

HIGHER DERIVATIVE ESTIMATES FOR STOKES EQUATIONS WITH CLOSELY SPACED RIGID INCLUSIONS IN THREE DIMENSIONS

HONGJIE DONG, HAIGANG LI, HUALJUN TENG, AND PEIHAO ZHANG

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we establish higher-order derivative estimates for the Stokes equations in a three-dimensional domain containing two closely spaced rigid inclusions. We construct a sequence of auxiliary functions via an inductive process to isolate the leading singular terms of higher-order derivatives within the narrow region between the inclusions. For a class of convex inclusions of general shapes, the construction of three-dimensional auxiliary functions — unlike the two-dimensional case — relies on the decay properties of solutions to a class of two-dimensional partial differential equations with singular coefficients. Taking advantage of this, we obtain pointwise upper bounds of derivatives up to the seventh order for general inclusions. Under additional symmetry conditions, we derive optimal estimates for derivatives of arbitrary order. Consequently, we obtain precise blow-up rates for the Cauchy stress and its higher-order derivatives in the narrow region between the inclusions.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we investigate higher-order derivative estimates for the solution to the Stokes equations in three dimensions, in the presence of two adjacent rigid particles suspended in a fluid. Let $D \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ be a smooth, bounded domain, and let D_1 and D_2 be two subdomains of D whose boundaries are of class $C^{m+1,\alpha}$, where $m \geq 1$ and $0 < \alpha < 1$. We assume that D_1 and D_2 are separated by a distance ε and are located strictly inside D , away from the outer boundary ∂D . More precisely, we assume

$$\overline{D}_1, \overline{D}_2 \subset D, \quad \varepsilon := \text{dist}(D_1, D_2) > 0, \quad \text{dist}(D_1 \cup D_2, \partial D) > \kappa_0 > 0,$$

where κ_0 is a constant independent of ε . We also assume that the $C^{m+1,\alpha}$ -norms of ∂D_1 and ∂D_2 are uniformly bounded independently of ε .

We consider the following Dirichlet problem for the Stokes system with two adjacent rigid inclusions D_1 and D_2 :

$$\begin{cases} \mu \Delta \mathbf{u} = \nabla p, & \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0 & \text{in } \Omega := D \setminus \overline{D}_1 \cup \overline{D}_2, \\ \mathbf{u}|_+ = \mathbf{u}|_-, & & \text{on } \partial D_i, i = 1, 2, \\ e(\mathbf{u}) = 0, & & \text{in } D_i, i = 1, 2, \\ \int_{\partial D_i} \psi_\alpha \cdot \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial \nu} \Big|_+ ds - \int_{\partial D_i} p \psi_\alpha \cdot \nu ds = 0, & i = 1, 2, \alpha = 1, 2, \dots, 6, \\ \mathbf{u} = \boldsymbol{\varphi}, & & \text{on } \partial D, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

Date: December 2, 2025.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 35J57, 35Q74, 74E30, 35B44.

Key words and phrases. Stokes equations, Optimal higher derivative estimates, Fluid-solid models, Rigid particles.

H. Dong was partially supported by the NSF under agreement DMS-2350129.

H. Li was partially Supported by Beijing Natural Science Foundation (No. 1242006), National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 12471191), and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (No. 2233200015).

where $\mu > 0$ is the viscosity, $e(\mathbf{u}) := \frac{1}{2}(\nabla \mathbf{u} + \nabla \mathbf{u}^T)$ is the strain tensor, and $\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial \nu}|_+ := \mu(\nabla \mathbf{u} + \nabla \mathbf{u}^T)\nu$, with ν denoting the unit outward normal to D_i for $i = 1, 2$. The functions $\{\psi_\alpha\}$ form a basis of the six-dimensional space of rigid displacements $\Psi := \{\psi \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^3; \mathbb{R}^3) \mid e(\psi) = 0\}$. Specifically, the basis functions of Ψ are given by

$$\psi_\alpha = \mathbf{e}_\alpha, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, 3, \quad \text{where } \{\mathbf{e}_\alpha, \alpha = 1, 2, 3\} \text{ is the standard basis of } \mathbb{R}^3,$$

$$\psi_4 = (x_2, -x_1, 0)^T, \quad \psi_5 = (x_3, 0, -x_1)^T, \quad \psi_6 = (0, x_3, -x_2)^T.$$

Throughout the paper, the subscripts \pm denote the limits from the exterior and interior of the inclusions, respectively. Since D is a bounded domain, the divergence-free condition $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0$, together with the divergence theorem, implies that the prescribed boundary velocity φ must satisfy the compatibility condition $\int_{\partial D} \varphi \cdot \nu = 0$, to ensure the existence and uniqueness of a solution. See, for instance, [27]. For a detailed treatment of the steady Stokes equations, we refer the interested reader to the monograph by Galdi [17].

Investigating field enhancement in the narrow region between two adjacent inclusions is of fundamental importance in both fluid mechanics and materials science. The mathematical modeling of rigid inclusions moving in a fluid is one of the most classical and long-standing problems in fluid dynamics, tracing back to the foundational work of Stokes [39], Kirchhoff [24], and Jeffery [20]. Complex fluids, particularly those containing suspended particles or inclusions, often exhibit highly intricate flow behaviors. Therefore, understanding the interaction between inclusions and the surrounding fluid is crucial for practical applications involving particulate flows [16].

In experimental regimes with very low Reynolds numbers, the fluid motion is well approximated by the Stokes equations. In two dimensions, Ammari, Kang, Kim, and Yu [1] studied stress concentration in Stokes flow with two identical disk-shaped inclusions. Since the stress is represented by the gradient of the velocity field, they showed — using bipolar coordinates — that the gradient blows up at the rate of $\varepsilon^{-1/2}$ as the distance ε between the inclusions vanishes. They also derived an asymptotic formula that explicitly characterizes the singular behavior of the solution.

However, as noted in [1] and emphasized by Kang in his ICM 2022 presentation [21], extending these results to general inclusions and higher dimensions remains a significant challenge. In this direction, Li and Xu recently developed a pointwise iteration method to obtain upper bounds for the gradient in the narrow gaps between inclusions with strictly convex boundaries [32, 33]. They demonstrated that the optimal blow-up rate is $\varepsilon^{-1/2}$ in two dimensions and $|\varepsilon \ln \varepsilon|^{-1}$ in three dimensions for general inclusions. Furthermore, they obtained pointwise estimates for second-order derivatives. The asymptotic formula of the concentrated stress for general inclusions has been further explored by Li, Zhang, and Zhang in [34].

To better understand the stress enhancement in the narrow region, it is crucial — both from engineering and computational mathematics perspectives [29] — to investigate higher-order derivative estimates for solutions to the Stokes equations. In the two-dimensional Stokes flow setting, we previously extended the energy iteration technique developed in [32, 33] and introduced a novel method for constructing a sequence of auxiliary functions [14]. This enabled us to derive the optimal blow-up rate $\varepsilon^{-m/2}$ for the m -th order derivatives of the solution under certain symmetry conditions on the domain. For the case of general inclusions, we also established pointwise upper bounds for higher-order derivatives.

In the two-dimensional setting, the auxiliary function was chosen as a special solution to a first-order ordinary differential equation tailored to satisfy the necessary structural conditions.

However, this approach cannot be directly extended to higher dimensions, as finding a suitable solution to a first-order partial differential equation in $(d - 1)$ variables with the required properties is no longer feasible. Therefore, new analytical tools must be developed.

As a continuation of [14], the present paper aims to construct a sequence of appropriate auxiliary functions for the three-dimensional case. These constructions are intricately connected to the decay properties of solutions to a class of two-dimensional inhomogeneous second-order partial differential equations with singular coefficients. We precisely quantify the singular behavior of higher-order derivatives in the Stokes system with closely spaced rigid inclusions in three dimensions.

This work is also partially motivated by the study of physical field enhancement between two hard inclusions in high-contrast materials, due to its close connection with linear elasticity. When two inclusions are closely spaced within a material, physical fields — such as stress — can become arbitrarily large in the narrow gap between them. The mathematical investigation of this phenomenon dates back to the seminal work of Babuška [4]. It is now well established that such field blow-up occurs in both electrostatics and elastostatics. A quantitative understanding of this behavior is essential, as it plays a critical role in applications such as light confinement in electrostatics and failure analysis in elastostatics.

Over the past two decades, substantial progress has been made by numerous researchers in characterizing field enhancement. For studies related to the conductivity problem. See, for example, [8, 3, 2, 5, 9, 22, 10, 37, 40, 15, 28]. For investigations on linear elasticity with hard inclusions, we refer the reader to [6, 7, 23, 30, 31, 13]. For results concerning the Stokes system or elliptic equations with general discontinuous coefficients and their applications, we refer the reader to [38, 12, 25, 11, 26, 36, 35] and the references therein.

Before presenting our main results, we first describe the domain setup and introduce the necessary notation. For convenience, we translate and rotate the coordinate system so that the points $P_1 = (0', \varepsilon/2) \in \partial D_1$ and $P_2 = (0', -\varepsilon/2) \in \partial D_2$ satisfy $\text{dist}(P_1, P_2) = \text{dist}(\partial D_1, \partial D_2) = \varepsilon$. There exists a constant $R > 0$, independent of ε , such that the portions of ∂D_1 and ∂D_2 near the origin can be represented as graphs of functions:

$$x_3 = \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + h_1(x') \quad \text{and} \quad x_3 = -\frac{\varepsilon}{2} - h_2(x') \quad \text{for } |x'| \leq 2R,$$

where we denote points in \mathbb{R}^3 by $x = (x', x_3)$, with $x' \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Here $h_1, h_2 \in C^{m+1, \alpha}(B_{2R}(0'))$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ are *radial* functions and satisfy the following conditions, for $2 \leq k \leq m+1$, $i = 1, 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{\varepsilon}{2} - h_2(x') &< \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + h_1(x') \quad \text{for } |x'| \leq 2R, \\ h_1(0') &= h_2(0') = 0, \quad \nabla_{x'} h_1(0') = \nabla_{x'} h_2(0') = 0, \\ h_1(x') + h_2(x') &= \sum_{j=1}^m a_j |x'|^{j+1} + O(|x'|^{m+1+\alpha}) \quad \text{for } |x'| \leq 2R, \\ |h_i(x')| &\leq C|x'|^2, \quad |\nabla_{x'} h_i(x')| \leq C|x'|, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k h_i(x')| \leq C, \end{aligned} \tag{1.2}$$

where $a_1 > 0$ and a_j , $j = 2, \dots, m$, are constants. For $0 \leq r \leq 2R$, we define the neck region between D_1 and D_2 as

$$\Omega_r := \left\{ (x', x_3) \in \Omega : -\frac{\varepsilon}{2} - h_2(x') < x_3 < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + h_1(x'), |x'| < r \right\}.$$

The top and bottom boundaries of the neck region are denoted by $\Gamma_r^+ := \{(x', x_3) \in \Omega : x_3 = \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + h_1(x'), |x'| < r\}$ and $\Gamma_r^- := \{(x', x_3) \in \Omega : x_3 = -\frac{\varepsilon}{2} - h_2(x'), |x'| < r\}$. Denote the

vertical distance at x' in the narrow region between D_1 and D_2 by

$$\delta(x') := \varepsilon + h_1(x') + h_2(x'), \quad |x'| \leq 2R.$$

It follows from (1.2) that $\frac{1}{C}(\varepsilon + |x'|^2) \leq \delta(x') \leq C(\varepsilon + |x'|^2)$. For $|z'| \leq R$ and $s < R$, set

$$\Omega_s(z') := \left\{ (x', x_3) \mid -\frac{\varepsilon}{2} - h_2(x') < x_3 < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + h_1(x'), |x' - z'| < s \right\}. \quad (1.3)$$

Throughout this paper, we use C to denote a generic constant, whose value may change from line to line. Unless otherwise specified, C depends only on κ_0 , κ , R , the boundary data φ , and the upper bounds of the $C^{m+1,\alpha}$ -norms of ∂D_1 and ∂D_2 , but is independent of the small parameter ε .

1.1. Upper bounds of the higher derivatives. According to the standard theory for Stokes equations, we have the following bound for $m \geq 0$:

$$\|\nabla^{m+1} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \setminus \Omega_R)} + \|\nabla^m(p - p(z))\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \setminus \Omega_R)} \leq C,$$

for some fixed point $z \in \Omega \setminus \Omega_R$. See, for instance, [17]. Our primary focus is to obtain higher-order derivative estimates for problem (1.1) in the narrow region Ω_R .

To this end, following the idea in [14] for the two-dimensional problem and instead of solving an ordinary differential equation, we construct a sequence of divergence-free auxiliary functions which are, however, directly connected to the following inhomogeneous elliptic partial differential equation in two dimensions:

$$\mathcal{L}\mathcal{U} := \Delta_{x'} \mathcal{U}(x') + \frac{3}{\varepsilon + h(x')} \nabla_{x'} h(x') \cdot \nabla_{x'} \mathcal{U}(x') = \mathcal{F}(x') \quad \text{in } B_{2R}(0') \quad (1.4)$$

with given $\mathcal{F}(x')$, where $h(x')$ is a positive function satisfying the third line in (1.2). In our setting, we will later take $h(x') = h_1(x') + h_2(x')$.

If $\mathcal{F}(x')$ is radial, i.e., $\mathcal{F}(x') = f(|x'|)$, then a special solution to (1.4) can be obtained directly by ordinary differential equation theory — similar to the approach for the two-dimensional Stokes problem in [14]. However, when $\mathcal{F}(x')$ is not radial — even for example, $\mathcal{F}(x') = f(|x'|)x_1$ — an explicit form of $\mathcal{U}(x')$ is generally not be easily obtained. Instead to find a special solution to (1.4), we establish the following estimates.

Proposition 1.1. *Suppose that \mathcal{F} is smooth. Let $\mathcal{U} \in C^{m+1}(B_{2R}(0'))$ be a solution to (1.4). If*

$$|\nabla_{x'}^l \mathcal{F}(x')| \leq C(\varepsilon + h(x'))^{\gamma - \frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq l \leq m, \quad x' \in B_{2R}(0') \quad (1.5)$$

for some constants C , then for $-3 \leq \gamma < -1$, we have

$$|\nabla_{x'}^l \mathcal{U}(x')| \leq C(\varepsilon + h(x'))^{\gamma - \frac{1}{2} + 1} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq l \leq m + 1, \quad x' \in B_{2R}(0'). \quad (1.6)$$

Here, we conjecture that (1.6) remains valid even when $\gamma \geq -1$ and in all dimensions. With the aid of Proposition 1.1, we are able to derive higher-order derivative estimates for the solution to (1.1) — up to the seventh order — for inclusions of various shapes, by constructing appropriate auxiliary functions.

Theorem 1.2. *Let D_1 , D_2 , D , and Ω be defined as above. Let $\mathbf{u} \in H^1(D; \mathbb{R}^3) \cap C^{m+1}(\bar{\Omega}; \mathbb{R}^3)$ and $p \in L^2(D) \cap C^m(\bar{\Omega})$ be the solution to (1.1), with $\varphi \in C^{m+1,\alpha}(\partial D; \mathbb{R}^3)$, for an integer $m \geq 0$ and $0 < \alpha < 1$. Then, for sufficiently small $0 < \varepsilon < 1/2$ and $x = (x', x_3) \in \Omega_R$, we have the following estimates:*

$$(i) \quad |\nabla \mathbf{u}(x)| \leq \frac{C(1 + |\ln \varepsilon| |x'|)}{|\ln \varepsilon| \delta(x')}, \quad |p(x) - p(z', 0)| \leq \frac{C}{|\ln \varepsilon| \delta(x')^{3/2}} + C \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega_R, \quad (1.7)$$

for some fixed point $(z', 0) \in \Omega_R$ with $|z'| = R/2$; and
(ii) for $1 \leq m \leq 6$,

$$|\nabla^{m+1} \mathbf{u}(x)| + |\nabla^m p(x)| \leq \frac{C}{|\ln \varepsilon|} \delta(x')^{-\frac{m+3}{2}} + C \delta(x')^{-\frac{m+1}{2}} \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega_R. \quad (1.8)$$

The core of the proof for Theorem 1.2 involves constructing a sequence of auxiliary functions to establish pointwise higher-order derivative estimates for solutions $(\mathbf{u}_i^\alpha, p_i^\alpha)$ to the following boundary value problem with narrow region

$$\begin{cases} \mu \Delta \mathbf{u}_i^\alpha = \nabla p_i^\alpha, \quad \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}_i^\alpha = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \mathbf{u}_i^\alpha = \psi_\alpha & \text{on } \partial D_i, \\ \mathbf{u}_i^\alpha = 0 & \text{on } \partial D_j \cup \partial D, \quad j \neq i, \end{cases} \quad \text{for } \alpha = 1, 2, \dots, 6, \quad i = 1, 2. \quad (1.9)$$

We use (\mathbf{u}_1^1, p_1^1) as an example to illustrate our method. As mentioned previously, we construct auxiliary functions satisfying (1.4) to suppress the growth of the inhomogeneous term near the origin, thereby isolating the singularities in higher-order derivatives of the solution in the narrow region.

First, we choose a divergence-free function \mathbf{v}_1^1 such that $\mathbf{v}_1^1 = \mathbf{u}_1^1$ on $\partial\Omega$ and a suitable \bar{p}_1 . The difference $\mathbf{w} := \mathbf{u}_1^1 - \mathbf{v}_1^1$ and $q := p_1^1 - \bar{p}_1$ then satisfy the zero boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} -\mu \Delta \mathbf{w} + \nabla q = \mathbf{f}_1^1, \quad \nabla \cdot \mathbf{w} = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \mathbf{w} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.10)$$

where $\mathbf{f}_1^1 := \mu \Delta \mathbf{v}_1^1 - \nabla \bar{p}_1$. By Proposition A.1, if $|\mathbf{f}_1^1| \leq C \delta(x')^{-1}$ in the narrow region Ω_{2R} , it follows that $|\nabla \mathbf{u}_1^1| \leq |\nabla \mathbf{v}_1^1| + C$. To achieve this, recalling that $\psi_1 = (1, 0, 0)^T$, we first define the auxiliary function

$$\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^1 = \psi_1 \left(k(x) + \frac{1}{2} \right), \quad \text{where } k(x) = \frac{x_3 - \frac{1}{2}(h_1 - h_2)(x')}{\delta(x')} \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R},$$

for $h_1(x')$ and $h_2(x')$ satisfying (1.2). It is easy to check that $k(x) + \frac{1}{2} = 1$ on Γ_{2R}^+ and $k(x) + \frac{1}{2} = 0$ on Γ_{2R}^- , and so $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^1 = \mathbf{u}_1^1$ on Γ_{2R}^\pm , but it fails to satisfy $\nabla \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^1 = 0$, since $\nabla \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^1 = \partial_{x_1} k(x) \neq 0$. We therefore need to introduce a correction term

$$\hat{\mathbf{v}}_1^1 = \left(F_1(x'), G_1(x'), H_1(x) \right)^T \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R},$$

vanishing on Γ_{2R}^+ (using $k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} = 0$ on $\Gamma_{2R}^+ \cup \Gamma_{2R}^-$) and ensuring $\nabla \cdot (\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^1 + \hat{\mathbf{v}}_1^1) = 0$. A sufficient condition is that $F_1(x')$, $G_1(x')$, and $H_1(x)$ satisfy

$$\partial_{x_1} F_1(x') + \partial_{x_2} G_1(x') + \frac{\partial_{x_1} \delta(x')}{\delta(x')} F_1(x') + \frac{\partial_{x_2} \delta(x')}{\delta(x')} G_1(x') = -\frac{3 \partial_{x_1} (h_1 - h_2)(x')}{\delta(x')} \quad (1.11)$$

and

$$H_1(x) = \partial_{x_1} (h_1 - h_2)(x') k(x) + \frac{1}{2} \partial_{x_1} (h_1 + h_2)(x') - \delta(x') (F_1(x) \partial_{x_1} k(x) - G_1(x) \partial_{x_2} k(x)).$$

See (3.6) and (3.7) below. This construction results in $\partial_{x_3 x_3} (\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^1)^{(1)}$ and $\partial_{x_3 x_3} (\hat{\mathbf{v}}_1^1)^{(2)}$ being the leading terms in $\mu \Delta (\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^1 + \hat{\mathbf{v}}_1^1)$, exhibiting a higher order $\delta(x')^{-2}$ singularity. To reduce this singularity, we introduce $\hat{p}_1(x) = \hat{p}_1(x')$ to cancel these terms, namely,

$$\partial_{x_1} \hat{p}_1(x') = \mu \partial_{x_3 x_3} (\mathbf{v}_1^1)^{(1)} = \frac{2\mu F(x')}{\delta(x')^2}, \quad \partial_{x_2} \hat{p}_1(x') = \mu \partial_{x_3 x_3} (\mathbf{v}_1^1)^{(2)} = \frac{2\mu G(x')}{\delta(x')^2}. \quad (1.12)$$

Thus, substituting (1.12) into (1.11) yields

$$\Delta_{x'} \hat{p}_1(x') + \frac{3}{\delta(x')} \nabla_{x'} \delta(x') \cdot \nabla_{x'} \hat{p}_1(x') = -\frac{6\mu \partial_{x_1}(h_1 - h_2)(x')}{\delta(x')^3} := \mathcal{F}_1(x').$$

By Proposition 1.1, $\hat{p}_1(x')$ satisfies (1.4) with $h = h_1 + h_2$ and $\gamma = -\frac{5}{2}$, ensuring the existence of auxiliary functions \mathbf{v}_1^1 and \hat{p}_1^1 with desired estimates. Then, the leading term in $\mu \Delta \mathbf{v}_1^1 - \nabla \hat{p}_1$ only appears in the third term, $\mu \partial_{x_3 x_3}(\mathbf{v}_1^1)^{(3)}$, which is a polynomial in x_3 . Thus, by choosing a polynomial \tilde{p}_1 in x_3 , we eliminate this term, guaranteeing $|\mathbf{f}_1^1| \leq C\delta(x')^{-1}$, and thus by Proposition A.1, $|\nabla \mathbf{u}_1^1| \leq |\nabla \mathbf{v}_1^1| + C$.

To estimate the second-order derivatives $\nabla^2 \mathbf{u}_1^1$, we further construct auxiliary functions $(\mathbf{v}_1^2, \bar{p}_2)$ to reduce the upper bounds of the inhomogeneous term in (1.10). We divide \mathbf{v}_1^2 into two parts, $\mathbf{v}_1^2 = \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^2 + \hat{\mathbf{v}}_1^2$. The first part, $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^2$, cancels the leading term of \mathbf{f}_1^1 , while the second part, $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_1^2$, ensures $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_1^2 = 0$. Both parts vanish on Γ_{2R}^\pm . From the first step, we know that the leading terms in \mathbf{f}_1^1 are $(\mathbf{f}_1^1)^{(1)}$ and $(\mathbf{f}_1^1)^{(2)}$. Therefore, we choose $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^2$ such that

$$\partial_{x_3 x_3}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^2)^{(i)} = (\mathbf{f}_1^1)^{(i)}, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Since $(\mathbf{f}_1^1)^{(i)}$ is expressible as a polynomial in x_3 , $(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^2)^{(i)}$ can be solved explicitly. See (3.24) and (3.26) below. If we simply set $(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^2)^{(3)} = 0$ such that $\nabla \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^2 = R(x', x_3)$, for some explicit function $R(x', x_3)$, then it is challenging to find a suitable $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_1^2$ satisfying $\nabla \cdot \hat{\mathbf{v}}_1^2 = -R(x', x_3)$ in this case. Here, a key idea is to first design $(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^2)^{(3)}$ such that $\nabla \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^2 = R(x')$, independent of x_3 . Then we construct $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_1^2$ in the form

$$\hat{\mathbf{v}}_1^2 = (F_2(x'), G_2(x'), H_2(x'))^T \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R},$$

with $\nabla \cdot \hat{\mathbf{v}}_1^2 = -R(x')$. Here, we take

$$H_2(x) = -2\delta(x')R(x')k(x) - \delta(x')\partial_{x_1}k(x)F_2(x') - \delta(x')\partial_{x_2}k(x)G_2(x')$$

and

$$\partial_{x_1}F_2(x') + \partial_{x_2}G_2(x') + \frac{\partial_{x_1}\delta(x')}{\delta(x')}F_2(x') + \frac{\partial_{x_2}\delta(x')}{\delta(x')}G_2(x') = 6R(x').$$

See (3.32) and (3.33) below.

Analogous to the first step, the functions $F_2(x')$ and $G_2(x')$ introduce new singularities in \mathbf{f}_1^2 . To cancel these leading singularities, we choose \hat{p}_2 such that

$$\partial_{x_1}\hat{p}_2 = \frac{2\mu F_2(x')}{\delta(x')^2}, \quad \partial_{x_2}\hat{p}_2 = \frac{2\mu G_2(x')}{\delta(x')^2}.$$

Then

$$\Delta_{x'} \hat{p}_2 + \frac{3}{\delta(x')} \nabla_{x'} \delta(x') \cdot \nabla_{x'} \hat{p}_2 = \frac{12\mu R(x')}{\delta(x')^2} := \mathcal{F}_2(x').$$

One can see that $\hat{p}_2(x')$ satisfies (1.4) with $h = h_1 + h_2$ and $\gamma = -\frac{3}{2}$. Hence, by virtue of Proposition 1.1, there exist auxiliary functions \mathbf{v}_1^2 and \hat{p}_2 with desired decays. We choose \tilde{p}_2 as a polynomial in x_3 to eliminate the singularity in the third term; see (3.40) below. Therefore, $|\mathbf{f}_1^2| = |\mu \Delta(\mathbf{v}_1^1 + \mathbf{v}_1^2) - \nabla(\bar{p}_1 + \bar{p}_2)| \leq C$, which implies $|\nabla^2 \mathbf{u}_1^1| \leq |\nabla^2(\mathbf{v}_1^1 + \mathbf{v}_1^2)| + C$ by Proposition A.1.

However, we cannot further proceed this procedure for the third and higher order derivatives, as it remains unclear whether Proposition 1.1 holds for $\gamma \geq -1$. Therefore, it is no longer possible to find a solution to (1.4) to construct an auxiliary divergence-free function

\mathbf{v}_1^3 . Instead, we introduce a non-divergence-free \mathbf{v}_1^3 and pressure \bar{p}_3 (see (3.47), (3.50), and (3.57)) such that

$$\left| \nabla^{m+1}(\mathbf{v}_1^1 + \mathbf{v}_1^2 + \mathbf{v}_1^3) \right| + \left| \nabla^m(\bar{p}_1 + \bar{p}_2 + \bar{p}_3) \right| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{m+3}{2}}, \quad m \geq 1, \quad (1.13)$$

and

$$\left\| \nabla^{m+1}(\mathbf{u}_1^1 - \sum_{i=1}^3 \mathbf{v}_1^i) \right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(x')/2}(x'))} + \left\| \nabla^m(p_1^1 - \sum_{i=1}^3 \bar{p}_i) \right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(x')/2}(x'))} \leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{3}{2}-m}. \quad (1.14)$$

By comparing the decay orders on the right-hand sides (1.13) and (1.14), we observe that when $m \geq 7$, the orders of $\delta(x')$, $m - \frac{3}{2} > \frac{m+3}{2}$. This means the estimates can no longer capture the leading behavior of $\nabla^8 \mathbf{u}_1^1$ and $\nabla^7 p_1^1$. Therefore, we can only establish the derivative estimates up to seventh-order for the general inclusion case.

For derivatives of order 8 or higher, we obtain a comparatively larger upper bound:

$$|\nabla^{m+1} \mathbf{u}_1^1(x)| + |\nabla^m p_1^1(x)| \leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{3}{2}-m}, \quad m \geq 7, \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega_R.$$

An open question is whether (1.6) holds for $\gamma \geq 1$. If confirmed, iterative application of our method would extend (1.8) to all $m \geq 1$. The detailed proofs are carried out component-wise for the decomposition, and the construction process is performed separately for each component $(\mathbf{u}_i^\alpha, p_i^\alpha)$ in Sections 3, 4, and 5, and Theorem 1.2 is then proved in Section 6.

However, by incorporating symmetry assumptions on both the domain and boundary data, we can directly obtain the optimal estimates. Specifically, we assume that $D_1 \cup D_2$ and D are symmetric about the coordinate axes, the boundary data satisfy $\varphi(-x) = -\varphi(x)$, and $h_1(x') = h_2(x') = \frac{1}{2}h(x')$ in Ω_{2R} . This setting clearly includes the most important case in practical applications, where D_1 and D_2 are two balls of equal radius.

Theorem 1.3. *Let D_1, D_2, D , and Ω be defined as above. Let $\mathbf{u} \in H^1(D; \mathbb{R}^3) \cap C^{m+1}(\bar{\Omega}; \mathbb{R}^3)$ and $p \in L^2(D) \cap C^m(\bar{\Omega})$ be the solution to (1.1), where $\varphi \in C^{m+1,\alpha}(\partial D; \mathbb{R}^3)$ for an integer $m \geq 0$ and $0 < \alpha < 1$, and $\varphi(-x) = -\varphi(x)$. Then, for sufficiently small $0 < \varepsilon < 1/2$ and $x = (x', x_3) \in \Omega_R$, the following estimates hold:*

$$(i) \quad |\nabla \mathbf{u}(x)| \leq \frac{C}{|\ln \varepsilon| \delta(x')} + C, \quad |p(x) - p(z', 0)| \leq \frac{C\varepsilon}{\delta(x')^2} + C \text{ for } (z', 0) \in \Omega_R \text{ with } |z'| = R/2;$$

and

$$(ii) \quad |\nabla^{m+1} \mathbf{u}(x)| + |\nabla^m p(x)| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{m+2}{2}} + C \quad \text{for } m \geq 1.$$

As a consequence, for the Cauchy stress tensor $\sigma[\mathbf{u}, p] = 2\mu\epsilon(\mathbf{u}) - p\mathbb{I}$, where \mathbb{I} is the identity matrix, we have

$$|\nabla^m \sigma[\mathbf{u}, p - p(z', 0)]| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{m+2}{2}} + C.$$

Remark 1.4. We would like to point out that our method works well in higher dimensions $d \geq 4$. The construction of the auxiliary functions is associated with the decaying solutions of $(d-1)$ -dimensional partial differential equations (1.4) and the method we utilize to prove Proposition 1.1 is valid for any $d \geq 3$.

1.2. Lower bounds of the higher derivatives. We will establish a lower bound for $|\nabla^{m+1} \mathbf{u}(x)|$ that exhibits the same blow-up rate as stated in Theorem 1.3, thereby confirming the optimality of the derived rates. This result is obtained under the assumption that $D_1 \cup D_2$ and D are symmetric with respect to the x_i -axis for $i = 1, 2, 3$, and that both

$h_1(x')$ and $h_2(x')$ are quadratic functions. Specifically, we set $h_1(x') = h_2(x') = \frac{1}{2}|x'|^2$ for $|x'| \leq 2R$. We define a linear continuous functional of φ :

$$\tilde{b}_j^{*\alpha}[\varphi] := \int_{\partial D_j^0} \psi_\alpha \cdot \sigma[\mathbf{u}^*, p^*] \nu, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, \dots, 6, \quad j = 1, 2,$$

where (\mathbf{u}^*, p^*) verifies

$$\begin{cases} \mu \Delta \mathbf{u}^* = \nabla p^*, & \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}^* = 0 & \text{in } \Omega^0, \\ \mathbf{u}^* = \sum_{\alpha=1}^6 C_*^\alpha \psi_\alpha & & \text{on } \partial D_1^0 \cup \partial D_2^0, \\ \int_{\partial D_1^0} \psi_\alpha \cdot \sigma[\mathbf{u}^*, p^*] \nu + \int_{\partial D_2^0} \psi_\alpha \cdot \sigma[\mathbf{u}^*, p^*] \nu = 0, & \alpha = 1, 2, \dots, 6, \\ \mathbf{u}^* = \varphi & & \text{on } \partial D, \end{cases}$$

where $D_1^0 := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid x + P_1 \in D_1\}$, $D_2^0 := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid x + P_2 \in D_2\}$ and $\Omega^0 := D \setminus \overline{D_1^0 \cup D_2^0}$.

Theorem 1.5. *Let $D_1, D_2 \subset D$ be defined as above and let $\mathbf{u} \in H^1(D; \mathbb{R}^3) \cap C^m(\bar{\Omega}; \mathbb{R}^3)$ be the solution to (1.1). Suppose that there exists a φ such that $\varphi(-x) = -\varphi(x)$ and $\tilde{b}_1^{*1}[\varphi], \tilde{b}_1^{*3}[\varphi] \neq 0$. Then for $m \geq 1$ and sufficiently small $0 < \varepsilon < 1/2$, there exists a small constant $r > 0$ which may depend on m , such that*

$$|\partial_{x_3} \mathbf{u}^{(1)}(r\sqrt{\varepsilon}, 0, 0)| \geq \frac{C|\tilde{b}_1^{*1}[\varphi]|}{|\ln \varepsilon|} \varepsilon^{-1}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^{m-1} \partial_{x_3}^2 (\mathbf{u})^{(1)}(r\sqrt{\varepsilon}, 0, 0)| \geq C|\tilde{b}_1^{*3}[\varphi]| \varepsilon^{-\frac{m+2}{2}}. \quad (1.15)$$

Consequently,

$$|\nabla_{x'}^{m-1} \partial_{x_3} \sigma[\mathbf{u}, p]|(r\sqrt{\varepsilon}, 0, 0) \geq C|\tilde{b}_1^{*3}[\varphi]| \varepsilon^{-\frac{m+2}{2}}.$$

Remark 1.6. The upper bound of $\sigma[\mathbf{u}, p - p(z', 0)]$, as established in Theorem 1.3, is of order $\frac{1}{\varepsilon}$. This blow-up rate is considered optimal, as it satisfies

$$|\sigma[\mathbf{u}, p - p(z', 0)]|(0', x_3) \geq \frac{1}{C\varepsilon},$$

as shown in [33, Theorem 4.6].

The optimality of the gradient estimates in (1.7) is confirmed by the lower-bound (1.15) with $m = 0$. The optimality of the higher-order derivative bounds in Theorem 1.3 is established through Theorem 1.5. However, for arbitrary convex functions $h_1(x')$ and $h_2(x')$, the optimality of the high-order derivative estimates in Theorem 1.2 remains unclear. It is speculated that the asymmetry $h_1(x') \neq h_2(x')$ could lead to additional singularities, as observed in the two-dimensional case [14].

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we first present a general $W^{m,\infty}$ estimate for Stokes equations with partially zero boundary conditions in a narrow region. The proof, given in the Appendix, is based on the $W^{m,p}$ estimates and a modified version of the energy method. Specifically, for an auxiliary function pair (\mathbf{v}, \bar{p}) satisfying the same boundary conditions as (\mathbf{u}, p) on Γ_{2R}^\pm , with $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v} = g(x)$ in Ω_{2R} for an explicit function $g(x)$, we reduce the local estimates of the differences $|\nabla^{m+1}(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v})|$ and $|\nabla^m(p - \bar{p})|$ to controlling the right-hand side terms $\mathbf{f} := \mu \Delta \mathbf{v}(x) - \nabla \bar{p}(x)$ and $g(x)$. Proposition 1.1 is proven in Subsection 2.2. In Section 3, we consider the Stokes system with prescribed Dirichlet boundary data ψ_α on ∂D_1 and ∂D_2 , for $\alpha = 1, 2$ (see (1.9) below). We demonstrate that if $h_1(x') = h_2(x')$, then the non-homogeneous term in equation (1.4) becomes radial. We then establish m -order derivative estimates for any m by constructing a sequence of divergence-free auxiliary

functions \mathbf{v}_α^m and corresponding \bar{p}_m in Ω_{2R} . This construction ensures that the quantity

$$\left| \sum_{l=1}^{m+1} (\mu \Delta \mathbf{v}_\alpha^l - \nabla \bar{p}_l)(x) \right|$$

satisfies the required pointwise upper bound in Ω_{2R} , as stated in Proposition 2.1. However, in cases where $h_1(x') \neq h_2(x')$, we are only able to construct three pairs of auxiliary functions $(\mathbf{v}_\alpha^l, \bar{p}_l)$, $l = 1, 2, 3$, by utilizing Proposition 1.1. This allows us to accurately capture the leading terms of the high-order derivative of equation (1.1) up to the seventh order. For derivatives of order eight or higher, we are only able to provide relatively coarse upper bounds. In Sections 4 and 5, we investigate the estimates of high-order derivatives for specific Dirichlet boundary data ψ_α on ∂D_1 and ∂D_2 , where $\alpha = 3, 4, 5, 6$, respectively. Finally, in Section 6, we prove Theorems 1.2, 1.3, and 1.5, based on the estimates established in Sections 3, 4, and 5.

2. PRELIMINARY RESULTS

In this section, we present high-order derivatives for a class of homogeneous Stokes equations and prove Proposition 1.1. Let D be a domain in \mathbb{R}^d , $d \geq 2$, with two closely disjoint subdomains D_1 and D_2 , and denote $\Omega = D \setminus \overline{D_1 \cup D_2}$. We consider the following Stokes equations:

$$\begin{cases} -\mu \Delta \mathbf{u} + \nabla p = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \mathbf{u} = \boldsymbol{\varphi} & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

with given smooth boundary data $\boldsymbol{\varphi}$ satisfying $\int_{\partial\Omega} \boldsymbol{\varphi} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu} = 0$. The existence and uniqueness of the solution to (2.1) are well known. By standard regularity theory, we have

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_{C^{m+1}(\Omega \setminus \Omega_R)} + \|p\|_{C^m(\Omega \setminus \Omega_R)} \leq C.$$

We only need to estimate the high-order derivatives of (2.1) in the narrow region Ω_{2R} .

Our approach involves constructing a series of different auxiliary functions to capture the singular behavior of the derivatives of any order of the solution to (2.1). Let (\mathbf{v}, \bar{p}) be a known function pair that satisfies $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{g}$ on $\Gamma_{2R}^+ \cup \Gamma_{2R}^-$ and $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v} = g(x)$ in Ω_{2R} , with

$$\|\mathbf{v}\|_{C^{m+1}(\Omega \setminus \Omega_R)} + \|\bar{p}\|_{C^m(\Omega \setminus \Omega_R)} \leq C.$$

Define the difference between (\mathbf{u}, p) and (\mathbf{v}, \bar{p}) as

$$\mathbf{w} := \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v} \quad \text{and} \quad q := p - \bar{p}.$$

Then, (\mathbf{w}, q) satisfies the following boundary value problem for the nonhomogeneous Stokes equations in the narrow region:

$$\begin{cases} -\mu \Delta \mathbf{w} + \nabla q = \mathbf{f} & \text{in } \Omega_{2R}, \\ \nabla \cdot \mathbf{w} = -g & \text{in } \Omega_{2R}, \\ \mathbf{w} = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_{2R}^+ \cup \Gamma_{2R}^-, \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

where $\mathbf{f} := \mu \Delta \mathbf{v} - \nabla \bar{p}$ and $g = \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}$. We have the following higher derivative estimates for (2.2).

2.1. Estimates for Stokes equations with non-zero divergence in the narrow region.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $\mathbf{w} \in H^1(\Omega_{\frac{3}{2}R}) \cap L^\infty(\Omega_{2R} \setminus \Omega_R)$ and $p \in L^\infty(\Omega_{2R} \setminus \Omega_R)$ be the solution to (2.2). For any $m \geq 1$, if*

$$|\nabla^k \mathbf{f}(x)| \leq C\delta(x')^{l-k}, \quad \forall 0 \leq k \leq m, \quad l \geq -\frac{3}{2} \quad \text{for } x = (x', x_d) \in \Omega_{2R},$$

and

$$|\nabla^k g(x)| \leq C\delta(x')^{\alpha-k}, \quad \forall 0 \leq k \leq m+1, \quad \alpha \geq -\frac{1}{2} \quad \text{for } x = (x', x_d) \in \Omega_{2R},$$

then it holds that

$$\|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(z')/2}(z'))} \leq C\delta(z')^{l+1} + C\delta(z')^\alpha, \quad z = (z', z_d) \in \Omega_R,$$

and for $z = (z', z_d) \in \Omega_R$,

$$\|\nabla^{m+1} \mathbf{w}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(z')/2}(z'))} + \|\nabla^m q\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(z')/2}(z'))} \leq C\delta(z')^{l+1-m} + C\delta(z')^{\alpha-m},$$

where $\Omega_s(z')$ is defined in (1.3).

The proof can be found in the Appendix. It can be deduced from Proposition 2.1 that in order to obtain higher derivative estimates of \mathbf{u} and p in Ω_R , it is sufficient to construct suitable auxiliary functions \mathbf{v} and \bar{p} in the region Ω_{2R} , such that \mathbf{f} and g and their derivatives have appropriate upper bounds. This is the central idea of the paper and the main challenge also lies here. In the construction process of auxiliary divergence-free functions, Proposition 1.1 plays an important role.

2.2. Proof of Proposition 1.1. In this subsection, we give the proof of Proposition 1.1. To this end, the following lemma is needed.

Lemma 2.2. *For any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists a universal constant C_α , such that*

$$\|(\varepsilon + h)^\alpha\|_{L^\infty(B_{\frac{1}{C_\alpha}\sqrt{\varepsilon+h(x'_0)}}(x'_0))} \leq C_\alpha(\varepsilon + h(x'_0))^\alpha, \quad x'_0 \in B_{2R}(0'). \quad (2.3)$$

In particular, there exists a constant $C := C_{-1/2}$ such that

$$\left\| \frac{\nabla_{x'} h}{\varepsilon + h} \right\|_{L^\infty(B_{\frac{1}{C}\sqrt{\varepsilon+h(x'_0)}}(x'_0))} \leq C(\varepsilon + h(x'_0))^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad x'_0 \in B_{2R}(0'). \quad (2.4)$$

Proof of Lemma 2.2. It follows from the third line in (1.2) that $\frac{1}{C}|x'|^2 \leq h(x') \leq C|x'|^2$, thus we only need to prove (2.3) for $h(x') = |x'|^2$. For any $x' \in B_{\sqrt{\varepsilon+h(x'_0)}}(x'_0)$, if $\alpha \geq 0$, by a direct calculation, we have

$$(\varepsilon + h(x'))^\alpha \leq C \left(\varepsilon + \left(|x'_0| + \sqrt{\varepsilon + |x'_0|^2} \right)^2 \right)^\alpha \leq C(\varepsilon + h(x'_0))^\alpha.$$

Thus, (2.3) holds for $\alpha \geq 0$. If $\alpha < 0$, we divide the proof into two cases.

Case 1: if $|x'_0| \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon}$, for any $x' \in B_{\sqrt{\varepsilon+h(x'_0)}}(x'_0)$, we have

$$(\varepsilon + h(x'))^\alpha \leq \varepsilon^\alpha \leq 2^{-\alpha}(\varepsilon + |x'_0|^2)^\alpha \leq C(\varepsilon + h(x'_0))^\alpha.$$

Case 2: if $|x'_0| > \sqrt{\varepsilon}$, there exists a small enough $r < \frac{1}{4}$ such that $||x'_0| - r\sqrt{\varepsilon + h(x'_0)}| > 0$, for any $x' \in B_{r\sqrt{\varepsilon + h(x'_0)}}(x'_0)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\varepsilon + h(x'))^\alpha &\leq \left(\varepsilon + |x'_0|^2 + r^2(\varepsilon + h(x'_0)) - 2r|x'_0|\sqrt{\varepsilon + h(x'_0)} \right)^\alpha \\ &\leq C \left(\varepsilon + (1 - 2\sqrt{2}r)|x'_0|^2 \right)^\alpha \leq C(\varepsilon + h(x'_0))^\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

We thus complete the proof. \square

The following well-known iteration lemma is needed for our proof, which is from e.g. [19, Chapter V, Lemma 3.1].

Lemma 2.3. *Let $f(t)$ be a nonnegative bounded function defined in $[\tau_0, \tau_1]$, $\tau_0 \geq 0$. Suppose that for $\tau_0 \leq t < s \leq \tau_1$, we have*

$$f(t) \leq [A(s - t)^{-a} + B] + \theta f(s),$$

where A, B, a, θ are nonnegative constants with $0 \leq \theta < 1$. Then for all $\tau_0 \leq \rho < R \leq \tau_1$ there holds

$$f(\rho) \leq c[A(R - \rho)^{-a} + B],$$

where c is a constant depending on a and θ .

With Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3 at hand, we now prove Proposition 1.1.

Proof of Proposition 1.1. Let $\mathcal{U}_1 := \mathcal{U}_1(r)$ and $\mathcal{U}_2 := \mathcal{U}_2(r)$, $r = |x'|$, be the solution to the following equation

$$\mathcal{L}\mathcal{U}_1 = C(\varepsilon + h(x'))^\gamma, \quad \mathcal{L}\mathcal{U}_2 = -C(\varepsilon + h(x'))^\gamma \quad \text{in } B_{2R}(0'). \quad (2.5)$$

The boundary condition will be determined later. By (1.4), we rewrite (2.5) as

$$\mathcal{U}_1'' + \left(\frac{1}{r} + \frac{3\delta(r)'}{\delta(r)} \right) \mathcal{U}_1' = C(\varepsilon + h(r))^\gamma, \quad \mathcal{U}_2'' + \left(\frac{1}{r} + \frac{3\delta(r)'}{\delta(r)} \right) \mathcal{U}_2' = -C(\varepsilon + h(r))^\gamma \quad \text{in } B_{2R}(0'). \quad (2.6)$$

We first prove (1.6) for $l = 0$. By (2.6), we choose U_1 and U_2 in the following form,

$$\mathcal{U}_1(x') = -C \int_r^{2R} \frac{1}{s(\varepsilon + h(s))^3} \int_0^s (\varepsilon + h(t))^{\gamma+3} t \, dt \, ds = -\mathcal{U}_2(x').$$

A direct calculation gives

$$\left| \int_r^{2R} \frac{1}{s(\varepsilon + h(s))^3} \int_0^s (\varepsilon + h(t))^{\gamma+3} t \, dt \, ds \right| \leq \left| \int_r^{2R} (\varepsilon + h(s))^\gamma s \, ds \right| \leq C(\varepsilon + h(x'))^{\gamma+1},$$

which implies

$$|\mathcal{U}_1|, |\mathcal{U}_2| \leq C(\varepsilon + h(x'))^{\gamma+1} \quad \text{in } B_{2R}(0'). \quad (2.7)$$

Let \mathcal{U} be the solution to (1.4) such that $\mathcal{U}(x') = 0$, $|x'| = 2R$. Notice that $\mathcal{U}_1(2R) = \mathcal{U}_2(2R) = 0$, by comparison principle and (2.7), we have

$$|\mathcal{U}(x')| \leq \max\{|\mathcal{U}_1|, |\mathcal{U}_2|\} \leq C(\varepsilon + h(x'))^{\gamma+1} \quad \text{for } x \in B_{2R}(0'). \quad (2.8)$$

For $l = 1$, we rewrite (1.4) as

$$\Delta \mathcal{U} = -\frac{3}{\varepsilon + h(x')} \nabla_{x'} h(x') \nabla_{x'} \mathcal{U}(x') + \mathcal{F}(x') := F(x') \quad \text{in } B_{2R}(0'). \quad (2.9)$$

For any $y' = (y_1, y_2) \in B_{2R}(0')$, we denote the cube centered at y' with radius d as follows

$$Q_d(y') = \{(x_1, x_2) : |x_1 - y_1| < d, |x_2 - y_2| < d\}.$$

By gradient estimate for the Poisson equation (see, for instance, [18, (3.15)]), we have

$$|\nabla_{x'} \mathcal{U}(y')| \leq \frac{4}{d} \sup_{\partial Q_d(y')} |\mathcal{U}| + d \sup_{Q_d(y')} |F|, \quad y' \in B_{2R}(0'). \quad (2.10)$$

For any fixed point $x'_0 \in B_{2R}(0')$, $0 < t < s \leq \frac{1}{2(C_a + C_{a+1} + C)} < 1$, assume $|\nabla_{x'} \mathcal{U}|$ attains its maximum $\sup_{Q_{t\sqrt{\varepsilon + h(x'_0)}}(x'_0)} |\nabla_{x'} \mathcal{U}|$ at $z'_0 \in \overline{Q_{t\sqrt{\varepsilon + h(x'_0)}}(x'_0)} \subset Q_{s\sqrt{\varepsilon + h(x'_0)}}(x'_0)$. By using (2.9) and (2.10) with $d = \frac{s-t}{10} \sqrt{\varepsilon + h(x'_0)}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{Q_{t\sqrt{\varepsilon + h(x'_0)}}(x'_0)} |\nabla_{x'} \mathcal{U}| = |\nabla_{x'} \mathcal{U}(z'_0)| \\ & \leq \frac{40}{(s-t)\sqrt{\varepsilon + h(x'_0)}} \sup_{\partial Q_{\frac{s-t}{10}\sqrt{\varepsilon + h(x'_0)}}(z'_0)} |\mathcal{U}| + \frac{(s-t)\sqrt{\varepsilon + h(x'_0)}}{10} \sup_{Q_{\frac{s-t}{10}\sqrt{\varepsilon + h(x'_0)}}(z'_0)} |F| \\ & \leq \frac{40}{(s-t)\sqrt{\varepsilon + h(x'_0)}} \sup_{Q_{s\sqrt{\varepsilon + h(x'_0)}}(x'_0)} |\mathcal{U}| + \frac{(s-t)\sqrt{\varepsilon + h(x'_0)}}{10} \sup_{Q_{s\sqrt{\varepsilon + h(x'_0)}}(x'_0)} |F| \\ & \leq \frac{40}{(s-t)\sqrt{\varepsilon + h(x'_0)}} \sup_{Q_{s\sqrt{\varepsilon + h(x'_0)}}(x'_0)} |\mathcal{U}| + \frac{3(s-t)\sqrt{\varepsilon + h(x'_0)}}{10} \left\| \frac{\nabla_{x'} h}{\varepsilon + h} \right\|_{L^\infty(Q_{s\sqrt{\varepsilon + h(x'_0)}}(x'_0))} \\ & \quad \cdot \sup_{Q_{s\sqrt{\varepsilon + h(x'_0)}}(x'_0)} |\nabla_{x'} \mathcal{U}| + \frac{(s-t)\sqrt{\varepsilon + h(x'_0)}}{10} \sup_{Q_{s\sqrt{\varepsilon + h(x'_0)}}(x'_0)} |\mathcal{F}|. \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

By (1.5), (2.8), and Lemma 2.2, we have

$$\sup_{Q_{s\sqrt{\varepsilon + h(x'_0)}}(x'_0)} |\mathcal{U}| \leq \|(\varepsilon + h)^{\gamma+1}\|_{L^\infty(Q_{s\sqrt{\varepsilon + h(x'_0)}}(x'_0))} \leq C(\varepsilon + h(x'_0))^{\gamma+1} \quad (2.12)$$

and

$$\sup_{Q_{s\sqrt{\varepsilon + h(x'_0)}}(x'_0)} |\mathcal{F}| \leq \|(\varepsilon + h)^\gamma\|_{L^\infty(Q_{s\sqrt{\varepsilon + h(x'_0)}}(x'_0))} \leq C(\varepsilon + h(x'_0))^\gamma. \quad (2.13)$$

It follows from (2.4), (2.11), (2.12), and (2.13) that

$$\sup_{Q_{t\sqrt{\varepsilon + h(x'_0)}}(x'_0)} |\nabla_{x'} \mathcal{U}| \leq \frac{3}{5} \sup_{Q_{s\sqrt{\varepsilon + h(x'_0)}}(x'_0)} |\nabla_{x'} \mathcal{U}| + \frac{C}{s-t} (\varepsilon + h(x'_0))^{\gamma+\frac{1}{2}}.$$

By Lemma 2.3, for any $0 < t < s \leq \frac{1}{2(C_a + C_{a+1} + C)}$, there holds

$$\sup_{Q_{t\sqrt{\varepsilon + h(x'_0)}}(x'_0)} |\nabla_{x'} \mathcal{U}| \leq \frac{C(\varepsilon + h(x'_0))^{\gamma+\frac{1}{2}}}{s-t},$$

which implies

$$|\nabla_{x'} \mathcal{U}(x'_0)| \leq C(\varepsilon + h(x'_0))^{\gamma+\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{for } x'_0 \in B_{2R}(0').$$

For $l \geq 2$, continuing to differentiate both side of equation (1.4) and repeating the previous process, we can obtain (1.6). We thus complete the proof. \square

At the end of this section, we rewrite

$$\psi_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \psi_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \psi_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \psi_4 = \begin{pmatrix} x_2 \\ -x_1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \psi_5 = \begin{pmatrix} x_3 \\ 0 \\ -x_1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \psi_6 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ x_3 \\ -x_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let $(\mathbf{u}_1^\alpha, p_1^\alpha)$, $\alpha = 1, 2, \dots, 6$, be the solution to (1.9). In the next three sections, we establish the higher derivative estimates of the solutions by applying Proposition 2.1. For each $(\mathbf{u}_1^\alpha, \bar{p}_1^\alpha)$, we will construct a series of auxiliary function pairs $(\mathbf{v}_\alpha^l, \bar{p}_l)$, $l = 1, 2, \dots, m+1$, such that the quantity $\left| \sum_{l=1}^{m+1} (\mu \Delta \mathbf{v}_\alpha^l - \nabla \bar{p}_l)(x) \right|$ satisfies a suitable upper bound in Ω_{2R} , as required by Proposition A.1. As mentioned before, we will use the modified Keller-type function $k(x) \in C^{m+1}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ to construct $(\mathbf{v}_\alpha^l, \bar{p}_l)$,

$$k(x) = \frac{x_3 - \frac{1}{2}(h_1 - h_2)(x')}{\delta(x')} \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}, \quad (2.14)$$

which satisfy $k(x) + \frac{1}{2} = 1$ on Γ_{2R}^+ , $k(x) + \frac{1}{2} = 0$ on Γ_{2R}^- , and $k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} = 0$ on $\Gamma_{2R}^+ \cup \Gamma_{2R}^-$. A direct calculation shows that

$$\partial_{x_i} k(x) = -\frac{\partial_{x_i}(h_1 - h_2)(x')}{2\delta(x')} - \frac{\partial_{x_i}(h_1 + h_2)(x')}{\delta(x')} k(x), \quad \partial_{x_3} k(x) = \frac{1}{\delta(x')} \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}. \quad (2.15)$$

3. ESTIMATES FOR $(\mathbf{u}_1^\alpha, p_1^\alpha)$, $\alpha = 1, 2$

In this section, we will establish high-order derivative estimates for the solution to equation (1.9) with ψ_1 and ψ_2 on the boundary ∂D_1 by utilizing Proposition 2.1. For general domains D_1 and D_2 , we construct auxiliary functions to accurately represent the leading terms up to the seventh-order derivatives. However, for eighth- and higher-order derivatives, we are only able to obtain an upper bound, as Proposition 1.1 is not applicable when $\gamma \geq -1$.

Proposition 3.1. *Under the same assumption as in Theorem 1.2, let \mathbf{u}_1^α and p_1^α be the solution to (1.9) with $\alpha = 1, 2$. Then for sufficiently small $0 < \varepsilon < 1/2$, we have*

$$(i) \quad |\nabla \mathbf{u}_1^\alpha(x)| \leq C(\varepsilon + |x'|^2)^{-1}, \quad |p_1^\alpha(x) - p_1^\alpha(z', 0)| \leq C(\varepsilon + |x'|^2)^{-\frac{3}{2}} \quad \text{in } \Omega_R$$

for some point $z = (z', 0) \in \Omega_R$ with $|z'| = R/2$; and

(ii) for high-order derivatives, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla^{m+1} \mathbf{u}_1^\alpha(x)| + |\nabla^m p_1^\alpha(x)| &\leq C(\varepsilon + |x'|^2)^{-\frac{m+3}{2}} \quad \text{for } m \leq 6, \\ |\nabla^{m+1} \mathbf{u}_1^\alpha(x)| + |\nabla^m p_1^\alpha(x)| &\leq C(\varepsilon + |x'|^2)^{\frac{3}{2}-m} \quad \text{for } m \geq 7 \end{aligned} \quad \text{in } \Omega_R.$$

Proof of Proposition 3.1. We only prove the case when $\alpha = 1$ for instance, since the other case is the same. We will construct a series of auxiliary function pairs $(\mathbf{v}_1^l(x), \bar{p}_l(x))$, $l = 1, 2, 3$ with appropriate pointwise upper bound estimates in Ω_{2R} . Unlike the two-dimensional case [14], these functions are not explicit. However, we prove that $\nabla^{m+1} \sum_{l=1}^{m+1} \mathbf{v}_1^l$ and $\nabla^m \sum_{l=1}^{m+1} \bar{p}_l$ capture the leading terms in $\nabla^{m+1} \mathbf{u}_1^1$ and $\nabla^m p_1^1$ for $m \leq 6$, respectively.

3.1. Gradient estimates. In order to apply Proposition A.1 to derive the estimates of $\nabla \mathbf{u}_1^1$, we first construct a divergence-free function \mathbf{v}_1^1 satisfying $\mathbf{v}_1^1 = \mathbf{u}_1^1 = \psi_1$ on Γ_{2R}^+ , $\mathbf{v}_1^1 = \mathbf{u}_1^1 = 0$ on Γ_{2R}^- , and suitable \bar{p}_1 such that

$$|\mu \Delta \mathbf{v}_1^1 - \nabla \bar{p}_1| \leq C\delta(x')^{-1}. \quad (3.1)$$

Then, their difference

$$\mathbf{w} := \mathbf{u}_1^1 - \mathbf{v}_1^1 \quad \text{and} \quad q := p_1^1 - \bar{p}_1$$

satisfy the following boundary value problem in the narrow region

$$\begin{cases} -\mu\Delta \mathbf{w} + \nabla q = \mathbf{f}_1^1 & \text{in } \Omega_{2R}, \\ \nabla \cdot \mathbf{w} = 0 & \text{in } \Omega_{2R}, \\ \mathbf{w} = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_{2R}^+ \cup \Gamma_{2R}^-, \end{cases}$$

where

$$\mathbf{f}_1^1 := \mu\Delta \mathbf{v}_1^1 - \nabla \bar{p}_1. \quad (3.2)$$

By Proposition A.1, we have $|\nabla \mathbf{u}_1^1| \leq |\nabla \mathbf{v}_1^1| + C$.

Step I.1. Construction of \mathbf{v}_1^1 and \bar{p}_1 and their estimates. We use the Keller-type function (2.14) to construct an auxiliary function \mathbf{v}_1^1 in the following form:

$$\mathbf{v}_1^1 = \psi_1 \left(k(x) + \frac{1}{2} \right) + \begin{pmatrix} F(x) \\ G(x) \\ H(x) \end{pmatrix} \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}, \quad (3.3)$$

where $F(x)$, $G(x)$, and $H(x)$ are to be determined in the following way. By a direct calculation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{x_1}(\mathbf{v}_1^1)^{(1)} &= \partial_{x_1} F(x) \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) + 2F(x)k(x)\partial_{x_1}k(x) + \partial_{x_1}k(x), \\ \partial_{x_2}(\mathbf{v}_1^1)^{(2)} &= \partial_{x_2} G(x) \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) + 2G(x)k(x)\partial_{x_2}k(x), \\ \partial_{x_3}(\mathbf{v}_1^1)^{(3)} &= \partial_{x_3} H(x) \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) + \frac{2k(x)}{\delta(x')} H(x). \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

In order to achieve $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_1^1 = 0$ in Ω_{2R} , we set

$$\frac{1}{4}(\partial_{x_1} F + \partial_{x_2} G + \partial_{x_3} H)(x) = -\frac{\partial_{x_1}(h_1 - h_2)(x')}{2\delta(x')}. \quad (3.5)$$

By (3.4) and (3.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{2\partial_{x_1}(h_1 - h_2)(x')}{\delta(x')} \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) + (2F(x)\partial_{x_1}k(x) + 2G(x)\partial_{x_2}k(x))k(x) + \partial_{x_1}k(x) \\ & + \frac{2k(x)}{\delta(x')} H(x) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

By using (2.15), we derive

$$H(x) = \partial_{x_1}(h_1 - h_2)(x')k(x) + \frac{1}{2}\partial_{x_1}(h_1 + h_2)(x') - \delta(x')(F(x)\partial_{x_1}k(x) - G(x)\partial_{x_2}k(x)). \quad (3.6)$$

Combining this with (3.5) and using (2.15) again, we see that $F(x)$ and $G(x)$ satisfy the following first-order partial differential equation:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{x_1} F(x) + \partial_{x_2} G(x) + \frac{\partial_{x_1}\delta(x')}{\delta(x')} F(x) + \frac{\partial_{x_2}\delta(x')}{\delta(x')} G(x) \\ - \delta(x')(\partial_{x_1}k(x)\partial_{x_3}F(x) - \partial_{x_2}k(x)\partial_{x_3}G(x)) = -\frac{3\partial_{x_1}(h_1 - h_2)(x')}{\delta(x')}. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, if we assume $F(x) = F(x')$ and $G(x) = G(x')$, then we have

$$\partial_{x_1} F(x') + \partial_{x_2} G(x') + \frac{\partial_{x_1}\delta(x')}{\delta(x')} F(x') + \frac{\partial_{x_2}\delta(x')}{\delta(x')} G(x') = -\frac{3\partial_{x_1}(h_1 - h_2)(x')}{\delta(x')}. \quad (3.7)$$

In order to cancel the leading terms in $\mu\Delta\mathbf{v}_1^1$ and derive (3.1), we first choose $\hat{p}_1(x) = \hat{p}_1(x')$ so that

$$\partial_{x_1}\hat{p}_1(x') = \mu\partial_{x_3x_3}(\mathbf{v}_1^1)^{(1)} = \frac{2\mu F(x')}{\delta(x')^2}, \quad \partial_{x_2}\hat{p}_1(x') = \mu\partial_{x_3x_3}(\mathbf{v}_1^1)^{(2)} = \frac{2\mu G(x')}{\delta(x')^2}. \quad (3.8)$$

Substituting (3.8) into (3.7), we derive

$$\Delta_{x'}\hat{p}_1(x') + \frac{3}{\delta(x')} \nabla_{x'}\delta(x')\nabla_{x'}\hat{p}_1(x') = -\frac{6\mu\partial_{x_1}(h_1 - h_2)(x')}{\delta(x')^3} := \mathcal{F}_1(x'). \quad (3.9)$$

By (1.2), we have

$$|\mathcal{F}_1(x')| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{5}{2}}.$$

Similarly,

$$|\nabla_{x'}^s \mathcal{F}_1(x')| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{5+s}{2}}, \quad 1 \leq s \leq m.$$

By Proposition 1.1 with $\gamma = -\frac{5}{2}$, there exists \hat{p}_1 which satisfies (3.9), with the following estimates

$$|\hat{p}_1| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{3}{2}}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k \hat{p}_1| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{3+k}{2}}, \quad \partial_{x_3}\hat{p}_1 = 0, \quad 0 \leq k \leq m+1. \quad (3.10)$$

Then, by (3.8), we have

$$F(x') = \frac{\delta(x')^2}{2\mu} \partial_{x_1}\hat{p}_1(x'), \quad G(x') = \frac{\delta(x')^2}{2\mu} \partial_{x_2}\hat{p}_1(x'), \quad (3.11)$$

and by (1.2) and (3.10), we get for $0 \leq k \leq m+1$,

$$|\nabla_{x'}^k F|, |\nabla_{x'}^k G| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{k}{2}}, \quad \partial_{x_3}F = \partial_{x_3}G = 0. \quad (3.12)$$

For $H(x)$, by (1.2), (2.14), (3.6), and (3.12), one can see that $H(x)$ has the following form

$$H(x) = H_1(x')x_3 + H_2(x'), \quad (3.13)$$

with the estimates for $k \geq 0$,

$$|\nabla_{x'}^k H_1| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{1+k}{2}}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k H_2| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{1-k}{2}}. \quad (3.14)$$

Thus, we obtain

$$|\nabla_{x'}^k \partial_{x_3}^s H| \leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{1}{2}-s-\frac{k}{2}}, \quad s \leq 1, \quad \partial_{x_3}^2 H = 0. \quad (3.15)$$

Hence, by (3.3), (3.12), and (3.15), we have, for $k \geq 1$ and $i = 1, 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla_{x'}^k \partial_{x_3}^s (\mathbf{v}_1^1)^{(i)}| &\leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{k}{2}-s} \quad \text{for } s \leq 2, \quad \partial_{x_3}^s (\mathbf{v}_1^1)^{(i)} = 0 \quad \text{for } s \geq 3, \\ |\nabla_{x'}^k \partial_{x_3}^s (\mathbf{v}_1^1)^{(3)}| &\leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{k}{2}-s} \quad \text{for } s \leq 3, \quad \partial_{x_3}^s (\mathbf{v}_1^1)^{(3)} = 0 \quad \text{for } s \geq 4. \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

In addition, it follows from (3.3), (3.8), and (3.16) that the leading term in $\mu\Delta\mathbf{v}_1^1 - \nabla\hat{p}_1$ is $\mu\partial_{x_3x_3}(\mathbf{v}_1^1)^{(3)}$, which is of order $\delta(x')^{-\frac{3}{2}}$. To further cancel out this leading term, we choose

$$\tilde{p}_1 = \frac{3\mu H_1(x')}{\delta(x')^2} x_3^2 + 2\mu \frac{H_2(x') - (h_1 - h_2)H_1(x')}{\delta(x')^2} x_3 \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}, \quad (3.17)$$

so that

$$\partial_{x_3}\tilde{p}_1 = \mu\partial_{x_3x_3}(\mathbf{v}_1^1)^{(3)}. \quad (3.18)$$

Moreover, by (3.14) and (3.17), we have, for $k \geq 0$,

$$|\nabla_{x'}^k \partial_{x_3}^s \tilde{p}_1| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{1+k}{2}-s}, \quad s \leq 2, \quad \partial_{x_3}^3 \tilde{p}_1 = 0. \quad (3.19)$$

Let $\bar{p}_1 = \hat{p}_1 + \tilde{p}_1$. Combining (3.10), (3.16), and (3.19), we have, for $m \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla \mathbf{v}_1^1| &\leq C\delta(x')^{-1}, \quad |\nabla^{m+1} \mathbf{v}_1^1| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{m+3}{2}}, \\ |\bar{p}_1| &\leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{3}{2}}, \quad |\nabla^m \bar{p}_1| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{m+3}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.20)$$

Step I.2. Estimates of \mathbf{f}_1^1 . By virtue of (3.2), (3.8), and (3.18), we have, for $i = 1, 2$,

$$(\mathbf{f}_1^1)^{(i)} = \mu \Delta_{x'}(\mathbf{v}_1^1)^{(i)} - \partial_{x_i} \tilde{p}_1, \quad (\mathbf{f}_1^1)^{(3)} = \mu \Delta_{x'}(\mathbf{v}_1^1)^{(3)} \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}.$$

By (3.3), (3.11), and (3.13), we notice that $(\mathbf{v}_1^1)^{(i)}$ is a quadratic polynomial in x_3 , while $(\mathbf{v}_1^1)^{(3)}$ is a cubic polynomial in x_3 . Therefore, by (3.16) and (3.19), we can rewrite \mathbf{f}_1^1 as polynomials in x_3 :

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{f}_1^1)^{(b)} &= S_{21}^b(x')x_3^2 + S_{11}^b(x')x_3 + S_{01}^b(x'), \quad b = 1, 2, \\ (\mathbf{f}_1^1)^{(3)} &= G_{31}(x')x_3^3 + G_{21}(x')x_3^2 + G_{11}(x')x_3 + G_{01}(x'), \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

where for any $s \geq 0$, $k = 0, 1, 2$ and $j = 0, 1, 2, 3$,

$$|\nabla_{x'}^s S_{k1}^b| \leq C\delta(x')^{-k-\frac{s+2}{2}}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^s G_{j1}| \leq C\delta(x')^{-j-\frac{s+1}{2}}. \quad (3.22)$$

Then, it is immediate from (3.21) and (3.22) that

$$|(\mathbf{f}_1^1)^{(1)}|, |(\mathbf{f}_1^1)^{(2)}| \leq C\delta(x')^{-1}, \quad |(\mathbf{f}_1^1)^{(3)}| \leq C\delta(x')^{-1/2}. \quad (3.23)$$

Hence,

$$|\mathbf{f}_1^1| \leq C(|(\mathbf{f}_1^1)^{(1)}| + |(\mathbf{f}_1^1)^{(2)}| + |(\mathbf{f}_1^1)^{(3)}|) \leq C\delta(x')^{-1} \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}.$$

By Proposition A.1, we obtain $\|\nabla \mathbf{u}_1^1 - \nabla \mathbf{v}_1^1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(x')/2}(x'))} \leq C$ for $x \in \Omega_R$. Thus, combining this with (3.20) yields

$$|\nabla \mathbf{u}_1^1(x)| \leq C|\nabla \mathbf{v}_1^1(x)| + C \leq C\delta(x')^{-1} \quad \text{in } \Omega_R.$$

Thus, Proposition 3.1 holds true for $m = 0$.

3.2. Second-order derivatives estimates. In order to derive second-order derivative estimates for the solutions of (1.9), we construct new auxiliary functions to further reduce the upper bounds of the non-homogeneous term.

Step II.1. Construction of \mathbf{v}_1^2 , \bar{p}_2 and their estimates. By (3.23), one can derive that the leading terms in \mathbf{f}_1^1 are $(\mathbf{f}_1^1)^{(1)}$ and $(\mathbf{f}_1^1)^{(2)}$. To cancel these leading terms, we construct a divergence-free function

$$\mathbf{v}_1^2 = \left((\mathbf{v}_1^2)^{(1)}(x), (\mathbf{v}_1^2)^{(2)}(x), (\mathbf{v}_1^2)^{(3)}(x) \right)^T$$

satisfying

$$(\mathbf{v}_1^2)^{(b)}(x) = \left(\sum_{i=0}^2 F_{b2}^i(x')x_3^i + \tilde{F}_{b2}(x') \right) \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right), \quad b = 1, 2, \quad (3.24)$$

and

$$(\mathbf{v}_1^2)^{(3)}(x) = \left(\sum_{i=0}^3 F_{32}^i(x')x_3^i + \tilde{F}_{32}(x) \right) \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right).$$

We emphasize that $F_{b2}^i(x')$, $i = 0, 1, 2$, are chosen to cancel out the leading terms in \mathbf{f}_1^1 in the following way

$$\mu \partial_{x_3 x_3} \left(\sum_{i=0}^2 F_{b2}^i(x')x_3^i \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \right) = -(\mathbf{f}_1^1)^{(b)}, \quad b = 1, 2. \quad (3.25)$$

By comparing the coefficients of each term of x_3 , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} F_{b2}^2(x') &= -\frac{\delta(x')^2}{12\mu} S_{21}^b(x'), \quad F_{b2}^1(x') = -\frac{\delta(x')^2}{6\mu} S_{11}^b(x') + (h_1 - h_2)(x') F_{b2}^2(x'), \\ F_{b2}^0(x') &= -\frac{\delta(x')^2}{2\mu} S_{01}^b(x') + (h_1 - h_2)(x') F_{b2}^1(x') + \frac{1}{4}(\varepsilon + 2h_1(x'))(\varepsilon + 2h_2(x')) F_{b2}^2(x'). \end{aligned}$$

To ensure $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_1^2 = 0$, we first take $F_{32}^i, i = 0, 1, 2, 3$, so that

$$\nabla \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \left(\sum_{i=0}^2 F_{12}^i(x') x_3^i \right) \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \\ \left(\sum_{i=0}^2 F_{22}^i(x') x_3^i \right) \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \\ \left(\sum_{i=0}^3 F_{32}^i(x') x_3^i \right) \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \end{pmatrix} := R(x')$$

is the 0-th order term in the polynomial of x_3 . By comparing the coefficients of each term of x_3 , we have

$$\begin{aligned} F_{32}^3(x') &= -\frac{\delta(x')^2}{5} \sum_{i=1}^2 \partial_{x_i} \left(\frac{F_{i2}^2(x')}{\delta(x')^2} \right), \\ F_{32}^2(x') &= -\frac{\delta(x')^2}{4} \sum_{i=1}^2 \partial_{x_i} \left(\frac{F_{i2}^1(x') - (h_1 - h_2)(x') F_{i2}^2(x')}{\delta(x')^2} \right) + (h_1 - h_2)(x') F_{32}^3(x'), \\ F_{32}^1(x') &= -\frac{\delta(x')^2}{3} \sum_{i=1}^2 \partial_{x_i} \left(\frac{F_{i2}^0(x')}{\delta(x')^2} - \frac{(h_1 - h_2)(x') F_{i2}^1(x')}{\delta(x')^2} - \frac{(\varepsilon + 2h_1)(\varepsilon + 2h_2)}{4\delta(x')^2} F_{i2}^2(x') \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4}(\varepsilon + 2h_1(x'))(\varepsilon + 2h_2(x')) F_{32}^3(x') + (h_1 - h_2)(x') F_{32}^2(x'), \\ F_{32}^0(x') &= \frac{\delta(x')^2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^2 \partial_{x_i} \left(\frac{(h_1 - h_2)(x') F_{i2}^0(x')}{\delta(x')^2} + \frac{(\varepsilon + 2h_1)(\varepsilon + 2h_2)}{4\delta(x')^2} F_{i2}^1(x') \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4}(\varepsilon + 2h_1(x'))(\varepsilon + 2h_2(x')) F_{32}^2(x') + (h_1 - h_2) F_{32}^1(x'), \end{aligned} \tag{3.26}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} R(x') &= -\sum_{i=1}^2 \partial_{x_i} \left(\frac{(\varepsilon + 2h_1(x'))(\varepsilon + 2h_2(x'))}{4\delta(x')^2} F_{i2}^0(x') \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{(\varepsilon + 2h_1(x'))(\varepsilon + 2h_2(x'))}{4\delta(x')^2} F_{32}^1(x') - \frac{h_1 - h_2}{\delta(x')^2} F_{32}^0(x'). \end{aligned} \tag{3.27}$$

By (3.22), (3.26), and (3.27), we have for $k \geq 0$ and $i = 0, 1, 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla_{x'}^k F_{b2}^i| &\leq C\delta(x')^{1-i-\frac{k}{2}}, \quad b = 1, 2, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k F_{32}^i| \leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{3}{2}-i-\frac{k}{2}}, \\ |\nabla_{x'}^k F_{32}^3| &\leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{3}{2}-\frac{k}{2}}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k R| \leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{k}{2}}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.28}$$

Finally, we choose $\tilde{F}_{12}(x')$, $\tilde{F}_{22}(x')$, and $\tilde{F}_{32}(x)$ such that

$$\nabla \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{F}_{12}(x') \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \\ \tilde{F}_{22}(x') \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \\ \tilde{F}_{32}(x) \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \end{pmatrix} = -R(x'), \tag{3.29}$$

so that $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_1^2 = 0$. By a direct calculation, (3.29) is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} & (\partial_{x_1} \tilde{F}_{12}(x') + \partial_{x_2} \tilde{F}_{22}(x') + \partial_{x_3} \tilde{F}_{32}(x)) (k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4}) + \frac{2k(x)}{\delta(x')} \tilde{F}_{32}(x) \\ & + 2(\tilde{F}_{12}(x') \partial_{x_1} k(x) + \tilde{F}_{22}(x') \partial_{x_2} k(x)) k(x) = -R(x'). \end{aligned} \quad (3.30)$$

To determine $\tilde{F}_{12}(x')$ and $\tilde{F}_{22}(x)$, we set

$$\partial_{x_1} \tilde{F}_{12}(x') + \partial_{x_2} \tilde{F}_{22}(x') + \partial_{x_3} \tilde{F}_{32}(x) = 4R(x'). \quad (3.31)$$

It follows from (3.30) and (3.31) that

$$\tilde{F}_{32}(x) = -2\delta(x')R(x')k(x) - \delta(x')\partial_{x_1}k(x)\tilde{F}_{12}(x') - \delta(x')\partial_{x_2}k(x)\tilde{F}_{22}(x'). \quad (3.32)$$

By (2.15), (3.31), and (3.32), we have

$$\partial_{x_1} \tilde{F}_{12}(x') + \partial_{x_2} \tilde{F}_{22}(x') + \frac{\partial_{x_1} \delta(x')}{\delta(x')} \tilde{F}_{12}(x') + \frac{\partial_{x_2} \delta(x')}{\delta(x')} \tilde{F}_{22}(x') = 6R(x'). \quad (3.33)$$

Similar to the argument that led to (3.8), we select $\hat{p}_2(x')$ such that

$$\partial_{x_1} \hat{p}_2 = \frac{2\mu \tilde{F}_{12}(x')}{\delta(x')^2}, \quad \partial_{x_2} \hat{p}_2 = \frac{2\mu \tilde{F}_{22}(x')}{\delta(x')^2}. \quad (3.34)$$

Substituting (3.34) into (3.33) yields

$$\Delta_{x'} \hat{p}_2 + \frac{3}{\delta(x')} \nabla_{x'} \delta(x') \nabla_{x'} \hat{p}_2 = \frac{12\mu R(x')}{\delta(x')^2} := \mathcal{F}_2(x'). \quad (3.35)$$

By (3.28), we have

$$|\nabla_{x'}^s \mathcal{F}_2(x')| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{3+s}{2}}, \quad 0 \leq s \leq m.$$

By using Proposition 1.1 with $\gamma = -\frac{3}{2}$, there exists \hat{p}_2 that satisfies (3.35) and for any $0 \leq l \leq m+1$,

$$|\nabla_{x'}^l \hat{p}_2| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{l}{2}}. \quad (3.36)$$

Combining (3.32), (3.34) and (3.36), we have, for any $k \geq 0$,

$$|\nabla_{x'}^k \tilde{F}_{b2}| \leq C\delta(x')^{1-\frac{k}{2}}, \quad b = 1, 2, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k \tilde{F}_{32}| \leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{3}{2}-\frac{k}{2}}. \quad (3.37)$$

By (3.21), (3.25), and (3.34), a calculation gives

$$\mathbf{f}_1^1 + \mu \Delta \mathbf{v}_1^2 - \nabla \hat{p}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \mu \Delta_{x'}(\mathbf{v}_1^2)^{(1)} \\ \mu \Delta_{x'}(\mathbf{v}_1^2)^{(2)} \\ (\mathbf{f}_1^1)^{(3)} + \mu \Delta(\mathbf{v}_1^2)^{(3)} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{i=0}^4 H_{i2}^1(x') x_3^i \\ \sum_{i=0}^4 H_{i2}^2(x') x_3^i \\ \sum_{i=0}^5 G_{i2}(x') x_3^i + \sum_{i=0}^3 \tilde{S}_{i2}(x') x_3^i \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.38)$$

where $\sum_{i=0}^5 G_{i2}(x') x_3^i = \mu \Delta_{x'}(\mathbf{v}_1^2)^{(3)}$ and $\sum_{i=0}^3 \tilde{S}_{i2}(x') x_3^i = (\mathbf{f}_1^1)^{(3)} + \mu \partial_{x_3 x_3}(\mathbf{v}_1^2)^{(3)}$. By (1.2), (3.28), (3.36) and (3.37), we obtain, for $k \geq 0$,

$$|\nabla_{x'}^k H_{i2}^b| \leq C\delta(x')^{-i-\frac{k}{2}}, \quad b = 1, 2, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k G_{i2}| \leq \delta(x')^{\frac{1}{2}-i-\frac{k}{2}}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k \tilde{S}_{i2}| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{1}{2}-i-\frac{k}{2}}. \quad (3.39)$$

Then from (3.38) and (3.39), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\Delta_{x'}(\mathbf{v}_1^2)^{(b)}| & \leq C, \quad b = 1, 2, \quad |\Delta_{x'}(\mathbf{v}_1^2)^{(3)}| \leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{1}{2}}, \\ |(\mathbf{f}_1^1)^{(3)} + \mu \partial_{x_3 x_3}(\mathbf{v}_1^2)^{(3)}| & \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the leading term in $\mathbf{f}_1^1 + \mu\Delta\mathbf{v}_1^2 - \nabla\hat{p}_2$ is $\sum_{i=0}^3 \tilde{S}_{i2}(x')x_3^i$. Thus, to further reduce the upper bound of the inhomogeneous term, we choose

$$\tilde{p}_2 = \sum_{i=0}^3 \frac{\tilde{S}_{i2}(x')}{i+1} x_3^{i+1} \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}, \quad (3.40)$$

such that $\partial_{x_3}\tilde{p}_2 = \sum_{i=0}^3 \tilde{S}_{i2}(x')x_3^i$.

Step II.2. Estimates of \mathbf{f}_1^2 . Let $\bar{p}_2 := \hat{p}_2 + \tilde{p}_2$ and $\mathbf{f}_1^2 := \mathbf{f}_1^1 + \mu\Delta\mathbf{v}_1^2 - \nabla\bar{p}_2$. By (3.38) and (3.40), we can write \mathbf{f}_1^2 as polynomials in x_3 :

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{f}_1^2)^{(b)} &= \sum_{i=1}^4 \left(H_{i2}^b - \frac{1}{i} \partial_{x_b} \tilde{S}_{(i-1)2} \right) (x') x_3^i + H_{02}^b(x') := \sum_{i=0}^4 S_{i2}^b(x') x_3^i, \quad b = 1, 2, \\ (\mathbf{f}_1^2)^{(3)} &= \sum_{i=0}^5 G_{i2}(x') x_3^i, \end{aligned}$$

where $S_{i2}^b(x') = H_{i2}^b(x') - \frac{1}{i} \partial_{x_b} \tilde{S}_{(i-1)2}(x')$, $1 \leq i \leq 4$, and $S_{02}^b(x') = H_{02}^b(x')$. In view of (3.39), we have for $k \geq 0$,

$$|\nabla_{x'}^k S_{i2}^b| \leq C\delta(x')^{-i-\frac{k}{2}}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k G_{i2}| \leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{1}{2}-i-\frac{k}{2}}. \quad (3.41)$$

It is immediate that $|(\mathbf{f}_1^2)^{(1)}| + |(\mathbf{f}_1^2)^{(2)}| \leq C$ and $|(\mathbf{f}_1^2)^{(3)}| \leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Thus, we have

$$|\mathbf{f}_1^2| \leq |(\mathbf{f}_1^2)^{(1)}| + |(\mathbf{f}_1^2)^{(2)}| + |(\mathbf{f}_1^2)^{(3)}| \leq C. \quad (3.42)$$

Step II.3. Estimates of $p_1^1(x)$, $\nabla p_1^1(x)$, and $\nabla^2 \mathbf{u}_1^1(x)$. By using (3.24), (3.28), (3.36), (3.37), and (3.40), a calculation gives for $k \geq 0$ and $b = 1, 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla_{x'}^k \partial_{x_3}^s (\mathbf{v}_1^2)^{(b)}| &\leq \delta(x')^{1-s-\frac{k}{2}} \quad \text{for } s \leq 4, \quad \partial_{x_3}^s (\mathbf{v}_1^2)^{(b)} = 0 \quad \text{for } s \geq 5, \\ |\nabla_{x'}^k \partial_{x_3}^s (\mathbf{v}_1^2)^{(3)}| &\leq \delta(x')^{\frac{3}{2}-s-\frac{k}{2}} \quad \text{for } s \leq 5, \quad \partial_{x_3}^s (\mathbf{v}_1^2)^{(3)} = 0 \quad \text{for } s \geq 6, \\ |\nabla_{x'}^k \partial_{x_3}^s \tilde{p}_2| &\leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{1}{2}-s-\frac{k}{2}} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq s \leq 4, \\ \partial_{x_3}^s \tilde{p}_2 &= 0 \quad \text{for } s \geq 5, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k \hat{p}_2| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{k}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.43)$$

By (3.42) and Proposition A.1, it holds that

$$\|\nabla^2(\mathbf{u}_1^1 - (\mathbf{v}_1^1 + \mathbf{v}_1^2))\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(x')/2}(x'))} + \|\nabla(p_1^1 - \bar{p}_1 - \bar{p}_2)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(x')/2}(x'))} \leq C. \quad (3.44)$$

By (3.43), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla^{m+1} \mathbf{v}_1^2| &\leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{m+3}{2}} \quad \text{for } m \geq 3, \quad |\nabla^{m+1} \mathbf{v}_1^2| \leq C\delta(x')^{-m} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq m \leq 2, \\ |\nabla^m \bar{p}_2| &\leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{m+3}{2}} \quad \text{for } m \geq 5, \quad |\nabla \bar{p}_2| \leq C\delta(x')^{-1}, \\ |\nabla^m \bar{p}_2| &\leq C\delta(x_1)^{\frac{1}{2}-m} \quad \text{for } 2 \leq m \leq 4, \quad |\bar{p}_2| \leq C\delta(x_1)^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.45)$$

It follows from (3.20) and (3.45) that for $x \in \Omega_R$,

$$|\nabla^2(\mathbf{v}_1^1(x) + \mathbf{v}_1^2(x))| + |\nabla(\bar{p}_1(x) + \bar{p}_2(x))| \leq C\delta(x')^{-2}. \quad (3.46)$$

By (3.44) and (3.46), we have for $x \in \Omega_R$,

$$|\nabla^2 \mathbf{u}_1^1(x)| + |\nabla p_1^1(x)| \leq C\delta(x')^{-2} \quad \text{in } \Omega_R.$$

For the estimates of $p_1^1(x)$, by the mean value theorem, (3.20), (3.44), and (3.45), we have

$$|p_1^1(x) - p_1^1(z', 0)| \leq |p_1^1 - \bar{p}_1 - \bar{p}_2 - (p_1^1 - \bar{p}_1 - \bar{p}_2)(z', 0)| + |\bar{p}_1 + \bar{p}_2| + C$$

$$\leq C\|\nabla(p_1^1 - \bar{p}_1 - \bar{p}_2)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_R)} + |\bar{p}_1 + \bar{p}_2| + C \leq C\delta(x')^{-3/2}$$

for a fixed point $(z', 0) \in \Omega_R$ with $|z'| = R/2$.

3.3. High-order derivatives estimates. Next, we inductively derive the estimates of $\nabla^{m+1}\mathbf{u}_1^1$ and $\nabla^m p_1^1$ based on Propositions 2.1 and A.1. Denote

$$\mathbf{f}_1^j := \mathbf{f}_1^{j-1}(x) + \mu \Delta \mathbf{v}_1^j(x) - \nabla \bar{p}_j(x) = \sum_{l=1}^j (\mu \Delta \mathbf{v}_1^l - \nabla \bar{p}_l)(x) \quad \text{for } 2 \leq j \leq m+1.$$

To use Proposition A.1 to derive higher derivative estimates, we successively construct auxiliary functions to make the non-homogeneous term as small as possible. To cancel out the singularity of $(\mathbf{f}_1^2)^{(b)}$, $b = 1, 2$, we choose $\mathbf{v}_1^3(x)$ satisfying

$$(\mathbf{v}_1^3(x))^{(b)} = \left(\sum_{i=0}^4 F_{b3}^i(x') x_3^i \right) \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right), \quad b = 1, 2, \quad (3.47)$$

where

$$F_{b3}^i(x') = -\frac{\delta(x')^2 S_{i2}^b(x')}{\mu(i+1)(i+2)} + (h_1 - h_2)(x') F_{b3}^{i+1}(x') + \frac{1}{4}(\varepsilon + 2h_1)(\varepsilon + 2h_2) F_{b3}^{i+2}(x'), \quad (3.48)$$

such that

$$\mu \partial_{x_3 x_3} (\mathbf{v}_1^3)^{(b)} = -(\mathbf{f}_1^2)^{(b)}, \quad b = 1, 2. \quad (3.49)$$

Here we use the convention that $F_{b3}^i(x') \equiv 0$ if $i \notin \{0, \dots, 4\}$ and $F_{33}^i = 0$ if $i \notin \{0, \dots, 5\}$. We note that once F_{b3}^i , $i = 0, 1, \dots, 4$ is determined, in general, there does not exist F_{33}^i , $i = 0, 1, \dots, 5$ such that $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_1^3 = 0$. By comparing the coefficients of the polynomial of x_3 , we take

$$(\mathbf{v}_1^3)^{(3)} = \sum_{i=0}^5 F_{33}^i(x') x_3^i \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right), \quad (3.50)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} F_{33}^i(x') &= (h_1 - h_2)(x') F_{33}^{i+1}(x') + \frac{1}{4}(\varepsilon + 2h_1(x'))(\varepsilon + 2h_2(x')) F_{33}^{i+2}(x') \\ &\quad - \frac{\delta(x')^2}{i+2} \sum_{j=1}^2 \partial_{x_j} \left(\delta(x')^{-2} \left(F_{13}^{i-1}(x') - (h_1 - h_2) F_{13}^i(x') - \frac{1}{4}(\varepsilon + 2h_1)(\varepsilon + 2h_2) F_{i3}^{i+1}(x') \right) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.51)$$

such that $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_1^3 = R(x')$, where

$$\begin{aligned} R(x') &= - \sum_{i=1}^2 \partial_{x_i} \left(\frac{(\varepsilon + 2h_1(x'))(\varepsilon + 2h_2(x'))}{4\delta(x')^2} F_{i3}^0(x') \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{(\varepsilon + 2h_1(x'))(\varepsilon + 2h_2(x'))}{4\delta(x')^2} F_{33}^1(x') - \frac{h_1(x') - h_2(x')}{\delta(x')^2} F_{33}^0(x'). \end{aligned} \quad (3.52)$$

By (1.2), (3.41), (3.48), (3.51), and (3.52), we have for $k \geq 0$, $i = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4$, and $b = 1, 2$,

$$|\nabla_{x'}^k F_{b3}^i| \leq C\delta(x')^{2-i-\frac{k}{2}}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k F_{32}^i| \leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{5}{2}-i-\frac{k}{2}}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k F_{32}^5| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{5}{2}-\frac{k}{2}}, \quad (3.53)$$

and

$$|\nabla_{x'}^k R| \leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{3}{2}-\frac{k}{2}}. \quad (3.54)$$

From (3.47), (3.49), and (3.50), a calculation gives

$$\mathbf{f}_1^2 + \mu \Delta \mathbf{v}_1^3 = \begin{pmatrix} \mu \Delta_{x'}(\mathbf{v}_1^3)^{(1)} \\ \mu \Delta_{x'}(\mathbf{v}_1^3)^{(2)} \\ (\mathbf{f}_1^2)^{(3)} + \mu \Delta(\mathbf{v}_1^3)^{(3)} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{i=0}^6 H_{i3}^1(x') x_3^i \\ \sum_{i=0}^6 H_{i3}^2(x') x_3^i \\ \sum_{i=0}^7 G_{i3}(x') x_3^i + \sum_{i=0}^5 \tilde{S}_{i3}(x') x_3^i \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.55)$$

where

$$\sum_{i=0}^7 G_{i3}(x') x_3^i = \mu \Delta_{x'}(\mathbf{v}_1^3)^{(3)} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=0}^5 \tilde{S}_{i3}(x') x_3^i = (\mathbf{f}_1^2)^{(3)} + \mu \partial_{x_3 x_3}(\mathbf{v}_1^3)^{(3)}.$$

By (3.53) and (3.54), we obtain for $k \geq 0$,

$$|\nabla_{x'}^k H_{i3}^b| \leq C \delta(x')^{1-i-\frac{k}{2}}, \quad b = 1, 2, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k G_{i2}| \leq \delta(x')^{\frac{3}{2}-i-\frac{k}{2}}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k \tilde{S}_{i3}| \leq C \delta(x')^{\frac{1}{2}-i-\frac{k}{2}}. \quad (3.56)$$

By (3.55) and (3.56), we derive, for $b = 1, 2$,

$$|\Delta_{x'}(\mathbf{v}_1^3)^{(b)}| \leq C \delta(x'), \quad |\Delta_{x'}(\mathbf{v}_1^3)^{(3)}| \leq C \delta(x')^{\frac{3}{2}}, \quad |(\mathbf{f}_1^2)^{(3)} + \mu \partial_{x_3 x_3}(\mathbf{v}_1^3)^{(3)}| \leq C \delta(x')^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Thus the leading term in $\mathbf{f}_1^2 + \mu \Delta \mathbf{v}_1^3$ is $\sum_{i=0}^5 \tilde{S}_{i3}(x') x_3^i$. To cancel this leading term, we take

$$\bar{p}_3 = \sum_{i=0}^5 \frac{\tilde{S}_{i3}(x')}{i+1} x_3^{i+1} \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}, \quad (3.57)$$

such that $\partial_{x_3} \bar{p}_3 = \sum_{i=0}^5 \tilde{S}_{i3}(x') x_3^i$.

From (3.55) and (3.57), we can write \mathbf{f}_1^3 as polynomials in x_3 :

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{f}_1^3)^{(b)} &= \sum_{i=1}^6 \left(H_{i3} - \frac{1}{i} \partial_{x_b} \tilde{S}_{(i-1)3} \right)(x') x_3^i + H_{03}(x') := \sum_{i=0}^6 S_{i3}^b(x') x_3^i, \quad b = 1, 2, \\ (\mathbf{f}_1^3)^{(3)} &= \sum_{i=0}^7 G_{i3}(x') x_3^i, \end{aligned}$$

where $S_{i3}^b(x') = H_{i3}(x') - \frac{1}{i} \partial_{x_b} \tilde{S}_{(i-1)3}(x')$, $1 \leq i \leq 6$, and $S_{03}^b(x') = H_{03}(x')$. In view of (3.56), we have for $k \geq 0$,

$$|\nabla_{x'}^k S_{i3}^b| \leq C \delta(x')^{1-i-\frac{k}{2}}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k G_{i3}| \leq C \delta(x')^{\frac{3}{2}-i-\frac{k}{2}}.$$

Thus, we have

$$|(\mathbf{f}_1^3)^{(b)}| \leq C \delta(x'), \quad b = 1, 2, \quad |(\mathbf{f}_1^3)^{(3)}| \leq C \delta(x')^{\frac{3}{2}},$$

and

$$|\mathbf{f}_1^3| \leq |(\mathbf{f}_1^3)^{(1)}| + |(\mathbf{f}_1^3)^{(2)}| + |(\mathbf{f}_1^3)^{(3)}| \leq C \delta(x'). \quad (3.58)$$

By using (3.47), (3.50), (3.53), (3.56), and (3.57), a calculation gives for $k \geq 0$ and $b = 1, 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla_{x'}^k \partial_{x_3}^s (\mathbf{v}_1^3)^{(b)}| &\leq \delta(x')^{2-s-\frac{k}{2}} \quad \text{for } s \leq 6, \quad \partial_{x_3}^s (\mathbf{v}_1^3)^{(b)} = 0 \quad \text{for } s \geq 7, \\ |\nabla_{x'}^k \partial_{x_3}^s (\mathbf{v}_1^3)^{(3)}| &\leq \delta(x')^{\frac{5}{2}-s-\frac{k}{2}} \quad \text{for } s \leq 7, \quad \partial_{x_3}^s (\mathbf{v}_1^3)^{(3)} = 0 \quad \text{for } s \geq 8, \\ |\nabla_{x'}^k \partial_{x_3}^s \bar{p}_3| &\leq C \delta(x')^{\frac{3}{2}-s-\frac{k}{2}} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq s \leq 6, \quad \partial_{x_3}^s \bar{p}_3 = 0 \quad \text{for } s \geq 7. \end{aligned} \quad (3.59)$$

Denote $\mathbf{v}^3 = \mathbf{v}_1^1 + \mathbf{v}_1^2 + \mathbf{v}_1^3$, $\bar{p}^3 = \bar{p}_1 + \bar{p}_2 + \bar{p}_3$. Recall that $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}^3 = R(x')$ with $|R(x')| \leq C \delta(x')^{3/2}$. By virtue of (3.58) and Proposition 2.1, we have for any $m \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla^{m+1}(\mathbf{u}_1^1 - \mathbf{v}^3)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(x')/2}(x'))} &+ \|\nabla^m(\bar{p}_1^1 - \bar{p}^3)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(x')/2}(x'))} \\ &\leq C(\delta(x')^{2-m} + \delta(x')^{\frac{3}{2}-m}) \leq C \delta(x')^{\frac{3}{2}-m}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.60)$$

By (3.59), we summarize

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla^{m+1}\mathbf{v}_1^3| &\leq C\delta(x')^{1-m} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq m \leq 4, \quad |\nabla^{m+1}\mathbf{v}_1^3| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{m+3}{2}} \quad \text{for } m \geq 5, \\ |\nabla^m\bar{p}_3| &\leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{3}{2}-m} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq m \leq 6, \quad |\nabla^m\bar{p}_3| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{m+3}{2}} \quad \text{for } m \geq 7. \end{aligned} \quad (3.61)$$

By (3.20), (3.45), and (3.61), we have

$$|\nabla^{m+1}\mathbf{v}^3| + |\nabla^m\bar{p}^3| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{m+3}{2}}. \quad (3.62)$$

It follows from (3.60) and (3.62) that for $m \geq 1$,

$$|\nabla^{m+1}\mathbf{u}_1^1| + |\nabla^m p_1^1| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{m+3}{2}} + \delta(x')^{\frac{3}{2}-m},$$

which implies that in Ω_R ,

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla^{m+1}\mathbf{u}_1^1| + |\nabla^m p_1^1| &\leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{m+3}{2}} \quad \text{for } m \leq 6, \\ |\nabla^{m+1}\mathbf{u}_1^1| + |\nabla^m p_1^1| &\leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{3}{2}-m} \quad \text{for } m \geq 7. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Proposition 3.1. \square

Remark 3.2. We would like to emphasize that, unlike in [14] for the two-dimensional case, Proposition 1.1 is essential for studying three or higher-dimensional problems. For example, $F(x') = -\frac{3(h_1-h_2)(x')}{\delta(x')}$ and $G(x') = 0$ is the solution of (3.7), but it is hard to find an \bar{p}_1 such that $|\mu\Delta\mathbf{v}_1^1 - \nabla\bar{p}_1| \leq C\delta(x')^{-1}$.

4. ESTIMATES FOR (\mathbf{u}_1^3, p_1^3)

In this section, we derive higher-order derivatives of \mathbf{u}_1^3 and p_1^3 using the method outlined in Proposition 3.1. We reduce the construction of auxiliary functions to studying a class of ordinary differential equations, thereby fully capture the singular behavior of $\nabla^{m+1}\mathbf{u}_1^3$ and $\nabla^m p_1^3$.

Proposition 4.1. *Under the same assumption as in Theorem 1.2, let \mathbf{u}_1^3 and p_1^3 be the solution to (1.9) with $\alpha = 3$. Then for sufficiently small $0 < \varepsilon < 1/2$, we have*

$$(i) \quad |\nabla\mathbf{u}_1^3(x)| \leq C(\varepsilon + |x'|^2)^{-\frac{3}{2}}, \quad |p_1^3(x) - p_1^3(z', 0)| \leq C(\varepsilon + |x'|^2)^{-2}, \quad x \in \Omega_R,$$

for some point $z = (z', 0) \in \Omega_R$, $|z'| = R/2$; and

(ii) for any $m \geq 1$,

$$|\nabla^{m+1}\mathbf{u}_1^3(x)| + |\nabla^m p_1^3(x)| \leq C(\varepsilon + |x'|^2)^{-\frac{m+4}{2}}, \quad x \in \Omega_R.$$

Proof of Proposition 4.1. The proof is similar to that of Proposition 3.1. To show the main idea more clearly, we divide the proof into three steps.

4.1. Gradient estimate. In order to establish the gradient estimate of \mathbf{u}_1^3 , we first construct a divergence-free auxiliary function \mathbf{v}_3^1 which satisfies the boundary condition $\mathbf{v}_3^1(x) = \mathbf{u}_1^3(x) = \psi_3$ on Γ_{2R}^+ , $\mathbf{v}_3^1(x) = \mathbf{u}_1^3(x) = 0$ on Γ_{2R}^- , and a corresponding \bar{p}_1 , such that

$$|\mu\Delta\mathbf{v}_3^1 - \nabla\bar{p}_1| \leq C\delta(x')^{-1}.$$

However, $\psi_3 = (0, 0, 1)^T$ introduce a higher singularity than $\psi_1 = (1, 0, 0)^T$ and $\psi_2 = (0, 1, 0)^T$. We divide the process into two steps to construct

$$\mathbf{v}_2^1 := \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_2^1 + \hat{\mathbf{v}}_2^1 \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{p}_1 := \tilde{p}_1 + \hat{p}_1.$$

Step I.1. Construction of $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1$ and \tilde{p}_1 . We begin by constructing an auxiliary function $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1$ that satisfies the boundary conditions $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1(x) = \mathbf{u}_1^3(x) = \psi_3$ on Γ_{2R}^+ and $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1(x) = \mathbf{u}_1^3(x) = 0$ on Γ_{2R}^- . The construction process of $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1(x)$ is similar to that of $\mathbf{v}_1^1(x)$ in Proposition 3.1, with some minor modifications. Specifically, we assume that $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1(x)$ takes the following form:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1(x) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ k(x) + \frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} F(x) \\ G(x) \\ H(x) \end{pmatrix} \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R},$$

where $k(x) = \frac{x_3 - \frac{1}{2}(h_1 - h_2)(x')}{\delta(x')}$ is defined in (2.14). By a direct calculation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{x_1}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1)^{(1)} &= \partial_{x_1}F(x) \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) + 2F(x)k(x)\partial_{x_1}k(x), \\ \partial_{x_2}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1)^{(2)} &= \partial_{x_2}G(x) \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) + 2G(x)k(x)\partial_{x_2}k(x), \\ \partial_{x_3}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1)^{(3)} &= \frac{1}{\delta(x')} + \partial_{x_3}H(x) \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) + \frac{2k(x)}{\delta(x')}H(x). \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

To determine $F(x)$, $G(x)$, and $H(x)$, instead of (3.5), we set

$$\frac{1}{4}(\partial_{x_1}F + \partial_{x_2}G + \partial_{x_3}H)(x) = \frac{1}{\delta(x')}. \quad (4.2)$$

By using (4.1), (4.2), and the divergence-free condition $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0$, we obtain

$$H(x) = -2k(x) - F(x)\delta(x')\partial_{x_1}k(x) - G(x)\delta(x')\partial_{x_2}k(x). \quad (4.3)$$

By (4.2) and (4.3), we conclude that $F(x)$ and $G(x)$ satisfy the following first-order differential equation:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{x_1}F(x) + \partial_{x_2}G(x) + \frac{\partial_{x_1}\delta(x')}{\delta(x')}F(x) + \frac{\partial_{x_2}\delta(x')}{\delta(x')}G(x) \\ - \delta(x')(\partial_{x_1}k(x)\partial_{x_3}F(x) + \partial_{x_2}k(x)\partial_{x_3}G(x)) = \frac{6}{\delta(x')}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

We assume $F(x) = F(x')$ and $G(x) = G(x')$. Then (4.4) becomes

$$\partial_{x_1}F(x) + \partial_{x_2}G(x) + \frac{\partial_{x_1}\delta(x')}{\delta(x')}F(x) + \frac{\partial_{x_2}\delta(x')}{\delta(x')}G(x) = \frac{6}{\delta(x')}. \quad (4.5)$$

Similar to (3.8) and (3.9), we choose $\tilde{p}_1^1(x')$ such that

$$\partial_{x_1}\tilde{p}_1^1(x') = \frac{2\mu F(x')}{\delta(x')^2}, \quad \partial_{x_2}\tilde{p}_1^1(x') = \frac{2\mu G(x')}{\delta(x')^2}. \quad (4.6)$$

Substituting (4.6) into (4.5) yields

$$\Delta_{x'}\tilde{p}_1^1(x') + \frac{3\partial_{x_1}\delta(x')}{\delta(x')} \partial_{x_1}\tilde{p}_1^1(x') + \frac{3\partial_{x_2}\delta(x')}{\delta(x')} \partial_{x_2}\tilde{p}_1^1(x') = \frac{12\mu}{\delta(x')^3}. \quad (4.7)$$

We rewrite (4.7) as

$$\tilde{p}_1^1(r)'' + \left(\frac{3\delta'(r)}{\delta(r)} + \frac{1}{r} \right) \tilde{p}_1^1(r)' = \frac{12\mu}{\delta(r)^3}. \quad (4.8)$$

Then

$$\tilde{p}_1^1(x') = -6\mu \int_r^R \frac{s}{\delta(s)^3} ds \quad (4.9)$$

is a particular solution, which is a radial function. By (4.6), we have

$$F(x') = \frac{\delta(x')^2}{2\mu} \partial_{x_1} \tilde{p}_1^1 = \frac{3x_1}{\delta(x')}, \quad G(x') = \frac{\delta(x')^2}{2\mu} \partial_{x_2} \tilde{p}_1^1 = \frac{3x_2}{\delta(x')}. \quad (4.10)$$

Substituting them into (4.3), we have

$$H(x) = -2k(x) - 3x_1 \partial_{x_1} k(x) - 3x_2 \partial_{x_2} k(x) = -2k(x) - 3r \partial_r k(x),$$

which is radial about x' . Therefore, we have

$$\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1(x) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ k(x) + \frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \frac{3x_1}{\delta(x')} \\ \frac{3x_2}{\delta(x')} \\ -2k(x) - 3x_1 \partial_{x_1} k(x) - 3x_2 \partial_{x_2} k(x) \end{pmatrix} \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}, \quad (4.11)$$

which satisfies the divergence-free condition $\nabla \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1 = 0$ in Ω_{2R} .

By (1.2) and a direct calculation, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla_{x'}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1)^{(i)}| &\leq C\delta(x')^{-1}, \quad |\partial_{x_3}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1)^{(i)}| \leq C\delta(x')^{-3/2}, \quad i = 1, 2, \\ |\nabla_{x'}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1)^{(3)}| &\leq C\delta(x')^{-1/2}, \quad |\partial_{x_3}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1)^{(3)}| \leq C\delta(x')^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

and for any $k \geq 1$, and $i = 1, 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla_{x'}^k \partial_{x_3}^s (\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1)^{(i)}| &\leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{1+k}{2}-s} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq s \leq 2, \quad \partial_{x_3}^s (\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1)^{(i)} = 0 \quad \text{for } s \geq 3, \\ |\nabla_{x'}^k \partial_{x_3}^s (\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1)^{(3)}| &\leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{k}{2}-s} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq s \leq 3, \quad \partial_{x_3}^s (\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1)^{(3)} = 0 \quad \text{for } s \geq 4. \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

By (4.12), one can see that the leading term in $\Delta(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1)^{(3)}$ is $\partial_{x_3 x_3}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1)^{(3)}$. To further cancel this leading term, we take

$$\tilde{p}_1(x) := \tilde{p}_1^1(x') + \mu \partial_{x_3} \left(H(x) \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \right) = \tilde{p}_1^1(x') + \mu \partial_{x_3}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1)^{(3)} - \frac{\mu}{\delta(x')}. \quad (4.13)$$

By (4.11) and the definition of $k(x)$, we see that $(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1)^{(i)}, i = 1, 2$, is a quadratic polynomial in x_3 , while $(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1)^{(3)}$ is a cubic polynomial in x_3 . By (4.6), (4.10), (4.11), (4.12), and (4.13), a direct calculation gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\mu \Delta \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1 - \nabla \tilde{p}_1 \\ &= \mu \begin{pmatrix} \Delta_{x'}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1)^{(1)} - \partial_{x_1 x_3}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1)^{(3)} + \partial_{x_1} \frac{1}{\delta(x')} \\ \Delta_{x'}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1)^{(2)} - \partial_{x_2 x_3}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1)^{(3)} + \partial_{x_2} \frac{1}{\delta(x')} \\ \Delta_{x'}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1)^{(3)} \end{pmatrix} := \begin{pmatrix} A_1(x')x_3^2 + B_1(x')x_3 + C_1(x') \\ A_2(x')x_3^2 + B_2(x')x_3 + C_2(x') \\ \hat{A}(x')x_3^3 + \hat{B}(x')x_3^2 + \hat{C}(x')x_3 + \hat{D}(x') \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

where for $0 \leq s \leq m$, in Ω_{2R} ,

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla_{x'}^s A_i| &\leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{7+s}{2}}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^s B_i| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{5+s}{2}}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^s C_i| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{3+s}{2}}, \quad i = 1, 2, \\ |\nabla_{x'}^s \hat{A}| &\leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{8+s}{2}}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^s \hat{B}| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{6+s}{2}}, \\ |\nabla_{x'}^s \hat{C}| &\leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{4+s}{2}}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^s \hat{D}| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{2+s}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

Recalling the definition of $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1$ in (4.11), by (4.14), a direct calculation shows, for $i = 1, 2$,

$$A_i = x_i A(r), \quad B_i = x_i B(r), \quad C_i = x_i C(r), \quad (4.16)$$

for some radial functions $A(r)$, $B(r)$, and $C(r)$. By using (4.14) and (4.15), we have

$$|(\mu\Delta\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1 - \nabla\tilde{p}_1)^{(i)}| \leq C\delta(x')^{-3/2}, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad |(\mu\Delta\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1 - \nabla\tilde{p}_1)^{(3)}| \leq C\delta(x')^{-1}. \quad (4.17)$$

Thus, we have $|\mu\Delta\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1 - \nabla\tilde{p}_1| \leq C\delta(x')^{-3/2}$.

However, this bound is too large to apply Proposition 2.1. Therefore, in order to fully capture the singularity in $\nabla\mathbf{u}_1^3$, we need to introduce additional divergence-free correctors to reduce the upper bound, $\delta(x')^{-3/2}$.

Step I.2. Construction of $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_3^1$ and \hat{p}_1 . It follows from (4.17) that the leading terms in $\mu\Delta\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1 - \nabla\tilde{p}_1$ are $(\mu\Delta\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1 - \nabla\tilde{p}_1)^{(i)}$, $i = 1, 2$. To cancel out them, similar to the process of Step II in the proof of Proposition 3.1, we choose the corrector $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_3^1$ in the following form in Ω_{2R} :

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{v}}_3^1(x) &= \begin{pmatrix} F_{11}^2(x')x_3^2 + F_{11}^1(x')x_3 + F_{11}^0(x') + \tilde{F}_{11}(x') \\ F_{21}^2(x')x_3^2 + F_{21}^1(x')x_3 + F_{21}^0(x') + \tilde{F}_{21}(x') \\ F_{31}^3(x')x_3^3 + F_{31}^2(x')x_3^2 + F_{31}^1(x')x_3 + F_{31}^0(x') + \tilde{F}_{31}(x) \end{pmatrix} \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4}\right) \\ &:= \begin{pmatrix} F_{11}(x) + \tilde{F}_{11}(x') \\ F_{21}(x) + \tilde{F}_{21}(x') \\ F_{31}(x) + \tilde{F}_{31}(x) \end{pmatrix} \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

We first construct $F_{11}(x)$, $F_{21}(x)$, and $F_{31}(x)$. Here $F_{11}(x)$ and $F_{21}(x)$ are chosen to cancel out $(\mu\Delta\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1 - \nabla\tilde{p}_1)^{(i)}$, $i = 1, 2$, in the following way,

$$\mu\partial_{x_3x_3} \left(F_{i1} \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \right) = -(\mu\Delta\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1 - \nabla\tilde{p}_1)^{(i)}, \quad i = 1, 2. \quad (4.19)$$

By comparing the coefficients of each term of x_3 , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} F_{i1}^2(x') &= -\frac{\delta(x')^2}{12\mu} A_i(x'), \quad F_{i1}^1(x') = -\frac{\delta(x')^2}{6\mu} B_i(x') + (h_1 - h_2)F_{i1}^2(x'), \\ F_{i1}^0(x') &= -\frac{\delta(x')^2}{2\mu} C_i(x') + (h_1 - h_2)F_{i1}^1(x') + \frac{1}{4}(\varepsilon + 2h_1(x'))(\varepsilon + 2h_2(x'))F_{i1}^2(x'), \quad i = 1, 2. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this and (4.16), we have, for $j = 0, 1, 2$,

$$F_{i1}^j(x') = x_i F^j(r) \quad (4.20)$$

for some radial functions $F^j(r)$. We further take

$$\begin{aligned} F_{31}^3(x') &= -\frac{\delta(x')^2}{5} \sum_{i=1}^2 \partial_{x_i} \left(\frac{F_{i1}^2(x')}{\delta(x')^2} \right), \\ F_{31}^2(x') &= \frac{\delta(x')^2}{4} \sum_{i=1}^2 \partial_{x_i} \left(\frac{(h_1 - h_2)(x')F_{i1}^2(x') - F_{i1}^1(x')}{\delta(x')^2} \right) + (h_1 - h_2)(x')F_{31}^3(x'), \\ F_{31}^1(x') &= \frac{\delta(x')^2}{3} \left(\sum_{i=1}^2 \partial_{x_i} \left(\frac{(h_1 - h_2)(x')F_{i1}^1(x') - F_{i1}^0(x')}{\delta(x')^2} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{i=1}^2 \partial_{x_i} \left(\frac{(\varepsilon + 2h_1(x'))(\varepsilon + 2h_2(x'))}{4\delta(x')^2} F_{i1}^2(x') \right) + (h_1 - h_2)(x')F_{31}^2(x') \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{4}(\varepsilon + 2h_1(x'))(\varepsilon + 2h_2(x'))F_{31}^3(x') \right), \end{aligned}$$

$$F_{31}^0(x') = \frac{\delta(x')^2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^2 \left(\partial_{x_i} \left(\frac{(h_1 - h_2)(x') F_{i1}^0(x')}{\delta(x')^2} \right) + \partial_{x_i} \left(\frac{(\varepsilon + 2h_1(x'))(\varepsilon + 2h_2(x'))}{4\delta(x')^2} F_{i1}^1(x') \right) \right) \\ + (h_1 - h_2)(x') F_{31}^1(x') + \frac{1}{4}(\varepsilon + 2h_1(x'))(\varepsilon + 2h_2(x')) F_{31}^2(x'),$$

satisfying

$$\nabla \cdot \begin{pmatrix} F_{11} \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \\ F_{21} \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \\ F_{31} \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \end{pmatrix} := R(x'),$$

where

$$R(x') = -\frac{h_1 - h_2}{\delta(x')^2} F_{31}^0(x') - \sum_{i=1}^2 \partial_{x_i} \left(\frac{(\varepsilon + 2h_1)(\varepsilon + 2h_2)}{4\delta(x')^2} F_{i1}^0(x') \right) - \frac{(\varepsilon + 2h_1)(\varepsilon + 2h_2)}{4\delta(x')^2} F_{31}^1(x')$$

is independent of x_3 . It follows from (4.20) that $F_{31}^j(x') = F_{31}^j(r)$. Recalling the definition of F_{i1} , $i = 1, 2$, by using (4.20) again, we have $\partial_{x_1} F_{11} + \partial_{x_2} F_{21}$ is a radial function. Hence $R(x')$ is radial. By using (1.2) and (4.15), we have, for $k \geq 0, i = 0, 1, 2$, and $j = 0, 1, 2, 3$,

$$|\nabla_{x'}^k F_{11}^i|, |\nabla_{x'}^k F_{21}^i| \leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{1}{2}-i-\frac{k}{2}}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k F_{31}^j| \leq C\delta(x')^{1-j-\frac{k}{2}}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k R| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{k}{2}}. \quad (4.21)$$

To ensure $\nabla \cdot \hat{\mathbf{v}}_3^1 = 0$, we now choose $\tilde{F}_{11}(x'), \tilde{F}_{21}(x')$, and $\tilde{F}_{31}(x)$ such that

$$\nabla \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{F}_{11}(x') \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \\ \tilde{F}_{21}(x') \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \\ \tilde{F}_{31}(x) \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \end{pmatrix} = -R(x'). \quad (4.22)$$

After a direct calculation, (4.22) becomes

$$\partial_{x_1} \tilde{F}_{11} \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) + \partial_{x_2} \tilde{F}_{21} \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) + 2k(x) \partial_{x_1} k(x') \tilde{F}_{11}(x') \\ + 2k(x') \partial_{x_2} k(x) \tilde{F}_{21}(x') + \partial_{x_3} \tilde{F}_{31} \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) + \frac{2k(x) \tilde{F}_{31}(x)}{\delta(x')} + R(x') = 0. \quad (4.23)$$

To determine $\tilde{F}_{11}(x'), \tilde{F}_{21}(x')$, and $\tilde{F}_{31}(x)$, we let

$$\partial_{x_1} \tilde{F}_{11}(x') + \partial_{x_2} \tilde{F}_{21}(x') + \partial_{x_3} \tilde{F}_{31}(x) = 4R(x'). \quad (4.24)$$

It follows from (4.23) and (4.24) that

$$\tilde{F}_{31}(x) = -2\delta(x') k(x) R(x') - \delta(x') \partial_{x_1} k(x) \tilde{F}_{11}(x') - \delta(x') \partial_{x_2} k(x) \tilde{F}_{21}(x'). \quad (4.25)$$

Substituting (4.25) into (4.24), we get

$$\partial_{x_1} \tilde{F}_{11}(x') + \frac{\partial_{x_1} \delta(x')}{\delta(x')} \tilde{F}_{11}(x') + \partial_{x_2} \tilde{F}_{21}(x') + \frac{\partial_{x_2} \delta(x')}{\delta(x')} \tilde{F}_{21}(x') = 6R(x'). \quad (4.26)$$

Similar to (3.7)-(3.9), to determine $\tilde{F}_{11}(x')$ and $\tilde{F}_{21}(x')$, we choose $\hat{p}_1(x')$ such that

$$\partial_{x_1} \hat{p}_1 = \frac{2\mu \tilde{F}_{11}(x')}{\delta(x')^2}, \quad \partial_{x_2} \hat{p}_1 = \frac{2\mu \tilde{F}_{21}(x')}{\delta(x')^2}. \quad (4.27)$$

Combining (4.26) and (4.27), we have

$$\Delta_{x'} \hat{p}_1 + \frac{3\partial_{x_1} \delta(x')}{\delta(x')} \partial_{x_1} \hat{p}_1 + \frac{3\partial_{x_2} \delta(x')}{\delta(x')} \partial_{x_2} \hat{p}_1 = \frac{12\mu R(x')}{\delta(x')^2}. \quad (4.28)$$

Since $R(x')$ is radial, by a similar argument that led to (4.8), we obtain

$$\hat{p}_1(x') = -12\mu \int_r^R \frac{1}{s\delta(s)^3} \int_0^s R(t)t\delta(t) dt ds. \quad (4.29)$$

Thus by (4.27), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{F}_{11}(x') &= \frac{\delta(x')^2}{2\mu} \partial_{x_1} \hat{p}_1 = \frac{6x_1}{r^2\delta(r)} \int_0^r R(t)t\delta(t) dt, \\ \tilde{F}_{21}(x') &= \frac{\delta(x')^2}{2\mu} \partial_{x_2} \hat{p}_1 = \frac{6x_2}{r^2\delta(r)} \int_0^r R(t)t\delta(t) dt. \end{aligned} \quad (4.30)$$

Substituting them into (4.25) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{F}_{31}(x) &= -2\delta(x')k(x)R(x') - \frac{6x_1\partial_{x_1}k(x)}{r^2} \int_0^r R(t)t\delta(t) dt - \frac{6x_1\partial_{x_1}k(x)}{r^2} \int_0^r R(t)t\delta(t) dt \\ &= -2\delta(x')k(x)R(x') - \frac{6\partial_r k(x)}{r} \int_0^r R(t)t\delta(t) dt := P(x')x_3 + Q(x'), \end{aligned} \quad (4.31)$$

which is radial with respect to x' . By (4.21), (4.29), (4.30), and (4.31), a calculation gives, for any $k \geq 0$,

$$|\nabla_{x'}^k \tilde{F}_{11}|, |\nabla_{x'}^k \tilde{F}_{21}| \leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{1-k}{2}}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k P| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{k}{2}}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k Q| \leq C\delta(x')^{1-\frac{k}{2}} \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}. \quad (4.32)$$

Now we define $\mathbf{v}_3^1(x) = \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1(x) + \hat{\mathbf{v}}_3^1(x)$ and $\bar{p}_1 = \tilde{p}_1 + \hat{p}_1$, which satisfy $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_3^1(x) = \nabla \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1(x) + \nabla \cdot \hat{\mathbf{v}}_3^1(x) = 0$ and $\partial_{x_3} \hat{p}_1 = 0$, respectively.

Step I.3. Estimates of \mathbf{f}_3^1 . Denote

$$\mathbf{f}_3^1 := \mu\Delta\mathbf{v}_3^1 - \nabla\bar{p}_1 \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}.$$

By virtue of (4.14), (4.18), (4.19), and (4.27), we have

$$\mathbf{f}_3^1 = \begin{pmatrix} \mu\Delta_{x'}(\hat{\mathbf{v}}_3^1)^{(1)}(x) \\ \mu\Delta_{x'}(\hat{\mathbf{v}}_3^1)^{(2)}(x) \\ \mu\Delta_{x'}(\hat{\mathbf{v}}_3^1)^{(3)}(x) + \mu\Delta_{x'}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1)^{(3)}(x) + \mu\partial_{x_3x_3}(\hat{\mathbf{v}}_3^1)^{(3)}(x) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.33)$$

It follows from (4.18) that $(\hat{\mathbf{v}}_3^1)^{(i)}, i = 1, 2$, is a polynomial of order 4 in x_3 , while $(\hat{\mathbf{v}}_3^1)^{(3)}$ is a polynomial of order 5 in x_3 . In view of (4.14), we can rewrite

$$(\mathbf{f}_3^1)^{(j)} = \sum_{i=0}^4 H_{i1}^j(x')x_3^i, \quad j = 1, 2, \quad (\mathbf{f}_3^1)^{(3)} = \sum_{i=0}^3 S_{i1}(x')x_3^i + \sum_{i=0}^5 G_{i1}(x')x_3^i \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}, \quad (4.34)$$

where

$$\sum_{i=0}^3 S_{i1}(x')x_3^i := \mu\Delta_{x'}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1)^{(3)} + \mu\partial_{x_3x_3}(\hat{\mathbf{v}}_3^1)^{(3)}, \quad \sum_{i=0}^5 G_{i1}(x')x_3^i := \mu\Delta_{x'}(\hat{\mathbf{v}}_3^1)^{(3)}.$$

By using (4.15), (4.21), and (4.32), for $s \geq 0$, $1 \leq i \leq 4$, $0 \leq j \leq 3$, and $0 \leq k \leq 5$,

$$|\nabla_{x'}^s H_{i1}^1|, |\nabla_{x'}^s H_{i1}^2| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{1}{2}-i-\frac{s}{2}}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^s S_{j1}| \leq C\delta(x')^{-1-j-\frac{s}{2}}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^s G_{k1}| \leq C\delta(x')^{-k-\frac{s}{2}}. \quad (4.35)$$

Therefore, by (4.34) and (4.35), we have

$$|(\mathbf{f}_3^1)^{(1)}|, |(\mathbf{f}_3^1)^{(2)}| \leq C\delta(x')^{-1/2}, \quad |(\mathbf{f}_3^1)^{(3)}| \leq C\delta(x')^{-1} \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}.$$

Thus,

$$|\mathbf{f}_3^1| \leq C(|(\mathbf{f}_3^1)^{(1)}| + |(\mathbf{f}_3^1)^{(2)}| + |(\mathbf{f}_3^1)^{(3)}|) \leq C\delta(x')^{-1} \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}. \quad (4.36)$$

By applying Proposition A.1 and using (4.36), we have for any $x \in \Omega_R$,

$$\|\nabla \mathbf{u}_1^3 - \nabla \mathbf{v}_1^3\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(x_1)/2}(x'))} \leq C.$$

By virtue of (4.13), (4.9), (4.12), (4.21), (4.29), and (4.32) we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla^l \mathbf{v}_3^1| &\leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{2l+1}{2}} \quad \text{for } l \leq 2, \quad |\nabla^l \mathbf{v}_3^1| \leq C\delta(x_1)^{-\frac{l+3}{2}} \quad \text{for } l \geq 3, \\ |\bar{p}_1| &\leq C\delta(x')^{-2}, \quad |\nabla^l \bar{p}_1| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{l+4}{2}} \quad \text{for } l \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, Proposition 4.1 holds for $m = 0$, with

$$|\nabla \mathbf{u}_1^3| \leq C|\nabla \mathbf{v}_3^1(x)| + C \leq C\delta(x')^{-3/2} \quad \text{in } \Omega_R.$$

4.2. Higher-order derivatives estimates. Denote

$$\mathbf{f}_3^j := \mathbf{f}_3^{j-1} + \mu \Delta \mathbf{v}_3^j(x) - \nabla \bar{p}_j(x) = \sum_{l=1}^j (\mu \Delta \mathbf{v}_3^l - \nabla \bar{p}_l)(x) \quad \text{for } 2 \leq j \leq m+1. \quad (4.37)$$

We will inductively prove that for $j \geq 1$, \mathbf{f}_2^j can be represented as polynomials in x_3 as follows:

$$(\mathbf{f}_3^j)^{(b)} = \sum_{i=0}^{2j+2} H_{ij}^b(x') x_3^i, \quad b = 1, 2, \quad (\mathbf{f}_3^j)^{(3)} = \sum_{i=0}^{2j+1} S_{ij}(x') x_3^i + \sum_{i=0}^{2j+3} G_{ij}(x') x_3^i \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}, \quad (4.38)$$

where for any $k \geq 0$,

$$|\nabla_{x'}^k H_{ij}^b(x')| \leq C\delta(x')^{j-i-\frac{k}{2}-\frac{3}{2}}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k S_{ij}| \leq C\delta(x')^{j-i-\frac{k}{2}-2}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k G_{ij}| \leq C\delta(x')^{j-i-\frac{k}{2}-1}. \quad (4.39)$$

Indeed, by (4.34) and (4.35), we have that (4.38) and (4.39) hold for $j = 1$. Assuming that (4.38) and (4.39) hold for $j = l-1$ with $l \geq 2$, that is, in Ω_{2R} ,

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{f}_3^{(l-1)})^{(b)} &= \sum_{i=0}^{2l} H_{i(l-1)}^b(x') x_3^i = \mu \Delta_{x'} (\mathbf{v}_3^{l-1})^{(b)}, \quad b = 1, 2, \\ (\mathbf{f}_3^{(l-1)})^{(3)} &= \sum_{i=0}^{2l-1} S_{i(l-1)}(x') x_3^i + \sum_{i=0}^{2l+1} G_{i(l-1)}(x') x_3^i, \end{aligned} \quad (4.40)$$

where for any $k \geq 0$,

$$|\nabla_{x'}^k H_{i(l-1)}^b| \leq C\delta(x')^{l-i-\frac{k}{2}-\frac{5}{2}}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k S_{i(l-1)}| \leq C\delta(x')^{l-i-\frac{k}{2}-3}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k G_{i(l-1)}| \leq C\delta(x')^{l-i-\frac{k}{2}-2}. \quad (4.41)$$

Step II.1. Construction of \mathbf{v}_3^l and \bar{p}_l . From (4.40) and (4.41), we see that the leading term in \mathbf{f}_3^{l-1} is $\sum_{i=0}^{2l-1} S_{i(l-1)}(x') x_3^i$. To cancel this bad term, we take

$$\tilde{p}_l = \sum_{i=0}^{2l-1} \frac{S_{i(l-1)}(x')}{i+1} x_3^{i+1} \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}$$

such that

$$\mathbf{f}_3^{l-1} - \nabla \tilde{p}_l = \begin{pmatrix} \mu \Delta_{x'}(\mathbf{v}_3^{l-1})^{(1)}(x) - \partial_{x_1} \tilde{p}_l \\ \mu \Delta_{x'}(\mathbf{v}_3^{l-1})^{(2)}(x) - \partial_{x_2} \tilde{p}_l \\ \sum_{i=0}^{2l+1} G_{i(l-1)}(x') x_3^i \end{pmatrix} := \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{i=0}^4 A_{i1}^1(x') x_3^i \\ \sum_{i=0}^4 A_{i1}^2(x') x_3^i \\ \sum_{i=0}^5 B_{i1}(x') x_3^i \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.42)$$

By (4.41), we have for any $k \geq 0$,

$$|\nabla_{x'}^k A_{i1}^1|, |\nabla_{x'}^k A_{i1}^2| \leq C \delta(x')^{l-i-\frac{k}{2}-\frac{5}{2}}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k B_{i1}| \leq C \delta(x')^{l-i-\frac{k}{2}-2} \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}. \quad (4.43)$$

It follows from (4.42) and (4.43) that

$$|(\mathbf{f}_3^{l-1})^{(j)} - \partial_{x_j} \tilde{p}_l| \leq C \delta(x')^{l-\frac{5}{2}}, \quad j = 1, 2, \quad |(\mathbf{f}_3^{l-1})^{(3)} - \partial_{x_3} \tilde{p}_l| \leq C \delta(x')^{l-2}.$$

To further reduce the upper bound, $\delta(x')^{l-\frac{5}{2}}$, we choose a divergence-free auxiliary function $\mathbf{v}_3^l(x)$ that satisfies $\mathbf{v}_3^l(x) = 0$ on $\Gamma_{2R}^+ \cup \Gamma_{2R}^-$, specifically,

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{v}_3^l)^{(j)} &= \left(\sum_{i=0}^{2l} F_{jl}^i(x') x_3^i + \tilde{F}_{jl}(x') \right) \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right), \quad j = 1, 2, \\ &\quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}. \quad (4.44) \\ (\mathbf{v}_3^l)^{(3)} &= \left(\sum_{i=0}^{2l+1} F_{3l}^i(x') x_3^i + \tilde{F}_{3l}(x) \right) \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Here we take $F_{1l}^i(x')$ and $F_{2l}^i(x')$, $i = 0, 1, \dots, 2l$, so that

$$\mu \partial_{x_3 x_3} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{2l} F_{jl}^i(x') x_3^i \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \right) + (\mathbf{f}_3^{l-1})^{(j)} - \partial_{x_j} \tilde{p}_l = 0, \quad j = 1, 2. \quad (4.45)$$

By comparing the coefficients of different order of x_3 , we have

$$F_{jl}^i(x') = - \frac{\delta(x')^2 A_{i(l-1)}^j(x')}{\mu(i+1)(i+2)} + (h_1 - h_2)(x') F_{jl}^{i+1}(x') + \frac{1}{4}(\varepsilon + 2h_1)(\varepsilon + 2h_2) F_{jl}^{i+2}(x'). \quad (4.46)$$

Here we used the convention that $F_{1l}^i, F_{2l}^i = 0$ if $i \notin \{0, \dots, 2l\}$ and $F_{3l}^i = 0$ if $i \notin \{0, \dots, 2l+1\}$. To ensure $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_3^2 = 0$, we set

$$\begin{aligned} F_{3l}^i(x') &= \sum_{j=1}^2 \frac{\delta(x')^2}{i+2} \left(\partial_{x_j} \left(\frac{(h_1 - h_2) F_{jl}^i(x') - F_{jl}^{i-1}(x')}{\delta(x')^2} + \frac{(\varepsilon + 2h_1)(\varepsilon + 2h_2)}{4\delta(x')^2} F_{jl}^{i+1}(x') \right) \right) \\ &\quad + (h_1 - h_2)(x') F_{3l}^{i+1}(x') + \frac{1}{4}(\varepsilon + 2h_1(x'))(\varepsilon + 2h_2(x')) F_{3l}^{i+2}(x'), \quad (4.47) \end{aligned}$$

such that

$$\nabla \cdot \begin{pmatrix} F_{1l} \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \\ F_{2l} \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \\ F_{3l} \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \end{pmatrix} := \nabla \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{2l} F_{1l}^i(x') x_3^i \right) \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \\ \left(\sum_{i=0}^{2l} F_{2l}^i(x') x_3^i \right) \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \\ \left(\sum_{i=0}^{2l+1} F_{3l}^i(x') x_3^i \right) \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \end{pmatrix} := R(x'),$$

where

$$R(x') = - \frac{h_1 - h_2}{\delta(x')^2} F_{3l}^0(x') - \frac{(\varepsilon + 2h_1(x'))(\varepsilon + 2h_2(x'))}{4\delta(x')^2} F_{3l}^1(x')$$

$$- \sum_{j=1}^2 \partial_{x_j} \left(\frac{(\varepsilon + 2h_1(x'))(\varepsilon + 2h_2(x'))}{4\delta(x')^2} F_{jl}^0(x') \right).$$

By (4.43), (4.46), and (4.47), a calculation gives, for $k \geq 0$, $0 \leq i \leq 2l$, and $0 \leq j \leq 2l+1$,

$$|\nabla_{x'}^k F_{1l}^i|, |\nabla_{x'}^k F_{2l}^i| \leq C\delta(x')^{l-i-\frac{k}{2}-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k F_{3l}^i| \leq C\delta(x')^{l-i-\frac{k}{2}}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k R| \leq C\delta(x')^{l-1-\frac{k}{2}}. \quad (4.48)$$

As in Step I.2, $R(x')$ is radial. In addition, we can choose \tilde{F}_{1l} , \tilde{F}_{2l} , \tilde{F}_{3l} , and \hat{p}_2 such that

$$\nabla \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{F}_{1l}(x') \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \\ \tilde{F}_{2l}(x') \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \\ \tilde{F}_{3l}(x') \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \end{pmatrix} = -R(x'), \quad \partial_{x_1} \hat{p}_l = \frac{2\mu \tilde{F}_{1l}(x')}{\delta(x')^2}, \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_{x_2} \hat{p}_l = \frac{2\mu \tilde{F}_{2l}(x')}{\delta(x')^2}.$$

As in (4.22)–(4.30), we derive

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{p}_l(x') &= -12\mu \int_r^R \frac{1}{s\delta(s)^3} \int_0^s R(t)t\delta(t) dt ds, \\ \tilde{F}_{il}(x') &= \frac{\delta(x')^2}{2\mu} \partial_{x_i} \hat{p}_l = \frac{6x_i}{r^2\delta(r)} \int_0^r R(t)t\delta(t) dt, \quad i = 1, 2, \end{aligned} \quad (4.49)$$

and

$$\tilde{F}_{3l}(x) = -2\delta(x')k(x)R(x') - \frac{6\partial_r k(x)}{r} \int_0^r R(t)t\delta(t) dt := P(x')x_3 + Q(x'). \quad (4.50)$$

By (4.48), (4.49), and (4.50), a calculation gives, for any $k \geq 0$,

$$|\nabla_{x'}^k \tilde{F}_{1l}|, |\nabla_{x'}^k \tilde{F}_{2l}| \leq C\delta(x')^{l-\frac{k+1}{2}}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k P| \leq C\delta(x')^{l-\frac{k+2}{2}}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k Q| \leq C\delta(x')^{l-\frac{k}{2}}. \quad (4.51)$$

Now we have $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_3^l = 0$.

Step II.2. Estimates of \mathbf{f}_3^l . Let $\bar{p}_l = \tilde{p}_l + \hat{p}_l$. By (4.37), (4.42), (4.45), and (4.49), we have

$$\mathbf{f}_3^l = \mathbf{f}_3^{l-1} + \mu \Delta \mathbf{v}_3^l - \nabla \bar{p}_l = \begin{pmatrix} \mu \Delta_{x'}(\mathbf{v}_3^l)^{(1)}(x) \\ \mu \Delta_{x'}(\mathbf{v}_3^l)^{(2)}(x) \\ \mu \Delta_{x'}(\mathbf{v}_3^l)^{(3)}(x) + \mu \Delta_{x'}(\mathbf{v}_3^{l-1})^{(3)}(x) + \mu \partial_{x_3 x_3}(\mathbf{v}_3^l)^{(3)}(x) \end{pmatrix}.$$

From (4.44), it follows that $(\mathbf{v}_3^l)^{(i)}$, $i = 1, 2$ is a polynomial in x_3 of order $2l+2$, while $(\mathbf{v}_3^1)^{(3)}$ is a polynomial in x_3 of order $2l+3$.

In view of (4.42), we can rewrite

$$(\mathbf{f}_3^l)^{(j)} = \sum_{i=0}^{2l+2} H_{il}^j(x') x_3^i, \quad j = 1, 2, \quad (\mathbf{f}_3^l)^{(3)} = \sum_{i=0}^{2l+1} S_{il}(x') x_3^i + \sum_{i=0}^{2l+3} G_{il}(x') x_3^i \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}, \quad (4.52)$$

where $\sum_{i=0}^{2l+1} S_{il}(x') x_3^i := \mu \Delta_{x'}(\hat{\mathbf{v}}_3^{l-1})^{(3)} + \mu \partial_{x_3 x_3}(\mathbf{v}_3^l)^{(3)}$ and $\sum_{i=0}^5 G_{il}(x') x_3^i := \mu \Delta_{x'}(\mathbf{v}_3^l)^{(3)}$. By using (4.43), (4.48), and (4.51), for $k \geq 0$, in Ω_{2R} ,

$$|\nabla_{x'}^k H_{il}^1|, |\nabla_{x'}^k H_{il}^2| \leq C\delta(x')^{l-i-\frac{k}{2}-\frac{3}{2}}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k S_{il}| \leq C\delta(x')^{l-i-\frac{k}{2}-2}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k G_{il}| \leq C\delta(x')^{l-i-\frac{k}{2}-1}. \quad (4.53)$$

Thus, (4.38) and (4.39) hold for any $j \geq 1$.

By (4.44), (4.48), and (4.51), we have, for $i = 1, 2$ and $k \geq 0$, in Ω_{2R} ,

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla_{x'}^k \partial_{x_3}^s (\mathbf{v}_3^l)^{(i)}| &\leq C\delta(x')^{l-s-\frac{k+1}{2}} \quad \text{for } s \leq 2l+2, \quad \partial_{x_3}^s (\mathbf{v}_3^l)^{(i)} = 0 \quad \text{for } s \geq 2l+3, \\ |\nabla_{x'}^k \partial_{x_3}^s (\mathbf{v}_3^l)^{(3)}| &\leq C\delta(x')^{l-s-\frac{k}{2}} \quad \text{for } s \leq 2l+3, \quad \partial_{x_3}^s (\mathbf{v}_3^l)^{(3)} = 0 \quad \text{for } s \geq 2l+4, \\ |\nabla_{x'}^k \partial_{x_3}^s \tilde{p}_l| &\leq C\delta(x')^{l-s-\frac{k+4}{2}} \quad \text{for } s \leq 2l, \quad \partial_{x_3}^s \tilde{p}_l = 0 \quad \text{for } s > 2l, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k \hat{p}_l| \leq C\delta(x')^{l-\frac{k+4}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.54)$$

From (4.52) and (4.53), we have

$$|(\mathbf{f}_3^{m+1})^{(1)}|, |(\mathbf{f}_3^{m+1})^{(2)}| \leq C\delta(x')^{m-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad |(\mathbf{f}_3^{m+1})^{(3)}| \leq C\delta(x')^{m-1} \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}.$$

Thus,

$$|\mathbf{f}_3^{m+1}| \leq C(|(\mathbf{f}_3^{m+1})^{(1)}| + |(\mathbf{f}_3^{m+1})^{(2)}| + |(\mathbf{f}_3^{m+1})^{(3)}|) \leq C\delta(x')^{m-1} \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}.$$

Similarly, for $1 \leq s \leq m+1$,

$$|\nabla^s \mathbf{f}_3^{m+1}| \leq C\delta(x')^{m-1-s} \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}.$$

Step II.3 Estimates of $\nabla^{m+1}\mathbf{u}_1^3$ and $\nabla^m p_1^3$. Denote

$$\mathbf{v}^{m+1}(x) = \sum_{l=1}^{m+1} \mathbf{v}_3^l(x), \quad \bar{p}^{m+1}(x) = \sum_{l=1}^{m+1} \bar{p}_l(x) \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}.$$

Then we have $\mathbf{v}^{m+1}(x) = \mathbf{u}_1^3(x)$ on Γ_{2R}^\pm , $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}^{m+1}(x) = 0$ in Ω_{2R} , and for $1 \leq s \leq m$,

$$|\mathbf{f}^{m+1}(x)| = |\mu \Delta \mathbf{v}^{m+1}(x) - \nabla \bar{p}^{m+1}(x)| \leq C\delta(x')^{m-1}, \quad |\nabla^s \mathbf{f}^{m+1}(x)| \leq C\delta(x')^{m-s-1}.$$

Thus, by Proposition A.1, it holds that

$$\|\nabla^{m+1}(\mathbf{u}_1^3 - \mathbf{v}^{m+1})\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(x')/2}(x'))} + \|\nabla^m(p_1^3 - \bar{p}^{m+1})\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(x')/2}(x'))} \leq C. \quad (4.55)$$

Moreover, by (4.54), we have, for $2 \leq l \leq m+1$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla^{m+1} \mathbf{v}_3^l| &\leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{m+4}{2}} \quad \text{for } l \leq \frac{m-2}{2}, \quad |\nabla^{m+1} \mathbf{v}_3^l| \leq C\delta(x')^{l-m-\frac{3}{2}} \quad \text{for } \frac{m-1}{2} \leq l, \\ |\nabla^m \bar{p}_l| &\leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{m+4}{2}} \quad \text{for } l \leq \frac{m-1}{2}, \quad |\nabla^m \bar{p}_l| \leq C\delta(x')^{l-m-2} \quad \text{for } \frac{m}{2} \leq l. \end{aligned} \quad (4.56)$$

It follows from (4.55) and (4.56) that for $m \geq 1$,

$$|\nabla^{m+1} \mathbf{u}_1^3| + |\nabla^m p_1^3| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{m+4}{2}} \quad \text{in } \Omega_R.$$

For the estimates of p_1^3 , for a fixed point $z = (z'_1, 0) \in \Omega_R$ with $|z'_1| = R$, by the mean value theorem, (4.55), and (4.56), we have

$$|p_1^3(x) - p_1^3(z'_1, 0)| \leq C\|\nabla(p_1^3 - \bar{p}_1 - \bar{p}_2)\|_{L^\infty} + C|\bar{p}_1(x) + \bar{p}_2(x)| + C \leq C\delta(x')^{-2}.$$

This finishes the proof of Proposition 4.1. \square

5. ESTIMATES FOR $(\mathbf{u}_1^\alpha, p_1^\alpha)$, $\alpha = 4, 5, 6$

In this section, we will derive the estimates of \mathbf{u}_1^α and p_1^α , $\alpha = 4, 5, 6$, by using the same method as in the proof of Proposition 3.1.

Proposition 5.1. *Under the same assumption as in Theorem 1.2, let \mathbf{u}_1^4 and p_1^4 be the solution to (1.9) with $\alpha = 4$. Then for sufficiently small $0 < \varepsilon < 1/2$, we have*

$$(i) \quad |\nabla \mathbf{u}_1^4(x)| \leq C(\varepsilon + |x'|^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad |p_1^4(x) - p_1^4(z', 0)| \leq C \quad \text{in } \Omega_R$$

for some point $z = (z', 0) \in \Omega_R$, $|z'| = R/2$, and

(ii) for any $m \geq 1$,

$$|\nabla^{m+1} \mathbf{u}_1^4(x)| + |\nabla^m p_1^4(x)| \leq C(\varepsilon + |x'|^2)^{-\frac{m+1}{2}} \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega_R.$$

Proof of Proposition 5.1. The proof essentially follows that of Proposition 3.1 with some modifications. We only list the key steps here.

Step I. Gradient estimates. We first choose

$$\mathbf{v}_4^1(x) = \begin{pmatrix} x_2 \\ -x_1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \left(k(x) + \frac{1}{2} \right) \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}, \quad (5.1)$$

which has the same boundary conditions as \mathbf{u}_1^4 on Γ_{2R}^\pm . Since $k(x)$ is radial in x' , we have

$$x_2 \partial_{x_1} k(x) = \frac{x_1 x_2}{r} \partial_r k(x) = x_1 \partial_{x_2} k(x). \quad (5.2)$$

By (1.2) and (5.2), a simple calculation yields

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_4^1 = 0, \quad \Delta(\mathbf{v}_4^1)^{(1)} = \Delta_{x'} k(x) x_2 + 2 \partial_{x_2} k(x), \quad \Delta(\mathbf{v}_4^1)^{(2)} = -\Delta_{x'} k(x) x_1 - 2 \partial_{x_1} k(x), \quad (5.3)$$

and for any $i = 1, 2, k \geq 0$,

$$|\nabla_{x'}^k \partial_{x_3}^s (\mathbf{v}_4^1)^{(i)}| \leq C \delta (x')^{\frac{1-k}{2}-s}, \quad s \leq 1, \quad \partial_{x_3}^2 (\mathbf{v}_4^1)^{(i)} = 0, \quad \nabla^k (\mathbf{v}_4^1)^{(3)} = 0.$$

Hence, we have for any $m \geq 0$

$$|\nabla^{m+1} \mathbf{v}_4^1| \leq C \delta (x')^{-\frac{m+1}{2}}. \quad (5.4)$$

Denote $\mathbf{f}_4^1 := \mu \Delta \mathbf{v}_4^1 - \nabla \bar{p}_1$ and take $\bar{p}_1(x) = 0$. By using (1.2), (2.14), and (5.3), \mathbf{f}_4^1 can be rewritten as

$$(\mathbf{f}_4^1)^{(b)} = S_{11}^b(x') x_3 + S_{01}^b(x'), \quad b = 1, 2, \quad (\mathbf{f}_4^1)^{(3)} = 0, \quad (5.5)$$

and for any $k \geq 0$,

$$|\nabla_{x'}^k S_{11}^b| \leq C \delta (x')^{-\frac{k+3}{2}}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k S_{01}^b| \leq C \delta (x')^{-\frac{k+1}{2}}. \quad (5.6)$$

By (5.1), one can see that

$$S_{i1}^1(x') = x_2 g_{i1}(r), \quad S_{i1}^2(x') = -x_1 g_{i1}(r), \quad i = 0, 1, \quad (5.7)$$

where $g_{11}(r) = \mu \partial_{rr} \left(\frac{1}{\delta(x')} \right) + \frac{3\mu}{r} \partial_r \left(\frac{1}{\delta(x')} \right)$ and $g_{01}(r) = \mu \partial_{rr} \left(\frac{\varepsilon + 2h_2(x')}{2\delta(x')} \right) + \frac{3\mu}{r} \partial_r \left(\frac{\varepsilon + 2h_2(x')}{2\delta(x')} \right)$.

It follows from (5.5) and (5.6) that

$$|\mathbf{f}_4^1| \leq C(|(\mathbf{f}_4^1)^{(1)}| + |(\mathbf{f}_4^1)^{(2)}|) \leq C \delta (x')^{-\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}. \quad (5.8)$$

By applying Proposition A.1 and using (5.8), we have for any $x \in \Omega_R$,

$$\|\nabla \mathbf{u}_1^4 - \nabla \mathbf{v}_4^1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(x')/2}(x'))} \leq C \delta (x')^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (5.9)$$

It follows from (5.4) and (5.9) that

$$|\nabla \mathbf{u}_1^4| \leq C|\nabla \mathbf{v}_4^1(x)| + C\delta(x')^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{in } \Omega_R.$$

Thus, Proposition 5.1 holds for $m = 0$.

Step II. Higher-order derivatives estimates. Denote

$$\mathbf{f}_4^j := \mathbf{f}_4^{j-1}(x) + \mu \Delta \mathbf{v}_4^j(x) - \nabla \bar{p}_j(x) = \sum_{l=1}^j (\mu \Delta \mathbf{v}_4^l - \nabla \bar{p}_l)(x) \quad \text{for } 2 \leq j \leq m+1.$$

In order to use Proposition A.1 to estimate $\nabla^{m+1} \mathbf{u}_1^4$ and $\nabla \bar{p}_m^4$ for $m \geq 1$, we need to construct a series of auxiliary functions \mathbf{v}_4^l and \bar{p}_l to successively reduce the upper bounds of the non-homogeneous term.

To cancel the leading terms introduced by $(\mathbf{f}_4^1)^{(b)}$, $b = 1, 2$, we first choose \mathbf{v}_4^2 satisfying

$$(\mathbf{v}_4^2)^{(b)} = \left(F_{b2}^1(x')x_3 + F_{b2}^0(x') \right) \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right), \quad b = 1, 2, \quad (5.10)$$

where

$$F_{b2}^0(x') = -\frac{\delta(x')^2}{2\mu} S_{01}^b(x') + (h_1 - h_2) F_{b2}^1(x'), \quad F_{b2}^1(x') = -\frac{\delta(x')^2}{6\mu} S_{11}^b(x'), \quad (5.11)$$

such that

$$\mu \partial_{x_3 x_3} (\mathbf{v}_4^2)^{(b)} = -(\mathbf{f}_4^1)^{(b)}, \quad b = 1, 2. \quad (5.12)$$

We also take $(\mathbf{v}_4^2)^{(3)} = 0$. Then, substituting (5.7) into (5.11), yields

$$F_{12}^1(x') = x_2 f_2^1(r), \quad F_{22}^1(x') = -x_1 f_2^1(r), \quad F_{12}^0(x') = x_2 f_2^0(r), \quad F_{22}^0(x') = -x_1 f_2^0(r), \quad (5.13)$$

where $f_2^1(r) = -\frac{\delta(x')^2}{2\mu} g_{01}(r) - \frac{\delta(x')^2}{6\mu} (h_1 - h_2) g_{11}(r)$ and $f_2^0(r) = -\frac{\delta(x')^2}{6\mu} g_{11}(r)$ are radial. By (5.10) and (5.13), a direct calculation gives $\partial_{x_1} (\mathbf{v}_4^2)^{(1)} + \partial_{x_2} (\mathbf{v}_4^2)^{(2)} = 0$. Thus $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_4^2 = 0$.

In addition, by (5.6) and (5.11), a calculation gives, for any $k \geq 0$,

$$|\nabla_{x'}^k F_{b2}^1| \leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{k}{2}}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k F_{b2}^0| \leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{3}{2}-\frac{k}{2}}. \quad (5.14)$$

Hence, by (1.2), (5.10), and (5.14), we get for $i = 1, 2$ and $k \geq 0$,

$$|\nabla_{x'}^k \partial_{x_3}^s (\mathbf{v}_4^2)^{(i)}| \leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{3-k}{2}-s}, \quad s \leq 3, \quad \partial_{x_3}^4 (\mathbf{v}_4^2)^{(i)} = 0, \quad \nabla^k (\mathbf{v}_4^2)^{(3)} = 0.$$

Therefore, for any $m \geq 0$,

$$|\nabla^{m+1} \mathbf{v}_4^2| \leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{1}{2}-m} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq m \leq 2, \quad |\nabla^{m+1} \mathbf{v}_4^2| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{m+1}{2}} \quad \text{for } m \geq 3.$$

Let $\bar{p}_2 = 0$. By (5.10), (5.12), and (5.14), we can write \mathbf{f}_4^2 as polynomials in x_3

$$(\mathbf{f}_4^2)^{(b)} = \mu \Delta_{x'} (\mathbf{v}_4^2)^{(b)} = \sum_{i=0}^3 S_{i2}^b(x') x_3^i, \quad (\mathbf{f}_4^2)^{(3)} = 0, \quad (5.15)$$

with the estimates for $k \geq 0$,

$$|\nabla_{x'}^k S_{i2}^b| \leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{1}{2}-i-\frac{k}{2}}. \quad (5.16)$$

Thus, we have

$$|(\mathbf{f}_4^2)^{(b)}| = |\mu \Delta_{x'} (\mathbf{v}_4^2)^{(b)}| \leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (\mathbf{f}_4^2)^{(3)} = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R},$$

and

$$|\mathbf{f}_4^2| \leq |(\mathbf{f}_4^2)^{(1)}| + |(\mathbf{f}_4^2)^{(2)}| + |(\mathbf{f}_4^2)^{(3)}| \leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

In fact, by (5.10) and (5.13), one can write

$$S_{i2}^1(x') = x_2 g_{i2}(r), \quad S_{i2}^2(x') = -x_1 g_{i2}(r), \quad i = 0, 1, 2, 3, \quad (5.17)$$

where $g_{i2}(x')$ are radial functions.

Now we will inductively prove that for $2 \leq j \leq m+1$, we can successively construct a sequence of divergence-free \mathbf{v}_4^j and $\bar{p}_j = 0$ to make \mathbf{f} in (2.2) as small as possible. Besides, it can be inductively proved that \mathbf{f}_4^j can be represented as polynomials in x_3 as follows:

$$(\mathbf{f}_4^j)^{(b)} = \mu \Delta_{x'}(\mathbf{v}_4^j)^{(b)} = \sum_{i=0}^{2j-1} S_{ij}^b(x') x_3^i, \quad b = 1, 2, \quad (\mathbf{f}_4^j)^{(3)} = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}, \quad (5.18)$$

where for any $k \geq 0$, $b = 1, 2$,

$$|\nabla_{x'}^k S_{ij}^b| \leq C \delta(x')^{j-i-\frac{k}{2}-\frac{3}{2}}, \quad \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_4^j = 0. \quad (5.19)$$

Indeed, by (5.15) and (5.16), we have (5.18) and (5.19) hold for $j = 2$. Assume that (5.18) and (5.19) hold for $j = l-1$ with $l \geq 3$, that is, in Ω_{2R} ,

$$(\mathbf{f}_4^{l-1})^{(b)} = \mu \Delta_{x'}(\mathbf{v}_4^{l-1})^{(b)} = \sum_{i=0}^{2l-3} S_{i(l-1)}^b(x') x_3^i, \quad b = 1, 2, \quad (\mathbf{f}_4^{l-1})^{(3)} = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}, \quad (5.20)$$

where for any $k \geq 0$ and $b = 1, 2$,

$$|\nabla_{x'}^k S_{i(l-1)}^b| \leq C \delta(x')^{l-i-\frac{k}{2}-\frac{5}{2}}, \quad \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_4^{l-1} = 0. \quad (5.21)$$

Then we will construct \mathbf{v}_4^l and $\bar{p}_l = 0$ so that \mathbf{f}_4^l satisfies (5.18) and (5.19).

It follows from (5.20) and (5.21) that

$$|(\mathbf{f}_4^{l-1})^{(b)}| \leq C \delta(x')^{l-\frac{5}{2}}, \quad b = 1, 2, \quad (\mathbf{f}_4^{l-1})^{(3)} = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}.$$

To reduce the upper bound, $\delta(x')^{l-\frac{5}{2}}$, we choose a divergence-free auxiliary function \mathbf{v}_4^l satisfying $\mathbf{v}_4^l(x) = 0$ on $\Gamma_{2R}^+ \cup \Gamma_{2R}^-$, specifically,

$$(\mathbf{v}_4^l)^{(b)} = \sum_{i=0}^{2l-3} F_{bl}^i(x') x_3^i \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right), \quad b = 1, 2 \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}. \quad (5.22)$$

We take $F_{bl}^i(x')$, $i = 0, \dots, 2l-3$, such that

$$\mu \partial_{x_3 x_3}(\mathbf{v}_4^l)^{(b)} = -(\mathbf{f}_4^{l-1})^{(b)}. \quad (5.23)$$

By comparing the coefficients of different order of x_3 , we have

$$F_{bl}^i(x') = -\frac{\delta(x')^2 S_{i(l-1)}^b(x')}{\mu(i+1)(i+2)} + (h_1 - h_2)(x') F_{bl}^{i+1}(x') + \frac{1}{4}(\varepsilon + 2h_1(x'))(\varepsilon + 2h_2(x')) F_{bl}^{i+2}(x'). \quad (5.24)$$

Here we use the convention that $F_{bl}^i(x') \equiv 0$ if $i \notin \{0, \dots, 2l-3\}$. Moreover, by (1.2), (5.21) and (5.24), we derive for $k \geq 0$, $0 \leq i \leq 2l-3$, in Ω_{2R} ,

$$|\nabla_{x'}^k F_{bl}^i| \leq C \delta(x')^{l-i-\frac{k}{2}-\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (5.25)$$

Let $(\mathbf{v}_4^l)^{(3)} = 0$ and $\bar{p}_l = 0$. By using (1.2), (5.22), (5.23), and (5.25), we have

$$(\mathbf{f}_4^l)^{(b)} = \mu \Delta_{x'}(\mathbf{v}_4^l)^{(b)} = \sum_{i=0}^{2l-1} S_{il}^b(x') x_3^i, \quad b = 1, 2, \quad (\mathbf{f}_4^l)^{(3)} = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}, \quad (5.26)$$

where for $k \geq 0$ and $b = 1, 2$,

$$|\nabla_{x'}^k S_{ij}^b| \leq C\delta(x')^{l-i-\frac{k}{2}-\frac{3}{2}}. \quad (5.27)$$

Therefore, by (5.26) and (5.27), we have

$$|(\mathbf{f}_4^l)^{(b)}| = |\mu\Delta_{x'}(\mathbf{v}_4^l)^b| \leq C\delta(x')^{l-\frac{3}{2}}, \quad (\mathbf{f}_4^l)^{(3)} = 0.$$

Hence (5.18) and (5.19) hold for $j = l$. By using (1.2), (5.10), and (5.25), a calculation gives for $l \geq 2$, $b = 1, 2$, and $k \geq 0$,

$$|\nabla_{x'}^k \partial_{x_3}^s (\mathbf{v}_4^l)^{(b)}| \leq C\delta(x')^{l-s-\frac{k+1}{2}} \text{ for } s \leq 2l-1, \quad \partial_{x_3}^s (\mathbf{v}_4^l)^{(b)} = 0 \text{ for } s \geq 2l, \quad \nabla^k (\mathbf{v}_4^l)^{(3)} = 0. \quad (5.28)$$

From (5.18) and (5.19), we have $|(\mathbf{f}_1^{m+1})^{(1)}|, |(\mathbf{f}_1^{m+1})^{(1)}| \leq C\delta(x')^{m-\frac{1}{2}}$, $(\mathbf{f}_1^{m+1})^{(3)} = 0$, and then

$$|\mathbf{f}_4^{m+1}| \leq |(\mathbf{f}_1^{m+1})^{(1)}| + |(\mathbf{f}_1^{m+1})^{(1)}| \leq C\delta(x')^{m-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Similarly, for $1 \leq s \leq m$, $|\nabla^s \mathbf{f}_4^{m+1}| \leq C\delta(x')^{m-s-\frac{1}{2}}$.

We now prove that \mathbf{v}_4^l constructed above satisfies the divergence-free condition (i.e., $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_4^l = 0$). To this end, we inductively show that for $j \geq 2$, S_{ij}^b can be written as

$$S_{ij}^1(x') = x_2 g_{ij}(r), \quad S_{ij}^2(x') = -x_1 g_{ij}(r), \quad i = 0, \dots, 2j-1, \quad (5.29)$$

where $g_{ij}(x')$ are radial. Indeed, it follows from (5.17) that (5.29) holds for $j = 2$. Assume (5.29) holds true for $j = l-1$ with $l \geq 3$, that is, in Ω_{2R} ,

$$S_{i(l-1)}^1(x') = x_2 g_{i(l-1)}(r), \quad S_{i(l-1)}^2(x') = -x_1 g_{i(l-1)}(r), \quad i = 0, \dots, 2l-3. \quad (5.30)$$

Substituting (5.30) into (5.24), we have

$$F_{1l}^i(x') = x_2 f_l^i(r), \quad F_{2l}^i(x') = -x_1 f_l^i(r), \quad i = 0, \dots, 2l-3, \quad (5.31)$$

for radial functions $f_l^i(r)$. By (5.22) and (5.31), after a simple calculation, we have (5.29) holds for any $j \geq 2$. By using (5.22) and (5.31) again, we have $\partial_{x_1}(\mathbf{v}_4^l)^{(1)} + \partial_{x_2}(\mathbf{v}_4^l)^{(2)} = 0$. Thus $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_4^l = 0$. Denote $\mathbf{v}^{m+1} := \sum_{l=0}^{m+1} \mathbf{v}_4^l(x)$, $\bar{p}^{m+1} := \sum_{l=0}^{m+1} \bar{p}_l = 0$. It is easy to verify that $\mathbf{v}^{m+1}(x) = \mathbf{u}_1^4(x) = 0$ on Γ_{2R}^\pm , $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}^{m+1}(x) = 0$ in Ω_{2R} , and

$$|\mathbf{f}^{m+1}(x)| = |\mu\Delta \mathbf{v}^{m+1}(x)| \leq C\delta(x')^{m-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad |\nabla^s \mathbf{f}^{m+1}(x)| \leq C\delta(x')^{m-s-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad 1 \leq s \leq m.$$

Thus, by applying Proposition A.1, there holds

$$\|\nabla^{m+1}(\mathbf{u}_1^4 - \mathbf{v}_4^1)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(x')/2}(x'))} + \|\nabla^m(p_1^4 - \bar{p}^{m+1})\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(x')/2}(x'))} \leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (5.32)$$

By (5.28), we obtain for $l \geq 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla^{m+1} \mathbf{v}_4^l| &\leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{m+1}{2}} \quad \text{for } l \leq \frac{m+1}{2}, \\ |\nabla^{m+1} \mathbf{v}_4^l| &\leq C\delta(x')^{l-m-\frac{3}{2}} \quad \text{for } \frac{m+2}{2} \leq l \leq m+1. \end{aligned} \quad (5.33)$$

It follows from (5.4) and (5.33) that for $m \geq 1$,

$$|\nabla^{m+1} \mathbf{v}^{m+1}| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{m+1}{2}}. \quad (5.34)$$

By (5.32) and (5.34), we have for $x \in \Omega_R$,

$$|\nabla^{m+1} \mathbf{u}_1^4| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{m+1}{2}}, \quad |\nabla^m p_1^4| \leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

For the estimates of $p_1^4(x)$, by the mean value theorem, (5.32), and the fact $\bar{p}_l = 0$, $l \geq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |p_1^4(x) - p_1^4(z', 0)| &\leq |p_1^4 - \bar{p}_1 - \bar{p}_2 - (p_1^4 - \bar{p}_1 - \bar{p}_2)(z', 0)| + |\bar{p}_1 + \bar{p}_2| \\ &\leq C \|\nabla(p_1^4 - \bar{p}_1 - \bar{p}_2)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_R)} \leq C \end{aligned}$$

for a fixed point $(z', 0) \in \Omega_R$ with $|z'| = R/2$. \square

Proposition 5.2. *Under the same assumption as in Theorem 1.2, let \mathbf{u}_1^α and p_1^α be the solution to (1.9) with $\alpha = 5, 6$. Then for sufficiently small $0 < \varepsilon < 1/2$, we have*

$$(i) \quad |\nabla \mathbf{u}_1^\alpha(x)| \leq C(\varepsilon + |x'|^2)^{-1}, \quad |p_1^\alpha(x) - p_1^i(z', 0)| \leq C(\varepsilon + |x'|^2)^{-\frac{3}{2}} \quad \text{in } \Omega_R$$

for some point $z = (z', 0) \in \Omega_R$ with $|z'| = R/2$; and

(ii) for high-order derivatives, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla^{m+1} \mathbf{u}_1^\alpha(x)| + |\nabla^m p_1^\alpha(x)| &\leq C(\varepsilon + |x'|^2)^{-\frac{m+3}{2}} \quad \text{for } m \leq 6, \\ |\nabla^{m+1} \mathbf{u}_1^\alpha(x)| + |\nabla^m p_1^\alpha(x)| &\leq C(\varepsilon + |x'|^2)^{\frac{3}{2}-m} \quad \text{for } m \geq 7 \end{aligned} \quad \text{in } \Omega_R.$$

Proof of Proposition 5.2. We only take the case $\alpha = 5$ for instance, since the other case is the same.

Step I. Gradient estimate. Similar to the proof of Proposition 3.1, we first set

$$\mathbf{v}_5^1(x) = \psi_5 \left(k(x) + \frac{1}{2} \right) + \begin{pmatrix} F(x) \\ G(x) \\ H(x) \end{pmatrix} \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}, \quad (5.35)$$

which satisfies $\mathbf{v}_5^1(x) = \mathbf{u}_1^5(x)$ on $\Gamma_{2R}^+ \cup \Gamma_{2R}^-$. A calculation gives

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{x_1}(\mathbf{v}_5^1)^{(1)} &= x_3 \partial_{x_1} k(x) + \partial_{x_1} F \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) + 2k(x) \partial_{x_1} k(x) F(x), \\ \partial_{x_2}(\mathbf{v}_5^1)^{(2)} &= \partial_{x_2} G(x) \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) + 2k(x) \partial_{x_2} k(x) G(x), \\ \partial_{x_3}(\mathbf{v}_5^1)^{(3)} &= -\frac{x_1}{\delta(x')} + \partial_{x_3} H \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) + H \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.36)$$

To ensure that $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_5^1(x) = 0$ in Ω_{2R} , we assume

$$\frac{1}{4}(\partial_{x_1} F + \partial_{x_2} G)(x) = x_2 \partial_{x_3} k(x) - \frac{x_1}{\delta(x')}. \quad (5.37)$$

By (5.35), (5.36), and $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_5^1 = 0$, we obtain

$$H(x) = -\delta(x') \partial_{x_1} k(x) F(x) - \delta(x') \partial_{x_2} k(x) G(x) + 2k(x) \left(x_1 - \delta(x') \partial_{x_1} k(x) x_3 \right). \quad (5.38)$$

Substituting (5.38) into (5.37), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{x_1} F + \frac{\partial_{x_1} \delta(x')}{\delta(x')} F + \partial_{x_2} G + \frac{\partial_{x_2} \delta(x')}{\delta(x')} G - \delta(x') \partial_{x_1} k(x) \partial_{x_3} F - \delta(x') \partial_{x_2} k(x) \partial_{x_3} G \\ = -\frac{6x_1}{\delta(x')} + 6\partial_{x_1} k(x) x_3 - \frac{2k(x) \partial_{x_1} \delta(x') x_3}{\delta(x')} + 2k(x) \partial_{x_1} k(x) \delta(x'). \end{aligned} \quad (5.39)$$

To determine $F(x)$ and $G(x)$, we consider

$$\partial_{x_1} F_1 + \frac{\partial_{x_1} \delta(x')}{\delta(x')} F_1 + \partial_{x_2} G_1 + \frac{\partial_{x_2} \delta(x')}{\delta(x')} G_1 - \delta(x') \partial_{x_1} k(x) \partial_{x_3} F_1 - \delta(x') \partial_{x_2} k(x) \partial_{x_3} G_1 = -\frac{6x_1}{\delta(x')}, \quad (5.40)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_{x_1} F_2 + \frac{\partial_{x_1} \delta(x')}{\delta(x')} F_2 + \partial_{x_2} G_2 + \frac{\partial_{x_2} \delta(x')}{\delta(x')} G_2 - \delta(x') \partial_{x_1} k(x) \partial_{x_3} F_2 - \delta(x') \partial_{x_2} k(x) \partial_{x_3} G_2 \\ &= 6 \partial_{x_1} k(x) x_3 - \frac{2k(x) \partial_{x_1} \delta(x') x_3}{\delta(x')} + 2k(x) \partial_{x_1} k(x) \delta(x'). \end{aligned} \quad (5.41)$$

For (5.41), we take a pair of particular solution

$$F_2(x) = -\frac{3x_3^2}{\delta(x')} - 2k(x)x_3, \quad G_2(x) = 0. \quad (5.42)$$

For (5.40), we assume $F_1(x) = F_1(x')$, $G_1(x) = G_1(x')$. In order to cancel the leading terms in $\mu \Delta \mathbf{v}_5^1$, we first choose \hat{p}_1 such that

$$\partial_{x_1} \hat{p}_1(x') = \frac{2\mu F_1(x')}{\delta(x')^2}, \quad \partial_{x_2} \hat{p}_1 = \frac{2\mu G_1(x')}{\delta(x')^2}. \quad (5.43)$$

Combining (5.40) and (5.43), we have

$$\Delta_{x'} \hat{p}_1(x') + \frac{3}{\delta(x')} \nabla_{x'} \delta(x') \nabla_{x'} \hat{p}_1(x') = -\frac{12\mu x_1}{\delta(x')^3} := \mathcal{F}_1(x').$$

Notice that $|\mathcal{F}_1(x')| \leq \delta(x')^{-\frac{5}{2}}$ and $|\nabla_{x'}^s \mathcal{F}_1(x')| \leq \delta(x')^{-\frac{s+5}{2}}$ for $1 \leq s \leq m$. By Proposition 1.1 with $\gamma = -\frac{5}{2}$, we obtain for $k \geq 0$,

$$|\hat{p}_1| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{3}{2}}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k \hat{p}_1| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{k+3}{2}}, \quad \partial_{x_3} \hat{p}_1 = 0. \quad (5.44)$$

Then by (1.2), (5.43), and (5.44), we have

$$|\nabla_{x'}^k F_1|, |\nabla_{x'}^k G_1| \leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{k}{2}}, \quad \partial_{x_3} F_1 = \partial_{x_3} G_1 = 0. \quad (5.45)$$

Let $F = F_1 + F_2$ and $G = G_1 + G_2$ so that F and G satisfy (5.39). For $H(x)$, by (1.2), (5.38), (5.42), and (5.45), we can write

$$H = \sum_{i=1}^3 H_i^g(x') x_3^i + \sum_{i=0}^1 H_i^b(x') x_3^i, \quad (5.46)$$

where for any $k \geq 0$

$$|\nabla_{x'}^k H_i^g(x')| \leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{3}{2}-i-\frac{k}{2}}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k H_i^b(x')| \leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{1}{2}-i-\frac{k}{2}}. \quad (5.47)$$

By (5.35), (5.41), (5.43), (5.38), and (5.47), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mu \Delta(\mathbf{v}_5^1)^i - \partial_{x_i} \hat{p}_1| \leq C\delta(x')^{-1}, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad |\Delta_{x'}(\mathbf{v}_5^1)^{(3)}| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \\ & \partial_{x_3 x_3}(\mathbf{v}_5^1)^{(3)} = \partial_{x_3 x_3} H \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \\ &= \partial_{x_3 x_3} \left(\sum_{i=1}^3 H_i^g(x') x_3^i \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \right) + \partial_{x_3 x_3} \left(\sum_{i=0}^1 H_i^b(x') x_3^i \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \right) := I_1 + I_2, \end{aligned} \quad (5.48)$$

where $|I_1| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ and $|I_2| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{3}{2}}$. Thus, the leading term in $\mu \Delta \mathbf{v}_5^1 - \nabla \hat{p}_1$ is $\mu \partial_{x_3 x_3} \left(\sum_{i=0}^1 H_i^b(x') x_3^i \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \right)$. To cancel this term, we take

$$\tilde{p}_1 = \mu \partial_{x_3} \left(\sum_{i=0}^1 H_i^b(x') x_3^i \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \right). \quad (5.49)$$

Let $\bar{p}_1 = \hat{p}_1 + \tilde{p}_1$ and denote $\mathbf{f}_5^1 = \mu \Delta \mathbf{v}_5^1 - \nabla \bar{p}_1$ in Ω_{2R} . By (1.2), (5.35), (5.43), (5.46), (5.48), and (5.49), we can write \mathbf{f}_5^1 in the following form

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{f}_5^1)^{(1)} &= \sum_{i=0}^2 S_{i1}^1(x') x_3^i + \sum_{j=1}^4 G_{j1}(x') x_3^j, \quad (\mathbf{f}_5^1)^{(2)} = \sum_{i=0}^2 S_{i1}^2(x') x_3^i, \\ (\mathbf{f}_5^1)^{(3)} &= \sum_{k=0}^3 \tilde{S}_{k1}(x') x_3^k + \sum_{l=1}^5 \tilde{G}_{l1}(x') x_3^l, \end{aligned} \quad (5.50)$$

where, for $0 \leq i \leq 2$, $1 \leq j \leq 4$, $0 \leq k \leq 3$, $1 \leq l \leq 5$, and $s \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla_{x'}^s S_{i1}^b| &\leq C \delta(x')^{-i-\frac{s}{2}-1}, \quad b = 1, 2, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^s G_{j1}| \leq C \delta(x')^{-j-\frac{s}{2}}, \\ |\nabla_{x'}^s \tilde{S}_{k1}| &\leq C \delta(x')^{-k-\frac{s}{2}-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^s \tilde{G}_{l1}| \leq C \delta(x')^{-l-\frac{s}{2}+\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.51)$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{i=0}^2 S_{i1}^b(x') x_3^i \right| &\leq C \delta(x')^{-1}, \quad \left| \sum_{j=1}^4 G_{j1}(x') x_3^j \right| \leq C, \\ \left| \sum_{k=0}^3 \tilde{S}_{k1}(x') x_3^k \right| &\leq C \delta(x')^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \left| \sum_{l=1}^5 \tilde{G}_{l1}(x') x_3^l \right| \leq C \delta(x')^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.52)$$

which implies $|(\mathbf{f}_5^1)^{(1)}|, |(\mathbf{f}_5^1)^{(2)}| \leq C \delta(x')^{-1}$ and $|(\mathbf{f}_5^1)^{(3)}| \leq C \delta(x')^{-1/2}$ in Ω_{2R} . Therefore,

$$|\mathbf{f}_5^1| \leq C \delta(x')^{-1} \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}. \quad (5.53)$$

By Proposition A.1 and (5.53), we have $\|\nabla \mathbf{u}_1^5 - \nabla \mathbf{v}_5^1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(x')/2}(x'))} \leq C$. Moreover, a direct calculation gives that in Ω_{2R} ,

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla \mathbf{v}_5^1| &\leq C \delta(x')^{-1}, \quad |\nabla^l \mathbf{v}_5^1| \leq C \delta(x')^{-\frac{l+2}{2}} \quad \text{for } l \geq 2, \\ |\bar{p}_1| &\leq C \delta(x')^{-3/2}, \quad |\nabla^l \bar{p}_1| \leq C \delta(x')^{-\frac{3+l}{2}} \quad \text{for } l \geq 1. \end{aligned} \quad (5.54)$$

Hence, it holds that $|\nabla \mathbf{u}_1^5| \leq |\nabla \mathbf{v}_5^1| + C \leq C \delta(x')^{-1}$.

Step II. Second-order derivatives estimates. Denote

$$\mathbf{f}_5^l := \mathbf{f}_5^{l-1}(x) + \mu \Delta \mathbf{v}_5^l(x) - \nabla \bar{p}_l(x), \quad 2 \leq l \leq m+1.$$

We first take

$$\mathbf{v}_5^2 := \begin{pmatrix} F_{12}^2(x') x_3^2 + F_{12}^1(x') x_3 + F_{12}^0(x') + \tilde{F}_{12}(x') \\ F_{22}^2(x') x_3^2 + F_{22}^1(x') x_3 + F_{22}^0(x') + \tilde{F}_{22}(x') \\ F_{32}^3(x') x_3^3 + F_{32}^2(x') x_3^2 + F_{32}^1(x') x_3 + F_{32}^0(x') + \tilde{F}_{32}(x) \end{pmatrix} \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right). \quad (5.55)$$

It follows from (5.52) that the leading term of $(\mathbf{f}_5^1)^{(b)}$, $b = 1, 2$, is $\sum_{i=0}^2 S_{i1}^b(x') x_3^i$, being of order $\delta(x')^{-1}$. To cancel this leading term, we choose F_{b2}^i , $b = 1, 2$ and $i = 0, 1, 2$, such that

$$\mu \partial_{x_3 x_3} \left(\sum_{i=0}^2 F_{b2}^i x_3^i \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \right) = - \sum_{i=0}^2 S_{i1}^b(x') x_3^i, \quad b = 1, 2. \quad (5.56)$$

By comparing the coefficients of each term of x_3 , we have

$$\begin{aligned} F_{b2}^2(x') &= -\frac{\delta(x')^2}{12\mu} S_{21}^b(x'), \quad F_{b2}^1(x') = -\frac{\delta(x')^2}{6\mu} S_{11}^b(x') + (h_1 - h_2)(x') F_{b2}^2(x'), \\ F_{b2}^0(x') &= -\frac{\delta(x')^2}{2\mu} S_{01}^b(x') + (h_1 - h_2)(x') F_{b2}^1(x') + \frac{1}{4}(\varepsilon + 2h_1(x'))(\varepsilon + 2h_2(x')) F_{b2}^2(x'). \end{aligned} \quad (5.57)$$

To ensure $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_5^2 = 0$, we take

$$\begin{aligned} F_{32}^3(x') &= -\frac{\delta(x')^2}{5} \sum_{i=1}^2 \partial_{x_i} \left(\frac{F_{i2}^2(x')}{\delta(x')^2} \right), \\ F_{32}^2(x') &= -\frac{\delta(x')^2}{4} \sum_{i=1}^2 \partial_{x_i} \left(\frac{F_{i2}^1(x') - (h_1 - h_2)(x') F_{i2}^2(x')}{\delta(x')^2} \right) + (h_1 - h_2)(x') F_{32}^3(x'), \\ F_{32}^1(x') &= -\frac{\delta(x')^2}{3} \sum_{i=1}^2 \partial_{x_i} \left(\frac{F_{i2}^0(x') - (h_1 - h_2)(x') F_{i2}^1(x')}{\delta(x')^2} - \frac{(\varepsilon + 2h_1)(\varepsilon + 2h_2)}{4\delta(x')^2} F_{i2}^2(x') \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4}(\varepsilon + 2h_1(x'))(\varepsilon + 2h_2(x')) F_{32}^3(x') + (h_1 - h_2)(x') F_{32}^2(x'), \\ F_{32}^0(x') &= \frac{\delta(x')^2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^2 \partial_{x_i} \left(\frac{(h_1 - h_2)(x') F_{i2}^0(x')}{\delta(x')^2} + \frac{(\varepsilon + 2h_1)(\varepsilon + 2h_2)}{4\delta(x')^2} F_{i2}^1(x') \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4}(\varepsilon + 2h_1(x'))(\varepsilon + 2h_2(x')) F_{32}^2(x') + (h_1 - h_2)(x') F_{32}^1(x'), \end{aligned}$$

such that

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_5^2 &= -\sum_{i=1}^2 \partial_{x_i} \left(\frac{(\varepsilon + 2h_1(x'))(\varepsilon + 2h_2(x'))}{4\delta(x')^2} F_{i2}^0(x') \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{(\varepsilon + 2h_1(x'))(\varepsilon + 2h_2(x'))}{4\delta(x')^2} F_{32}^1(x') - \frac{h_1 - h_2}{\delta(x')^2} F_{32}^0(x') := R(x'). \end{aligned} \quad (5.58)$$

By (1.2), (5.51), (5.57), (5.57), and (5.58), we have

$$|\nabla_{x'}^k F_{12}^i|, |\nabla_{x'}^k F_{22}^i| \leq C\delta(x')^{1-i-\frac{k}{2}}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k F_{31}^j| \leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{3}{2}-j-\frac{k}{2}}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k R| \leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{k}{2}}. \quad (5.59)$$

Furthermore, to make $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_5^2 = 0$, we choose $\tilde{F}_{12}(x')$, $\tilde{F}_{22}(x')$, and $\tilde{F}_{32}(x)$ such that

$$\nabla \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{F}_{12}(x') \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \\ \tilde{F}_{22}(x') \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \\ \tilde{F}_{32}(x) \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \end{pmatrix} = -R(x') \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}.$$

Similar to the argument that led to (4.23)–(4.28), we derive

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{F}_{12}(x') &= \frac{\delta(x')^2}{2\mu} \partial_{x_1} \hat{p}_2, \quad \tilde{F}_{22}(x') = \frac{\delta(x')^2}{2\mu} \partial_{x_2} \hat{p}_2, \\ \tilde{F}_{31}(x) &= -2\delta(x') k(x) R(x') - \delta(x') \partial_{x_1} k(x) \tilde{F}_{11}(x') - \delta(x') \partial_{x_1} k(x) \tilde{F}_{21}(x'), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\Delta_{x'} \hat{p}_2 + \frac{3}{\delta(x')} \nabla_{x'} \delta(x') \nabla_{x'} \hat{p}_2 = \frac{12\mu R(x')}{\delta(x')^2} := \mathcal{F}_2(x').$$

By (5.59), we have $|\mathcal{F}_2(x')| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{3}{2}}$ and $|\nabla_{x'}^s \mathcal{F}_2(x')| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{s+3}{2}}$. Using Proposition 1.1 with $\gamma = -\frac{3}{2}$ and (4.49), we derive, for any $k \geq 0$ and $b = 1, 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{p}_2| &\leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{1}{2}}, & |\nabla_{x'}^k \hat{p}_2| &\leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{k}{2}}, \\ |\nabla_{x'}^k \tilde{F}_{b2}| &\leq C\delta(x')^{1-\frac{k}{2}}, & |\nabla_{x'}^k \tilde{F}_{32}| &\leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{3}{2}-\frac{k}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.60)$$

Therefore, by (5.50), (5.51), (5.55), (5.56), and (5.59)–(5.60), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{f}_5^1)^{(b)} + \mu\Delta(\mathbf{v}_5^2)^{(b)} - \partial_{x_b} \hat{p}_2 &= \mu\Delta_{x'}(\mathbf{v}_5^2)^{(b)} = \sum_{i=0}^4 \hat{G}_{i1}^b(x')x_3^i, \quad b = 1, 2, \\ (\mathbf{f}_5^1)^{(3)} + \mu\Delta(\mathbf{v}_5^2)^{(3)} - \partial_{x_3} \hat{p}_2 &= \sum_{i=0}^3 \bar{S}_{i1}(x')x_3^i + \sum_{i=0}^5 \bar{G}_{i1}(x')x_3^i, \end{aligned} \quad (5.61)$$

where

$$\sum_{i=0}^3 \bar{S}_{i1}(x')x_3^i := (\mathbf{f}_5^1)^{(3)} - \partial_{x_3} \hat{p}_2 + \mu\partial_{x_3 x_3}(\mathbf{v}_5^2)^{(3)}, \quad \sum_{i=0}^5 \bar{G}_{i1}(x_1)x_2^i := \mu\Delta_{x'}(\mathbf{v}_5^2)^{(3)}.$$

For $s \geq 0$, $b = 1, 2$, $i = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4$, $j = 0, 1, 2, 3$, and $k = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$,

$$|\nabla_{x'}^s \hat{G}_{i1}^b| \leq C\delta(x')^{-i-\frac{s}{2}}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^s \bar{S}_{j1}| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{1}{2}-j-\frac{s}{2}}, \quad |\nabla^s \bar{G}_{k1}| \leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{1}{2}-k-\frac{s}{2}}.$$

Thus, the leading term in $\mathbf{f}_5^1 + \mu\Delta\mathbf{v}_5^2 - \nabla\tilde{p}_2$ is $\sum_{i=0}^3 \bar{S}_{i1}(x')x_3^i$, which is of order $\delta(x')^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. Then we take

$$\tilde{p}_2 = \sum_{i=0}^3 \frac{1}{i+1} \bar{S}_{i1}(x')x_3^{i+1} \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}. \quad (5.62)$$

Set $\bar{p}_2 = \tilde{p}_2 + \hat{p}_2$. By using (5.61) and (5.62), we can write

$$(\mathbf{f}_5^2)^{(b)} = \sum_{i=1}^4 S_{i2}^b(x')x_3^i, \quad b = 1, 2, \quad (\mathbf{f}_5^2)^{(3)} = \sum_{i=0}^5 G_{i2}(x')x_3^i \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}.$$

For $k \geq 0$, $0 \leq i \leq 4$, and $0 \leq j \leq 5$,

$$|\nabla_{x'}^k S_{i2}| \leq C\delta(x')^{-i-\frac{k}{2}}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k G_{j2}| \leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{1}{2}-j-\frac{k}{2}}. \quad (5.63)$$

Therefore, $|\mathbf{f}_5^2| \leq C$ in Ω_{2R} .

By using (5.55), (5.59), (5.60), and (5.62), a calculation gives for $k \geq 0$ and $b = 1, 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla_{x'}^k \partial_{x_3}^s (\mathbf{v}_5^2)^{(b)}| &\leq \delta(x')^{1-s-\frac{k}{2}} \quad \text{for } s \leq 4, \quad \partial_{x_3}^s (\mathbf{v}_5^2)^{(b)} = 0 \quad \text{for } s \geq 5, \\ |\nabla_{x'}^k \partial_{x_3}^s (\mathbf{v}_5^2)^{(3)}| &\leq \delta(x')^{\frac{3}{2}-s-\frac{k}{2}} \quad \text{for } s \leq 5, \quad \partial_{x_3}^s (\mathbf{v}_5^2)^{(3)} = 0 \quad \text{for } s \geq 6, \\ |\nabla_{x'}^k \partial_{x_3}^s \tilde{p}_2| &\leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{1}{2}-s-\frac{k}{2}} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq s \leq 4, \quad \partial_{x_3}^s \tilde{p}_2 = 0 \quad \text{for } s \geq 5, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k \hat{p}_2| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{k}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.64)$$

By Proposition A.1, it holds that

$$\|\nabla^2(\mathbf{u}_1^5 - \mathbf{v}_5^1 - \mathbf{v}_5^2)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(x')/2}(x'))} + \|\nabla(p_1^5 - \bar{p}_1 - \bar{p}_2)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(x')/2}(x'))} \leq C. \quad (5.65)$$

By (5.64), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla^{m+1}\mathbf{v}_5^2| &\leq C\delta(x')^{-m} \text{ for } 0 \leq m \leq 2, \quad |\nabla^{m+1}\mathbf{v}_5^2| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{m+3}{2}} \text{ for } m \geq 3, \\ |\nabla^m\bar{p}_2| &\leq C\delta(x_1)^{\frac{1}{2}-m} \text{ for } 2 \leq m \leq 4, \quad |\nabla^m\bar{p}_2| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{m+3}{2}} \text{ for } m \geq 5, \\ |\bar{p}_2| &\leq C\delta(x_1)^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad |\nabla\bar{p}_2| \leq C\delta(x')^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.66)$$

It follows from (5.54) and (5.66) that

$$|\nabla^2\mathbf{v}^2(x)| + |\nabla\bar{p}^2(x)| \leq C\delta(x')^{-2}. \quad (5.67)$$

By (5.65) and (5.67), we have for $x \in \Omega_R$,

$$|\nabla^2\mathbf{u}_5^1(x)| + |\nabla p_1^5(x)| \leq C\delta(x')^{-2} \text{ in } \Omega_R.$$

For the estimates of $p_1^5(x)$, by the mean value theorem, (5.54), (5.65), and (5.66), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |p_1^5(x) - p_1^5(z', 0)| &\leq |p_1^5 - \bar{p}_1 - \bar{p}_2 - (p_1^5 - \bar{p}_1 - \bar{p}_2)(z', 0)| + |\bar{p}_1 + \bar{p}_2| + C \\ &\leq C\|\nabla(p_1^5 - \bar{p}_1 - \bar{p}_2)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_R)} + |\bar{p}_1 + \bar{p}_2| + C \leq C\delta(x')^{-3/2} \end{aligned}$$

for a fixed point $(z', 0) \in \Omega_R$ with $|z'| = R/2$.

Step III. Higher derivative estimates. To apply Proposition 2.1 to derive higher derivative estimates, we successively construct auxiliary functions to make \mathbf{f} and g in (2.2) as small as possible. In order to cancel out the singularity of $(\mathbf{f}_5^2)^{(b)}$, $b = 1, 2$, we choose $\mathbf{v}_5^3(x)$ satisfying

$$(\mathbf{v}_5^3(x))^{(b)} = \left(\sum_{i=0}^4 F_{b3}^i(x') x_3^i \right) \left(k(x)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right), \quad b = 1, 2, \quad (5.68)$$

where

$$F_{b3}^i(x') = -\frac{\delta(x')^2 S_{i2}^b(x')}{\mu(i+1)(i+2)} + (h_1 - h_2)(x') F_{b3}^{i+1}(x') + \frac{1}{4}(\varepsilon + 2h_1(x'))(\varepsilon + 2h_2(x')) F_{b3}^{i+2}(x'), \quad (5.69)$$

such that

$$\mu \partial_{x_3 x_3} (\mathbf{v}_5^3)^{(b)} = -(\mathbf{f}_5^2)^{(b)}, \quad b = 1, 2. \quad (5.70)$$

Here we use the convention that $F_{b3}^i(x') \equiv 0$ if $i \notin \{0, \dots, 4\}$ and $F_{33}^i = 0$ if $i \notin \{0, \dots, 5\}$. Then we take

$$(\mathbf{v}_5^3)^{(3)} = \sum_{i=0}^5 F_{33}^i(x') x_3^i, \quad (5.71)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} F_{33}^i(x') &= (h_1 - h_2)(x') F_{33}^{i+1}(x') + \frac{1}{4}(\varepsilon + 2h_1(x'))(\varepsilon + 2h_2(x')) F_{33}^{i+2}(x') \\ &\quad - \frac{\delta(x')^2}{i+2} \sum_{j=1}^2 \partial_{x_j} \left(\delta(x')^{-2} (F_{j3}^{i-1}(x') - (h_1 - h_2)(x') F_{13}^i(x') - \frac{1}{4}(\varepsilon + 2h_1)(\varepsilon + 2h_2) F_{j3}^{i+1}(x')) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (5.72)$$

such that

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_5^3 &= - \sum_{i=1}^2 \partial_{x_i} \left(\frac{(\varepsilon + 2h_1(x'))(\varepsilon + 2h_2(x'))}{4\delta(x')^2} F_{i3}^0(x') \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{(\varepsilon + 2h_1(x'))(\varepsilon + 2h_2(x'))}{4\delta(x')^2} F_{33}^1(x') - \frac{h_1(x') - h_2(x')}{\delta(x')^2} F_{33}^0(x') := R(x'). \end{aligned} \quad (5.73)$$

By (5.63), (5.69), (5.72), and (5.73), we have for $k \geq 0$, $i = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4$, and $b = 1, 2$,

$$|\nabla_{x'}^k F_{b3}^i| \leq C\delta(x')^{2-i-\frac{k}{2}}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k F_{33}^i| \leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{5}{2}-i-\frac{k}{2}}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k F_{33}^5| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{5}{2}-\frac{k}{2}}, \quad (5.74)$$

and $|\nabla_{x'}^k R| \leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{3}{2}-\frac{k}{2}}$. By (5.68), (5.70), and (5.71), a calculation gives

$$\mathbf{f}_1^2 + \mu\Delta\mathbf{v}_5^3 = \begin{pmatrix} \mu\Delta_{x'}(\mathbf{v}_5^3)^{(1)} \\ \mu\Delta_{x'}(\mathbf{v}_5^3)^{(2)} \\ (\mathbf{f}_5^2)^{(3)} + \mu\Delta(\mathbf{v}_5^3)^{(3)} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{i=0}^6 H_{i3}^1(x')x_3^i \\ \sum_{i=0}^6 H_{i3}^2(x')x_3^i \\ \sum_{i=0}^7 G_{i3}(x')x_3^i + \sum_{i=0}^5 \tilde{S}_{i3}(x')x_3^i \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5.75)$$

where

$$\sum_{i=0}^7 G_{i3}(x')x_3^i = \mu\Delta_{x'}(\mathbf{v}_5^3)^{(3)} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=0}^5 \tilde{S}_{i2}(x')x_3^i = (\mathbf{f}_5^2)^{(3)} + \mu\partial_{x_3x_3}(\mathbf{v}_5^3)^{(3)}.$$

By (5.74), we obtain for $k \geq 0$,

$$|\nabla_{x'}^k H_{i3}^b| \leq C\delta(x')^{1-i-\frac{k}{2}}, \quad b = 1, 2, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k G_{i3}| \leq \delta(x')^{\frac{3}{2}-i-\frac{k}{2}}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k \tilde{S}_{i3}| \leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{1}{2}-i-\frac{k}{2}}. \quad (5.76)$$

By (5.75) and (5.76),

$$|\Delta_{x'}(\mathbf{v}_5^3)^{(b)}| \leq C\delta(x'), \quad b = 1, 2, \quad |\Delta_{x'}(\mathbf{v}_5^3)^{(3)}| \leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{3}{2}}, \quad |(\mathbf{f}_5^2)^{(3)} + \mu\partial_{x_3x_3}(\mathbf{v}_5^3)^{(3)}| \leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Thus, the leading term in $(\mathbf{f}_5^2)^{(3)} + \mu\partial_{x_3x_3}(\mathbf{v}_5^3)^{(3)}$ is $\sum_{i=0}^5 \tilde{S}_{i3}(x')x_3^i$. To cancel this leading term, we take

$$\bar{p}_3 = \sum_{i=0}^5 \frac{\tilde{S}_{i3}(x')}{i+1} x_3^{i+1} \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}, \quad (5.77)$$

such that $\partial_{x_3}\bar{p}_3 = \sum_{i=0}^5 \tilde{S}_{i3}(x')x_3^i$.

From (5.75) and (5.77), we can write \mathbf{f}_1^3 as polynomials in x_3 :

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{f}_5^3)^{(b)} &= \sum_{i=1}^6 \left(H_{i3} - \frac{1}{i} \partial_{x_b} \tilde{S}_{(i-1)3} \right) (x') x_3^i + H_{03}(x') := \sum_{i=0}^6 S_{i3}^b(x') x_3^i, \quad b = 1, 2, \\ (\mathbf{f}_5^3)^{(3)} &= \sum_{i=0}^7 G_{i3}(x') x_3^i, \end{aligned}$$

where $S_{i3}^b(x') = H_{i3}(x') - \frac{1}{i} \partial_{x_b} \tilde{S}_{(i-1)3}(x')$, $1 \leq i \leq 6$, and $S_{03}^b(x') = H_{03}(x')$. In view of (5.76), we have for $k \geq 0$,

$$|\nabla_{x'}^k S_{i3}^b| \leq C\delta(x')^{1-i-\frac{k}{2}}, \quad |\nabla_{x'}^k G_{i3}| \leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{3}{2}-i-\frac{k}{2}}.$$

Thus, we have $|(\mathbf{f}_5^3)^{(b)}| \leq C\delta(x')$, $b = 1, 2$, $|(\mathbf{f}_5^3)^{(3)}| \leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{3}{2}}$ in Ω_{2R} , and then

$$|\mathbf{f}_5^3| \leq |(\mathbf{f}_5^3)^{(1)}| + |(\mathbf{f}_5^3)^{(2)}| + |(\mathbf{f}_5^3)^{(3)}| \leq C\delta(x'). \quad (5.78)$$

By using (5.68), (5.71), (5.74), (5.76), and (5.77), a calculation gives for $k \geq 0$ and $b = 1, 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla_{x'}^k \partial_{x_3}^s (\mathbf{v}_5^3)^{(b)}| &\leq \delta(x')^{2-s-\frac{k}{2}} \quad \text{for } s \leq 6, \quad \partial_{x_3}^s (\mathbf{v}_5^3)^{(b)} = 0 \quad \text{for } s \geq 7, \\ |\nabla_{x'}^k \partial_{x_3}^s (\mathbf{v}_5^3)^{(3)}| &\leq \delta(x')^{\frac{5}{2}-s-\frac{k}{2}} \quad \text{for } s \leq 7, \quad \partial_{x_3}^s (\mathbf{v}_5^3)^{(3)} = 0 \quad \text{for } s \geq 8, \\ |\nabla_{x'}^k \partial_{x_3}^s \bar{p}_3| &\leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{3}{2}-s-\frac{k}{2}} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq s \leq 6, \quad \partial_{x_3}^s \bar{p}_3 = 0 \quad \text{for } s \geq 7. \end{aligned} \quad (5.79)$$

Denote $\mathbf{v}^3 = \mathbf{v}_1^1 + \mathbf{v}_1^2 + \mathbf{v}_1^3$ and $\bar{p}^3 = \bar{p}_1 + \bar{p}_2 + \bar{p}_3$. Recall that $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}^3 = R(x')$ with $|R(x')| \leq C\delta(x')^{3/2}$. By virtue of (5.78) and Proposition 2.1, we have for any $m \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\nabla^{m+1}(\mathbf{u}_1^1 - \mathbf{v}^3)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(x')/2}(x'))} + \|\nabla(p_1^1 - \bar{p}^3)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(x')/2}(x'))} \\ & \leq C(\delta(x')^{2-m} + \delta(x')^{\frac{3}{2}-m}) \leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{3}{2}-m}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.80)$$

By (5.79), we summarize

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla^{m+1}\mathbf{v}_5^3| & \leq C\delta(x')^{1-m} \text{ for } 0 \leq m \leq 4, \quad |\nabla^{m+1}\mathbf{v}_5^3| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{m+3}{2}} \text{ for } m \geq 5, \\ |\nabla^m\bar{p}_3| & \leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{3}{2}-m} \text{ for } 0 \leq m \leq 5, \quad |\nabla^m\bar{p}_3| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{m+3}{2}} \text{ for } m \geq 6. \end{aligned} \quad (5.81)$$

By (5.54), (5.66), and (5.81), we have

$$|\nabla^{m+1}\mathbf{v}^3| + |\nabla^m\bar{p}^3| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{m+3}{2}}. \quad (5.82)$$

It follows from (5.80) and (5.82) that for $m \geq 1$,

$$|\nabla^{m+1}\mathbf{u}_1^5| + |\nabla^m p_1^5| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{m+3}{2}} + \delta(x')^{\frac{3}{2}-m},$$

which implies that in Ω_R ,

$$|\nabla^{m+1}\mathbf{u}_1^5| + |\nabla^m p_1^5| \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{m+3}{2}} \text{ for } m \leq 5, \quad |\nabla^{m+1}\mathbf{u}_1^5| + |\nabla^m p_1^5| \leq C\delta(x')^{\frac{3}{2}-m} \text{ for } m \geq 6.$$

This finishes the proof of Proposition 5.2. \square

6. PROOFS OF THE MAIN THEOREMS

In this section, we complete the proof of Theorems 1.2, 1.3, and 1.5 by using Propositions 3.1, 4.1, 5.1, and 5.2.

6.1. Decomposition of the solution. Recall that the rigid displacement space in dimension three is given by $\Psi = \text{span}\{\psi_1, \psi_2, \psi_3, \psi_4, \psi_5, \psi_6\}$, where ψ_α is defined in Section 2. It follows from $e(\mathbf{u}) = 0$ that

$$\mathbf{u} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^6 C_i^\alpha \psi_\alpha \quad \text{in } D_i, \quad i = 1, 2,$$

where C_i^α are constants to be determined by (\mathbf{u}, p) later. We decompose the solution of (1.1) as follows:

$$\mathbf{u}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^2 \sum_{\alpha=1}^6 C_i^\alpha \mathbf{u}_i^\alpha(x) + \mathbf{u}_0(x), \quad p(x) = \sum_{i=1}^2 \sum_{\alpha=1}^6 C_i^\alpha p_i^\alpha(x) + p_0(x), \quad x \in \Omega, \quad (6.1)$$

where $\mathbf{u}_i^\alpha, \mathbf{u}_0 \in C^{m+1}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$, $p_i^\alpha, p_0 \in C^m(\Omega)$, respectively, satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \mu \Delta \mathbf{u}_i^\alpha = \nabla p_i^\alpha, & \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}_i^\alpha = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \mathbf{u}_i^\alpha = \psi_\alpha & & \text{on } \partial D_i, \\ \mathbf{u}_i^\alpha = 0 & & \text{on } \partial D_j \cup \partial D, \quad j \neq i, \end{cases} \quad i = 1, 2, \quad (6.2)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \mu \Delta \mathbf{u}_0 = \nabla p_0, & \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}_0 = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \mathbf{u}_0 = 0 & & \text{on } \partial D_1 \cup \partial D_2, \\ \mathbf{u}_0 = \varphi & & \text{on } \partial D. \end{cases} \quad (6.3)$$

We rewrite (6.1) as

$$\mathbf{u} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^6 (C_1^\alpha - C_2^\alpha) \mathbf{u}_1^\alpha + \mathbf{u}_b \quad \text{and} \quad p = \sum_{\alpha=1}^6 (C_1^\alpha - C_2^\alpha) p_1^\alpha + p_b \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

where $\mathbf{u}_b := \sum_{\alpha=1}^6 C_2^\alpha (\mathbf{u}_1^\alpha + \mathbf{u}_2^\alpha) + \mathbf{u}_0$ and $p_b := \sum_{\alpha=1}^6 C_2^\alpha (p_1^\alpha + p_2^\alpha) + p_0$.

6.2. Upper bounds for the higher derivatives for $h_1(x') \neq h_2(x')$. Since $\mathbf{u}_1^\alpha + \mathbf{u}_2^\alpha - \psi_\alpha = 0$ on $\partial D_1 \cup \partial D_2$, $\alpha = 1, 2, \dots, 6$, it was proved in [32, Proposition 2.4] that, $\nabla(\mathbf{u}_1^\alpha + \mathbf{u}_2^\alpha - \psi_\alpha)$ has no singularity in the narrow region. In fact, for $m \geq 1$, $\nabla^m(\mathbf{u}_1^\alpha + \mathbf{u}_2^\alpha)$ and $\nabla^m(p_1^\alpha + p_2^\alpha)$ are also bounded in the narrow region. The proof is the same as that in [14, Proposition 6.1], thus we omit the details here.

Proposition 6.1. *Let $\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{u}_i^\alpha \in C^{m+1,\alpha}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$, $p_0, p_i^\alpha \in C^{m,\alpha}(\Omega)$ be the solution to (6.2) and (6.3). Then, for any $m \geq 0$, we have*

$$\|\nabla^{m+1}(\mathbf{u}_1^\alpha + \mathbf{u}_2^\alpha)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_R)} + \|\nabla^m(p_1^\alpha + p_2^\alpha - (p_1^\alpha + p_2^\alpha)(z', 0))\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_R)} \leq C$$

and

$$\|\nabla^{m+1}\mathbf{u}_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_R)} + \|\nabla^m(p_0 - p_0(z', 0))\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_R)} \leq C,$$

for some point $z = (z', 0) \in \Omega_R$ with $|z'| = R/2$.

For the coefficients C_i^α , $i = 1, 2$, $\alpha = 1, 2, \dots, 6$, which depend only on the gradient estimates, we have the following result, which can be found in [33, Proposition 2.5].

Proposition 6.2. *Let C_i^α be defined in (6.1). Then*

$$|C_i^\alpha| \leq C, \quad i = 1, 2, \alpha = 1, 2, \dots, 6,$$

and

$$|C_1^\alpha - C_2^\alpha| \leq \frac{C}{|\ln \varepsilon|}, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, 5, 6, \quad |C_1^3 - C_2^3| \leq C\varepsilon, \quad |C_1^4 - C_2^4| \leq C.$$

We now prove the main result, Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. By virtue of Propositions 3.1, 4.1, 5.2, 6.1, and 6.2, we have, for $x \in \Omega_R$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla \mathbf{u}(x)| &\leq \sum_{\alpha=1}^6 |C_1^\alpha - C_2^\alpha| |\nabla \mathbf{u}_1^\alpha(x)| + C \\ &\leq \frac{C}{|\ln \varepsilon| \delta(x')} + \frac{C\varepsilon}{\delta(x')^{\frac{3}{2}}} + \frac{C}{\delta(x')^{\frac{1}{2}}} + C \leq \frac{C}{|\ln \varepsilon| \delta(x')} + \frac{C}{\delta(x')^{\frac{1}{2}}} \leq \frac{C(1 + |\ln \varepsilon| |x'|)}{|\ln \varepsilon| \delta(x')}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |p(x) - p(z', 0)| &\leq \sum_{\alpha=1}^6 |(C_1^\alpha - C_2^\alpha)(p_1^\alpha(x) - p_1^\alpha(z', 0))| + C \\ &\leq \frac{C}{|\ln \varepsilon| \delta(x')^{\frac{3}{2}}} + \frac{C\varepsilon}{\delta(x')^2} + C \leq \frac{C}{|\ln \varepsilon| \delta(x')^{\frac{3}{2}}} + C, \end{aligned} \tag{6.4}$$

where $(z', 0) \in \Omega_R$ with $|z'| = R$ is a fix point.

For higher-order derivative estimates, when $m \geq 1$, by using Propositions 3.1, 4.1, 5.2, 6.1, and 6.2 again, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla^{m+1} \mathbf{u}(x)| &\leq \sum_{\alpha=1}^6 |C_1^\alpha - C_2^\alpha| |\nabla^{m+1} \mathbf{u}_1^\alpha(x)| + C \\ &\leq \frac{C}{|\ln \varepsilon|} (\delta(x')^{-\frac{m+3}{2}} \chi_{m \leq 6} + \delta(x')^{\frac{3}{2}-m} \chi_{m \geq 7}) + C \varepsilon \delta(x')^{-\frac{m+4}{2}} + C \delta(x')^{-\frac{m+1}{2}} + C \\ &\leq \begin{cases} \frac{C}{|\ln \varepsilon|} \delta(x')^{-\frac{m+3}{2}} + C \delta(x')^{-\frac{m+1}{2}} & \text{for } m \leq 6, \\ \frac{C}{|\ln \varepsilon|} \delta(x')^{\frac{3}{2}-m} + C \delta(x')^{-\frac{m+1}{2}} & \text{for } m \geq 7. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$|\nabla^m p(x)| \leq \sum_{\alpha=1}^6 |C_1^\alpha - C_2^\alpha| |\nabla^m p_1^\alpha| + C \leq \begin{cases} \frac{C}{|\ln \varepsilon|} \delta(x')^{-\frac{m+3}{2}} + C \delta(x')^{-\frac{m+1}{2}} & \text{for } m \leq 6, \\ \frac{C}{|\ln \varepsilon|} \delta(x')^{\frac{3}{2}-m} + C \delta(x')^{-\frac{m+1}{2}} & \text{for } m \geq 7. \end{cases}$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.2. \square

6.3. Upper bounds for the higher derivatives for $h_1(x') = h_2(x') = \frac{1}{2}h(x')$. If $h_1(x') = h_2(x')$, we can improve the estimates in Proposition 3.1, by constructing a family of auxiliary functions \mathbf{v}_α^l , $\alpha = 1, 2$ in terms of Green function, similar to [14, Proposition 3.3].

Proposition 6.3. *Under the same assumption as in Theorem 1.2, let \mathbf{u}_1^α and p_1^α be the solution to (1.9) with $\alpha = 1, 2$ and $h_1(x') = h_2(x') = \frac{1}{2}h(x')$. Then for sufficiently small $0 < \varepsilon < 1/2$, we have*

$$(i) \quad |\nabla \mathbf{u}_1^\alpha(x)| \leq C(\varepsilon + |x'|^2)^{-1}, \quad |p_1^\alpha(x) - p_1^\alpha(z', 0)| \leq C(\varepsilon + |x'|^2)^{-1/2}, \quad x \in \Omega_R,$$

for some point $z = (z', 0) \in \Omega_R$ with $|z'| = R/2$; and

$$(ii) \quad |\nabla^{m+1} \mathbf{u}_1^\alpha(x)| + |\nabla^m p_1^\alpha(x)| \leq C(\varepsilon + |x'|^2)^{-\frac{m+2}{2}}, \quad \text{for } m \geq 1, \quad x \in \Omega_R.$$

Proof. The proof is similar to that in [14, Proposition 3.3]. We only present the key steps when $\alpha = 1$, since the case when $\alpha = 2$ is analogous. Since $h_1(x') = h_2(x') = \frac{1}{2}h(x')$, $\delta(x') = \varepsilon + h(x')$, and the Keller-type function becomes $k(x) = \frac{x_3}{\delta(x')}$ in Ω_{2R} . In order to apply Proposition 2.1, we construct a series of auxiliary functions \mathbf{v}_1^l and \bar{p}_l , such that $|\mu \Delta \mathbf{v}_1^l - \nabla \bar{p}_l|$ as small as possible.

We begin by choosing $\mathbf{v}_1^1 = ((\mathbf{v}_1^1)^{(1)}, (\mathbf{v}_1^1)^{(2)}, (\mathbf{v}_1^1)^{(3)})$ with

$$(\mathbf{v}_1^1)^{(1)}(x) = \frac{x_3}{\delta(x')} + \frac{1}{2}, \quad (\mathbf{v}_1^1)^{(2)}(x) = 0 \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega_{2R}, \quad (6.5)$$

and

$$(\mathbf{v}_1^1)^{(3)}(x) = - \int_{-\frac{1}{2}\delta(x')}^{x_3} \partial_{x_1} (\mathbf{v}_1^1)^{(1)}(x', y) dy \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega_{2R}, \quad (6.6)$$

One can see the leading term in $\Delta \mathbf{v}_1^1$ is $\partial_{x_3 x_3} (\mathbf{v}_1^1)^{(3)}$, which is of order $\delta(x')^{-\frac{3}{2}}$. In order to cancel this leading term, we choose

$$\bar{p}_1 = \frac{\mu \partial_{x_1} h(x')}{\delta(x')^2} x_3 \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}. \quad (6.7)$$

Let $\mathbf{f}_1^1 = \mu \Delta \mathbf{v}_1^1 - \nabla \bar{p}_1$, by (6.5), (6.6), and (6.7), a direct calculation shows that

$$|\mathbf{f}_1^1| \leq C(|(\mathbf{f}_1^1)^{(1)}| + |(\mathbf{f}_1^1)^{(2)}| + |(\mathbf{f}_1^1)^{(3)}|) \leq C \delta(x')^{-1} \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}.$$

Denote

$$\mathbf{f}_1^j := \mathbf{f}_1^{j-1}(x) + \mu \Delta \mathbf{v}_1^j(x) - \nabla \bar{p}_j(x) = \sum_{l=1}^j (\mu \Delta \mathbf{v}_1^l - \nabla \bar{p}_l)(x) \quad \text{for } 2 \leq j \leq m+1.$$

Next, we choose auxiliary functions $\mathbf{v}_1^l(x)$ and $\bar{p}_l(x)$ to further reduce the upper bound of \mathbf{f}_1^j in Ω_{2R} . For $l \geq 2$, we choose $\mathbf{v}_1^l = ((\mathbf{v}_1^l)^{(1)}, (\mathbf{v}_1^l)^{(2)}, (\mathbf{v}_1^l)^{(3)})^T$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{v}_1^l)^{(i)}(x) &= -\frac{1}{\mu} \int_{-\frac{1}{2}\delta(x')}^{\frac{1}{2}\delta(x')} G(x_3, y) (\mathbf{f}_1^{l-1})^{(i)}(x', y) dy, \quad i = 1, 2, \\ (\mathbf{v}_1^l)^{(3)}(x) &= -\int_{-\frac{1}{2}\delta(x')}^{x_3} \partial_{x_1}(\mathbf{v}_1^l)^{(1)}(x', y) + \partial_{x_2}(\mathbf{v}_1^l)^{(2)}(x', y) dy \end{aligned} \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}, \quad (6.8)$$

where

$$G(x_3, y) = \frac{1}{\delta(x')} \begin{cases} (y + \frac{1}{2}h(x') + \frac{\varepsilon}{2})(x_3 - \frac{1}{2}h(x') - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}), & -\frac{\varepsilon}{2} - \frac{1}{2}h(x') \leq y \leq x_3, \\ (y - \frac{1}{2}h(x') - \frac{\varepsilon}{2})(x_3 + \frac{1}{2}h(x') + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}), & x_3 \leq y \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{1}{2}h(x'). \end{cases}$$

Then it is easy to verify that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu \partial_{x_3 x_3} (\mathbf{v}_1^l)^{(i)} &= -(\mathbf{f}_1^{l-1})^{(i)}, \quad i = 1, 2, \\ \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_1^l &= \partial_{x_1}(\mathbf{v}_1^l)^{(1)} + \partial_{x_2}(\mathbf{v}_1^l)^{(2)} + \partial_{x_3}(\mathbf{v}_1^l)^{(3)} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (6.9)$$

By (6.5) and (6.7), we see that $(\mathbf{f}_1^l)^{(i)}$, $i = 1, 2$, are odd functions with respect to x_3 . By induction, it follows from (6.8) that $(\mathbf{v}_1^l)^{(i)}$ and \bar{p}_l are also odd functions with respect to x_3 for any $l \geq 2$ and $i = 1, 2$. Thus, by (6.8), we derive $(\mathbf{v}_1^l)^{(3)}(x', -\frac{1}{2}\delta(x')) = (\mathbf{v}_1^l)^{(3)}(x', \frac{1}{2}\delta(x')) = 0$ and $\mathbf{v}_1^l = 0$ on $\Gamma_{2R}^+ \cup \Gamma_{2R}^-$.

Furthermore, we take

$$\bar{p}_l = \mu \int_0^{x_3} \left(\Delta_{x'} (\mathbf{v}_1^{l-1})^{(3)} + \partial_{x_3 x_3} (\mathbf{v}_1^l)^{(3)} \right) (x', y) dy \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R}, \quad (6.10)$$

such that

$$\partial_{x_3} \bar{p}_l = \mu \Delta_{x'} (\mathbf{v}_1^{l-1})^{(3)} + \mu \partial_{x_3 x_3} (\mathbf{v}_1^l)^{(3)}. \quad (6.11)$$

By (6.9) and (6.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{f}_1^l)^{(i)} &= (\mathbf{f}_1^{l-1})^{(i)} + \mu \Delta (\mathbf{v}_1^l)^{(i)} - \partial_{x_i} \bar{p}_l = \mu \Delta_{x'} (\mathbf{v}_1^l)^{(i)} - \partial_{x_i} \bar{p}_l, \quad i = 1, 2, \\ (\mathbf{f}_1^l)^{(3)} &= (\mathbf{f}_1^{l-1})^{(3)} + \mu \Delta (\mathbf{v}_1^l)^{(3)} - \partial_{x_3} \bar{p}_l = \mu \Delta_{x'} (\mathbf{v}_1^l)^{(3)}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.12)$$

We can inductively prove the following estimates, for $j \geq 1$ and $j = 1, 2, \dots, m+1$,

$$|(\mathbf{f}_1^j)^{(1)}|, |(\mathbf{v}_1^j)^{(2)}| \leq C\delta(x')^{j-1}, \quad |(\mathbf{v}_1^j)^{(3)}| \leq C\delta(x')^{j-1/2}, \quad |\bar{p}_j| \leq C\delta(x')^{j-3/2}, \quad (6.13)$$

and for $i = 1, 2$ and $0 \leq k \leq m+1$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla_{x'}^k \partial_{x_3}^s (\mathbf{v}_1^j)^{(i)}| &\leq C\delta(x')^{(2j-2s-k-2)/2} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq s \leq 2j-1, \quad \partial_{x_3}^s (\mathbf{v}_1^j)^{(i)} = 0 \quad \text{for } s \geq 2j, \\ |\nabla_{x'}^k \partial_{x_3}^s (\mathbf{v}_1^j)^{(3)}| &\leq C\delta(x')^{(2j-2s-k-1)/2} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq s \leq 2j, \quad \partial_{x_3}^s (\mathbf{v}_1^j)^{(3)} = 0 \quad \text{for } s \geq 2j+1, \\ |\nabla_{x'}^k \partial_{x_3}^s \bar{p}_j| &\leq C\delta(x')^{(2j-2s-k-3)/2} \quad \text{for } s \leq 2j-1, \quad \partial_{x_3}^s \bar{p}_j = 0 \quad \text{for } s \geq 2j. \end{aligned} \quad (6.14)$$

By (6.12) and (6.14), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |(\mathbf{f}_1^{m+1})^{(i)}| &\leq C \left(|\Delta_{x'}(\mathbf{v}_1^{m+1})^{(i)}| + |\partial_{x_i} \bar{p}_{m+1}| \right) \leq C \delta(x')^{m-1}, \quad i = 1, 2, \\ |(\mathbf{f}_1^{m+1})^{(3)}| &\leq C |\Delta_{x'}(\mathbf{v}_1^{m+1})^{(3)}| \leq C \delta(x')^{m-\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$|\mathbf{f}_1^{m+1}| \leq C \delta(x_1)^{m-1} \quad \text{and} \quad |\nabla^s \mathbf{f}_1^{m+1}| \leq C \delta(x_1)^{m-s-1} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq s \leq m.$$

Denote

$$\mathbf{v}^{m+1}(x) = \sum_{l=1}^{m+1} \mathbf{v}_1^l(x), \quad \bar{p}^{m+1}(x) = \sum_{l=1}^{m+1} \bar{p}_l(x).$$

It is easy to verify that $\mathbf{v}^{m+1}(x) = \mathbf{u}_1^1(x)$ on Γ_{2R}^\pm , $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}^{m+1}(x) = 0$ in Ω_{2R} . Moreover, for $1 \leq s \leq m$,

$$|\mathbf{f}^{m+1}(x)| = |\mu \Delta \mathbf{v}^{m+1}(x) - \nabla \bar{p}^{m+1}(x)| \leq C \delta(x_1)^{m-1}, \quad |\nabla^s \mathbf{f}^{m+1}(x)| \leq C \delta(x_1)^{m-s-1}.$$

Thus, by virtue of Proposition A.1, it holds that

$$\|\nabla^{m+1}(\mathbf{u}_1^1 - \mathbf{v}^{m+1})\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(x')/2}(x'))} + \|\nabla^m(p_1^1 - \bar{p}^{m+1})\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(x')/2}(x'))} \leq C. \quad (6.15)$$

By (6.8), (6.10), (6.13), and (6.14), we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla^{m+1} \mathbf{v}_1^l| &\leq C \delta(x')^{-\frac{m+2}{2}} \quad \text{for } l \leq \frac{m+1}{2}, \\ |\nabla^{m+1} \mathbf{v}_1^l| &\leq C \delta(x')^{l-m-2} \quad \text{for } \frac{m+2}{2} \leq l \leq m+1, \\ |\nabla^m \bar{p}_l| &\leq C \delta(x')^{-\frac{m+2}{2}} \quad \text{for } l \leq \frac{m}{2}, \\ |\nabla^m \bar{p}_l| &\leq C \delta(x')^{\frac{2l-2m-3}{2}} \quad \text{for } \frac{m+1}{2} \leq l \leq m+1. \end{aligned} \quad (6.16)$$

It follows from (6.16) that

$$|\nabla \mathbf{v}^{m+1}(x)| \leq C \delta(x')^{-1} \quad (6.17)$$

and for $m \geq 1$,

$$|\nabla^{m+1} \mathbf{v}^{m+1}(x)| + |\nabla^m \bar{p}^{m+1}(x)| \leq C \delta(x')^{-\frac{m+2}{2}}. \quad (6.18)$$

From (6.15), (6.17), and (6.18), we have

$$|\nabla \mathbf{u}_1^1(x)| \leq C \delta(x')^{-1}, \quad |\nabla^{m+1} \mathbf{u}_1^1(x)| + |\nabla^m p_1^1(x)| \leq C \delta(x')^{-\frac{m+2}{2}} \quad \text{in } \Omega_R.$$

The estimate of p_1^α is the same as that in [14, Proposition 3.3], since \bar{p}_1 and \bar{p}_2 are odd in x_3 , we thus omit the details here. This completes the proof of Proposition 6.3. \square

We are now in a position to prove Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. The proof for the estimates of \mathbf{u} and p in Theorem 1.2 is similar to that of Theorem 1.2. Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.3, we have

$$C_1^\alpha = C_2^\alpha, \quad \alpha = 4, 5, 6. \quad (6.19)$$

See [33, Propositions 4.5]. Thus, by Propositions 4.1, 6.2, and 6.3, (6.4) becomes

$$|p(x) - p(z', 0)| \leq \sum_{\alpha=1}^3 |(C_1^\alpha - C_2^\alpha)(p_1^\alpha(x) - p_1^\alpha(z', 0))| + C \leq \frac{C}{\delta(x')^{\frac{1}{2}} |\ln \varepsilon|} + \frac{C\varepsilon}{\delta(x')^2} + C.$$

Hence, by Propositions 4.1, 6.2, and 6.3, we have for $m \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\nabla^m \sigma[\mathbf{u}, p - p(z', 0)]| \\
& \leq \sum_{\alpha=1}^2 |C_1^\alpha - C_2^\alpha| \left(|\nabla^{m+1} \mathbf{u}_1^\alpha(x)| + |\nabla^m(p_1^\alpha - p_1^\alpha(z', 0))| \right) \\
& \quad + |C_1^3 - C_2^3| \left(|\nabla^{m+1} \mathbf{u}_1^3(x)| + |\nabla^m(p_1^3 - p_1^3(z', 0))| \right) + C \\
& \leq \frac{C}{|\ln \varepsilon|} \delta(x')^{-\frac{m+2}{2}} + C\varepsilon \delta(x')^{-\frac{m+4}{2}} + C \leq C\delta(x')^{-\frac{m+2}{2}} + C.
\end{aligned}$$

The proof of Theorem 1.3 is finished. \square

6.4. Lower bounds for the higher derivatives.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. By [33, (4.42), Propositions 4.1, p48], we have

$$|C_1^\alpha - C_2^\alpha| \geq \frac{C|\tilde{b}_1^{*\alpha}[\varphi]|}{|\ln \varepsilon|}, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, \quad |C_1^3 - C_2^3| \geq C\varepsilon|\tilde{b}_1^{*3}[\varphi]|. \quad (6.20)$$

By Proposition 6.2 and (4.12), we have

$$|(C_1^3 - C_2^3)\partial_{x_3}(\mathbf{u}_1^3)^{(1)}| \leq C\varepsilon(|\partial_{x_3}(\mathbf{v}_3^1)^{(1)}| + C) \leq C\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

It follows from (6.5) that for some small $r > 0$,

$$|\partial_{x_3}(\mathbf{v}_1^1)^{(1)}(r\sqrt{\varepsilon}, 0, 0)| = |(\delta(x')^{-1})(r\sqrt{\varepsilon}, 0, 0)| \geq C\varepsilon^{-1},$$

Hence,

$$|\partial_{x_3}(\mathbf{u}_1^1)^{(1)}(r\sqrt{\varepsilon}, 0, 0)| \geq C\varepsilon^{-1}. \quad (6.21)$$

Note that $(\mathbf{v}_2^1)^{(1)} = 0$, thus

$$|\partial_{x_3}(\mathbf{u}_1^2)^{(1)}(r\sqrt{\varepsilon}, 0, 0)| \leq C. \quad (6.22)$$

Combining (6.19) and (6.20)–(6.22), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\partial_{x_3} \mathbf{u}^{(1)}(r\sqrt{\varepsilon}, 0, 0)| &= \left| \sum_{\alpha=1}^3 (C_1^\alpha - C_2^\alpha) \partial_{x_3}(\mathbf{u}_1^\alpha)^{(1)} + \partial_{x_3}(\mathbf{u}_b)^{(1)} \right| (r\sqrt{\varepsilon}, 0, 0) \\
&\geq |(C_1^1 - C_2^1) \partial_{x_3}(\mathbf{u}_1^1)^{(1)}| - C\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} - C \geq \frac{C|\tilde{b}_1^{*1}[\varphi]|}{|\ln \varepsilon|} \varepsilon^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

For the higher-order derivative estimates, by Proposition 6.2 and (6.14), we have, for $m \geq 1$, $\alpha = 1, 2$,

$$|(C_1^\alpha - C_2^\alpha) \nabla_{x'}^{m-1} \partial_{x_3}^2 (\mathbf{u}_1^\alpha)^{(1)}| \leq C |\ln \varepsilon|^{-1} \left| \sum_{i=1}^{m+1} \nabla_{x'}^{m-1} \partial_{x_3}^2 (\mathbf{v}_\alpha^i)^{(1)} + C \right| \leq C |\ln \varepsilon|^{-1} \varepsilon^{-\frac{m+1}{2}}. \quad (6.23)$$

It follows from (4.11) that for small $r > 0$, which may depend on m ,

$$|\nabla_{x'}^{m-1} \partial_{x_3}^2 (\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3^1)^{(1)}(r\sqrt{\varepsilon}, 0, 0)| \geq C\varepsilon^{-\frac{m+4}{2}},$$

and by (4.21), (4.32), and (4.54),

$$|\nabla_{x'}^{m-1} \partial_{x_3}^2 (\hat{\mathbf{v}}_3^1)^{(1)}| + \sum_{i=2}^{m+1} |\nabla_{x'}^{m-1} \partial_{x_3}^2 (\mathbf{v}_3^i)^{(1)}| \leq C\varepsilon^{-\frac{m+2}{2}}.$$

Hence,

$$|\nabla_{x'}^{m-1} \partial_{x_3}^2 (\mathbf{u}_1^3)^{(1)}|(r\sqrt{\varepsilon}, 0, 0) \geq C\varepsilon^{-\frac{m+4}{2}}. \quad (6.24)$$

Combining (6.19), (6.20), (6.23), and (6.24), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla_{x'}^{m-1} \partial_{x_3}^2 \mathbf{u}^{(1)}|(r\sqrt{\varepsilon}, 0, 0) &= \left| \sum_{\alpha=1}^3 (C_1^\alpha - C_2^\alpha) \nabla_{x'}^{m-1} \partial_{x_3}^2 (\mathbf{u}_1^\alpha)^{(1)} + \nabla_{x'}^{m-1} \partial_{x_3}^2 (\mathbf{u}_b)^{(1)} \right|(r\sqrt{\varepsilon}, 0, 0) \\ &\geq |(C_1^3 - C_2^3) \nabla_{x'}^{m-1} \partial_{x_3}^2 (\mathbf{u}_1^3)^{(1)}| - C|\ln \varepsilon|^{-1} \varepsilon^{-\frac{m+1}{2}} \geq C|\tilde{b}_1^{*3}[\varphi]| \varepsilon^{-\frac{m+2}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

For the lower bound of the Cauchy stress $\sigma[\mathbf{u}, p - p(z', 0)]$, by using (6.20), (6.23), and (6.24), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &|\nabla_{x'}^{m-1} \partial_{x_3} \sigma[\mathbf{u}, p - p(z', 0)]|(r\sqrt{\varepsilon}, 0, 0) \\ &\geq \left| \sum_{\alpha=1}^3 (C_1^\alpha - C_2^\alpha) \nabla_{x'}^{m-1} \partial_{x_3} \left(2\mu e(\mathbf{u}_1^\alpha) - (p_1^\alpha - p_1^\alpha(z', 0))\mathbb{I} \right) \right|(r\sqrt{\varepsilon}, 0, 0) - C \\ &\geq C|(C_1^3 - C_2^3) \nabla_{x'}^{m-1} \partial_{x_3} e_{13}(\mathbf{u}_1^3)| (r\sqrt{\varepsilon}, 0, 0) - C|\ln \varepsilon|^{-1} \varepsilon^{-\frac{m+1}{2}} \geq C|\tilde{b}_1^{*3}[\varphi]| \varepsilon^{-\frac{m+2}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.5. \square

APPENDIX A. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 2.1

By the regularity of \mathbf{u} in $\Omega \setminus \Omega_R$ and the definition of \mathbf{v} stated at the beginning of Section 2, we have

$$\|\mathbf{w}\|_{C^{m+1}(\Omega \setminus \Omega_R)} + \|q\|_{C^m(\Omega \setminus \Omega_R)} \leq C.$$

To prove Proposition 2.1, we decompose the solution of (2.2) into two parts

$$\mathbf{w} := \mathbf{w}_1 + \mathbf{w}_2, \quad q := q_1 + q_2 \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R},$$

where (\mathbf{w}_1, q_1) satisfies a nonhomogeneous Stokes equation

$$\begin{cases} -\mu \Delta \mathbf{w}_1 + \nabla q_1 = \mathbf{f} & \text{in } \Omega_{2R}, \\ \nabla \cdot \mathbf{w}_1 = 0 & \text{in } \Omega_{2R}, \\ \mathbf{w}_1 = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega_{2R}, \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

while (\mathbf{w}_2, q_2) satisfies a homogeneous Stokes equation

$$\begin{cases} -\mu \Delta \mathbf{w}_2 + \nabla q_2 = 0 & \text{in } \Omega_{2R}, \\ \nabla \cdot \mathbf{w}_2 = g & \text{in } \Omega_{2R}, \\ \mathbf{w}_2 = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_{2R}^\pm, \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

and $\|\mathbf{w}_2\|_{C^{m+1}(\Omega \setminus \Omega_R)} + \|q_2\|_{C^m(\Omega \setminus \Omega_R)} \leq C$.

For higher derivative estimates of (\mathbf{w}_1, q_1) , we have the following result, which can be found in [14, Proposition 2.1].

Proposition A.1. [14] *Let $\mathbf{w}_1 \in H^1(\Omega_{\frac{3}{2}R}) \cap L^\infty(\Omega_{2R} \setminus \Omega_R)$ and $p_1 \in L^\infty(\Omega_{2R} \setminus \Omega_R)$ be the solution to (A.1). For any $m \geq 1$, if*

$$|\nabla^k \mathbf{f}(x)| \leq C\delta(x')^{l-k}, \quad \forall 0 \leq k \leq m, \quad l \geq -\frac{3}{2} \quad \text{for } x = (x', x_d) \in \Omega_{2R},$$

then it holds that

$$\|\nabla \mathbf{w}_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(z')/2}(z'))} \leq C\delta(z')^{l+1}, \quad z = (z', z_d) \in \Omega_R,$$

and

$$\|\nabla^{m+1}\mathbf{w}_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(z')/2}(z'))} + \|\nabla^m q_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(z')/2}(z'))} \leq C\delta(z')^{l+1-m}, \quad z = (z', z_d) \in \Omega_R.$$

For higher derivative estimates of (\mathbf{w}_2, q_2) , we have the following result, the proof of which will be given later.

Proposition A.2. *Let $\mathbf{w}_2 \in H^1(\Omega_{\frac{3}{2}R}) \cap L^\infty(\Omega_{2R} \setminus \Omega_R)$ and $p_2 \in L^\infty(\Omega_{2R} \setminus \Omega_R)$ be the solution to (A.2). For any $m \geq 1$, if*

$$|\nabla^k g(x)| \leq C\delta(x')^{\alpha-k}, \quad \forall 0 \leq k \leq m, \quad \alpha \geq -\frac{1}{2} \quad \text{for } x = (x', x_d) \in \Omega_{2R},$$

then it holds that

$$\|\nabla \mathbf{w}_2\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(z')/2}(z'))} \leq C\delta(z')^\alpha, \quad z = (z', z_d) \in \Omega_R,$$

and

$$\|\nabla^{m+1}\mathbf{w}_2\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(z')/2}(z'))} + \|\nabla^m q_2\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(z')/2}(z'))} \leq C\delta(z')^{\alpha-m}, \quad z = (z', z_d) \in \Omega_R.$$

Proof of Proposition 2.1. Since $\mathbf{w} := \mathbf{w}_1 + \mathbf{w}_2$, $q := q_1 + q_2$, by using Propositions A.1 and A.2, we have, for any $z = (z', z_d) \in \Omega_R$,

$$\|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(z')/2}(z'))} \leq \|\nabla \mathbf{w}_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(z')/2}(z'))} + \|\nabla \mathbf{w}_2\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(z')/2}(z'))} \leq C\delta(z')^{l+1} + C\delta(z')^\alpha,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\nabla^{m+1}\mathbf{w}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(z')/2}(z'))} + \|\nabla^m q\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(z')/2}(z'))} \\ & \leq \|\nabla^{m+1}\mathbf{w}_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(z')/2}(z'))} + \|\nabla^{m+1}\mathbf{w}_2\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(z')/2}(z'))} + \|\nabla^m q_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(z')/2}(z'))} \\ & \quad + \|\nabla^m q_2\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(z')/2}(z'))} \leq C\delta(z')^{l+1-m} + C\delta(z')^{\alpha-m}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Proposition 2.1. \square

We next prove Proposition A.2 for \mathbf{w}_2 . We first recall the classical result for the divergence equation, the proof can be found in [17, section III.3].

Lemma A.3. *Let Ω 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 $\phi \in H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that*

$$\operatorname{div} \phi = f \quad \text{in } \Omega \quad \text{and} \quad \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C\|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)},$$

where C is a constant depending only on d .

With Lemma A.3 at hand, we derive the estimates for the pressure term q .

Lemma A.4. *Let (\mathbf{w}, q) be the solution to*

$$-\mu\Delta \mathbf{w} + \nabla(q - q_\Omega) = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega. \tag{A.3}$$

Then it holds

$$\int_\Omega |q - q_\Omega|^2 dx \leq C \int_\Omega |\nabla \mathbf{w}|^2 dx, \tag{A.4}$$

where $q_\Omega := \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_\Omega q dx$, and C is a constant depending only on d and μ .

Proof. By Lemma A.3, there exists a function $\phi \in H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\operatorname{div} \phi = q - q_\Omega$ in Ω , with the estimates

$$\|\nabla \phi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq C_0 \|q - q_\Omega\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

where $C_0 = C_0(d)$. Using this ϕ as a test function of (A.3) and integrating by parts gives

$$\mu \int_{\Omega} \nabla \mathbf{w} \cdot \nabla \phi \, dx - \int_{\Omega} |q - q_\Omega|^2 \, dx = 0.$$

By the Cauchy inequality and (A.5), we have

$$\int_{\Omega} |q - q_\Omega|^2 \, dx \leq \frac{1}{2C_0} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \phi|^2 + C \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \mathbf{w}|^2 \, dx \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} |q - q_\Omega|^2 \, dx + C \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \mathbf{w}|^2 \, dx,$$

which implies (A.4). This completes the proof. \square

To prove Proposition A.2, we need the following L^q -estimate for incompressible Stokes equations in a bounded domain, with partially vanishing boundary data, which can be found in [17, p.278].

Theorem A.5. *Let Ω be an arbitrary domain in \mathbb{R}^d , $d \geq 2$, with a boundary portion σ of class C^{m+2} , $m \geq 0$. Let Ω_0 be any bounded subdomain of Ω 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

$$\begin{aligned} (\nabla \mathbf{u}, \nabla \psi) &= -\langle \mathbf{f}, \psi \rangle + (p, \nabla \cdot \psi) \quad \text{for all } \psi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega_0), \\ (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}, \varphi) &= (\mathbf{g}, \varphi) \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega_0), \quad \mathbf{u} = 0 \quad \text{at } \sigma. \end{aligned}$$

Then, if $\mathbf{f} \in W^{m,q}(\Omega_0)$, we have $\mathbf{u} \in W^{m+2,q}(\Omega')$, $p \in W^{m+1,q}(\Omega')$, for any Ω' satisfying (1) $\Omega' \subset \Omega$, (2) $\partial\Omega' \cap \partial\Omega$ is a strictly interior subregion of σ . Finally, the following estimate holds

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_{W^{m+2,q}(\Omega')} + \|p\|_{W^{m+1,q}(\Omega')} \leq C (\|\mathbf{f}\|_{W^{m,q}(\Omega_0)} + \|\mathbf{g}\|_{W^{m+1,q}(\Omega_0)} + \|\mathbf{u}\|_{W^{1,q}(\Omega_0)} + \|p\|_{L^q(\Omega_0)}),$$

where $C = C(d, m, q, \Omega', \Omega_0)$.

For convenience, in the sequel we omit the subscripts and denote $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{w}_2$. Applying Theorem A.5 and a bootstrap argument yields the following proposition.

Proposition A.6. *Let (\mathbf{w}, q) be the solution to (A.2). Then for $z = (z', z_d) \in \Omega_R$, the following estimates hold:*

$$\|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(z')/2}(z'))} \leq C \left(\delta(z')^{-\frac{d}{2}} \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{L^2(\Omega_{\delta(z')}(z'))} + \|\mathbf{g}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(z')}(z'))} + \delta(z') \|\nabla \mathbf{g}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(z')}(z'))} \right),$$

and for $m \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\nabla^{m+1} \mathbf{w}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(z')/2}(z'))} + \|\nabla^m q\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(z')/2}(z'))} \\ &\leq C \delta(z')^{-m-1} \left(\delta(z')^{1-\frac{d}{2}} \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{L^2(\Omega_{\delta(z')}(z'))} + \sum_{j=0}^{m+1} \delta(z')^{1+j} \|\nabla^j \mathbf{g}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(z')}(z'))} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Proposition A.6. For $z = (z', z_d) \in \Omega_R$, we take the change of variables as before

$$\begin{cases} x' - z' = \delta(z') y', \\ x_d = \delta(z') y_d, \end{cases}$$

which transforms $\Omega_{\delta(z')}(z)$ into a nearly unit size domain Q_1 , where

$$Q_r = \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}^d : -\frac{\varepsilon}{2\delta} - \frac{1}{\delta} h_2(\delta y' + z') < y_d < \frac{\varepsilon}{2\delta} + \frac{1}{\delta} h_1(\delta y' + z'), |y'| < r \right\}, \quad \delta = \delta(z'),$$

with top and bottom boundaries denoted by $\hat{\Gamma}_1^+$ and $\hat{\Gamma}_1^-$. For $y \in Q_1$, set

$$\mathcal{W}(y', y_d) := \mathbf{w}(z' + \delta(z') y', \delta(z') y_d), \quad \mathcal{P}(y', y_d) := \delta(z') q(z' + \delta(z') y', \delta(z') y_d),$$

and

$$\mathcal{P}_1(y', y_d) := \frac{1}{|Q_1|} \int_{Q_1} \mathcal{P}, \quad \mathcal{G}(y', y_d) := \delta(z') g(z' + \delta(z') y', \delta(z') y_d),$$

It follows from (A.2) that

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

By applying Theorem A.5 with $m = 0$ and $q = 4$, we obtain, for any $0 < r < R \leq 1$,

$$\|\mathcal{W}\|_{W^{2,4}(Q_r)} + \|\mathcal{P} - \mathcal{P}_1\|_{W^{1,4}(Q_r)} \leq C (\|\mathcal{G}\|_{W^{1,4}(Q_R)} + \|\mathcal{W}\|_{W^{1,4}(Q_R)} + \|\mathcal{P} - \mathcal{P}_1\|_{L^4(Q_R)}).$$

Applying the interpolation inequality, for any $\theta_0 \in (0, 1)$,

$$\|\mathcal{W}\|_{W^{1,4}(Q_R)} \leq \theta_0 \|\mathcal{W}\|_{W^{2,4}(Q_R)} + \frac{C}{\theta_0} \|\mathcal{W}\|_{L^4(Q_R)},$$

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathcal{W}\|_{W^{2,4}(Q_r)} + \|\mathcal{P} - \mathcal{P}_1\|_{W^{1,4}(Q_r)} \\ & \leq C \theta_0 \|\mathcal{W}\|_{W^{2,4}(Q_R)} + \frac{C}{\theta_0} \|\mathcal{W}\|_{L^4(Q_R)} + C (\|\mathcal{G}\|_{W^{1,4}(Q_R)} + \|\mathcal{P} - \mathcal{P}_1\|_{L^4(Q_R)}). \end{aligned}$$

Taking θ_0 small enough such that $C\theta_0 \leq \frac{1}{4}$, then by Lemma 2.3, we get

$$\|\mathcal{W}\|_{W^{2,4}(Q_r)} + \|\mathcal{P} - \mathcal{P}_1\|_{W^{1,4}(Q_r)} \leq C (\|\mathcal{W}\|_{L^4(Q_R)} + \|\mathcal{G}\|_{W^{1,4}(Q_R)} + \|\mathcal{P} - \mathcal{P}_1\|_{L^4(Q_R)}).$$

Employing the Sobolev embedding theorem and the Poincaré inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\nabla \mathcal{W}\|_{L^\infty(Q_r)} + \|\mathcal{P} - \mathcal{P}_1\|_{L^\infty(Q_r)} \leq C (\|\mathcal{W}\|_{W^{2,4}(Q_r)} + \|\mathcal{P} - \mathcal{P}_1\|_{W^{1,4}(Q_r)}) \\ & \leq C (\|\mathcal{W}\|_{W^{1,2}(Q_R)} + \|\mathcal{G}\|_{W^{1,4}(Q_R)} + \|\mathcal{P} - \mathcal{P}_1\|_{L^4(Q_R)}) \\ & \leq C (\|\nabla \mathcal{W}\|_{L^2(Q_R)} + \|\mathcal{P} - \mathcal{P}_1\|_{L^4(Q_R)} + \|\mathcal{G}\|_{L^\infty(Q_R)} + \|\nabla \mathcal{G}\|_{L^\infty(Q_R)}). \end{aligned} \tag{A.6}$$

In order to control the last term involving \mathcal{P} , by means of the interpolation inequality and (A.4), for any $\theta_1 \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{P} - \mathcal{P}_1\|_{L^4(Q_R)} & \leq \theta_1 \|\mathcal{P} - \mathcal{P}_1\|_{L^\infty(Q_R)} + C(\theta_1) \|\mathcal{P} - \mathcal{P}_1\|_{L^2(Q_R)} \\ & \leq \theta_1 \|\mathcal{P} - \mathcal{P}_1\|_{L^\infty(Q_R)} + C(\theta_1) \|\nabla \mathcal{W}\|_{L^2(Q_R)}. \end{aligned} \tag{A.7}$$

By (A.6) and A.7,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\nabla \mathcal{W}\|_{L^\infty(Q_r)} + \|\mathcal{P} - \mathcal{P}_1\|_{L^\infty(Q_r)} \\ & \leq C \theta_1 \|\mathcal{P} - \mathcal{P}_1\|_{L^\infty(Q_R)} + C (\|\nabla \mathcal{W}\|_{L^2(Q_R)} + \|\mathcal{G}\|_{L^\infty(Q_R)} + \|\nabla \mathcal{G}\|_{L^\infty(Q_R)}). \end{aligned}$$

Chosing θ_1 small enough such that $C\theta_1 \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and using Lemma 2.3 again, we have

$$\|\nabla \mathcal{W}\|_{L^\infty(Q_r)} + \|\mathcal{P} - \mathcal{P}_1\|_{L^\infty(Q_r)} \leq C (\|\nabla \mathcal{W}\|_{L^2(Q_R)} + \|\mathcal{G}\|_{L^\infty(Q_R)} + \|\nabla \mathcal{G}\|_{L^\infty(Q_R)}).$$

Taking $r = \frac{1}{2}$, $R = 1$, and rescaling back to (\mathbf{w}, q) , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(z')/2}(z'))} \\ & \leq C \left(\delta(z')^{-\frac{d}{2}} \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{L^2(\Omega_{\delta(z')}(z'))} + \|\mathbf{g}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(z')}(z'))} + \delta(z') \|\nabla \mathbf{g}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\delta(z')}(z'))} \right). \end{aligned}$$

By applying Theorem A.5 with $m = 1, 2, \dots$ and repeating the process above, we conclude that Proposition A.6 holds. \square

From Proposition A.6, the $W^{m+1,\infty}$ estimates of \mathbf{w} depends on the local energy estimates $\|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{L^2(\Omega_{\delta(z')}(z'))}$ and the pointwise estimates of $\nabla^j g$, $j = 0, 1, \dots, m+1$, in the narrow region. Indeed, we are able to demonstrate that the local energy estimates $\|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{L^2(\Omega_{\delta(z')}(z'))}$ are also closely related to the pointwise upper bound of $g(x)$ itself in the narrow region. To this end, we first prove that the global energy of \mathbf{w} is bounded in the domain $\Omega_{\frac{3}{2}R}$.

Lemma A.7. *Let (\mathbf{w}, q) be the solution to (A.2). If*

$$|g(x)| \leq C\delta(x')^{-1/2} \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R} \quad \text{and } \|\mathbf{w}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{2R} \setminus \Omega_R)} \leq C, \quad (\text{A.8})$$

then $\int_{\Omega_{\frac{3}{2}R}} |\nabla \mathbf{w}|^2 \leq C$.

Proof. For $1 \leq t < s \leq 2$, let η be a smooth function satisfying $\eta(x') = 1$ if $|x'| < tR$, $\eta(x') = 0$ if $|x'| > sR$, $0 \leq \eta(x') \leq 1$ if $tR \leq |x'| \leq sR$, and $|\nabla_{x'} \eta(x')| \leq \frac{C}{s-t}$. Suppose (\mathbf{w}, q) is the solution to (A.2), then it also verifies

$$-\mu \Delta \mathbf{w} + \nabla(q - q_{sR}) = 0, \quad (\text{A.9})$$

where $q_{sR} := \frac{1}{|\Omega_{sR}|} \int_{\Omega_{sR}} q$. Multiplying the first equation in (A.9) by $\eta^2 \mathbf{w}$ and integrating by parts, we get

$$\mu \int_{\Omega_{sR}} \eta^2 |\nabla \mathbf{w}|^2 \leq 2\mu \int_{\Omega_{sR}} |\nabla_{x'} \eta| |\eta \nabla \mathbf{w}| |\mathbf{w}| + \int_{\Omega_{sR}} |(q - q_{sR}) \nabla \cdot (\mathbf{w} \eta^2)|. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

By virtue of the Cauchy inequality and (A.8), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega_{sR}} |\nabla_{x'} \eta| |\eta \nabla \mathbf{w}| |\mathbf{w}| & \leq \frac{1}{8} \int_{\Omega_{sR}} \eta^2 |\nabla \mathbf{w}|^2 + \frac{C}{(s-t)^2} \int_{\Omega_{2R} \setminus \Omega_R} |\mathbf{w}|^2 \\ & \leq \frac{1}{8} \int_{\Omega_{sR}} \eta^2 |\nabla \mathbf{w}|^2 + \frac{C}{(s-t)^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.11})$$

It follows from (A.8) that

$$\int_{\Omega_{sR}} g(x)^2 \leq C \int_{\Omega_{sR}} \frac{1}{\delta(x')} \leq C. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

For the last term on the right-hand side of (A.10), by (A.4), (A.8), (A.12), and the Cauchy inequality, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega_{sR}} |(q - q_{sR}) \nabla \cdot (\mathbf{w} \eta^2)| & \leq \int_{\Omega_{sR}} |q - q_{sR}| |g| + |q - q_{sR}| |\mathbf{w}| |\nabla \eta| \\ & \leq \frac{\mu}{4} \int_{\Omega_{sR}} |\nabla \mathbf{w}|^2 + \frac{C}{(s-t)^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.13})$$

Substituting (A.11) and (A.13) into (A.10), we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega_{tR}} |\nabla \mathbf{w}|^2 \leq \frac{1}{3} \int_{\Omega_{sR}} |\nabla \mathbf{w}|^2 + \frac{C}{(s-t)^2}.$$

Hence, by Lemma 2.3 with $\rho = \frac{3}{2}$ and $R = 2$, we complete the proof. \square

The following Caccioppoli-type inequality is a key step to build an adapted version of iteration formula, used in [14]

Lemma A.8. (*Caccioppoli-type Inequality*) *Let (\mathbf{w}, q) be the solution to (A.2). Then for $z = (z', z_d) \in \Omega_R$ and for $0 < t < s \leq C\sqrt{\delta(z')}$, there holds*

$$\int_{\Omega_t(z')} |\nabla \mathbf{w}|^2 \leq \left(\frac{1}{4} + \frac{C\delta(z')^2}{(s-t)^2} \right) \int_{\Omega_s(z')} |\nabla \mathbf{w}|^2 + C \int_{\Omega_s(z')} |g|^2. \quad (\text{A.14})$$

Proof. Since $\mathbf{w} = 0$ on $\partial D_1 \cup \partial D_2$, employing Poincaré inequality, it is not difficult to deduce (see [7, (3.36) and (3.39)])

$$\int_{\Omega_s(z')} |\mathbf{w}|^2 \leq C\delta(z')^2 \int_{\Omega_s(z')} |\nabla \mathbf{w}|^2. \quad (\text{A.15})$$

For $0 < t < s \leq R$, let η 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 $|\nabla_{x'} \eta(x')| \leq \frac{2}{s-t}$. Let $q_{s;z'} = \frac{1}{|\Omega_s(z')|} \int_{\Omega_s(z')} q$. Multiplying the equation

$$-\mu \Delta \mathbf{w} + \nabla(q - q_{s;z'}) = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega_s(z')$$

by $\eta^2 \mathbf{w}$ and integrating by parts, we obtain

$$\mu \int_{\Omega_s(z')} \eta^2 |\nabla \mathbf{w}|^2 = -\mu \int_{\Omega_s(z')} (\mathbf{w} \nabla \mathbf{w}) \cdot \nabla \eta^2 + \int_{\Omega_s(z')} \nabla \cdot (\eta^2 \mathbf{w}) (q - q_{s;z'}). \quad (\text{A.16})$$

Next, we shall estimate the terms on the right-hand side of (A.16) one by one.

For the first term in (A.16), Cauchy's inequality gives

$$\int_{\Omega_s(z')} |\mathbf{w} \nabla \mathbf{w}| |\nabla \eta^2| \leq \frac{1}{8} \int_{\Omega_s(z')} |\nabla \mathbf{w}|^2 + \frac{C}{(s-t)^2} \int_{\Omega_s(z')} |\mathbf{w}|^2. \quad (\text{A.17})$$

For the last term, by using the second line of (A.2), (A.4), and Young's inequality, we have

$$\left| \int_{\Omega_s(z')} (q - q_{s;z'}) \nabla \cdot (\eta^2 \mathbf{w}) \right| \leq \frac{\mu}{8} \int_{\Omega_s(z')} |\nabla \mathbf{w}|^2 + C \int_{\Omega_s(z')} |\mathbf{w}|^2 |\nabla \eta|^2 + C \int_{\Omega_s(z')} |g|^2, \quad (\text{A.18})$$

where C depends only on d and μ . Combining (A.15) and (A.17)–(A.18) with (A.16) yields (A.14). \square

By virtue of Lemmas A.7, A.8, and the iteration technique, we can deduce the following lemma, which illustrates the relationship between the local estimates of $\|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{L^2(\Omega_{\delta(z')}(z'))}$ and the pointwise estimates of $g(x)$ in Ω_{2R} .

Lemma A.9. *Let $\mathbf{w} \in H^1(\Omega_{\frac{3}{2}R})$ be the solution to (A.2). If*

$$|g(x)| \leq C\delta(x')^\alpha, \quad \alpha \geq -\frac{1}{2}, \quad x \in \Omega_{2R}, \quad (\text{A.19})$$

then $\int_{\Omega_{\delta(z')}(z')} |\nabla \mathbf{w}|^2 \leq C\delta(z')^{d+2\alpha}$, for $z \in \Omega_R$.

Proof. Denote $E(t) := \int_{\Omega_t(z')} |\nabla \mathbf{w}|^2$, by (A.19), we have

$$\int_{\Omega_s(z')} |g|^2 \leq C s^{d-1} \delta(z')^{2\alpha+1}, \quad 0 < s \leq C\sqrt{\delta(z')}. \quad (\text{A.20})$$

By using (A.14) and (A.20), we derive

$$E(t) \leq \left(\frac{1}{4} + \left(\frac{c_0 \delta(z')}{s-t} \right)^2 \right) E(s) + C s^{d-1} \delta(z')^{2\alpha+1}, \quad (\text{A.21})$$

where c_0 is a constant and we fix it now. Let $k_0 = \left\lceil \frac{1}{8c_0 \sqrt{\delta(z')}} \right\rceil$ and $t_i = \delta(z') + 2c_0 i \delta(z')$, $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, k_0$. Then taking $s = t_{i+1}$ and $t = t_i$ in (A.21), we have

$$E(t_i) \leq \frac{1}{2} E(t_{i+1}) + C(i+1)^{d-1} \delta(z')^{d+2\alpha}.$$

After k_0 iterations, and using Lemma A.7, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} E(t_0) &\leq \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^{k_0} E(t_{k_0}) + C \delta(z')^{d+2\alpha} \sum_{i=0}^{k_0-1} \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^i (i+1)^{d-1} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^{k_0} \int_{\Omega_{\frac{3}{2}R}} |\nabla \mathbf{w}|^2 + C \delta(z')^{d+2\alpha} \leq C \delta(z')^{d+2\alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

for sufficiently small ε . This completes the proof. \square

Proof of Proposition A.2. Combining Lemma A.9 and Proposition A.6, we finish the proof of Proposition A.2. \square

DECLARATIONS

Data availability. Data sharing not applicable to this article as no data sets were generated or analyzed during the current study.

Financial interests. The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

Conflict of interest. The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Ammari; H. Kang; D. Kim; S. Yu, Quantitative estimates for stress concentration of the Stokes flow between adjacent circular cylinders, SIAM J. Math. Anal. 55 (2023), no. 4, 3755-3806.
- [2] H. Ammari; H. Kang; H. Lee; J. Lee; M. Lim, Optimal estimates for the electrical field in two dimensions, J. Math. Pures Appl. 88 (2007) 307-324.
- [3] H. Ammari; H. Kang; M. Lim, Gradient estimates for solutions to the conductivity problem, Math. Ann. 332 (2005), 277-286.
- [4] I. Babuška; B. Andersson; P. Smith; K. Levin, Damage analysis of fiber composites. I. Statistical analysis on fiber scale, Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg. 172 (1999), 27-77.
- [5] E. Bao; Y.Y. Li; B. Yin, Gradient estimates for the perfect conductivity problem, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 193 (2009), 195-226.
- [6] J.G. Bao; H.G. Li; Y.Y. Li, Gradient estimates for solutions of the Lamé system with partially infinite coefficients, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 215 (2015), 307-351.
- [7] J.G. Bao; H.G. Li; Y.Y. Li, Gradient estimates for solutions of the Lamé system with partially infinite coefficients in dimensions greater than two, Adv. Math. 305 (2017), 298-338.
- [8] E. Bonnetier; M. Vogelius, An elliptic regularity result for a composite medium with “touching” fibers of circular cross-section, SIAM J. Math. Anal. 31 (2000), no. 3, 651-677.
- [9] E. Bonnetier and F. Triki, Pointwise bounds on the gradient and the spectrum of the Neumann-Poincaré operator: the case of 2 discs, Multi-scale and high-contrast PDE: from modelling, to mathematical analysis, to inversion, 2012, pp. 81-91.
- [10] E. Bonnetier and F. Triki, On the spectrum of the Poincaré variational problem for two close-to-touching inclusions in 2D, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 209 (2013), no. 2, 541-567.

- [11] J. Choi and D. Kim, Estimates for Green functions of Stokes systems in two dimensional domains, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 471 (2019), no. 1-2, 102-125.
- [12] H.J. Dong and D. Kim, Weighted L^q -estimates for stationary Stokes system with partially BMO coefficients, *J. Differential Equations* 264 (2018), no. 7, 4603–4649.
- [13] H.J. Dong; H.G. Li; H.J. Teng; P.H. Zhang, Optimal higher derivative estimates for solutions of the Lamé system with closely spaced hard inclusions. arXiv:2411.15498. Preprint (2024).
- [14] H.J. Dong; H.G. Li; H.J. Teng; P.H. Zhang, Optimal higher derivative estimates for Stokes equations with closely spaced rigid inclusions. arXiv:2412.09135. Preprint (2024).
- [15] H.J. Dong; Y.Y. Li; Z.L. Yang, Optimal gradient estimates of solutions to the insulated conductivity problem in dimension greater than two. *J. Eur. Math. Soc.* 27 (2025), no. 8, 3275–3296.
- [16] D. D. Joseph, Interrogations of Direct Numerical Simulation of Solid-Liquid Flow, manuscript, <https://dept.aem.umn.edu/people/faculty/joseph/archive/docs/Interog-1.pdf> (2002).
- [17] G.P. Galdi, An introduction to the mathematical theory of the Navier-Stokes equations: steady-state problems, Springer, Cham (2011).
- [18] D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger. *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order*, volume 224. Springer, 2001.
- [19] M. Giaquinta. *Multiple integrals in the calculus of variations and nonlinear elliptic systems*. Princeton University Press: Princeton, NJ, 1983.
- [20] G.B. Jeffery, The motion of ellipsoidal particles immersed in a viscous fluid, *Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A*, 102 (1922), 161-179.
- [21] H. Kang, Quantitative analysis of field concentration in presence of closely located inclusions of high contrast. *ICM-International Congress of Mathematicians. Vol. 7. Sections 15-20*, 5680-5699, EMS Press, Berlin, [2023].
- [22] H. Kang; H. Lee; K. Yun, Optimal estimates and asymptotics for the stress concentration between closely located stiff inclusions, *Math. Ann.* 363 (2015), 1281-1306.
- [23] H. Kang; S. Yu, Quantitative characterization of stress concentration in the presence of closely spaced hard inclusions in two-dimensional linear elasticity, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 232 (2019) 121-196.
- [24] G. Kirchhoff, Über die Bewegung eines Rotationskörpers in einer Flüssigkeit, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 71 (1869), 237-281.
- [25] M. Kohr and W. L. Wendland, Variational approach for the Stokes and Navier-Stokes systems with non-smooth coefficients in Lipschitz domains on compact Riemannian manifolds, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 57 (2018), no. 6, Paper No. 165, 41 pp.
- [26] M. Kohr, S. E. Mikhailov, and W. L. Wendland, Layer potential theory for the anisotropic Stokes system with variable L^∞ symmetrically elliptic tensor coefficient, *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.*, 44 (2021), pp. 9641-9674
- [27] O.A. Ladyzhenskaya, *The mathematical theory of viscous incompressible flow*, Mathematics and its applications, vol 2, 2nd edn. Gordon and Breach, New York (1969).
- [28] B.Y. Li; H.G. Li; Y.L. Li, Second-order finite element methods for linear elasticity with closely spaced inclusions. Submitted.
- [29] B.Y. Li; H.G. Li; Z.Z. Yang, Convergent finite element methods for the perfect conductivity problem with close-to-touching inclusions. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.* 44 (2024), no. 6, 3280-3312.
- [30] H.G. Li, Lower bounds of gradient's blow-up for the Lamé system with partially infinite coefficients, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* 149 (2021), 98-134.
- [31] H.G. Li; L.J. Xu. Second derivative estimates and gradient asymptotics for closely located inclusions in linear elasticity. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* 57 (2025), no. 1, 753–788.
- [32] H.G. Li; L.J. Xu, Estimates for stress concentration between two adjacent rigid inclusions in two-dimensional Stokes flow. *Sci. China Math.* 68 (2025), no. 3, 577–614.
- [33] H.G. Li; L.J. Xu, Estimates for stress concentration between two adjacent rigid inclusions in Stokes flow. *J. Funct. Anal.* 286 (2024), no. 6, Paper No. 110313, 53 pp.
- [34] H.G. Li; J.H. Zhang; P.H. Zhang, Characterization of the stress concentration between two adjacent rigid particles in Stokes flow. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 64 (2025), no. 3, Paper No. 103, 33 pp.
- [35] Y.Y. Li; L. Nirenberg. Estimates for elliptic system from composite material. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 56 (2003), 892-925.
- [36] Y.Y. Li; M. Vogelius. Gradient estimates for solutions to divergence form elliptic equations with discontinuous coefficients. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* 153 (2000), 91-151.

- [37] Y.Y. Li; Z.L. Yang, Gradient estimates of solutions to the insulated conductivity problem in dimension greater than two, *Math. Ann.* 385 (2023), no. 3-4, 1775–1796.
- [38] Z.L. Li, K. Ito and M.-C. Lai, An augmented approach for Stokes equations with a discontinuous viscosity and singular forces, *Comput. & Fluids* 36 (2007), no.3, 622-635;
- [39] G. Stokes, On the effect of internal friction of fluids on the motion of pendulums, *Trans. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* 9 (1851), 8-85.
- [40] B. Weinkove, The insulated conductivity problem, effective gradient estimates and the maximum principle, *Math. Ann.* 385 (2023), no. 1-2, 1-16.

(H.J. Dong) DIVISION OF APPLIED MATHEMATICS, BROWN UNIVERSITY, 182 GEORGE STREET, PROVIDENCE, RI 02912, USA

Email address: Hongjie.Dong@brown.edu

(H.G. Li) SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, BEIJING NORMAL UNIVERSITY, LABORATORY OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPLEX SYSTEMS, MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, BEIJING 100875, CHINA.

Email address: hgli@bnu.edu.cn

(H.J. Teng) SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, BEIJING NORMAL UNIVERSITY, LABORATORY OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPLEX SYSTEMS, MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, BEIJING 100875, CHINA.

Email address: hjt2021@mail.bnu.edu.cn

(P.H. Zhang) SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, HENAN UNIVERSITY, KAIFENG 475004, CHINA.

Email address: phzhang@henu.edu.cn