TWO PHASE FREE BOUNDARY PROBLEM FOR POISSON KERNELS
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Abstract. We provide a potential theoretic characterization of vanishing chord-arc domains under minimal assumptions. In particular we show that, in the appropriate class of domains, the oscillation of the logarithm of the interior and exterior Poisson kernels yields a great deal of geometric information about the domain. We use techniques from classical calculus of variations, potential theory and quantitative geometric measure theory to accomplish this. A striking feature of this work is that we make (almost) no a priori topological assumptions on our domains by contrast with [BH16] and [KT06].

1. Introduction

Questions concerning the connections between the geometry of a domain and the regularity of its boundary with the potential theoretic properties of the domain, the behavior of singular integrals on the boundary, and the boundary regularity to solutions of elliptic PDEs have generated a flurry of activity in the area of non-smooth analysis (see [Tor97] and [Tor19] for a brief recent history and references). In this paper we focus on the potential theoretic properties of a domain and its complement and explore their ties to the geometry of the domain. In particular, we show that if $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n = \Omega^+ + \Omega^-$ and the interior of its complement $\Omega^-$ are connected, their common boundary is Ahlfors regular (see Definition 2.8) and the logarithm of the Poisson kernel of each domain is in $VMO_{loc}$, then the unit normal is also in $VMO_{loc}$ and the domain is vanishing Reifenberg flat (see Definitions 2.2 and 2.12). We contrast our result with those in the literature in order to emphasize the wealth of geometric information (thus far overlooked) encoded in the assumption concerning the oscillation of the logarithm of the Poisson kernels.

In [KT06] the authors established the following: suppose that $\Omega^\pm$ are chord-arc domains (i.e, NTA domains with Ahlfors regular boundary), and that $k^\pm$ are the Poisson kernels of $\Omega^\pm$ with poles $X^\pm \in \Omega^{\pm}$. If $\log k^\pm \in VMO_{loc}(\sigma)$ then...
the unit normal vector \( \nu \in VMO_{\text{loc}}(\sigma) \) where \( \sigma = \mathcal{H}^{n-1} \cap \partial \Omega \) (see Definition 2.17). In particular the assumption that \( \Omega^{\pm} \) are chord arc domains ensures that \( \partial \Omega^{\pm} \) is uniformly rectifiable (see Definition 2.11). In [BH16] the authors relax the geometric conditions as they do not require \( \Omega^{\pm} \) to be NTA. Furthermore via a novel approach using layer potentials rather than blow ups, they prove that if \( \Omega^{\pm} \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) are connected domains, whose common boundary is uniformly rectifiable then \( \log k^{\pm} \in VMO_{\text{loc}}(\sigma) \) implies that \( \nu \in VMO_{\text{loc}}(\sigma) \). We also mention the recent work Prats-Tolsa [PT19], where the authors studied a different but closely related problem arising in Kenig-Toro [KT06]. They study the kernel between harmonic measures \( \omega^{\pm} \) of \( \Omega^{\pm} \), and show that for Reifenberg flat NTA domains, small oscillation for the logarithm of that kernel is also closely linked to small oscillation for the unit normal \( \nu \).

In this paper we loosen the \textit{a priori} assumption in [KT06] and instead deduce as much geometric information as possible from the regularity of \( \log k^{\pm} \). Furthermore using classical tools from the calculus of variations we establish that in this context the oscillation of the unit normal controls the flatness of the boundary. More precisely we show that:

**Theorem 1.1.** Let \( n \geq 3 \) and suppose \( \Omega^{+} \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) and \( \Omega^{-} = \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{\Omega^{+}} \) are connected domains satisfying \( \partial \Omega := \partial \Omega^{+} = \partial \Omega^{-} \), and that \( \partial \Omega \) is \((n-1)\)-Ahlfors regular. Then the following are equivalent:

(i) \( \Omega^{\pm} \) are both (locally)-vanishing chord-arc domains with \( \nu \in VMO_{\text{loc}}(\sigma) \) and \( \Omega \) are vanishing Reifenberg flat domains (see Definition 2.2)

(ii) There are \( X^{\pm} \in \Omega^{\pm} \) such that \( k^{\pm} = \frac{d\omega^{\pm}}{d\sigma} \) exist and \( \log k^{\pm} \in VMO_{\text{loc}}(d\sigma) \).

Furthermore we obtain corresponding quantitative results, see Theorems 4.11 and 4.13.

In this paper techniques from potential theory and geometric measure theory come together yielding geometric results. In Section 2 basic definitions from both areas are presented. In Section 3 we apply classical tools of geometric measure theory dating back to DiGioagi’s original work on sets of locally finite perimeter. See [Mag12] for references and an approach aligned to the one presented here. The novelty is that we extend these tools from perimeter minimizers to sets of locally finite perimeter with Ahlfors regular boundaries\(^1\), which allows us to remove topological hypothesis from previous works concerning potential theory in “rough” domains. In particular, Corollary 3.10 which is well known and plays a fundamental role in the proof of regularity of perimeter minimizers holds in our setting and it shows that control on the oscillation of the unit normal provides both local control on the flatness of the boundary as well as local separation properties (see Definition 2.2). The proof of these separation properties appear in Appendix A where we also include a very detailed local graphical decomposition property in ball where the unit normal has small oscillation. These results should be contrasted with those in [Sem91a], [Sem91b], [KT99], [HMT10], [Mer16a] and [Mer16b]. In [Sem91a] and [Sem91b], Semmes introduced the notion of chord arc surfaces with

---

\(^1\)Rather a representative whose boundary agrees with the support of the Gauss-Green measure. See Remark 3.1.
small constant. He focused on characterizing such surfaces through the behavior of singular integral operators on them. He expressed interest in obtaining potential theoretic characterizations. These characterizations were investigated by Kenig and Toro, with the a priori assumption of Reifenberg flatness in [KT97], [KT99] and [KT03]. As a consequence of results herein (Corollary 3.12), we show that the flatness hypothesis is redundant, this in turn, allows one to remove the a priori assumption of Reifenberg flatness from some theorems in the aforementioned works of Kenig and Toro (e.g., Theorem 4.2 in [KT99]). In Section 4 we focus on the local two phase free boundary problem for the Poisson kernels. In Section 4.1 we show that local doubling properties of \( \omega^{\pm} \) combined with the Ahlfors regularity of the boundary yield the existence of corkscrew balls on both sides (locally) and therefore imply local uniform rectifiability of the boundary (see Lemma 4.3 and Corollary 4.4). In Section 4.2 we show that in our setting, the assumption \( \log k^{\pm} \in VMO_{loc}(d\sigma) \) yields information about the doubling properties of \( \omega^{\pm} \) and the local optimal behavior of \( k^{\pm} \) (see Lemma 4.10). Combining the results in Sections 4.1 and 4.2 we recover the hypothesis in [BH16]. The proof of Theorem 4.11 follows the general scheme of the proof in [BH16] with additional special attention given to the constants in order to prove a quantitative result, in particular for unbounded domains.
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2. Preliminaries

Throughout this paper, \( E \) denotes a set of locally finite perimeter in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) (see [EG92] or [Mag12] for relevant definitions) and \( \Omega \) denotes a domain (open and connected set) that is also a set of locally finite perimeter in \( \mathbb{R}^n \). We recall a few results.

Let \( \Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) be a locally compact set. For \( x \in \Sigma \) and \( r > 0 \) define

\[
\Theta(x, r) = \inf_L \left\{ \frac{1}{r} D[\Sigma \cap B(x, r), L \cap B(Q, r)] \right\}
\]

where the infimum is taken over all \((n-1)\)-planes containing \( x \). Here \( D \) denotes the Hausdorff distance, that is, for \( A, B \subset \mathbb{R}^n \), \( D[A, B] = \sup\{d(a, B) : a \in A\} + \sup\{d(b, A) : b \in B\} \). With this in hand, we can define flatness as in Reifenberg [Rei60]:

**Definition 2.1** (Reifenberg Flat and Vanishing Reifenberg Flat sets). We say \( \Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) is \( \delta \)-Reifenberg flat set for some \( \delta > 0 \) if for each compact set \( K \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) there
exists $R_K$ such that

\begin{equation}
\sup_{r \in (0,R_K]} \sup_{x \in K \cap F} \Theta(x, r) < \delta.
\end{equation}

We say $\Sigma$ is $(\delta, R)$–Reifenberg flat if

\begin{equation}
\sup_{r \in (0,R]} \sup_{x \in F} \Theta(x, r) < \delta.
\end{equation}

We say $\Sigma$ is vanishing Reifenberg flat set if for every compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$

\[ \lim_{r \to 0} \sup_{x \in \Sigma \cap K} \Theta(x, r) = 0. \]

**Definition 2.2** (Reifenberg Flat and Vanishing Reifenberg Flat domains). We say that a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is $\delta$-Reifenberg flat (or $(\delta, R)$-Reifenberg flat, vanishing Reifenberg flat), if $\partial \Omega$ is $\delta$-Reifenberg flat (resp. $(\delta, R)$-Reifenberg flat, vanishing Reifenberg flat) and $\Omega$ satisfies the separation condition: for every $y \in \partial \Omega$ and $0 < r < R$ there exists a direction $\nu$ such that if $x \in B(y, r)$ and $\langle x - y, \nu \rangle > \delta r$ then $x \in \Omega^*$, and if $\langle x - y, \nu \rangle < -\delta r$ then $x \in \Omega$.

Additionally, if $\Omega$ is unbounded we have the further requirement that $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \partial \Omega$ consists of two connected components $\Omega$ and $\text{int}(\Omega^*) \neq \emptyset$ and that $\partial \Omega$ is $(\delta_n, R)$-Reifenberg flat for some $R > 0$. Here $\delta_n > 0$ is chosen small enough so that $\Omega$ is an NTA domain (see Definition 2.17) up to scale $R_0 = R/10$, see Lemma 3.1 in [KT97].

Note that the definition above is slightly different from the one in [KT03] as we do not require flatness at large scale.

**Theorem 2.3.** Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a set of locally finite perimeter in $U$. There exists a non-negative Radon measure $\|\partial E\|$ on $U$, and a $\|\partial E\|$-measurable function $\nu_E : U \to \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

(i) $|\nu_E(x)| = 1$ for $\|\partial E\|$-a.e. $x \in U$.

(ii) $\int_U \chi_E \cdot \text{div} \varphi = -\int_U \varphi \cdot \nu_E d\|\partial E\|$ for all $\varphi \in C^1_c(U, \mathbb{R}^n)$.

The vector-valued Radon measure $\mu_E$ defined by $\mu_E = \nu_E \|\partial E\|$ is called the Gauss-Green measure of $E$ and $\|\partial E\|$ is referred to as the perimeter measure. The function $\nu_E$ is called the measure theoretic normal vector to $\partial E$.

**Remark 2.4.** For a set of locally finite perimeter $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ there are several notions of boundary: the reduced boundary $\partial^r E$, the measure theoretic boundary $\partial E$, the support of the Gauss-Green measure, and the topological boundary (see [EG92] or [Mag12] for relevant definitions). The following relationship between different notions of the boundary holds

\begin{equation}
\partial^r E \subset \partial E \subset \text{spt} \mu_E \subset \partial E.
\end{equation}

In particular, $\partial^r E = \partial E$ implies $\partial^r E = \partial E = \text{spt} \mu_E = \partial E$.

De Giorgi’s structure theorem yields the following result.

**Theorem 2.5.** For a set of locally finite perimeter $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$,

\begin{equation}
\|\partial E\| = \mathcal{H}^{n-1} \cap \partial^r E.
\end{equation}
For a vector-valued Radon measure $\mu$, the total variation of $\mu$, which we denote by $|\mu|$, has the following characterization on open sets

\begin{equation}
|\mu|(V) = \sup \left\{ \int_E \text{div} \varphi : \varphi \in C_c^1(V; \mathbb{R}^n), |\varphi| \leq 1 \right\}.
\end{equation}

In light of Borel regularity, for arbitrary Borel set $A$,

\[ |\mu|(A) = \inf \left\{ |\mu|(V) : A \subset V, V \text{ open} \right\}, \]

in particular $|\mu_E| = \|\partial E\|$ as expected.

**Proposition 2.6** (Lower semi-continuity of weak* convergence). If $\mu_k$ and $\mu$ are vector-valued Radon measures with $\mu_k \rightharpoonup \mu$, i.e. for every $\phi \in C_c(R^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$

\[ \int \phi \cdot d\mu_k \to \int \phi \cdot d\mu, \]

then for every open set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ we have

\begin{equation}
|\mu|(A) \leq \liminf_{k \to \infty} |\mu_k|(A).
\end{equation}

**Proposition 2.7.** Let $\mu_k$ be vector valued Radon measures on $\mathbb{R}^n$.

1. If $\mu_k \rightharpoonup \mu$ and $|\mu_k| \rightharpoonup \nu$, then for every Borel set $F \subset \mathbb{R}^n$,

\begin{equation}
|\mu|(F) \leq \nu(F).
\end{equation}

Furthermore, if $F$ is a bounded Borel set with $\nu(\partial F) = 0$, then

\begin{equation}
\mu(F) = \lim_{h \to \infty} \mu_h(F).
\end{equation}

2. If $\mu_k \rightharpoonup \mu$, $|\mu_k|(\mathbb{R}^n) \to |\mu|(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and $|\mu|(\mathbb{R}^n) < \infty$, then $|\mu_k| \rightharpoonup |\mu|$.

**Definition 2.8** (Ahlfors regularity). A measure $\mu$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ is said to be $d$-Ahlfors regular if there exists a positive finite constant $C_A$ such that

\begin{equation}
C_A^{-1} r^d \leq \mu(B(x, r)) \leq C_A r^d
\end{equation}

for all $x \in \text{spt} \mu$ and all $0 < r < \text{diam spt} \mu$. More generally, we say that a measure $\mu$ is $d$-Ahlfors regular up to scale $r_0$ if (2.9) holds for all $0 < r < r_0$. In either case, the constant $C_A$ is called the Ahlfors regularity constant for $\mu$. If $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $\mu = \mathcal{H}^{n-1} \cap \partial E$, and (2.9) holds with $d = n-1$ then $\partial E$ is said to be Ahlfors regular or Ahlfors regular up to scale $r_0$.

**Definition 2.9** (Uniformly Rectifiable (UR) sets). A set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ that is Ahlfors $d$-regular, is said to be uniformly rectifiable if it contains “Big Pieces of Lipschitz Images”. This means there exist a pair of constants $\theta, \Lambda > 0$ such that for all $x \in A$ and all $0 < r \leq \text{diam}(A)$ there is a Lipschitz mapping $g : B(0, r) \subset \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\text{Lip}(g) \leq \Lambda$ such that $\mathcal{H}^d \left( E \cap g(B(0, r)) \right) \geq \theta r^d$.

One reason uniformly rectifiable sets are ubiquitous is that they are “spaces on which you can do harmonic analysis.” An example of this, to be used later, is the following characterization of uniformly rectifiable sets in co-dimension 1.
\section*{Theorem 2.10} ([Dav91], [MMV96], and [NTV14]). Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an $(n-1)$-dimensional Ahlfors regular, closed set with surface measure $\sigma := \mathcal{H}^{n-1}|_E$. Then $E$ is uniformly rectifiable (UR) if and only if the Riesz transform operator (see Definition 4.5, $R$ is $L^2$ bounded with respect to surface measure, in the sense that
\begin{equation}
\sup_{\varepsilon > 0} \| R_{\varepsilon} f \|_{L^2(E, \sigma)} \leq C \| f \|_{L^2(E, \sigma)},
\end{equation}
Remark 2.13. It is clear that the local conditions in the definition above are equivalent to replacing arbitrary compact sets by balls centered on the boundary with radius less than, say, $(1/4) \text{diam}(\partial E)$. This is obvious if $\partial E$ is unbounded and if $\partial E$ is bounded we can cover $\partial E$ by a finite collection of such balls.

\section*{Definition 2.11} (UR domain, see [HMT10]). We will say that a domain $\Omega$ is a UR domain if $\partial \Omega$ is UR, and if the measure theoretic boundary $\partial_\ast \Omega$ (see [EG92, Chapter 5]) satisfies $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial \Omega \setminus \partial_\ast \Omega) = 0$.

Note, in particular, that if an Ahlfors regular domain satisfies the two-sided corkscrew conditions then it is a UR domain (see [DJ90, Theorem 1] and also Badger [Bad12]). In particular the two sided corkscrew condition forces $\partial_\ast \Omega = \partial \Omega$ (see Remark 2.4).

\section*{Definition 2.12} (BMO and VMO). Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a set of locally finite perimeter with $\partial E$ Ahlfors regular up to scale $r_0$. Then, for all $0 < r < r_0$ and all $f \in L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \setminus \partial E)$ we define
\begin{equation}
\| f \|_n(x, r) = \sup_{0 < s < r} \left( \int_{B(x, s) \setminus \partial E} \left| f(y) - \int_{B(x, s) \setminus \partial E} f(z) d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(z) \right|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(y) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{equation}
and
\begin{equation}
\| f \|_n(B(x, r)) = \sup_{y \in B(x, r)} \| f \|_n(y, r)
\end{equation}
We say that:
\begin{enumerate}
\item $f \in \text{BMO}_{\text{loc}}(\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \setminus \partial E)$ if for every compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, there exist $R_K > 0$ and $C_K > 0$ such that
\begin{equation}
\sup_{0 < r < R_K} \sup_{x \in \partial E \cap K} \| f \|_n(B(x, r)) \leq C_K.
\end{equation}
\item $f \in \text{BMO}_{\text{loc}}(\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \setminus \partial E)$ with constant $\kappa > 0$ if for every compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, there exists $R_K > 0$ such that
\begin{equation}
\sup_{0 < r < R_K} \sup_{x \in \partial E \cap K} \| f \|_n(B(x, r)) \leq \kappa.
\end{equation}
\item $f \in \text{VMO}_{\text{loc}}(\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \setminus \partial E)$ if for every compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$,
\begin{equation}
\lim_{r \to 0} \sup_{x \in \partial E \cap K} \| f \|_n(B(x, r)) = 0.
\end{equation}
\end{enumerate}

Remark 2.13. It is clear that the local conditions in the definition above are equivalent to replacing arbitrary compact sets by balls centered on the boundary with radius less than, say, $(1/4) \text{diam}(\partial E)$. This is obvious if $\partial E$ is unbounded and if $\partial E$ is bounded we can cover $\partial E$ by a finite collection of such balls.

\section*{Definition 2.12 (BMO and VMO).} Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a set of locally finite perimeter with $\partial E$ Ahlfors regular up to scale $r_0$. Then, for all $0 < r < r_0$ and all $f \in L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \setminus \partial E)$ we define
\begin{equation}
\| f \|_n(x, r) = \sup_{0 < s < r} \left( \int_{B(x, s) \setminus \partial E} \left| f(y) - \int_{B(x, s) \setminus \partial E} f(z) d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(z) \right|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(y) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{equation}
and
\begin{equation}
\| f \|_n(B(x, r)) = \sup_{y \in B(x, r)} \| f \|_n(y, r)
\end{equation}
We say that:
\begin{enumerate}
\item $f \in \text{BMO}_{\text{loc}}(\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \setminus \partial E)$ if for every compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, there exist $R_K > 0$ and $C_K > 0$ such that
\begin{equation}
\sup_{0 < r < R_K} \sup_{x \in \partial E \cap K} \| f \|_n(B(x, r)) \leq C_K.
\end{equation}
\item $f \in \text{BMO}_{\text{loc}}(\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \setminus \partial E)$ with constant $\kappa > 0$ if for every compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, there exists $R_K > 0$ such that
\begin{equation}
\sup_{0 < r < R_K} \sup_{x \in \partial E \cap K} \| f \|_n(B(x, r)) \leq \kappa.
\end{equation}
\item $f \in \text{VMO}_{\text{loc}}(\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \setminus \partial E)$ if for every compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$,\begin{equation}
\lim_{r \to 0} \sup_{x \in \partial E \cap K} \| f \|_n(B(x, r)) = 0.
\end{equation}
\end{enumerate}

Remark 2.13. It is clear that the local conditions in the definition above are equivalent to replacing arbitrary compact sets by balls centered on the boundary with radius less than, say, $(1/4) \text{diam}(\partial E)$. This is obvious if $\partial E$ is unbounded and if $\partial E$ is bounded we can cover $\partial E$ by a finite collection of such balls.

\section*{Remark 2.13.} It is clear that the local conditions in the definition above are equivalent to replacing arbitrary compact sets by balls centered on the boundary with radius less than, say, $(1/4) \text{diam}(\partial E)$. This is obvious if $\partial E$ is unbounded and if $\partial E$ is bounded we can cover $\partial E$ by a finite collection of such balls.
Definition 2.14 (Corkscrew Condition). We say an open set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ satisfies the $(M, R_0)$ interior corkscrew condition if for every $x \in \partial E$ and $r \in (0, R_0)$ there exist a ball $B_1 = B(x_1, r/M)$ such that $B_1 \subset E \cap B(x, r)$. We call $x_1$ the interior corkscrew points respectively.

Definition 2.15 (Two-sided Corkscrew Condition). We say an open set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ satisfies the $(M, R_0)$ two-sided corkscrew condition if for every $x \in \partial E$ and $r \in (0, R_0)$ there exist two balls $B_1 = B(x_1, r/M)$ and $B_2 = B(x_2, r/M)$ such that $B_1 \subset E \cap B(x, r)$ and $B_2 \subset E^c \cap B(x, r)$, where $E^c$ denotes the complement of $E$. We call $x_1$ and $x_2$ the interior and exterior corkscrew points respectively.

Definition 2.16 (Harnack Chain Condition). Following [JK82], we say that a domain $\Omega$ satisfies the (C, R)-Harnack Chain condition if for every $0 < r \leq R, \Lambda \geq 1$, and every pair of points $X, X' \in \Omega$ with $\delta(X), \delta(X') \geq \rho$ and $|X - X'| < \Lambda r$, there is a chain of open balls $B_1, \ldots, B_N \subset E$ with $N \leq C \log_2 \Lambda + 1$, and $X \in B_1, X' \in B_N, B_k \cap B_{k+1} \neq \emptyset$ for all $k = 1, \ldots, N - 1$ and $C^{-1} \text{diam}(B_k) \leq \text{dist}(B_k, \partial \Omega) \leq C \text{diam}(B_k)$ for all $k = 1, \ldots, N$. The chain of balls is called a “Harnack Chain”.

Definition 2.17 (NTA and Chord Arc Domain). We say that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a Non-Tangentially Accessible Domain (NTA) with constants $(M, R_0)$, if it satisfies the $(M, R_0)$-Harnack chain condition and the $(M, R_0)$ two-sided corkscrew condition. If $\Omega$ is unbounded, we require that $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \partial \Omega$ consists of two, non-empty, connected components. Note that if $\Omega$ is unbounded, then $R_0 = \infty$ is allowed.

Finally, if $\Omega$ is an NTA domain whose boundary is Ahlfors regular we say that $\Omega$ is a chord arc domain.

Remark 2.18. Sometimes in the definition of unbounded NTA domains, it is required that $R_0 = \infty$ (see, e.g. [KT97], [KT06]). This is to obtain estimates on harmonic measure/functions at arbitrarily large scales. Since we are only interested in local geometric properties of $\Omega$, we allow $R_0 < \infty$ even for unbounded domains $\Omega$. Note that the presence of two-sided corkscrews at any scale implies that the measure theoretic and topological boundaries coincide.

Definition 2.19. Let $\delta \in (0, \delta_n)$. A set of locally finite perimeter $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is said to be a $\delta$-chord arc domain (or chord arc domain with small constant) if $\Omega$ is a $\delta$-Reifenberg flat domain, $\partial \Omega$ is Ahlfors regular and for each compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ there exists some $R > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{x \in \partial \Omega \cap K} \|\nu_{\partial \Omega}\|(x, R) < \delta.$$  

We say a domain $\Omega$ is a chord arc domain with vanishing constant if it is a chord arc domain with small constant and for each compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$

$$\lim_{r \to 0} \sup_{x \in \partial \Omega \cap K} \|\nu_{\partial \Omega}\|(x, r) = 0,$$

(2.16) that is if $\nu_{\partial \Omega} \in VMO_{\text{loc}}(H^{n-1} \setminus \partial \Omega)$.

Remark 2.20. We recall from [KT97, Theorem 3.1] that there exists a $\delta_n$ such that if $\Omega$ is a $\delta$-Reifenberg flat domain for some $\delta \leq \delta_n$, then $\Omega$ is an NTA domain, and since $\partial \Omega$ is Ahlfors regular, $\Omega$ is a chord arc domain. This justifies the name $\delta$-chord arc domain (or chord arc domain with vanishing constant).
3. Flatness from Control on Oscillation

In this section we introduce a class of well behaved sets \( \mathcal{A}(C_A, r_0) \), and prove our key geometric result, Corollary 3.10. Namely in the class, \( \mathcal{A}(C_A, r_0) \), the oscillation of the unit normal controls the flatness (in the sense of Reifenberg) of the boundary. One key tool is the “excess” of a set of locally finite perimeter, first introduced by De Giorgi in [DG61] and ubiquitous in the calculus of variations. Due to Lemma 3.4, all of our arguments could also be written in terms of the mean oscillation of the unit normal.

\[
\mathcal{A}(C_A, r_0) = \left\{ E \subset \mathbb{R}^n \mid E \text{ is a set of locally finite perimeter satisfying } \partial E = \text{spt } \mu_E \text{ and its perimeter measure } \| \partial E \| \text{ is } (n-1)\text{-Ahlfors regular up to scale } r_0 \text{ with constant } C_A \right\}.
\]

Evidently uniformly rectifiable domains with Ahlfors regularity constant \( C_A \) form a subset \( \mathcal{A}(C_A, r_0) \). A more general class of surfaces, quasiminimal surfaces of codimension 1 (see [DS98]), are a more general example of previously studied objects that fall within the class in (3.1).

Remark 3.1. The condition that \( \partial E = \text{spt } \mu_E \) corresponds to choosing a representative for our set amongst the equivalence class of sets of locally finite perimeter (see [Mag12, Proposition 12.19, Remark 16.11]): for any set of finite perimeter \( E \), we can find a Borel set \( F \) such that \(|E \Delta F| = 0\), \( \partial F = \text{spt } \mu_F = \text{spt } \mu_E \).

This choice is necessary since we want to deduce information on the topological boundary from information on the unit outer normal, which is merely defined on the reduced boundary \( \partial^* E \), see for example Lemma 3.8 and Theorem 3.9.

A particularly useful property of \( \mathcal{A}(C_A, r_0) \) is that if \( E \in \mathcal{A}(C_A, r_0) \) then \( \mathbb{R}^n \setminus E \in \mathcal{A}(C_A, r_0) \). This follows since \( \mu_E = -\mu_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus E} \) and \( \partial E = \partial(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus E) \).

Remark 3.2. If \( E \in \mathcal{A}(C_A, r_0) \) then \( \partial E = \text{spt } \mu_E \) then the set \( \partial E \) is \((n-1)\)-Ahlfors regular and \( \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial E \setminus \partial^* E) = 0 \) (see Theorem 6.9 [Mat95]). Thus

\[
|\mu_E| = \|\partial E\| = \mathcal{H}^{n-1} \bigcap \partial E = \mathcal{H}^{n-1} \bigcap \partial E.
\]

Definition 3.3 (Cylinders and excess). For \( r > 0 \), \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \), and some \( \nu \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \), we let

\[
C(x, r, \nu) = \{ y : |(x - y, \nu)| < r, |x - y - (x - y, \nu)| < r \}
\]

denote the cylinder with axial direction \( \nu \), and radius and height \( r \). For a set of locally finite perimeter \( E \), \( x \in \partial E \), \( r > 0 \), and \( \nu \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \) we define the cylindrical excess

\[
e(e, x, r, \nu) = \frac{1}{r^{n-1}} \int_{C(x, r, \nu) \cap \partial^* E} \frac{|y - \nu|^2}{2} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}
\]

The following lemma elucidates the relationship between oscillation of the unit normal and excess.
Lemma 3.4. Let $E \in \mathcal{A}(C_A, r_0)$ and let $Q \in E$ and $r < r_0$. There exists some constant, $C > 0$ (which depends only on $C_A$ and the dimension) such that

\[(3.4) \quad \int_{B(Q, r) \cap \partial^* E} |v_E - (v_E)_Q|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \leq Ce(E, Q, r, \nu)\]

for any $\nu \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. Furthermore, as long as

\[(3.4) \quad \int_{B(Q, r) \cap \partial^* E} |v_E - (v_E)_Q|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} < 1\]

then,

\[(3.5) \quad e \left( E, Q, \frac{r}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{(v_E)_Q}{\|v_E\|_Q} \right) \leq C \int_{B(Q, r) \cap \partial^* E} |v_E - (v_E)_Q|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}\]

Proof. We first prove (3.4). Note that $B(Q, r) \cap \partial^* E \subset C(Q, r, \nu) \cap \partial^* E$ for any $Q \in E$ and $r > 0$. Thus

\[e(E, Q, r, \nu) \geq c \int_{B(Q, r) \cap \partial^* E} \frac{|v_E - \nu|^2}{2} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1},\]

where $c$ is a constant that depends only on the Ahlfors regularity of $E$. We can compute

\[(3.6) \quad \int_{B(Q, r) \cap \partial^* E} |v_E(x) - (v_E)_Q|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \leq 2 \int_{B(Q, r) \cap \partial^* E} |v_E(x) - \nu|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} + 2 \int_{B(Q, r) \cap \partial^* E} |\nu - (v_E)_Q|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}\]

\[\leq 4 \int_{B(Q, r) \cap \partial^* E} |v_E(x) - \nu|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \leq Ce(E, Q, r, \nu),\]

where the second inequality above follows from the triangle inequality and Jensen’s inequality. This is exactly (3.4).

To prove (3.5) assume

\[\int_{B(Q, r) \cap \partial^* E} |v_E - (v_E)_Q|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} = \epsilon < 1.\]

We first estimate $|(v_E)_Q|$, note,

\[(3.7) \quad (1-|(v_E)_Q|)^2 = \int_{B(Q, r) \cap \partial^* E} (|v_E| - |(v_E)_Q|)^2 d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \leq \int_{B(Q, r) \cap \partial^* E} |v_E - (v_E)_Q|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} = \epsilon\]

and

\[(3.8) \quad |(v_E)_Q| = \int_{B(Q, r) \cap \partial^* E} v_E d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \leq \int_{B(Q, r) \cap \partial^* E} |v_E| d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} = 1.\]

Combining (3.7) with (3.8) ensures that $1 - \sqrt{\epsilon} \leq |v_E)_Q| \leq 1$. Let $v_0 \equiv \frac{(v_E)_Q}{|(v_E)_Q|}$ and compute,

\[|v_E - v_0| \leq |v_E - (v_E)_Q| + |(v_E)_Q| \left| 1 - \frac{1}{|(v_E)_Q|} \right| \leq |v_E - (v_E)_Q| + |1 - (v_E)_Q|\]
\[
\leq |v_E - (v_E)_{Q,r}| + \epsilon^{1/2},
\]
so that
\[
(3.9) \quad |v_E - v_0|^2 \leq 2|v_E - (v_E)_{Q,r}|^2 + 2\epsilon.
\]
Notably, (3.9) and \(C(Q, \frac{r}{\sqrt{2}}, v_0) \subset B(Q, r)\) imply
\[
e \left( E, Q, \frac{r}{\sqrt{2}}, v_0 \right) = \frac{2(n-1)/2}{r^{n-1}} \int_{C(Q, \frac{r}{\sqrt{2}}, v_0) \cap \partial^* E} \frac{|v_E - v_0|^2}{2} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}
\]
\[
\leq \frac{2(n-1)/2}{r^{n-1}} \int_{C(Q, \frac{r}{\sqrt{2}}, v_0) \cap \partial^* E} |v_E - (v_E)_{Q,r}|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}
\]
\[
+ \frac{2(n-1)/2 \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(C(Q, \frac{r}{\sqrt{2}}, v_0) \cap \partial^* E)}{r^{n-1}} \epsilon
\]
\[
\leq \frac{2(n+1)/2 \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(B(Q, r) \cap \partial^* E)}{r^{n-1}} \left( \int_{B(Q, r) \cap \partial^* E} |v_E - (v_E)_{Q,r}|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} + \epsilon \right)
\]
\[
= \frac{2(n+1)/2 \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(B(x, r) \cap \partial^* E)}{r^{n-1}} \epsilon \leq C_n \cdot C_A \epsilon.
\]
\]
\[
\square
\]

**Remark 3.5.** The excess is invariant under translation and scaling in the sense that if \(E_{x,r} = \frac{E-x}{r}\), then
\[
(3.10) \quad e(E_{x,r}, 0, 1, v) = e(E, x, r, v).
\]

Furthermore, if \(r < s\), the non-negativity of the integrand ensures
\[
\frac{1}{r^{n-1}} \int_{C(x,s,v) \cap \partial^* E} \frac{|v_E - v|^2}{2} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \leq \left( \frac{s}{r} \right)^{n-1} \frac{1}{s^{n-1}} \int_{C(x,s,v) \cap \partial^* E} \frac{|v_E - v|^2}{2} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1},
\]
that is,
\[
(3.11) \quad e(E, x, r, v) \leq \left( \frac{s}{r} \right)^{n-1} e(E, x, s, v).
\]

Finally, since \(v, v_E\) are each of unit length, \(\frac{|v_E - v|^2}{2} = 1 - \langle v, v \rangle\) so that
\[
(3.12) \quad e(E, x, r, v) = \frac{1}{r^{n-1}} \int_{C(x,r,v) \cap \partial^* E} 1 - \langle v, v \rangle d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}.
\]

The following compactness theorem is the key tool used in proving the flatness result.

**Theorem 3.6.** If \(\{E_k\} \subset \mathcal{A}(C_A, r_0)\) with \(0 \in \partial E_k\) for all \(k \geq 1\), there exists a subsequence \(\{E_{k_j}\}\), a set \(E\) of locally finite perimeter, and a non-negative Radon measure, \(\mu\), such that
\[
E_{k_j} \overset{L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n)}{\rightharpoonup} E, \quad \mu_{E_{k_j}} \rightharpoonup \mu_E \quad \text{and} \quad |\mu_{E_{k_j}}| \to \mu.
\]

Additionally, \(\partial E = \text{spt} \mu_E\) and \(\mu\) is \((n-1)\)-Ahlfors regular up to scale \(r_0\) with constant \(C_A\). Furthermore, \(|\mu_E| \leq \mu\) and

1. If \(x \in \partial E\), then there exists \(x_{k_j} \in \partial E_{k_j}\) such that \(x_{k_j} \to x\).
(2) If \( x \in \text{spt} \mu \), then there exists \( x_{k_j} \in \partial E_{k_j} \) such that \( x_{k_j} \to x \).

(3) If \( x_{k_j} \in \partial E_{k_j} \) and \( x_{k_j} \to x \) then \( x \in \text{spt} \mu \).

**Remark 3.7.** We note that (2) and (3) in Theorem 3.6 combine to say that \( x \in \text{spt} \mu \) if and only if there exists \( x_{k_j} \in \partial E_{k_j} \) such that \( x_{k_j} \to x \). However, without additional hypotheses, all that is known is that
\[
\text{spt} \mu_E \subseteq \text{spt} \mu.
\]

**Proof.** It follows from Ahlfors regularity and a diagonalization argument that sets with uniformly Ahlfors regular boundary are pre-compact in the space of sets of locally finite perimeter. This guarantees the existence of a subsequence \( E_{k_j} \to E \) in \( L_{1}^{1} \) and \( \mu_{k_j} \to \mu_E \) in a weak star sense. Without loss of generality (see Remark 3.1) we may assume that \( \text{spt} \mu_E = \partial E \). Finally, the \( \{\mu_{E_{k_j}}\} \) are uniformly Ahlfors regular (see Remark 3.2) and hence precompact. Without explicitly relabeling the new subsequence, there exists a \( \mu \) so that \( \mu_{E_{k_j}} \to \mu \) in the weak star sense. Thus (3.13) holds.

The fact that \( |\mu| \leq \mu \) follows from (2.7). This ensures that \( \text{spt} \mu \subseteq \text{spt} \mu \), so (2) which is a standard fact implies (1). Moreover (2) and the uniform upper regularity of \( \{|\mu_{E_{k_j}}|\} \) imply the upper Ahlfors regularity of \( \mu \).

We show (3) and lower Ahlfors regularity of \( \mu \) simultaneously. Take \( x_{k_j} \in \partial E_{k_j} = \text{spt} \mu_{E_{k_j}} \) such that \( x_{k_j} \to x \). Note that given \( \epsilon > 0 \), for \( k_j \) large enough, \( B(x_{k_j}, s - \epsilon) \subseteq B(x, s(1 - \epsilon/2)) \).

Fix \( 0 < s < r_0 \) and \( 0 < \epsilon < 1 \). Since \( E_{k_j} \in A(C_{A}, r_0) \) it follows that
\[
C_{A}^{-1}(s(1 - \epsilon))^{n-1} \leq |\mu_{E_{k_j}}| B(x_{k_j}, s(1 - \epsilon)) \leq |\mu_{E_{k_j}}| B(x, s(1 - \epsilon/2))
\]
so that by weak* convergence of \(|\mu_{E_{k_j}}| \) to \( \mu \)
\[
C_{A}^{-1}(s(1 - \epsilon))^{n-1} \leq \limsup_{j} |\mu_{E_{k_j}}| B(x, s(1 - \epsilon/2)) \leq \mu B(x, s(1 - \epsilon/2)),
\]
taking \( \epsilon \to 0 \) results in \( C_{A}^{-1} s^{n-1} \leq \mu(B(x, s)) \) for all \( s \in (0, r_0) \); in particular \( x \in \text{spt} \mu \), verifying (3). On the other hand, since (2) and (3) combine to show that \( x \in \text{spt} \mu \) if and only if there exists \( x_{k_j} \in \partial E_{k_j} \) such that \( x_{k_j} \to x \), this demonstrates that \( \mu \) is \((n - 1)\)-lower Ahlfors regular up to scale \( r_0 \) with constant \( C_{A} \).  

We now prove that small excess implies local measure theoretic separation. To simplify notation, define \( e_n(E, x, r) = e(E, x, r, e_n) \).

**Lemma 3.8** (**Separation Lemma**). Given \( C_A \geq 1 \), \( t_0 \in (0, 1) \), there exists \( \omega(n, t_0, C_A) \) such that for all \( E \in A(C_A, 2r) \) if there exists \( x_0 \in \partial E \) and \( \nu \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \) with
\[
e(E, x_0, 2r, \nu) \leq \omega(n, t_0, C_A)
\]
then
\[
|x - x_0| < t_0 r \quad \forall x \in C(x_0, r, \nu) \cap \partial E,
\]
\[
|\{x \in C(x_0, r, \nu) \cap E \mid |x - x_0| > t_0 r\}| = 0,
\]
and
\[
|\{x \in C(x_0, r, \nu) \cap E^c \mid |x - x_0| < -t_0 r\}| = 0.
\]
Proof. The proof follows by a compactness-contradiction argument. If Lemma 3.8 does not hold, there exist $C_A > 1$, $t_0 \in (0, 1)$, a sequence of sets and radii $(F_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \in \mathcal{A}(C_A, 2r_k)$, a sequence of points $x_k \in \partial F_k$, and a sequence of directions $v_k \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, with
\[ e(F_k, x_k, 2r_k, v_k) \leq 2^{-k}, \]
such that at least one of the following conditions holds for infinitely many $k$:

\begin{align*}
(3.17) & \quad \{x \in C(x_k, r_k, v_k) \cap \partial F_k \mid t_0 r_k < |q_k(x)|\} \neq \emptyset, \\
(3.18) & \quad \{x \in C(x_k, r_k, v_k) \cap F_k \mid q_k(x) > t_0 r_k\} > 0, \\
(3.19) & \quad \{x \in C(x_k, r_k, v_k) \cap F_k^c \mid q_k(x) < -t_0 r_k\} > 0,
\end{align*}

where $q_k(x) = \langle x - x_k, v_k \rangle$.

By rescaling, recentering, and rotating (see Remark 3.5) we may assume that $v_k \equiv e_n$, $x_k \equiv 0$ and $r_k \equiv 1$. Note that the transformed domains are now in $\mathcal{A}(C_A, 2)$.

Abusing notation we call these new sets $F_k$. Note that,
\[ e_n(F_k, 0, 2) \leq 2^{-k} \quad \forall k \geq 1. \]

Writing $C_r = C(0, r, e_n)$ and $q(x) = \langle x, e_n \rangle$ we rewrite (3.17) - (3.19) as,
\begin{align*}
(3.20) & \quad \{x \in C_1 \cap \partial F_k \mid t_0 \leq |q(x)|\} \neq \emptyset, \\
(3.21) & \quad \{x \in C_1 \cap F_k \mid q(x) > t_0\} > 0, \\
(3.22) & \quad \{x \in C_1 \cap F_k^c \mid q(x) < -t_0\} > 0.
\end{align*}

By Theorem 3.6, there exists a set of finite perimeter $F \subset C_{5/3}$ with $0 \in \partial F = \text{spt } [\mu_F]$ such that, by passing to a subsequence which we do not explicitly relabel, $F_k \cap C_{5/3} \rightharpoonup F$ in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $\mu_{F_k} \cap C_{5/3} \rightharpoonup \mu_F$, and $[\mu_{F_k} \cap C_{5/3}] \rightharpoonup \mu$.

Consider an open set $U$ such that $\overline{U} \subset C_{5/3}$. Then,
\[ 2^{-k} \leq \frac{5}{3} \lesssim n-1 \]
\[ e_n(F_k, 0, 5/3) \geq \int_{U \cap \partial F_k} (1 - e_n \cdot v_{F_k}) d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} = [\mu_{F_k}](U) - e_n \cdot \nu_{F_k}(U) \geq 0. \]

By hypothesis, as $k$ tends to infinity $e_n(F_k, 0, 5/3) \leq \frac{5}{3} \lesssim n-1 \lesssim e_n(F_k, 0, 2) \to 0$.

This combined with (3.23) yields
\[ 0 \leq \lim_{k \to \infty} [\mu_{F_k}](U) - e_n \cdot \mu_{F_k}(U) \leq C_n \lim_{k \to \infty} e_n(F_k, 0, 5/3) = 0 \]

Thus (2.8) combined with the fact that $[\mu_F] \leq \mu$ and the properties of weak convergence allows us to conclude that
\[ \mu(U) = e_n \cdot \mu_{F}(U) \quad \text{for any open set } U, \quad \mu(\partial U) = 0. \]

Note that by Theorem 3.6, $\mu$ is Ahlfors-upper regular with constant $C_A$ up to scale 2 and $\mu(B(x, r)) \geq C_A r^n$ for all $x \in C_{4/3} \cap \text{spt } \mu$ and all $r \leq 1/3$. Hence for
\( x \in C_{4/3} \cap \text{spt } \mu \) a.e. \( r \in (0, 1/3) \), \( \mu(\partial B(x, r)) = 0 \) and by (3.25) \( \mu(B(x, r)) = e_n \cdot \mu_F(B(x, r)) \). Hence for \( x \in \partial^* F \cap C_{4/3} \)

\[
(3.26) \quad \lim_{r \to 0} \frac{\mu(B(x, r))}{|\mu_F(B(x, r))|} = e_n \cdot \nu_F(x) \leq 1.
\]

Thus \( \mu \leq |\mu_F| \) which implies \( \mu = |\mu_F| = \mathcal{H}^{n-1} \ll \partial^* F \), and \( \nu_F(x) = e_n \cdot \mathcal{H}^{n-1} \)-a.e. \( x \in \partial^* F \). In particular, \( e_n(F, 0, 4/3) = 0 \), at which point [Mag12, Proposition 22.2] asserts that \( F \cap C_{4/3} \) is equivalent (in the sense of sets of locally finite perimeter) to \( C_{4/3} \cap \{q(x) < 0\} \) or \( C_{4/3} \cap \{q(x) > 0\} \). Without loss of generality, assume the prior which we write as

\[
(3.27) \quad C_{4/3} \cap F \sim \{q(x) < 0\} \cap C_{4/3}.
\]

We assumed, that one of (3.20) - (3.22) holds for infinitely many \( k \). First suppose that (3.20) holds for infinitely many \( k \). By passing to a subsequence, we may assume that (3.20) holds for all \( k \in \mathbb{N} \). Then, for all \( k \in \mathbb{N} \), there exists \( x_k \in \partial F_k \cap C_1 \) such that \( t_0 \leq |q(x_k)| \). By passing to a subsequence, \( x_k \to x_\infty \) for some \( x_\infty \in \overline{C}_1 \) and \( |q(x_\infty)| \geq t_0 \). By Theorem 3.6 (3), \( x_\infty \in \text{spt } \mu = \text{spt } \mu_F = \partial F \). Hence (see [Mag12, Proposition 12.19])

\[
(3.28) \quad 0 < |B(x_\infty, s) \cap F| < \omega_n s^n \quad \forall s > 0.
\]

Since \( |q(x_\infty)| \geq t_0 \), then (3.27) implies that for \( s \leq \min\{1/8, |q(x_\infty)|/2\} \) satisfies

\[
(3.29) \quad |B(x_\infty, s) \cap F| = \begin{cases} 
\omega_n s^n & \text{if } q(x_\infty) < 0 \\
0 & \text{if } q(x_\infty) > 0
\end{cases}
\]

which contradicts (3.28). This shows that (3.20) cannot hold for infinitely many \( k \).

Arguing as above and invoking Theorem 3.6 (3) we conclude that there exists \( k_0 \in \mathbb{N} \) such that for all \( k \geq k_0 \)

\[
(3.30) \quad \{x \in C_{5/4} \cap \partial F_k \mid t_0 < |q(x)| \leq 1\} = \emptyset.
\]

However, by [Mag12, Equation 16.7] for all \( r \in (1, 5/4) \)

\[
|\mu_{F_k \cap C_r}| = |\mu_C| \ll F_k^{(1)} \ll |\mu_{F_k}| \ll (C_r \cap \{\nu_E = \nu_C\})
\]

For almost every \( r \in (1, 5/4) \) \( |\mu_{F_k}|(\partial C_r) = 0 \) for all \( k \). So, for any such \( r \) (3.30) demonstrates

\[
(3.31) \quad |\mu_{F_k \cap C_r}|(\{x \in C_r \mid t_0 < |q(x)| < 1\}) = 0 \quad \forall k \geq k_0.
\]

We claim (3.31) implies that for almost every \( r \in (1, 5/4) \), \( \chi_{C_r \cap F_k} \) is locally constant on \( [t_0 < |q(x)| < 1] \cap C_r \) which implies \( \chi_{C_r \cap F_k} \) is constant on \( [t_0 < |q(x)| < 1] \). Indeed, for each choice of sign \( U_\pm = \{t < \pm q(x) < 1\} \cap C_1 \) is open and connected so (3.31) guarantees that for any \( \varphi \in C^1_\nu(U_\pm) \)

\[
0 = |\mu_{F_k}|(U_\pm) \geq \sup_{\varphi \in C^1_\nu(U_\pm)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi \, d\mu_{F_k} = \sup_{\varphi \in C^1_\nu(U_\pm)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \chi_{F_k} \nabla \varphi \, dx.
\]

So \( \chi_{F_k} \) is almost everywhere constant in each \( U_\pm \) by [Mag12, Lemma 7.5].
By (3.27) and $F_k \cap C_{S/3} \xrightarrow{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} F$, it follows that for $k \geq k_0$

$$\chi_{F_k \cap C_1} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for almost every } x \in C_1 \cap \{ t_0 < q(x) < 1 \} \\ 1 & \text{for almost every } x \in C_1 \cap \{-1 < q(x) < t_0 \} \end{cases}$$

This shows that (3.21) and (3.22) cannot happen for infinitely many $k$. \hfill \Box

The (qualitative) separation lemma above can be further improved to a quantitative "height bound" of $\partial E$ by fairly standard techniques in the theory of sets of locally finite perimeter (see Theorem A.2). Topological considerations then imply the following theorem. The requisite proofs are included in Appendix A.

**Theorem 3.9.** Given $C_A \geq 1$ and $n \geq 2$, there exists a constant $\epsilon_1(n, C_A) > 0$ such that if $E \in \mathcal{A}(C_A, 4r_0)$ for some $r_0 > 0$, and $x_0 \in \partial E$ satisfies

$$e(E, x_0, 2r, \nu) \leq \epsilon_1$$

for some $\nu \in \mathbb{S}^n$ and $0 < r < 2r_0$, then

$$\langle x - x_0, \nu \rangle \leq C_1 e(E, x_0, 2r, \nu) \frac{1}{\|
u\|^n} \quad \forall x \in C(x_0, r, \nu) \cap \partial E,$$

and

$$\left\{ x \in C(x_0, r, \nu) \cap E : \langle x - x_0, \nu \rangle > C_1 e(E, x_0, 2r, \nu) \frac{1}{\|
u\|^n} \right\} = \emptyset,$$

and

$$\left\{ x \in C(x_0, r, \nu) \cap E^c : \langle x - x_0, \nu \rangle < -C_1 e(E, x_0, 2r, \nu) \frac{1}{\|
u\|^n} \right\} = \emptyset.$$

An immediate quantitative consequence of Lemma 3.4 and Theorem 3.9 is

**Corollary 3.10.** Given $n \geq 2$, and $C_A \geq 1$ there exist constants $\epsilon_2 = \epsilon_2(n, C_A)$ and $C_2 = C(n, C_A)$ such that if $E \in \mathcal{A}(C_A, r_0)$ (for some $r_0 > 0$) satisfies

$$\sup_{r < r_0} \left( \int_{B(x,r) \cap \partial E} \left| \nu_E - (\nu_E)_x \right|^2 \mathcal{H}^{n-1} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \epsilon_2,$$

for some $x \in \partial E$, then

$$\sup_{\rho < r_0/8} \Theta(x, \rho) \leq C_2 \epsilon_2^{\frac{1}{n}}.$$

In particular, if $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a domain such that $\partial \Omega = \partial \Omega$, $\partial \Omega$ is $(n-1)$-Ahlfors regular, and $v_E \in BMO(\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \sqsubset \partial \Omega)$ with

$$\sup_{r < r_0} \sup_{x \in \partial \Omega} \left( \int_{B(x,r) \cap \partial \Omega} \left| v_E - (v_E)_x \right|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \epsilon_2,$$

then $\Omega$ is a $(r_0/8, C_2 \epsilon_2^{\frac{1}{n}})$-Reifenberg flat domain.

**Proof.** As in Remark 2.4, $\partial \Omega = \partial \Omega$ and $\partial \Omega$ is Ahlfors regular imply

$$\partial \Omega = \text{spt } \mu_{\Omega}, \quad \| \partial \Omega \| \text{ is Ahlfors regular}.$$

That is, $\Omega \in \mathcal{A}(C_A, r_0)$ for some constants $C_A$, and all $r_0$. Therefore the corollary is a consequence of Theorem 3.9. \hfill \Box

An immediate qualitative consequence of Lemma 3.10 and Theorem 3.9 is
Corollary 3.11. If $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a domain such that $\partial_v \Omega = \partial \Omega$, $\partial \Omega$ is $(n-1)$-Ahlfors regular, and $\nu_E \in VMO_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \setminus \partial \Omega)$ then $\partial \Omega$ is a vanishing Reifenberg flat set.

Corollary 3.10 also has the following quantitative consequence for $\delta$-CADs, see Definition 2.19.

Corollary 3.12. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a domain with $\partial_v \Omega = \partial \Omega$ and with $(n-1)$-Ahlfors regular boundary with constant $C_A$. Further assume, if $\Omega$ is unbounded, that $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \partial \Omega$ consists of two nonempty connected components. Then, there exists a $\delta_n > 0$ such that for $\delta \in (0, \delta_n)$, there exists $\epsilon_\delta < \epsilon_2$ such that if $\sup_{x \in \partial \Omega} \|\nu\|(x, R_0) < \epsilon_\delta$, for some $R_0$, then $\Omega$ is a $\delta$-chord arc domain.

4. An Application to a Two-Phase Problem For Harmonic Measure

In this section, we consider a two-phase free boundary problem for harmonic measure, originally studied by Kenig-Toro in [KT06] and later by [BH16]. In particular, we complete the proof of Theorem 1.1, and prove a quantitative version of it (Theorem 4.13).

4.1. The Existence of Corkscrews. The goal of this subsection is to show that the doubling of harmonic measure implies interior corkscrews (Lemma 4.3). Later, we will show that control on the oscillation of the log of the Poisson kernel implies doubling. This is an important step in proving Theorem 4.11 as it will allow us use the theory of UR domains (by way of Appendix B). First we recall what it means for harmonic measure to be doubling.

Definition 4.1. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a domain with harmonic measure $\omega$. We say that $\omega$ is locally doubling with constant $C$, if for every compact set $K$ there exists $r_K > 0$ such that

$$\omega(B(x, 2r)) < C \omega(B(x, r)),$$

for all $x \in \partial \Omega \cap K$ and all $r \in (0, r_K)$. We also refer to $r_K$ as the (local) doubling condition radius.

Remark 4.2. We often assume that $r_K$ is sufficiently small compared to the distance from the pole of $\omega$ to the boundary $\partial \Omega$. This allows us to focus on local regions away from the pole, so that we can use preliminary estimates on the harmonic measure with ease.

To prove estimates that are uniform on compacta, it is important to keep track what the value of each constant depends on, and in particular, whether or not it depends on the choice of compact set. For simplicity we may say the value depends on allowable constants, if it only depends on the dimension $n$ and the Ahlfors regularity constant, and does not depend on the compact set. The following Lemma 4.3, which might be considered folklore, shows the existence of interior corkscrews given the doubling of harmonic measure. This is an essential step, as it allows us to gain topological information on $\Omega$ from the regularity of the Poisson kernel. We sketch the proof here, which is a small modification of the proof of [HM15, Lemma 3.14] (see also [HLMN17, Lemma 4.24]).
Lemma 4.3. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a domain whose boundary is Ahlfors regular with constant $C_A$. Fix $X_0 \in \Omega$. Suppose $\omega^\infty$ is locally doubling with constant $C_0$. There exists an $\eta = \eta(n, C_A) > 0$ such that for every closed ball $K$, if $r_K < \eta(X_0)$ is the doubling radius of $\omega^\infty$ in $K$, then $\Omega$ admits an interior corkscrew ball at every $x \in \partial \Omega \cap K$ up to radius $s_K := \eta r_K$ with constant $C_1 = C(n, C_A, C_0)$.

Proof. Fix the closed ball $K$ and recall that $r_K$ is the local doubling radius. The proof of this lemma requires a slight modification of the argument in [HM15, Lemma 3.14]. Recall the following relationship between the Green function and the harmonic measure. For $\Phi \in C_c^{00}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$

\begin{equation}
(4.2) \quad \int_{\partial \Omega} \Phi(y) \, d\omega^X(y) - \Phi(X) = - \int_{\Omega} \nabla G(X, Y) \nabla \Phi(Y) \, dY, \quad \text{a.e. } X \in \Omega,
\end{equation}

where $\omega := \omega^X$ and $G(Y) := G(X, Y)$ are the harmonic measure and Green’s function for $\Omega$ with pole at $X$. It was proven in [HM15, Lemma 2.40] that there exists $k_0 > 2$ depending only on dimension and the Ahlfors regularity constant such that for all $x \in \partial \Omega$ and $0 < r < \min\{\delta(X_0)/k_0, \text{diam}(\partial \Omega)\}$, for $B = B(x, r)$

\begin{equation}
(4.3) \quad \sup_{r/2 \leq \rho \leq r} G(Y) \leq \frac{1}{|B|} \int_B G(Y) \, dY \leq r \frac{\omega(CB)}{\sigma(CB)},
\end{equation}

where all implicit (and explicit) constants depend only on dimension and the Ahlfors regularity constant.

Now let $x \in \partial \Omega$ and $0 < r < \min\{\delta(X_0)/k_0, 10^{-3} \text{diam}(\partial \Omega), 10^{-3} r_K / C\}$, where $r_K$ is the doubling condition radius for $\omega$ and $C$ is as in (4.3). Without loss of generality we may assume $r_K \ll \min\{\delta(X), \text{diam}(\partial \Omega)\}$, so that the above minimum equals $10^{-3} r_K / C$. Set $B := B(x, r)$ and $\Phi \in C_c^{00}(\frac{1}{2} B)$ be such that $0 \leq \Phi \leq 1$, $\Phi \equiv 1$ on $\frac{1}{100} B$ and $|\nabla \Phi| \leq 8/r$. Using (4.2) with $X = X_0$ we obtain

\begin{equation}
(4.4) \quad r \omega(\frac{1}{100} B) \leq r \int_{\partial \Omega \cap \frac{1}{100} B} \Phi(y) \, d\omega^X(y) = -r \int_{\Omega} \nabla G(Y) \nabla \Phi(Y) \, dY
\leq 8 \int_{\Omega \cap \frac{1}{4} B} |\nabla G(Y)| \, dY
\leq 8 \int_{\frac{1}{4} B \cap \Omega} |\nabla G(Y)| \, dY + 8 \int_{\frac{1}{4} B \cap \Sigma_\rho} |\nabla G(Y)| \, dY
= A + B,
\end{equation}

where $\Sigma_\rho(r)$ is the ‘boundary strip’, $\Sigma_\rho := \{Y \in \Omega : \delta(Y) \leq \rho r\}$ and $\rho > 0$ is a small number to be chosen momentarily. Let $W = \{I\}$ be a Whitney decomposition of $\Omega$ and let $I := \{I \in W : I \cap \frac{1}{2} B \cap \Sigma_\rho \neq \emptyset\}$. Then using standard interior estimates (the Caccioppoli inequality and the Moser estimate)

\begin{equation}
(4.5) \quad B \leq 8 \sum_{I \in J} \int_{I} |\nabla G(Y)| \, dY \leq C' \sum_{I \in J} \ell(I)^{n-1} |G(Y_I)|,
\end{equation}

where $Y_I$ is the center of the Whitney cube $I$ and $\ell(I)$ is the side length of $I$. For each $I \in J$ we use the Hölder continuity at the boundary of the Green function (which

\footnote{We may move $X_0$ slightly using the Harnack inequality.}
only depends on dimension and the Ahlfors regularity constant), in conjunction with (4.3), to get the estimate
\[ G(Y) \leq \left( \frac{\ell(I)}{r} \right)^{\alpha} \frac{1}{|\partial B|} \int_{2B \cap \Omega} G(Y) \, dY \leq \left( \frac{\ell(I)}{r} \right)^{\alpha} r \omega(CB) \sigma(CB). \]

Summing over \( I \subset \mathcal{I} \), and using an elementary geometric argument, whose proof we temporarily postpone, we have that
\[ (4.6) \quad \mathcal{B} \leq \rho^\alpha r \omega(CB) \leq \rho^\alpha r \omega(\frac{1}{100}B), \]
where we used that the harmonic measure is doubling up to \( r_K \).

Then there exists \( \rho > 0 \) depending on \( C_0,n \), and \( C \) (which depended additionally on \( C_A \)), small enough so that the upper bound in (4.6) can be absorbed in the left hand side of (4.4) at which point we have
\[ \mathcal{A} = 8 \int_{\frac{1}{2}B \cap \Omega} |\nabla G(Y)| \, dY \geq \frac{1}{2} r \omega(\frac{1}{100}B) > 0. \]

Since \( \mathcal{A} > 0 \) there exists a point \( Y_B \in \frac{1}{2}B \cap \Omega \) such that \( \delta(Y_B) > \rho r \), which shows that \( \Omega \) satisfies the \((\frac{1}{2}, R_0)\)-interior corkscrew condition, where
\[ R_0 = \min\{\delta(X)/\kappa_0, 10^{-3} \text{diam}(\partial \Omega), 10^{-3} r_K/C\} = 10^{-3} r_K/C =: s_K. \]
Hence we finish the proof of the lemma with constant \( \eta := 10^{-3}/C \).

Now we sketch the ‘elementary geometric argument’, that is, how we used the estimate on \( G(Y_I) \) and (4.5) to obtain (4.6). If we let
\[ \tilde{I} := \{ I \in \mathcal{W} : I \cap \frac{1}{2}B \neq \emptyset \} \]
then we observe that the Whitney property of each \( I \in \tilde{I} \) ensures that \( \ell(I) \leq r \) and for each \( I \in \tilde{I} \) there exists \( \tilde{x}_I \) in \( B(x, Cr) \cap \partial \Omega \) such that
\[ \ell(I) \approx \text{dist}(I, \partial \Omega) \approx \text{dist}(\tilde{x}_I, Y), \quad \forall Y \in I. \]

Now fix \( k \) such that \( 2^{-k} \leq \rho r \), denote \( \tilde{I}_k := \{ I \in \tilde{I} : \ell(I) = 2^{-k} \} \) and cover \( B(x, Cr) \cap \partial \Omega \) by balls \( \{ B(x_k, j) \} \) with \( x_k, j \in \partial \Omega \) such that \( \{ \frac{1}{2}B_k, j \} \) are disjoint. Using Ahlfors regularity to compare surface areas we see that for each fixed \( k \),
\[ \# \{ B_k, j \} \approx r^{n-1} 2^{k(n-1)}. \]

Now for each \( I \in \tilde{I}_k \) associate an index \( j \) such that \( x_I \in B_k, j \) and notice we have \( \text{dist}(Y, x_k, j) \leq 2^{-k} \) for all \( Y \in I \). Since the \( I \in \tilde{I}_k \) are disjoint, comparing volumes we have that for fixed \( j \)
\[ \# \{ I \in \tilde{I}_k : I \text{ is associated to } j \} \leq C, \]
where \( C \) depends on dimension. It follows from our bound on \( \# \{ B_k, j \} \) that
\[ \# \tilde{I}_k \approx r^{n-1} 2^{k(n-1)}. \]

Now breaking the sum over \( k \) in (4.5) and using our bound for \( G(Y_I) \) we obtain
\[ \mathcal{B} \leq \omega(CB) r^{2-n-\alpha} \sum_{k \geq \log_2(\rho r)} \sum_{I \in \tilde{I}_k} 2^{-k(n-1+\alpha)} \]
\[ \leq \omega(CB)r^{2-n-\alpha} \sum_{k=\log_2(r)} r^{n-1}\gamma^{k(n-1)2^{-k(n-1)\alpha}} \]
\[ \leq \rho^n r\omega(CB) \]
as desired, where we used \( \sigma(CB) \approx r^{n-1} \) in the first line. \( \Box \)

One immediate corollary is that domains with Ahlfors regular boundaries have uniformly rectifiable boundaries whenever the interior and exterior harmonic measures are doubling.

**Corollary 4.4.** Suppose \( \Omega^+ \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) and \( \Omega^- = \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{\Omega^+} \) are (connected) domains with common topological boundary \( \partial \Omega := \partial \Omega^+ = \partial \Omega^- \) and \( \text{diam}(\partial \Omega^+) < \infty \), which has the additional property that \( \partial \Omega \) is \((n-1)\)-Ahlfors regular. Suppose further that there exists \( X^+ \in \Omega^+ \) and \( X^- \in \Omega^- \) such that the harmonic measures \( \omega_{X^+} \) and \( \omega_{X^-} \) are doubling. Then \( \partial \Omega \) is uniformly rectifiable and \( \partial \Omega = \partial_\ast \Omega \). In particular, \( \Omega^\pm \) are UR domains.

### 4.2. A Localization Result.

The major technical result of this section is Theorem 4.11, which, roughly, states that the local oscillation of the Poisson kernel controls the local oscillation of the unit normal. Perhaps contrary to the spirit of a “localized result” the scale at which we get control of the oscillation of the unit normal depends on the compact set; however the quantitative control does not, see (4.45) and (4.46).

Our main tool in the proof of Theorem 4.11 is the single layer potential, we recall its definition now:

**Definition 4.5 (Riesz transforms and the single layer potential).** Let \( F \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) be an \((n-1)\)-dimensional AR (hence closed) set with surface measure \( \sigma = \mathcal{H}^{n-1} \cap F \). We define the (vector valued) Riesz kernel as

\[ \mathcal{K}(x) = \tilde{c}_n \frac{x}{|x|^n} \]

where \( \tilde{c}_n \) is chosen so that \( \mathcal{K} \) is the gradient of fundamental solution to the Laplacian. For a Borel measurable function \( f \), we then define the Riesz transform

\[ Rf(X) := \mathcal{K} \ast (f \sigma)(X) = \int_F \mathcal{K}(X-y)f(y) \, d\sigma(y) \quad X \in \mathbb{R}^n, \]

as well as the truncated Riesz transforms

\[ R_\varepsilon f(X) := \int_{F \cap \{|X-y|>\varepsilon\}} \mathcal{K}(X-y)f(y) \, d\sigma(y), \quad \varepsilon > 0. \]

We define \( S \) the single layer potential for the Laplacian relative to \( E \) to be

\[ Sf(X) := \int_F \mathcal{E}(X-y)f(y) \, d\sigma(y), \]

where \( \mathcal{E}(X) = c_n |X|^{2-n} \) is the (positive) fundamental solution to the Laplacian in \( \mathbb{R}^n \). Notice that \( \nabla Sf(X) = Rf(X) \) for \( X \notin F \).

The singular layer potential is useful in that it gives solutions to the Neumann problem. However, in order to make sense of boundary data in a rough domain we need to introduce the concept of non-tangential regions:
**Definition 4.6** (Nontangential approach region and maximal function). Fix $\alpha > 0$ and let $\Omega$ be a domain, then for $x \in \partial \Omega$ we define the nontangential approach region (or “cone”)

\[(4.10) \quad \Gamma(x) = \Gamma_\alpha(x) = \{Y \in \Omega : |Y - x| < (1 + \alpha)\delta(Y)\}.
\]

We also define the nontangential maximal function for $u : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$

\[(4.11) \quad Nu(x) = \mathcal{N}_\alpha u(x) = \sup_{Y \in \Gamma_\alpha(x)} |u(Y)|, \quad x \in \partial \Omega.
\]

We make the convention that $Nu(x) = 0$ when $\Gamma_\alpha(x) = \emptyset$ and that $\alpha = 1$ when no subscript appears in $\Gamma$.

The relationship between the two definitions above is made clear in the following two lemmas:

**Lemma 4.7** ([HMT10], [Dav91]). Suppose that $\Omega$ is a UR domain (recall Definition 2.11) whose measure theoretic and topological boundary agree up to a set of $H^{n-1}$ measure zero. For all $p \in (1, \infty)$ we have

\[(4.12) \quad \|\mathcal{N}(\nabla Sf)\|_{L^p(d\sigma)} \leq C\|f\|_{L^p(d\sigma)},
\]

where $C$ depends on the UR character of $\partial \Omega$, dimension, $p$, and the aperture of the cones defining $\mathcal{N}$.

Estimate (4.12) is essentially proved in [Dav91]; bounds for the non-tangential maximal function of $\nabla Sf$ follow from uniform bounds for the truncated singular integrals, plus a standard Cotlar Lemma argument; the details may be found in [HMT10, Proposition 3.20].

In addition, we have the following result proved in [HMT10].

**Lemma 4.8** ([HMT10] Proposition 3.30). If $\Omega$ is a UR domain, whose measure theoretic and topological boundary agree up to a set of $H^{n-1}$ measure zero, then for a.e. $x \in \partial \Omega$, and for all $f \in L^p(d\sigma)$, $1 < p < \infty$,

\[(4.13) \quad \lim_{Z \to x \atop Z \in \Gamma^-} \nabla Sf(Z) = -\frac{1}{2} \nu(x)f(x) + T f(x),
\]

and

\[(4.14) \quad \lim_{Z \to x \atop Z \in \Gamma^+} \nabla Sf(Z) = \frac{1}{2} \nu(x)f(x) + T f(x).
\]

where $\Gamma^+(x)$ is the cone at $x$ relative to $\Omega$, $\Gamma^-(x)$ is the cone at $x$ relative to $\Omega_{\text{ext}}$, $\nu$ is the unit outer normal to $\Omega$, and $T$ is a (vector-valued) principal value singular integral operator:

\[T f(x) = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0^+} \int_{y \in \partial \Omega \setminus B(x, \epsilon)} \nabla \mathcal{E}(x - y)f(y)d\sigma(y).
\]

**Remark 4.9.** As in [BH16], we have taken our fundamental solution to be positive, so for that reason there are some changes in sign in both (4.13) and (4.14) as compared to the formulation in [HMT10].

\footnote{In the settings treated here, this is always a set of $H^{n-1}$ measure zero [HMT10, Proposition 2.9].}
Next we show that if $\log k$ has small BMO norm, the measure $\omega = k \, d\sigma$ is doubling. The proof uses the fact that $\sigma$ is doubling. We remark that in general, the fact that $\| \log k \|_{BMO} < \infty$ or that $k$ satisfies a reverse Hölder inequality, does not ensure that $\omega = k \, d\sigma$ is doubling, see the discussions and example in [ST89, Chapter I].

**Lemma 4.10.** Let $\sigma$ be a doubling measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $\omega = k \, d\sigma$ be another Radon measure. There exists $\tau_0$ small, such that if

$$\| \log k \|_1 (B(x_0, 4r_0)) < \tau \leq \tau_0 \text{ for some } x_0 \in \text{spt } \sigma \text{ and } r_0 > 0.$$  

Then the following holds for $B \subset B(x_0, 2r_0)$ with $B$ a ball centered in $\text{spt } \sigma$.

1. There is a constant $C$ depending on $n$ such that

$$\frac{1}{1 + C\tau} \int_B k \, d\sigma \leq e^{\int_B \log k \, d\sigma} \leq \int_B k \, d\sigma = \frac{\omega(B)}{\sigma(B)}.$$  

2. Given $p > 1$, there exists $\tau(p) \leq \tau_0$ such that if (4.15) holds with $\tau \leq \tau(p)$ then for any Borel set $E \subset B$, where $B$ is as before

$$\frac{\omega(E)}{\omega(B)} \geq c(p, \tau) \left( \frac{\sigma(E)}{\sigma(B)} \right)^p.$$  

Here the constant $c(p, \tau) \to 1$ as $\tau \to 0$.

3. In particular, for $x \in \text{spt } \sigma$ such that $B(x, 2r) \subset B(x_0, 2r_0)$

$$\omega(B(x, 2r)) \leq C \omega(B(x, r)),$$

where the constant $C$ depends on $n$ and the doubling constant of $\sigma$.

4. Given $r > 1$ there exists $\tau(r) \leq \tau_0$ such that if (4.15) holds with $\tau \leq \tau(r)$ then the weight $k$ satisfies the reverse Hölder inequality for $r$, i.e.

$$\left( \int_B k^r \, d\sigma \right)^{1/r} \leq C(r, \tau) \int_B k \, d\sigma.$$  

Here the constant $C(r, \tau) \to 1$ as $\tau \to 0$.

**Proof.** By the local version of John-Nirenberg inequality for doubling measures (see [ABKY11, Theorem 5.2]) we have

$$\sigma \left( \left\{ x \in B : |\log k(x) - (\log k)_B| > \lambda \right\} \right) \leq C_1 e^{-C_2 \lambda} \sigma(B)$$

for all $\lambda > 0$. Therefore

$$\int_B e^{\lambda \log k - (\log k)_B} \, d\sigma$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sigma(B)} \int_0^{\infty} \sigma \left( \left\{ x \in B : e^{\lambda \log k(x) - (\log k)_B} > s \right\} \right) ds$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{\sigma(B)} \int_0^{\lambda} \sigma(B) ds + \frac{1}{\sigma(B)} \int_0^{\infty} \sigma \left( \left\{ x \in B : |\log k(x) - (\log k)_B| > \lambda \right\} \right) e^{\lambda} d\lambda$$

$$\leq 1 + C_1 \int_0^{\infty} e^{-C_2 \lambda} \lambda^{1+k} d\lambda$$

$$\leq 1 + C\tau,$$  

(4.20)

$$\leq 1 + C\tau,$$  

for all $\lambda > 0$. Therefore
if \( \tau \) is sufficiently small (depending on the constant \( C_2 \)). (4.16) follows immediately.

Similarly, provided \( \tau \) is small enough depending on \( p \) we also have

\[(4.21) \quad \int_B e^{\frac{1}{p} \log k - (\log k)^b} \, d\sigma \leq 1 + C_p \tau.\]

Let \( q = p / (p - 1) \) be the Hölder conjugate of \( p \). It follows that

\[
\int_B k d\sigma \cdot \left( \int_B k^{-\frac{q}{p}} d\sigma \right)^\frac{p}{q} = \int_B e^{\log k - (\log k)^b} d\sigma \cdot \left( \int_B e^{-\frac{1}{p} (\log k - (\log k)^b)} d\sigma \right)^{p-1} \leq \int_B e^{\log k - (\log k)^b} d\sigma \cdot \left( \int_B e^{\frac{1}{p} \log k - (\log k)^b} d\sigma \right)^{p-1} \leq (1 + C_p \tau)^p,
\]

i.e. \( k \in A_p(\sigma) \), where \( A_p \) is the Muckenhoupt class with power \( p > 1 \).

Let \( g \geq 0 \) be an arbitrary measurable function on \( B \). We have

\[
\int_B g d\sigma \leq \left( \int_B g^p k d\sigma \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left( \int_B k^{-\frac{q}{p}} d\sigma \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq (1 + C_p \tau) \sigma(B) \left( \int_B k d\sigma \right)^{-\frac{1}{p}} \left( \int_B g^p k d\sigma \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.
\]

In particular for any Borel set \( E \subset B \), by plugging in the above inequality \( g = \chi_E \), we get

\[
\frac{\sigma(E)}{\sigma(B)} \leq (1 + C_p \tau) \left( \frac{\omega(E)}{\omega(B)} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}},
\]

or equivalently

\[
\frac{\omega(E)}{\omega(B)} \geq c(p, \tau) \left( \frac{\sigma(E)}{\sigma(B)} \right)^p
\]

with \( c(p, \tau) = 1 / (1 + C_p \tau)^p ). The doubling property (4.18) follows by taking \( E = (1/2)B \) and bounding \( c(p, \tau) \) below by \( c(p, \tau_0) \).

Let \( r > 1 \), then (4.21) applied to \( p = 1 + 1/r \) implies that for \( \tau \) small enough depending on \( r \) we have

\[
\int_B k^r d\sigma \leq (1 + C_r \tau)^{1/2}.
\]

Taking \( r \)-th root on both sides of the inequality and using (4.16), we get

\[
\left( \int_B k^r d\sigma \right)^{1/r} \leq (1 + C_r \tau)^{1/r} e^{(\log k)^b} \leq (1 + C_r \tau)^{1/r} \int_B k d\sigma,
\]

i.e. \( k \in RH_r(\sigma) \), where \( RH_r \) denotes weight that satisfies the reverse Hölder inequality with power \( r > 1 \).
After we establish the reverse Hölder inequality (4.19), it is not difficult to show
\begin{equation}
\left( \int_B \left( \frac{1}{\log \frac{r}{a}} \right)^2 \, d\sigma \right)^{1/2} \leq C \left( \| \log k \|_r (4B) \right)^{1/8} \leq C \tau^{1/8},
\end{equation}
where $a = e^{\int_B \log k \, d\sigma}$. For details of the proof we refer interested readers to [BH16, Lemma 1.33].

The following result states that control on the oscillation of the logarithm of the interior and exterior Poisson kernel provides control on the oscillation of the unit normal.

**Theorem 4.11.** Let $\Omega^+ \subset \mathbb{R}^n, \Omega^- = \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{\Omega^+}$ be connected domains with common (topological) boundary, $\partial \Omega^+ = \partial \Omega^- = \partial \Omega$. Assume that $\partial \Omega$ is $(n-1)$-Ahlfors regular and let $X^\pm \in \Omega^\pm$ be such that $k^\pm = \frac{d\sigma}{d\omega}$ exist. Given $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $\kappa_1 > 0$ depending on $\delta(X^\pm), \epsilon, n$ and the Ahlfors regularity constant $C_A$ such that if $\log k^\pm \in BMO_{\text{loc}}(\sigma)$ with constant $0 < \kappa \leq \kappa_1$, then $\nu \in BMO_{\text{loc}}(\sigma)$ with constant at most $\epsilon$. In particular, if $\log k^\pm \in VMO_{\text{loc}}(\sigma)$, then $\nu \in VMO_{\text{loc}}(\sigma)$.

**Remark 4.12.** The proof of the above theorem yields a quantitative estimate, see (4.45) and (4.46).

**Proof.** Let $A > 2$ be a constant depending on dimension and the Ahlfors regularity constant such that if $x_0 \in \partial \Omega$ and $r_0 \in (0, \text{diam } \partial \Omega)$ then there exists $^{3}$ a dyadic cube $Q$ as in Lemma B.2 such that
\[
\Delta(x_0, r_0/A) \subset Q \subset \Delta(x_0, r_0).
\]

Let $\tau(p)$ be as in Lemma 4.10 such that (4.17) holds with power $p = 1 + 1/(2(n-1))$. Suppose that $\log k^\pm \in BMO_{\text{loc}}(\sigma)$ with constant $\kappa \in (0, \kappa_1)$, where $\kappa_1 \leq \tau(p)$ will be determined after (4.43). Notice that in the case when $\log k^\pm \in VMO_{\text{loc}}(\sigma)$ this holds for every $\kappa > 0$. Fix $B^* = B(y_0, 4R)$ for some $y_0 \in \partial \Omega$ and $R \in (0, \text{diam } (\partial \Omega)/4)$ and set $\overline{B} = \frac{1}{4} B^*$. Since $\log k^\pm \in BMO_{\text{loc}}(\sigma)$ with constant $\kappa$, there exists a radius $r_1 = r_0(\tau, B^*) < c \min \{ R, \delta(X^\pm) \}$ (with $c > 0$ depending on dimension and Ahlfors regularity) such that
\[
\| \log k \|_{c}(B(z_0, 2r_0)) < \kappa, \quad \forall z_0 \in B^* \cap \partial \Omega.
\]

The proof of Lemma 4.10 establishes that $\omega^\pm$ are doubling up to radius $r_0$ on balls centered on $B^* \cap \partial \Omega$, with a doubling constant depending on $n$ and $C_A$. Moreover by choice of $c$ and Lemma 4.3, the domains $\Omega^\pm$ both admit an interior corkscrew ball for every $x \in B^* \cap \partial \Omega$ up to radius $r_0$. Thus, we record for later use that, in the language of Appendix B, $\Omega$ satisfies the $(x_0, M_0, r_0)$-DLTSCS$^5$ for all $x_0 \in \overline{B}$.

From this point forth, $x_0$ will denote an arbitrary point in $B \cap \partial \Omega$. Let $1 < M < \infty$ and $\theta \in (0, 1)$ be determined later. For $x \in B(x_0, r_0/(20A)) \cap \partial \Omega$, let $r \in (0, \theta r_0)$ be such that $\Delta := \Delta(x, r) \subset \Delta^* := \Delta(x, Mr) \subset B(x_0, r_0/(5A))$.

$^5$See Lemma B.2, properties (iv) and (vii).

$^6$Here we have uniform control on the doubling constant by Lemma 4.10 and the choice of $\kappa_1$.

$^7$This is a local two-sided corkscrew condition.
For any \( y, z \in \Delta \), we let \( y^* \) and \( z^* \) denote arbitrary points in the non-tangential approach regions in \( \Omega^- \), \( \Gamma^-(y) \cap B(y, r/2) \) and \( \Gamma^-(z) \cap B(z, r/2) \), respectively. Following [BH16, Theorem 1.1] we first show

\[
\begin{align*}
(4.23) \quad & \left( \int_\Delta \left| \nabla S_{\Lambda^*}(z^*) - \int_\Delta \nabla S_{\Lambda^*}(y^*) \, d\sigma(y) \right|^2 \, d\sigma(z) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \leq \frac{C_1}{\omega(B(x_0, r_0/(5A)))} \cdot \left( \frac{r}{r_0} \right)^{1/2} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} + C_2 M^{\frac{M}{2}} \kappa n^{\frac{1}{4}} + C_3 \frac{1}{M} ,
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \omega \) is the harmonic measure of \( \Omega^+ \) with pole \( X^+ \), and the constants \( C_1, C_2, C_3 > 0 \) only depend on \( n \), the Ahlfors regularity constant \( C_A \) and \( \delta(X^-) \). In particular, \( \omega = k^* \, d\sigma \). We decompose \( 1_{\Lambda^*} \) as

\[
(4.24) \quad 1_{\Lambda^*} = \left[ \left( 1 - \frac{k^*}{a} \right) 1_{\Lambda^*} \right] + \left[ \frac{k^*}{a} \right] - \left[ \left( \frac{k^*}{a} \right) 1_{(\Lambda^*)} \right] ,
\]

where \( a = a_{1, M} = e^{f_{\Lambda^*} \log k^* \, d\sigma} \). We want to estimate the left hand side of (4.23) by using this decomposition and the triangle inequality. This gives three terms, which we denote as \( I, II \) and \( III \):

\[
(4.25) \quad I = \left( \int_\Delta \nabla S \left[ \left( 1 - \frac{k}{a} \right) 1_{\Lambda^*} \right] (z^*) - \int_\Delta \nabla S \left[ \left( 1 - \frac{k}{a} \right) 1_{\Lambda^*} \right] (y^*) \, d\sigma(y) \right)^2 \, d\sigma(z) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} ,
\]

\[
(4.26) \quad II = \left( \int_\Delta \nabla S \left[ \frac{k}{a} \right] (z^*) - \int_\Delta \nabla S \left[ \frac{k}{a} \right] (y^*) \, d\sigma(y) \right)^2 \, d\sigma(z) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} ,
\]

and

\[
(4.27) \quad III = \left( \int_\Delta \nabla S \left[ \left( \frac{k}{a} \right) 1_{(\Lambda^*)} \right] (z^*) - \int_\Delta \nabla S \left[ \left( \frac{k}{a} \right) 1_{(\Lambda^*)} \right] (y^*) \, d\sigma(y) \right)^2 \, d\sigma(z) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} .
\]

For simplicity we drop the super-index and write \( k = k^* \). We will leave the estimate of \( I \) for last as it requires the use of the localization Lemma B.4.

For \( II \), we recall that \( k = k^* \) is the Poisson kernel for \( \Omega \) with pole at \( X^+ \). Moreover, \( \mathcal{E}(\cdot - z^*) \) and \( \mathcal{E}(\cdot - y^*) \) are harmonic in \( \Omega \) since \( z^*, y^* \in \Omega^- \), and decay to 0 at infinity, and are therefore equal to their respective Poisson integrals in \( \Omega \). Consequently,

\[
(4.28) \quad II \leq \frac{1}{a} \left( \int_\Delta \nabla \mathcal{E}(X^+ - z^*) - \nabla \mathcal{E}(X^+ - y^*) \, d\sigma(y) \right)^2 \, d\sigma(z) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} .
\]

Note that, since \( y^*, z^* \in B(x, 2r) \) and \( |X^+ - x| > r_0 \)

\[
\left| \nabla \mathcal{E}(X^+ - z^*) - \nabla \mathcal{E}(X^+ - y^*) \right| \leq \frac{r}{r_0} .
\]

Then continuing (4.28), we have, using (4.17) with power \( p = 1 + 1/(2(n - 1)) \),
probability measure (in III
To estimate $C$
where we understand that, if $\text{diam}(\partial \Omega) < \infty$, the sums are finite and terminate for $2/r \geq \text{diam}(\partial \Omega)$.

$$III \leq \sum_{(j/2^M \leq \frac{n}{2})} \left( \int_{\Delta} \int_{A_j} \frac{r \omega(A_j)}{(2r)^n a} \frac{d\sigma(w)}{d\sigma(y)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

To estimate $III_a$ and $III_b$ we use (4.16), the fact that $A_j \subset \Delta_j$ (in $III_a$), that $\omega$ is a probability measure (in $III_b$) and (4.17) again with $p = 1 + 1/(2(n - 1))$. 

$$III_a = \sum_{(j/2^M \leq \frac{n}{2})} \frac{r \sigma(A_j)}{(2r)^n a} \sum_{(j/2^M \leq \frac{n}{2})} \frac{\omega(A_j)}{(2r)^n a} \frac{\sigma(A_j)}{\omega(A_j)}$$

$$\leq \sum_{(j/2^M \leq \frac{n}{2})} \frac{r \sigma(A_j)}{(2r)^n a} \sum_{(j/2^M \leq \frac{n}{2})} \frac{\omega(A_j)}{(2r)^n a} \frac{1}{M} \cdot \frac{(Mr)^{n-1/2}}{(2r)^n \cdot (Mr)^{1/2}}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \sum_{(j/2^M \leq \frac{n}{2})} 2^{-j/2} = \frac{C}{M}$$
We make the observation that if \( \nabla S \) dominate \( -\Delta \), this end, we make the observation that if \( \nabla S \) dominate \( -\Delta \).

As before the constant \( C > 0 \) in (4.32) and (4.33) depends only on \( n \) and the Ahlfors regularity constant. Combining (4.30), (4.31), (4.32) and (4.33) we conclude that

\[
III \leq C(n, C_A) \frac{M}{r_0} \cdot \frac{C(n, C_A)}{\omega(B(x_0, r_0/(5A)) \cdot M} \cdot \left( \frac{\nu}{r_0} \right)^{1/2} \cdot \frac{M}{r_0} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}}.
\]

The idea to estimate \( I \) is to approximate \( \Omega \), locally, by UR domains, so that we may exploit Lemmas 4.7 and 4.8 on those approximate domains. Using the fact that the \( (x_0, M_0, r_0) \)-DLTSCS holds, we may invoke Lemma B.4 to construct two UR domains \( T_{\Omega}^{+} \subseteq \Omega^{+} \), where \( Q \) is a dyadic cube such that \( \Delta(x_0, r_0/(4A)) \subseteq Q \subseteq \Delta(x_0, r_0/4) \), where the definition of \( A \) above allows us to find such a cube. In particular,

\[
\partial T_{\Omega}^{+} \cap \Delta(x_0, r_0/(4A)) = \Delta(x_0, r_0/(4A))
\]

and for \( \mathcal{H}^{n-1} \) a.e. \( x \in \Delta(x_0, r_0/(4A)) \) the unit outer normals \( v_{T_{\Omega}^{+}}(x) \) exist and satisfy

\[
v_{T_{\Omega}^{+}}(x) = \pm \nu_{\Omega^{+}}(x).
\]

For any open set \( U \) let

\[
S_{U; f}(X) := \int_{\partial U} E(X - y)f(y) d\sigma(y).
\]

In our context \( U \) is either \( \Omega^{+} \) or \( T_{\Omega}^{+} \). The coincidence of \( \partial T_{\Omega}^{+} \cap \Delta(x_0, r_0/(4A)) \) and \( \Delta(x_0, r_0/(4A)) \) allows us to conclude for \( f \in L^{2}(\Delta(x_0, r_0/(4A))) \) with \( \text{sp} f \subseteq \Delta(x_0, r_0/(4A)) \),

\[
S_{\Omega^{+}} f(X) = S_{\Omega^{-}} f(X) = S_{T_{\Omega}^{+}} f(X),
\]

for all \( X \notin \Delta(x_0, r_0/(4A)) \).

Recall

\[
I = \int_{\Delta} \nabla S \left[ \left( 1 - \frac{k}{a} \right) 1_{\Delta^{+}} \left( z^{+} \right) - \int_{\Delta} \nabla S \left[ \left( 1 - \frac{k}{a} \right) 1_{\Delta^{+}} \left( y^{+} \right) \right] d\sigma(y) \right]^{2} d\sigma(z) \right]^{1/2},
\]

where \( z^{+} \) and \( y^{+} \) are in non-tangential regions in \( \Omega^{+} \) over \( y, z \in \partial \Omega \). We want to dominate \( \nabla S \left[ \left( 1 - \frac{k}{a} \right) 1_{\Delta^{+}} \right] \left( z^{+} \right) \) by a non-tangential maximal function in \( T_{\Omega}^{-} \). To this end, we make the observation that if \( r/r_0 \) is sufficiently small (which we may ensure by adjusting the value of \( \theta \)) then for any \( y \in \Delta \), the non-tangential cone \( \Gamma^{+}(y) \cap B(y, r/2) \subset T_{\Omega}^{-} \) provided we take the constant \( K \) in the definition of \( T_{\Omega}^{-} \).
large enough depending on dimension and the Ahlfors regularity of $\partial \Omega$.\footnote{This does not affect the validity of Lemma B.4.} To see this, one needs to inspect the definition of $\mathcal{W}_Q$ (see Appendix B) and note that if $Z \in \Gamma^-(y) \cap B(y, 2r)$ then $\delta(Z) \sim |Z - y| < 2r$ and therefore $Z$ is inside a Whitney cube $I$ for $\Omega^-$ with
\[\text{dist}(I, y) \sim \ell(I) \sim \delta(Z) < 2r \leq \ell(Q).\]
By choosing $K$ sufficiently large, depending on allowable parameters, we can guarantee the existence of a cube $Q' \subset Q$ containing $y \in Q'$ with length $\ell(Q') \approx_K \ell(I)$. Hence $Z \in U_{Q'} \subset T_{Q'}$. Moreover, recall the construction of the Whitney region $U_{Q'} \setminus \text{int}I' \subset U_{Q'}$ where $I' = (1 + \tau)I$ for some (small) parameter $\tau > 0$ (see Appendix B). This forces $\text{dist}(Z, \partial T_{Q'}) \gtrsim \ell(I) \sim |Z - y|$ and therefore
\[Z \in \Gamma_{\beta, T_{Q'}}(y) := \{Y \in T_{Q'} : |Y - y| < (1 + \beta)\text{dist}(Y, \partial T_{Q'})\},\]
where $\beta = \beta(n, C_A, \theta) \gg 1$. We conclude that
\[\Gamma^-(y) \cap B(y, r/2) \subset \Gamma_{\beta, T_{Q'}}(y) \cap B(y, r/2).\]

With these observations in hand, we can estimate $I$. By (4.12) and (4.22), we have
\[I \leq 2 \left( \int_{\Delta} \tilde{N} \left( \nabla S_{T_{Q'}} \left[ \left( 1 - \frac{k}{a} \right) l_{\Delta^*} \right] \right)^2 d\sigma \right)^{1/2}\]
\[\leq C \left( \frac{\sigma(\Delta^*)}{\sigma(\Delta)} \right)^{1/2} \left( \int_{\Delta^*} \left| 1 - \frac{k}{a} \right|^2 d\sigma \right)^{1/2}\]
\[\leq CM^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \left( \|\log k\|, (B(x_0, r_0)) \right)^{1/8} \leq CM^{\frac{n-1}{2}} r^{1/8},\]
where $\tilde{N}$ is the non-tangential maximal function in $T_{Q'}$ with aperture $\beta$ (which dominates $S_{T_{Q'}} \left[ \left( 1 - \frac{k}{a} \right) l_{\Delta^*} \right]$) by the arguments in the preceding paragraph. Note that $C > 0$ above depends only on $\beta > 0, n, C_A$ and the UR constants of $\partial \Omega$, which in turn only depend on $n, C_A$ and $\delta(X^*)$.\footnote{The operator $T_{E}$ is defined in the same way as $S_{E}$.} Putting (4.29), (4.34) and (4.38) together we finally obtain (4.23). The estimate analogous to (4.23) when $y^*$ and $z^*$ are in $\Gamma^+(y) \cap B(y, r/2)$ and $\Gamma^+(z) \cap B(z, r/2)$ is also true by symmetry. It remains to use the jump relations to get an estimate on the oscillation of unit outer normal. Here we again use the approximations $T_{Q'}^\pm$. Applying the jump relation in Lemma 4.8 to $T_{Q'}^\pm$, and using (4.36), (4.35) and the containment $\Gamma^+(y) \cap B(y, r/2) \subset \Gamma_{\beta, T_{Q'}}(y) \cap B(y, r/2)$, we obtain for $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}$ a.e. $y \in \Delta(x_0, r_0)/(4A))$
\[v_{\Omega^+}(y) l_{\Delta^*}(y) = \lim_{Z \to y^{+ \gamma}} \nabla S1_{\Delta^*}(Z) - \lim_{Z \to y^{+ \gamma}} \nabla S1_{\Delta^*}(Z).\]
Here, we need to make the further observation that the principal value singular integral operators $T_{\partial T_{Q'}}^\pm(4.13)$ and (4.14) have the property that
\[T_{\partial T_{Q'}} f = T_{\partial T_{Q'}} f\]
whenever \( f \in L^2(\Delta(x_0, r_0/(4A))) \) with \( \text{spt} f \subseteq \Delta(x_0, r_0/(4A)) \). This is because 
\[
\partial T_\Omega \cap B(x_0, r_0/(4A)) = \partial T_\Omega \cap B(x_0, r_0/(4A)).
\]
Taking non-tangential limits in (4.23) and using (4.39), we obtain 
\[
(4.40) \quad \left( \int_{B(x,r)} \left| v_{\Omega^+}(y) - \int_{B(x,r)} v_{\Omega^+}(z) \, d\sigma(z) \right|^2 \, d\sigma(y) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \frac{C_1}{\omega(B(x_0, r_0/(4A)))} \cdot \left( \frac{r}{r_0} \right)^{1/2} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} + C_2 M^\frac{\omega_0}{2} k^\frac{1}{2} + C_3 \frac{M}{k},
\]
for \( x \in \partial \Omega \cap B(x_0, r_0/(20A)) \) and \( 0 < r \leq \theta r_0 \). Here, as above, the constants \( C_1, C_2 \geq 0 \) depend on \( n \) and \( C_A \) and \( C_3 \) depends on \( n, C_A \) and \( \delta(X^+) \). Notice that we may apply the same argument to \( \Omega^- \) and \( \log k^- \) to get an analogous estimate to (4.40).

We define a constant 
\[
(4.41) \quad C_4 = \frac{C_1}{\inf_{x_0 \in \tilde{B} \cap \partial \Omega} \omega^+(B(x_0, r_0/(5A)))}.
\]
In fact, for each \( x_0 \in \tilde{B} \cap \partial \Omega \), the harmonic measure \( \omega^+(B(x_0, r_0/(5A))) \geq 0 \) since \( \sigma \ll \omega^+ \). Consider an arbitrary pair \( x_0, x_0' \in \tilde{B} \cap \partial \Omega \) such that \( |x_0 - x_0'| < r_0/(5A) \).

By the doubling property of \( \omega^+ \) (up to radius \( r_0 \)), we have 
\[
\omega^+(B(x_0, r_0/(5A))) \leq \omega^+(B(x_0', r_0/(5A))) \leq C \omega^+(B(x_0', r_0/(5A))).
\]
Since \( \tilde{B} \cap \partial \Omega \) is compact, it can be covered by finitely many balls centered on \( \tilde{B} \cap \partial \Omega \) with radii \( r_0/(5A) \). In particular the denominator in (4.41) is a strictly positive constant depending on the domains \( \Omega^+ \) and \( \tilde{B} \), and thus the constant \( C_4 \) is well-defined. Notice that the same argument applied to \( \log k^- \) combined with (4.40) and (4.41) yields:

\[
(4.42) \quad \left( \int_{B(x,r)} \left| v_{\Omega^+}(y) - \int_{B(x,r)} v_{\Omega^+}(z) \, d\sigma(z) \right|^2 \, d\sigma(y) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C_4 \left( \frac{r}{r_0} \right)^{1/2} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} + C_2 M^\frac{\omega_0}{2} k^\frac{1}{2} + \frac{C_3}{M},
\]
where \( C_4 = C_4(n, C_A, \tilde{B}, \Omega^+) \). For \( \epsilon > 0 \) sufficiently small (satisfying \( C_3 \epsilon \leq 4 \)), we choose the constant \( M \) such that \( \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} = \frac{\epsilon}{4} \) and \( \frac{C_3}{\sqrt{M}} \leq 1 \); we also choose the constant \( \theta \) such that \( M \theta < 1/(10A) \) and \( C_4 \theta^{1/2} \leq 1 \). Then (4.42) becomes

\[
(4.43) \quad \left( \int_{B(x,r)} \left| v_{\Omega^+}(y) - \int_{B(x,r)} v_{\Omega^+}(z) \, d\sigma(z) \right|^2 \, d\sigma(y) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \epsilon^2 + C_5 e^{-(n-1)k^\frac{1}{2}},
\]
where \( C_5 \) depends on \( n \) and \( C_A \). Note that in the above estimate, only \( \theta \) depends on \( \tilde{B} \). Thus, perhaps further shrinking \( \kappa_1 \) (depending on \( \epsilon, n, C_A \) and \( \delta(X^+) \) and independent of \( \tilde{B} \)), (4.43) becomes

\[
(4.44) \quad \left( \int_{B(x,r)} \left| v_{\Omega^+}(y) - \int_{B(x,r)} v_{\Omega^+}(z) \, d\sigma(z) \right|^2 \, d\sigma(y) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \epsilon^2 + C_5 e^{-(n-1)k^\frac{1}{2}},
\]
Theorem 4.13. Let \( n \geq 3 \) and suppose \( \Omega^+ \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) and \( \Omega^- = \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{\Omega^+} \) are (connected) domains satisfying \( \partial \Omega := \partial \Omega^+ = \partial \Omega^- \), and that \( \partial \Omega \) is \((n - 1)\)-Ahlfors regular. Then the following are equivalent:

(i) \( \Omega^\pm \) are both (locally)-vanishing chord-arc domains (see Definition 2.19).

(ii) There exist \( X^+ \in \Omega^+ \) and \( X^- \in \Omega^- \) such that \( k^+ = \frac{d\omega^+}{d\sigma} \) and \( k^- = \frac{d\omega^-}{d\sigma} \) exist and \( \log k^\pm \in VMO_{loc}(d\sigma) \).

Proof of Theorem 1.1. (i) implies (ii) is the main theorem in [KT03]. That (ii) implies (i) follows from Theorem 4.11. Indeed, by Corollary 3.11, to show that \( \Omega^\pm \) are (locally)-vanishing chord arc domains it suffices to prove that \( \nu \in VMO_{loc}(d\sigma) \). Theorem 4.11 asserts that this is the case when \( \log k^\pm \in VMO_{loc}(d\sigma) \). \( \square \)

4.3. Free Boundary Results. In this section we combine Theorem 4.11 with Corollaries 3.10 and 3.11 to obtain information about the local geometry of a domain (with minimal hypothesis) from the local oscillation of the logarithm of the interior and exterior Poisson kernels.

Theorem (Theorem 1.1). Let \( n \geq 3 \) and suppose \( \Omega^+ \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) and \( \Omega^- = \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{\Omega^+} \) are (connected) domains satisfying \( \partial \Omega := \partial \Omega^+ = \partial \Omega^- \), and that \( \partial \Omega \) is \((n - 1)\)-Ahlfors regular. Then the following are equivalent:

(i) \( \Omega^\pm \) are both (locally)-vanishing chord-arc domains (see Definition 2.19).

(ii) There exists \( X^+ \in \Omega^+ \) and \( X^- \in \Omega^- \) such that \( k^+ = \frac{d\omega^+}{d\sigma} \) and \( k^- = \frac{d\omega^-}{d\sigma} \) exist and \( \log k^\pm \in VMO_{loc}(d\sigma) \).

Proof. This is a combination of Theorem 4.11, Corollary 3.10 and the work in [KT99]. \( \square \)
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APPENDIX A. PROOF OF THEOREM 3.9

In this section we prove Theorem 3.9; that small excess implies flatness in the sense of Reifenberg. This is a corollary of the height bound, Theorem A.2. Many of the techniques, included for completeness, are standard. Another consequence of Theorem A.2 is a Lipschitz Approximation Theorem, Theorem A.3, which is proven at the end of this section. It is of independent interest and is not used in this paper.

The next lemma is contained in [Mag12, Lemma 22.11]. We recall some notation introduced in other sections. We define \( q(x) = (x, e_n) \), \( p(x) = x - q(x)e_n \), \( C_r = \{ |q(x)| < r \} \cap \{ |p(x)| < r \} \), \( D_r = p(C_r) \) and \( D = p(C_1) \). We consider \( D, D_t \) to be subsets of \( \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \). Finally, when the set \( E \) is clear from context, recall \( e_n(x, r) = e(E, x, r, e_n) \) and if \( x = 0 \), \( e_n(r) = e(E, 0, r, e_n) \).

**Lemma A.1** (Excess Measure). If \( E \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) is a set of locally finite perimeter in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) with \( 0 \in \partial E \), such that for some \( t_0 \in (0, 1) \) (3.14), (3.15), and (3.16) are each satisfied with \( r = 1 \) and \( v = e_n \), then writing \( M = C_1 \cap \partial^* E \) for all Borel \( G \subset D \),

(A.1) \[
\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(G) = \int_{M \cap p^{-1}(G)} (v_E, e_n) d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}.
\]

Moreover,

(A.2) \[
\int_D \varphi dx = \int_M \varphi(p(x))(v_E(x), e_n) d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}
\]
and

(A.3) \[
\int_{E_t \cap D} \varphi dx = \int_{M \cap |q(x)| > t} \varphi(p(x))(v_E(x), e_n) d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \quad \forall t \in (-1, 1)
\]
where \( E_t = \{ z \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \mid (z, t) \in E \} \). In fact, the set function

(A.4) \[
\zeta(G) = \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(M \cap p^{-1}(G)) - \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(G)
\]
defines a Radon measure in \( D \), and is called the excess measure of \( E \) over \( D \) since \( \zeta(D) = e(E, 0, 1, e_n) \).

**Theorem A.2** (Height bound). Given \( C_A \geq 1, r_0 > 0 \, \text{and} \, n \geq 2 \), there exist constants \( \epsilon_1 = \epsilon(n, C_A) > 0 \) and \( C_1 = C(n, C_A) \geq 1 \) such that if \( E \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) is Ahlfors regular with constant \( C_A \) up to scale \( 4r_0 \) and \( x_0 \) satisfies

(A.5) \[
e_n(x_0, 4r_0) \leq \epsilon_1,
\]

then

(A.6) \[
\frac{1}{r_0} \sup\{|q(x_0) - q(y)| : y \in C(x_0, r_0, e_n) \cap \partial E\} \leq C_1 \epsilon_n(x_0, 4r_0)^\frac{1}{n-1}.
\]

**Proof.** By Remark 3.5 we let \( x_0 = 0 \) and \( 2r_0 = 1 \). We then want to show that \( |q(x)| \leq c_0(n) e_n(2)^\frac{1}{n-1} \) whenever \( x \in C_{1/2} \cap \partial E \).

We first assume that \( \epsilon_1 \leq \min \{ \omega(n, 1, C_A), 2^{-n} \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(D) \} \), with \( \omega(n, 1, C_A) \) from Lemma 3.8. Then, by Lemma 3.8, \( |q(x)| \leq \frac{1}{4} \) whenever \( x \in C_1 \cap \partial^* E =: M \),
and moreover $E$ satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma A.1 with $t_0 = \frac{1}{4}$. Therefore
\begin{equation}
0 \leq \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(M) - \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(D) \leq e_n(1) \leq 2^{n-1} e_n(2) \tag{A.7}
\end{equation}
and
\begin{equation}
0 \leq \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(M \cap \{q(x) > t\}) - \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(E \cap D) \leq 2^{n-1} e_n(2) \quad \forall t \in (-1, 1). \tag{A.8}
\end{equation}

Now, we consider $f : (-1, 1) \to [0, \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(M)]$ defined by
\begin{equation}
f(t) = \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(M \cap \{q(x) > t\}). \tag{A.9}
\end{equation}
By Lemma 3.8
\begin{equation}
f(t) = \begin{cases}
\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(M) & -1 < t < -\frac{1}{4} \\
0 & \frac{1}{4} < t < 1.
\end{cases} \tag{A.10}
\end{equation}

Since $f$ is decreasing and right-continuous there exists $|t_0| < \frac{1}{4}$ such that
\begin{equation}
f(t) = \begin{cases}
f(t) \leq \frac{\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(M)}{2} & t \geq t_0 \\
f(t) > \frac{\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(M)}{2} & t < t_0.
\end{cases} \tag{A.11}
\end{equation}

Claim: If $x \in C_{1/2} \cap \partial E$ then $|q(x) - t_0| \leq c(n)e_n(2)^{\frac{1}{2n-1}}$. In particular, since $0 \in \partial E$, this ensures $|t_0| \leq c(n)e_n(2)^{\frac{1}{2n-1}}$.

The claim will be verified by showing that $q(x) - t_0 \leq c(n)e_n(2)^{\frac{1}{2n-1}}$, then considering $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus E$ to get $|q(x) - t_0| \leq c(n)e_n(2)^{\frac{1}{2n-1}}$. Since $\partial E = \text{spt} \mu_E = \partial^* E$ and the projection function $q$ is continuous, it suffices to prove the estimate for $x \in C_{1/2} \cap \partial^* E$.

To bound $q(x) - t_0$, we first show there exists $t_1$ with $q(x) - t_1 \leq c(n)e_n(2)^{\frac{1}{2n-1}}$ and then that $t_1 - t_0$ satisfies a similar upper-bound.

By choice of $\epsilon_1$, $\sqrt{e_n(2)} < \frac{1}{2n-1} \leq \frac{\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(M)}{2}$. So, we choose $t_1 \in (t_0, \frac{1}{4})$ such that
\begin{equation}
f(t) = \begin{cases}
f(t) \leq \sqrt{e_n(2)} & \forall t \geq t_1 \\
f(t) > \sqrt{e_n(2)} & \forall t < t_1.
\end{cases} \tag{A.12}
\end{equation}

To see $q(x) - t_1 \leq c(n)e_n(2)^{\frac{1}{2n-1}}$ for all $x \in C_{1/2} \cap \partial^* E$, note if $y \in C_{1/2} \cap \partial^* E$ and $q(y) > t_1$, then $q(y) - t_1 < \frac{1}{4}$ since $t_1 \in (t_0, 1/4)$ and $|q(y)| < \frac{1}{4}$. In particular, $(q(y) - t_1)$ is a small enough scale for Ahlfors-regularity to hold. Hence,
\begin{equation}
C_A^{-1}(q(y) - t_1)^{n-1} \leq |\mu_E|(B(y, q(y) - t_1)). \tag{A.13}
\end{equation}
Since $x \in B(y, q(y) - t_1)$ implies $q(y) - q(x) \leq |x - y| < q(y) - t_1$ and since $y \in C_{1/2}$ with $q(y) - t_1 < \frac{1}{2}$,
\begin{equation}
B(y, q(y) - t_1) \subset \{x \in C_1 \mid q(x) > t_1\}. \tag{A.14}
\end{equation}
Thus $B(y, q(y) - t_1) \cap \partial^* E \subset M \cap \{q > t_1\}$. So, (A.13) and (A.14) imply
\begin{equation}
C_A^{-1}(q(y) - t_1)^{n-1} \leq |\mu_E|(C_1 \cap \{q(x) > t_1\}) = \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(M \cap \{q(x) > t_1\}) = f(t_1). \tag{A.15}
\end{equation}
By the choice of $t_1$ in (A.12), it follows that under the standing assumption $q(y) - t_1 > 0$ we have
\begin{equation}
q(y) - t_1 \leq c(n, C_A)e_n(2)^{\frac{1}{2n-1}}, \tag{A.16}
\end{equation}
as desired. Note, (A.16) is trivially true when $q(y) \leq t_1$.

Next we show that $t_1 - t_0 \leq c_n e_n(2)^{\frac{1}{m-1}}$, which verifies the Claim 1. We will use a slicing result, see [Mag12, Theorem 18.11] which ensures that for almost every $t \in (-1, 1)$,

$$H^{n-2}(\partial^* E_t) \Delta (\partial^* E_t) = 0,$$

where $(\partial^* E_t) = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} : (z, t) \in \partial^* E\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ and $E_t = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} | (z, t) \in E\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. Furthermore, the co-area formula ensures that for any $g : \mathbb{R}^n \to [0, \infty]$ a non-negative Borel function,

$$\int_{\partial^* E_t} g \sqrt{1 - \langle y_E, e_n \rangle^2} dH^{n-1} = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left( \int_{(\partial^* E_t)} g dH^{n-2} \right) dt.$$

In particular, realizing the square-root term on the left is just the Jacobian of the projection $p$, and choosing the function $g = \chi_{C_1}$, recalling that $C_1 \cap \partial^* E \supset M$ is Ahlfors regular up to scale 2,

$$\int_{-1}^1 H^{n-2}(\partial^* E_t \cap D) dt = \int_M \sqrt{1 - \langle y_E, e_n \rangle^2} dH^{n-1} \leq \left(2H^{n-1}(M)\right)^\frac{1}{2} \left(\int_M (1 - \langle y_E, e_n \rangle) dH^{n-1}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq c(n, C_A) \sqrt{e_n(2)}.$$

We extract from the above that

$$\int_{-1}^1 H^{n-2}(\partial^* E_t \cap D) dt \leq \int_{-1}^1 H^{n-2}(\partial^* E_t \cap D) dt \leq c(n) \sqrt{e_n(2)}.$$

For almost all $t \in [t_0, 1]$ it follows from $H^{n-1}(E_t \cap D) \leq H^{n-1}(M \cap \{q(x) > t\})$, (A.7), (A.8), and (A.11) that

$$H^{n-1}(E_t \cap D) \leq \frac{H^{n-1}(M)}{2} \leq \frac{H^{n-1}(D)}{2} + 2^{n-2} e_n(2) \leq \frac{3}{4} H^{n-1}(D),$$

where we used that $e_n(2) \leq 2^{-n} H^{n-1}(D)$.

Applying the relative isoperimetric inequality (see [Mag12, (12.45)]) in $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ to the set $E_t \cap D$ we have

$$H^{n-2}(D \cap \partial^* E_t) \geq c(n) H^{n-1}(E_t \cap D)^{\frac{n-2}{n-1}} \text{ for a.e. } t \in [t_0, 1)$$

(A.19) and (A.20) together imply (where the constant $c(n)$ can change in every instance, but only depends on $n$)

$$\int_{t_0}^{t_1} H^{n-1}(E_t \cap D)^{\frac{n-2}{n-1}} dt \leq c(n) \int_{t_0}^{t_1} H^{n-1}(E_t \cap D)^{\frac{n-2}{n-1}} dt \leq c(n) \sqrt{e_n(2)}.$$

Finally, (A.8) and (A.12) yield for $t < t_1$,

$$H^{n-1}(E_t \cap D) \geq H^{n-1}(M \cap \{q(x) > t\}) - 2^{n-1} e_n(2) \geq \sqrt{e_n(2)} - 2^{n-1} e_n(2) \geq c(n) \sqrt{e_n(2)},$$

which combined with (A.21) ensures

$$(t_1 - t_0) e_n(2)^{\frac{1}{m-1}} = (t_1 - t_0) \sqrt{e_n(2)^{\frac{n-2}{n-1}}} \leq c(n) \sqrt{e_n(2)}.$$
so that $t_1 - t_0 \leq c(n)e_n(2)^{\frac{1}{m-1}}$ as desired. \hfill \Box

We are now ready to prove Theorem 3.9 which first appears in Section 3 above. We restate it here for convenience:

**Theorem.** Fix $C_A \geq 1, r_0 > 0$, and $n \geq 2$. Let $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon(C_A, n) > 0$ be as in Theorem A.2. If $E \in \mathcal{A}(C_A, 4r_0)$ and $x_0 \in \partial E$ satisfies

\[ e(E, x_0, 2r, \nu) \leq \epsilon_1 \]

for some $\nu \in \mathbb{S}^n$ and $0 < r < 2r_0$ then

\[ \{ x \in C(x_0, r, \nu) \cap E \mid \langle x - x_0, \nu \rangle > rC_1 e(E, x_0, 2r, \nu)^{\frac{1}{m-1}} \} = \emptyset \]

and

\[ \{ x \in C(x_0, r, \nu) \cap E^c \mid \langle x - x_0, \nu \rangle < -rC_1 e(E, x_0, 2r, \nu)^{\frac{1}{m-1}} \} = \emptyset. \]

**Proof of Theorem 3.9.** We will verify (A.23), and (A.24) follows similarly. By translation and rotation, without loss of generality we suppose $x_0 = 0$ and $\nu = e_n$. Suppose (A.23) fails. Then, there exists $x \in C_r \cap E$ with $q(x) > rC_1 e_n(2r)^{\frac{1}{m-1}}$. However, $\epsilon_1 \leq \omega(n, 1/4, C_A)$ guarantees that (3.15) holds with $r_0 = \frac{1}{4}$. However, (3.15) guarantees that there exists some $y \in C_r \cap E^c$ with $q(x) < q(y) < r$. But then, there exists $z \in \partial E$ which lies on the line segment connecting $x$ and $y$. In particular, $q(z) > q(x) > rC_1 e_n(2r)^{\frac{1}{m-1}}$ contradicting Theorem A.2. \hfill \Box

The following theorem is also a consequence of the height bound, Theorem A.2. Hereafter, $\nabla'$ denotes the gradient in $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$.

**Theorem A.3 (Lipschitz function approximation).** There exist positive $C_3 = C(n, C_A), \epsilon_3 = \epsilon(n, C_A), \delta_0 = \delta(n, C_A)$, and $L = L(n, C_A) < 1$ with the following properties. If $E \in \mathcal{A}(C_A, 13r)$ and $e_n(x_0, 13r) \leq \epsilon_1$ with $x_0 \in \partial E$, then for $M = C(x_0, r) \cap \partial E$ and $M_0 = \{ y \in M \mid \sup_{0 < s < 8r} e_n(y, s) < \delta_0 \}$ there exists $u : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \to \mathbb{R}$ with $\text{Lip}(u) \leq L$ and

\[ \sup_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \frac{|u|}{r} \leq C_3 e_n(x_0, 13r)^{\frac{1}{m-1}} \]

such that $M_0 \subset M \cap \Gamma$ where

\[ \Gamma = x_0 + \{(z, u(z)) \mid z \in D_r \}. \]

Furthermore,

\[ \frac{H^{n-1}(M \Delta \Gamma)}{r^{n-1}} \leq C_3 e_n(x_0, 13r), \]

\[ \frac{1}{r^{n-1}} \int_{D_r} |\nabla' u|^2 \leq C_3 e_n(x_0, 13r), \]

and

\[ \text{dist}(x, (p(x), u(x))) = |q(x) - u(p(x))| \leq 2L \text{dist}(p(x), p(M_0)) \quad \forall x \in M. \]
In fact, (A.29) ensures there exist Lipschitz functions $u_\pm$ defined by

\begin{align}
(A.30) \quad u_+(x) &= \begin{cases} u(x) & x \in p(M_0) \\
\inf_{y \in p(M_0)} u(y) + L|x - y| & x \in D \setminus p(M_0) \end{cases} \\
(A.31) \quad u_-(x) &= \begin{cases} u(x) & x \in p(M_0) \\
\sup_{y \in p(M_0)} u(y) - L|x - y| & x \in D \setminus p(M_0) \end{cases}
\end{align}

with the property that

\begin{align}
(A.32) \quad u_-(p(x)) &\leq q(x) \leq u_+(p(x)) \quad \forall x \in M.
\end{align}

Proof. Step 1: Up to replacing $E$ with $E_{x_0,r}$ and correspondingly replacing $u$ with $u_r(z) = r^{-1}u(rz)$, we can reduce to proving that if $E \in \mathcal{A}(C(A,13))$ with $0 \in \partial E$, if

\begin{align}
(A.33) \quad M = C \cap \partial E, \quad M_0 = \{y \in M \mid \sup_{0<s<8} e_n(y,s) < \delta_0(n,C_A)\},
\end{align}

and if $e_n(0,13) \leq \epsilon_1$ then there exists a Lipschitz function $u : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \to \mathbb{R}$ with $\text{Lip}(u) \leq L < 1$ such that

\begin{align}
(A.34) \quad \sup_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} |u| \leq C_3 e_n(0,13) \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}
\end{align}

such that $M_0 \subset M \cap \Gamma$ where

\begin{align}
(A.35) \quad \Gamma = \{(z,u(z)) \mid z \in D\}.
\end{align}

Furthermore,

\begin{align}
(A.36) \quad \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(M \Delta \Gamma) \leq C_3 e_n(0,13)
\end{align}

and

\begin{align}
(A.37) \quad \int_D |
abla' u|^2 \leq C_3 e_n(0,13).
\end{align}

By Theorem A.2 it follows that

\begin{align}
(A.38) \quad \sup_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} |q(x)| \mid x \in C_2 \cap \partial E \leq C_1 e_n(0,13) \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}.
\end{align}

By choosing $\epsilon_3 \leq \epsilon_1 \leq \omega(n, \frac{1}{4}, C_A)$, $E$ satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 3.8. Consequently, Lemma A.1 and (3.11) imply,

\begin{align}
(A.39) \quad 0 \leq \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(M \cap p^{-1}(G)) - \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(G) \leq e_n(0,1) \leq 13^{n-1} e_n(0,13),
\end{align}

for every Borel set $G \subset D$. Meanwhile, Theorem 3.9 ensures

\begin{align}
(A.40) \quad \left\{ x \in C_2 \mid q(x) < -\frac{1}{4} \right\} \subset C_2 \cap E \subset \left\{ x \in C_2 \mid q(x) < \frac{1}{4} \right\}.
\end{align}

Step two: We show that $M_0$ is contained in the graph of a Lipschitz function $u$, satisfying (A.34) and (A.36). In order to create the Lipschitz function, we first need to know $M_0$ is non-empty. This follows from a covering argument done later in more detail in (A.47).
Define $\| \cdot \| = \max\{|p(\cdot)|, |q(\cdot)|\}$. Then, $C(y, s) = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \|z - y\| < s\}$. For fixed $y \in M_0$ and $x \in M$ and consider $F = E_{y, \|x - y\|}$. Notably, $\|x - y\| < 2$. Since $y \in M_0$ and $4\|x - y\| < 2$ it follows from (3.10) and (A.33) that 

$$e_n(F, 0, 4) = e_n(E, y, 4\|x - y\|) \leq \delta_0.$$ 

So, choosing $\delta_0 \leq \epsilon_1$ allows us to apply Theorem A.2 to $F \in \mathcal{A}(C_A, 4)$ and conclude that 

$$(A.41) \quad \sup\{|q(w)| \in C \cap \partial F\} \leq C_1e_n(F, 0, 4) \frac{1}{n-\eta} \leq C_1\delta_0^{\frac{1}{2(n-\eta)}}.$$ 

Applying this height-bound to the specific point $w = \frac{3}{n-\eta}|y - x|$ we find 

$$(A.42) \quad |q(x) - q(y)| \leq C_0(n)\delta_0^{\frac{1}{n-\eta}}\|y - x\|.$$ 

If we now define $L = C_1\delta_0^{\frac{1}{n-\eta}}$ and choose $\delta_0$ so small that $L < 1$ it follows from (A.42) that $|q(x) - q(y)| < \|x - y\|$ which ensures $\|x - y\| = |p(x) - p(y)|$, and hence (A.42) can be written 

$$(A.43) \quad |q(x) - q(y)| \leq L|p(x) - p(y)|, \quad \forall y \in M_0, x \in M,$$

which implies that $p|_{M_0}$ is invertible. Define $u : p(M_0) \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $u(p(x)) = q(x)$ for every $x \in M_0$. Evidently, (A.43) ensures $u$ satisfies 

$$(A.44) \quad |u(p(x)) - u(p(y))| \leq L|p(x) - p(y)|, \quad \forall x, y \in M_0.$$ 

Since $M_0 \subset M$, it follows from (A.38) that 

$$(A.45) \quad |u(p(x))| = |q(x)| \leq C_1e_n(0, 13) \frac{1}{n-\eta}, \quad \forall x \in M_0.$$ 

Via Kirzbraun’s theorem and truncation we extend $u$ from $p(M_0)$ to $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ with Lipschitz constant $L < 1$ such that the $L^\infty$-bound from (A.45) holds on all of $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, which verifies (3.34). The definition of $u$ on $p(M_0)$ guarantees $M_0 \subset M \cap \Gamma$ where $\Gamma$ is as in (A.35).

Next we show (A.36). By definition of $M_0$, for every $y \in M \setminus M_0$ there exists $s_y \in (0, 8)$ with 

$$(A.46) \quad \delta_0 s_y^{n-1} \leq \int_{C(y, s_y) \cap \partial E} \frac{|y_E - e_n|^2}{2} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}.$$ 

Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the set of all balls $B(y_k, \sqrt{2}s_k)$ centered on $M \setminus M_0$ satisfying (A.46) of radius at most $8\sqrt{2}$. Each ball is contained in $C_{1+8\sqrt{2}} \subset C_{13}$. By Besicovitch’s covering theorem (see [EG92, Theorem 2, Section 1.5.2]) we partition $\mathcal{F}$ into $N_n$ disjoint families of balls $\mathcal{G}_j$. Then, there exists $j$ such that 

$$\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(M \setminus M_0) \leq N_n \sum_{B(y_k, \sqrt{2}s_k) \in \mathcal{G}_j} \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(M \setminus M_0) \cap B(y_k, \sqrt{2}s_k)$$

$$\leq N_n \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(M \cap B(y_k, \sqrt{2}s_k))$$

$$\leq N_n C_A 2^{\frac{n}{2n}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} s_k^{n-1}.$$
Since \( C(y_k, s_k, e_n) \subset B(y_k, \sqrt{2}s_k) \) the family of cylinders are also mutually disjoint. So, (A.46) combined with the preceding computation yields

\[
\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(M \setminus M_0) \leq C \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} s_k^{n-1} \leq \frac{C}{\delta_0} \sum_{k} \int_{C(y_k, s_k)} |\nu_E - e_n|^2 \, d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}
\]

(A.47)

Keeping in mind that \( \delta_0 < \min\{C_1^{-2(n-1)}, \epsilon_3\} \), if \( \epsilon_3 \) is small enough that \( \delta_0 \geq \frac{C_{\epsilon_3}}{\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(D)} \) it follows that \( M_0 \) is non-empty. this also adds an additional constrain on \( \epsilon_3 \). A consequence of (A.47) and \( M \setminus \Gamma \subset M \setminus M_0 \) is

(A.48)

\[
\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(M \setminus \Gamma) \leq C e_n(0, 13).
\]

To finish verifying (A.36) it remains to bound \( \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\Gamma \setminus M) \).

Indeed, \( \text{Lip}(u) \leq 1 \) and \( M_0 \subset \Gamma \) together ensure

\[
\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\Gamma \setminus M) \leq \sqrt{1 + |\nabla' u|^2} \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(p(\Gamma \setminus M)) \leq \sqrt{2} \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(M \cap p^{-1}(p(\Gamma \setminus M))) .
\]

But, \( M \cap p^{-1}(p(\Gamma \setminus M)) \subset M \setminus \Gamma \), so by the bound in (A.48), we have the necessary bound on \( \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\Gamma \setminus M) \), verifying (A.36) with a constant we denote as \( C_3 \).

3. Step 3: We verify (A.37).

The first necessary observation is to note that for almost every \( x \in M \cap \Gamma \),

(A.49)

\[
\nu_E(x) = \lambda(x) \frac{(-\nabla' u(p(x)), 1)}{\sqrt{1 + |\nabla' u(p(x))|^2}}
\]

where \( \lambda(x) \in \{-1, 1\} \). Since \( |\nu_E - e_n|^2 = |\nu_E|^2 \), (A.49) implies

\[
e_n(0, 1) \geq \frac{1}{2} \int \int_{M \cap \Gamma} |p(\nu_E)|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} = \frac{1}{2} \int \int_{M \cap \Gamma} \frac{|\nabla' u(\nu_E(x))|^2}{1 + |\nabla' u(\nu_E(x))|^2} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(x) = \frac{1}{2} \int \int_{p(M \cap \Gamma)} \frac{|\nabla' u(z)|^2}{1 + |\nabla' u(z)|^2} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(z).
\]

Since \( \text{Lip}(u) < 1 \) it follows that

(A.50)

\[
\int_{p(M \cap \Gamma)} |\nabla' u(z)|^2 \leq 2^\frac{3}{2} e_n(0, 1).
\]

On the other hand, \( \text{Lip}(u) < 1 \) and (A.36) imply

(A.51)

\[
\int_{p(M \Delta \Gamma)} |\nabla' u|^2 \leq \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(p(M \Delta \Gamma)) \leq \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(M \Delta \Gamma) \leq C_3 e_n(0, 13).
\]

Since \( e_n(0, 1) \leq 13^{n-1} e_n(0, 13) \), (A.50) and (A.51) together guarantee (A.37).
Step 4: Note that (A.43) and the definition of $u_\pm$ in (A.30) and (A.31) ensure (A.32) holds. So we conclude by showing (A.29). In fact, if $M_0$ were closed, then (A.43) would immediately verify (A.29).

In case $M_0$ is not closed, fix $\epsilon > 0$ small. For $x \in M \setminus M_0$ choose $y \in M_0$ such that $\text{dist}(p(x), p(y)) \leq \text{dist}(x, p(M_0)) + \epsilon$. Then,

$$|q(x) - u(p(x))| \leq u_+ (p(x)) - u_-(p(x))$$

$$\leq (u(p(y)) + L|p(x) - p(y)|) - (u(p(y)) - L|p(x) - p(y)|)$$

$$\leq 2L|p(x) - p(y)|$$

$$\leq 2L \text{dist}(x, p(M_0)) + 2L \epsilon.$$

Taking $\epsilon \to 0$ verifies (A.29). $\square$

**APPENDIX B. APPROXIMATION BY UR DOMAINS FOR SETS WITH DOUBLY LOCAL TWO-SIDED CORKSCREWS**

In this appendix, we build UR “domains”\(^{10}\) which (locally) approximate open sets satisfying a (doubly) local two-sided corkscrew (DLTSCS) condition with Ahlfors regular boundary. This will allow us to directly use the work of [HMT10] on singular integrals on UR domains.

**Definition B.1** (Doubly local two-sided corkscreen condition). Let $R_0 \in (0, \infty)$, $M_0 \geq 2$ and $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We say an open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, with $x_0 \in \partial \Omega$ satisfies the $(x_0, M_0, R_0)$-doubly local two-sided corkscreen condition or $(x_0, M_0, R_0)$-DLTSCS condition, if for every $x \in B(x_0, R_0) \cap \partial \Omega$ and $r \in (0, R_0)$ there exist two points $X_1, X_2$ such that $B(X_1, r/M_0) \subset B(x, r) \cap \Omega$ and $B(X_2, r/M_0) \subset B(x, r) \setminus \overline{\Omega}$.

The first step in the construction is to introduce the appropriate notion of boundary “cubes” for sets with $(n-1)$-dimensional Ahlfors regular boundary. These constructions were introduced in the work of David [Dav88] and were refined by Christ [Chr90]. The dyadic “families” built later by Hytönen and Kairema in [HK12] are better adapted to our needs, thus we describe them below.

**Lemma B.2** (Dyadic cubes [Dav88, Chr90, HK12]). Suppose $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is an $(n-1)$-dimensional, closed Ahlfors regular set. Then there exist $N, a_0, \gamma, C_2$ and $C_3$ depending on $n$ and the Ahlfors regularity constant such that the following holds. For each $t \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$ there exists a collection of Borel sets (“cubes”)

$$D_k^t := \{Q_j^t \subset E : j \in S_k\},$$

where $S_k$ denotes some (possibly finite) index set depending on $k$, satisfying

(i) $E = \cup_j Q_j^t$ for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}$.

(ii) If $m \geq k$ then either $Q_j^m \subset Q_j^t$ or $Q_j^m \cap Q_j^t = \emptyset$.

(iii) For each $(j, k)$ and each $m < k$, there is a unique $i$ such that $Q_j^t \subset Q_i^m$.

(iv) $\text{diam}(Q_j^t) \leq C_2 2^{-k}$.

(v) Each $Q_j^k$ contains some “surface ball” $\Delta(x_j^k, a_0 2^{-k}) := B(x_j^k, a_0 2^{-k}) \cap E$.

\(^{10}\)We use the terminology in [HMT10], where domains are open sets.
(vi) $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\{x \in Q_j^k : \text{dist}(x, E \setminus Q_j^k) \leq \rho 2^{-k}\}) \leq C_2 \rho^n \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(Q_j^k)$, for all $k, j$ and for all $\rho \in (0, a_0)$.

(vii) For every surface ball $\Delta(x, r) = B(x, r) \cap E$, $x \in E$ and $r \in (0, \text{diam } E)$ there exists $t$ and $Q \in \mathcal{D}'$ with $B \subset Q$ and $\text{diam}(Q) \leq C_3 r$.

If $Q \in \mathcal{D}'_k$ for some some $t \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ we set $\ell(Q) = 2^{-k}$. Evidently, $\text{diam}(Q) \approx \ell(Q)$, provided $2^{-k} \leq \text{diam}(E)$\footnote{We ignore the cubes for which, $2^{-k} \gg \text{diam}(E)$, because (v) implies that eventually $\mathcal{D}'_k$ consists of a single cube if $\text{diam}(E) < \infty$ and $k$ is sufficiently large.}, and we refer to $\ell(Q)$ as the “side length” of $Q$.

Remark B.3. When we use these dyadic cubes we always start knowing that the DLTSCS condition holds on some ball $B(x_0, R_0)$. The flexibility of the families (the index $t$ above) allows us to find a cube $Q$ such that $B(x_0, C_3^{-1} R_0) \cap \partial \Omega \subset Q \subset B(x_0, R_0) \cap \partial \Omega$. This is not entirely necessary as we could have modified Christ’s construction to accomplish something similar with possibly a smaller constant.

From this point onward, we work with $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, an $(n - 1)$-dimensional Ahlfors regular set ($E$ will eventually be the boundary of an open set.) and a particular dyadic grid $\mathcal{D} := \mathcal{D}'$ for some fixed $t$. However, in what follows there will be no constants that depend on $t$ and in our application we will want freedom to choose $t$ (see Remark B.3).

For $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ an $(n - 1)$-dimensional Ahlfors regular set, we denote by $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{W}(E)$ the collection of (closed) $n$-dimensional dyadic Whitney cubes of $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus E$, that is the collection $\mathcal{W} = \{I\}$ form a pairwise non-overlapping (their boundaries may intersect) covering of $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus E$ with the property that
$$4 \text{diam}(I) \leq \text{dist}(4I, E) \leq \text{dist}(I, E) \leq 40 \text{diam}(I),$$
(see [Ste70, Chapter VI]). Moreover, whenever $I_1, I_2 \in \mathcal{W}$ with $I_1 \cap I_2 \neq \emptyset$
$$\text{diam}(I_1) \approx \text{diam}(I_2).$$
For $I \in \mathcal{W}$ we let $\ell(I)$ denote the side length of $I$.

Now we relate these two notions of cubes, to form Carleson and Whitney-type regions associated to each boundary cube $Q$. These are almost exactly as in [HM14]\footnote{The difference here is that the regions are not ‘augmented’ by exploiting connectivity which was present in [HM14].}.

We let $K \gg 1$ be a large parameter and for $Q \in \mathcal{D}(E)$ we define $\mathcal{W}_Q := \mathcal{W}_Q(K) := \{I \in \mathcal{W}(E) : K^{-1} \ell(Q) \leq \ell(I) \leq K \ell(Q), \text{dist}(I, Q) \leq K \ell(Q)\}$. Since $E$ is Ahlfors regular, one can show that $\mathcal{W}_Q$ is non-empty provided $K$ is chosen large enough. We do not fix $K$ at this point because we will eventually set $E = \partial \Omega$ and want to capture the (local) corkscrew points afforded by the DLTSCS condition. Next we fix $\tau$ a small parameter depending on dimension so that the $(1 + \tau)$-dialates of $I \in \mathcal{W}$, $I' := I'_{\tau} := (1 + \tau)I$ maintain the Whitney property $\ell(I') \approx \text{dist}(I', E) \approx \text{dist}(I, E)$.
and \( I^* \) meets \( J^* \) if and only if \( I \cap J \neq \emptyset \). We also may ensure (by choice of \( \tau \) small) that if \( I \cap J \neq \emptyset \) and \( I \neq J \) then \( I^* \cap (\frac{3}{4} J) = \emptyset \).

Finally, we define the **Whitney regions relative to \( Q \)**

\[
U_Q(K) := \bigcup_{t \in W_Q(K)} I^*
\]

and the **Carleson boxes relative to \( Q \)**

\[
T_Q(K) := \text{int} \left( \bigcup_{Q' \in \mathbb{D}} U_{Q'}(K) \right)
\]

where \( \mathbb{D} := \{ Q' \in \mathbb{D} : Q' \subseteq Q \} \).

Now we are ready to state our approximation lemma.

**Lemma B.4.** Let \( M_0 \geq 2 \) and \( R_0 > 0 \). If \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) is an open set with \( (n - 1) \)-dimensional Ahlfors regular boundary \( \partial \Omega \) satisfying \( \partial_x \Omega = \partial \Omega \) with \( x_0 \in \partial \Omega \) such that \( \Omega \) satisfies the \((x_0, M_0, 2R_0)\)-DLTSCS condition, then there exist \( K \gg 1 \) and \( M'_0 \geq M_0 \) depending on \( n, R_0, M_0 \) and the Ahlfors regularity constant such that the following holds.

Let \( E = \partial \Omega \cup \mathbb{D}(E), \ 'W = 'W(E^c), etc. be as above. Suppose \( Q \subseteq B(x_0, R_0) \) such that \( Q \subseteq B(x_0, R_0) \) then the sets

\[
T_Q^+ := T_Q^0(K) := T_Q(K) \cap \Omega
\]

and

\[
T_Q^0 := T_Q(K) := T_Q(K) \cap (\overline{\Omega})^c
\]

are non-empty. They satisfy the \((M'_0, \ell(Q))\)-two sided corkscrew condition (see Definition 2.15) and \( \partial T_Q^0 \) are \((n - 1)\)-Ahlfors regular with constant depending on \( M_0, R_0 \) and the Ahlfors regularity constant such that the following holds.

**Proof.** Fix \( Q \subseteq B(x_0, R_0) \). We chose \( K \) big enough to ensure that for \( Q' \in \mathbb{D} \) with \( Q' \in B(x_0, R_0) \) the sets

\[
U_{Q'}^+ := U_{Q'}^+(K) := U_{Q'}(K) \cap \Omega \text{ and } U_{Q'}^- := U_{Q'}^-(K) := U_{Q'}(K) \cap (\overline{\Omega})^c
\]

are non-empty. To see that such a choice (depending on \( M_0, R_0 \) and Ahlfors regular for \( \partial \Omega \)) exists, we note that if \( x \in Q' \subseteq B(x_0, R_0) \) then necessarily \( \ell(Q') \leq CR_0 \) and the ball \( B(x, \frac{1}{2} \ell(Q')) \) contains two corkscrew points, one for \( \Omega \) and one for \( (\overline{\Omega})^c \). Choosing \( K \ll 1/(CM_0) \) ensures that these points are contained in \( U_{Q'}(K) \).

---

\(^{13}\)See Remark B.3.

\(^{14}\)See the discussion following 2.11 and note that since \( \text{diam}(T_Q) \approx_k \ell(Q) \), \( T_Q \) satisfies the two-sided corkscrew condition.
We also have that $\partial T_Q^+ \cap \Omega$ are both Ahlfors regular by the work of [HM14] (see the Appendix therein). It is also easy to see that $\partial T_Q^+ \cap \Omega = Q$, since for every $x \in Q$, $x \in Q_i \in \mathcal{D}_Q$ with $\ell(Q_i) \to 0$ as $j \to \infty$. Using that $U_Q^+$ are non-empty we see that there exist $X_j \in U_Q \to x$ as $j \to \infty$ and hence $x \in \partial T_Q^+$ (see (B.1) and (B.2)).

Next, we show that $T_Q^+$ both satisfy the $(M_0, \ell(Q))$-two sided corkscrew condition. Again the hypotheses are symmetric so we may just show $T_Q^+$ satisfies the $(M_0, \ell(Q))$-two sided corkscrew condition. To this end, let $x \in \partial T_Q^+$ and $r \in (0, \ell(Q))$ and fix $A_0$ to be chosen. We break into cases, following closely [HM14, HMM16].

**Case 1:** $r < A_0 \delta(x)$, where $\delta(x) := \text{dist}(x, \partial \Omega)$. In this case, $\delta(x) > 0$ and $x$ is ‘far’ from $\partial \Omega$. Necessarily (since $\delta(x) > 0$), $x \in \partial \Omega$ for some ‘fat’ Whitney cube $\Omega'$ with $\text{int}(\Omega') \subset T_Q^+$ and also $x \in \Omega$ for some $\Omega \in \mathcal{W}'\setminus \cup_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_Q} W_Q^\prime$. The Whitney property of $\Omega$ and $J$ yields $\ell(\Omega') \approx \ell(J) \approx \delta(x) \geq r/A_0$. It follows (from our choice of $\tau$) that $J$ contains an exterior corkscrew point and $\Omega'$ contains an interior corkscrew point for $T_Q^+$ at $x$ at scale $r$, with constants depending on $A_0$, for now.

**Case 2:** $r \geq A_0 \delta(x)$. In this case, we are close enough to the boundary so that we may exploit the $(M_0, R_0)$-DLTSCS condition for $\Omega$. We break into further cases.

**Case 2a:** $\delta(x) > 0$. In this case $x \in \partial \Omega$ for some $\Omega$ as in Case 1. Let $\hat{x} \in \partial \Omega$ be such that $\delta(x) \approx |x - \hat{x}|$, where the implicit constants depend on $K$ (which we have fixed). Note that the existence of $\hat{x}$ is afforded by the Whitney property of $\Omega$. Moreover, $\Omega \in \mathcal{W}'Q$ for some $Q \subset Q$. Since

$$|x - \hat{x}| \leq C_k \delta(x) \leq C_k r/A_0 < C_k \ell(Q)/A_0,$$

choosing $A_0$ large enough we may find $Q^\prime$ whose closure contains $\hat{x}$, $Q^\prime \subset Q$ and $\ell(Q^\prime) \approx r/A_0$.

where the implicit constants depend on $n$, the Ahlfors regularity constant and $K$. Note that by the $(x_0, M_0, 2R_0)$-DLTSCS condition of $\Omega$, $U_Q^+$ are both non-empty, we may find two points $X^+_{Q'} \in U_Q^+$ with

$$\text{dist}(X^+_{Q'}, \partial T_Q^+) \geq C_k \ell(Q^\prime) \approx r/A_0.$$

Here one may take each $X^+_{Q'}$ to be the center of a Whitney cube in $\mathcal{W}'Q$. We then choose $A_0 \gg 2$ such that

$$|x - X^+_{Q'}| \leq |x - \hat{x}| + |\hat{x} - X^+_{Q'}| \leq r/A_0 < r/2.$$

Having fixed such an $A_0$, depending on the allowable parameters, we have

$$\text{dist}(X^+_{Q'}, \partial T_Q^+) \geq C_k \ell(Q^\prime) \geq r$$

so that $X^+_{Q'}$ may serve as interior and exterior corkscrews (resp.) for $T_Q^+$ at $x$ at scale $r$.

**Case 2b:** $\delta(x) = 0$. In this case, things are easier than Case 2a, provided we can show $x \in \partial \Omega$. Indeed, we may forgo the step of finding $\hat{x}$ above, by setting $\hat{x} = x$ and repeating the above argument verbatim. To show $x \in \partial \Omega$, we use that $\delta(x) = 0$ and $x \in \partial T_Q^+$ so there exists a sequence of points $X_i \in U_Q^+$ with $Q_i \subset Q$ and $\ell(Q_i) \to 0$, $|X_i - x| \to 0$ as $i \to \infty$. Here we used $\delta(X_i) \approx \ell(Q_i)$ by the Whitney property of

---

Note that the choice of $A_0$ depends on $K$, which is now fixed.
cubes in $\mathcal{W}_Q$, and that $\delta(\cdot)$ is continuous. Moreover, for each $i$ there exists $\hat{X}_i \in Q_i$ with $|X_i - \hat{X}_i| \leq \ell(Q_i)$ so that
$$|x - \hat{X}_i| \leq |x - X_i| + |X_i - \hat{X}_i| \to 0 \text{ as } i \to \infty.$$  
Since $\hat{X}_i \in Q$ this shows $x \in \overline{Q}$ and we can proceed as in Case 2a.

Again by [DJ90, Theorem 1], a domain with Ahlfors regular boundary and satisfying two-sided corkscREW condition up to its diameter is a UR domain. Thus, the only thing left to do is show that the measure theoretic unit normals for $T_{\hat{Q}}^+$ agree with the unit normal of $\Omega$ up to a sign. Again, the symmetry of the hypotheses in the theorem and the fact that $\partial_+ \Omega = \partial \Omega$ allow us only consider $T_{\hat{Q}}^+$.

Since $T_{\hat{Q}}^+$ have $(n-1)$-Ahlfors regular boundary and satisfy the two-sided corkscREW condition, Federer’s criteria ensures that $T_{\hat{Q}}^+$ is a set of locally finite perimeter [EG92, Theorem 1, Section 5.11]. The structure theorem for sets of locally finite perimeter ensures that the measure theoretic unit normal to $\partial T_{\hat{Q}}^+$ exists $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}$-a.e. [EG92, Theorem 2, Section 5.7.3]. Since $Q \subset \partial \Omega$ and $\partial T_{\hat{Q}}^+ \cap \hat{Q} = Q$ the measure theoretic tangents to $\partial T_{\hat{Q}}^+$ and $\partial \Omega$ must agree $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}$-a.e. in $Q$. Thus the measure theoretic outer unit normal for $T_{\hat{Q}}^+$ and $\Omega$ must agree up to a sign for $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}$-a.e. $x \in Q$.

To show that $\nu_{T_{\hat{Q}}^+}(x) = \nu_\Omega(x)$ for $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}$ a.e. in $Q$, assume that $x \in \partial^* T_{\hat{Q}} \cap \hat{Q}$ then $\nu_{T_{\hat{Q}}^+}(x) = \pm \nu_\Omega(x)$. Suppose that $\nu_{T_{\hat{Q}}^+}(x) = -\nu_\Omega(x)$ and set
$$H^+ := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : (y - x) \cdot \nu_\Omega(x) \geq 0\}.$$  
This is a half-space through $x$, perpendicular to $\nu_\Omega(x)$. The blow-up of the reduced boundary [EG92, Section 5.7, Corollary 1] gives
$$\lim_{r \to 0^+} \frac{\mathcal{L}^n(B(x, r) \cap \Omega \cap H^+)}{\mathcal{L}^n(B(x, r))} = 0,$$
which of course implies
$$\lim_{r \to 0^+} \frac{\mathcal{L}^n(B(x, r) \cap T_{\hat{Q}}^+ \cap H^+)}{\mathcal{L}^n(B(x, r))} = 0.$$  
On the other hand, using $\nu_{T_{\hat{Q}}^+}(x) = -\nu_\Omega(x)$, and applying [EG92, Section 5.7, Corollary 1] to the set $T_{\hat{Q}}^+$ gives
$$\lim_{r \to 0^+} \frac{\mathcal{L}^n(B(x, r) \cap T_{\hat{Q}}^+ \cap H^+)}{\mathcal{L}^n(B(x, r))} = 1,$$
which is impossible. Therefore $\nu_{T_{\hat{Q}}^+}(x) = \nu_\Omega(x)$ and we have proved the lemma. □
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