Hindawi Publishing Corporation
Boundary Value Problems
Volume 2007, Article ID 61602, 9 pages
doi:10.1155/2007/61602

Research Article

Removable Singularities of $\mathscr{W}\mathscr{T}$-Differential Forms and Quasiregular Mappings

Olli Martio, Vladimir Miklyukov, and Matti Vuorinen

Received 14 May 2006; Revised 6 September 2006; Accepted 20 September 2006

Recommended by Ugo Pietro Gianazza

A theorem on removable singularities of $\mathscr{W}\mathscr{T}$-differential forms is proved and applied to quasiregular mappings.

1. Main theorem

We recall some facts on differential forms and quasiregular mappings. Our notation is as in [1]. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a Riemannian manifold of the class C^3, $\dim \mathcal{M} = n$, without boundary. Each differential form α can be written in terms of the local coordinates $x_1,\dots,x_n$ as the linear combination

$$\alpha = \sum_{1\le i_1<\cdots<i_k\le n} \alpha_{i_1\cdots i_k} dx_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge dx_{i_k}. \tag{1.1}$$

Let α be a differential form defined on an open set $D \subset \mathcal{M}$. If $\mathcal{F}(D)$ is a class of functions defined on D, then we say that the differential form α is in this class provided that $\alpha_{i_1\cdots i_k} \in \mathcal{F}(D)$. For instance, the differential form α is in the class $L^p(D)$ if all its coefficients are in this class.

A differential form α of degree k on the manifold $\mathcal{M}$ with coefficients $\alpha_{i_1\cdots i_k} \in L^p_{\text{loc}}(\mathcal{M})$ is called *weakly closed* if for each differential form β, $\deg\beta = k+1$, with compact support $\operatorname{supp}\beta = \overline{\{m \in \mathcal{M} : \beta \neq 0\}}$ in $\mathcal{M}$ and with coefficients in the class $W^1_{q,\text{loc}}(\mathcal{M})$, $1/p + 1/q = 1$, $1 \le p, q \le \infty$, we have

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}} \langle \alpha, \delta\beta \rangle * \;\; _{\mathcal{M}} = 0. \tag{1.2}$$

Here the operator $*$ and the exterior differentiation d define the codifferential operator δ by the formula

$$\delta\alpha = (-1)^k *^{-1} d * \alpha \tag{1.3}$$

for a differential form α of degree k.

Clearly, $\delta\alpha$ is a differential form of degree $k-1$. For smooth differential forms α condition (1.2) agrees with the traditional condition of closedness $d\alpha = 0$.

For an arbitrary simple form of degree k,

$$w = w_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge w_k, \tag{1.4}$$

we set

$$\|w\| = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k} |w_i|^2\right)^{1/2}. \tag{1.5}$$

For a simple form w we have Hadamard's inequality

$$|w| \le \prod_{i=1}^{k} |w_i|. \tag{1.6}$$

Taking these into account and using the inequality between geometric and arithmetic means

$$\left(\prod_{i=1}^{k} |w_i|\right)^{1/k} \le \frac{1}{k}\sum_{i=1}^{k} |w_i| \le \left(\frac{1}{k}\sum_{i=1}^{k} |w_i|^2\right)^{1/2} \tag{1.7}$$

we obtain

$$|w| \le k^{-k/2}\|w\|^k. \tag{1.8}$$

Let

$$w = w_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge w_k, \qquad \theta = \theta_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \theta_{n-k} \tag{1.9}$$

be simple weakly closed differential forms on $\mathcal{M}$.

We say that the pair of forms (1.9) satisfies a $\mathcal{WT}$-condition on $\mathcal{M}$ if there exist constants $\nu_1, \nu_2 > 0$ such that almost everywhere on $\mathcal{M}$

$$\nu_1\|w\|^{kp} \le \langle w, *\theta\rangle, \qquad \|\theta\| \le \nu_2\|w\|. \tag{1.10}$$

Our main removability result for differential forms is the following.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a Riemannian C^3-manifold, $\dim M = n \ge 2$, and let $E \subset \mathcal{M}$ be a compact set of p-capacity zero, $1 \le p \le n$. Let Z and θ be simple forms on $\mathcal{M} \setminus E$ of degrees $k-1$, $n-k$, respectively, $\|dZ\| \in L^{kp}_{\text{loc}}$. Suppose that the pair dZ and θ satisfies a $\mathcal{WT}$-condition on $\mathcal{M} \setminus E$.*

If

$$\operatorname*{ess\ sup}_{m \in \mathcal{M}\setminus E} |Z(m)| < \infty, \tag{1.11}$$

then there exist forms $\widetilde{Z}$, $\widetilde{\theta}$ *such that* $\|d\widetilde{Z}\|, \|\widetilde{\theta}\| \in L^{kp}$ *on* $\mathcal{M}$, *the pair* $d\widetilde{Z}$, $\widetilde{\theta}$ *satisfies the* $\mathcal{WT}$*-condition on* $\mathcal{M}$ *and their restrictions to* $\mathcal{M} \setminus E$ *coincide with* Z, θ, *respectively.*

2. p-capacity

First we recall some basic facts about condensers. Let D be an open set on $\mathcal{M}$ and let $A, B \subset D$ be such that $\overline{A}$ and $\overline{B}$ are compact in D and $\overline{A} \cap \overline{B} = \varnothing$. Each triple $(A, B; D)$ is called a *condenser* on $\mathcal{M}$.

We fix $p \geq 1$. The p-capacity of the condenser $(A, B; D)$ is defined by

$$\operatorname{cap}_p(A, B; D) = \inf \int_D |\nabla \varphi|^p * \ _{\mathcal{M}}, \tag{2.1}$$

where the infimum is taken over the set of all continuous functions φ of class $W^1_{p,\mathrm{loc}}(D)$ such that $\varphi|_A = 0$, $\varphi|_B = 1$. It is easy to see that for a pair $(A, B; D)$ and $(A_1, B_1; D)$ with $A_1 \subset A$, $B_1 \subset B$ we have

$$\operatorname{cap}_p(A_1, B_1; D) \leq \operatorname{cap}_p(A, B; D). \tag{2.2}$$

A standard approximation argument shows that the quantity $\operatorname{cap}_p(A, B; D)$ does not change if one restricts the class of functions in the variational problem (2.1) to smooth functions φ equal to 0 and 1 in the sets A and B, respectively, and $\nabla \varphi \neq 0$ a.e. on $\mathcal{M} \setminus (A \cup B)$.

We say that a compact set $E \subset \mathcal{M}$ is of p-capacity zero, if $\operatorname{cap}_p(E, U; \mathcal{M}) = 0$ for all open sets $U \subset \mathcal{M}$ such that $E \cap \overline{U} = \varnothing$.

We will need the following lemma.

Lemma 2.1. *A set* $E \subset \mathcal{M}$ *is of 1-capacity zero if and only if*

$$\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(E) = 0. \tag{2.3}$$

Proof. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and an open set $U \subset \mathcal{M}$ such that $\operatorname{cap}_1(E, U; M) = 0$. Choose a smooth function $\varphi : \mathcal{M} \to [0, 1]$ such that $\varphi|_E = 0$, $\varphi|_U = 1$, $\nabla \varphi \neq 0$ a.e. on $\mathcal{M} \setminus (E \cup U)$ and

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}} |\nabla \varphi| * \ _{\mathcal{M}} \leq \varepsilon. \tag{2.4}$$

By the coarea formula we have

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}} |\nabla \varphi| * \ _{\mathcal{M}} = \int_0^1 dt \int_{G_t} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} = \int_0^1 \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(G_t), \tag{2.5}$$

where $G_t = \{m \in \mathcal{M} : \varphi(m) = t\}$ is a level set of φ [2, Section 3.2].

Thus we obtain

$$\inf_t \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(G_t) \leq \varepsilon \tag{2.6}$$

and there exist sets G_t of arbitrarily small $(n-1)$-measure.

Since U is open it is possible only for the set E of $(n-1)$-measure zero. □

If a compact set $E \subset \mathcal{M}$ is of p-capacity zero, then E is of q-capacity zero for all $q \in [1,p]$. By Lemma 2.1 we conclude that a set E of p-capacity zero, $p \geq 1$, satisfies $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(E) = 0$. In particular, such a set has n-measure zero.

3. Applications to quasiregular mappings

Let $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ be Riemannian manifolds of dimension n. It is convenient to use the following definition [3, Section 14]. A continuous mapping $F : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{N}$ of the class $W^1_{n,\mathrm{loc}}(\mathcal{M})$ is called a *quasiregular* mapping if F satisfies

$$|F'(m)|^n \leq K J_F(m) \tag{3.1}$$

almost everywhere on $\mathcal{M}$. Here $F'(m) : T_m(\mathcal{M}) \to T_{F(m)}(\mathcal{N})$ is the formal derivative of $F(m)$, further, $|F'(m)| = \max_{|h|=1} |F'(m)h|$. We denote by $J_F(m)$ the Jacobian of F at the point $m \in \mathcal{M}$, that is, the determinant of $F'(m)$.

For the following statement, see [1, Theorem 6.15, page 90].

Lemma 3.1. *If $F = (F_1,\dots,F_n) : \mathcal{M} \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is a quasiregular mapping and $1 \leq k < n$, then the pair of forms*

$$w = dF_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dF_k, \qquad \theta = dF_{k+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge dF_n \tag{3.2}$$

satisfies a $\mathcal{WT}$-condition on $\mathcal{M}$ with the structure constants $\nu_1 = \nu_1(n,k,K)$, $\nu_2 = \nu_2(n,k,K)$, and $p = n/k$.

We point out some special cases of Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a domain, $1 \leq k \leq n$, and let $E \subset D$ be a compact set of the n/k-capacity zero. Suppose that a quasiregular mapping*

$$F = (F_1,\dots,F_k,F_{k+1},\dots,F_n) : D \setminus E \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \tag{3.3}$$

satisfies (1.11) with

$$Z(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} (-1)^{i-1} c_i F_i dF_1 \wedge dF_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge \widetilde{dF_i} \wedge \cdots \wedge dF_k, \tag{3.4}$$

where the symbol $\widetilde{dF_i}$ means that this factor is omitted and $c_i = \mathrm{const}$, $\sum_{i=1}^{k} c_i = 1$.

Then there exists a quasiregular mapping $\widetilde{F} : D \to \mathbb{R}^n$ for which $\widetilde{F}|_{D\setminus E} = F$.

Proof. Since the statement is a special case of Theorem 1.1, it suffices to show that Z and θ satisfy the assumptions of the theorem. We have

$$dZ = \sum_{i=1}^{k}(-1)^{i-1}c_i dF_i \wedge dF_1 \wedge dF_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge \widetilde{dF_i} \wedge \cdots \wedge dF_k = dF_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dF_k. \tag{3.5}$$

If we put

$$\theta = dF_{k+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge dF_n, \tag{3.6}$$

then by Lemma 3.1 the pair of forms $w = dZ$ and θ satisfies (1.10) on $D \setminus E$. Using Theorem 1.1 we can conclude that forms Z and θ have extensions to D. Moreover for an arbitrary subdomain D', $E \subset D' \subset\subset D$, it follows

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{D'\setminus E} J_F(x)dx_1 \cdots dx_n &= \int_{D'\setminus E} dF_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dF_n = \int_{D'\setminus E} dZ \wedge \theta \\ &\leq C \int_{D'\setminus E} |dZ||\theta| dx_1 \cdots dx_n \leq C\|dZ\|_{L^p(D'\setminus E)}\|\theta\|_{L^q(D'\setminus E)}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

where $C = \text{const} < \infty$ [2, Section 1.7] and $p = n/k$, $q = n/(n-k)$.

From this it is easy to see that the vector function F belongs to $W^1_{n,\mathrm{loc}}$ in D and E is removable for the quasiregular mapping F. Note that in the definition of a quasiregular mapping continuity is not needed, see [4, Section 3, Chapter II]. This property has a local character and its proof for subdomains of $\mathbb{R}^n$ implies its correctness for manifolds. □

The case $k = 1$ reduces to the well-known case, see Miklyukov [5].

Corollary 3.3. *Let $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a domain, and let $E \subset D$ be a compact set of n-capacity zero. Suppose that*

$$F = (F_1, F_2, \dots, F_n) : D \setminus E \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \tag{3.8}$$

is a quasiregular mapping such that

$$\sup_{x \in D\setminus E} |F_1(x)| < \infty. \tag{3.9}$$

Then there exists a quasiregular mapping $\widetilde{F} : D \to \mathbb{R}^n$ for which $\widetilde{F}|_{D\setminus E} = F$.

For $k = n$ we have the following result.

Corollary 3.4. *Let $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a domain, and let $E \subset D$ be a compact set of Hausdorff $(n-1)$-measure zero. Suppose that*

$$F = (F_1, F_2, \dots, F_n) : D \setminus E \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \tag{3.10}$$

is a quasiregular mapping such that

$$\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{x \in D\setminus E} J_F(x) < \infty. \tag{3.11}$$

Then there exists a quasiregular mapping $f^* : D \to \mathbb{R}^n$ for which $f^*|_{D\setminus E} = f$.

Proof. Since the Jacobian determinant of F is bounded and E is of $(n-1)$-measure zero, the quasiregularity of F implies that F and the form

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n}(-1)^i F_i dF_1 dF_2 \wedge \cdots \widetilde{dF_i} \cdots \wedge dF_n \tag{3.12}$$

belong to $L^\infty_{\text{loc}}(D)$. Hence the corollary follows from Theorem 3.2. □

Remark 3.5. Observe that Corollary 3.4 has an easy alternative proof. Since $J_F(x)$ is bounded and E is of $(n-1)$-measure zero, the quasiregularity of F implies that the derivative of F belongs to $L^\infty_{\text{loc}}(D)$ and F is a Lipschitz mapping in $D \setminus E$. This shows that F can be extended to a Lipschitz mapping on D. It is clear that the extended mapping is quasiregular in D.

Corollary 3.4 gives the following version of the well-known Painlevé theorem.

Corollary 3.6. *Let $E \subset D \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a compact set of linear measure zero. Let $F : D \setminus E \to \mathbb{C}$ be a holomorphic function. The set E is removable for F if and only if*

$$\sup_{z\in K\setminus E} |F'(z)| < \infty, \tag{3.13}$$

for each compact set $K \subset D$.

4. Proof of Theorem 1.1

We will need the following integration by parts formula for differential forms [1].

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\alpha \in W^1_{p,\text{loc}}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\beta \in W^1_q(\mathcal{M})$ be differential forms,* $\deg\alpha + \deg\beta = n-1$, $1/p + 1/q = 1$, $1 \le p, q \le \infty$, *and let β have a compact support. Then*

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}} d\alpha \wedge \beta = (-1)^{\deg\alpha+1}\int_{\mathcal{M}} \alpha \wedge d\beta. \tag{4.1}$$

In particular, the form α is weakly closed if and only if $d\alpha = 0$ a.e. on $\mathcal{M}$.

Let $D \subset \mathcal{M}$ be a domain containing E and with a compact closure in $\mathcal{M}$. Let $\{U_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of open sets $U_k \subset \mathcal{M}$ such that

$$E \subset U_k, \qquad \overline{U}_k \subset D, \qquad \cap_{k=1}^\infty U_k = E. \tag{4.2}$$

Fix a nonnegative smooth function $\psi : \mathcal{M} \to \mathbb{R}$, $0 \le \psi \le 1$, with a compact support and $\psi \equiv 1$ on D. Fix a $k = 1, 2, \ldots$ and a smooth function $\varphi : \mathcal{M} \to \mathbb{R}$, $0 \le \varphi \le 1$, with the properties

$$\varphi|_E = 0, \quad \operatorname{supp}\varphi \subset U_k, \quad \varphi = 1 \quad \forall m \in \mathcal{M} \setminus U_k. \tag{4.3}$$

The form $\psi^p\varphi^p Z \wedge \theta$ has a compact support in $\mathcal{M} \setminus E$. This yields

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}\setminus E} d(\psi^p\varphi^p Z \wedge \theta) = 0. \tag{4.4}$$

Using (4.1) we have

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}\setminus E}\psi^p\varphi^p dZ\wedge\theta+(-1)^{\deg Z}\int_{\mathcal{M}\setminus E}\psi^p\varphi^p Z\wedge d\theta=-\int_{\mathcal{M}\setminus E}d(\psi^p\varphi^p)\wedge Z\wedge\theta. \tag{4.5}$$

Observe that

$$dZ\wedge\theta=\langle dZ,*\theta\rangle *\ _{\mathcal{M}}. \tag{4.6}$$

The form θ is closed and, consequently, from (1.10) we get

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_1\int_{\mathcal{M}\setminus E}\psi^p\varphi^p\|dZ\|^{kp} * \quad &\le \int_{\mathcal{M}\setminus E}\psi^p\varphi^p\langle dZ,*\theta\rangle * \quad = -\int_{\mathcal{M}\setminus E}d(\psi^p\varphi^p)\wedge Z\wedge\theta\\ &= -\int_{\mathcal{M}\setminus E}\langle d(\psi^p\varphi^p)\wedge Z,*\theta\rangle *\\ &\le \int_{\mathcal{M}\setminus E}|d(\psi^p\varphi^p)\wedge Z||*\theta| * \quad .\end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

But $\deg\theta=n-k$ and by (1.8) we have

$$|*\theta|=|\theta|\le(n-k)^{(n-k)/2}\|\theta\|^{n-k}. \tag{4.8}$$

Thus from the second condition of (1.10), it follows that

$$\nu_1\int_{\mathcal{M}\setminus E}\psi^p\varphi^p\|dZ\|^{kp} * \quad \le \nu_3\int_{\mathcal{M}\setminus E}|d(\psi^p\varphi^p)\wedge Z|\,\|dZ\|^{p-1} * \quad , \tag{4.9}$$

where $\nu_3=(n-k)^{(n-k)/2}\nu_2$.

By (1.11) there exists a constant $0<M<\infty$ such that

$$|Z(m)|<M \quad \text{for a.e. in } \mathcal{M}\setminus E. \tag{4.10}$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\nu_1\int_{\mathcal{M}\setminus E}\psi^p\varphi^p\|dZ\|^{kp} * \quad \le \nu_3 M\int_{\mathcal{M}\setminus E}|d(\psi^p\varphi^p)|\,\|dZ\|^{p-1} * \quad . \tag{4.11}$$

However,

$$|d(\psi^p\varphi^p)|\le p\varphi^p\psi^{p-1}|\nabla\psi|+p\varphi^{p-1}\psi^p|\nabla\varphi|, \tag{4.12}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\nu_1\int_{\mathcal{M}\setminus E}\psi^p\varphi^p\|dZ\|^{kp} *\\ &\quad\le p\nu_3 M\int_{\mathcal{M}\setminus E}\varphi^p\psi^{p-1}|\nabla\psi|\|dZ\|^{p-1} * \quad + p\nu_3 M\int_{\mathcal{M}\setminus E}\psi^p\varphi^{p-1}|\nabla\varphi|\|dZ\|^{p-1} * \quad .\end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

Next we use the Cauchy inequality

$$ab^{p-1} \le \frac{\varepsilon^{kp}}{kp}a^p + \frac{p-1}{kp}\varepsilon^{kp/(1-p)}b^{kp} \tag{4.14}$$

for $a, b, \varepsilon > 0,\ p \ge 1$.

For $\varepsilon > 0$ this implies two estimates

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathcal{M}\setminus E} \varphi^p \psi^{p-1} |\nabla\psi| \|dZ\|^{n-k} * \\
&\quad \le \frac{n-k}{kp}\varepsilon^{kp/(k-n)} \int_{\mathcal{M}\setminus E} \varphi^p \psi^p \|dZ\|^{kp} * \quad + \frac{\varepsilon^{kp}}{kp}\int_{\mathcal{M}\setminus E} \varphi^p |\nabla\psi|^p * \quad, \\
&\int_{\mathcal{M}\setminus E} \varphi^{p-1} \psi^{p} |\nabla\varphi| \|dZ\|^{n-k} * \\
&\quad \le \frac{n-k}{kp}\varepsilon^{kp/(k-n)} \int_{\mathcal{M}\setminus E} \varphi^p \psi^p \|dZ\|^{kp} * \quad + \frac{\varepsilon^{kp}}{kp}\int_{\mathcal{M}\setminus E} \psi^p |\nabla\varphi|^p * \quad .
\end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

Now from (4.13) it follows

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nu_1 \int_{\mathcal{M}\setminus E} \psi^p \varphi^p \|dZ\|^{kp} * \\
&\quad \le C_1 \int_{\mathcal{M}\setminus E} \psi^p \varphi^p \|dZ\|^{kp} * \quad + C_2 \int_{\mathcal{M}\setminus E} \varphi^p |\nabla\psi|^p * \quad + C_2 \int_{\mathcal{M}\setminus E} \psi^p |\nabla\varphi|^p * \quad ,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

where

$$C_1 = \frac{n-k}{k}\nu_3 M \varepsilon^{kp/(k-n)}, \qquad C_2 = \nu_3 M \frac{\varepsilon^{kp}}{k}. \tag{4.17}$$

Choose $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that $C_1 = \nu_1/2$. Then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\nu_1 \int_{\mathcal{M}\setminus E} \psi^p \varphi^p \|dZ\|^{kp} * \\
&\quad \le \nu_3 M \frac{\varepsilon_0^{kp}}{k} \int_{\mathcal{M}\setminus E} \varphi^p |\nabla\psi|^p * \quad + \nu_3 M \frac{\varepsilon_0^{kp}}{k} \int_{\mathcal{M}\setminus E} \psi^p |\nabla\varphi|^p * \\
&\quad = \nu_3 M \frac{\varepsilon_0^{kp}}{k} \int_{U_k\setminus E} |\nabla\varphi|^p * \quad + \nu_3 M \frac{\varepsilon_0^{kp}}{k} \int_{\mathcal{M}\setminus D} |\nabla\psi|^p *
\end{aligned} \tag{4.18}$$

and since $0 \le \psi,\ \varphi \le 1$,

$$\frac{1}{2}\nu_1 \int_{D\setminus U_k} \|dZ\|^{kp} * \quad \le \nu_3 M \frac{\varepsilon_0^{kp}}{k}\left(\int_{U_k\setminus E} |\nabla\varphi|^p * \quad + \int_{\mathcal{M}\setminus D} |\nabla\psi|^p * \quad \right). \tag{4.19}$$

The special choice of φ and ψ permits to take the infimum over φ and ψ such that

$$\frac{1}{2}\nu_1 \int_{D\setminus U_k} \|dZ\|^{kp} * \quad \le \nu_3 M \frac{\varepsilon_0^{kp}}{k}\operatorname{cap}_p(E, U_k; \mathcal{M}) + \nu_3 M \frac{\varepsilon_0^{kp}}{k}\operatorname{cap}_p(D, \mathcal{M}; \mathcal{M}). \tag{4.20}$$

However, $\text{cap}_p(E,\mathcal{M}\setminus U_k;\mathcal{M})=0$ and thus we arrive at the estimates

$$\frac{1}{2}\nu_1\int_{D\setminus U_k}\|dZ\|^{kp}* \quad \le \nu_3 M\frac{\varepsilon_0^{kp}}{k}\,\text{cap}_p(D,\mathcal{M};\mathcal{M}), \tag{4.21}$$

$$\frac{1}{2}\nu_1\int_{D}\|dZ\|^{kp}* \quad \le \nu_3 M\frac{\varepsilon_0^{kp}}{k}\,\text{cap}_p(D,\mathcal{M};\mathcal{M}) \tag{4.22}$$

because by Lemma 2.1 the set E is of $(n-1)$-measure zero.

Next by Lemma 2.1, the coefficients of Z can be extended to $W^1_{p,\text{loc}}$-functions in $\mathcal{M}$. This is due to the estimate (4.22) and to the ACL-property of W^1_p-functions; note that the ACL-property can be easily transformed to the manifold $\mathcal{M}$ since $\mathcal{M}$ is in the class C^3.

Thus, Z can be extended up to some form $\widetilde{Z}$. Moreover clearly, $\|d\widetilde{Z}\|\in L^{kp}_{\text{loc}}(\mathcal{M})$. The extension of θ is analogous. Theorem 1.1 is completely proved.

Acknowledgment

Authors would like to thank the referee for his good work and very useful remarks.

References

[1] D. Franke, O. Martio, V. Miklyukov, M. Vuorinen, and R. Wisk, "Quasiregular mappings and $\mathcal{WT}$-classes of differential forms on Riemannian manifolds," *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, vol. 202, no. 1, pp. 73–92, 2002.

[2] H. Federer, *Geometric Measure Theory*, vol. 153 of *Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften*, Springer, New York, 1969.

[3] J. Heinonen, T. Kilpeläinen, and O. Martio, *Nonlinear Potential Theory of Degenerate Elliptic Equations*, Oxford Mathematical Monographs, The Clarendon Press, New York, 1993.

[4] Yu. G. Reshetnyak, *Space Mappings with Bounded Distortion*, vol. 73 of *Translations of Mathematical Monographs*, American Mathematical Society, Rhode Island, 1989.

[5] V. Miklyukov, "Removable singularities of quasi-conformal mappings in space," *Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR*, vol. 188, no. 3, pp. 525–527, 1969 (Russian).

Olli Martio: Department of Mathematics, University of Helsinki, P.O. Box 68,
00014 Helsinki, Finland
Email address: martio@cc.helsinki.fi

Vladimir Miklyukov: Department of Mathematics, Volgograd State University,
Universitetskii prospect 100, Volgograd 400062, Russia
Email address: miklyuk@vlink.ru

Matti Vuorinen: Department of Mathematics, University of Turku, 20014 Turku, Finland
Email address: vuorinen@utu.fi

Special Issue on Boundary Value Problems on Time Scales

Call for Papers

The study of dynamic equations on a time scale goes back to its founder Stefan Hilger (1988), and is a new area of still fairly theoretical exploration in mathematics. Motivating the subject is the notion that dynamic equations on time scales can build bridges between continuous and discrete mathematics; moreover, it often revels the reasons for the discrepancies between two theories.

In recent years, the study of dynamic equations has led to several important applications, for example, in the study of insect population models, neural network, heat transfer, and epidemic models. This special issue will contain new researches and survey articles on Boundary Value Problems on Time Scales. In particular, it will focus on the following topics:

- Existence, uniqueness, and multiplicity of solutions
- Comparison principles
- Variational methods
- Mathematical models
- Biological and medical applications
- Numerical and simulation applications

Before submission authors should carefully read over the journal's Author Guidelines, which are located at http://www.hindawi.com/journals/ade/guidelines.html. Authors should follow the Advances in Difference Equations manuscript format described at the journal site http://www.hindawi.com/journals/ade/. Articles published in this Special Issue shall be subject to a reduced Article Processing Charge of €200 per article. Prospective authors should submit an electronic copy of their complete manuscript through the journal Manuscript Tracking System at http://mts.hindawi.com/ according to the following timetable:

Manuscript Due	April 1, 2009
First Round of Reviews	July 1, 2009
Publication Date	October 1, 2009

Lead Guest Editor

Alberto Cabada, Departamento de Análise Matemática, Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, 15782 Santiago de Compostela, Spain; alberto.cabada@usc.es

Guest Editor

Victoria Otero-Espinar, Departamento de Análise Matemática, Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, 15782 Santiago de Compostela, Spain; mvictoria.otero@usc.es