound estimates. Therefore, the establishment of the estimates of \( u_i^\alpha, p_i^\alpha \), and \( C_i^\alpha \) in this paper is actually a complementary unity.

**Proposition 2.6.** Let \( C_i^\alpha \) be defined in (2.2). Then

\[
|C_i^\alpha| \leq C, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, \ldots, 6,
\]

and

\[
|C_1^\alpha - C_2^\alpha| \leq \frac{C}{|\ln \varepsilon|}, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, 5, 6, \quad |C_1^3 - C_2^3| \leq C\varepsilon, \quad \text{and} \quad |C_1^1 - C_2^1| \leq C.
\]
2.3. The Completion of the Proof of Theorem 1.1

Now, we are in a position to complete the proof of Theorem 1.1.

**Proof of Theorem 1.1.** We rewrite (2.2) as

\[ \nabla u = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{6} (C_1^\alpha - C_2^\alpha) \nabla u_1^\alpha + \nabla u_b, \quad \text{and} \quad p = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{6} (C_1^\alpha - C_2^\alpha) p_1^\alpha + p_b, \quad \text{in} \ \Omega, \]

where

\[ u_b := \sum_{\alpha=1}^{6} C_2^\alpha (u_1^\alpha + u_2^\alpha) + u_0, \quad p_b := \sum_{\alpha=1}^{6} C_2^\alpha (p_1^\alpha + p_2^\alpha) + p_0, \]

whose gradients are obviously bounded, due to Proposition 2.5 and Proposition 2.6.

By virtue of the above estimates of \(|\nabla u_1^\alpha(x)|\), established in Propositions 2.1–2.6, we obtain

\[
|\nabla u(x)| \leq \sum_{\alpha=1}^{6} |(C_1^\alpha - C_2^\alpha) \nabla u_1^\alpha(x)| + C
\]

\[
\leq \sum_{\alpha=1,2,5,6} |(C_1^\alpha - C_2^\alpha) \nabla u_1^\alpha(x)| + |(C_1^3 - C_2^3) \nabla u_1^3(x)| + C|\nabla u_1^3(x)| + C
\]

\[
\leq \frac{C}{|\ln \varepsilon| \delta(x') + C\varepsilon \left( \frac{1}{\delta(x')} + \frac{|x'|}{\delta^2(x')} \right) + C \left( \frac{|x'|}{\delta(x')} + 1 \right) + C(1 + |\ln \varepsilon||x'|) \]

\[
\leq \frac{C(1 + |\ln \varepsilon||x'|)}{|\ln \varepsilon|(|\varepsilon + |x'|^2|).} \tag{2.18}
\]

Taking into account \( q_1^\alpha = p_1^\alpha - \tilde{p}_1^\alpha \), let us denote

\[ q := \sum_{\alpha=1}^{6} (C_1^\alpha - C_2^\alpha) q_1^\alpha + q_b, \quad \text{where} \quad q_b := \sum_{\alpha=1}^{6} C_2^\alpha (q_1^\alpha + q_2^\alpha) + q_0. \]

By means of the estimates of \( p_1^\alpha(x) \) in Propositions 2.1–2.6

\[
|p(x) - (q)_{\delta,x'}| \leq \sum_{\alpha=1}^{6} |(C_1^\alpha - C_2^\alpha) (p_1^\alpha(x) - (q_1^\alpha)_{\delta,x'})| + C
\]

\[
\leq \sum_{\alpha=1,2,5,6} |(C_1^\alpha - C_2^\alpha) (p_1^\alpha(x) - (q_1^\alpha)_{\delta,x'})| + |(C_1^3 - C_2^3) (p_3^3(x) - (q_3^3)_{\delta,x'})| + C|(p_3^3(x) - (q_3^3)_{\delta,x'})| + C
\]

\[
\leq \frac{C}{|\ln \varepsilon|} \left( \frac{|x'|}{\delta(x')} + \frac{|x'|}{\delta^2(x')} \right) + \frac{C\varepsilon}{\delta^2(x')} + C
\]

\[
\leq \frac{C|x'|}{|\ln \varepsilon||\varepsilon + |x'|^2|} + \frac{C}{\varepsilon + |x'|^2}, \tag{2.19}
\]

we conclude that (1.1) holds.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is completed. \( \square \)

3. Preliminaries

In this section we recall and prove some basic results about Stokes systems. The results are concerning the energy estimates, \( W^{1,\infty} \) estimates and a Caccioppoli-type inequality, which are needed to apply the iteration technique in the subsequent Sections.
3.1. Some Basic Results. A basic result for the theoretical and numerical analysis of the Stokes systems in a bounded domain \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d \) is the existence of a continuous right inverse of the divergence as an operator from the Sobolev space \( H^1_0(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \) into the space \( L^2(\Omega) \) of functions in \( L^2(\Omega) \) with vanishing mean value. For a Lipschitz domain \( \Omega \), this result is proved by employing compactness arguments, see, for example, [51].

**Lemma 3.1.** Let \( \Omega \) be a bounded Lipschitz domain in \( \mathbb{R}^d \). Given \( f \in L^2(\Omega) \) with \( \int_\Omega f = 0 \). Then there exists a function \( \phi \in H^1_0(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \) such that

\[
\text{div} \, \phi = f \quad \text{in} \, \Omega,
\]

and

\[
\| \phi \|_{H^1_0(\Omega)} \leq C\| f \|_{L^2(\Omega)},
\]

where \( C > 0 \) is a constant depending only on \( d \) and \( \text{diam}(\Omega) \).

By virtue of Lemma 3.1, we have the following estimate for the pressure term \( q \).

**Lemma 3.2.** Let \((w, q)\) be the solution to

\[
-\mu \Delta w + \nabla q = g, \quad \text{in} \, \Omega,
\]

where \( g \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \). Then

\[
\int_\Omega |q - q_0|^2 \, dx \leq C \int_\Omega |\nabla w|^2 \, dx + C \int_\Omega |g|^2 \, dx,
\]

where \( q_0 := \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_\Omega q \, dx \), and \( C > 0 \) is a constant depending only on \( d, \mu \) and \( \text{diam}(\Omega) \).

**Proof.** By Lemma 3.1, there exists a function \( \phi \in H^1_0(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \) such that

\[
\text{div} \, \phi = q - q_0, \quad \text{in} \, \Omega,
\]

with estimate

\[
\| \phi \|_{H^1_0(\Omega)} \leq C_0 \| q - q_0 \|_{L^2(\Omega)},
\]

where the constant \( C_0 \) is fixed now. Now we use this \( \phi \) as a test function to \( 3.1 \), and apply the integration by parts,

\[
\mu \int_\Omega \nabla w \cdot \nabla \phi \, dx - \int_\Omega |q - q_0|^2 \, dx = \int_\Omega g \phi \, dx.
\]

Employing Young’s inequality and taking into account 3.1, we have

\[
\int_\Omega |q - q_0|^2 \, dx \leq \frac{1}{2C_0} \int_\Omega |\nabla \phi|^2 \, dx + C \int_\Omega |\nabla w|^2 \, dx + \frac{1}{2C_0} \int_\Omega |\phi|^2 \, dx + C \int_\Omega |g|^2 \, dx
\]

\[
\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega |q - q_0|^2 \, dx + C \int_\Omega |\nabla w|^2 \, dx + C \int_\Omega |g|^2 \, dx,
\]

which implies 3.3. The proof is completed.

An immediate consequence of Lemma 3.2 is obtained by a rescaling argument.

**Corollary 3.3.** If \( \Omega \) is a ball \( B_r \), then estimate 3.1 becomes

\[
\| \phi \|_{L^2(B_r)} + r\| \nabla \phi \|_{L^2(B_r)} \leq C r \| f \|_{L^2(B_r)},
\]

and 3.3 becomes

\[
\int_{B_r} |q - q_{B_r}|^2 \, dx \leq C \int_{B_r} |\nabla w|^2 \, dx + C r^2 \int_{B_r} |g|^2 \, dx,
\]
where $C$ is independent of $r$.

Proof. Indeed, if $(w, q)$ satisfies
\[-\mu \Delta w + \nabla q = g, \quad \text{in } B_r,
\]
then by rescaling, $(\tilde{w}, \tilde{q})$ satisfies
\[-\mu \Delta \tilde{w} + \nabla \tilde{q} = \tilde{g}, \quad \text{in } B_1,
\]
where
\[
\tilde{w}(y) = w(ry), \quad \tilde{q}(y) = rq(ry), \quad \tilde{g}(y) = r^2 g(ry).
\]
Employing (3.3) for (3.5) completes the proof. \qed

Before proceeding to our result, we must recall another well-known result for Stokes system. The following $L^p$ estimate for Stokes flow in a bounded domain, with partially vanishing boundary data, can be found in [11, Theorem IV.5.1].

**Theorem 3.4.** Let $\Omega$ be an arbitrary domain in $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 2$, with a boundary portion $\sigma$ of class $C^{m+2}$, $m \geq 0$. Let $\Omega_0$ be any bounded subdomain of $\Omega$ with $\partial \Omega_0 \cap \partial \Omega = \sigma$. Further, let
\[
\mathbf{u} \in W^{1,q}(\Omega_0), \quad p \in L^q(\Omega_0), \quad 1 < q < \infty,
\]
be such that
\[
(\nabla \mathbf{u}, \nabla \psi) = -\langle \mathbf{f}, \psi \rangle + (p, \nabla \cdot \psi), \quad \text{for all } \psi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega_0),
\]
\[
(\mathbf{u}, \nabla \varphi) = 0, \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega_0),
\]
\[
\mathbf{u} = 0, \quad \text{at } \sigma.
\]
Then, if $\mathbf{f} \in W^{m,q}(\Omega_0)$, we have
\[
\mathbf{u} \in W^{m+2,q}(\Omega'), \quad p \in W^{m+1,q}(\Omega'),
\]
for any $\Omega'$ satisfying
\(1\) $\Omega' \subset \Omega$,
\(2\) $\partial \Omega' \cap \partial \Omega$ is a strictly interior subregion of $\sigma$.

Finally, the following estimate holds
\[
\|\mathbf{u}\|_{W^{m+2,q}(\Omega')} + \|p\|_{W^{m+1,q}(\Omega')} \leq C \left(\|\mathbf{f}\|_{W^{m,q}(\Omega_0)} + \|\mathbf{u}\|_{W^{1,q}(\Omega_0)} + \|p\|_{L^q(\Omega_0)}\right),
\]
where $C = C(d, m, q, \Omega', \Omega_0)$.

In our setting, we consider the domain
\[
Q_r = \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid -\frac{\varepsilon}{28} - \frac{1}{\delta} h_2(\delta y' + z') < y_d < \frac{\varepsilon}{28} + \frac{1}{\delta} h_1(\delta y' + z'), \ |y'| < r \right\},
\]
where $\delta = \delta(z') = \varepsilon + |z'|^2$ and $h_1(x') = h_2(x') = \frac{1}{2}|x'|^2$. Then $Q_1$ has a nearly unit size. Denote its top and bottom boundaries by $\hat{\Gamma}_1^+$ and $\hat{\Gamma}_1^-$. Applying a bootstrap argument yields the following Proposition from Theorem 3.4.

**Proposition 3.5.** Let $q \in (1, \infty)$ and let $\mathcal{W} \in W^{1,q}(Q_1)$ and $\mathcal{G} \in L^q(Q_1)$ be a weak solution of
\[
\begin{cases}
-\nabla \cdot \sigma [\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{G}] = \mathcal{F}, & \text{in } Q_1 \\
\nabla \cdot \mathcal{W} = 0, & \text{in } Q_1, \\
\mathcal{W} = 0, & \text{on } \sigma := \hat{\Gamma}_1^+ \cup \hat{\Gamma}_1^-.
\end{cases}
\]
Then if $F \in L^{\infty}(Q_1)$, we have
\[
\|\nabla W\|_{L^{\infty}(Q_{1/2})} + \|G - G_1\|_{L^{\infty}(Q_{1/2})} \leq C(\|F\|_{L^{\infty}(Q_1)} + \|\nabla W\|_{L^2(Q_1)}),
\]
where $G_1 = \frac{1}{|Q_1|} \int_{Q_1} G$.

**Proof.** We apply Theorem 3.4 to (3.7), starting with $m = 0$ (since $\partial D_i$ is of class $C^{2,\gamma}$) and $q = 2$, then the following holds:
\[
\|W\|_{W^{2,2}(Q_{2/3})} + \|G - G_1\|_{W^{1,2}(Q_{2/3})} \leq C(\|F\|_{L^{\infty}(Q_1)} + \|W\|_{W^{1,2}(Q_1)} + \|G - G_1\|_{L^2(Q_1)}).
\]

By virtue of Lemma 3.2 and Poincaré inequality (since $W = 0$ on $\sigma$), we get
\[
\|W\|_{W^{2,2}(Q_{2/3})} + \|G - G_1\|_{W^{1,2}(Q_{2/3})} \leq C(\|F\|_{L^{\infty}(Q_1)} + \|\nabla W\|_{L^2(Q_1)}).
\]

Employing Sobolev embedding theorem, we have $W^{1,2}(Q_1) \subset L^{2^*}(Q_1)$, where $2^* = \frac{2d}{d-2} > d$, while, $W^{1,p}(Q_1)$ are compactly embedded in $C^0(Q_1)$ if $p > d$. Hence, using Theorem 3.4 again for $m = 0$ and some $p > d$ (here $d = 2, 3$), we obtain (3.8). 

### 3.2. Local $W^{1,\infty}$ Estimates

Thanks to the following change of variables
\[
\begin{aligned}
x' - z' &= \delta(z')y', \\
x_d &= \delta(z')y_d,
\end{aligned}
\]
we transforms $\Omega_{\delta(z')} (z')$ into a nearly unite size domain $Q_1$ defined by (3.10).

Recall that each $u^\alpha_i$ is incompressible, that is,
\[
\nabla \cdot u^\alpha_i = 0, \quad \text{in } \Omega,
\]
and meanwhile each $v^\alpha_i$ that we constructed in Section 2 is also incompressible in $\Omega_{2R}$, that is,
\[
\nabla \cdot v^\alpha_i = 0, \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R},
\]
with $\|v^\alpha_i\|_{C^{2,\gamma}(\Omega \setminus \Omega_R)} \leq C$. Then their differences
\[
w^\alpha_i := u^\alpha_i - v^\alpha_i, \quad \text{and } q^\alpha_i := p^\alpha_i - \bar{p}^\alpha_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \alpha = 1, 2 \ldots, d(d+1)/2,
\]
verify boundary value problem (2.11). By applying Proposition 3.5, the following Proposition holds:

**Proposition 3.6.** Let $(w, q)$ be the solution to (2.11). Then the following estimate holds
\[
\|\nabla w\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega_{\delta/2}(z'))} + \|q - q_{\delta,z'}\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega_{\delta/2}(z'))} \leq C\left(\delta^{-d/2}\|\nabla w\|_{L^2(\Omega_{\delta}(z'))} + \delta\|f\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega_{\delta}(z'))}\right),
\]
where $\delta = \delta(z')$ and $q_{\delta,z'} = \frac{1}{|\Omega_{\delta}(z')|} \int_{\Omega_{\delta}(z')} q$.

**Proof.** Using change of variables (3.9), let us define
\[
W(y', y_d) := w(\delta y' + z', \delta y_d), \quad V(y', y_d) := v(\delta y' + z', \delta y_d), \quad y \in Q_1,
\]
and
\[
G(y', y_d) := q(\delta y' + z', \delta y_d), \quad P(y', y_d) := \delta q(\delta y' + z', \delta y_d), \quad y \in Q_1.
\]
It follows from (2.11) that

\[
\begin{cases}
-\mu \Delta W + \nabla (\mathcal{G} - \mathcal{G}_1) = \mu \Delta V - \nabla \bar{P}, & \text{in } Q_1, \\
\nabla \cdot W = 0, & \text{in } Q_1, \\
W = 0, & \text{on } \Gamma^+_1 \cup \Gamma^-_1.
\end{cases}
\]

Due to Lemma 3.5, we have

\[
\|\nabla W\|_{L^\infty(Q_{1/2})} + \|\mathcal{G} - \mathcal{G}_1\|_{L^\infty(Q_{1/2})} \leq C \left(\|\mu \Delta V - \nabla \bar{P}\|_{L^\infty(Q_1)} + \|\nabla W\|_{L^2(Q_1)} \right).
\]

Rescaling back, there holds

\[
\|\nabla w\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{1/2}(z'))} + \|q - q_{z'; z'}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{1/2}(z'))} \leq C \left(\delta^{1-\frac{2}{d}} \|\nabla w\|_{L^2(\Omega_{1}(z'))} + \delta^2 \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega_{1}(z'))} \right).
\]

Thus, (3.10) is proved. \( \square \)

### 3.3. Global Energy Estimates

To apply Proposition 3.6, we need to first establish the energy estimates \( \|\nabla w\|_{L^2(\Omega(z'))} \). To this aim, it requires to prove the global energy is bounded in the whole domain \( \Omega \), under certain assumptions on the right hand side of the equation in (2.11). The following Lemma will be used to directly prove the boundedness of the energy of \( w^i \) for the case \( \alpha = 1, 2 \) in 3D. While, for other cases, more technique is presented in Subsection 4.2 and Subsection 4.3.

**Lemma 3.7.** Let \( (w, q) \) be the solution to (2.11). Then if \( v \in C^{2, \gamma}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \) and \( \bar{p} \in C^{1, \gamma}(\Omega) \) satisfy

\[
\|v\|_{C^0(\Omega, \Omega_R)} \leq C, \quad \|\bar{p}\|_{C^0(\Omega, \Omega_R)} \leq C, \tag{3.11}
\]

and

\[
\left| \int_{\Omega_R} \sum_{j=1}^d f_j^{(j)} w^{(j)} dx \right| \leq C \left( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w|^2 dx \right)^{1/2}, \tag{3.12}
\]

then

\[
\int_{\Omega} |\nabla w|^2 dx \leq C. \tag{3.13}
\]

**Proof.** Suppose \( (w, q) \) is the solution to (2.11), then it also verifies

\[
-\mu \Delta w + \nabla (q - q_{\text{out}}) = \mu \Delta v - \nabla \bar{p}, \tag{3.14}
\]

where \( q_{\text{out}} := \int_{\Omega \setminus \Omega_R} q dx \). Multiplying equation (3.11) by \( w \), and integrating by parts, yields

\[
\mu \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w|^2 dx - \int_{\Omega} (q - q_{\text{out}}) \nabla \cdot w dx = \int_{\Omega} f \cdot w dx.
\]

In view of the second and third lines in (2.11), we have

\[
\mu \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w|^2 dx = - \int_{\Omega \setminus \Omega_R} (q - q_{\text{out}}) \nabla \cdot v dx + \int_{\Omega} f \cdot w dx. \tag{3.15}
\]

By Hölder’s inequality and (3.11),

\[
\left| \int_{\Omega \setminus \Omega_R} (q - q_{\text{out}}) \nabla \cdot v dx \right| \leq C \left( \int_{\Omega \setminus \Omega_R} |q - q_{\text{out}}|^2 dx \right)^{1/2}. \tag{3.16}
\]
Applying Lemma 3.2 to (3.14) in $\Omega \setminus \Omega_R$ and using (3.11),
\[
\int_{\Omega \setminus \Omega_R} |q - q_{R,s}|^2 \, dx \leq C \int_{\Omega \setminus \Omega_R} |\nabla w|^2 \, dx + C.
\] (3.17)

As far as the second term on the right hand side of (3.16) is concerned, by assumptions (3.11) and (3.12), and using Poincaré inequality, we deduce
\[
\left| \int_{\Omega} f \cdot w \, dx \right| \leq C\left( \int_{\Omega_R} f \cdot w \, dx \right) + C \left( \int_{\Omega \setminus \Omega_R} |\nabla w|^2 \, dx \right)^{1/2} \leq C \left( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w|^2 \, dx \right)^{1/2}.
\] (3.18)

Thus, combining (3.15), (3.18), we conclude that (3.13) holds. The proof of Lemma 3.7 is finished.

Remark 3.8. We remark that the boundedness of the global energy is an important step to employ our iteration approach to obtain the boundedness of the local energy in a small subregion of the narrow region. We begin by the following Caccioppoli-type inequality to establish the local energy estimates. More details, see Section 4 and Section 5.

3.4. A Caccioppoli-type Inequality. We need the following simple lemma, see, for example, [25].

Lemma 3.9. Let $f(t) \geq 0$ be bounded in $[\tau_0, \tau_1]$ with $\tau_0 \geq 0$. Suppose for $\tau_0 \leq t < s \leq \tau_1$, we have
\[
f(t) \leq \theta f(s) + \frac{A}{(s-t)^\alpha} + B,
\]
for some $\theta \in (0,1)$. Then for any $\tau_0 \leq t < s \leq \tau_1$ there holds
\[
f(t) \leq C(\alpha, \theta)\left( \frac{A}{(s-t)^\alpha} + B \right).
\]

For Stokes system, the following Caccioppoli-type inequality is a starting point to build an adapted version of the iteration formula used in [10][11] to deal with Lamé system. For $|z'| \leq R/2$ and $s < R/2$, let
\[
\Omega_s(z') := \left\{ (x', x_d) \in -\frac{\varepsilon}{2} + h_2(x') < x_d < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + h_1(x'), |x' - z'| < s \right\}.
\]

Lemma 3.10. (Caccioppoli-type Inequality) Let $(w, q)$ be the solution to (2.11). For $0 < t < s < R$, there holds
\[
\int_{\Omega_s(z')} |\nabla w|^2 \, dx \leq C \frac{\delta^2(z')}{(s-t)^2} \int_{\Omega_s(z')} |\nabla w|^2 \, dx + C ((s-t)^2 + \delta^2(z')) \int_{\Omega_s(z')} |f|^2 \, dx.
\] (3.19)

Proof. Since $w = 0$ on $\partial D_1 \cup \partial D_2$, employing Poincaré inequality, it is not difficult to deduce, see (11),
\[
\int_{\Omega_s(z')} |w|^2 \, dx \leq C \delta^2(z') \int_{\Omega_s(z')} |\nabla w|^2 \, dx.
\] (3.20)

For $0 < t < s \leq R$, let $\eta$ be a smooth function satisfying $\eta(x') = 1$ if $|x' - z'| < t$, $\eta(x') = 0$ if $|x' - z'| > s$, $0 \leq \eta(x') \leq 1$ if $t \leq |x' - z'| < s$, and $|\eta'(x')| \leq \frac{2}{s-t}$. Let $q_{s,z'} = \frac{1}{|\Omega_s(z')|} \int_{\Omega_s(z')} \eta \, dx$. Multiplying the equation
\[-\mu \Delta w + \nabla (q - q_{s,z'}) = f := \mu \Delta v - \nabla \bar{p}, \quad \text{in } \Omega_s(z'),\]
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Next, we shall estimate the terms on the right-hand side of (3.21) one by one.

For the first term in (3.21), employing the Cauchy's inequality,

$$\int_{\Omega_r(z')} |\nabla \eta |^2 |\nabla w | dx \leq \frac{1}{4} \int_{\Omega_r(z')} |\nabla w |^2 dx$$

and for the second term,

$$\frac{1}{\mu} \int_{\Omega_r(z')} \eta^2 f \cdot w dx \leq \frac{C}{(s-t)^2} \int_{\Omega_r(z')} |w|^2 dx + C(s-t)^2 \int_{\Omega_r(z')} |f|^2 dx.$$  

For the last term, in view of (3.9), and by means of the rescaling argument as in Corollary 3.3, we have

$$\int_{\Omega_r(z')} |q - q_{s; x'}|^2 dx \leq C_1 \int_{\Omega_r(z')} |\nabla w |^2 dx + C \delta^2(z') \int_{\Omega_r(z')} |f|^2 dx,$$

where $C_1$ is fixed now. Making use of the second line of (2.11), $\nabla \cdot w = \nabla \cdot v = 0$ in $\Omega_R$, and applying Young's inequality, we have

$$\frac{1}{\mu} \int_{\Omega_r(z')} (q - q_{s; x'}) \nabla \cdot (\eta^2 w) dx \leq \frac{1}{4 C_1} \int_{\Omega_r(z')} |q - q_{s; x'}|^2 \eta^2 dx + C \int_{\Omega_r(z')} |w|^2 |\nabla \eta |^2 dx.$$  

Combining (3.20) and (3.22) with (3.21) yields

$$\int_{\Omega_r(z')} |\nabla w |^2 dx \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_r(z')} |\nabla w |^2 dx + \frac{C \delta^2(z')}{(s-t)^2} \int_{\Omega_r(z')} |\nabla w |^2 dx$$

$$+ C \left( (s-t)^2 + \delta^2(z') \right) \int_{\Omega_r(z')} |f|^2 dx.$$

By virtue of Lemma 3.9, we deduce that estimate (3.19) holds.  

In order to apply Proposition 3.3 to establish the $L^\infty$ estimates of $|\nabla w_1^2|$ in $\Omega_{2R}$, from the right hand side of (3.11), we will start from the Caccioppoli-type inequality (3.19) and build an iteration formula, based on the method developed in Section 4.4, to obtain the local energy in the small region $\Omega_{3s}(z')$. This depends on more information of every $\mathbf{v}_1^1$ and $p_1^1$, constructed in Section 2. More calculations are given in next Sections.

4. PROOFS FOR THE MAIN ESTIMATES IN 3D

This section is devoted to establishing the main estimates, listed in Section 2, to prove our main result in 3D, Theorem 1.1. To express our idea clear, first we consider the case $\alpha = 1, 2$ in Subsection 4.1, where the derivation is not too complex, compared with the rest cases. Since the treatment is subtle for the cases
α = 3, 5, 6, Subsections 4.2 and 4.3 are also technical, especially when we deal with the boundedness of the corresponding global energy $E_a$.

### 4.1. Estimates of $|\nabla u^\alpha_1|$ and $|p^\alpha_1|$, $\alpha = 1, 2$. Recall the definition of $v^\alpha_1$ in (2.7),

\[ v^\alpha_1 = \psi_\alpha \left( k(x) + \frac{1}{2} \right) + x_\alpha \psi_3 \left( k(x) - \frac{1}{2} \right), \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}. \]

By direct calculations, for the first order derivatives,

\[ \partial_{x_j}(v^\alpha_1)^{(\alpha)} = -\frac{2x_j}{\delta(x')} k(x), \quad \partial_{x_3}(v^\alpha_1)^{(\alpha)} = \frac{1}{\delta(x')}, \quad \alpha, j = 1, 2; \quad (4.1) \]

\[ \nabla(v^\alpha_1)^{(\beta)} = 0, \quad \alpha, \beta = 1, 2, \quad \alpha \neq \beta; \quad (4.2) \]

\[ |\partial_{x_3}(v^\alpha_1)^{(3)}| \leq C, \quad |\partial_{x_3}(v^\alpha_1)^{(3)}| = \frac{2x_\alpha}{\delta(x')}, \quad \alpha = 1, 2. \quad (4.3) \]

Clearly, we have

\[ \nabla \cdot v^\alpha_1 = 0, \quad \text{for } \alpha = 1, 2. \]

Furthermore, concerning the second order derivatives,

\[ |\partial_{x_1x_1}(v^\alpha_1)^{(\alpha)}|, |\partial_{x_2x_2}(v^\alpha_1)^{(\alpha)}| \leq \frac{C}{\delta(x')}; \quad (4.4) \]

\[ \partial_{x_3x_3}(v^\alpha_1)^{(\alpha)} = 0; \quad (4.5) \]

\[ |\partial_{x_1x_1}(v^\alpha_1)^{(3)}|, |\partial_{x_2x_2}(v^\alpha_1)^{(3)}| \leq \frac{C|x_\alpha|}{\delta(x')}, \quad |\partial_{x_3x_3}(v^\alpha_1)^{(3)}| = \frac{2x_\alpha}{\delta(x')}. \quad (4.6) \]

In order to control the right hand side of (2.11), $|f^\alpha_1|$, we choose $\bar{p}^\alpha_1 \in C^{1, \gamma}(\Omega)$ such that

\[ \bar{p}^\alpha_1 = \frac{2\mu x_\alpha}{\delta(x')} k(x), \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}, \]

and $\|\bar{p}^\alpha_1\|_{C^{1, \gamma}(\Omega_{2R})} \leq C$. Luckily, it is easy to observe that

\[ \mu \partial_{x_3}(v^\alpha_1)^{(3)} - \bar{p}^\alpha_1 = 0. \quad (4.7) \]

We emphasize that this observation is crucial, because it not only makes the possible biggest term $\partial_{x_3x_3}(v^\alpha_1)^{(3)} = \frac{2x_\alpha}{\delta^2(x_1)}$, among the Hessian matrix of $v^\alpha_1$, not appear in $|f^\alpha_1|$, but also does not cause the other terms in $|f^\alpha_1|$ to become larger. To be specific, since

\[ |\partial_{x_3} \bar{p}^\alpha_1| \leq \frac{C}{\delta(x')}, \quad (4.8) \]

it follows from (4.1), (4.2), and (4.7) that

\[ |(f^\alpha_1)^{(\alpha)}| = \left| \mu \partial_{x_1x_1}(v^\alpha_1)^{(\alpha)} + \mu \partial_{x_2x_2}(v^\alpha_1)^{(\alpha)} - \partial_{x_3} \bar{p}^\alpha_1 \right| \leq \frac{C}{\delta(x_1)}, \quad \alpha = 1, 2; \]

\[ |(f^\alpha_1)^{(\beta)}| = \left| - \partial_{x_3} \bar{p}^\alpha_1 \right| \leq \frac{C}{\delta(x_1)}, \quad \alpha, \beta = 1, 2, \quad \alpha \neq \beta; \]

while, in view of (4.7),

\[ |(f^\alpha_1)^{(3)}| = \left| \mu \partial_{x_1x_1}(v^\alpha_1)^{(3)} + \mu \partial_{x_2x_2}(v^\alpha_1)^{(3)} \right| \leq \frac{C|x'|}{\delta(x')}, \quad \alpha = 1, 2. \]

By the way, the above estimates yield

\[ |f^\alpha_1| = |\mu \Delta v^\alpha_1 - \nabla \bar{p}^\alpha_1| \leq \frac{C}{\delta(x')}. \quad (4.9) \]
It will be vital and useful when we apply (3.19) and (3.10). Let us denote the total energy in $\Omega$ by

$$E_i^\alpha := \int_\Omega |\nabla w_i^\alpha|^2 \, dx.$$  

The above properties of $w_1^\alpha$ and $\bar{p}_1^\alpha$ enables us to obtain the boundedness of $E_i^\alpha$, $\alpha = 1, 2$, which is a very important step to employ our iteration approach.

**Lemma 4.1.** Let $(w_i^\alpha, q_i^\alpha)$ be the solution to (2.11), for $\alpha = 1, 2$. Then

$$E_i^\alpha = \int_\Omega |\nabla w_i^\alpha|^2 \, dx \leq C, \quad i = 1, 2.$$  

**Proof.** Here and throughout this paper, we only prove the case of $i = 1$ for instance, since the case $i = 2$ is the same. From Lemma 3.7, the proof of inequality (4.10) is reduced to proving condition (3.12), i.e.

$$\left| \int_{\Omega_R} \sum_{j=1}^d f^{(j)}(w_j^{(j)}) \, dx \right| \leq C \left( \int_\Omega |\nabla w|^2 \, dx \right)^{1/2}.  \quad (4.11)$$

For this, first as in [10], by mean value theorem and Poincaré inequality, there exists $\delta \in (R, \frac{3}{2}R)$ such that

$$\int_{-\varepsilon/2-h_2(x')<x_3<\varepsilon/2+h_1(x')} |w_i^\alpha| \, dx_3 \leq C \left( \int_\Omega |\nabla w_i^\alpha|^2 \, dx \right)^{1/2}.  \quad (4.11)$$

Recalling (4.5) and (4.7), we know that

$$\partial_{x^3}(v_i^\alpha)^{(\alpha)} = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \mu \partial_{x^3}(v_i^\alpha)^{(3)} - \bar{p}_i^\alpha = 0.$$  

For $j = 1, 2$, applying integration by parts with respect to $x'$,

$$\left| \int_{\Omega_R} f^{(j)}(w_1^\alpha)^{(j)} \, dx \right| = \left| \int_{\Omega_R} (w_1^\alpha)^{(j)} (\mu \Delta x'(v_1^\alpha)^{(j)} - \partial_{x^3} \bar{p}_1^\alpha) \, dx \right|$$

$$\leq C \int_{\Omega_R} |\Delta x'(v_1^\alpha)^{(j)}||\nabla x'(v_1^\alpha)^{(j)}| + \left| \partial_{x^3}(v_1^\alpha)^{(j)} \right| |\bar{p}_1^\alpha| \, dx$$

$$+ C \int_{-\varepsilon/2-h_2(x')<x_3<\varepsilon/2+h_1(x')} |(w_1^\alpha)^{(j)}| \, dx_3 =: I_1 + C I_2^{(j)};$$

and for $j = 3$,

$$\left| \int_{\Omega_R} f^{(3)}(w_1^\alpha)^{(3)} \, dx \right| = \mu \int_{\Omega_R} (w_1^\alpha)^{(3)} \Delta x'(v_1^\alpha)^{(3)} \, dx$$

$$\leq C \int_{\Omega_R} |\Delta x'(w_1^\alpha)^{(3)}||\nabla x'(v_1^\alpha)^{(3)}| \, dx + C \int_{-\varepsilon/2-h_2(x')<x_3<\varepsilon/2+h_1(x')} |(w_1^\alpha)^{(3)}| \, dx_3$$

$$=: I_2 + C I_2^{(3)}.$$

In view of (4.2), (4.12) and (4.3),

$$|\nabla x'(v_1^\alpha)^{(j)}|, |\bar{p}_1^\alpha| \leq \frac{C|x'|}{\delta(x')}, \quad j = 1, 2, \quad \text{and} \quad |\nabla x'(v_1^\alpha)^{(3)}| \leq C, \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega_{2R}.  \quad (4.12)$$
Applying Hölder’s inequality and using (4.12),
\[ |I_1| \leq C \left( \int_{\Omega_{c_0}} |\nabla_x (v_i^\alpha)^{(j)}|^2 + |p_i^\alpha|^2 \, dx \right)^{1/2} \left( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla_x (w_i^\alpha)^{(j)}|^2 \, dx \right)^{1/2} \]
\[ \leq C \left( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_i^\alpha|^2 \, dx \right)^{1/2}, \]
and
\[ |I_2| \leq C \left( \int_{\Omega_{c_0}} |\nabla_x (v_i^\alpha)^{(3)}|^2 \, dx \right)^{1/2} \left( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla_x (w_i^\alpha)^{(3)}|^2 \, dx \right)^{1/2} \]
\[ \leq C \left( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_i^\alpha|^2 \, dx \right)^{1/2}. \]
Together with (4.11), (4.12) is proved. Then, thanks to Lemma 3.7, the proof of Lemma 4.1 is finished. \( \square \)

**Remark 4.2.** With (4.10), as mentioned before, we can directly apply classical elliptic estimates, see [1, 2, 50], to obtain \( \|\nabla w_i^\alpha\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_R)} \leq C \). So we only focus on the estimates in \( \Omega_R \).

Integrating (4.9), we have
\[ \int_{\Omega_{c_0}(z')} |f_i^\alpha|^2 \, dx \leq \frac{C s^2}{\delta(z')} \] (4.13)
This and (4.10) are good enough to employ the adapted iteration technique to obtain the following local energy estimates.

**Lemma 4.3.** Let \( (w_i^\alpha, q_i^\alpha) \) be the solution to (2.11), for \( \alpha = 1, 2 \). Then
\[ \int_{\Omega_{c_0}(z')} |\nabla w_i^\alpha|^2 \, dx \leq C \delta^3(z'), \quad \alpha = 1, 2, \quad i = 1, 2. \] (4.14)

**Proof.** The iteration scheme we use in the proof is in spirit similar to that used in [1, 38]. Let us set
\[ E(t) := \int_{\Omega_{c_0}(z')} |\nabla w_i^\alpha|^2 \, dx. \]
Combining (4.13) with (3.19) yields
\[ E(t) \leq \left( \frac{c_0 \delta(z')}{s - t} \right)^2 E(s) + C \left( (s - t)^2 + \delta^2(z') \right) \frac{s^2}{\delta(z')}, \] (4.15)
where \( c_0 \) is a constant and we fix it now. Let \( k_0 = \left[ \frac{1}{4c_0 \sqrt{\delta(z')}} \right] \) and \( t_i = \delta(z') + 2c_0 \delta(z'), i = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, k_0 \). So, applying (4.15) with \( s = t_{i+1} \) and \( t = t_i \), we have the following iteration formula:
\[ E(t_i) \leq \frac{1}{4} E(t_{i+1}) + C(i + 1) \delta^3(z'). \]
After \( k_0 \) iterations, and by virtue of (4.10), we obtain
\[ E(t_0) \leq \left( \frac{1}{4} \right)^k E(t_k) + C \delta^3(z') \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \left( \frac{1}{4} \right)^l (l + 1) \]
\[ \leq \left( \frac{1}{4} \right)^k E_1^\alpha + C \delta^3(z') \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \left( \frac{1}{4} \right)^l (l + 1) \leq C \delta^3(z'), \]
for sufficiently small $\varepsilon$ and $|z'|$. As a consequence, (4.13) is proved. □

We are now in a position to prove Proposition 2.1.

Proof of Proposition 2.1. By using (4.14) and (4.19), and applying (3.10), we have

$$
\|\nabla w_1^0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{3/2}(z'))} + |q_1^0 - (q_1^0)_{\delta z'}|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{3/2}(z'))} 
\leq C \left( \delta^{-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} \|\nabla w\|_{L^2(\Omega_{\delta}(z'))} + \delta \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta}(z'))} \right) \leq C.
$$

Since $w_1^0 = u_1^0 - v_1^0$, $q_1^0 = p_1^0 - \tilde{p}_1^0$, it follows from (4.12) that

$$
|\nabla u_1^0(z)| \leq |\nabla v_1^0(z)| + |\nabla w_1^0(z)| \leq \frac{C}{\delta(z')}, \quad z \in \Omega_R,
$$

$$
|\nabla u_1^0(0', z_3)| \geq |\nabla v_1^0(0', z_3)| - C \geq \frac{1}{C\delta(z')}, \quad |z_3| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2};
$$

and by (2.12), we deduce

$$
|p_1^0 - (q_1^0)_{\delta z'}|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{3/2}(z'))} \leq |q_1^0 - (q_1^0)_{\delta z'}|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{3/2}(z'))} + \|\tilde{p}_1^0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{3/2}(z'))} 
\leq C + \|\tilde{p}_1^0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{3/2}(z'))} \leq \frac{C|z'|}{\delta(z')} + C.
$$

Therefore, Proposition 2.1 is proved. □

Remark 4.4. From the above calculations, our method works well for general $h_1(x')$ and $h_2(x')$. For example, if $h_1 = h_2 = h(x')$ satisfies (1.5)-(1.6), then we take

$$
v_1^0 = \psi_\alpha \left( k(x) + \frac{1}{2} \right) + \frac{\partial x_2 \left( h_1 + h_2 \right)(x')}{\delta(x')} \psi_\alpha \left( k^2(x) - \frac{1}{4} \right), \quad \alpha = 1, 2, \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}.
$$

It is easy to check that $\nabla \cdot v_1^0 = 0$ in $\Omega_{2R}$. As far as the estimates of $v_1^0$ and $f_1^0$ are concerned, only slight modification is needed.

4.2. Estimates of $|\nabla u_1^3|$ and $|p_1^3|$. Recalling the definition of $v_3^1$ in $\Omega_{2R}$, (2.13),

$$
v_3^1 = \psi_3 \left( k(x) + \frac{1}{2} \right) + \frac{3}{\delta(x')} \left( \sum_{\alpha=1}^2 x_\alpha \psi_\alpha + 2x_3 \psi_3 \left( \frac{|x'|^2}{\delta(x')} - \frac{1}{3} \right) \right) \left( k^2(x) - \frac{1}{4} \right).
$$

We will often use the identity

$$
\partial_{x_j} k(x) = -\frac{2x_j}{\delta(x')} k(x), \quad \text{(4.16)}
$$

in the sequel in order to collect the similar terms. By direct calculations, we deduce

$$
\partial_{x_j} (v_1^3)^{(j)} = \left( \frac{3}{\delta(x')} - \frac{18x_j^2}{\delta^2(x')} \right) k^2(x) - \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{3}{\delta(x')} - \frac{6x_j^2}{\delta^2(x')} \right), \quad j = 1, 2; \quad \text{(4.17)}
$$

$$
\partial_{x_j} (v_1^3)^{(j)} = \frac{18x_1x_2}{\delta^2(x')} k^2(x) + \frac{3}{2} \frac{x_1 x_2}{\delta^2(x')}, \quad \partial_{x_3} (v_1^3)^{(j)} = \frac{6x_j}{\delta^2(x')} k(x), \quad j, l = 1, 2, j \neq l; \quad \text{(4.18)}
$$

while, for $j = 3$,

$$
\partial_{x_l} (v_1^3)^{(3)} := A_{13}^3 (x') x_3 + A_{33}^3 (x') x_3^3, \quad \text{and} \quad |\partial_{x_l} (v_1^3)^{(3)}| \leq \frac{C|x_l|}{\delta(x')}, \quad l = 1, 2, \quad \text{(4.19)}
$$
where the coefficients of \(x_1^3, A_{k1}^3(x')\), are just some polynomials of \(x')\, and

\[
\partial x_3 (v_1^{3})^{(3)} = \left( \frac{18|x'|^2}{\delta^2(x')} - \frac{6}{\delta(x')} \right) k^2(x) - \frac{3}{2} \left( \frac{|x'|^2}{\delta^2(x')} - \frac{1}{\delta(x')} \right), \tag{4.20}
\]

Combining (4.17) and (4.20) implies that such \(v_1^{3}\) is incompressible in \(\Omega_{2R}\), that is,

\[
\nabla \cdot v_1^{3} = 0, \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}.
\]

Consequently, it follows from (4.17), (4.20) that

\[
|\nabla v_1^{3}| \leq C \left( \frac{1}{\delta(x')} + \frac{|x'|}{\delta^2(x')} \right), \tag{4.21}
\]

and

\[
|\nabla v_1^{3}(0', x_3)| \geq \frac{1}{C} \frac{1}{\delta(x')}, \quad \text{if } |x_3| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.
\]

Notice that

\[
\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_1^{3}|^2 dx \leq C \int_{\Omega} \left( \frac{1}{\delta(x')} + \frac{|x'|}{\delta^2(x')} \right)^2 dx \leq C, \tag{4.22}
\]

it is impossible prove the boundedness of the global energy of \(w_1^{3}\) by directly applying Lemma 4.1. So we must improve our technique later.

In order to control \(f_1^{3} = \mu \Delta v_1^{3} - \nabla \vec{p}_1^{3}\), we need to check the second order derivatives of \(v_1^{3}\). It is easy to see from (4.20) that \(|\partial x_3 x_3 (v_1^{3})^{(3)}| \leq \frac{C}{\delta^2(x')}\), which is the biggest term in \(\partial_3^2 (v_1^{3})^{(j)}\). So we construct a \(\vec{p}_1^{3} \in C^{1,\gamma}(\Omega)\), defined in (2.10),

\[
\vec{p}_1^{3} = -\frac{3 \mu}{2 \delta^2(x')} + \frac{18 \mu}{\delta(x')} \left( \frac{|x'|^2}{\delta(x')} - \frac{1}{3} \right) k^2(x), \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}.
\]

We notice that at this moment we can not directly get \(\mu \partial x_3 (v_1^{3})^{(3)} - \vec{p}_1^{3} = 0\) as we dealt with \(v_1^{3}\) in Subsection 4.1. Indeed,

\[
\mu \partial x_3 (v_1^{3})^{(3)} - \vec{p}_1^{3} = \frac{3 \mu}{2 \delta^2(x')} \left( \frac{|x'|^2}{\delta(x')} - \frac{1}{3} \right) k^2(x), \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}.
\]

However, by observation, we find that the right hand side of (4.23) is independent of \(x_3\). After differentiating it with respect to \(x_3\), we still have

\[
\mu \partial x_3 x_3 (v_1^{3})^{(3)} - \partial x_3 \vec{p}_1^{3} = 0. \tag{4.24}
\]

Thus, the biggest term \(\partial x_3 x_3 (v_1^{3})^{(3)}\) vanishes.

Meanwhile,

\[
\partial x_3 \vec{p}_1^{3} = \frac{6 \mu x_j}{\delta^3(x')} + \frac{36 \mu}{\delta^2(x')} \left( 2x_j + x_l - \frac{4x_j |x'|}{\delta(x')} \right) k^2(x), \quad j, l = 1, 2, \quad j \neq l,
\]

can also cancel the other big terms

\[
\partial x_3 x_3 (v_1^{3})^{(j)} = \frac{6x_j}{\delta^3(x')},
\]

which implies, for \(j, l = 1, 2\) and \(j \neq l\),

\[
\left| \mu \partial x_3 x_3 (v_1^{3})^{(j)} - \partial x_3 \vec{p}_1^{3} \right| = \left| -\frac{36 \mu}{\delta^2(x')} \left( 2x_j + x_l - \frac{4x_j |x'|}{\delta(x')} \right) k^2(x) \right| \leq C |x'| \delta^2(x'), \tag{4.25}
\]

Thus, this is the approximation we are seeking.
For other terms, 
\[ |\partial_{x_1x_1}(v_1^3)^{(j)}|, |\partial_{x_2x_2}(v_1^3)^{(j)}| \leq \frac{C|x_j|}{\delta^2(x')} \], \quad |\partial_{x_1x_1}(v_1^3)^{(3)}|, |\partial_{x_2x_2}(v_1^3)^{(3)}| \leq \frac{C}{\delta(x')} \] (4.26)

To summarise, we have 
\[ |f_1^3| = |\mu \Delta v_1^3 - \nabla \bar{p}_1^3| \leq \frac{C|x'|}{\delta^2(x')} \], \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}. \] (4.27)

As a consequence, we obtain 
\[ \int_{\Omega_{s}(x')} |f_1^3|^{2} dx \leq \frac{Cs^2}{\delta^3(x')} (s + |z'|^2), \] (4.28)

which is to prepare for applying (4.19) to prove Proposition 2.3.

**Lemma 4.5.** Let \((w_i^3, q_i^3)\) be the solution to (2.11), for \(\alpha = 3\). Then 
\[ \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_i^3|^2 dx \leq C, \quad i = 1, 2. \] (4.29)

**Proof.** Similarly as in Lemma 4.1 by virtue of Lemma 3.7 it suffice to proving 
\[ \left| \int_{\Omega_{\rho}(x')} \sum_{j=1}^{3} (f_1^3)^{(j)} (w_1^3)^{(j)} dx \right| \leq C \left( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_i^3|^2 dx \right)^{1/2}, \] (4.30)

where \(r_0 \in (R, \frac{3}{4}R)\) is fixed by 4.11.

First, for \(j = 1, 2, \) in view of 4.20
\[ \int_{\Omega_{\rho}} (f_1^3)^{(j)} (w_1^3)^{(j)} dx = \int_{\Omega_{\rho}} (w_1^3)^{(j)} (\mu \Delta (v_1^3)^{(j)} - \partial_{x_j} \bar{p}_1^3) dx. \] (4.31)

Note that here we can not use the integration by parts with the respect to \(x'\) any more as in Lemma 4.1 because even if we did, after that the terms \(|\partial_{x_1}(v_1^3)^{(j)}| \leq \frac{C}{\delta^2(x')}\) are still too large to prove (4.30), see for example (4.22). Observing from (4.17), (4.18) and (4.20), we can write \((f_1^3)^{(j)}\) in the polynomial form
\[ \mu \Delta (v_1^3)^{(j)} - \partial_{x_j} \bar{p}_1^3 := A_0^3 j(x') + A_2^3 j(x') x_3^2, \]
where \(A_0^3 j(x')\) are polynomials of \(x_1\) and \(x_2\), and in view of (4.20) and (4.26),
\[ \left| A_0^3 j(x') + A_2^3 j(x') x_3^2 \right| \leq \frac{C|x'|}{\delta^2(x')} . \]

However, by simple differentiation, we know
\[ \partial_{x_3} \left( A_0^3 j(x') x_3 + \frac{1}{3} A_2^3 j(x') x_3^3 \right) = A_0^3 j(x') + A_2^3 j(x') x_3^2, \]
while at this moment,
\[ \int_{\Omega_{\rho}} \left| A_0^3 j(x') x_3 + \frac{1}{3} A_2^3 j(x') x_3^3 \right|^2 \leq C \int_{\Omega_{\rho}} \frac{|x'|^2}{\delta^2(x')} \leq C. \]

So, we rewrite (4.31) as follows:
\[ \int_{\Omega_{\rho}} (f_1^3)^{(j)} (w_1^3)^{(j)} dx = \int_{\Omega_{\rho}} (w_1^3)^{(j)} \partial_{x_3} \left( A_0^3 j(x') x_3 + \frac{1}{3} A_2^3 j(x') x_3^3 \right) dx. \]
Since $w = 0$ on $\partial D_1 \cup \partial D_2$, we apply the integration by parts with respect to $x_3$, instead of $x'$ used in Lemma 4.11. By Hölder inequality, we deduce
\[
\left| \int_{\Omega_{r_0}} (f_1^3)^{(j)}(w_1^3)^{(j)} \, dx \right| \leq \int_{\Omega_{r_0}} |\partial_{x_3}(w_1^3)^{(j)}| A_0^{3j}(x_3) + \frac{1}{3} A_2^{3j}(x') x_3^3 \, dx \\
\leq C \left( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_1^3|^2 \, dx \right)^{1/2}.
\]
Hence,
\[
\left| \sum_{j=1}^2 \int_{\Omega_{r_0}} (f_1^3)^{(j)}(w_1^3)^{(j)} \, dx \right| \leq C \left( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_1^3|^2 \, dx \right)^{1/2}. \tag{4.32}
\]
For $j = 3$, in view of (4.22), and by means of (4.11),
\[
\int_{\Omega_{r_0}} |\nabla x'(v_1^3)|^2 \, dx \leq C \int_{\Omega_{r_0}} |x'|^2 \delta^2(x') \leq C,
\]
so we can still use the integration by parts with respect to $x'$, similarly as in Lemma 3.7, and use (4.11) again to obtain
\[
\left| \int_{\Omega_{r_0}} (f_1^3)^{(3)}(w_1^3)^{(3)} \, dx \right| = \left| \int_{\Omega_{r_0}} (w_1^3)^{(3)}(\mu \partial_{x_1} (v_1^3)^{(3)} + \mu \partial_{x_2} (v_1^3)^{(3)}) \, dx \right| \\
\leq \int_{\Omega_{r_0}} |\nabla x'(w_1^3)|^2 \mu \partial_{x_1} (v_1^3)^{(3)} + \mu \partial_{x_2} (v_1^3)^{(3)} \, dx \\
+ \int_{x_3 = \delta^2(x')} |(w_1^3)^{(3)}| \, dx' \\
\leq C \left( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla (w_1^3)|^2 \, dx \right)^{1/2}. \tag{4.33}
\]
Taking into account (4.32) and (4.33), we obtain (4.31), so (4.28). Thanks to Lemma 3.7, the proof of Lemma 4.5 is finished. \hfill \Box

With (4.28) and (4.29), we may argue as before to complete the proof of Proposition 2.3.

**Proof of Proposition 2.3.** Substituting (4.28) into (4.19), instead of (4.15),
\[
\int_{\Omega_{t}(z')} |\nabla w_1^3|^2 \, dx \leq C \delta^2(z') \frac{(s - t)^2}{3} \int_{\Omega_{t}(z')} |\nabla w_1^3|^2 \, dx + C ((s - t)^2 + \delta^2(z')) \frac{s}{3^3(z')} (s + |z'|^2).
\]
By the same iteration process used in Lemma 4.3, we deduce
\[
\int_{\Omega_{t}(z')} |\nabla w_1^3|^2 \, dx \leq C \delta^2(z'). \tag{4.34}
\]
Substituting this, together with (4.27), into (4.10) yields
\[
\|\nabla w_1^3\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{t/2}(z'))} + \|q_1^3 - (q_1^3)_{t/2} v_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{t/2}(z'))} \\
\leq C \left( \delta^{-\frac{3}{2}} \|\nabla w_1^3\|_{L^2(\Omega_{t}(z'))} + \delta \|f_1^3\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{t}(z'))} \right) \\
\leq C \left( \delta^{-\frac{3}{2}} (z') + \frac{|z'|}{\delta(z')} \right) \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{\delta(z')}}
\]
Recalling $w_1^2 = u_1^2 - v_1^3$ and using (4.21), Proposition 2.3 is proved. □

4.3. Estimates of $|\nabla u_1^2|$ and $|p_1^2|$, $\alpha = 4, 5, 6$. For $u_1^4$, because $\psi_4$ does not include the component $x_3$, it is easy a little bit to construct $v_1^4 \in C^{2,\gamma}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$. Set

$$v_1^4 = \psi_4 \left(k(x) + \frac{1}{2}\right), \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R},$$

and $\|v_1^4\|_{C^{2,\gamma}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C$. Then, a simple calculation shows that

$$\partial_{x_1}(v_1^4)^{(1)} = -\frac{2x_1x_2}{\delta(x')} k(x), \quad |\partial_{x_2}(v_1^4)^{(1)}| \leq C, \quad \partial_{x_3}(v_1^4)^{(1)} = \frac{x_2}{\delta(x')};$$

$$|\partial_{x_1}(v_1^4)^{(2)}| \leq C, \quad \partial_{x_2}(v_1^4)^{(2)} = \frac{2x_1x_2}{\delta(x')} k(x), \quad \partial_{x_3}(v_1^4)^{(2)} = -\frac{x_1}{\delta(x')} ,$$

which directly gives

$$\nabla \cdot v_1^4 = 0, \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}.$$

Further, for the second order derivatives

$$|\partial_{x_1x_1}(v_1^4)^{(1)}|, |\partial_{x_2x_2}(v_1^4)^{(1)}(\alpha)| \leq \frac{C|x'|}{\delta(x')}, \quad \alpha = 1, 2,$$

so that

$$\int_{\Omega_{2R}} |\mu \Delta v_1^4|^2 \leq C \int_{\Omega_{2R}} \frac{|x'|^2}{\delta^2(x')} \leq C.$$

Proof of Proposition 2.4 for $\alpha = 4$. Since the above bounds for $v_1^4$ are much better than the analogues of the case $\alpha = 1, 2$, and satisfy the conditions in Lemma 3.7 with taking $\tilde{p}_1^4 = 0$, the rest of the Proof of Proposition 2.4 for $\alpha = 4$ is the same as that for Proposition 2.1. We omit the details here. □

For $u_1^5$ and $u_1^6$, we construct $v_1^5 \in C^{2,\gamma}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$, such that in $\Omega_{2R}$,

$$v_1^5 = \psi_5 \left(k(x) + \frac{1}{2}\right) + \frac{3}{5} \left(1 - \frac{4x_1^2}{\delta(x')} - \frac{25}{3} x_3 k(x) \right) \left(k^2(x) - \frac{1}{4}\right),$$

and $\|v_1^5\|_{C^{2,\gamma}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C$. For reader’s convenience, we repeat it here. By a careful calculation and using (3.19), we have

$$\partial_{x_1}(v_1^5)^{(1)} = -2x_1k^2(x) - 3 \left(k^2(x) - \frac{1}{4}\right) \left(\frac{8x_1}{\delta(x')} - \frac{8x_1^3}{3\delta^2(x')} - \frac{50x_1}{3} k^2(x)\right)$$

$$- \frac{3}{5}k^2(x) \left(\frac{4x_1}{\delta(x')} - \frac{16x_1^2}{\delta^2(x')} - \frac{100x_1}{3k^2(x)}\right);$$

$$\partial_{x_2}(v_1^5)^{(2)} = -3 \left(k^2(x) - \frac{1}{4}\right) \left(\frac{4x_1}{\delta(x')} - \frac{8x_1^2}{\delta^2(x')}\right) + \frac{3}{5} \frac{16x_1x_2^2}{\delta^2(x')} k^2(x);$$

and

$$\partial_{x_3}(v_1^5)^{(3)} = -\frac{x_1}{\delta(x')} + \frac{3}{5}k^2(x) \left(\frac{16x_1}{3\delta(x')} - \frac{8x_1|x'|^2}{\delta^2(x')} - 30x_1k^2(x)\right)$$

$$+ \frac{3}{5}k^2(x) \left(\frac{32x_1}{3\delta(x')} - \frac{16x_1|x'|^2}{\delta^2(x')} - 20x_1k^2(x)\right).$$
The above calculation shows that
\[
\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_1^5 = \partial_{x_1}(\mathbf{v}_1^5)^{(1)} + \partial_{x_2}(\mathbf{v}_1^5)^{(2)} + \partial_{x_3}(\mathbf{v}_1^5)^{(3)} = 0, \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}.
\]

For the other terms,
\[
|\partial_{x_2}(\mathbf{v}_1^5)^{(1)}| \leq \frac{C|x_2|}{\delta(x')}, \quad \partial_{x_3}(\mathbf{v}_1^5)^{(1)} = \frac{9}{2} \mu(x) + \frac{6}{5} \left( \frac{1}{\delta(x')} - \frac{4x_1^2}{\delta^2(x')} \right) k(x) - 20k^3(x); \quad (4.35)
\]
\[
|\partial_{x_1}(\mathbf{v}_1^5)^{(2)}| \leq \frac{C|x_1|}{\delta(x')}, \quad \partial_{x_2}(\mathbf{v}_1^5)^{(2)} = - \frac{24}{5} \frac{x_1x_2}{\delta^3(x')} k(x); \quad (4.36)
\]
and
\[
|\partial_{x_j}(\mathbf{v}_1^5)^{(j)}| \leq \frac{C|x_j|}{\delta(x')}, \quad |\partial_{x_1}(\mathbf{v}_1^5)^{(3)}|, |\partial_{x_2}(\mathbf{v}_1^5)^{(3)}| \leq C. \quad (4.37)
\]

For the second derivatives,
\[
\partial_{x_3x_3}(\mathbf{v}_1^5)^{(1)} = \frac{9}{2\delta(x')} + \frac{6}{5} \left( \frac{1}{\delta^2(x')} - \frac{4x_1^2}{\delta^3(x')} \right) \frac{60}{\delta(x')} k^2(x);
\]
\[
\partial_{x_3x_3}(\mathbf{v}_1^5)^{(2)} = - \frac{24}{5} \frac{x_1x_2}{\delta^3(x')};
\]
and
\[
\partial_{x_3x_3}(\mathbf{v}_1^5)^{(3)} = \frac{48}{5} \left( \frac{2x_1}{\delta^2(x')} - \frac{3x_1|x'|^2}{\delta^3(x')} \right) k(x) - \frac{120x_1}{\delta(x')} \frac{k^3(x)}{\delta(x')} + \frac{9x_1}{\delta(x')} k(x).
\]
Note that all of these three terms above are large,
\[
|\partial_{x_3x_3}(\mathbf{v}_1^5)^{(j)}| \leq \frac{C|x_j|}{\delta^2(x')}, \quad j = 1, 2, \quad |\partial_{x_3x_3}(\mathbf{v}_1^5)^{(3)}| \leq \frac{C|x_j|}{\delta^2(x')}. \quad (4.38)
\]

Here we choose \( \tilde{p}_1^5 \in C^{1,\gamma}(\Omega) \) such that
\[
\tilde{p}_1^5 = \frac{6\mu}{5} \frac{x_1}{\delta^2(x')} + \frac{72\mu}{5} \frac{x_1}{\delta^3(x')} \left( \frac{2}{3} \frac{|x'|^2}{\delta(x')} \right) k(x), \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R},
\]
and \( ||\tilde{p}_1^5||_{C^{1,\gamma}(\Omega_{2R})} \leq C \). A straightforward calculation gives
\[
\partial_{x_1} \tilde{p}_1^5 = \frac{6\mu}{5} \left( \frac{x_1}{\delta^2(x')} - \frac{4x_1^2}{\delta^3(x')} \right) + \frac{72\mu}{5} \left( \frac{2}{3} \frac{|x'|^2}{\delta^3(x')} - \frac{|x'|^2}{\delta^4(x')} + \frac{8x_1^3}{\delta^5(x')} \right) k(x);
\]
\[
\partial_{x_2} \tilde{p}_1^5 = - \frac{24\mu}{5} \frac{x_1x_2}{\delta^3(x')} + \frac{72\mu}{5} \left( - \frac{4x_1x_2}{3\delta^2(x')} + \frac{2x_1x_2|x'|^2}{\delta^3(x')} - \frac{x_1x_2}{\delta^4(x')} + \frac{x_1x_2}{\delta^5(x')} \right) k(x);
\]
and
\[
\partial_{x_3} \tilde{p}_1^5 = \mu \left( \frac{96}{5} \frac{x_1}{\delta^2(x')} - \frac{144}{5} \frac{x_1|x'|^2}{\delta^3(x')} \right) k(x).
\]
Consequently,
\[
\mu \partial_{x_3x_3}(\mathbf{v}_1^5)^{(1)} - \partial_{x_1} \tilde{p}_1^5 = \frac{9\mu}{2\delta(x')} - \frac{72\mu}{5} \left( \frac{29}{\delta^2(x')} - \frac{6x_1^2 + |x'|^2}{\delta^3(x')} + \frac{8x_1^3}{\delta^4(x')} \right) k^2(x); \quad (4.39)
\]
\[
\mu \partial_{x_3x_3}(\mathbf{v}_1^5)^{(2)} - \partial_{x_2} \tilde{p}_1^5 = - \frac{72\mu}{5} \left( - \frac{4}{3\delta^2(x')} + \frac{2(|x'|^2 - 1)}{\delta^3(x')} + \frac{2|x'|^2}{\delta^3(x')} \right) k^2(x); \quad (4.40)
\]
and
\[ \mu \partial_{x_1 x_3} (\mathbf{v}^5_1) - \partial_{x_2} p^5_1 = \frac{9 \mu x_1}{\delta(x')} k(x) - \frac{120 \mu x_1}{\delta(x')} k^3(x). \] (4.41)

Obviously, they all do not vanish, but they make \(|f^5_1|\) become smaller.

In summary,
\[ |f^5_1| = |\mu \Delta \mathbf{v}^5_1 - \nabla p^5_1| \leq \frac{C}{\delta(x')}, \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}. \]

This is much better than (4.38). Moreover,
\[ \int_{\Omega(x')} |f^5_1|^2 \, dx \leq \frac{C s^2}{\delta(x')} . \] (4.42)

Notice that this bound is the same as in (4.13) for \(f^1_1\). So, in order to apply (4.15) and the iteration process as in Lemma 4.3 it remains to prove the boundedness of \(E^0_{\alpha}, \alpha = 5, 6\).

**Lemma 4.6.** Let \((w^\alpha_1, q^\alpha_1)\) be the solution to (2.11), for \(\alpha = 5, 6\). Then \(E^1_\alpha = \int_\Omega |\nabla w^\alpha_1|^2 \, dx \leq C, \quad \alpha = 5, 6.\) (4.43)

**Proof.** Similarly as in the proof of Lemma 4.3, we rewrite (4.39)–(4.41) into the form of polynomials as follows:
\[ \mu \partial_{x_1 x_3} (\mathbf{v}^5_1) - \partial_{x_2} p^5_1 = A_0^{51}(x') + A_2^{51}(x') x_3 = \partial_{x_3} \left( A_0^{51}(x') x_3 + \frac{1}{3} A_2^{51}(x') x_3^3 \right), \]
\[ \mu \partial_{x_1 x_3} (\mathbf{v}^5_1) - \partial_{x_2} p^5_1 = A_2^{52}(x') x_3^2 = \partial_{x_3} \left( \frac{1}{3} A_2^{52}(x') x_3^3 \right), \]
\[ \mu \partial_{x_1 x_3} (\mathbf{v}^5_1) - \partial_{x_2} p^5_1 = A_1^{53} x_3 + A_3^{53} x_3^3 = \partial_{x_3} \left( \frac{1}{2} A_1^{53} x_3^2 + \frac{1}{4} A_3^{53} x_3^4 \right), \]

where \(A_j^{5j}(x')\) are polynomials of \(x'\). Moreover,
\[ \left| A_0^{51}(x') x_3 + \frac{1}{3} A_2^{51}(x') x_3^3 \right|, \left| \frac{1}{3} A_2^{52}(x') x_3^3 \right|, \left| \frac{1}{2} A_1^{53} x_3^2 + \frac{1}{4} A_3^{53} x_3^4 \right| \leq C. \]

Applying the integration by parts with respect to \(x_3\), and using \(w = 0\) on \(\partial D_1 \cup \partial D_2\) and Hölder inequality, gives
\[ \left| \int_{\Omega_{\alpha_0}} (\mu \partial_{x_1 x_3} (\mathbf{v}^5_1) - \partial_{x_2} p^5_1)(\mathbf{w}^5_1) \, dx \right| \leq C \int_{\Omega_{\alpha_0}} |\partial_{x_3} (\mathbf{w}^5_1)| \, dx \leq C \left( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \mathbf{w}^5_1|^2 \, dx \right)^{1/2}, \quad j = 1, 2, 3. \]

For other terms \(\Delta_{x'} (\mathbf{v}^5_1)(j)\), since (4.39)–(4.41), we still use the integration by parts with respect to \(x'\) as (4.33) in Lemma 4.3
\[ \left| \int_{\Omega_{\alpha_0}} (\mathbf{w}^5_1)(j) (\mu \partial_{x_1 x_1} (\mathbf{v}^5_1)(j) + \mu \partial_{x_2 x_2} (\mathbf{v}^5_1)(j)) \, dx \right| \leq C \left( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla (\mathbf{w}^5_1)(j)|^2 \, dx \right)^{1/2}. \]

Thus,
\[ \left| \int_{\Omega_{\alpha_0}} \sum_{j=1}^3 (f^5_1)(j)(\mathbf{v}^5_1)(j) \, dx \right| \leq C \left( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \mathbf{w}^5_1|^2 \, dx \right)^{1/2}. \]
Lemma 4.7. We have

\[ \frac{1}{C} |\ln \varepsilon| \leq a_{11}^{\alpha} \leq C |\ln \varepsilon|, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, 5, 6; \]

\[ \frac{1}{C \varepsilon} \leq a_{11}^{3} \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon}, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{C} \leq a_{11}^{4} \leq C. \]

Proof. By means of Proposition 2.4 and 4.46,

\[ a_{11}^{11} \leq C \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_{1}|^2 \, dx \leq C \int_{\Omega_{2R}} \frac{dx}{\delta^2(x')} + C \leq C |\ln \varepsilon|. \]
On the other hand, thanks to (4.3) and Proposition 2.1
\[ a_{11}^3 \geq \frac{1}{C} \int_{\Omega_R} |e(u_1^3)|^2 dx \geq \frac{1}{C} \int_{\Omega_R} |\partial_{x_3}(v_1^3)^{(1)}|^2 dx - C \geq \frac{1}{C} \int_{\Omega_R} \frac{dx}{\delta^2(x')} - C \geq \frac{\ln \varepsilon}{C}. \]
For \( \alpha = 2, 5, 6 \), the proof is the same and so is omitted. Thus, (4.47) is proved.

For \( a_{11}^{33} \), from Proposition 2.3 we have
\[ a_{11}^{33} \leq C \int_\Omega |\nabla u_1^3|^2 dx \leq C \int_{\Omega_R} \left( \frac{1}{\delta(x_1)} + \frac{|x'|}{\delta^2(x')} \right)^2 dx + C \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon}. \]
For the lower bound,
\[ a_{11}^{33} \geq \frac{1}{C} \int_{\Omega_R} |e(u_1^3)|^2 dx \geq \frac{1}{C} \int_{\Omega_R} \sum_{j=1}^2 |\partial_{x_3}(v_1^3)^{(j)} + \partial_{x_3}(w_1^3)^{(j)}|^2 dx \]
\[ \geq \frac{1}{C} \int_{\Omega_R} \sum_{j=1}^2 |\partial_{x_3}(v_1^3)^{(j)}|^2 dx - \frac{2}{C} \int_{\Omega_R} \sum_{j=1}^2 |\partial_{x_3}(v_1^3)^{(j)}||\partial_{x_3}(w_1^3)^{(j)}| dx. \]
With the aid of (4.48),
\[ \int_{\Omega_R} \sum_{j=1}^2 |\partial_{x_3}(v_1^3)^{(j)}|^2 dx \geq \frac{1}{C} \int_{\Omega_R} \frac{|x'|^2}{\delta^2(x')} dx' \]
\[ \geq \frac{1}{C} \int_0^R \frac{r^3}{(\varepsilon + r^2)^3} dr \geq \frac{1}{C\varepsilon} \int_0^{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \frac{r^3}{(1 + r^2)^3} dr \geq \frac{1}{C\varepsilon}, \]
and by Proposition 2.3
\[ \int_{\Omega_R} \sum_{j=1}^2 |\partial_{x_3}(v_1^3)^{(j)}||\partial_{x_3}(w_1^3)^{(j)}| dx \leq \int_{\Omega_R} \frac{|x'|}{\delta^{3/2}(x')} dx' \leq C. \]
Consequently, \( a_{11}^{33} \geq \frac{1}{C\varepsilon}. \) Estimate (4.48) for \( a_{11}^{33} \) is proved.

On account of Proposition 2.3 we readily have
\[ a_{11}^{44} \leq C \int_\Omega |\nabla u_1^4|^2 dx \leq C \int_{\Omega_R} \frac{|x'|^2}{\delta^2(x')} dx + C \leq C, \]
while
\[ a_{11}^{44} \geq \int_{\Omega_R \setminus \Omega_{R/2}} |\partial_{x_3}(v_1^4)^{(2)}|^2 \geq \int_{\Omega_R \setminus \Omega_{R/2}} \frac{|x'|^2}{\delta^2(x')} dx \geq \frac{1}{C}. \]
So that estimate (4.48) is proved. \( \square \)

For the other terms of \( (a_{11}^{\alpha \beta})_{6 \times 6} \) and \( b_1^\beta \), we have

**Lemma 4.8.** We have
\[ |a_{11}^{34}| = |a_{11}^{43}| \leq C \ln \varepsilon, \quad |a_{11}^{33}| = |a_{11}^{44}| \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon}, \quad \beta = 5, 6, \quad (4.49) \]
\[ |a_{11}^{\alpha \beta}| = |a_{11}^{\beta \alpha}| \leq C, \quad \alpha, \beta = 1, \ldots, 6, \quad \alpha \neq \beta, \quad otherwise; \quad (4.50) \]
\[ |a_{11}^{\alpha \beta} + a_{21}^{\beta \alpha}| \leq C, \quad \alpha, \beta = 1, \ldots, 6; \quad (4.51) \]
and
\[ |b_1^\beta| \leq C, \quad \beta = 1, \ldots, 6. \quad (4.52) \]
For the reader’s convenience, we put the stress tensor precisely here:
\[
\sigma[u,p] = 2\mu\varepsilon(u) - pI \\
= \begin{pmatrix}
2\mu\partial_{x_3}u^{(1)} - p & \mu(\partial_{x_2}u^{(1)} + \partial_{x_1}u^{(2)}) & \mu(\partial_{x_1}u^{(3)} + \partial_{x_3}u^{(1)}) \\
\mu(\partial_{x_2}u^{(1)} + \partial_{x_1}u^{(2)}) & 2\mu\partial_{x_1}u^{(2)} - p & \mu(\partial_{x_1}u^{(3)} + \partial_{x_3}u^{(2)}) \\
\mu(\partial_{x_1}u^{(3)} + \partial_{x_3}u^{(1)}) & \mu(\partial_{x_2}u^{(3)} + \partial_{x_3}u^{(2)}) & 2\mu\partial_{x_3}u^{(3)} - p
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

Proof. First, we estimate $a_{11}^{34}$, for an example. By Propositions 2.3 and 2.4, we obtain
\[
|a_{11}^{34}| = C \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_3^3 \cdot \nabla u_1^1| \, dx \leq C \int_{\Omega_R} \frac{|x'|}{\delta(x')} \left( \frac{1}{\delta(x_1)} + \frac{|x'|}{\delta^2(x')} \right) \, dx + C|\ln \varepsilon|.
\]

For $|a_{11}^{12}|$, we introduce the cylinder $C_r$ by
\[
C_r := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid |x'| < r, \ |x_3| < \varepsilon + \frac{r^2}{2} \right\},
\]
and adapt the method in [17]. We write $a_{11}^{12}$ in the form of \[4.44\] and in view of Proposition 2.1
\[
|a_{11}^{12}| \leq \left| \int_{\partial D_1 \cap C_r} \psi_2 \cdot \sigma[u_1^1,p_1^1] - (q_1^1)_{\delta,x'} \nu \right| + C.
\]

Note that the unit normal vector on $\partial D_1 \cap C_R$ is
\[
\nu = (n_1, n_2, n_3) = \left( \frac{x_1}{\sqrt{1 + |x'|^2}}, \frac{x_2}{\sqrt{1 + |x'|^2}}, -\frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + |x'|^2}} \right).
\]

So
\[
\psi_2 \cdot \sigma[u_1^1,p_1^1] \nu|_{\partial D_1 \cap C_r} = \sigma_{21}[u_1^1,p_1^1]n_1 + \sigma_{22}[u_1^1,p_1^1]n_2 + \sigma_{23}[u_1^1,p_1^1]n_3
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + |x'|^2}} \left( \mu(\partial_{x_2}(u_1^1)^{(1)}) + \partial_{x_1}(u_1^1)^{(2)})x_1 + (2\mu\partial_{x_2}(u_1^1)^{(2)} - p_1^1)x_2
\]
\[
- \mu(\partial_{x_2}(u_1^1)^{(3)} + \partial_{x_3}(u_1^1)^{(1)}) \right).
\]

While, by using \[14.3\], \[2.12\], and $\partial_{x_2}(v_1^1)^{(3)} = -\frac{4\mu x_1^2 x_2^2}{\delta^2(x')}^2$, we have
\[
\left|\psi_2 \cdot \sigma[v_1^1,\bar{p}_1^1] \nu|_{\partial D_1 \cap C_r} \right| = \left| \frac{-4\mu x_1 x_2 x_3}{\sqrt{1 + |x'|^2} \delta^2(x')} \left( 1 - \frac{x_3^2}{\delta^2(x')} \right) \right| \leq C,
\]

Hence,
\[
\left| \int_{\partial D_1 \cap C_r} \psi_2 \cdot \sigma[v_1^1,\bar{p}_1^1] \nu \right| \leq C.
\]

Using Proposition 2.1 again,
\[
\left| \int_{\partial D_1 \cap C_r} \psi_2 \cdot \sigma[w_1^1,q_1^1] - (q_1^1)_{\delta,x'} \nu \right| \leq C.
\]

Therefore, $|a_{11}^{12}| \leq C$.

Next, we prove $a_{11}^{11}$, for another example. Similarly,
\[
|a_{11}^{11}| \leq \left| \int_{\partial D_1 \cap C_r} \psi_3 \cdot \sigma[u_1^1,p_1^1] - (q_1^1)_{\delta,x'} \nu \right| + C,
\]
and

$$\psi_3 \cdot \sigma[u_1, p_1]v |_{\partial D_i \cap \mathcal{C}_n} = \sigma_{31}[u_1, p_1]n_1 + \sigma_{32}[u_1, p_1]n_2 + \sigma_{33}[u_1, p_1]n_3$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + |x'|^2}} \left( \mu(\partial x_1(u_1)^{(3)} + \partial x_3(u_1)^{(1)})x_1 \right.$$

$$\left. + \mu(\partial x_2(u_1)^{(3)} + \partial x_3(u_1)^{(2)})x_2 - 2\mu \partial x_3(u_1)^{(3)} - p_1 \right).$$

By virtue of estimate (4.3),

$$\left| \psi_3 \cdot \sigma[u_1, p_1]v \right| |_{\partial D_i \cap \mathcal{C}_n} \leq \frac{C|x'|}{\delta(x')} + C|x'|.$$

Therefore, in view of \(|\nabla w|^i \leq C, \)

$$\left| \int_{\partial D_i \cap \mathcal{C}_n} \psi_3 \cdot \sigma[u_1, p_1]v \right| \leq \int_{\partial D_i \cap \mathcal{C}_n} \psi_3 \cdot \sigma[v_1, p_1]v \right| + C \leq C.$$

The rest terms can be dealt with by the same way, so we omit the details here. \(\square\)

Now let us prove Proposition 2.6.

Proof of Proposition 2.6. By using the trace theorem, we can prove the boundedness of \(C^a_i, \) similarly as in \([11]\). To solve \(|C^a_1 - C^a_2|, \) we use the first six equations in \([4.40]: \)

$$a_{11}(C_1 - C_2) = f := b_1 - (a_{11} + a_{21})C_2,$$

where \(a_{11} := (a_{11}^{\alpha \beta})_{\alpha, \beta = 1}, \) \(C_i := (C_i^1, \ldots, C_i^6)^T, \) and \(b_1 := (b_1^1, \ldots, b_1^6)^T. \) From \([11], \) the matrix \(a_{11} \) is positive definite. Denote \(\text{cof}(A)_{\alpha \beta} \) by the cofactor of \(A := (a_{11}^{\alpha \beta})_{6 \times 6} \) for simplicity of notation. By Lemma 1.37 and Lemma 1.38 we have

$$\frac{1}{C_\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|^4 \leq \text{det } A \leq \frac{C}{C_\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|^4,$$

and

$$\frac{1}{C_\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|^3 \leq \text{cof}(A)_{\alpha \alpha} \leq \frac{C}{C_\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|^3, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, 5, 6,$$

$$\frac{1}{C_\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|^4 \leq \text{cof}(A)_{33} \leq C |\ln \varepsilon|^4, \quad \frac{1}{C_\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|^4 \leq \text{cof}(A)_{44} \leq \frac{C}{C_\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|^4;$$

$$|\text{cof}(A)_{\alpha \beta}| \leq \frac{C}{C_\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|^2, \quad \alpha, \beta = 1, 2, 5, 6, \alpha \neq \beta,$$

$$|\text{cof}(A)_{33}, |\text{cof}(A)_{3a}| \leq C |\ln \varepsilon|^4, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, 4,$$

$$|\text{cof}(A)_{44}, |\text{cof}(A)_{4a}| \leq \frac{C}{C_\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|^3, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, 5, 6,$$

$$|\text{cof}(A)_{33}, |\text{cof}(A)_{3a}| \leq C |\ln \varepsilon|^3, \quad \alpha = 5, 6.$$

Thus, by Cramer’s rule, we readily obtain

$$|C^a_1 - C^a_2| \leq \frac{C \text{cof}(A)_{\alpha \alpha}}{\text{det } A} \leq \frac{C}{|\ln \varepsilon|}, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, 5, 6,$$

and

$$|C^3_1 - C^3_2| \leq \frac{C}{\text{det } A} |\ln \varepsilon|^4 \leq C \varepsilon, \quad |C^4_1 - C^4_2| \leq \frac{C \text{cof}(A)_{44}}{\text{det } A} \leq C.$$

Proposition 2.6 is proved. \(\square\)
5. Proofs for the Estimates in 2D

The proof of Theorem 1.4 for dimensions two can be achieved by quite analogous arguments as for Theorem 1.1 This section is devoted to presenting the main ingredients, the main differences with the 3D case, and a sketch of the proof of Theorem 1.4.

5.1. Decomposition of the Solution. In dimensions two,

\[ \Psi = \text{span} \left\{ \psi_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \psi_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \psi_3 = \begin{pmatrix} x_2 \\ -x_1 \end{pmatrix} \right\} \]

It follows from \( e(u) = 0 \) that

\[ u = \sum_{i=1}^{3} C_i^\alpha \psi_\alpha, \quad \text{in } D_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \]

where \( C_i^\alpha \) are six free constants to be determined by \( (u, p) \) later. We decompose the solution of (1.8) in 2D as follows:

\[ u(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{2} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{3} C_i^\alpha u_\alpha(x) + u_0(x), \quad p(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{2} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{3} C_i^\alpha p_\alpha(x) + p_0(x), \quad x \in \Omega, \]

(5.1)

where \( u_\alpha, u_0 \in C^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2), p_\alpha, p_0 \in C^1(\Omega) \), respectively, satisfying

\[
\begin{cases}
\nabla \cdot \sigma[u_\alpha, p_\alpha] = 0, & \nabla \cdot u_\alpha = 0, & \text{in } \Omega, \\
\nabla \cdot u_\alpha = \psi_\alpha, & \text{on } \partial D_i, & i = 1, 2, \\
\n u_\alpha = 0, & \text{on } \partial D_j \cup \partial D, & j \neq i,
\end{cases}
\]

(5.2)

and

\[
\begin{cases}
\nabla \cdot \sigma[u_0, p_0] = 0, & \nabla \cdot u_0 = 0, & \text{in } \Omega, \\
u_0 = 0, & \text{on } \partial D_1 \cup \partial D_2, \\
u_0 = \varphi, & \text{on } \partial D.
\end{cases}
\]

(5.3)

As before, we assume, without loss of generality, that \( h_1(x_1) = h_2(x_1) = \frac{1}{2} x_1^2 \) for \( |x_1| \leq R \). Then, the Keller-type function \( k(x) \in C^{2,\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^2) \) becomes

\[ k(x) = \frac{x_2}{\delta(x_1)}, \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}, \]

and \( \|k(x)\|_{C^{2,\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Omega_R)} \leq C \), and satisfies \( k(x) = \frac{1}{2} \) on \( \partial D_1 \), \( k(x) = -\frac{1}{2} \) on \( \partial D_2 \), \( k(x) = 0 \) on \( \partial D \). Clearly,

\[ |k(x)| \leq \frac{1}{2}, \quad \partial_{x_1}k(x) = -\frac{2x_1}{\delta(x_1)}k(x), \quad \partial_{x_2}k(x) = \frac{1}{\delta(x_1)}, \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}. \]

In the following, we only pay attention to the estimates in \( \Omega_{2R} \), as in 3D.
5.2. **Estimates of \( |\nabla u_1| \) and \( |p_1| \).** To estimate \( \nabla u_1 \), we construct \( v_1 \in C^{2,\gamma}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^2) \), such that
\[
v_1 = \left( k(x) + \frac{1}{2} \right) \psi_1 + x_1 \left( k^2(x) - \frac{1}{4} \right) \psi_2, \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R},
\]
and \( \bar{p}_1 \in C^{1,\gamma}(\Omega) \) such that
\[
\bar{p}_1 = \frac{2\mu x_1}{\delta(x_1)} k(x), \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}.
\]
By direct calculations,
\[
\partial_{x_1}(v_1^{(1)}) = \partial_{x_1}k(x) = -\frac{2x_1}{\delta(x_1)} k(x), \quad \partial_{x_2}(v_1^{(1)}) = \partial_{x_2}k(x) = \frac{1}{\delta(x_1)};
\]
and
\[
|\partial_{x_1}(v_1^{(2)})| \leq C, \quad \partial_{x_2}(v_1^{(2)}) = \frac{2x_1}{\delta(x_1)} k(x).
\]
Clearly,
\[
\nabla \cdot v_1 = \partial_{x_1}(v_1^{(1)}) + \partial_{x_2}(v_1^{(2)}) = 0, \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R},
\]
and
\[
\mu \partial_{x_2}(v_1^{(2)}) - \bar{p}_1 = 0, \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}.
\]
By further calculations,
\[
\partial_{x_1x_2}(v_1^{(1)}) = -\frac{2}{\delta(x_1)} k(x) + \frac{8x_1^2}{\delta^2(x_1)} k(x), \quad \partial_{x_1x_2}(v_1^{(1)}) = 0;
\]
\[
|\partial_{x_1x_1}(v_1^{(2)})| \leq \frac{C|x_1|}{\delta(x_1)} \quad \text{and} \quad |\partial_{x_1}(\bar{p}_1)| \leq \frac{C}{\delta(x_1)}.
\]
Therefore
\[
|f_1^1| = |\mu \Delta v_1 - \nabla \bar{p}_1| = \left| \left( \frac{\mu \partial_{x_1x_1}(v_1^{(1)}) - \partial_{x_1}(\bar{p}_1)}{\mu \partial_{x_1x_1}(v_1^{(2)})} \right) \right| \leq \frac{C}{\delta(x_1)}.
\]
So that we have
\[
\int_{\Omega_{z(\epsilon)}} |f_1^1|^2 \ dx \leq \frac{Cs}{\delta(z_1)}.
\]
By virtue of divergence free condition, \((5.8)\), using estimates \((5.9), (5.6)\), and thanks to Lemma \(3.7\) we can prove
\[
\int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_1|^2 \ dx \leq C.
\]
Then, combining with \((5.12)\) and applying the iteration process in Lemma \(4.3\) allows us to show that
\[
\int_{\Omega_{z(\epsilon)}} |\nabla w_1|^2 \ dx \leq C\delta^2(z').
\]
Substituting \((5.13)\) and \((5.11)\) into \((3.10)\), we conclude that the above \( \nabla v_1 \) and \( \bar{p}_1 \) are the main singular terms of \( \nabla u_1 \) and \( p_1 \), respectively.
Proposition 5.1. Let \( u_1^1 \in C^{2,\gamma}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2) \), \( p_1^1 \in C^{1,\gamma}(\Omega) \) be the solution to \( \text{Estimates for Stress Concentration of the Stokes Flow} \). Then we have

\[
\| \nabla (u_1^1 - v_1^1) \|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta/2}(x'))} + \| q_1^1 - (q_1^1)_{\delta,x'} \|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta/2}(x'))} \leq C, \quad x \in \Omega_R.
\]

Consequently, in view of \( (5.6) \) and \( (5.7) \),

\[
\frac{1}{C\delta(x_1)} \leq |\nabla u_1^1| \leq \frac{C}{\delta(x_1)}, \quad x \in \Omega_R;
\]

and

\[
\| p_1^1 - (q_1^1)_{\delta,x_1} \|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta/2}(x_1))} \leq C \left( \frac{|x_1|}{\delta(x_1)} + 1 \right), \quad x \in \Omega_R.
\]

Since the proof of Proposition 5.1 is standard, like for Proposition 2.4 in 3D, we omit the details here.

5.3. Estimates of \( |\nabla u_2^2| \) and \( |p_2^2| \). To estimate \( u_2^2 \), we construct \( v_1^2 \in C^{2,\gamma}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2) \), such that

\[
v_1^2 = \psi_2 \left( k(x) + \frac{1}{2} \right) + \frac{6}{\delta(x_1)} \left( \psi_1 x_1 + \psi_2 x_2 \left( \frac{2x_1^2}{\delta(x_1)} - \frac{1}{3} \right) \right) \left( k^2(x) - \frac{1}{4} \right), \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R},
\]

(5.14)

and choose \( \bar{p}_1^2 \in C^{1,\gamma}(\Omega) \) such that

\[
\bar{p}_1^2 = -\frac{3\mu}{\delta^2(x_1)} + \frac{18\mu}{\delta(x_1)} \left( \frac{2x_1^2}{\delta(x_1)} - \frac{1}{3} \right) k^2(x), \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}.
\]

(5.15)

A direct calculation yields

\[
\partial_{x_1}(v_1^2)^{(1)} = 6 \left( \frac{1}{\delta(x_1)} - \frac{2x_1^2}{\delta^2(x_1)} \right) \left( k^2(x) - \frac{1}{4} \right) - \frac{24x_1^2}{\delta^2(x_1)} k^2(x),
\]

(5.16)

\[
\partial_{x_2}(v_1^2)^{(1)} = \frac{12x_1}{\delta^2(x_1)} k^2(x),
\]

(5.17)

\[
\partial_{x_1}(v_1^2)^{(2)} = 3 \left( -\frac{3x_1}{\delta(x_1)} + \frac{4x_1^3}{\delta^3(x_1)} \right) k(x) + 12 \left( \frac{3x_1}{\delta(x_1)} - \frac{8x_1^3}{\delta^3(x_1)} \right) k^3(x),
\]

(5.18)

and

\[
\partial_{x_2}(v_1^2)^{(2)} = \frac{1}{\delta(x_1)} + 6 \left( \frac{6x_1^2}{\delta^2(x_1)} - \frac{1}{\delta(x_1)} \right) k^2(x) - \frac{1}{2\delta(x_1)} \left( \frac{6x_1^2}{\delta(x_1)} - 1 \right).
\]

(5.19)

Thus, it is obvious that

\[
\nabla \cdot v_1^2 = 0, \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R},
\]

and

\[
\mu \partial_{x_2}(v_1^2)^{(2)} - \bar{p}_1^2 = \frac{3\mu}{2\delta(x_1)} + \frac{3\mu}{\delta^2(x_1)} (1 - x_1^2),
\]

which directly implies that

\[
\mu \partial_{x_2x_2}(v_1^2)^{(2)} - \partial_{x_2} \bar{p}_1^2 = 0.
\]

On the other hand,

\[
\partial_{x_2} \bar{p}_1^2 = \frac{12\mu x_1}{\delta^3(x_1)} - \frac{36\mu x_1}{\delta^2(x_1)} \left( \frac{8x_1^2}{\delta(x_1)} - 3 \right) k^2(x).
\]
Then we have
\[
\left| \mu \partial_{xx} (\mathbf{v}_1^2) - \partial_{x_1} \mathbf{p}_1^2 \right| = \left| \frac{36 \mu x_1}{\delta^2(x_1)} \left( \frac{8x_1^2}{\delta(x_1)} - 3 \right) k^2(x) \right| \leq \frac{C|x_1|}{\delta^2(x_1)},
\]
which is smaller than \( |\partial_{xx} (\mathbf{v}_1^2)| \). The following estimates are also needed:
\[
\frac{1}{C \delta(x_1)} \leq |\partial_{x_1} (\mathbf{v}_1^2)|, \quad |\partial_{x_2} (\mathbf{v}_1^2)| \leq \frac{C|x_1|}{\delta(x_1)},
\]
(5.20)
and
\[
\frac{1}{C \delta(x_1)} \leq |\partial_{x_1} (\mathbf{v}_1^2)|, \quad |\partial_{x_1,x_1} (\mathbf{v}_1^2)| \leq \frac{C|x_1|}{\delta(x_1)},
\]
(5.21)
Therefore, we have
\[
|\mu \Delta \mathbf{v}_1^2 - \nabla \mathbf{p}_1^2| = \left| \left( \mu \Delta (\mathbf{v}_1^2)^{(1)} - \partial_{x_1} \mathbf{p}_1^2 \right) \right| \leq \frac{C|x_1|}{\delta^2(x_1)}.
\]
We use the integration by parts with respect to \( x_3 \), as in Lemma 4.5 and the same argument to prove Proposition 2.3 to obtain

**Proposition 5.2.** Let \( \mathbf{u}_1^2 \in C^{2,\gamma}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2) \), \( \mathbf{p}_1^2 \in C^{1,\gamma}(\Omega) \) be the solution to (5.23).
Then we have
\[
\| \nabla (\mathbf{u}_1^2 - \mathbf{v}_1^2) \|_{L^\infty(\Omega \setminus \{x_3 = 0\})} + \| q_1^2 - (q_1^2)_{x_3} \|_{L^\infty(\Omega \setminus \{x_3 = 0\})} \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{\delta(x_1)}} \quad x \in \Omega_R.
\]
Consequently, in view of (5.20) and (5.21),
\[
\frac{1}{C \delta(x_1)} \leq |\nabla \mathbf{u}_1^2| \leq C \left( \frac{1}{\delta(x_1)} + \frac{|x_1|}{\delta^2(x_1)} \right), \quad x \in \Omega_R;
\]
and
\[
\| p_1^2 - (q_1^2)_{x_3} \|_{L^\infty(\Omega \setminus \{x_3 = 0\})} \leq \frac{C}{\delta^2(x_1)} \quad x \in \Omega_R.
\]

5.4. Estimate of \( |\nabla \mathbf{u}_1^3| \) and \( |\mathbf{p}_1^3| \). For \( \mathbf{u}_1^3 \), we construct \( \mathbf{v}_1^3 \in C^{2,\gamma}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2) \), such that
\[
\mathbf{v}_1^3 = \psi_3 \left( k(x) + \frac{1}{2} \right) + \left( 1 - \frac{4x_1^2}{\delta(x_1)} - 5x_2 k(x) \right) \left( 2x_1 k(x) \left( 2 - \frac{4x_1^2}{\delta(x_1)} - 3x_2 k(x) \right) \right) \left( k^2(x) - \frac{1}{4} \right), \quad x \in \Omega_{2R},
\]
and choose \( \mathbf{p}_1^3 \in C^{1,\gamma}(\Omega) \) such that
\[
\mathbf{p}_1^3 = \frac{2 \mu x_1}{\delta^2(x_1)} + \frac{12 \mu x_1}{\delta(x_1)} \left( 1 - \frac{2x_1^2}{\delta(x_1)} \right) k^2(x), \quad x \in \Omega_{2R}.
\]
By careful calculations,
\[
\partial_{x_1} (\mathbf{v}_1^3)^{(1)} = -\frac{9x_1}{2} k^2(x) + 12 \left( \frac{-x_1}{\delta(x_1)} + \frac{2x_1^3}{\delta^2(x_1)} \right) k^2(x) + 30x_1 k^4(x)
\]
\[
+ 2 \left( \frac{x_1}{\delta(x_1)} - \frac{x_1^3}{\delta^2(x_1)} \right),
\]
(5.22)
Consequently, \( \partial_{x_2}(v_1^3)^{(1)} = \frac{9}{2}k(x) + 2\left( \frac{1}{\delta(x_1)} - \frac{4x_1^2}{\delta^2(x_1)} \right) k(x) - 20k^3(x) + \frac{1}{2} \), \( \partial_{x_1}(v_1^3)^{(2)} = -2k(x) - \frac{1}{2} + 2\left( \frac{5x_1^2}{\delta(x_1)} - \frac{4x_1^4}{\delta^2(x_1)} \right) k(x) + \frac{3x_2}{2}k^2(x) + (4 - 6x_1^2) - \frac{52x_1^3}{\delta(x_1)} + \frac{64x_1^4}{\delta^2(x_1)} k^3(x) + 48x_1^7k^5(x) \), \( \partial_{x_2}(v_1^3)^{(2)} = -\frac{2x_1}{\delta(x_1)} + \frac{9x_1^3}{2}k^2(x) + \frac{2x_1^3}{\delta^2(x_1)} + 12\left( \frac{x_1}{\delta(x_1)} - \frac{2x_1^3}{\delta^2(x_1)} \right) k^2(x) - 30x_1k^4(x) \).

Thus, \( \nabla \cdot v_1^3 = \partial_{x_1}(v_1^3)^{(1)} + \partial_{x_2}(v_1^3)^{(2)} = 0 \), in \( \Omega_{2R} \).

But, at this moment, we not only have no \( \mu \partial_{x_2}(v_1^3)^{(2)} - \partial_{x_2}p_1^3 = 0 \), even \( \mu \partial_{x_2x_2}(v_1^3)^{(2)} - \partial_{x_2x_1}p_1^3 = 0 \). Indeed, we only have the following upper bounds:

\[ \left| \mu \partial_{x_2x_2}(v_1^3)^{(2)} - \partial_{x_2}p_1^3 \right| = \left| \frac{18x_1x_2}{\delta^2(x_1)} - \frac{120x_1x_2^2}{\delta^4(x_1)} \right| \leq \frac{C|x_1|}{\delta(x_1)}, \]

and

\[ \left| \mu \partial_{x_2x_2}(v_1^3)^{(1)} - \partial_{x_1}p_1^3 \right| = \left| \frac{9\mu}{2\delta(x_1)} - \frac{72\mu x_2^2}{\delta^3(x_1)} + \frac{144\mu x_2^2}{\delta^4(x_1)} - \frac{192\mu x_2^2}{\delta^5(x_1)} \right| \leq \frac{C}{\delta(x_1)}. \]

Furthermore,

\[ \left| \partial_{x_1x_1}(v_1^3)^{(1)} \right| \leq \frac{C}{\delta(x_1)}, \quad \left| \partial_{x_1x_1}(v_1^3)^{(2)} \right| \leq \frac{C|x_1|}{\delta(x_1)}. \]

Therefore,

\[ \left| \mu \Delta v_1^3 - \nabla p_1^3 \right| \leq \frac{C}{\delta(x_1)}, \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}. \]

Then, making use of the integration method in Lemma 4.6 by a routine process as before, we have

**Proposition 5.3.** Let \( u_0^3 \in C^{2,\gamma}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2) \), \( p_0^3 \in C^{1,\gamma}(\Omega) \) be the solution to \( \text{(5.22)}. \) Then

\[ \| \nabla(u_i^3 - v_i^3) \|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{4/3}(x'))} + \| q_i^3 - (q_i^3)^{\delta; x'} \|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{4/3}(x'))} \leq C, \quad \text{in } \Omega_R. \]

Consequently,

\[ \| \nabla u_i^3 \| \leq \frac{C}{\delta(x_1)}, \quad \text{and } \| p_i^3 - (p_i^3)^{\delta; x_1} \|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{4/3}(x_1))} \leq \frac{C|x_1|}{\delta^2(x_1)}, \quad x \in \Omega_R. \]

Similar to Proposition 2.5

**Proposition 5.4.** Let \( u_0, u_i^\alpha \in C^{2,\gamma}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2) \), \( p_0, p_i^\alpha \in C^{1,\gamma}(\Omega) \) be the solution to \( \text{(5.2)} \) and \( \text{(5.3)} \). Then

\[ \| \nabla u_0 \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \| p_0 \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C; \]

and

\[ \| \nabla(u_i^\alpha + u_2^\alpha) \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \| p_i^\alpha + p_2^\alpha \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C. \]
5.5. Estimates for $C_i$. Instead of (4.10), we have
\[
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3} C_i^\alpha a^{\alpha}_1 + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{3} C_i^\alpha a^{\alpha}_2 - b^\beta_1 &= 0, \\
\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3} C_i^\alpha a^{\alpha}_1 + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{3} C_i^\alpha a^{\alpha}_2 - b^\beta_2 &= 0.
\end{aligned}
\]  \tag{5.26}

First, for $a^{\alpha\beta}_1$,

**Lemma 5.5.** We have
\[
\frac{1}{C} \leq a^{11}_1 \leq C, \quad \frac{1}{C \varepsilon^{3/2}} \leq a^{22}_1 \leq C, \quad \frac{1}{C \varepsilon} \leq a^{33}_1 \leq C; \tag{5.27}
\]
\[
|a^{12}_1| = |a^{21}_1| \leq C |\ln \varepsilon|, \quad |a^{13}_1| = |a^{31}_1| \leq C, \quad |a^{23}_1| = |a^{32}_1| \leq C |\ln \varepsilon|, \tag{5.28}
\]
\[
|a^{11}_1 + a^{12}_1, |a^{11}_1 + a^{12}_1, |a^{11}_1 + a^{12}_1| \leq C; \tag{5.29}
\]
\[
|b^\beta_1| \leq C, \quad \beta = 1, 2, 3. \tag{5.30}
\]

**Proof.** (i) **Proof of (5.27).** For $a^{11}_1$, it follows from (4.44) and Proposition 5.11 that
\[
a^{11}_1 \leq C \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_1|^2 \, dx \leq C \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\delta^2(x_1)} \, dx + C \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{3/2}}.
\]
On the other hand, on account of (5.6) and Proposition 5.11 we derive
\[
a^{11}_1 \geq \frac{1}{C} \int_{\Omega} |e(u_1)|^2 \, dx \geq \frac{1}{C} \int_{\Omega} |\partial_{x_2}(v^{1(1)}_1)|^2 \, dx - C \geq \frac{1}{C} \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\delta^2(x_1)} \, dx - C \geq \frac{1}{C \varepsilon^{3/2}}.
\]

For $a^{22}_1$, from Proposition 5.2, we have
\[
a^{22}_1 \leq C \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_2|^2 \, dx \leq C \int_{\Omega} \left( \frac{1}{\delta(x_1)} + \frac{|x_1|}{\delta^2(x_1)} \right)^2 \, dx + C \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{3/2}}.
\]

For the lower bound, first employing the triangle inequality,
\[
a^{22}_1 \geq \frac{1}{C} \int_{\Omega} |e(u_2)|^2 \, dx \geq \frac{1}{C} \int_{\Omega} |\partial_{x_2}(v^{2(1)}_1) + \partial_{x_2}(w^{2(1)}_1)|^2 \, dx
\]
\[
\geq \frac{1}{C} \int_{\Omega} |\partial_{x_2}(v^{2(1)}_1)|^2 \, dx - \frac{2}{C} \int_{\Omega} |\partial_{x_2}(v^{2(1)}_1)||\partial_{x_2}(w^{2(1)}_1)| \, dx.
\]

Using (5.21),
\[
\int_{\Omega} |\partial_{x_2}(v^{2(1)}_1)|^2 \, dx \geq \frac{1}{C} \int_{\Omega} \frac{x_2^2}{\delta^3(x_1)} \, dx \geq \frac{1}{C} \int_{|x_1|<R} \frac{x_2^2}{\delta^3(x_1)} \, dx \geq \frac{1}{C} \int_{0}^{R} \frac{r^2}{(\varepsilon + r^2)^3} \, dr \geq \frac{1}{C \varepsilon^{3/2}} \int_{0}^{R} \frac{r^2}{(1 + r^2)^3} \, dr \geq \frac{1}{C \varepsilon^{3/2}}.
\]

while, by virtue of Proposition 5.2
\[
\int_{\Omega} |\partial_{x_2}(v^{2(1)}_1)||\partial_{x_2}(w^{2(1)}_1)| \, dx \leq \int_{\Omega} \frac{|x_1|}{\delta^3(x_1)} \, dx \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}.
\]

Hence, $a^{22}_1 \geq \frac{1}{C \varepsilon^{3/2}}$. 
For $a_{11}^{33}$, using Proposition 5.3
\[ a_{11}^{33} \leq C \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 dx \leq C \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\delta^2(x_1)} dx + C \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}. \]

For the lower bound, in view of (5.23) and Proposition 5.3,
\[ a_{11}^{33} \geq \frac{1}{C} \int_{\Omega_R} |\partial_x u(\psi^{(1)})|^2 dx - C \geq \frac{1}{C} \int_{\Omega_R} \frac{4x_2^2}{\delta^4(x_1)} \left(1 - \frac{4x_2^2}{\delta(x_1)}\right)^2 dx - C \]
\[ \geq \frac{1}{C} \int_{|x_1| < \varepsilon} \frac{1}{\delta(x_1)} dx - C \geq \frac{1}{C} \sqrt{\varepsilon}. \]

Thus, estimate (5.27) is proved.

(ii) Proof of (5.28) – (5.30). To prove (5.28), for the reader's convenience, we put the matrix $\sigma[u, p]$ here:
\[ \sigma[u, p] = 2\mu e(u) - p I = \begin{pmatrix} 2\mu \partial_x u^{(1)} - p & \mu(\partial_x u^{(1)} + \partial_x u^{(2)}) \\ \mu(\partial_x u^{(1)} + \partial_x u^{(2)}) & 2\mu \partial_x u^{(2)} - p \end{pmatrix}. \]

Define the cylinder $C_r$ by
\[ C_r := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \ | \ |x_1| < r, \ |x_2| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{r^2}{2} \right\}. \]

Note that the unit normal vector on $\partial D_1 \cap C_R$ is
\[ \nu = (n_1, n_2) = \left( \frac{x_1}{\sqrt{1 + x_1^2}}, \frac{-1}{\sqrt{1 + x_1^2}} \right). \]

Then, for $a_{11}^{12}$,
\[ \psi_2 \cdot \sigma[u_1, p_1]|_{\partial D_1 \cap C_R} = \sigma_{21}[u_1^1, p_1^1] n_1 + \sigma_{22}[u_1^1, p_1^1] n_2 \]
\[ = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + x_1^2}} (\mu(\partial_x u^{(1)} - p) x_1 + 2\mu \partial_x u^{(2)} x_1 + \mu \partial_x u^{(2)} + p). \]

It follows from (5.3) – (5.7) that
\[ \left| \psi_2 \cdot \sigma[v_1, p_1]|_{\partial D_1 \cap C_R} \right| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + x_1^2}} \left| \mu x_1 \left( \frac{1}{\delta(x_1)} + \frac{x_2^2}{\delta^2(x_1)} - \frac{4x_2^2}{\delta^3(x_1)} \right) \right| \]
\[ \leq C \left( 1 + \frac{|x_1|}{\delta(x_1)} \right). \]

By virtue of Proposition 5.1, we derive
\[ |a_{11}^{12}| \leq \int_{\partial D_1 \cap C_R} \psi_2 \cdot \sigma[v_1, p_1]|_{\partial D_1 \cap C_R} dx + C \int_{|x_1| < R} \frac{|x_1|}{\delta(x_1)} dx + C |\ln \varepsilon|. \]

For $a_{11}^{13}$,
\[ \psi_3 \cdot \sigma[u_1, p_1]|_{\partial D_1 \cap C_R} = n_1 (x_2 \sigma_{11}[u_1, p_1] - x_1 \sigma_{21}[u_1, p_1]) + n_2 (x_2 \sigma_{12}[u_1, p_1] - x_1 \sigma_{22}[u_1, p_1]) \]
\[ = \frac{x_1}{\sqrt{1 + x_1^2}} (9x_1^2 (2\mu \partial_x u^{(1)} + \partial_x u^{(2)}) - \mu x_1 (\partial_x u^{(1)} + \partial_x u^{(2)}) - 2\mu \partial_x u^{(2)} - p) \]
\[ - \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + x_1^2}} (\mu x_1 (\partial_x u^{(1)} + \partial_x u^{(2)}) - 2\mu \partial_x u^{(2)} - p). \]
Using (5.4)–(5.7) again, we deduce
\[ |\varphi_3 \cdot \sigma[v_1^1, p_1^1] \nu|_{\partial \Omega, c_C R} \leq C. \]

Employing Proposition 5.1. again, yields
\[ |a_{11}^{13}| \leq \int_{\partial \Omega, c_C R} |\varphi_3 \cdot \sigma[v_1^1, p_1^1] \nu| + C \leq C. \]

For \( a_{11}^{23} \), we use the volume integral, instead of the boundary integral,
\[
a_{11}^{23} = \int_{\Omega_R} (2\mu e(u_1^2), e(u_1^3)) \, dx + C
= \int_{\Omega_R} (2\mu e(v_1^2), e(v_1^3)) \, dx + \int_{\Omega_R} (2\mu e(v_1^2), e(w_1^3)) \, dx
+ \int_{\Omega_R} (2\mu e(w_1^2), e(v_1^3)) \, dx + \int_{\Omega_R} (2\mu e(w_1^2), e(w_1^3)) \, dx + C
=: III_1 + III_2 + III_3 + III_4 + C. \]

By using (5.11) and (5.19) and (5.22)–(5.24),
\[ |III_1| \leq C. \]

It follows from Proposition 5.2 and Proposition 5.3 that
\[ |III_2| \leq C \int_{\Omega_R} \frac{|x_1|}{\delta^2(x_1)} \, dx \leq C |\ln \varepsilon|, \quad |III_3| \leq C \int_{\Omega_R} \frac{1}{\delta^{3/2}(x_1)} \, dx \leq C |\ln \varepsilon|, \quad |III_4| \leq C. \]

So \( |a_{11}^{23}| \leq C |\ln \varepsilon| \). Thus, (5.28) is proved.

(iii) The proofs of (5.29) and (5.30) are easy. We omit the details here. The Lemma is proved. \( \square \)

**Proposition 5.6.** Let \( C_1^\alpha \) be defined in (5.1). Then
\[ |C_1^\alpha| \leq C, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, 3, \]
and
\[ |C_1^1 - C_2^1| \leq C \varepsilon, \quad |C_1^2 - C_2^2| \leq C \varepsilon^{3/2}, \quad |C_1^3 - C_2^3| \leq C \sqrt{\varepsilon}. \]

**Proof.** First, by using the trace theorem, we can prove the boundedness of \( C_1^\alpha \), similarly as in [10]. To solve \( |C_1^1 - C_2^1| \), we use the first three equations:
\[
a_{11}(C_1 - C_2) = f := b_1 - (a_{11} + a_{21})C_2, \]
where \( a_{ij} := (a_{ij}^\alpha)^{\alpha, \beta = 1}, C_1 := (C_1^1, C_1^2, C_1^3)^T \), and \( b_1 := (b_1^1, b_1^2, b_1^3)^T \). It is known from [10] that the matrix \( a_{11} = (a_{11}^3)^{\alpha, \beta = 1} \) is positive definite. By virtue of Cramer’s rule and Lemma 5.5, we obtain
\[
|C_1^1 - C_2^1| = \left| \frac{1}{\det a_{11}} \begin{vmatrix} a_{11}^{22} & a_{11}^{23} \\ a_{11}^{32} & a_{11}^{33} \end{vmatrix} - f^1 \begin{vmatrix} a_{11}^{22} & a_{11}^{23} \\ a_{11}^{32} & a_{11}^{33} \end{vmatrix} + f^2 \begin{vmatrix} a_{11}^{22} & a_{11}^{23} \\ a_{11}^{32} & a_{11}^{33} \end{vmatrix} f^3 \begin{vmatrix} a_{11}^{22} & a_{11}^{23} \\ a_{11}^{32} & a_{11}^{33} \end{vmatrix} \right|
\leq C \varepsilon^{5/2} \left( |f^1| a_{11}^{22} a_{11}^{33} + |f^2| a_{11}^{12} a_{11}^{13} + |f^3| a_{11}^{22} a_{11}^{33} \right)
\leq C \varepsilon^{5/2} \left( |f|^1 \varepsilon^{-2} + |f^2| \varepsilon^{-1/2} |\ln \varepsilon| + |f^3| \varepsilon^{-3/2} \right) \leq C \sqrt{\varepsilon}. \]

Similarly,
\[ |C_1^2 - C_2^2| \leq C \varepsilon^{3/2}, \quad |C_1^3 - C_2^3| \leq C \sqrt{\varepsilon}. \]
Thus, the proof is finished. □

5.6. The Completion of the Proof of Theorem 1.4. Now let us complete the proof of Theorem 1.4.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. We rewrite (5.1) as

$$ \nabla u = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{3} (C_1^\alpha - C_2^\alpha) \nabla u_1^\alpha + \nabla u_b, \quad \text{and} \quad p = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{3} (C_1^\alpha - C_2^\alpha) p_1^\alpha + p_b, \quad \text{in} \ \Omega, $$

where

$$ u_b := \sum_{\alpha=1}^{3} C_2^\alpha (u_1^\alpha + u_2^\alpha), \quad p_b := \sum_{\alpha=1}^{3} C_2^\alpha (p_1^\alpha + p_2^\alpha) + p_0 $$

which are bounded since $u_1^\alpha + u_2^\alpha = \psi_\alpha$ on $\partial D_1 \cup \partial D_2$. Then by virtue of Lemma 5.5 and Propositions 5.1–5.3,

$$ |\nabla u(x)| \leq \sum_{\alpha=1}^{3} |(C_1^\alpha - C_2^\alpha) \nabla u_1^\alpha(x)| + C $$

$$ \leq \frac{C\sqrt{\varepsilon}}{\delta(x_1)} + C\varepsilon^{3/2} \left( \frac{1}{\delta(x_1)} + \frac{|x_1|}{\delta^2(x_1)} \right) + \frac{C\sqrt{\varepsilon}}{\varepsilon + x_1^2}. $$

(5.31)

For $|p|$, similarly,

$$ |p(x) - (q)_{\delta,x}| \leq \sum_{\alpha=1}^{3} |(C_1^\alpha - C_2^\alpha) (p_1^\alpha(x) - (q_1^\alpha)_{\delta,x'})| + C $$

$$ \leq C\sqrt{\varepsilon} \left( \frac{|x_1|}{\delta(x_1)} + 1 \right) + \frac{C\varepsilon^{3/2}}{\delta^2(x_1)} + \frac{C\sqrt{\varepsilon}|x_1|}{\delta^2(x_1)} \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon + x_1^2}. $$

(5.32)

Thus, Theorem 1.4 is proved. □

6. The Proof of Theorem 1.5. Lower Bounds

In this section, we prove the lower bounds of $\nabla u$ on the segment $P_1P_2$ in dimensions two and three, following the method in [36]. Recalling that $(u^*, p^*)$ verifies (1.12), we decompose

$$ u^* = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{d(d+1)/2} C_{*\alpha} u_{i*}^{\alpha} + u_0^*, \quad \text{and} \quad p^* = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{d(d+1)/2} C_{*\alpha} p^{\alpha*} + p_0^*, $$

where $(u^{*\alpha}, p^{*\alpha})$ satisfies

$$ \begin{cases} \nabla \cdot \sigma [u^{*\alpha}, p^{*\alpha}] = 0, & \nabla \cdot u^{*\alpha} = 0, \quad \text{in} \ \Omega_0, \\ u^{*\alpha} = \psi_\alpha, & \text{on} \ \partial D_1^0 \cup \partial D_2^0, \\ u^{*\alpha} = 0, & \text{on} \ \partial D, \end{cases} $$

(6.1)

and $(u_0^*, p_0^*)$ satisfies

$$ \begin{cases} \nabla \cdot \sigma [u_0^*, p_0^*] = 0, & \nabla \cdot u_0^* = 0, \quad \text{in} \ \Omega_0, \\ u_0^* = 0, & \text{on} \ \partial D_1^0 \cup \partial D_2^0, \\ u_0^* = \varphi, & \text{on} \ \partial D. \end{cases} $$

(6.2)
In view of the definition of the blow-up factors (1.11), we define, similarly,
\[ \tilde{b}_j^\beta := \int_{\partial D_j} \psi_\beta \cdot \sigma[u_b, p_b] \nu, \]  
(6.3)
where
\[ u_b := \sum_{\alpha=1}^{d(d+1)/2} C_2^\alpha u^\alpha + u_0, \quad p_b := \sum_{\alpha=1}^{d(d+1)/2} C_2^\alpha p^\alpha + p_0, \]
and
\[ u^\alpha := u_1^\alpha + u_2^\alpha, \quad p^\alpha := p_1^\alpha + p_2^\alpha \]
satisfies
\[ \begin{cases} \nabla \cdot \sigma[u^\alpha, p^\alpha] = 0, & \nabla \cdot u^\alpha = 0, \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ u^\alpha = \psi_\alpha, & \text{on } \partial D_1 \cup \partial D_2, \\ u^\alpha = 0, & \text{on } \partial D, \end{cases} \]  
(6.4)
and \((u_0, p_0)\) satisfies
\[ \begin{cases} \nabla \cdot \sigma[u_0, p_0] = 0, & \nabla \cdot u_0 = 0, \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_0 = 0, & \text{on } \partial D_1 \cup \partial D_2, \\ u_0 = \varphi, & \text{on } \partial D. \end{cases} \]  
(6.5)

Then, comparing (1.11) with (6.3), we have

**Proposition 6.1.** For \( \beta = 1, \ldots, d(d+1)/2 \), we have the following assertions:

(i) If \( d = 2 \),
\[ |\tilde{b}_1^\beta | \varphi - \tilde{b}_1^\alpha | \varphi| \leq C \sqrt{\varepsilon}; \]  
(6.6)
(ii) If \( d = 3 \),
\[ |\tilde{b}_1^\beta | \varphi - \tilde{b}_1^\alpha | \varphi| \leq \frac{C}{|\ln \varepsilon|}. \]  
(6.7)

To prove Proposition 6.1, we need the convergence of \( u^\alpha, p^\alpha, u_0, p_0 \) and \( C_2^\alpha \).

Set\[ \rho_2^\alpha(\varepsilon) := \epsilon^{1/2}, \quad \alpha = 1, 3, \quad \rho_2^\alpha(\varepsilon) := \epsilon^{1/4}, \quad \alpha = 2, \quad \rho_3^\alpha(\varepsilon) := \epsilon^{1/2}, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, 5, 6, \quad \rho_3^\alpha(\varepsilon) := \epsilon^{1/4}, \quad \alpha = 3, \quad \rho_3^\alpha(\varepsilon) := \epsilon^{2/3}, \quad \alpha = 4. \]

6.1. Convergence of \( u_1^\alpha \) and \( p_1^\alpha \). For \( \alpha = 1, \ldots, d(d+1)/2 \), let us define \( (u_1^\alpha, p_1^\alpha) \) satisfying
\[ \begin{cases} \nabla \cdot \sigma[u_1^\alpha, p_1^\alpha] = 0, & \nabla \cdot u_1^\alpha = 0, \quad \text{in } \Omega^0, \\ u_1^\alpha = \psi_\alpha, & \text{on } \partial D_1^0 \setminus \{0\}, \\ u_1^\alpha = 0, & \text{on } \partial D_2^0 \cup \partial D. \end{cases} \]  
(6.8)

For each \( \alpha \), we will prove that \( u_1^\alpha \to u_1^\alpha \) when \( \varepsilon \to 0 \), with proper convergence rates.

We define the auxiliary function \( k^*(x) \) as the limit of \( k(x) \) as \( \varepsilon \to 0 \). Namely, \( k^*(x) = \frac{1}{2} \) on \( \partial D_1^0 \), \( k^*(x) = -\frac{1}{2} \) on \( \partial D_2^0 \cup \partial D \) and
\[ k^*(x) = \frac{x_d}{|x'|^2}, \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}, \quad \|k^*(x)\|_{C^2(\Omega^0 \setminus \Omega_{2R})} \leq C, \]
where \( \Omega^0 := \{(x', x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid -\frac{|x'|^2}{2} < x_d < \frac{|x'|^2}{2}, \quad |x'| < r \}, \quad r < R. \)

Then
Lemma 6.2. Let \((u_1^\alpha, p_1^\alpha)\) and \((u_1^{\ast\alpha}, p_1^{\ast\alpha})\) satisfy (2.3) and (6.3), respectively. Then the following boundary estimates hold

\[
|\nabla(u_1^\alpha - u_1^{\ast\alpha})(x)|_{x \in \partial D} + |(p_1^\alpha - p_1^{\ast\alpha})(x)|_{x \in \partial D} \leq C \rho_D^2(\varepsilon). \tag{6.9}
\]

Proof. Notice that \((u_1^\alpha - u_1^{\ast\alpha}, p_1^\alpha - p_1^{\ast\alpha})\) satisfies

\[
\begin{cases}
\nabla \cdot \sigma[u_1^\alpha - u_1^{\ast\alpha}, p_1^\alpha - p_1^{\ast\alpha}] = 0, & \text{in } V := D \setminus (D_1 \cup D_2 \cup D_1^0 \cup D_2^0), \\
\nabla \cdot (u_1^\alpha - u_1^{\ast\alpha}) = 0, & \text{in } V, \\
u_1^\alpha - u_1^{\ast\alpha} = \psi_\alpha - u_1^{\ast\alpha}, & \text{on } \partial D_1 \setminus D_1^0, \\
u_1^\alpha - u_1^{\ast\alpha} = -u_1^{\ast\alpha}, & \text{on } \partial D_2 \setminus D_2^0, \\
u_1^\alpha - u_1^{\ast\alpha} = u_1^{\ast\alpha} - \psi_\alpha, & \text{on } \partial D_1^0 \setminus (D_1 \cup \{0\}), \\
u_1^\alpha - u_1^{\ast\alpha} = u_1^{\ast\alpha}, & \text{on } \partial D_2^0 \setminus D_2, \\
u_1^\alpha - u_1^{\ast\alpha} = 0, & \text{on } \partial D.
\end{cases}
\]

We will prove the case that \(\alpha = 1\) in 3D for instance, since the other cases are similar.

If \(x \in \partial D_1 \setminus D_1^0 \subset \Omega_0 \setminus \Omega_R^0\), then we notice that the point \((x', x_3 - \varepsilon/2) \in \Omega^0 \setminus \Omega_R^0\). By using mean value theorem,

\[
|(u_1^1 - u_1^{\ast 1})(x', x_3)| = |(\psi_1 - u_1^{\ast 1})(x', x_3)| = |u_1^{\ast 1}(x', x_3 - \varepsilon/2) - u_1^{\ast 1}(x', x_3)| \leq C \varepsilon. \tag{6.10}
\]

Let

\[
C_\varepsilon := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d \left| x' < r, \frac{\varepsilon}{3} - r^2 \leq x_d \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3} + r^2 \right. \right\}, \quad r < R.
\]

If \(x \in \partial D_1 \setminus \partial D_1^0 \setminus (D_2 \cup C_{\varepsilon})\), where \(0 < \theta < 1\) is some constant to be determined later, then by mean value theorem and Proposition 2.1, we have

\[
|(u_1^1 - u_1^{\ast 1})(x', x_3)| \leq \frac{C \varepsilon}{\varepsilon + |x'|^2} \leq C \varepsilon^{1 - 2\theta}. \tag{6.11}
\]

Similarly, for \(x \in \partial D_2 \setminus D_2^0\),

\[
|(u_1^1 - u_1^{\ast 1})(x', x_3)| \leq C \varepsilon, \tag{6.12}
\]

and for \(x \in \partial D_2^0 \setminus (D_2 \cup C_{\varepsilon})\), we have

\[
|(u_1^1 - u_1^{\ast 1})(x', x_3)| \leq C \varepsilon^{1 - 2\theta}. \tag{6.13}
\]

Define another auxiliary function

\[
v_1^{\ast 1} = \psi_1 \left( k^*(x) + \frac{1}{2} \right) + u_3 x_3 \left( (k^*(x))^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right), \quad \text{in } \Omega_2^\ast R^0,
\]

and \(\|v_1^{\ast 1}\|_{C^2(\Omega^0 \setminus \Omega_R^0)} \leq C\). Recalling (6.7), we have

\[
|\partial_{x_3}(v_1^1 - v_1^{\ast 1})| \leq \frac{C \varepsilon}{|x'|^2 (\varepsilon + |x'|^2)}.
\]

For \(x \in \Omega_R^0\) with \(|x'| = \varepsilon^\theta\), it follows from Proposition 2.1 that

\[
|\partial_{x_3}(u_1^1 - u_1^{\ast 1})(x', x_3)| \leq |\partial_{x_3}(u_1^1 - v_1^1) + \partial_{x_3}(v_1^1 - v_1^{\ast 1}) + \partial_{x_3}(v_1^{\ast 1} - u_1^{\ast 1})|(x', x_3) \leq C \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{4\theta - 1}} \right). \tag{6.14}
\]
Thus, for $x \in \Omega^0_R$ with $|x'| = \varepsilon^{\theta}$, by using the triangle inequality, (6.13), the mean value theorem, and (6.14),

$$|(u_1^1 - u_1^{*1})(x', x_3)| \leq |(u_1^1 - u_1^{*1})(x', x_3) - (u_1^1 - u_1^{*1})(x', -h_2(x'))| + C\varepsilon^{1-2\theta}$$

$$\leq |\partial_{x_3}(u_1^1 - u_1^{*1})| \cdot (h_1(x') + h_2(x'))|_{|x'|=\varepsilon^{\theta}} + C\varepsilon^{1-2\theta}$$

$$\leq C \left(1 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{4\theta-1}}\right)\varepsilon^{2\theta} + C\varepsilon^{1-2\theta} = C \left(\varepsilon^{2\theta} + \varepsilon^{1-2\theta}\right). \quad (6.15)$$

By taking $2\theta = 1 - 2\theta$, we get $\theta = \frac{1}{4}$. Substituting it into (6.11), (6.13) and (6.15), and using (6.10), (6.12), and $u_1^1 - u_1^{*1} = 0$ on $\partial D$, we obtain

$$|u_1^1 - u_1^{*1}| \leq C\varepsilon^{1/2}, \quad \text{on } \partial(V \setminus C_{\varepsilon^{1/4}}).$$

Applying the maximum modulus for Stokes systems in $V \setminus C_{\varepsilon^{1/4}}$ (see, for example, the book of Ladyzhenskaya [34]), we obtain (6.9) with $\alpha = 1$ in 3D. The proof is finished. \[\square\]

6.2. Convergence of $\frac{C^a + C^b}{2} - C^a$. Next, we prove the convergence of $\frac{C^a + C^b}{2} - C^a$ under the symmetric conditions (S1) and (S$\varphi$) for simplicity. It follows from (4.46) and (5.26) that

$$\begin{cases}
\sum_{\alpha=1}^{d(d+1)/2} C_1^a a_{11}^\alpha + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{d(d+1)/2} C_2^a a_{21}^\alpha - b_1^\alpha = 0, \\
\sum_{\alpha=1}^{d(d+1)/2} C_1^a a_{12}^\alpha + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{d(d+1)/2} C_2^a a_{22}^\alpha - b_2^\alpha = 0,
\end{cases} \quad \beta = 1, \ldots, d(d+1)/2. \quad (6.16)$$

By a rearrangement, from the first line of (6.10), we have

$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^{d(d+1)/2} (C_1^a + C_2^a) a_{11}^\alpha + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{d(d+1)/2} C_2^a (a_{21}^\alpha - a_{11}^\alpha) - b_1^\alpha = 0,$$

and

$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^{d(d+1)/2} (C_1^a + C_2^a) a_{12}^\alpha + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{d(d+1)/2} C_2^a (a_{22}^\alpha - a_{21}^\alpha) - b_2^\alpha = 0.$$

Adding these two equations together leads to

$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^{d(d+1)/2} (C_1^a + C_2^a)(a_{11}^\alpha + a_{21}^\alpha) + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{d(d+1)/2} (C_1^a - C_2^a)(a_{11}^\alpha - a_{21}^\alpha) - 2b_1^\alpha = 0. \quad (6.17)$$

Similarly, for the second equation of (6.10), we have

$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^{d(d+1)/2} (C_1^a + C_2^a)(a_{12}^\alpha + a_{22}^\alpha) + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{d(d+1)/2} (C_1^a - C_2^a)(a_{12}^\alpha - a_{22}^\alpha) - 2b_2^\alpha = 0. \quad (6.18)$$
Then, adding (6.17) and (6.18) together, and dividing by two, we obtain
\[
\sum_{\alpha=1}^{d(d+1)/2} C_1^\alpha + C_2^\alpha a_{\alpha\beta} + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{d(d+1)/2} \frac{C_1^\alpha - C_2^\alpha}{2} (a_{11} - a_{22} + a_{21} - a_{12}) - (b_1^\beta + b_2^\beta) = 0,
\]
where
\[
a_{\alpha\beta} = \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} a_{ij} = -\left( \int_{\partial D_1} \psi_\beta \cdot \sigma[u^\alpha, p^\alpha] \nu + \int_{\partial D_2} \psi_\beta \cdot \sigma[u^\alpha, p^\alpha] \nu \right),
\]
and \(u^\alpha := u_1^\alpha + u_2^\alpha\), \(p^\alpha := p_1^\alpha + p_2^\alpha\) satisfy (6.4).

On the other hand, from the third line of (1.12), we deduce
\[
\sum_{\alpha=1}^{d(d+1)/2} C_1^\alpha a_{\alpha\beta} = \int_{\partial D_1} \psi_\beta \cdot \sigma[u^\alpha, p^\alpha] \nu + \int_{\partial D_2} \psi_\beta \cdot \sigma[u^\alpha, p^\alpha] \nu \leq C \rho_d^3(\varepsilon) \|\varphi\|_{L^\infty(\partial D)},
\]
(6.23)
where \(b_1^\beta|\varphi\) is defined by (4.44), and \(b_1^\beta|\varphi\) by (6.22).

Proof. Recalling the definitions (4.15), (2.3) and (2.4), using the integration by parts, we have
\[
b_1^\beta[\varphi] = \int_{\partial D_1} \psi_\beta \cdot \sigma[u_0^\alpha, p_0^\alpha] \nu = -\int_{\partial D} \varphi \cdot \sigma[u_1^\beta, p_1^\beta] \nu.
\]
Similarly, in view of (6.1), (6.2), and (6.22), we deduce
\[
b_1^\beta[\varphi] = \int_{\partial D_1} \varphi \cdot \sigma[u_1^\beta, p_1^\beta] \nu.
\]
Thus,
\[
b_1^\beta[\varphi] - b_1^\beta[\varphi] = -\int_{\partial D} \varphi \cdot \sigma[u_1^\beta - u_1^\beta, p_1^\beta - p_1^\beta] \nu.
\]
Applying Lemma 6.2 implies (6.23). \(\square\)

As far as \(a_{\alpha\beta}\) and \(a_{\alpha\beta}^\alpha\) are concerned,

Lemma 6.4. Let \(u^\alpha\) and \(u^\alpha\) be defined by (6.4) and (6.1), respectively, \(\alpha = 1, \ldots, d(d+1)/2\). Then
\[
\int_{\partial D_1} \psi_\beta \cdot \sigma[u^\alpha, p^\alpha] \nu - \int_{\partial D_1} \psi_\beta \cdot \sigma[u^\alpha, p^\alpha] \nu \leq C \rho_d^3(\varepsilon) \|\varphi\|_{L^\infty(\partial D)}.
\]
(6.24)
Proof. For \( \alpha = 1, \ldots, d(d+1)/2 \), it follows from (6.4) that
\[
\begin{aligned}
\nabla \cdot [u^\alpha - \psi_\alpha, p^\alpha] = 0, \quad \nabla \cdot (u^\alpha - \psi_\alpha) = 0, & \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\
u^\alpha - \psi_\alpha = 0, & \quad \text{on } \partial D_1 \cup \partial D_2, \\
u^\alpha - \psi_\alpha = -\psi_\alpha, & \quad \text{on } \partial D.
\end{aligned}
\]
Using the integration by parts, for \( \alpha = 1, \ldots, d(d+1)/2 \),
\[
\int_{\partial D_1} \psi_\beta \cdot \sigma[u^\alpha, p^\alpha] \nu = \int_{\partial D_1} \psi_\beta \cdot \sigma[u^\alpha - \psi_\alpha, p^\alpha] \nu = \int_{\partial D} \psi_\alpha \cdot \sigma[u^\alpha, p^\alpha] \nu.
\]
Similarly,
\[
\int_{\partial D_1^2} \psi_\beta \cdot \sigma[u^\alpha, p^\alpha] \nu = \int_{\partial D} \psi_\alpha \cdot \sigma[u_1^\alpha, p_1^\alpha] \nu.
\]
Hence,
\[
\int_{\partial D_1} \psi_\beta \cdot \sigma[u^\alpha, p^\alpha] \nu - \int_{\partial D_1} \psi_\beta \cdot \sigma[u^\alpha, p^\alpha] \nu = \int_{\partial D} \psi_\alpha \cdot \sigma[u_1^\alpha, p_1^\alpha] \nu.
\]
Thus, by virtue of Lemma 6.2, we obtain (6.24). \( \square \)

Next, we prove the convergence of \( C_1^\alpha + C_2^\alpha - C_\ast^\alpha \) in 2D and 3D, respectively.

**Proposition 6.5.** Assume that \( D_1 \cup D_2 \) and \( D \) satisfies (S1), and \( \varphi \) satisfies the symmetric condition (S\( \varphi \)). Let \( C_1^\alpha \), \( C_2^\alpha \), and \( C_\ast^\alpha \) be defined in (2.2) and (1.12), respectively. Then

(i) If \( d = 2 \),
\[
C_1^\alpha + C_2^\alpha = C_\ast^\alpha \equiv 0, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, \quad \text{and } \left| \frac{C_1^\alpha + C_2^\alpha}{2} - C_\ast^\alpha \right| \leq C\sqrt{\varepsilon};
\]

(ii) If \( d = 3 \),
\[
C_1^\alpha + C_2^\alpha = C_\ast^\alpha \equiv 0, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, 3, \quad \text{and } \left| \frac{C_1^\alpha + C_2^\alpha}{2} - C_\ast^\alpha \right| \leq \frac{C}{|\ln \varepsilon|}, \quad \alpha = 4, 5, 6.
\]

**Proof.** We distinguish two cases to prove it, based on dimension.

(i) For \( d = 2 \), in view of our hypotheses (S1), we consider the symmetry of the domain with respect to the origin first, and observe that, for \( \alpha = 1, 2 \),
\[
u_2^\alpha(x)|_{\partial D_1} = u_1^\alpha(-x)|_{\partial D_2} = 0, \quad u_2^\alpha(x)|_{\partial D_2} = u_1^\alpha(-x)|_{\partial D_1} = \psi_\alpha,
\]
and
\[
u_2^\alpha(x)|_{\partial D} = u_1^\alpha(-x)|_{\partial D} = 0.
\]
Since \( \nabla \cdot [u^\alpha, p^\alpha] = 0 \) in \( \Omega \), we obtain
\[
u_2^\alpha(x) = u_1^\alpha(-x), \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad \alpha = 1, 2.
\]
Therefore, combining the definition of \( a_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} \) defined in (4.45), we have
\[
a_{11}^{\alpha\beta} = a_{22}^{\alpha\beta}, \quad a_{12}^{\alpha\beta} = a_{21}^{\alpha\beta}, \quad \alpha, \beta = 1, 2.
\]
(6.25)

For \( \alpha = 3 \), since
\[
u_2^\alpha(x)|_{\partial D_1} = -u_3^\alpha(-x)|_{\partial D_2} = 0, \quad u_2^\alpha(x)|_{\partial D_2} = -u_1^\alpha(-x)|_{\partial D_1} = \psi_3,
\]
\[
u_2^\alpha(x)|_{\partial D} = -u_1^\alpha(-x)|_{\partial D} = 0,
\]
it follows that \( u_3^3(x) = -u_3^3(-x) \) in \( \Omega \). Thus,
\[
\begin{align*}
  a_{11}^{33} &= -a_{22}^{33}, & a_{12}^{33} &= -a_{21}^{33}, & a_{12}^{33} = -a_{21}^{33}, & \alpha = 1, 2, & \text{ and } a_{11}^{33} = a_{22}^{33}, a_{12}^{33} = a_{21}^{33}. & (6.26)
\end{align*}
\]

Similarly, due to the symmetry of the domain with respect to \( \{ x_2 = 0 \} \), let us set
\[
\begin{align*}
  u_2^1(x_1, x_2) &= \begin{pmatrix} (u_2^1)(1)(x_1, x_2) \\ (u_2^1)(2)(x_1, x_2) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} (u_1^1)(1)(x_1, -x_2) \\ -(u_1^1)(2)(x_1, -x_2) \end{pmatrix}, \\
  u_2^2(x_1, x_2) &= \begin{pmatrix} (u_2^2)(1)(x_1, x_2) \\ (u_2^2)(2)(x_1, x_2) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -(u_1^2)(1)(x_1, -x_2) \\ (u_1^2)(2)(x_1, -x_2) \end{pmatrix}, \\
  u_2^3(x_1, x_2) &= \begin{pmatrix} (u_2^3)(1)(x_1, x_2) \\ (u_2^3)(2)(x_1, x_2) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -(u_1^3)(1)(x_1, -x_2) \\ (u_1^3)(2)(x_1, -x_2) \end{pmatrix}.
\end{align*}
\]

Thus, for example,
\[
\begin{align*}
  (2\mu e(u_2^1), e(u_2^2)) &= \mu \left( 2\partial_{x_1} (u_2^1)^{(1)} \partial_{x_1} (u_2^1)^{(2)} + 2\partial_{x_2} (u_2^1)^{(1)} \partial_{x_2} (u_2^1)^{(2)} \\
  &\quad+ (\partial_{x_1} (u_1^1)^{(2)} + \partial_{x_2} (u_1^1)^{(1)}) \cdot (\partial_{x_1} (u_2^2)^{(1)} + \partial_{x_2} (u_2^2)^{(2)}) \right) \\
  &= - (2\mu e(u_1^1), e(u_1^2)),
\end{align*}
\]

so that we have
\[
\begin{align*}
  a_{12}^{12} &= -a_{11}^{12}, & a_{12}^{12} &= -a_{21}^{12}. & (6.27)
\end{align*}
\]

Similarly,
\[
\begin{align*}
  a_{22}^{13} &= -a_{11}^{13}, & a_{12}^{13} &= -a_{21}^{13}, & \text{ but } a_{22}^{13} = a_{11}^{23}, & a_{12}^{23} = a_{21}^{23}. & (6.28)
\end{align*}
\]

Then, combining \((6.25)\)–\((6.28)\), we deduce
\[
\begin{align*}
  a_{11}^{11} = a_{12}^{12} = a_{13}^{13} = a_{22}^{12} = a_{22}^{11} = a_{22}^{22} = a_{22}^{33} = a_{22}^{32} = a_{22}^{31} = 0. & (6.29)
\end{align*}
\]

Thus, from \((6.25)\) and \((6.28)\),
\[
\alpha, \beta = 1, 2, 3, \alpha \neq \beta. & (6.30)
\]

Similarly,
\[
\alpha, \beta = 1, 2, 3, \alpha \neq \beta. & (6.31)
\]

Finally, on account of the symmetry condition of the boundary data \((S_\varnothing)\), we set
\[
  u_0(x) = -u_0(-x).
\]

Then
\[
  b_1^\alpha = -b_2^\alpha, & \alpha = 1, 2, & b_1^3 = b_2^3. & (6.32)
\]

Similarly,
\[
  b_1^{*\alpha} = -b_2^{*\alpha}, & \alpha = 1, 2, & b_1^{*3} = b_2^{*3}. & (6.33)
\]

Now substituting \((6.29)\) and \((6.32)\) directly into \((4.36)\), and using Cramer’s rule, we deduce
\[
\begin{align*}
  C_1^\alpha &= -C_2^\alpha, & \alpha = 1, 2, & \text{ and } C_1^3 = C_2^3. & (6.34)
\end{align*}
\]
Similarly, substituting (6.31) and (6.33) directly into (6.21), we obtain

\[
\begin{pmatrix} C_1^3 + C_2^3 \frac{C_1^1 - C_2^1}{2} + 2b_1^3 - (C_1^1 - C_2^1)(a_{11}^3 + a_{12}^3) \end{pmatrix}
\]

Similarly, substituting (6.31) and (6.33) directly into (6.21), we obtain

\[
C_\alpha^\alpha = 0, \quad \alpha = 1, 2,
\]
and

\[
\begin{pmatrix} a_{\alpha}^{11} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & a_{\alpha}^{22} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & a_{\alpha}^{33} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ C_\alpha^3 \end{pmatrix} = 0
\]

Combining (6.35) and (6.36), we have

\[
\begin{pmatrix} a_{\alpha}^{11} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & a_{\alpha}^{22} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & a_{\alpha}^{33} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ C_\alpha^3 \end{pmatrix} = 0
\]

where

\[
B^3 = 2(b_1^3 - b_3^3) - (C_1^1 - C_2^1)(a_{11}^3 + a_{12}^3) - C_\alpha^3(a_{\alpha}^{33} - a_{\alpha}^3),
\]
and \((a_{\alpha}^{\alpha})^3_{\alpha, \beta=1}^3\) is positive definite; the details can be found in [60]. It follows from Propositions 6.6, 6.8 and 6.9 that

\[
B^3 = O(\sqrt{\varepsilon}).
\]

By Cramer’s rule, we obtain

\[
\left| \frac{C_1^3 + C_2^3}{2} - C_\alpha^3 \right| \leq C\sqrt{\varepsilon}.
\]

(ii) For \(d = 3\), firstly, by using the symmetry of the domain with respect to the origin,

\[
a_{11}^{\alpha \beta} = a_{22}^{\alpha \beta}, \quad a_{12}^{\alpha \beta} = a_{21}^{\alpha \beta}, \quad \alpha, \beta = 1, 2, 3,
\]

and

\[
a_{11}^{\alpha \beta} = -a_{22}^{\alpha \beta}, \quad a_{12}^{\alpha \beta} = -a_{21}^{\alpha \beta}, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, 3, \quad \beta = 4, 5, 6,
\]

Secondly, due to the symmetry of the domain with respect to \(\{x_3 = 0\}\), set

\[
u_2^\alpha(x', x_3) = \begin{pmatrix} (u_2^\alpha)^{(1)}(x', x_3) \\ (u_2^\alpha)^{(2)}(x', x_3) \\ (u_2^\alpha)^{(3)}(x', x_3) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, 4,
\]

\[
\begin{pmatrix} (u_2^\alpha)^{(1)}(x', x_3) \\ (u_2^\alpha)^{(2)}(x', x_3) \\ (u_2^\alpha)^{(3)}(x', x_3) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, 4,
\]

\[
\begin{pmatrix} (u_2^\alpha)^{(1)}(x', x_3) \\ (u_2^\alpha)^{(2)}(x', x_3) \\ (u_2^\alpha)^{(3)}(x', x_3) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, 4,
\]

\[
\begin{pmatrix} (u_2^\alpha)^{(1)}(x', x_3) \\ (u_2^\alpha)^{(2)}(x', x_3) \\ (u_2^\alpha)^{(3)}(x', x_3) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, 4,
\]

\[
\begin{pmatrix} (u_2^\alpha)^{(1)}(x', x_3) \\ (u_2^\alpha)^{(2)}(x', x_3) \\ (u_2^\alpha)^{(3)}(x', x_3) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, 4,
\]

\[
\begin{pmatrix} (u_2^\alpha)^{(1)}(x', x_3) \\ (u_2^\alpha)^{(2)}(x', x_3) \\ (u_2^\alpha)^{(3)}(x', x_3) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, 4,
\]

\[
\begin{pmatrix} (u_2^\alpha)^{(1)}(x', x_3) \\ (u_2^\alpha)^{(2)}(x', x_3) \\ (u_2^\alpha)^{(3)}(x', x_3) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, 4,
\]

\[
\begin{pmatrix} (u_2^\alpha)^{(1)}(x', x_3) \\ (u_2^\alpha)^{(2)}(x', x_3) \\ (u_2^\alpha)^{(3)}(x', x_3) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, 4,
\]

\[
\begin{pmatrix} (u_2^\alpha)^{(1)}(x', x_3) \\ (u_2^\alpha)^{(2)}(x', x_3) \\ (u_2^\alpha)^{(3)}(x', x_3) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, 4,
\]

\[
\begin{pmatrix} (u_2^\alpha)^{(1)}(x', x_3) \\ (u_2^\alpha)^{(2)}(x', x_3) \\ (u_2^\alpha)^{(3)}(x', x_3) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, 4,
\]

\[
\begin{pmatrix} (u_2^\alpha)^{(1)}(x', x_3) \\ (u_2^\alpha)^{(2)}(x', x_3) \\ (u_2^\alpha)^{(3)}(x', x_3) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, 4,
\]

\[
\begin{pmatrix} (u_2^\alpha)^{(1)}(x', x_3) \\ (u_2^\alpha)^{(2)}(x', x_3) \\ (u_2^\alpha)^{(3)}(x', x_3) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, 4,
\]
and
\[
\begin{pmatrix}
(u_2^\alpha)(1)(x', x_3) \\
(u_2^\alpha)(2)(x', x_3) \\
(u_2^\alpha)(3)(x', x_3)
\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}
-(u_1^\alpha)(1)(x', -x_3) \\
-(u_1^\alpha)(2)(x', -x_3) \\
-(u_1^\alpha)(3)(x', -x_3)
\end{pmatrix}, \quad \alpha = 3, 5, 6.
\]

For example, since
\[
(2\mu e(u_1^1), e(u_2^2))
\]
\[
= \mu \left( 2\partial_{x_1}(u_1^1)\partial_{x_1}(u_2^2) + 2\partial_{x_2}(u_1^1)\partial_{x_2}(u_2^2) + 2\partial_{x_3}(u_1^1)\partial_{x_3}(u_2^2) 
\right)
\]
\[
+ \left( \partial_{x_1}(u_1^2) + \partial_{x_2}(u_1^2) \right) \cdot \left( \partial_{x_1}(u_2^2) + \partial_{x_2}(u_2^2) \right)
\]
\[
+ \left( \partial_{x_1}(u_1^3) + \partial_{x_3}(u_1^3) \right) \cdot \left( \partial_{x_1}(u_2^3) + \partial_{x_3}(u_2^3) \right)
\]
\[
= (2\mu e(u_1^1), e(u_1^2)),
\]
we have
\[
a_{22}^{12} = a_{11}^{12}, \quad a_{12}^{12} = a_{21}^{12}, \quad (6.40)
\]
Similarly, we obtain
\[
a_{22}^{\alpha \beta} = a_{11}^{\alpha \beta}, \quad a_{12}^{\alpha \beta} = a_{21}^{\alpha \beta}, \quad \alpha, \beta = 1, 2, 4, \quad (6.41)
\]
\[
a_{22}^{\alpha \beta} = a_{11}^{\alpha \beta}, \quad a_{12}^{\alpha \beta} = a_{21}^{\alpha \beta}, \quad \alpha, \beta = 3, 5, 6, \quad (6.42)
\]
and
\[
a_{22}^{\alpha \beta} = -a_{11}^{\alpha \beta}, \quad a_{12}^{\alpha \beta} = -a_{21}^{\alpha \beta}, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, 4, \quad \beta = 3, 5, 6. \quad (6.43)
\]
Further, using the symmetry of the domain with respect to \(x_1\)-axis, we set
\[
\begin{pmatrix}
(u_2^\alpha)(1)(x', x_3) \\
(u_2^\alpha)(2)(x', x_3) \\
(u_2^\alpha)(3)(x', x_3)
\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}
-(u_1^\alpha)(1)(x_1, -x_2, -x_3) \\
(u_1^\alpha)(2)(x_1, -x_2, -x_3) \\
(u_1^\alpha)(3)(x_1, -x_2, -x_3)
\end{pmatrix}, \quad \alpha = 2, 3, 4, 5,
\]
and
\[
\begin{pmatrix}
(u_2^\alpha)(1)(x', x_3) \\
(u_2^\alpha)(2)(x', x_3) \\
(u_2^\alpha)(3)(x', x_3)
\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}
(u_1^\alpha)(1)(x_1, -x_2, -x_3) \\
-(u_1^\alpha)(2)(x_1, -x_2, -x_3) \\
-(u_1^\alpha)(3)(x_1, -x_2, -x_3)
\end{pmatrix}, \quad \alpha = 1, 6.
\]
Then
\[
a_{22}^{\alpha \beta} = a_{11}^{\alpha \beta}, \quad a_{12}^{\alpha \beta} = a_{21}^{\alpha \beta}, \quad \alpha, \beta = 2, 3, 4, 5, \quad a_{22}^{16} = a_{11}^{16}, \quad a_{12}^{16} = a_{21}^{16}, \quad (6.44)
\]
and
\[
a_{22}^{\alpha \beta} = -a_{11}^{\alpha \beta}, \quad a_{12}^{\alpha \beta} = -a_{21}^{\alpha \beta}, \quad \alpha = 1, 6, \quad \beta = 2, 3, 4, 5. \quad (6.45)
\]
Besides, thanks to the symmetry of the domain with respect to \( x_2 \)-axis, set

\[
\mathbf{u}_2^{\alpha}(x', x_3) = \begin{pmatrix}
\mathbf{u}_2^{(1)}(x', x_3) \\
\mathbf{u}_2^{(2)}(x', x_3) \\
\mathbf{u}_2^{(3)}(x', x_3)
\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}
\mathbf{u}_1^{(1)}(-x_1, x_2, -x_3) \\
-(\mathbf{u}_1^{(2)}(-x_1, x_2, -x_3) \\
-(\mathbf{u}_1^{(3)}(-x_1, x_2, -x_3)
\end{pmatrix}, \quad \alpha = 1, 3, 4, 6,
\]

and

\[
\mathbf{u}_2^{\beta}(x', x_3) = \begin{pmatrix}
\mathbf{u}_2^{(1)}(x', x_3) \\
\mathbf{u}_2^{(2)}(x', x_3) \\
\mathbf{u}_2^{(3)}(x', x_3)
\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}
-(\mathbf{u}_1^{(1)}(-x_1, x_2, -x_3) \\
\mathbf{u}_1^{(2)}(-x_1, x_2, -x_3) \\
-(\mathbf{u}_1^{(3)}(-x_1, x_2, -x_3)
\end{pmatrix}, \quad \alpha = 2, 5.
\]

Then

\[
a_2^{\alpha \beta} = a_1^{\alpha \beta}, \quad a_2^{\beta \alpha} = a_2^{\alpha \beta}, \quad \alpha, \beta = 1, 3, 4, 6, \quad a_2^{25} = a_1^{25}, \quad a_2^{22} = a_2^{25}.
\]

and

\[
a_2^{\alpha \beta} = -a_1^{\alpha \beta}, \quad a_2^{\beta \alpha} = -a_2^{\alpha \beta}, \quad \alpha = 2, 5, \beta = 1, 3, 4, 6.
\]

In summary, combining (6.37) and (6.47), we obtain

\[
a_1^{\alpha \beta} = a_2^{\alpha \beta} = 0, \quad a_2^{\beta \alpha} = a_2^{\alpha \beta} = 0, \quad \alpha = 1, \beta = 2, 3, 4, 6,
\]

\[
a_1^{\alpha \beta} = a_2^{\beta \alpha} = 0, \quad a_2^{\alpha \beta} = a_2^{\alpha \beta} = 0, \quad \alpha = 2, \beta = 3, 4, 5,
\]

\[
a_1^{\alpha \beta} = a_2^{\beta \alpha} = 0, \quad a_2^{\alpha \beta} = a_2^{\alpha \beta} = 0, \quad \alpha = 3, \beta = 4, 5, 6,
\]

\[
a_1^{\alpha \beta} = a_2^{\beta \alpha} = 0, \quad a_2^{\alpha \beta} = a_2^{\alpha \beta} = 0, \quad \alpha = 4, \beta = 5, 6,
\]

\[
a_1^{56} = a_2^{56} = 0, \quad a_2^{56} = a_2^{56} = 0.
\]

Thus,

\[
a^\alpha \beta = 0, \quad \alpha, \beta = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, \alpha \neq \beta.
\]

Similarly,

\[
a_2^{\alpha \beta} = 0, \quad \alpha, \beta = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, \alpha \neq \beta.
\]

Finally, by the symmetry \((S_\phi)\), setting

\[
\mathbf{u}_0(x) = -\mathbf{u}_0(-x),
\]

it is easy to see that

\[
b_1^\alpha = -b_2^\alpha, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, 3, \quad b_2^\alpha = b_2^\alpha, \quad \alpha = 4, 5, 6.
\]

Similarly,

\[
b_1^{*\alpha} = -b_2^{*\alpha}, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, 3, \quad b_2^{*\alpha} = b_2^{*\alpha}, \quad \alpha = 4, 5, 6.
\]

Now coming back to (1.46) and using the Cramer’s rule, (6.48) and (5.51), we deduce

\[
C_1^\alpha = -C_2^\alpha, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, 3, \quad C_1^{*\alpha} = C_2^{*\alpha}, \quad \alpha = 4, 5, 6.
\]

By virtue of (6.49), equation (6.41) becomes

\[
\mathcal{A}C = \mathcal{B},
\]

where

\[
\mathcal{A} = \text{diag}(a_1^{11}, a_2^{22}, a_3^{33}, a_4^{44}, a_5^{55}, a_6^{66}), \quad \mathcal{C} = \left(0, 0, 0, \frac{C_1^4 + C_2^4}{2}, \frac{C_1^5 + C_2^5}{2}, \frac{C_1^6 + C_2^6}{2}\right)^T.
\]
and
\[ B = \left( 0, 0, 0, 2b_1^4, 2b_1^5 - (C_1^1 - C_2^1)(a_{11}^{15} + a_{12}^{15}), 2b_1^6 - (C_1^2 - C_2^2)(a_{11}^{26} + a_{12}^{26}) \right)^T. \]

Similarly, substituting (6.50) and (6.52) into (6.21), we obtain
\[ A^* C^* = B^*, \tag{6.55} \]
where
\[ A^* = \text{diag}(a_{11}^{11}, a_{22}^{22}, a_*^{33}, a_*^{44}, a_*^{55}, a_*^{66}), \]
and
\[ C^* = \left( 0, 0, 0, C_4^4, C_5^5, C_6^6 \right)^T, \quad B^* = \left( 0, 0, 0, 2b_1^4, 2b_1^5, 2b_1^6 \right)^T. \]

Combining (6.51) and (6.56), we have
\[ A(C - C^*) = B - B^* - C^* (A - A^*) =: R, \]
where \( R = (R^1, \ldots, R^6)^T \). From Proposition 2.6, Lemma 6.3 and Lemma 6.4, one can find that
\[ R^\alpha = O \left( \frac{1}{\ln \varepsilon} \right), \quad \alpha = 1, \ldots, 6. \]

Then by Cramer’s rule,
\[ \left| C^\alpha_2 + C^\alpha_2 - C^\alpha_* \right| \leq \frac{C}{\ln \varepsilon}. \]

The proof of Proposition 6.7 is completed. \( \square \)

**Proof of Proposition 6.7** Note that
\[ C_2^\alpha \int_{\partial D_1} \psi_\beta \cdot \sigma[u^\alpha, p^\alpha] \nu \tag{6.56} \]
\[ - C_2^\alpha \int_{\partial D_0^\alpha} \psi_\beta \cdot \sigma[u^\alpha, p^\alpha] \nu \]
\[ = C_2^\alpha \left( \int_{\partial D_1} \psi_\beta \cdot \sigma[u^\alpha, p^\alpha] \nu \right) - \int_{\partial D_0^\alpha} \psi_\beta \cdot \sigma[u^\alpha, p^\alpha] \nu \]
\[ + \left( C_2^\alpha - C_2^\alpha \right) \int_{\partial D_0^\alpha} \frac{\partial u^\alpha}{\partial \nu} \cdot \psi_\beta. \]

Then
\[ \tilde{b}_1^\beta [\varphi] - \tilde{b}_1^\beta [\varphi] = \int_{\partial D_1} \psi_\beta \cdot \sigma[u_0, p_0] \nu - \int_{\partial D_0^\alpha} \psi_\beta \cdot \sigma[u_0, p_0] \nu \]
\[ + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{d(d+1)/2} C_2^\alpha \left( \int_{\partial D_1} \psi_\beta \cdot \sigma[u^\alpha, p^\alpha] \nu \right) \]
\[ + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{d(d+1)/2} \left( C_2^\alpha - C_2^\alpha \right) \int_{\partial D_0^\alpha} \frac{\partial u^\alpha}{\partial \nu} \cdot \psi_\beta. \]

By virtue of Lemma 6.3 and Lemma 6.4, it suffices to proving the convergence of \( C_2^\alpha - C_2^\alpha \).

If \( d = 2 \), we have from Proposition 6.6 and Proposition 6.5 that
\[ |C_2^\alpha - C^\alpha_*| = \left| \frac{C_2^\alpha + C_2^\alpha}{2} - C^\alpha_* \right| = \left| \frac{C_2^\alpha - C_2^\alpha}{2} \right| \leq C \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \sqrt{\varepsilon}, & \alpha = 1, \\ \varepsilon^{3/2}, & \alpha = 2, \end{array} \right. \]
and
\[ |C_2^3 - C_2^3| = \left| \frac{C_2^3 + C_2^3}{2} - C_2^3 \right| = \left| \frac{C_2^3 - C_2^3}{2} \right| \leq C \sqrt{\varepsilon}. \]
Due to Lemma 5.3 and Lemma 6.4, we obtain (6.6).

If \( d = 3 \), by Propositions 2.6 and Proposition 5.6, we have
\[
|C^\alpha_2 - C^\alpha_*| = \left| \frac{C^\alpha_2 + C^\alpha_{*2} - C^\alpha_*}{2} \right| = \frac{|C^\alpha - C^\alpha_*|}{2} \leq C \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
\frac{1}{\ln \varepsilon}, & \alpha = 1, 2, \\
\frac{1}{\varepsilon}, & \alpha = 3,
\end{array} \right.
\]
and
\[
|C^\alpha_2 - C^\alpha_*| = \left| \frac{C^\alpha_2 + C^\alpha_{*2} - C^\alpha_*}{2} \right| = \frac{|C^\alpha + C^\alpha_* - C^\alpha_*|}{2} \leq C \frac{1}{|\ln \varepsilon|}, \alpha = 4, 5, 6.
\]
This, together with Lemma 6.3 and Lemma 6.4, implies that
\[
|\tilde{b}_1^\beta \varphi - \tilde{b}_1^* \varphi| \leq C \frac{1}{|\ln \varepsilon|}.
\]

The proof of Proposition 6.1 is finished. \( \square \)

6.3. The Completion of the Proof of Theorem 1.5

Proof of Theorem 1.5 for \( d = 2 \). We first obtain from Proposition 6.1 that, if \( \tilde{b}_1^4 \varphi \neq 0 \), then there exists a sufficiently small constant \( \varepsilon_0 > 0 \) such that for \( 0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0 \),
\[
|\tilde{b}_1^4 \varphi| \geq \frac{1}{2} |\tilde{b}_1^4 \varphi| > 0.
\]

By virtue of (2.17) and Proposition 6.5, we obtain
\[
\sum_{n=1}^{2} (C^\alpha_1 - C^\alpha_2) a_{11}^\beta \tilde{b}_1^\beta = \tilde{b}_1^0, \quad \beta = 1, 2.
\]

It follows from Lemma 6.5 and (6.29) that
\[
\frac{1}{C} \varepsilon^{-2} \leq \det A \leq C \varepsilon^{-2},
\]
where \( A = (a_{11}^\beta)^2 \). By Cramer’s rule and (6.56), we get
\[
|C^\alpha_1 - C^\alpha_2| = \left| \frac{1}{\det A} \tilde{b}_1^0 \varphi a_{11}^\beta + O(\varepsilon^{3/2}) \right| \geq \frac{|\tilde{b}_1^0 \varphi|}{C^2} \varepsilon. \tag{6.57}
\]

Moreover, from Proposition 5.2 and Proposition 5.6,
\[
|(C^\alpha_2 - C^\alpha_2) \nabla u_i^2(0, x_2)| \leq C \varepsilon. \tag{6.58}
\]

Combining Proposition 5.4 and (6.57) yields
\[
|\nabla u(0, x_2)| = \sum_{n=1}^{2} (C^\alpha_1 - C^\alpha_2) \nabla u_1^0(0, x_2) + \nabla u_2(0, x_2) \geq |(C^\alpha_1 - C^\alpha_2) \nabla u_1^0(0, x_2)| - C \geq \frac{|\tilde{b}_1^0 \varphi|}{C \sqrt{\varepsilon}}.
\]

Theorem 1.5 for 2D is proved. \( \square \)

Proof of Theorem 1.5 for \( d = 3 \). By Propositions 2.6 and 2.8, we obtain
\[
|(C^\alpha_1 - C^\alpha_2) \nabla u_i^3(0', x_3)| \leq C.
\]
Then
\[
|\nabla u(0', x_3)| = \sum_{n=1}^{3} (C^\alpha_1 - C^\alpha_2) \nabla u_1^3(0', x_3) + \nabla u_3(0', x_3) \geq \frac{|\tilde{b}_1^0 \varphi|}{C \sqrt{\varepsilon}}.
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
&\geq \left| \sum_{\alpha=1}^{2} (C_{1}^{\alpha} - C_{2}^{\alpha}) \nabla u_{1}^{(0', x_{3})} \right| - C \geq \left| \sum_{\alpha=1}^{2} (C_{1}^{\alpha} - C_{2}^{\alpha}) \nabla v_{1}^{(0', x_{3})} \right| - C \\
&\geq \left| \sum_{\alpha=1}^{2} (C_{1}^{\alpha} - C_{2}^{\alpha}) \partial_{x_{3}} v_{1}^{(0', x_{3})} \right| - C.
\end{align*}
\]

For \( x = (0', x_{3}) \in \Omega_{R} \), from the definition of \( v_{1}^{1} \) in (2.7) and (4.12), we have
\[
\partial_{x_{3}} v_{1}^{1}(0', x_{3}) = \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon}, 0, 0 \right)^{T}.
\]

Similarly,
\[
\partial_{x_{3}} v_{1}^{2}(0', x_{3}) = \left( 0, \frac{1}{\varepsilon}, 0 \right)^{T}.
\]

Thus, it suffices to prove the lower bounds of \( C_{1}^{\alpha} - C_{2}^{\alpha} \), \( \alpha = 1, 2 \).

It follows from (2.17) and Proposition 6.5 that
\[
\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3} (C_{1}^{\alpha} - C_{2}^{\alpha}) a_{11}^{\alpha} = \tilde{b}_{1}^{2}, \quad \beta = 1, 2, 3.
\]

By virtue of Lemma 4.7 and Lemma 4.8, and (6.48), we deduce
\[
\frac{1}{C_{\varepsilon}} |\ln \varepsilon|^{2} \leq \det \tilde{A} \leq \frac{C_{\varepsilon}}{\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|^{2},
\]
where \( \tilde{A} = (a_{11}^{\alpha})_{\alpha, \beta=1}^{\beta} \). Denote the cofactor of \( a_{11}^{\alpha} \) by \( \text{cof}(\tilde{A})_{\alpha \beta} \). Then
\[
\frac{1}{C_{\varepsilon}} |\ln \varepsilon| \leq \text{cof}(\tilde{A})_{\alpha \alpha} \leq \frac{C_{\varepsilon}}{\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, \quad \frac{1}{C_{\varepsilon}} |\ln \varepsilon|^{2} \leq \text{cof}(\tilde{A})_{33} \leq C_{\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|^{2},
\]
\[
|\text{cof}(\tilde{A})_{\alpha \beta}| \leq \frac{C_{\varepsilon}}{\varepsilon}, \quad \alpha, \beta = 1, 2, \quad \alpha \neq \beta,
\]
and
\[
|\text{cof}(\tilde{A})_{3 \alpha}|, |\text{cof}(\tilde{A})_{\alpha 3}| \leq C_{\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|, \quad \alpha = 1, 2.
\]

Using Cramer’s rule, if \( \tilde{b}_{1}^{2}(\varphi) \neq 0 \), \( \alpha = 1, 2 \), then
\[
|C_{1}^{\alpha} - C_{2}^{\alpha}| = \left| \frac{1}{\det \tilde{A}} \tilde{b}_{1}^{\alpha}(\varphi) \text{cof}(\tilde{A})_{\alpha \alpha} + O \left( \frac{1}{|\ln \varepsilon|^{2}} \right) \right| \geq \left| \frac{\tilde{b}_{1}^{\alpha}(\varphi)}{C_{\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|} \right|, \quad \alpha = 1, 2.
\]

Applying Proposition 6.1, if \( \tilde{b}_{1}^{\alpha}(\varphi) \neq 0 \) for some \( \alpha_{0} \in \{1, 2\} \), then there exists a small enough constant \( \varepsilon_{0} > 0 \) such that for \( 0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_{0} \),
\[
\left| \tilde{b}_{1}^{\alpha}(\varphi) \right| \geq \frac{1}{2} \left| \tilde{b}_{1}^{\alpha}(\varphi) \right| > 0.
\]

This, together with (6.58) and (6.61), gives
\[
|\nabla u(0', x_{3})| \geq \left| \frac{\tilde{b}_{1}^{\alpha}(\varphi)}{C_{\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|} \right|.
\]

So, the proof of Theorem 1.5 in 3D is completed. \( \square \)

Finally, we give a sketched proof of Corollary 1.7.
Proof of Corollary 1.7. If \( d = 2 \), under the symmetric assumptions, we have from (6.34),
\[
C_1^3 = C_2^3.
\]
Repeat the upper bound estimates in the proof of Theorem 1.4, we have, instead of (5.31) and (5.32),
\[
|\nabla u(x)| \leq \sum_{\alpha=1}^{2} |(C_1^\alpha - C_2^\alpha) \nabla u_1^\alpha(x)| + C \leq \frac{C \sqrt{\varepsilon}}{\delta(x_1)} + C \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{\delta(x_1)}}.
\]
For \( |p| \), similarly,
\[
|p(x) - (q)_{\delta,x'}| \leq \sum_{\alpha=1}^{2} |(C_1^\alpha - C_2^\alpha) (p_1^\alpha(x) - (q_1^\alpha)_{\delta,x'})| + C \leq C \sqrt{\varepsilon} \left( \frac{|x_1|}{\delta(x_1)} + 1 \right) + \frac{C \varepsilon^{3/2}}{\delta^2(x_1)} + \frac{C}{\sqrt{\delta(x_1)}}.
\]
Thus, (1.25) is proved.

For the lower bound, by virtue of (6.57) and \( |\partial_{x_2}(u_1^{(1)})|(0, x_2) \geq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \),
\[
|\sigma[u, p]|(0, x_2) = |2\mu e(u) - p|\big|(0, x_2)\big|
\geq \left| \sum_{\alpha=1}^{2} (C_1^\alpha - C_2^\alpha) \left( 2\mu e(u_1^\alpha) - p_1^\alpha \right) \right|(0, x_2) - C
\geq |C_1^\alpha - C_2^\alpha| 2\mu e_{12}(u_1^\alpha) \bigg|(0, x_2) - C \geq \frac{[\delta_1^\alpha] \|\varphi\|}{C \varepsilon}, \quad |x_2| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.
\]
If \( d = 3 \), from (6.53), we have
\[
C_1^\alpha = C_2^\alpha, \quad \alpha = 4, 5, 6.
\]
Instead of (2.18) and (2.19),
\[
|\nabla u(x)| \leq \sum_{\alpha=1}^{3} |(C_1^\alpha - C_2^\alpha) \nabla u_1^\alpha(x)| + C \leq \sum_{\alpha=1,2}^{3} |(C_1^\alpha - C_2^\alpha) \nabla u_1^\alpha(x)| + \left| (C_1^3 - C_2^3) \nabla u_1^3(x) \right| + C \leq \frac{C}{\ln \varepsilon \delta(x')},
\]
and
\[
|p(x) - (q)_{\delta,x'}| \leq \sum_{\alpha=1}^{3} |(C_1^\alpha - C_2^\alpha) (p_1^\alpha(x) - (q_1^\alpha)_{\delta,x'})| + C \leq \sum_{\alpha=1,2}^{3} |(C_1^\alpha - C_2^\alpha) (p_1^\alpha(x) - (q_1^\alpha)_{\delta,x'})| + \left| (C_1^3 - C_2^3) (p_1^3(x) - (q_1^3)_{\delta,x'}) \right| + C \leq \frac{C}{\ln \varepsilon} \left( \frac{|x'|}{\delta(x')} + 1 \right) + \frac{C \varepsilon}{\delta^2(x')} + C
\leq \frac{C|x'|}{\ln \varepsilon \delta(x')} + \frac{C}{\delta(x')} \leq \frac{C}{\delta(x')}.
\]
which implies (1.14).

For the lower bound, similarly as (6.61), and in view of Proposition 6.1,

\[ |C_1^3 - C_2^3| = \frac{1}{\det \bar{A}} \frac{\hat{b}_1^{33}[\varphi]}{\text{cof}(\bar{A})_{33}} + O \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{\ln \varepsilon} \right) \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{C} |\tilde{b}_1^{*33}[\varphi]|. \]

Then, if \( |\tilde{b}_1^{*33}[\varphi]| \neq 0 \), then

\[ \sigma[u, p](0', x_3) = |2\mu e(u) - p I|(0', x_3) \geq \left| \sum_{\alpha=1}^{3} (C_1^3 - C_2^3) \left( 2\mu e_{11}(u_1^3) - p_{11}^3 \right) \right|(0', x_3) - C \]

\[ \geq \left| (C_1^3 - C_2^3) \left( 2\mu e_{11}(u_1^3) - p_{11}^3 \right) \right|(0', x_3) - C \geq \frac{\hat{b}_1^{*33}[\varphi]}{C\varepsilon}, \quad |x_3| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \]

The proof of Corollary 1.7 is finished. \( \square \)
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