



On some questions of topology for S^1 -valued fractional Sobolev spaces

Haïm Brezis, Petru Mironescu

► To cite this version:

Haïm Brezis, Petru Mironescu. On some questions of topology for S^1 -valued fractional Sobolev spaces. RACSAM. Real Academia de Ciencias. Serie A, Matemáticas - Revista de la Real Academia de Ciencias Exactas, Físicas y Naturales. Serie A, Matemáticas, 2001, 95 (1), pp.121-143. hal-00747695

HAL Id: hal-00747695

<https://hal.science/hal-00747695>

Submitted on 1 Nov 2012

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

ON SOME QUESTIONS OF TOPOLOGY FOR S^1 -VALUED FRACTIONAL SOBOLEV SPACES

HAIM BREZIS^{(1),(2)} AND PETRU MIRONESCU⁽³⁾

I. Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to describe the homotopy classes (i.e., path-connected components) of the space $W^{s,p}(\Omega; S^1)$. Here, $0 < s < \infty$, $1 < p < \infty$, Ω is a smooth, bounded, connected open set in \mathbb{R}^N and

$$W^{s,p}(\Omega; S^1) = \{u \in W^{s,p}(\Omega; S^1); |u| = 1 \text{ a.e.}\}.$$

Our main results are

Theorem 1. *If $sp < 2$, then $W^{s,p}(\Omega; S^1)$ is path-connected.*

Theorem 2. *If $sp \geq 2$, then $W^{s,p}(\Omega; S^1)$ and $C^0(\bar{\Omega}; S^1)$ have the same homotopy classes in the sense of [7]. More precisely:*

- a) *each $u \in W^{s,p}(\Omega; S^1)$ is $W^{s,p}$ -homotopic to some $v \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}; S^1)$;*
- b) *two maps $u, v \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}; S^1)$ are C^0 -homotopic if and only if they are $W^{s,p}$ -homotopic.*

Here a simple consequence of the above results

Corollary 1. *If $0 < s < \infty$, $1 < p < \infty$ and Ω is simply connected, then $W^{s,p}(\Omega; S^1)$ is path-connected.*

Indeed, when $sp < 2$ this is the content of Theorem 1. When $sp \geq 2$, we use a) of Theorem 2 to connect $u_1, u_2 \in W^{s,p}(\Omega; S^1)$ to $v_1, v_2 \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}; S^1)$; since Ω is simply connected, we may write $v_j = e^{i\varphi_j}$ for $\varphi_j \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}; \mathbb{R})$ and then we connect v_1 to v_2 via $e^{i[(1-t)\varphi_1 + t\varphi_2]}$.

When M is a compact connected manifold, the study of the topology of $W^{1,p}(\Omega; M)$ was initiated in Brezis - Li [7] (see also White [26] for some related questions). In particular, these authors proved Theorems 1 and 2 in the special case $s = 1$. The analysis of homotopy

Typeset by $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{M}\mathcal{S}$ -TEX

classes for an arbitrary manifold M and $s = 1$ was subsequently tackled by Hang - Lin [15]. The passage to $W^{s,p}$ introduces two additional difficulties:

- a) when s is not an integer, the $W^{s,p}$ norm is not “local”;
- b) when $s \geq 2$ (or more generally $s > 1 + \frac{1}{p}$), gluing two maps in $W^{s,p}$ does not yield a map in $W^{s,p}$.

In our proofs, we exploit in an essential way the fact that the target manifold is S^1 . (The case of a general target is widely open.) In particular, we use the existence of a lifting of $W^{s,p}$ unimodular maps when $s \geq 1$ and $sp \geq 2$ (see Bourgain - Brezis - Mironescu [4]). Another important tool is the following

Composition Theorem (Brezis - Mironescu [10]). *If $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R})$ has bounded derivatives and $s \geq 1$, then $\varphi \mapsto f \circ \varphi$ is continuous from $W^{s,p} \cap W^{1,sp}$ into $W^{s,p}$.*

Remark 1. A very elegant and straightforward proof of this Composition Theorem has been given by V.Maz'ya and T.Shaposhnikova [18].

A related question is the description, when $sp \geq 2$, of the homotopy classes of $W^{s,p}(\Omega; S^1)$ in terms of lifting. Here is a partial result

Theorem 3. *We have*

- a) *if $s \geq 1$, $N \geq 3$, and $2 \leq sp < N$, then*

$$[u]_{s,p} = \{ue^{i\varphi}; \varphi \in W^{s,p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}) \cap W^{1,sp}(\Omega; \mathbb{R})\};$$

- b) *if $sp \geq N$, then*

$$[u]_{s,p} = \{ue^{i\varphi}; \varphi \in W^{s,p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R})\}.$$

Theorem 3 is due to Rubinstein - Sternberg [21] in the special case where $s = 1$, $p = 2$ and Ω is the solid torus in \mathbb{R}^3 .

When $0 < s < 1$, $N \geq 3$ and $2 \leq sp < N$, there is no such simple description of $[u]_{s,p}$. For instance, using the “non-lifting” results in Bourgain - Brezis - Mironescu [4], it is easy to see that

$$[1]_{s,p} \supsetneq \{e^{i\varphi}; \varphi \in W^{s,p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R})\}.$$

Here is an example: if $N = 3$, $\Omega = B_1$, $0 < s < 1$, $1 < p < \infty$, $2 \leq sp < 3$, then

- a) $u(x) = e^{1/|x|^\alpha} \in [1]_{s,p}$;
 - b) there is no $\varphi \in W^{s,p}(B_1; \mathbb{R})$ such that $u = e^{i\varphi}$
- for α satisfying $\frac{3-sp}{p} \leq \alpha < \frac{3-sp}{sp}$.

However, we conjecture the following result

Conjecture 1. *Assume that $0 < s < 1$, $1 < p < \infty$, $N \geq 3$ and $2 \leq sp < N$. Then*

$$[u]_{s,p} = \overline{u\{e^{i\varphi}; \varphi \in W^{s,p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R})\}}^{W^{s,p}}.$$

We will prove below (see Corollary 2) that “half” of Conjecture 1 holds, namely

$$[u]_{s,p} \supset \overline{u\{e^{i\varphi}; \varphi \in W^{s,p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R})\}}^{W^{s,p}}.$$

In a different but related direction, we establish some partial results concerning the density of $C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}; S^1)$ into $W^{s,p}(\Omega; S^1)$.

Theorem 4. *We have, for $0 < s < \infty$, $1 < p < \infty$:*

- a) if $sp < 1$, then $C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}; S^1)$ is dense in $W^{s,p}(\Omega; S^1)$;*
- b) if $1 \leq sp < 2$, $N \geq 2$, then $C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}; S^1)$ is not dense in $W^{s,p}(\Omega; S^1)$;*
- c) if $sp \geq N$, then $C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}; S^1)$ is dense in $W^{s,p}(\Omega; S^1)$;*
- d) if $s \geq 1$ and $sp \geq 2$, then $C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}; S^1)$ is dense in $W^{s,p}(\Omega; S^1)$.*

There is only one missing case for which we make the following

Conjecture 2. *If $0 < s < 1$, $1 < p < \infty$, $N \geq 3$, $2 \leq sp < N$, then $C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}; S^1)$ is dense in $W^{s,p}(\Omega; S^1)$.*

This problem is open even when Ω is a ball in \mathbb{R}^3 . We will prove below the equivalence of Conjectures 1 and 2.

Parts of Theorem 4 were already known. Part a) is due to Escobedo [14]; so is part b), but in this case the idea goes back to Schoen - Uhlenbeck [24] (see also Bourgain - Brezis - Mironescu [5]). For $s = 1$, part c) is due to Schoen - Uhlenbeck [24]; their argument can be adapted to the general case (see, e.g., Brezis - Nirenberg [12] or Brezis - Li [7]). The only new result is part d). The proof relies heavily on the Composition Theorem and Theorems 2 and 3. We do not know any direct proof of d). We also mention that for $s = 1$ and $\Omega = B_1$, Theorem 4 was established by Bethuel - Zheng [3]. For a general compact connected manifold M and for $s = 1$, the question of density of $C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}; M)$ into $W^{1,p}(\Omega; M)$ was settled by Bethuel [1] and Hang - Lin [15].

Remark 2. In Theorems 2 and 4, one may replace Ω by a manifold with or without boundary. The statements are unchanged. However, the argument in the proof of Theorem 1 does not quite go through to the case of a manifold without boundary. Nevertheless, we make the following

Conjecture 3. *Let Ω be a manifold without boundary with $\dim \Omega \geq 2$. Then $W^{s,p}(\Omega; M)$ is path-connected for every $0 < s < \infty, 1 < p < \infty$ with $sp < 2$, and for every compact connected manifold M .*

Note that the condition $\dim \Omega \geq 2$ is necessary, since $W^{s,p}(S^1; S^1)$ is not path-connected when $sp \geq 1$.

Finally, we investigate the local path-connectedness of $W^{s,p}(\Omega; S^1)$. Our main result is

Theorem 5. *Let $0 < s < \infty, 1 < p < \infty$. Then $W^{s,p}(\Omega; S^1)$ is locally path-connected. Consequently, the homotopy classes coincide with the connected components and they are open and closed.*

The heart of the matter in the proof is the following

Claim. Let $0 < s < \infty, 1 < p < \infty$. Then there is some $\delta > 0$ such that, if $\|u - 1\|_{W^{s,p}} < \delta$, then u may be connected to 1 in $W^{s,p}$.

As a consequence of Theorem 5, we have

Corollary 2. *Let $0 < s < 1, 1 < p < \infty$. Then*

$$[u]_{s,p} \supset \overline{\{ue^{i\varphi}; \varphi \in W^{s,p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R})\}}^{W^{s,p}} = u \overline{\{e^{i\varphi}; \varphi \in W^{s,p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R})\}}^{W^{s,p}}.$$

Equality in Corollary 2 follows from the well-known fact that $W^{s,p} \cap L^\infty$ is an algebra. The inclusion is a consequence of the fact that, clearly, we have

$$[u]_{s,p} \supset \{ue^{i\varphi}; \varphi \in W^{s,p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R})\}$$

and of the closedness of the homotopy classes.

Another consequence of Theorem 5 is

Corollary 3. *Conjecture 1 \Leftrightarrow Conjecture 2.*

Proof. By Corollary 2, we have

$$[u]_{s,p} \supset u \overline{\{e^{i\varphi}; \varphi \in W^{s,p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R})\}}^{W^{s,p}}.$$

We prove that the reverse inclusion follows from Conjecture 1. By Proposition 1 a) below, we may take $u = 1$. Let $v \in [1]_{s,p}$. By Theorem 5, there is some $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\|v - w\|_{W^{s,p}} < \varepsilon \Rightarrow w \in [1]_{s,p}$. Let $(w_n) \subset C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}; S^1)$ be such that $w_n \rightarrow v$ in $W^{s,p}$

and $\|w_n - v\|_{W^{s,p}} < \varepsilon$. By Theorem 2 b), we obtain that w_n and 1 are homotopic in $C^0(\bar{\Omega}; S^1)$. Thus $w_n = e^{i\varphi_n}$ for some **globally** defined smooth φ_n . Hence

$$v \in \overline{\{e^{i\varphi}; \varphi \in W^{s,p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R})\}}^{W^{s,p}}.$$

Conversely, assume that Conjecture 2 holds. Let $u \in W^{s,p}(\Omega; S^1)$. By Theorem 2 a), there is some $w \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}; S^1)$ such that $w \in [u]_{s,p}$. By Proposition 1 b), we have $u\bar{w} \in [1]_{s,p}$. Thus $u\bar{w} \in \overline{\{e^{i\varphi}; \varphi \in W^{s,p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R})\}}^{W^{s,p}}$, so that clearly $u\bar{w} \in \overline{\{e^{i\varphi}; \varphi \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}; \mathbb{R})\}}^{W^{s,p}}$. Finally, $u \in \overline{\{we^{i\varphi}; \varphi \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}; \mathbb{R})\}}^{W^{s,p}}$, i.e. u may be approximated by smooth maps.

In the same vein, we raise the following

Open Problem 1. Let Ω be a manifold with or without boundary. Is $W^{s,p}(\Omega; M)$ locally path-connected for every s, p and every compact manifold M ?

The case $s = 1$ can be settled using the methods of Hang - Lin [15]. We will return to this question in a subsequent work; see Brezis - Mironescu [11].

The reader who is looking for more open problems may also consider the following

Open Problem 2. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a smooth bounded domain. Assume $0 < s < \infty$, $1 < p < \infty$ and $1 \leq sp < 2$ (this is the range where $C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}; S^1)$ is not dense in $W^{s,p}(\Omega; S^1)$). Set

$$\mathcal{R}_0 = \{u \in W^{s,p}(\Omega; S^1); u \text{ is smooth except a finite number of points}\}.$$

(Here, the number and location of singular points is left free). Is \mathcal{R}_0 dense in $W^{s,p}(\Omega; S^1)$?

Comment. \mathcal{R}_0 is known to be dense in $W^{s,p}(\Omega; S^1)$ in many cases, e.g.:

- a) $s = 1$ and $1 \leq p < 2$; see Bethuel-Zheng [3]
- b) $s = 1 - 1/p$ and $2 < p < 3$; see Bethuel [2]
- c) $s = 1/2$ and $p = 2$; see Rivière [20].

The paper is organized as follows

- I. Introduction
- II. Proof of Theorem 1
- III. Proof of Theorems 2 and 3
- IV. Proof of Theorem 4
- V. Proof of Theorem 5

Appendix A. An extension lemma

Appendix B. Good restrictions

Appendix C. Global lifting

Appendix D. Filling a hole - the fractional case

Appendix E. Slicing with norm control

II. Proof of Theorem 1

Case 1: $sp < 1$

When $sp < 1$, we have the following more general result

Theorem 6. *If $s > 0$, $1 < p < \infty$, $sp < 1$ and M is a compact manifold, then $W^{s,p}(\Omega; M)$ is path-connected.*

Proof. Fix some $a \in M$. For $u \in W^{s,p}(\Omega; M)$, let

$$\tilde{u} = \begin{cases} u, & \text{in } \Omega \\ a, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega \end{cases}.$$

Since $sp < 1$, we have $\tilde{u} \in W_{loc}^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N; M)$. Let $U(t, x) = \tilde{u}(x/(1-t))$, $0 \leq t < 1$, $x \in \Omega$ and $U(1, x) \equiv a$. Then clearly $U \in C([0, 1]; W^{s,p}(\Omega; M))$ and U connects u to the constant a (here we use only $sp < N$).

Case 2: $1 < sp < 2$, $N \geq 2$

In this case one could adapt the tools developed in Brezis - Li [7], but we prefer a more direct approach.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be such that the projection onto $\partial\Omega$ be well-defined and smooth in the region $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^N; \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) < 2\varepsilon\}$. Let $\omega = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega; \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) < \varepsilon\}$. We have $\partial\omega = \partial\Omega \cup \Lambda$, where $\Lambda = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega; \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) = \varepsilon\}$.

Since $1 < sp < 2$, we have $1/p < s < 1 + 1/p$; thus, for $u \in W^{s,p}$ we have $\text{tr } u \in W^{s-1/p,p}$. Let $u \in W^{s,p}(\Omega; S^1)$. Fix some $a \in S^1$ and define $v \in W^{s-1/p,p}(\partial\omega; S^1)$ by

$$v = \begin{cases} \text{tr } u, & \text{on } \partial\omega \\ a, & \text{on } \Lambda \end{cases}.$$

We use the following extension result. (The first result of this kind is due to Hardt - Kinderlehrer - Lin [16]; it corresponds to our lemma when $\sigma = 1 - 1/p$, $p < 2$.)

Lemma 1. *Let $0 < \sigma < 1$, $1 < p < \infty$, $\sigma p < 1$. Then any $v \in W^{\sigma,p}(\partial\omega; S^1)$ has an extension $w \in W^{\sigma+1/p,p}(\omega; S^1)$.*

The proof is given in Appendix A; see Lemma A.1. It relies heavily on the lifting results in Bourgain - Brezis - Mironescu [4].

Returning to the proof of Case 2, with w given by Lemma 1, set

$$\tilde{u} = \begin{cases} u, & \text{in } \Omega \\ w, & \text{in } \omega \\ a, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus (\Omega \cup \omega) \end{cases}.$$

Clearly, $\tilde{u} \in W_{loc}^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N; S^1)$ and \tilde{u} is constant outside some compact set. As in the proof of Theorem 6, we may use \tilde{u} to connect u to a , since once more we have $sp < N$.

Case 3: $sp = 1$, $N \geq 2$

The idea is the same as in the previous case; however, there is an additional difficulty, since in the limiting case $s = 1/p$ the trace theory is delicate - in particular, $\text{tr } W^{1/p,p} \neq L^p$ (unless $p = 1$). Instead of trace, we work with a notion of “good restriction” developed in Appendix B; when $s = 1/2$, $p = 2$, the space of functions in $H^{1/2}$ having 0 as good restriction on the boundary coincides with the space $H_{00}^{1/2}$ of Lions - Magenes [17] (see Theorem 11.7, p. 72).

Our aim is to prove that any $u \in W^{1/p,p}(\Omega; S^1)$ can be connected to a constant $a \in S^1$.

Step 1: we connect $u \in W^{1/p,p}(\Omega; S^1)$ to some $u_1 \in W^{1/p,p}(\Omega; S^1)$ having a good restriction on $\partial\Omega$

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be such that the projection Π onto $\partial\Omega$ be well-defined and smooth in the set $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^N; \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) < 2\varepsilon\}$. For $0 < \delta < \varepsilon$, set $\Sigma_\delta = \{x \in \Omega; \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) = \delta\}$. By Fubini, for a.e. $0 < \delta < \varepsilon$, we have

$$(1) \quad u|_{\Sigma_\delta} \in W^{1/p,p}(\Sigma_\delta) \text{ and } \int_{\Sigma_\delta} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{N+1}} dy ds_x < \infty.$$

By Lemma B.5, this implies that u has a good restriction on Σ_δ , and that $\text{Rest } u|_{\Sigma_\delta} = u|_{\Sigma_\delta}$ a.e. on Σ_δ .

Let any $0 < \delta < \varepsilon$ satisfying (1). For $0 < \lambda < \delta$, let Ψ_λ be the smooth inverse of $\Pi|_{\Sigma_\lambda} : \Sigma_\lambda \rightarrow \partial\Omega$. Let also $\Omega_\lambda = \{x \in \Omega; \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) > \lambda\}$. Consider a continuous family of diffeomorphisms $\Phi_t : \bar{\Omega} \rightarrow \bar{\Omega}_{t\delta}$, $0 \leq t \leq 1$, such that $\Phi_0 = \text{id}$ and $\Phi_t|_{\partial\Omega} = \Psi_{t\delta}$.

Then $t \mapsto u \circ \Phi_t$ is a homotopy in $W^{1/p,p}$. Moreover, if $u_t = u \circ \Phi_t$, then $u_0 = u$ and $u_1|_{\partial\Omega} = u|_{\Sigma_\delta} \circ \Psi_\delta|_{\partial\Omega}$. By (1), u_1 has a good restriction on $\partial\Omega$.

Step 2: we extend u_1 to \mathbb{R}^N

Let $\omega = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \bar{\Omega}; \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) < \varepsilon\}$. As in Case 2, we fix some $a \in S^1$ and set

$$v = \begin{cases} u_1, & \text{on } \partial\Omega \\ a, & \text{on } \Lambda \end{cases}.$$

Clearly, $v \in W^{1/p,p}(\partial\omega)$, so that $v \in W^{\sigma,p}(\partial\omega)$ for $0 < \sigma < 1/p$. We fix any $0 < \sigma < 1/p$. By Lemma 1, there is some $w \in W^{\sigma+1/p,p}(\omega; S^1)$ such that $w|_{\partial\omega} = v$. We define

$$\tilde{u}_1 = \begin{cases} u_1, & \text{in } \Omega \\ w, & \text{in } \omega \\ a, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus (\Omega \cup \omega) \end{cases}.$$

We claim that $\tilde{u}_1 \in W_{loc}^{1/p,p}(\mathbb{R}^N; S^1)$. Obviously, $\tilde{u} \in W_{loc}^{1/p,p}(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega)$. It remains to check that $\tilde{u}_1 \in W^{1/p,p}(\Omega \cup \omega)$. This is a consequence of

Lemma 2. *Let $0 < s < 1, 1 < p < \infty, sp \geq 1$ and $\rho > s$. Let $u_1 \in W^{s,p}(\Omega)$ and $w \in W^{\rho,p}(\omega)$. Assume that u_1 has a good restriction $\text{Rest } u_1|_{\partial\Omega}$ on $\partial\Omega$ and that $\text{tr } w|_{\partial\Omega} = \text{Rest } u_1|_{\partial\Omega}$. Then the map*

$$\begin{cases} u_1, & \text{in } \Omega \\ w, & \text{in } \omega \end{cases}$$

belongs to $W^{s,p}(\Omega \cup \omega)$.

Clearly, in the proof of Lemma 2 it suffices to consider the case of a flat boundary. When $\Omega = (-1, 1)^{N-1} \times (0, 1)$ and $\omega = (-1, 1)^{N-1} \times (-1, 0)$, the proof of Lemma 2 is presented in Appendix B; see Lemma B.4.

Returning to Case 3 and applying Lemma 2 with $s = 1/p$, $\rho = \sigma + 1/p$, we obtain that $\tilde{u}_1 \in W_{loc}^{1/p,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$. As in the two previous cases, this means that u_1 is $W^{1/p,p}$ -homotopic to a constant.

Case 4: $1 \leq sp < 2, N = 1$

In this case, Ω is an interval. Recall the following result proved in Bourgain - Brezis - Mironescu [4] (Theorem 1): if Ω is an interval and $sp \geq 1$, then for each $u \in W^{s,p}(\Omega; S^1)$ there is some $\varphi \in W^{s,p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$ such that $u = e^{i\varphi}$. Recall also that, when $sp \geq N$, then $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R})$ functions f with bounded derivatives operate on $W^{s,p}$; that is, the map $\varphi \mapsto f \circ \varphi$

is continuous from $W^{s,p}$ into itself (see, e.g., Peetre [19] for $sp > N$, Runst - Sickel [23], Corollary 2 and Remark 5 in Section 5.3.7 or Brezis - Mironescu [9] when $sp = N$; this is also a consequence of the Composition Theorem). By combining these two results, we find that the homotopy $t \mapsto e^{i(1-t)\varphi}$ connects $u = e^{i\varphi}$ to 1.

The proof of Theorem 1 is complete.

III. Proof of Theorems 2 and 3

We start with some useful remarks. For $u \in W^{s,p}(\Omega; S^1)$, let $[u]_{s,p}$ denote its homotopy class in $W^{s,p}$.

Proposition 1. *Let $0 < s < \infty$, $1 < p < \infty$. For $u, v \in W^{s,p}(\Omega; S^1)$, we have*

- a) $u[v]_{s,p} = [uv]_{s,p}$;
- b) $[u]_{s,p} = [v]_{s,p} \Leftrightarrow [u\bar{v}]_{s,p} = [1]_{s,p}$;
- c) $[u]_{s,p} [v]_{s,p} = [uv]_{s,p}$.

The proof relies on two well-known facts: $W^{s,p} \cap L^\infty$ is an algebra; moreover, if $u_n \rightarrow u$, $v_n \rightarrow v$ in $W^{s,p}$ and $\|u_n\|_{L^\infty} \leq C$, $\|v_n\|_{L^\infty} \leq C$, then $u_n v_n \rightarrow uv$ in $W^{s,p}$. Here is, for example, the proof of c) (using a)). Let first $u_1 \in [u]_{s,p}$, $v_1 \in [v]_{s,p}$. If U, V are homotopies connecting u_1 to u and v_1 to v , then UV connects $u_1 v_1$ to uv ; thus $[u]_{s,p} [v]_{s,p} \subset [uv]_{s,p}$. Conversely, if $w \in [uv]_{s,p}$, then $w \in u[v]_{s,p}$ (by a)), so that $w\bar{u} \in [v]_{s,p}$. Therefore, $w = u(w\bar{u}) \in [u]_{s,p} [v]_{s,p}$.

We next recall the degree theory for $W^{s,p}$ maps; see Brezis - Li - Mironescu - Nirenberg [8] for the general case, White [25] when $s = 1$ or Rubinstein - Sternberg [20] for the space $H^1(\Omega; S^1)$ and Ω the solid torus in \mathbb{R}^3 . Let $0 < s < \infty$, $1 < p < \infty$ be such that $sp \geq 2$. Let $u \in W^{s,p}(S^1 \times \Lambda; S^1)$, where Λ is some open connected set in \mathbb{R}^k . Clearly, for a.e. $\lambda \in \Lambda$, $u(\cdot, \lambda) \in W^{s,p}(S^1; S^1)$. For any such λ , $u(\cdot, \lambda)$ is continuous, so that it has a winding number (degree) $\deg(u(\cdot, \lambda))$. The main result in [8] asserts that, if $sp \geq 2$, then this degree is constant a.e. and stable under $W^{s,p}$ convergence.

In the particular case where $s \geq 1$, there is a formula

$$\deg(u(\cdot, \lambda)) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{S^1} u(x, \lambda) \wedge \frac{\partial u}{\partial \tau}(x, \lambda) ds_x,$$

where $u \wedge v = u_1 v_2 - u_2 v_1$. It then follows that, if $s \geq 1$ and $sp \geq 2$, we have

$$\deg(u|_{S^1 \times \Lambda}) = \int_{\Lambda} \int_{S^1} u(x, \lambda) \wedge \frac{\partial u}{\partial \tau}(x, \lambda) ds_x d\lambda.$$

Clearly, the above result extends to domains which are diffeomorphic to $S^1 \times \Lambda$. In the sequel, we are interested in the following particular case: let Γ be a simple closed smooth curve in Ω and, for small $\varepsilon > 0$, let Γ_ε be the ε -tubular neighborhood of Γ . We fix an orientation on Γ .

Let $\Phi : S^1 \times B_\varepsilon \rightarrow \Gamma_\varepsilon$ be a diffeomorphism such that $\Phi|_{S^1 \times \{0\}} : S^1 \times \{0\} \rightarrow \Gamma$ be an orientation preserving diffeomorphism; here B_ε is the ball of radius ε in \mathbb{R}^{N-1} . Then we may define $\deg(u|_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}) = \deg(u \circ \Phi|_{S^1 \times B_\varepsilon})$; this integer is stable under $W^{s,p}$ convergence.

We now prove b) of Theorem 2, which we restate as

Proposition 2. *Let $0 < s < \infty$, $1 < p < \infty$, $sp \geq 2$. Let $u, v \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}; S^1)$. Then $[u]_{s,p} = [v]_{s,p}$ if and only if u and v are C^0 -homotopic.*

Proof. Using Proposition 1, we may assume $v = 1$. Suppose first that $u \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}; S^1)$ and 1 are C^0 -homotopic. Then u and 1 are $W^{s,p}$ -homotopic. Indeed, when $s = 1$, this is proved in Brezis - Li [7], Proposition A.1; however, their proof works without modification for any s . We sketch an alternative proof: since u and 1 are C^0 -homotopic, there is some $\varphi \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}; \mathbb{R})$ such that $u = e^{i\varphi}$. Then $t \mapsto e^{i(1-t)\varphi}$ connects u to 1 in $W^{s,p}$.

Conversely, assume that the smooth map u is $W^{s,p}$ -homotopic to 1. By continuity of the degree, we then have $\deg(u|_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}) = 0$ for each Γ . Since u is smooth, we obtain

$$0 = \deg(u|_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}) = \deg(u|_\Gamma) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_\Gamma u \wedge \frac{\partial u}{\partial \tau} ds.$$

Thus the closed form $X = u \wedge Du$ has the property that $\int_\Gamma X \cdot \tau ds = 0$ for any simple closed smooth curve Γ . By the general form of the Poincaré lemma, there is some $\varphi \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}; \mathbb{R})$ such that $X = D\varphi$. One may easily check that $u = e^{i(\varphi+C)}$ for some constant C . Then $t \mapsto e^{i(1-t)(\varphi+C)}$ connects u to 1 in $C^0(\bar{\Omega}; S^1)$.

We now turn to the proof of the remaining assertions in Theorems 2 and 3.

Case 1: $sp \geq N$, $N \geq 2$

Step 1: each $u \in W^{s,p}(\Omega; S^1)$ can be connected to a smooth map $v \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}; S^1)$

This is proved in Brezis - Li [7], Proposition A.2, for $s = 1$ and $p \geq N$; their arguments apply to any s and any p such that $sp \geq N$. The main idea originates in the paper Schoen - Uhlenbeck [23]; see also Brezis - Nirenberg [12], [13].

Step 2: we have $[u]_{s,p} = \{ue^{i\varphi}; \varphi \in W^{s,p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R})\}$

Let $\varphi \in W^{s,p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$. Then $t \mapsto ue^{i(1-t)\varphi}$ connects $ue^{i\varphi}$ to u in $W^{s,p}$. (Recall that, if $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R})$ has bounded derivatives and $sp \geq N$, then the map $\varphi \mapsto f \circ \varphi$ is continuous

from $W^{s,p}$ into itself.) This proves “ \supset ”. To prove the reverse inclusion, by Proposition 1, it suffices to show that $[1]_{s,p} \subset \{e^{i\varphi}; \varphi \in W^{s,p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R})\}$.

Let $v \in [1]_{s,p}$. For each $x \in \Omega$, let $B_x \subset \Omega$ be a ball containing x . We recall the following lifting result from Bourgain - Brezis - Mironescu [4] (Theorem 2): if U is simply connected in \mathbb{R}^N and $sp \geq N$, then for each $w \in W^{s,p}(U; S^1)$ there is some $\psi \in W^{s,p}(U; \mathbb{R})$ such that $w = e^{i\psi}$. Thus, for each $x \in \Omega$ there is some $\varphi_x \in W^{s,p}(B_x; \mathbb{R})$ such that $v|_{B_x} = e^{i\varphi_x}$. Note that, in $B_x \cap B_y$, we have $\varphi_x - \varphi_y \in W^{s,p}(B_x \cap B_y; 2\pi\mathbb{Z})$. Therefore, $\varphi_x - \varphi_y \in VMO(B_x \cap B_y; 2\pi\mathbb{Z})$, since $sp \geq N$. It then follows that $\varphi_x - \varphi_y$ is constant a.e. on $B_x \cap B_y$; see Brezis - Nirenberg [12], Section I.5.

By a standard continuation argument, we may thus define a (multi-valued) argument φ for v in the following way: fix some $x_0 \in \Omega$. For any $x \in \Omega$, let γ be a simple smooth path from x_0 to x . Then, for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, there is a unique function $\varphi^\gamma \in W^{s,p}(\gamma_\varepsilon; \mathbb{R})$ such that $v|_{\gamma_\varepsilon} = e^{i\varphi^\gamma}$ and $\varphi^\gamma|_{B_\varepsilon(x_0)} = \varphi_{x_0}|_{B_\varepsilon(x_0)}$; here, γ_ε is the ε -tubular neighborhood of γ . We then set

$$\varphi|_{B_\varepsilon(x)} = \varphi^\gamma|_{B_\varepsilon(x)}.$$

We actually claim that φ is single-valued. This follows from

Lemma 3. *Assume that $0 < s < \infty$, $1 < p < \infty$, $sp \geq N$, $N \geq 2$. If $w \in W^{s,p}(S^1 \times B_1; S^1)$ is such that $\deg(w|_{S^1 \times B_1}) = 0$, then there is some $\psi \in W^{s,p}(S^1 \times B_1)$ such that $w = e^{i\psi}$.*

Here, B_1 is the unit ball in \mathbb{R}^{N-1} . The proof of Lemma 3 is presented in Appendix C; see Lemma C.1.

Returning to the claim that φ is single-valued, we have that $\deg(v|_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}) = 0$ for each Γ , since $v \in [1]_{s,p}$. By Lemma 3, a standard argument implies that φ is single-valued.

The proof of Theorems 2 and 3 when $sp \geq N$ is complete.

Case 2: $s \geq 1$, $1 < p < \infty$, $N \geq 3$, $2 \leq sp < N$

Step 1: we have $[u]_{s,p} = \{ue^{i\varphi}; \varphi \in W^{s,p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}) \cap W^{1,sp}(\Omega; \mathbb{R})\}$

For “ \supset ”, we use the Composition Theorem mentioned in the Introduction, which implies that $t \mapsto ue^{i(1-t)\varphi}$ connects $ue^{i\varphi}$ to u in $W^{s,p}$.

For “ \subset ” it suffices to prove that $[1]_{s,p} \subset \{e^{i\varphi}; \varphi \in W^{s,p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}) \cap W^{1,sp}(\Omega; \mathbb{R})\}$. We proceed as in Case 1, Step 2. Let $v \in [1]_{s,p}$. The corresponding lifting result we use is the following (see Bourgain - Brezis - Mironescu [4], Lemma 4): if $s \geq 1$, $sp \geq 2$ and U is simply connected in \mathbb{R}^N , then for each $w \in W^{s,p}(U; S^1)$ there is some $\psi \in W^{s,p}(U; \mathbb{R}) \cap W^{1,sp}(U; \mathbb{R})$ such that $w = e^{i\psi}$. As in Case 1, for each x there is some $\varphi_x \in W^{s,p}(B_x; \mathbb{R}) \cap W^{1,sp}(B_x; \mathbb{R})$ such that $v|_{B_x} = e^{i\varphi_x}$. Since $\varphi_x - \varphi_y \in W^{1,1}(B_x \cap B_y; 2\pi\mathbb{Z})$,

we find that $\varphi_x - \varphi_y$ is constant ae. on $B_x \cap B_y$ (see [4], Theorem B.1.). These two ingredients allow the construction of a multi-valued phase $\varphi \in W^{s,p} \cap W^{1,sp}$ for v . To prove that φ is actually single-valued, we rely on

Lemma 4. *Assume that $s \geq 1$, $1 < p < \infty$, $N \geq 3$, $2 \leq sp < N$. If $w \in W^{s,p}(S^1 \times B_1; S^1)$ is such that $\deg(w|_{S^1 \times B_1}) = 0$, then there is some $\psi \in W^{s,p}(S^1 \times B_1; \mathbb{R}) \cap W^{1,sp}(S^1 \times B_1; \mathbb{R})$ such that $v = e^{i\psi}$.*

The proof of Lemma 4 is given in Appendix C; see Lemma C.2.

The proof of Step 1 is complete.

Step 2: assume $s \geq 1$, $1 < p < \infty$, $sp \geq 2$; then, for each $u \in W^{s,p}(\Omega; S^1)$, there is some $v \in W^{s,p}(\Omega; S^1) \cap C^\infty(\Omega; S^1)$ such that $v \in [u]_{s,p}$

Consider the form $X = u \wedge Du$. Then $X \in W^{s-1,p}(\Omega) \cap L^{sp}(\Omega)$ (see Bourgain - Brezis - Mironescu [4], Lemmas D.1 and D.2). Let $\varphi \in W^{s,p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}) \cap W^{1,sp}(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$ be any solution of $\Delta\varphi = \operatorname{div} X$ in Ω . By the Composition Theorem, we then have $e^{-i\varphi} \in W^{s,p}(\Omega; S^1)$, and thus $v = ue^{-i\varphi} \in W^{s,p}(\Omega; S^1)$. We claim that $v \in C^\infty(\Omega; S^1)$. Indeed, let B be any ball in Ω . Since $s \geq 1$ and $sp \geq 2$, there is some $\psi \in W^{s,p}(B; \mathbb{R}) \cap W^{1,sp}(B; \mathbb{R})$ such that $u|_B = e^{i\psi}$. It then follows that $X|_B = D\psi$. Thus $\Delta\varphi = \Delta\psi$ in B , i.e., $\psi - \varphi$ is harmonic in B . Since in B we have $v = ue^{-i\varphi} = e^{i(\psi-\varphi)}$, we obtain that $v \in C^\infty(B)$, so that the claim follows.

Using Step 1 and the equality $v = ue^{-i\varphi}$, we obtain that $v \in [u]_{s,p}$.

Step 3: for each $u \in W^{s,p}(\Omega; S^1)$, there is some $w \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}; S^1)$ such that $w \in [u]_{s,p}$

In view of Step 2, it suffices to consider the case where $u \in W^{s,p}(\Omega; S^1) \cap C^\infty(\Omega; S^1)$. We use the same homotopy as in Step 1, Case 3, in the proof of Theorem 1: $t \mapsto u \circ \Phi_t$, where Φ_t is a continuous family of diffeomorphisms $\Phi_t : \bar{\Omega} \rightarrow \bar{\Omega}_{t\delta}$ such that $\Phi_0 = \operatorname{id}$. Clearly, $v = u \circ \Phi_1 \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}; S^1)$.

The conclusions of Theorems 2 and 3 when $s \geq 1$, $1 < p < \infty$, $N \geq 3$, $2 \leq sp < N$ follow from Proposition 2 and Steps 1 and 3.

We now complete the proof of Theorem 2 with

Case 3: $0 < s < 1$, $1 < p < \infty$, $N \geq 3$, $2 \leq sp < N$

In this case, all we have to prove is that, for each $u \in W^{s,p}(\Omega; S^1)$, there is some $v \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}; S^1)$ such that $v \in [u]_{s,p}$. The ideas we use in the proof are essentially due to Brezis - Li [7] (see §1.3, “Filling” a hole).

We may assume that u is defined in a neighborhood \mathcal{O} of $\bar{\Omega}$; this is done by extending u by reflections across the boundary of Ω - the extended map is still in $W^{s,p}$ since $0 < s < 1$. We next define a good covering of Ω : let $\varepsilon > 0$ be small enough; for $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$, we set

$$\mathcal{C}_N^x = \bigcup \{x + \varepsilon l + (0, \varepsilon)^N; l \in \mathbb{Z}^N \text{ and } x + \varepsilon l + (0, \varepsilon)^N \subset \mathcal{O}\}.$$

Define also $\mathcal{C}_j^x, j = 1, \dots, N-1$, by backward induction : \mathcal{C}_j^x is the union of faces of cubes in \mathcal{C}_{j+1}^x .

By Fubini, for a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$, we have $u|_{\mathcal{C}_j^x} \in W^{s,p}, j = 1, \dots, N-1$, in the following sense: since $1/p < s < 1$, we have $\text{tr } u|_{\mathcal{C}_{N-1}^x} \in W^{s-1/p,p}$ for all x . However, for a.e. x , we have the better property $\text{tr } u|_{\mathcal{C}_{N-1}^x} = u|_{\mathcal{C}_{N-1}^x} \in W^{s,p}$. For any such x , we have $\text{tr } \left(u|_{\mathcal{C}_{N-1}^x} \right) |_{\mathcal{C}_{N-2}^x} \in W^{s-1/p,p}$, but once more for a.e. such x we have the better property $\text{tr } \left(u|_{\mathcal{C}_{N-1}^x} \right) |_{\mathcal{C}_{N-2}^x} = u|_{\mathcal{C}_{N-2}^x} \in W^{s,p}$, and so on. (See Appendix E for a detailed discussion).

We fix any x having the above property and we drop from now on the superscript x .

Step 1: we connect u to some smoother map u_1

Let $k = [sp]$, so that $2 \leq k \leq N-1$. Since $u|_{\mathcal{C}_k} \in W^{s,p}$ and $sp \geq k$, there is a neighborhood ω of \mathcal{C}_k in \mathcal{C}_{k+1} and an extension $\tilde{u} \in W^{s+1/p,p}(\omega; S^1)$ of $u|_{\mathcal{C}_k}$. This extension is first obtained in each cube $C \subset \mathcal{C}_{k+1}$ starting from $u|_{\partial C}$ (see Brezis - Nirenberg [12], Appendix 3, for the existence of such an extension). We next glue together all these extensions to obtain \tilde{u} ; \tilde{u} belongs to $W^{s+1/p,p}$ since $1/p < s + 1/p < 1 + 1/p$. Moreover, the explicit construction in [12] yields some $\tilde{u} \in C^\infty(\omega \setminus \mathcal{C}_k)$. We next extend \tilde{u} to \mathcal{C}_{k+1} in the following way: for each $C \subset \mathcal{C}_{k+1}$, let Σ_C be a convex smooth hypersurface in $C \cap \omega$. Since Σ_C is k -dimensional and $k \geq 2$, $\tilde{u}|_{\Sigma_C}$ may be extended smoothly in the interior of Σ_C as an S^1 -valued map (here, we use the fact that $\pi_k(S^1) = 0$). Let \tilde{u}_C be such an extension. Then the map

$$v = \begin{cases} \tilde{u}, & \text{outside the } \Sigma_C \text{'s} \\ \tilde{u}_C, & \text{inside } \Sigma_C \end{cases}$$

belongs to $W^{s+1/p,p}(\mathcal{C}_{k+1})$. To summarize, we have found some $v \in W^{s+1/p,p}(\mathcal{C}_{k+1}; S^1)$ such that $v|_{\mathcal{C}_k} = u|_{\mathcal{C}_k}$.

Pick any $s < s_1 < \min\{s + 1/p, 1\}$ and let p_1 be such that $s_1 p_1 = sp + 1$ (note that $1 < p_1 < \infty$). By Gagliardo - Nirenberg (see, e.g., Runst [22], Lemma 1, p.329 or Brezis - Mironescu [10], Corollary 3), we have $W^{s+1/p,p} \cap L^\infty \subset W^{s_1,p_1}$. Thus $v \in W^{s_1,p_1}(\mathcal{C}_{k+1})$.

We complete the construction of the smoother map u_1 in the following way: if $k = N-1$, then v is defined in \mathcal{C}_N and we set $u_1 = v$; if $k < N-1$, we extend v to \mathcal{C}_N with the help of

Lemma 5. *Let $0 < s_1 < \infty, 1 < p_1 < \infty, 1 < s_1 p_1 < N, [s_1 p_1] \leq j < N$. Then any $v \in W^{s_1,p_1}(\mathcal{C}_j; S^1)$ has an extension $u_1 \in W^{s_1,p_1}(\mathcal{C}_N; S^1)$ such that $u_1|_{\mathcal{C}_l} \in W^{s_1,p_1}$ for $l = j, \dots, N-1$.*

When $s_1 = 1$, Lemma 5 is due to Brezis - Li [7], Section 1.3, ‘‘Filling’’ a hole; for the general case, see Lemma D.3 in Appendix D.

We summarize what we have done so far: if $k = [sp]$, then there are some s_1, p_1 such that $s < s_1 < 1$, $1 < p_1 < \infty$, $s_1 p_1 = sp + 1$ and a map $u_1 \in W^{s_1, p_1}(\mathcal{C}_N; S^1)$ such that $u_1|_{\mathcal{C}_j} \in W^{s_1, p_1}$, $j = k, \dots, N-1$ and $u_1|_{\mathcal{C}_k} = u|_{\mathcal{C}_k}$. By Gagliardo - Nirenberg and the Sobolev embeddings, we have in particular $u_1|_{\mathcal{C}_j} \in W^{s, p}$, $j = k, \dots, N-1$. Finally, u and u_1 are $W^{s, p}$ -homotopic by

Lemma 6. *Let $0 < s < 1$, $1 < p < \infty$, $1 < sp < N$, $[sp] \leq j < N$. If $u|_{\mathcal{C}_l} \in W^{s, p}$, $u_1|_{\mathcal{C}_l} \in W^{s, p}$, $l = j, \dots, N$, and $u|_{\mathcal{C}_j} = u_1|_{\mathcal{C}_j}$, then u and u_1 are $W^{s, p}$ -homotopic.*

The case $s = 1$ is due to Brezis - Li [7]; the proof of Lemma 6 in the general case is presented in the Appendix D- see Lemma D.4.

Step 2: induction on $[sp]$

If $k = [sp] = N - 1$, we have connected in the previous step u to $u_1 \in W^{s_1, p_1}(\mathcal{C}_N; S^1)$, where $s < s_1 < 1$, $1 < p_1 < \infty$ and $s_1 p_1 = sp + 1 \geq N$. Using Case 1 (i.e., $sp \geq N$) from this section, u_1 may be connected in W^{s_1, p_1} (and thus in $W^{s, p}$, by Gagliardo - Nirenberg and the Sobolev embeddings) to some $v \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}; S^1)$. This case is complete.

If $k = [sp] = N - 2$, then $[s_1 p_1] = N - 1$. By the previous case, u_1 can be connected in W^{s_1, p_1} (and thus in $W^{s, p}$) to some $v \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}; S^1)$. Clearly, the general case follows by induction.

The proof of Theorems 2 and 3 is complete.

We end this section with two simple consequences of the above proofs; these results supplement the description of the homotopy classes.

Corollary 4. *Let $0 < s < \infty$, $1 < p < \infty$, $sp \geq 2$, $N \geq 2$. For $u, v \in W^{s, p}(\Omega; S^1)$, we have $[u]_{s, p} = [v]_{s, p} \Leftrightarrow \deg(u|_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}) = \deg(v|_{\Gamma_\varepsilon})$ for every Γ .*

Corollary 5. *Let $0 < s_1, s_2 < \infty$, $1 < p_1, p_2 < \infty$, $s_1 p_1 \geq 2$, $s_2 p_2 \geq 2$, $N \geq 2$. For $u, v \in W^{s_1, p_1}(\Omega; S^1) \cap W^{s_2, p_2}(\Omega; S^1)$, we have $[u]_{s_1, p_1} = [v]_{s_1, p_1} \Leftrightarrow [u]_{s_2, p_2} = [v]_{s_2, p_2}$.*

Clearly, Corollary 5 follows from Corollary 4. As for Corollary 4, let $u_1, v_1 \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}; S^1)$ be such that $[u_1]_{s, p} = [u]_{s, p}$ and $[v_1]_{s, p} = [v]_{s, p}$. Then, by Theorem 2 b),

$$(2) \quad [u]_{s, p} = [v]_{s, p} \Leftrightarrow [u_1]_{s, p} = [v_1]_{s, p} \Leftrightarrow [u_1]_{C^0} = [v_1]_{C^0} \Leftrightarrow \deg(u_1|_\Gamma) = \deg(v_1|_\Gamma), \quad \forall \Gamma.$$

Moreover, we have

$$(3) \quad \deg(u_1|_\Gamma) = \deg(v_1|_\Gamma) \Leftrightarrow \deg(u_1|_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}) = \deg(v_1|_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}) \Leftrightarrow \deg(u|_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}) = \deg(v|_{\Gamma_\varepsilon}), \quad \forall \Gamma,$$

by standard properties of the degree.

We obtain Corollary 4 by combining (2) and (3).

IV. Proof of Theorem 4

According to the discussion in the Introduction, we only have to prove part d). Let $s \geq 1$, $1 < p < \infty$, $N \geq 3$, $2 \leq sp < N$. Let $u \in W^{s,p}(\Omega; S^1)$. By Theorem 2 a), there is some $v \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}; S^1)$ such that $v \in [u]_{s,p}$. By Theorem 3 b), there is some $\varphi \in W^{s,p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}) \cap W^{1,sp}(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$ such that $v = ue^{i\varphi}$. Let $(\varphi_n) \subset C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}; \mathbb{R})$ be such that $\varphi_n \rightarrow \varphi$ in $W^{s,p} \cap W^{1,sp}$. By the Composition Theorem, the sequence of smooth maps $(ve^{-i\varphi_n})$ converges to u in $W^{s,p}(\Omega; S^1)$.

The proof of Theorem 4 is complete.

V. Proof of Theorem 5

We start this section with a discussion on the stability of the degree: recall that if $sp \geq 2$, then $\deg(u|_{\Gamma_\varepsilon})$ is well-defined and stable under $W^{s,p}$ convergence. However, while the condition $sp \geq 2$ is optimal for the existence of the degree (see Brezis - Li - Mironescu - Nirenberg [8], Remark 1), the stability of the degree of $W^{s,p}$ maps holds under (the weaker assumption of) W^{s_1,p_1} convergence, where $s_1 p_1 \geq 1$. This property and Corollary 4 suggest the following generalization of Theorem 5

Theorem 7. *Let $0 < s < \infty$, $1 < p < \infty$, $0 < s_1 < s$, $1 < p_1 < \infty$, $1 \leq s_1 p_1 \leq sp$. Then for each $u \in W^{s,p}(\Omega; S^1)$ there is some $\delta > 0$ such that*

$$\{v \in W^{s,p}(\Omega; S^1); \|v - u\|_{W^{s_1,p_1}} < \delta\} \subset [u]_{s,p}.$$

Note that $W^{s,p}(\Omega; S^1) \subset W^{s_1,p_1}(\Omega; S^1)$, by Gagliardo - Nirenberg and the Sobolev embeddings, so that Theorem 5 follows from Theorem 7 when $sp \geq 2$ (when $sp < 2$, there is nothing to prove, by Theorem 1).

Proof of Theorem 7

Step 1: reduction to special values of s, s_1, p, p_1

We claim that it suffices to prove Theorem 7 when

$$(4) \quad 0 < s_1 < s < 1 - (N - 1)/p, \quad 1 < p < \infty, \quad 1 < p_1 < \infty, \quad sp = 2, \quad s_1 p_1 = 1, \quad N \geq 2.$$

Indeed, assume Theorem 7 proved for all the values of s, s_1, p, p_1 satisfying (4). Let $0 < s_0 < \infty$, $1 < p_0 < \infty$, $N \geq 2$ be such that $s_0 p_0 \geq 2$ (when $N = 1$ or $s_0 p_0 < 2$, there is nothing to prove). Let $u \in W^{s_0,p_0}$ and let s, s_1, p, p_1 satisfy (4) and the additional

condition $s < s_0$. By Gagliardo - Nirenberg and the Sobolev embeddings, there is some $\delta_0 > 0$ such that

$$(5) \quad M = \{v \in W^{s_0, p_0}(\Omega; S^1); \|v - u\|_{W^{s_0, p_0}} < \delta_0\} \subset \{v \in W^{s, p}(\Omega; S^1); \|v - u\|_{W^{s_1, p_1}} < \delta\}.$$

By the special case of Theorem 7, we have $v \in M \Rightarrow v \in [u]_{s, p}$. By Corollary 5, we obtain $M \subset [u]_{s_0, p_0}$, i.e., $[u]_{s_0, p_0}$ is open.

In conclusion, it suffices to prove Theorem 7 under assumption (4). Moreover, by Proposition 1 we may assume $u = 1$.

Step 2: construction of a good covering

We fix a small neighborhood \mathcal{O} of $\bar{\Omega}$. By reflections across the boundary of Ω , we may associate to each $u \in W^{s, p}(\Omega; S^1)$ an extension $\tilde{u} \in W^{s, p}(\mathcal{O}; S^1)$ satisfying

$$(6) \quad \|\tilde{u} - \tilde{v}\|_{W^{s, p}(\mathcal{O})} \leq C_1 \|u - v\|_{W^{s, p}(\Omega)}$$

and

$$(7) \quad \|\tilde{u} - \tilde{v}\|_{W^{s_1, p_1}(\mathcal{O})} \leq C_1 \|u - v\|_{W^{s_1, p_1}(\Omega)}.$$

In this section, C_1, C_2, \dots denote constants independent of u, v, \dots

We fix some small $\varepsilon > 0$. By Lemma E.2 in Appendix E, for each $v \in W^{s, p}(\Omega; S^1)$ there is some $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ (depending possibly on v) such that the covering \mathcal{C}_N^x has the properties

$$(8) \quad v|_{\mathcal{C}_j^x} \in W^{s, p}, \quad j = 1, \dots, N - 1$$

and

$$(9) \quad \|v|_{\mathcal{C}_1^x} - 1\|_{W^{s_1, p_1}(\mathcal{C}_1^x)} \leq C_2 \|v - 1\|_{W^{s_1, p_1}(\mathcal{O})} \leq C_2 C_1 \|v - 1\|_{W^{s_1, p_1}(\Omega)}$$

(the last inequality follows from (7)).

While x may depend on v , the covering \mathcal{C}_N^x has two features independent of v :

$$(10) \quad \text{the number of squares in } \mathcal{C}_2^x \text{ has a uniform upper bound } K;$$

$$(11) \quad \begin{aligned} &\text{if } C^1, C^2 \text{ are two squares in } \mathcal{C}_2^x, \text{ there is a path of squares in } \mathcal{C}_2^x \\ &\text{each one having an edge in common with its neighbours, connecting} \\ &C^1 \text{ to } C^2. \end{aligned}$$

Step 3: choice of δ

We rely on

Lemma 7. *Let $C = (0, \varepsilon)^2$ and $0 < s_1 < 1$, $1 < p_1 < \infty$, $s_1 p_1 = 1$. Then for each $\delta_1 > 0$ there is some $\delta_2 > 0$ such that every map $v \in W^{s_1, p_1}(\partial C; S^1)$ satisfying*

$$(12) \quad \|v - 1\|_{W^{s_1, p_1}(\partial C)} < \delta_2$$

has a lifting $\varphi \in W^{s_1, p_1}(\partial C; \mathbb{R})$ such that

$$(13) \quad \|\varphi\|_{W^{s_1, p_1}(\partial C)} < \delta_1.$$

Clearly, in Lemma 7, C may be replaced by the unit disc. For the unit disc, the proof of Lemma 7 is given in Appendix C; see Lemma C.3.

In particular, if (12) holds, then we have

$$(14) \quad \|\varphi\|_{L^1(\partial C)} < C_3 \delta_1$$

for some C_3 independent of the δ 's.

We now take δ_1 such that

$$(15) \quad \delta_1 < \pi \varepsilon / C_3.$$

With δ_2 provided by Lemma 7, we choose

$$(16) \quad \delta = \min \{\delta_2 / C_0, \delta_2 / C_1 C_2\}.$$

Step 4: construction of a global lifting for $v|_{\mathcal{C}_1^x}$

Let $v \in W^{s, p}(\Omega; S^1)$ satisfy $\|v - 1\|_{W^{s_1, p_1}} < \delta$. Since $\delta \leq \delta_2 / C_1 C_2$, (9) implies that the conclusion of Lemma 7 holds for $v|_{\partial C}$ and every square C in \mathcal{C}_2^x . Thus, for every $C \in \mathcal{C}_2^x$, $v|_{\partial C}$ has a lifting φ_C satisfying (14) and $\varphi_C \in W^{s_1, p_1}(\partial C)$.

We claim that $\varphi_C \in W^{s, p}(\partial C)$. The statement being local, it suffices to prove that $\varphi_C \in W^{s, p}(L)$, where L is the union of three edges in ∂C . Since L is Lipschitz homeomorphic with an interval, by Theorem 1 in [4] there is some $\psi \in W^{s, p}(L)$ such that $v = e^{i\psi}$ in L (here we use $0 < s < 1$ and $sp = 2 \geq 1$). In L , we have $\psi - \varphi_C \in (W^{s, p} + W^{s_1, p_1})(L; 2\pi\mathbb{Z})$; thus $\psi - \varphi_C$ is constant a.e. in L (see [4], Remark B.3), so that the claim follows.

Since $sp > 1$ and $v|_{\mathcal{C}_1^x} \in W^{s, p}$, $\varphi_C \in W^{s, p}$, we may redefine $v|_{\mathcal{C}_1^x}$ and φ_C on null sets in order to have continuous functions. We claim that the function $\varphi(y) = \varphi_C(y)$, if $y \in C$ is well-defined on \mathcal{C}_1^x (and thus continuous and $W^{s, p}$). By (11), it suffices to prove that, if

C^1, C^2 are squares in \mathcal{C}_2^x having the edge \mathcal{E} in common, then $\varphi_{C^1} = \varphi_{C^2}$ on \mathcal{E} . Clearly, on \mathcal{E} we have $\varphi_{C^2} = \varphi_{C^1} + 2l\pi$ for some $l \in \mathbb{Z}$. Thus

$$\|\varphi_{C^1} + 2l\pi\|_{L^1(\mathcal{E})} = \|\varphi_{C^2}\|_{L^1(\mathcal{E})} < C_3\delta_1,$$

by (14). It follows that

$$(17) \quad 2|l|\pi\varepsilon = \|2l\pi\|_{L^1(\mathcal{E})} \leq \|\varphi_{C^1}\|_{L^1(\mathcal{E})} + C_3\delta_1 < 2C_3\delta_1,$$

which implies $l = 0$ by (15) and (16).

In conclusion, $v|_{\mathcal{C}_1^x}$ has a global lifting $\varphi \in W^{s,p}(\mathcal{C}_1^x; \mathbb{R})$.

Step 5: construction of a good extension w of $v|_{\mathcal{C}_1^x}$

Let $\varphi_2 \in W^{s+1/p,p}(\mathcal{C}_2^x; \mathbb{R})$ be an extension of φ , $\varphi_3 \in W^{s+2/p,p}(\mathcal{C}_3^x; \mathbb{R})$ an extension of φ_2 , and so on; let $\varphi_N \in W^{s+(N-1)/p,p}(\mathcal{C}_N^x; \mathbb{R})$ be the final extension. Note that these extensions exist since $s < 1 + (N-1)/p$, so that trace theory applies. We set $w = e^{i\varphi_N} \in W^{s+(N-1)/p,p}(\mathcal{C}_N^x; S^1)$. Since $(s + (N-1)/p) \cdot p = N + 1 > N$, we obtain by Theorem 3 that $w \in [1]_{s+(N-1)/p,p}$. By Corollary 5, we also have $w \in [1]_{s,p}$.

We complete the proof of Theorem 7 by proving

Step 6: $w \in [v]_{s,p}$

We rely on the following variant of Lemma 6

Lemma 8. *Let $0 < s < 1$, $1 < p < \infty$, $1 < sp < N$, $[sp] \leq j < N$. Let $v, w \in W^{s,p}(\mathcal{C}_N; S^1)$ be such that $v|_{\mathcal{C}_l} \in W^{s,p}$, $w|_{\mathcal{C}_l} \in W^{s,p}$, $l = j, \dots, N-1$. Assume that $v|_{\mathcal{C}_j}$ and $w|_{\mathcal{C}_j}$ are $W^{s,p}$ -homotopic. Then v and w are $W^{s,p}$ -homotopic.*

The proof of Lemma 8 is given Appendix D; see Lemma D.5.

When $N \geq 3$, we are going to apply Lemma 8 with $j = 2$. In order to prove that $v|_{\mathcal{C}_2}$ and $w|_{\mathcal{C}_2}$ are $W^{s,p}$ -homotopic, it suffices to find, for each $C \in \mathcal{C}_2$, a homotopy U_C from $v|_C$ to $w|_C$ preserving the boundary condition on ∂C ; we next glue together these homotopies (this works since $0 < s < 1$). We construct U_C using the lifting: since $sp = 2 = \dim C$ and C is simply connected, by Theorem 2 in [4] there is some $\psi \in W^{s,p}(C; \mathbb{R})$ such that $v = e^{i\psi}$ in C . By taking traces, we find that $v|_{\partial C} = e^{i\text{tr } \psi} = e^{i\varphi_C}$; thus $\text{tr } \psi - \varphi_C \in (W^{s-1/p,p} + W^{s,p})(\partial C; 2\pi\mathbb{Z})$. Therefore, $\text{tr } \psi - \varphi_C$ is constant a.e., by Remark B.3 in [4]. We may assume that $\text{tr } \psi = \varphi_C = \text{tr } \varphi_2$. Then $t \mapsto e^{i((1-t)\psi + t\varphi_2)}$ is the desired homotopy U_C .

When $N = 2$, the above argument proves directly (i.e., without the help of Lemma 8) that $w \in [v]_{s,p}$.

The proof of Theorem 7 is complete.

Appendix A. An extension lemma

In this appendix, we investigate, in a special case, the question whether a map in $W^{\sigma,p}(\partial\omega; S^1)$ admits an extension in $W^{\sigma+1/p,p}(\omega; S^1)$.

Lemma A.1. *Let $0 < \sigma < 1$, $1 < p < \infty$, $\sigma p < 1$, $N \geq 2$. Let ω be a smooth bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^N . Then every $v \in W^{\sigma,p}(\partial\omega; S^1)$ has an extension $w \in W^{\sigma+1/p,p}(\omega; S^1)$.*

Proof. We distinguish two cases: $\sigma \leq 1 - 1/p$ and $\sigma > 1 - 1/p$.

Case $\sigma \leq 1 - 1/p$: since $\sigma p < 1$, v may be lifted in $W^{\sigma,p}$ (see Bourgain - Brezis - Mironescu [4]), i.e. there is some $\psi \in W^{\sigma,p}(\partial\omega; \mathbb{R})$ such that $v = e^{i\psi}$. Let $\varphi \in W^{\sigma+1/p,p}(\omega; \mathbb{R})$ be an extension of ψ . Then $w = e^{i\varphi} \in W^{\sigma+1/p,p}(\omega; S^1)$ (since $\sigma + 1/p \leq 1$ and $x \mapsto e^{ix}$ is Lipchitz). Clearly, w has all the required properties.

Case $\sigma > 1 - 1/p$: the argument is similar, but somewhat more involved. The proof in [4] actually yields a lifting which is better than $W^{\sigma,p}$; more specifically, this lifting ψ belongs to $W^{t\sigma,p/t}$ for $0 < t \leq 1$, see Remark 2, p.41, in the above reference. On the other hand, since $\sigma > 1 - 1/p$, we have $t = p/(\sigma p + 1) < 1$. For this choice of t , we obtain that v has a lifting $\psi \in W^{\sigma,p} \cap W^{1-1/(\sigma p + 1), \sigma p + 1}$. This ψ has an extension $\varphi \in W^{\sigma+1/p,p} \cap W^{1, \sigma p + 1}$. By the Composition Theorem stated in the Introduction, the map $w = e^{i\varphi}$ belongs to $W^{\sigma+1/p,p}(\omega; S^1)$. Clearly, we have $\text{tr } w = v$.

Remark A.1. The special case $p < 2$ and $\sigma = 1 - 1/p$ was originally treated by Hardt - Kinderlehrer - Lin [16] via a totally different method. Their argument extends to the case $p < 2$ and $\sigma p < 1$, but does not seem to apply when $p \geq 2$.

Appendix B. Good restrictions

In this appendix, we describe a natural substitute for the trace theory when $s = 1/p$; it is known that the standard trace theory is not defined in this limiting case.

For simplicity, we consider mainly the case of a flat boundary. However, we state Lemma B.5 (used in the proof of Theorem 1) for a general domain. We start by introducing some

Notations: let $Q = (0, 1)^{N-1}$, $\Omega_+ = Q \times (0, 1)$, $\Omega_- = Q \times (-1, 0)$, $\Omega = \Omega_+ \cup \Omega_- = Q \times (-1, 1)$. If v is a function defined on Q , we set $\tilde{v}(x', t) = v(x)$ for $(x', t) \in \Omega$.

Lemma B.1. *Let $0 < s < 1$, $1 < p < \infty$. Then for $u \in W^{s,p}(\Omega_+)$ and for any function v defined on Q , the following assertions are equivalent:*

a) $v \in W^{s,p}(Q)$ and

$$(B.1) \quad I = \int_{\Omega_+} \frac{|u(x) - \tilde{v}(x)|^p}{x_N^{sp}} dx < \infty;$$

- b) the map $w_1 = \begin{cases} u, & \text{in } \Omega_+ \\ \tilde{v}, & \text{in } \Omega_- \end{cases}$ belongs to $W^{s,p}(\Omega)$;
- c) the map $w_2 = \begin{cases} u - \tilde{v}, & \text{in } \Omega_+ \\ 0, & \text{in } \Omega_- \end{cases}$ belongs to $W^{s,p}(\Omega)$.

Proof. Recall that, if U is a smooth or cube-like domain, then an equivalent (semi-) norm on $W^{s,p}(U)$ is given by

$$(B.2) \quad f \mapsto \left(\sum_{j=1}^N \int_0^\infty \int_{\{x \in U; x+te_j \in U\}} \frac{|f(x+te_j) - f(x)|^p}{t^{sp+1}} dx dt \right)^{1/p}$$

(see, e.g., Triebel [25]).

Clearly, both b) and c) imply that $v \in W^{s,p}(Q)$. Conversely, for $v \in W^{s,p}(Q)$ we have to prove the equivalence of (B.1), b) and c). We consider the norm given by (B.2). Taking into account the fact that w_1, w_2 belong to $W^{s,p}$ in Ω_+ and Ω_- , we see that

$$(B.3) \quad w_1 \in W^{s,p}(\Omega) \Leftrightarrow J = \int_{\Omega_+} \int_{-1}^0 \frac{|u(x) - \tilde{v}(x)|^p}{(x_N - t)^{sp+1}} dt dx < \infty$$

and

$$(B.4) \quad w_2 \in W^{s,p}(\Omega) \Leftrightarrow J < \infty.$$

The lemma follows from the obvious inequality

$$\frac{1 - 2^{-sp}}{sp} I \leq J \leq \frac{1}{sp} I.$$

We now assume in addition that $sp \geq 1$ and derive the following

Corollary B.1. *Let $0 < s < 1$, $1 < p < \infty$ be such that $sp \geq 1$. Then, for every $u \in W^{s,p}(\Omega_+)$ we have*

- a) for each $0 \leq t_0 < 1$, there is at most one function v defined on Q such that the maps

$$w_1^{t_0} = \begin{cases} u, & \text{in } Q \times (t_0, 1) \\ \tilde{v}, & \text{in } Q \times (-1, t_0) \end{cases}$$

and

$$w_2^{t_0} = \begin{cases} u - \tilde{v}, & \text{in } Q \times (t_0, 1) \\ 0, & \text{in } Q \times (-1, t_0) \end{cases}$$

belong to $W^{s,p}(\Omega)$;

b) for a.e. $0 \leq t_0 < 1$, the function $v = u(\cdot, t_0)$ has the property that $w_1^{t_0}, w_2^{t_0} \in W^{s,p}(\Omega)$.

(As usual, the uniqueness of v is understood a.e.)

The above corollary suggests the following

Definition: let $0 < s < 1$, $1 < p < \infty$, $sp \geq 1$, $0 \leq t_0 < 1$. Let $u \in W^{s,p}(\Omega_+)$ and let v be a function defined on Q . Then v is the downward good restriction of u to $\{x_N = t_0\}$ if $w_1^{t_0}, w_2^{t_0} \in W^{s,p}(\Omega)$; we then write $v = \text{Rest } u|_{x_N=t_0}^-$. Similarly, for $0 < t_0 < 1$ we may define an upward good restriction $\text{Rest } u|_{x_N=t_0}^+ = v$ as the unique function v defined on Q satisfying the two equivalent conditions

$$\text{a) } W_1^{t_0} = \begin{cases} \tilde{v}, & \text{in } Q \times (t_0, 1) \\ u, & \text{in } Q \times (0, t_0) \end{cases} \in W^{s,p}(\Omega_+)$$

and

$$\text{b) } W_2^{t_0} = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{in } Q \times (t_0, 1) \\ u - \tilde{v}, & \text{in } Q \times (0, t_0) \end{cases} \in W^{s,p}(\Omega_+).$$

If v is both an upward and a downward good restriction, we call it a good restriction and we write $v = \text{Rest } u|_{x_N=t_0}$.

Corollary B.2. Let $0 < s < 1$, $1 < p < \infty$, $sp \geq 1$. Let $u \in W^{s,p}(\Omega_+)$. Then, for a.e. $0 < t_0 < 1$, we have $\text{Rest } u|_{x_N=t_0} = u(\cdot, t_0)$.

Remark B.1. If $sp > 1$, then functions $u \in W^{s,p}(\Omega_+)$ have traces for **all** $0 \leq t_0 \leq 1$. However, these traces need not be good restrictions. Here is an example: For $N = 2$, one may prove that the map $x \mapsto (x - 1/2e_1)/|x - 1/2e_1|$ belongs to $W^{s,p}(\Omega)$ if $0 < s < 1$, $1 < p < \infty$, $sp < 2$. However, if $sp > 1$, its trace

$$\text{tr } u|_{x_2=0} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } x_1 > 1/2 \\ -1, & \text{if } x_1 < 1/2 \end{cases}$$

does not belong to $W^{s,p}(0, 1)$, so that it is not a good restriction.

Remark B.2. In the limiting case $s = 1/p$, functions in $W^{s,p}$ do not have traces. However, they do have good restrictions a.e.

Here is yet another simple consequence of Lemma B.1

Corollary B.3. Let $0 < s < 1$, $1 < p < \infty$, $sp \geq 1$. Let $u_{\pm} \in W^{s,p}(\Omega_{\pm})$ be such that $\text{Rest } u_+|_{x_N=0}^- = \text{Rest } u_-|_{x_N=0}^+$.

Then the map $w = \begin{cases} u_+, & \text{in } \Omega_+ \\ u_-, & \text{in } \Omega_- \end{cases}$ belongs to $W^{s,p}$.

The following results explain the connections between good restrictions and traces.

Lemma B.2. *Let $0 < s < 1$, $1 < p < \infty$, $sp > 1$. Let $u \in W^{s,p}(\Omega_+)$. Assume that there exists $v = \text{Rest } u|_{x_N=0}^-$. Then $v = \text{tr } u|_{x_N=0}$.*

Proof. Let $w = \begin{cases} u - \tilde{v}, & \text{in } \Omega_+ \\ 0, & \text{in } \Omega_- \end{cases}$. By Lemma B.1, we have $w \in W^{s,p}(\Omega)$. By trace theory and continuity of the trace, we have $0 = \text{tr } w|_{x_N=0}$, so that $\text{tr } u|_{x_N=0} = v$.

Lemma B.3. *Let $0 < s < 1$, $1 < p < \infty$, $sp \geq 1$. Let $u \in W^{s+1/p,p}(\Omega_+)$. Then, considered as a $W^{s,p}$ function, u has a good downward restriction to $\{x_N = 0\}$ which coincides with $\text{tr } u|_{x_N=0}$.*

Proof. Let $v = \text{tr } u|_{x_N=0}$. Then $v \in W^{s,p}(Q)$, by the trace theory. By Lemma B.1, it remains to prove that

$$(B.5) \quad \int_{\Omega_+} \frac{|u(x) - \tilde{v}(x)|^p}{x_N^{sp}} dx < \infty.$$

Assume first that $s + 1/p = 1$. Then (B.5) follows from the well-known Hardy inequality

$$(B.6) \quad \int_Q \int_0^1 \frac{|u(x', t) - u(x', 0)|^p}{t^p} dt dx \leq C \|Du\|_{L^p}^p, \quad \forall u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega_+).$$

Consider now the case where $s + 1/p \neq 1$. Let $\sigma = s + 1/p$. We are going to prove that

$$(B.7) \quad \int_{\Omega_+} \frac{|u(x) - \tilde{v}(x)|^p}{x_N^{sp}} dx \leq C \|u\|_{W^{\sigma,p}}^p$$

for some convenient equivalent (semi-) norm on $W^{\sigma,p}$. It is useful to consider the norm

$$(B.8) \quad f \mapsto \left(\sum_{j=1}^N \int_0^\infty \int_{\{x \in U; x+te_j \in U, x+2te_j \in U\}} \frac{|f(x+2te_j) - 2f(x+te_j) + f(x)|^p}{t^{\sigma p+1}} dx dt \right)^{1/p}$$

(see, e.g., Triebel [24]).

For any $x' \in Q$ such that $u_{x'} = u(x', \cdot) \in W^{\sigma,p}(0, 1)$, the map

$$f_{x'}(t) = \begin{cases} u(x', t), & \text{if } t > 0 \\ v(x'), & \text{if } t < 0 \end{cases}$$

belongs to $W^{\sigma,p}(-1,1)$, by standard trace theory. Moreover, for any such x' we have

$$(B.9) \quad \|f_{x'}\|_{W^{\sigma,p}(-1,1)}^p \leq C \|u_{x'}\|_{W^{\sigma,p}(0,1)}^p,$$

i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\infty \int_{\{h \in (-1,1); h+t \in (-1,1), h+2t \in (-1,1)\}} \frac{|f_{x'}(h+2t) - 2f_{x'}(h+t) + f_{x'}(h)|^p}{t^{\sigma p+1}} dh dt \leq \\ & C \int_0^\infty \int_{\{h \in (0,1); h+t \in (0,1), h+2t \in (0,1)\}} \frac{|u_{x'}(h+2t) - 2u_{x'}(h+t) + u_{x'}(h)|^p}{t^{\sigma p+1}} dh dt. \end{aligned}$$

In particular,

$$(B.10) \quad I = \int_0^{1/2} \int_{-2t}^{-t} \frac{|f_{x'}(h+2t) - 2f_{x'}(h+t) + f_{x'}(h)|^p}{t^{\sigma p+1}} dh dt \leq C \|u_{x'}\|_{W^{\sigma,p}}^p.$$

Since

$$(B.11) \quad I \geq C \int_0^{1/3} \frac{|u(x',t) - v(x')|^p}{t^{\sigma p}} dt = C \int_0^{1/3} \frac{|u(x',t) - v(x')|^p}{t^{sp+1}} dt,$$

we find that

$$(B.12) \quad \int_0^{1/3} \frac{|u(x',t) - v(x')|^p}{t^{sp+1}} dt \leq C \|u_{x'}\|_{W^{\sigma,p}}^p.$$

On the other hand, we clearly have

$$(B.13) \quad \int_{1/3}^1 \frac{|u(x',t) - v(x')|^p}{t^{sp+1}} dt \leq C \|u_{x'}\|_{L^p}^p + C |v(x')|^p.$$

By combining (B.12), (B.13) and integrating with respect to x' , we obtain (B.7). The proof of Lemma B.3 is complete.

A simple consequence of Lemma B.3 is the following

Lemma B.4. *Let $0 < s < 1$, $1 < p < \infty$, $sp \geq 1$ and $\rho > s$. Let $u_1 \in W^{s,p}(\Omega_+)$ and $u_2 \in W^{\rho,p}(\Omega_-)$. Assume that u_1 has a good downward restriction $v = \text{Rest } u_1|_{x_N=0}^-$ and that $v = \text{tr } u_2|_{x_N=0}$. Then the map*

$$w = \begin{cases} u_1, & \text{in } \Omega_+ \\ u_2, & \text{in } \Omega_- \end{cases}$$

belongs to $W^{s,p}(\Omega)$.

Proof. Let $u_3 \in W^{s+1/p,p}(\Omega_-)$ be an extension of v . Then $w = w_1 + w_2$, where

$$w_1 = \begin{cases} u_1, & \text{in } \Omega_+ \\ u_3, & \text{in } \Omega_- \end{cases}$$

and

$$w_2 = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{in } \Omega_+ \\ u_2 - u_3, & \text{in } \Omega_- \end{cases}.$$

By Lemma B.3 and the assumption $v = \text{Rest } u_1|_{x_N=0}^-$, we have $\text{Rest } u_1|_{x_N=0}^- = \text{Rest } u_3|_{x_N=0}^+$. By Corollary B.3, we find that $w_1 \in W^{s,p}(\Omega)$. It remains to prove that $w_2 \in W^{s,p}(\Omega)$. Let $\sigma = \min\{\rho, s + 1/p, 1\}$. Then $w_2 \in W^{\sigma,p}(\Omega)$, by standard trace theory. Thus $w_2 \in W^{s,p}(\Omega)$.

We conclude this section by stating the following precised form of Corollary B.1, b) in the case of a general boundary. We use the same notations as in the proof of Theorem 1, Case 4.

Lemma B.5. *Let $u \in W^{1/p,p}(\Omega)$. Then*

a) for a.e. $0 < \delta < \varepsilon$ we have

$$(B.14) \quad u|_{\Sigma_\delta} \in W^{1/p,p}(\Sigma_\delta) \text{ and } \int_{\Sigma_\delta} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{N+1}} dy ds_x < \infty;$$

b) for any such δ , u has a good restriction to Σ_δ which coincides (a.e. on Σ_δ) with $u|_{\Sigma_\delta}$.

Appendix C. Global lifting

In this appendix, we investigate the existence of a global lifting in some domains with non-trivial topology.

Lemma C.1. *Let $0 < s < \infty$, $1 < p < \infty$, $sp \geq N$, $N \geq 2$. Let $u \in W^{s,p}(S^1 \times B_1; S^1)$ be such that $\deg(u|_{S^1 \times B_1}) = 0$. Then there is some $\varphi \in W^{s,p}(S^1 \times B_1; S^1)$ such that $u = e^{i\varphi}$.*

Here, B_1 is the unit ball in \mathbb{R}^{N-1} .

Proof. Let $v : \mathbb{R} \times B_1 \rightarrow S^1$, $v(t, x) = u(e^{it}, x)$. Then $v \in W_{loc}^{s,p}(\mathbb{R} \times B_1; S^1)$, where “loc” refers only to the variable t . By Theorem 2 in Bourgain - Brezis - Mironescu [4], there is some $\psi \in W_{loc}^{s,p}(\mathbb{R} \times B_1; \mathbb{R})$ such that $v = e^{i\psi}$. We claim that ψ is 2π -periodic in the

variable t . Indeed, for a.e. $x \in B_1$, we have $u \in W^{s,p}(S^1 \times \{x\}; S^1)$ and $\deg(u|_{S^1 \times \{x\}}) = 0$. In particular, for any such x the map $u|_{S^1 \times \{x\}}$ has a continuous lifting η_x . On the other hand, for a.e. $x \in B_1$ we have $\psi_x = \psi(\cdot, x) \in W_{loc}^{s,p}(\mathbb{R} \times \{x\}; \mathbb{R})$. Thus, with $\lambda_x(t) = \eta_x(e^{it})$, we find that for a.e. $x \in B_1$ the function $\psi_x - \lambda_x$ is continuous and $2\pi\mathbb{Z}$ -valued; therefore it is a constant. Since λ_x is 2π -periodic, so is ψ_x for a.e. $x \in B_1$. We obtain that ψ is 2π -periodic in the variable t . Thus the map $\varphi : S^1 \times B_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\varphi(e^{it}, x) = \psi(t, x)$ is well-defined and belongs to $W^{s,p}(S^1 \times B_1; \mathbb{R})$. Moreover, we clearly have $u = e^{i\varphi}$.

In the same vein, we have

Lemma C.2. *Let $s \geq 1$, $1 < p < \infty$, $N \geq 3$, $2 \leq sp < N$. Let $u \in W^{s,p}(S^1 \times B_1; S^1)$ be such that $\deg(u|_{S^1 \times B_1}) = 0$. Then there is some $\varphi \in W^{s,p}(S^1 \times B_1; \mathbb{R}) \cap W^{1,sp}(S^1 \times B_1; \mathbb{R})$ such that $u = e^{i\varphi}$.*

The proof is similar to that of Lemma C.1; one has to use Lemma 4 in [4] instead of Theorem 2 in [4].

Lemma C.3. *Let $1 < p < \infty$ and $\delta_1 > 0$. Then there is some $\delta_2 > 0$ such that every $v \in W^{1/p,p}(S^1; S^1)$ satisfying $\|v - 1\|_{W^{1/p,p}(S^1)} < \delta_2$ has a global lifting $\varphi \in W^{1/p,p}(S^1; \mathbb{R})$ such that $\|\varphi\|_{W^{1/p,p}(S^1)} < \delta_1$.*

Proof. Recall that if I is an interval, then every $w \in W^{1/p,p}(I; S^1)$ has a lifting $\psi \in W^{1/p,p}(I; \mathbb{R})$ (see Bourgain - Brezis - Mironescu [4], Theorem 1). Moreover, this lifting may be chosen to be (locally) continuous with respect to w , i.e. for every $w_0 \in W^{1/p,p}(I; S^1)$ there is some $\delta_0 > 0$ such that in the set

$$\{w; \|w - w_0\|_{W^{1/p,p}(I; S^1)} < \delta_0\}$$

there is a lifting $w \mapsto \psi$ continuous for the $W^{1/p,p}$ norm. (This assertion can be established using the same argument as in Step 7 of the proof of Theorem 4 in Brezis - Nirenberg [12]; it can also be derived from the explicit construction of ψ in the proof of Theorem 1 in [4]; see also Boutet de Monvel-Berthier - Georgescu - Purice [6] when $p = 2$).

Let $I = [-2\pi, 2\pi]$. To each $v \in W^{1/p,p}(S^1; S^1)$ we associate the map $w \in W^{1/p,p}(I; S^1)$, $w(t) = v(e^{it})$. By the above considerations, for every $\delta_3 > 0$ there is some $\delta_4 > 0$ such that, if $\|v - 1\|_{W^{1/p,p}(S^1)} < \delta_4$, then w has a lifting ψ such that $\|\psi\|_{W^{1/p,p}(I)} < \delta_3$. We claim that ψ is 2π -periodic if δ_3 is small enough. Indeed, the function $\xi(t) = \psi(t - 2\pi) - \psi(t)$ belongs to $W^{1/p,p}([0, 2\pi]; 2\pi\mathbb{Z})$, so that ξ is constant a.e. (see [4], Theorem B.1). Since $\|\xi\|_{L^1} \leq \|\psi\|_{L^1} < C\delta_3$, we have $\xi = 0$ (i.e. ψ is 2π -periodic) if $C\delta_3 < 2\pi$.

Thus, for δ_3 small enough, the map $\varphi(e^{it}) = \psi(t)$ is well-defined, belongs to $W^{1/p,p}$ and satisfies $\|\varphi\|_{W^{1/p,p}(S^1)} < \delta_1$ and $u = e^{i\varphi}$.

Appendix D. Filling a hole - the fractional case

We adapt to fractional Sobolev spaces the technique of Brezis - Li [7], Section 1.3.

The first two results are preparations for the proofs of Lemmas 5,6 and 8 (see Lemmas D.3, D.4 and D.5 below).

Lemma D.1. *Let $0 < s < 1$, $1 < p < \infty$, $1 < sp < N$. Let $C = (-1, 1)^N$ and $u \in W^{s,p}(\partial C)$. Then $\tilde{u} \in W^{s,p}(C)$; here, $\tilde{u}(x) = u(x/|x|)$ and $|\cdot|$ is the L^∞ norm in \mathbb{R}^N . Moreover, the map $u \mapsto \tilde{u}$ is continuous from $W^{s,p}(\partial C)$ into $W^{s,p}(C)$.*

Proof. Clearly, we have $\|\tilde{u}\|_{L^p(C)} \leq C_0 \|u\|_{L^p(\partial C)}$. Thus it suffices to prove, for the Gagliardo semi-norms in $W^{s,p}$, the inequality

$$(D.1) \quad \|\tilde{u}\|_{W^{s,p}(C)}^p \leq C_1 (\|u\|_{W^{s,p}(\partial C)}^p + \|u\|_{L^p(\partial C)}^p).$$

We have

$$(D.2) \quad \int_C \int_C \frac{|\tilde{u}(x) - \tilde{u}(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dx dy = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \int_{\partial C} \int_{\partial C} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^p}{|\tau x - \sigma y|^{N+sp}} \tau^{N-1} \sigma^{N-1} ds_x ds_y d\tau d\sigma.$$

We claim that

$$(D.3) \quad I = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \frac{\tau^{N-1} \sigma^{N-1}}{|\tau x - \sigma y|^{N+sp}} d\tau d\sigma \leq C_2 / |x - y|^{N+sp}.$$

Indeed,

$$(D.4) \quad \begin{aligned} I &= \int_0^1 \int_0^{1/\tau} \frac{\tau^{N-1} (\lambda \tau)^{N-1}}{|\tau x - \lambda \tau y|^{N+sp}} d\lambda d\tau = \\ &= \int_0^1 \int_0^{1/\tau} \tau^{N-sp-1} \frac{\lambda^{N-1}}{|x - \lambda y|^{N+sp}} d\lambda d\tau \leq I_1 + I_2, \end{aligned}$$

where $I_1 = \int_0^1 \int_0^2$ and $I_2 = \int_0^1 \int_2^\infty$.

On the one hand, we have

$$(D.5) \quad \begin{aligned} I_1 &= \int_0^1 \int_0^2 \tau^{N-sp-1} \frac{\lambda^{N-1}}{|x - \lambda y|^{N+sp}} d\lambda d\tau \\ &\leq C_3 \int_0^1 \int_0^2 \tau^{N-sp-1} \frac{\lambda^{N-1}}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} d\lambda d\tau \leq C_4 / |x - y|^{N+sp}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$(D.6) \quad \begin{aligned} I_2 &= \int_0^1 \int_2^\infty \tau^{N-sp-1} \frac{\lambda^{N-1}}{|x - \lambda y|^{N+sp}} d\lambda d\tau \\ &\leq C_5 \int_0^1 \int_2^\infty \tau^{N-sp-1} \frac{\lambda^{N-1}}{\lambda^{N+sp}} d\lambda d\tau = C_5 \int_0^1 \int_2^\infty \tau^{N-sp-1} \lambda^{-sp-1} d\lambda d\tau \leq C_6. \end{aligned}$$

We obtain (D.3) by combining (D.4), (D.5) and (D.6). Finally, (D.1) follows from (D.2) and (D.3).

The proof of Lemma D.1 is complete.

Lemma D.2. *Let $0 < s < 1$, $1 < p < \infty$, $1 < sp < N$. Let $v, w \in W^{s,p}(C; S^1)$ be such that $v|_{\partial C} = w|_{\partial C} \in W^{s,p}(\partial C)$. Then, there is a homotopy $U \in C^0([0, 1]; W^{s,p}(C; S^1))$ such that $U(0, \cdot) = v$, $U(1, \cdot) = w$ and $U(t, \cdot)|_{\partial C} = v|_{\partial C}, \forall t \in [0, 1]$.*

Proof. Let $u = v|_{\partial C}$. It clearly suffices to prove the lemma in the special case $w = \tilde{u}$. In this case, let, for $0 \leq t < 1$,

$$U(t, x) = \begin{cases} v(x/(1-t)), & \text{if } |x| \leq 1-t \\ \tilde{u}(x), & \text{if } 1-t < |x| \leq 1 \end{cases};$$

set $U(1, \cdot) = \tilde{u}$. Clearly, $U \in C^0([0, 1]; W^{s,p}(C; S^1))$. It remains to prove that $U(t, \cdot) \rightarrow \tilde{u}$ as $t \rightarrow 1$. Let

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} v(x), & \text{if } |x| \leq 1 \\ \tilde{u}(x), & \text{if } |x| > 1 \end{cases}$$

and $g = f - \tilde{u}$. Then $f, \tilde{u} \in W_{loc}^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, so that $g \in W_{loc}^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Since $g = 0$ outside C , we actually have $g \in W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \|U(t, \cdot) - \tilde{u}\|_{W^{s,p}(C)}^p &= \|g(\cdot/(1-t))\|_{W^{s,p}(C)}^p \leq \\ \|g(\cdot/(1-t))\|_{W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)}^p &= (1-t)^{N-sp} \|g\|_{W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)}^p \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as $t \rightarrow 1$. The proof of Lemma D.2 is complete.

We introduce a useful notation: let $u \in W^{s_1, p_1}(\mathcal{C}_k)$, where $0 < s_1 < 1$, $1 < p_1 < \infty$, $1 < s_1 p_1 < N$. We extend, for each $C \in \mathcal{C}_{k+1}$, $u|_{\partial C}$ to C as in Lemma D.1. Let \tilde{u} be the map obtained by gluing these extensions. We next extend \tilde{u} to \mathcal{C}_{k+2} in the same manner, and so on, until we obtain a map defined in \mathcal{C}_N ; call it $H_k(u)$.

Lemma D.3. *Let $0 < s_1 < 1$, $1 < p_1 < \infty$, $1 < s_1 p_1 < N$, $[s_1 p_1] \leq j < N$. Then every $v \in W^{s_1, p_1}(\mathcal{C}_j; S^1)$ has an extension $u_1 \in W^{s_1, p_1}(\mathcal{C}_N; S^1)$ such that $u_1|_{\mathcal{C}_l} \in W^{s_1, p_1}$ for $l = j, \dots, N-1$.*

Proof. We take $u_1 = H_j(v)$. We may use repeatedly Lemma D.1, since for $l = j+1, \dots, N$ we have $1 < s_1 p_1 < l$.

Lemma D.4. *Let $0 < s < 1$, $1 < p < \infty$, $1 < sp < N$, $[sp] \leq j < N$. If $u|_{C_l} \in W^{s,p}$, $u_1|_{C_l} \in W^{s,p}$, $l = j, \dots, N-1$, and $u|_{C_j} = u_1|_{C_j}$, then u and u_1 are $W^{s,p}$ -homotopic.*

Proof. We argue by backward induction on j . If $j = N-1$, then for each $C \in \mathcal{C}_N$ Lemma D.2 provides a $W^{s,p}$ -homotopy of $u|_C$ and $u_1|_C$ preserving the boundary condition. By gluing together these homotopies we find that u and u_1 are $W^{s,p}$ -homotopic (here we use $1/p < s < 1$). Suppose now that the conclusion of the lemma holds for $j+1$; we prove it for j , assuming that $j \geq [sp]$. By assumption, u and $H_{j+1}(u|_{C_{j+1}})$ are $W^{s,p}$ -homotopic, and so are u_1 and $H_{j+1}(u_1|_{C_{j+1}})$. It suffices therefore to prove that $v = H_{j+1}(u|_{C_{j+1}})$ and $v_1 = H_{j+1}(u_1|_{C_{j+1}})$ are $W^{s,p}$ -homotopic. For each $C \in \mathcal{C}_{j+1}$, we have $v|_{\partial C} = v_1|_{\partial C} = u|_{\partial C} = u_1|_{\partial C}$. By Lemma D.2, $v|_C$ and $v_1|_C$ are connected by a homotopy preserving the trace on ∂C . Gluing together these homotopies, we find that $v|_{C_{j+1}}$ and $v_1|_{C_{j+1}}$ are $W^{s,p}$ -homotopic. If U connects $v|_{C_{j+1}}$ to $v_1|_{C_{j+1}}$, then Lemma D.1 used repeatedly implies that $t \mapsto H_{j+1}(U(t))$ connects in $W^{s,p}(\mathcal{C}_N; S^1)$ the map $H_{j+1}(v|_{C_{j+1}})$ to $H_{j+1}(v_1|_{C_{j+1}})$, i.e., v to v_1 .

The proof of Lemma D.4 is complete.

Lemma D.5. *Let $0 < s < 1$, $1 < p < \infty$, $1 < sp < N$, $[sp] \leq j < N$. Let $v, w \in W^{s,p}(\mathcal{C}_N; S^1)$ be such that $v|_{C_l} \in W^{s,p}$, $w|_{C_l} \in W^{s,p}$, $l = j, \dots, N-1$. Assume that $v|_{C_j}$ and $w|_{C_j}$ are $W^{s,p}$ -homotopic. Then v and w are $W^{s,p}$ -homotopic.*

Proof. By Lemma D.4, v and $H_j(v|_{C_j})$ (respectively w and $H_j(w|_{C_j})$) are $W^{s,p}$ -homotopic. If U connects $v|_{C_j}$ to $w|_{C_j}$ in $W^{s,p}$, then as in the proof of Lemma D.4, we obtain that $t \mapsto H_j(U(t))$ connects $H_j(v|_{C_j})$ to $H_j(w|_{C_j})$ in $W^{s,p}$. Thus v and w are $W^{s,p}$ -homotopic.

Appendix E. Slicing with norm control

In this section, we prove the existence of good coverings for $W^{s,p}$ maps. The arguments are rather standard.

Without loss of generality, we may consider maps defined in \mathbb{R}^N . Throughout this section, we assume $\varepsilon = 1$, i.e. we consider a covering with cubes of size 1. We start by introducing some useful notations: for $x \in C^N = (0, 1)^N$ and for $j = 1, \dots, N-1$, let

$$C_j = \bigcup \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^j t_k e_{i_k} + \sum_{l=1}^{N-j} \lambda_l e_{j_l}; t_k \in \mathbb{R}, \lambda_l \in \mathbb{Z}, \{e_{i_k}\} \cup \{e_{j_l}\} = \{e_1, \dots, e_N\} \right\}$$

and $C_j(x) = x + C_j$. (With the notations introduced in Section 3, we have $C_j(x) = \mathcal{C}_j^x$ when $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$).

For a fixed set $\Lambda \subset \{1, \dots, N\}$ such that $|\Lambda| = j$, let also

$$C_j^\Lambda = \left\{ \sum_{i \in \Lambda} t_i e_i + \sum_{j \notin \Lambda} \lambda_j e_j; t_i \in \mathbb{R}, \lambda_j \in \mathbb{Z} \right\},$$

so that

$$C_j = \cup \{C_j^\Lambda; \Lambda \subset \{1, \dots, N\}, |\Lambda| = j\},$$

and with obvious notations

$$C_j(x) = \cup \{C_j^\Lambda(x); \Lambda \subset \{1, \dots, N\}, |\Lambda| = j\}.$$

Instead of considering a fixed (semi-) norm on $W^{s,p}$, $0 < s < 1$, $1 < p < \infty$, it is convenient to consider a family of equivalent norms

$$|f|_j^p = \sum_{\substack{\Lambda \subset \{1, \dots, N\} \\ |\Lambda| = j}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^j} \frac{|f(x + \sum_{i \in \Lambda} t_i e_i) - f(x)|^p}{|t|^{j+sp}} dt dx$$

(see, e.g., Triebel [24]). An obvious computation yields, for the usual Gagliardo (semi-) norm on $C_j^\Lambda(x)$,

Lemma E.1. *Let $0 < s < 1$, $1 < p < \infty$ and $u \in W^{s,p}$. Then*

$$\sum_{\substack{\Lambda \subset \{1, \dots, N\} \\ |\Lambda| = j}} \int_{C^N} \|u\|_{W^{s,p}(C_j^\Lambda(x))}^p dx \leq |u|_j^p$$

for some C independent of u .

We next define the norm $\|u\|_{W^{s,p}(C_j(x))}$ by the formula

$$\|u\|_{W^{s,p}(C_j(x))}^p = \sum_{C \in C_{j+1}(x)} \|u\|_{W^{s,p}(\partial C)}^p.$$

Lemma E.2. *Let $0 < s < 1$, $1 < p < \infty$. Then, for $u \in W^{s,p}$, we have*

a) for a.e. $x \in C^N$, $u|_{C_j(x)} \in W_{loc}^{s,p}$, $j = 1, \dots, N-1$;

b) there is a fat set (i.e., with positive measure) $A \subset C^N$ such that

$$(E.2) \quad \|u\|_{W^{s,p}(C_j(x))}^p \leq C |u|_j^p, \quad \forall x \in A.$$

Remark E.1. Here, $u|_{C_j(x)}$ are restrictions, not traces. However, when $sp > 1$ we may replace restrictions by traces, by a standard argument. We obtain

Corollary E.1. *Let $0 < s < 1$, $1 < p < \infty$, $sp > 1$. Let $u \in W^{s,p}$. Then, for a.e. $x \in C^N$, $\text{tr } u|_{C_{N-1}(x)} \in W^{s,p}$. Moreover, for a.e. $x \in C^N$, $\text{tr } u|_{C_{N-1}(x)}$ has a trace on $C_{N-2}(x)$ which belongs to $W^{s,p}$, and so on.*

Proof of Lemma E.2. In order to avoid long computations, we treat only the case $j = 1, N = 2$. The general case does not bring any additional difficulty. Let $C \in C_1(x)$; denote its lower (resp. upper, left, right) edge by C^l (resp. C^u , C^L , C^R). By (E.1), we have $u|_{C^l} \in W^{s,p}$ for a.e. $x \in C^2$ and, for x in a fat set, $\sum_{C \in C_1(x)} \|u\|_{W^{s,p}(C^l)}^p \leq \text{const. } |u|_1^p$. Similar statements hold for the other edges.

It remains to control the cross - integrals in the Gagliardo norm, e.g. to prove

$$(E.3) \quad I = \int_{C^2} \sum_{C \in C_1(x)} \int_{C^l} \int_{C^L} \frac{|u(y) - u(z)|^p}{|y - z|^{2+sp}} dy dz \leq \text{const. } \|u\|_{W^{s,p}}^p$$

(here, we take the usual Gagliardo norm in $W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^2)$). We have

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \int_{C^2} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \frac{|u(x + m_1 e_1 + m_2 e_2 + \tau e_1) - u(x + m_1 e_1 + m_2 e_2 + \sigma e_2)|^p}{|\tau e_1 - \sigma e_2|^{2+sp}} d\sigma d\tau dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \frac{|u(y + \tau e_1) - u(y + \sigma e_2)|^p}{|\tau e_1 - \sigma e_2|^{2+sp}} d\sigma d\tau dy \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \frac{|u(z) - u(z - \tau e_1 + \sigma e_2)|^p}{|\tau e_1 - \sigma e_2|^{2+sp}} d\sigma d\tau dz \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{|u(z + h) - u(z)|^p}{|h|^{2+sp}} dh dz = \|u\|_{W^{s,p}}^p. \end{aligned}$$

The proof of Lemma E.2 is complete.

Acknowledgements. The first author (H.B.) warmly thanks Yanyan Li for useful discussions. He is partially supported by a European Grant ERB FMRX CT980201, and is also a member of the Institut Universitaire de France. This work was initiated when the second author (P.M.) was visiting Rutgers University; he thanks the Mathematics Department for its invitation and hospitality. It was completed while both authors were visiting the Isaac Newton Institute in Cambridge, which they also wish to thank.

References

- [1] **F. Bethuel**, *The approximation problem for Sobolev maps between two manifolds*, Acta Math., **167** (1991), 153-206.

- [2] **F. Bethuel**, *Approximation in trace spaces defined between manifolds*, Nonlinear Anal. TMA, **24** (1994), 121-130.
- [3] **F. Bethuel and X. Zheng**, *Density of smooth functions between two manifolds in Sobolev spaces*, J. Funct. Anal., **80** (1988), 60-75.
- [4] **J. Bourgain, H. Brezis and P. Mironescu**, *Lifting in Sobolev spaces*, J. d'Analyse Mathématique, **80** (2000), 37-86.
- [5] **J. Bourgain, H. Brezis and P. Mironescu**, *On the structure of the space $H^{1/2}$ with values into the circle*, C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris, **321** (2000), 119-124.
- [6] **A. Boutet de Monvel-Berthier, V. Georgescu and R. Purice**, *A boundary value problem related to the Ginzburg-Landau model*, Comm. Math. Phys., **142** (1991), 1-23.
- [7] **H. Brezis and Y. Li**, *Topology and Sobolev spaces*, J. Funct. Anal., (to appear).
- [8] **H. Brezis, Y. Li, P. Mironescu and L. Nirenberg**, *Degree and Sobolev spaces*, Top. Meth. in Nonlinear Anal., **13** (1999), 181-190.
- [9] **H. Brezis and P. Mironescu**, *Composition in fractional Sobolev spaces*, Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems, **7** (2001), 241-246.
- [10] **H. Brezis and P. Mironescu**, *Gagliardo-Nirenberg, composition and products in fractional Sobolev spaces*, Journal of Evolution Equations, (to appear).
- [11] **H. Brezis and P. Mironescu**, in preparation.
- [12] **H. Brezis and L. Nirenberg**, *Degree Theory and BMO, Part I: Compact manifolds without boundaries*, Selecta Math., **1** (1996), 197-263.
- [13] **H. Brezis and L. Nirenberg**, *Degree Theory and BMO, Part II: Compact manifolds with boundaries*, Selecta Math., **2** (1996), 309-368.
- [14] **M. Escobedo**, *Some remarks on the density of regular mappings in Sobolev classes of S^M -valued functions*, Rev. Mat. Univ. Complut. Madrid, **1** (1988), 127-144.
- [15] **F. B. Hang and F. H. Lin**, *Topology of Sobolev mappings II*, (to appear).
- [16] **R. Hardt, D. Kinderlehrer and F. H. Lin**, *Stable defects of minimizers of constrained variational principles*, Ann. IHP, Anal. Nonlinéaire, **5** (1988), 297-322.
- [17] **J. L. Lions and E. Magenes**, *Problèmes aux limites non homogènes*, Dunod, 1968; English translation, Springer, 1972.
- [18] **V. Maz'ya and T. Shaposhnikova**, *An elementary proof of the Brezis and Mironescu theorem on the composition operator in fractional Sobolev spaces*, (to appear).
- [19] **J. Peetre**, *Interpolation of Lipschitz operators and metric spaces*, Mathematica (Cluj), **12** (1970), 1-20.

- [20] **T. Rivière**, *Dense subsets of $H^{1/2}(S^2; S^1)$* , Ann. of Global Anal. and Geom., (to appear).
- [21] **J. Rubinstein and P. Sternberg**, *Homotopy classification of minimizers of the Ginzburg-Landau energy and the existence of permanent currents*, Comm. Math. Phys., **179** (1996), 257-263.
- [22] **T. Runst**, *Mapping properties of nonlinear operators in spaces of Triebel-Lizorkin and Besov type*, Analysis Mathematica, **12** (1986), 313-346.
- [23] **T. Runst and W. Sickel**, *Sobolev spaces of fractional order, Nemytskij operators, and nonlinear partial differential equations*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin and New York, 1996.
- [24] **R. Schoen and K. Uhlenbeck**, *Boundary regularity and the Dirichlet problem for harmonic maps*, J. Diff. Geom., **18** (1983), 253-268.
- [25] **H. Triebel**, *Theory of function spaces*, Birkhäuser, Basel and Boston, 1983.
- [26] **B. White**, *Homotopy classes in Sobolev spaces and the existence of energy minimizing maps*, Acta Math., **160** (1988), 1-17.

(1) ANALYSE NUMÉRIQUE
UNIVERSITÉ P. ET M. CURIE, B.C. 187
4 PL. JUSSIEU
75252 PARIS CEDEX 05

(2) RUTGERS UNIVERSITY
DEPT. OF MATH., HILL CENTER, BUSCH CAMPUS
110 FRELINGHUYSEN RD, PISCATAWAY, NJ 08854
E-mail address: `brezis@ccr.jussieu.fr`; `brezis@math.rutgers.edu`

(3) DÉPARTEMENT DE MATHÉMATIQUES
UNIVERSITÉ PARIS-SUD
91405 ORSAY
E-mail address: : `Petru.Mironescu@math.u-psud.fr`