

## On convergence theory for Beltrami equations

VLADIMIR RYAZANOV, URI SREBRO,  
EDUARD YAKUBOV

(Presented by V. Ya. Gutlyanskii)

**Abstract.** This paper is devoted to convergence theorems which play an important role in our scheme for deriving theorems on the existence of solutions of the Beltrami equations.

**2000 MSC.** 30C65, 30C75.

**Key words and phrases.** Weakly complete space, weakly fundamental sequences, weak convergence, ring  $Q$ -homeomorphism, ACL, Sobolev classes.

### 1. Introduction

Let  $D$  be a domain in the complex plane  $\mathbb{C}$ , i.e., a connected and open subset of  $\mathbb{C}$ , and let  $\mu : D \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  be a measurable function with  $|\mu(z)| < 1$  a.e. The *Beltrami equation* is an equation of the form

$$f_{\bar{z}} = \mu(z) \cdot f_z, \quad (1.1)$$

where  $f_{\bar{z}} = \bar{\partial}f = (f_x + if_y)/2$ ,  $f_z = \partial f = (f_x - if_y)/2$ ,  $z = x + iy$ , and  $f_x$  and  $f_y$  are partial derivatives of  $f$  with respect to  $x$  and  $y$ , respectively. The function  $\mu$  is called the *complex coefficient* and

$$K_\mu(z) = \frac{1 + |\mu(z)|}{1 - |\mu(z)|} \quad (1.2)$$

the *maximal dilatation* or, in short, the *dilatation* of Eq. (1.1). The Beltrami equation (1.1) is said to be *degenerate* if  $\operatorname{ess\,sup} K_\mu(z) = \infty$ .

---

Received 18.03.2008

Recall that a function  $f : D \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  is *absolutely continuous on lines*, abbr.  $f \in \mathbf{ACL}$ , if, for every closed rectangle  $R$  in  $D$ , whose sides are parallel to the coordinate axes,  $f|_R$  is absolutely continuous on almost all line segments in  $R$  which are parallel to the sides of  $R$ . In particular,  $f$  is ACL (possibly modified on a set of Lebesgue measure zero) if it belongs to the Sobolev class  $W_{loc}^{1,1}$  of locally integrable functions with locally integrable first generalized derivatives and, conversely, if  $f \in \mathbf{ACL}$  has locally integrable first partial derivatives, then  $f \in W_{loc}^{1,1}$ , see, e.g., 1.2.4 in [9]. For a sense-preserving ACL homeomorphism  $f : D \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ , the Jacobian  $J_f(z) = |f_z|^2 - |f_{\bar{z}}|^2$  is nonnegative a.e. In this case, the *complex dilatation*  $\mu_f$  of  $f$  is the ratio  $\mu(z) = f_{\bar{z}}/f_z$ , if  $f_z \neq 0$  and  $\mu(z) = 0$  otherwise, and the *dilatation*  $K_f(z)$  of  $f$  is  $K_\mu(z)$ , see (1.2). Note that  $|\mu(z)| \leq 1$  a.e. and  $K_\mu(z) \geq 1$  a.e. Given a function  $Q : D \rightarrow [1, \infty]$ , a sense-preserving ACL homeomorphism  $f : D \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  is called a  $Q(z)$ -*quasiconformal mapping* if  $K_f(z) \leq Q(z)$  a.e., see [11].

Recall also that, given a family of paths  $\Gamma$  in  $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$ , a Borel function  $\rho : \overline{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  is called *admissible* for  $\Gamma$ , abbr.  $\rho \in \text{adm } \Gamma$ , if

$$\int_\gamma \rho(z) |dz| \geq 1 \tag{1.3}$$

for each  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ . The *modulus* of  $\Gamma$  is defined by

$$M(\Gamma) = \inf_{\rho \in \text{adm } \Gamma} \int_{\mathbb{C}} \rho^2(z) \, dx \, dy. \tag{1.4}$$

Motivated by the ring definition of quasiconformality in [6], we introduce the following notion that extends and localizes the notion of a quasiconformal mapping. Let  $D$  be a domain in  $\mathbb{C}$ ,  $z_0 \in \overline{D}$ , and  $Q : D \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  a measurable function. We say that a homeomorphism  $f : D \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{C}}$  is a *ring  $Q$ -homeomorphism* at the point  $z_0$  if

$$M(\Delta(fC_0, fC_1, fD)) \leq \int_{A \cap D} Q(z) \cdot \eta^2(|z - z_0|) \, dx \, dy \tag{1.5}$$

for every ring

$$A = A(z_0, r_1, r_2) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : r_1 < |z - z_0| < r_2\}, \quad 0 < r_1 < r_2 < \infty,$$

and for every continua  $C_0$  and  $C_1$  in  $D$  which belong to the different components of the complement to the ring  $A$  in  $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$ , containing  $z_0$  and  $\infty$ ,

respectively, and for every measurable function  $\eta : (r_1, r_2) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  such that

$$\int_{r_1}^{r_2} \eta(r) dr = 1. \quad (1.6)$$

## 2. On convergence of Sobolev's functions

First of all, let us recall the necessary definitions and basic facts on the Sobolev spaces  $W^{l,p}$  and  $L^p, p \in [1, \infty]$ . Given an open set  $U$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and a natural number  $l$ ,  $C_0^l(U)$  denotes a collection of all functions  $\varphi : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with compact support having all partial continuous derivatives of order at most  $l$  in  $U$ .  $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(U)$  if  $\varphi \in C_0^l(U)$  for all  $l = 1, 2, \dots$ . A vector  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$  with natural coordinates is called a *multiindex*. Every multiindex  $\alpha$  is associated with the differential operator  $D^\alpha = \partial^{|\alpha|} / \partial x_1^{\alpha_1} \dots \partial x_n^{\alpha_n}$  where  $|\alpha| = \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_n$ .

Now, let  $u$  and  $v : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be locally integrable functions. The function  $v$  is called the *generalized derivative*  $D^\alpha u$  of  $u$  if

$$\int_{\Omega} u D^\alpha \varphi dx = (-1)^{|\alpha|} \int_{\Omega} v \varphi dx \quad \forall \varphi \in C_0^\infty. \quad (2.1)$$

The concept of the generalized derivative was introduced by Sobolev in [13]. The *Sobolev class*  $W^{l,p}(\Omega)$  consists of all functions  $u : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  in  $L^p(U)$ ,  $p \geq 1$ , with generalized derivatives of order  $l$  summable of order  $p$ . A function  $u : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  belongs to  $W_{loc}^{l,p}(U)$  if  $u \in W^{l,p}(U_*)$  for every open set  $U_*$  with compact closure  $\overline{U_*} \subset U$ . A similar notion introduced for vector-functions  $f : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  in the component-wise sense.

A function  $\omega : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with a compact support in  $\mathbb{B}$  is called a *Sobolev averaging kernel* if  $\omega$  is nonnegative, belongs to  $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \omega(x) dx = 1. \quad (2.2)$$

The well-known example of such a function is  $\omega(x) = \gamma \varphi(|x|^2 - \frac{1}{4})$ , where  $\varphi(t) = e^{1/t}$  for  $t < 0$  and  $\varphi(t) \equiv 0$  for  $t \geq 0$ , and the constant  $\gamma$  is chosen so that (2.2) holds. Later on, we use only  $\omega$  depending on  $|x|$ .

Let  $U$  be a nonempty bounded open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and  $f \in L^1(U)$ . Extending  $f$  by zero outside of  $U$ , we set

$$f_h = \omega_h * f = \int_{|y| \leq 1} f(x + hy) \omega(y) dy = \frac{1}{h^n} \int_U f(z) \omega\left(\frac{z-x}{h}\right) dz, \quad (2.3)$$

where  $f_h = \omega_h * f$ ,  $\omega_h(y) = \omega(y/h)$ ,  $h > 0$ , is called the *Sobolev mean function* for  $f$ . It is known that  $f_h \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ ,  $\|f_h\|_p \leq \|f\|_p$  for every  $f \in L^p(U)$ ,  $p \in [1, \infty]$ , and  $f_h \rightarrow f$  in  $L^p(U)$  for every  $f \in L^p(U)$ ,  $p \in [1, \infty)$  (see, e.g., 1.2.1 in [9]). It is clear that if  $f$  has a compact support in  $U$ , then  $f_h$  also has a compact support in  $U$  for small enough  $h$ .

A sequence  $\varphi_k \in L^1(U)$  is called *weakly fundamental* if

$$\lim_{k_1, k_2 \rightarrow \infty} \int_U \Phi(x) (\varphi_{k_1}(x) - \varphi_{k_2}(x)) dx = 0 \quad \forall \Phi \in L^\infty(U)$$

It is well known that the space  $L^1(U)$  is *weakly complete*, i.e., every weakly fundamental sequence  $\varphi_k \in L^1(U)$  converges weakly in  $L^1(U)$  (see, e.g., Theorem IV.8.6 in [3]). Give also the following useful statement (see, e.g., Theorem 1.2.5 in [7]).

**Proposition 2.1.** *Let  $f$  and  $g \in L^1_{loc}(U)$ . If*

$$\int f \varphi dx = \int g \varphi dx \quad \forall \varphi \in C_0^\infty(U), \quad (2.4)$$

*then  $f = g$  a.e.*

Later on, in comparison with [11], we apply the following lemma instead of Lemma III.3.5 in [10] which is not valid for  $p = 1$ .

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $U$  be a bounded open set in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , and let  $f_k : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a sequence of functions of the class  $W^{1,1}(U)$ . Suppose that  $f_k \rightarrow f$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  weakly in  $L^1(U)$ ,  $\partial f_k / \partial x_j$ ,  $k = 1, 2, \dots$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$  are uniformly bounded in  $L^1(U)$  and their indefinite integrals are absolutely equicontinuous. Then  $f \in W^{1,1}(U)$  and  $\partial f_k / \partial x_j \rightarrow \partial f / \partial x_j$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  weakly in  $L^1(U)$ .*

**Remark 2.1.** The weak convergence  $f_k \rightarrow f$  in  $L^1(U)$  implies that

$$\sup_k \|f_k\|_1 < \infty$$

(see, e.g., IV.8.7 in [3]). The latter together with

$$\sup_k \|\partial f_k / \partial x_j\|_1 < \infty,$$

$j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , implies that  $f_k \rightarrow f$  by the norm in  $L^q$  for every  $1 < q < n/(n - 1)$ , the limit function  $f$  belongs to  $BV(U)$ , the class of functions of bounded variation, but, generally speaking, not to the class  $W^{1,1}(U)$  (see, e.g., Remark in 4.6 and Theorem 5.2.1 in [4]). Thus, the additional condition of Lemma 2.1 on absolute equicontinuity of the indefinite integrals of  $\partial f_k / \partial x_j$  is essential (cf. also Remark to Theorem I.2.4 in [10]).

*Proof of Lemma 2.1.* It is known that the space  $L^1$  is weakly complete (see Theorem IV.8.6 in [3]). Thus, it suffices to prove that the sequences  $\frac{\partial f_k}{\partial x_j}$  are weakly fundamental in  $L^1$ .

Indeed, by the definition of generalized derivatives, we have

$$\int_U \varphi(x) \frac{\partial f_k}{\partial x_j} dx = - \int_U f_k(x) \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_j} dx \quad \forall \varphi \in C_0^\infty(U). \quad (2.5)$$

Note that the integrals on the right-hand side in (2.5) are bounded linear functionals in  $L^1(U)$ , and the sequence  $f_k$  is weakly fundamental in  $L^1(U)$  because  $f_k \rightarrow f$  weakly in  $L^1(U)$ . Hence, in particular,

$$\int_U \varphi(x) \left( \frac{\partial f_{k_1}}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial f_{k_2}}{\partial x_j} \right) dx \rightarrow 0 \quad \forall \varphi \in C_0^\infty(U)$$

as  $k_1$  and  $k_2 \rightarrow \infty$ .

Now, let  $\Phi \in L^\infty(U)$ . Then  $\|\Phi_h\|_\infty \leq \|\Phi\|_\infty$  and  $\Phi_h \rightarrow \Phi$  in the norm of  $L^1(U)$  for its Sobolev mean functions  $\Phi_h$ , and, hence,  $\Phi_h \rightarrow \Phi$  in measure as  $h \rightarrow 0$ . Set  $\varphi_m = \Phi_{h_m}$ , where  $\Phi_{h_m} \rightarrow \Phi$  a.e. as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ . Considering the restrictions of  $\Phi$  to compacta in  $U$ , we may assume that  $\varphi_m \in C_0^\infty(U)$ . By the Egoroff theorem,  $\varphi_m \rightarrow \Phi$  uniformly on a set  $S \subset U$  such that  $|U \setminus S| < \delta$ , where  $\delta > 0$  can be arbitrary small (see, e.g., III.6.12 in [3]). Given  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_S (\Phi(x) - \varphi_m(x)) \left( \frac{\partial f_{k_1}}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial f_{k_2}}{\partial x_j} \right) dx \right| \\ & \leq 2 \cdot \max_{x \in S} |\Phi(x) - \varphi_m(x)| \cdot \sup_{k=1,2,\dots} \int_U \left| \frac{\partial f_k}{\partial x_j} \right| dx \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3} \end{aligned}$$

for all large enough  $m$ . Choosing one such  $m$ , we have

$$\left| \int_U \varphi_m(x) \left( \frac{\partial f_{k_1}}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial f_{k_2}}{\partial x_j} \right) dx \right| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3}$$

for  $k_1$  and  $k_2$  large enough. By the absolute equicontinuity of the indefinite integrals of  $\partial f_k/\partial x_j$ , there is  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$\int_E \left| \frac{\partial f_k}{\partial x_j} \right| dx \leq \frac{1}{12} \frac{\varepsilon}{\|\Phi\|_\infty}$$

for all  $k = 1, 2, \dots$  and every measurable set  $E \subset U$  with  $|E| < \delta$  (see IV.8.10 and IV.8.11 in [3]). Setting  $E = U \setminus S$ , we obtain

$$\left| \int_U \Phi(x) \left( \frac{\partial f_{k_1}}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial f_{k_2}}{\partial x_j} \right) dx \right| \leq I_1 + I_2 + I_3,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \left| \int_E (\Phi(x) - \varphi_m(x)) \left( \frac{\partial f_{k_1}}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial f_{k_2}}{\partial x_j} \right) dx \right|, \\ I_2 &= \left| \int_S (\Phi(x) - \varphi_m(x)) \left( \frac{\partial f_{k_1}}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial f_{k_2}}{\partial x_j} \right) dx \right|, \\ I_3 &= \left| \int_U \varphi_m(x) \left( \frac{\partial f_{k_1}}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial f_{k_2}}{\partial x_j} \right) dx \right|, \end{aligned}$$

and, hence by the above arguments,

$$\left| \int_U \Phi(x) \left( \frac{\partial f_{k_1}}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial f_{k_2}}{\partial x_j} \right) dx \right| \leq \varepsilon$$

for large enough  $k_1$  and  $k_2$ . Thus,  $\frac{\partial f_k}{\partial x_j}$  is weakly fundamental in  $L^1(U)$ , and hence  $\frac{\partial f_k}{\partial x_j}$  converges weakly in  $L^1(U)$  just to  $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}$  by (2.5), see Proposition 2.1. □

### 3. On convergence of ACL homeomorphisms

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $D$  be a domain in  $\mathbb{C}$ , and let  $f_n : D \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  be a sequence of sense-preserving ACL homeomorphisms with complex dilatations  $\mu_n$  such that*

$$\frac{1 + |\mu_n(z)|}{1 - |\mu_n(z)|} \leq Q(z) \in L^1_{\text{loc}} \quad \forall n = 1, 2, \dots \tag{3.1}$$

*If  $f_n \rightarrow f$  uniformly on each compact set in  $D$ , where  $f$  is a homeomorphism, then  $f \in \text{ACL}$  and  $\partial f_n$  and  $\bar{\partial} f_n$  converge weakly in  $L^1_{\text{loc}}$  to  $\partial f$  and  $\bar{\partial} f$ , respectively. Moreover, if, in addition,  $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$  a.e., then  $\bar{\partial} f = \mu \partial f$  a.e.*

**Remark 3.1.** In fact, it is easy to show that, under condition (3.1),  $f_n$  and  $f$  belong to  $W_{loc}^{1,1}$  (see, e.g., (3.2) below and II.3.27 in [3]). Moreover, if, in addition,  $Q \in L_{loc}^p$ , then  $f_n$  and  $f$  belong to  $W_{loc}^{1,s}$ ,  $\partial f_n \rightarrow \partial f$  and  $\bar{\partial} f_n \rightarrow \bar{\partial} f$  weakly in  $L_{loc}^s$ , where  $s = 2p/(1 + p)$  (see, e.g., Lemma 2.2 in [1]). Finally,  $f$  is a  $Q(z)$ -quasiconformal mapping, see [11].

*Proof of Theorem 3.1.* To prove the first part of the theorem, it suffices by Lemma 2.1 to show that  $\partial f_n$  and  $\bar{\partial} f_n$  are uniformly bounded in  $L_{loc}^1$  and have locally absolute equicontinuous indefinite integrals. So, let  $C$  be a compact set in  $D$ , and let  $V$  be an open set with their compact closure  $\bar{V}$  in  $D$  such that  $C \subset V$ , say  $V = \{z \in D : \text{dist}(z, C) < r\}$ , where  $r < \text{dist}(C, \partial D)$ . Note that

$$|\bar{\partial} f_n| \leq |\partial f_n| \leq |\partial f_n| + |\bar{\partial} f_n| \leq Q^{1/2}(z) \cdot J_n^{1/2}(z) \quad \text{a.e.,}$$

where  $J_n$  is the Jacobian of  $f_n$ . Consequently, by the Hölder inequality and Lemma III.3.3 in [8],

$$\int_E |\partial f_n| \, dx \, dy \leq \left| \int_E Q(z) \, dx \, dy \right|^{1/2} |f_n(C)|^{1/2}$$

for every measurable set  $E \subseteq C$ . Hence, by the uniform convergence of  $f_n$  to  $f$  on  $C$ ,

$$\int_E |\partial f_n| \, dx \, dy \leq \left| \int_E Q(z) \, dx \, dy \right|^{1/2} |f(V)|^{1/2} \tag{3.2}$$

for large enough  $n$  and, thus, the first part of the proof is completed.

We now assume that  $\mu_n(z) \rightarrow \mu(z)$  a.e. Set  $\zeta(z) = \bar{\partial} f(z) - \mu(z) \partial f(z)$  and show that  $\zeta(z) = 0$  a.e. Indeed, for every disk  $B$  with  $\bar{B} \subset D$ , by the triangle inequality

$$\left| \int_B \zeta(z) \, dx \, dy \right| \leq I_1(n) + I_2(n),$$

where

$$I_1(n) = \left| \int_B (\bar{\partial} f(z) - \bar{\partial} f_n(z)) \, dx \, dy \right|$$

and

$$I_2(n) = \left| \int_B (\mu(z) \partial f(z) - \mu_n(z) \partial f_n(z)) \, dx \, dy \right|$$

Note that  $I_1(n) \rightarrow 0$  because  $\bar{\partial} f_n \rightarrow \bar{\partial} f$  weakly in  $L^1_{\text{loc}}$  by the first part of the proof. Next,  $I_2(n) = I'_2(n) + I''_2(n)$ , where

$$I'_2(n) = \left| \int_B \mu(z) (\partial f(z) - \partial f_n(z)) \, dx \, dy \right|$$

and

$$I''_2(n) = \left| \int_B (\mu(z) - \mu_n(z)) \partial f_n(z) \, dx \, dy \right|.$$

Again, by the weak convergence  $\partial f_n \rightarrow \partial f$  in  $L^1_{\text{loc}}$ , we have that  $I'_2(n) \rightarrow 0$  because  $\mu \in L^\infty$ . Moreover, given  $\varepsilon > 0$ , by (3.2)

$$\int_E |\partial f_n(z)| \, dx \, dy < \varepsilon, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots, \tag{3.3}$$

whenever  $E$  is every measurable set in  $B$  with  $|E| < \delta$  for small enough  $\delta > 0$ .

Further, by the Egoroff theorem (see, e.g., III.6.12 in [3]),  $\mu_n(z) \rightarrow \mu(z)$  uniformly on some set  $S \subset B$  such that  $|E| < \delta$ , where  $E = B \setminus S$ . Hence,  $|\mu_n(z) - \mu(z)| < \varepsilon$  on  $S$  and, by (3.3),

$$\begin{aligned} I''_2(n) &\leq \varepsilon \int_S |\partial f_n(z)| \, dx \, dy + 2 \int_E |\partial f_n(z)| \, dx \, dy \\ &\leq \varepsilon \left\{ \left( \int_B Q(z) \, dx \, dy \right)^{1/2} \cdot |f(\lambda B)|^{1/2} + 2 \right\} \end{aligned}$$

for some  $\lambda > 1$  and for all large enough  $n$ , i.e.  $I''_2(n) \rightarrow 0$ , because  $\varepsilon > 0$  is arbitrary. Thus,  $\int_B \zeta(z) \, dx \, dy = 0$  for all disks  $B$  with  $\bar{B} \subset D$ . Finally, by the Lebesgue theorem on the differentiability of indefinite integrals (see, e.g., IV(6.3) in [12]),  $\zeta(z) = 0$  a.e. in  $D$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 3.1.** *Let  $D$  be a domain in  $\bar{\mathbb{C}}$  and  $f_n : D \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{C}}$ ,  $n$*



*Proof.* Indeed, suppose that  $f(z_1) = f(z_2)$  for some  $z_1 \neq z_2$  in  $D$ . For small  $t > 0$ , let  $D_t$  be a disk of the spherical radius  $t$  centered at  $z_1$  such that  $\overline{D_t} \subset D$  and  $z_2 \notin \overline{D_t}$ . Then, for all  $n$ ,  $f_n(\partial D_t)$  separates  $f_n(z_1)$  from  $f_n(z_2)$  and, hence,  $s(f_n(z_1), f_n(\partial D_t)) < s(f_n(z_1), f_n(z_2))$ . Thus, for every such  $t$ , there is  $\zeta_n(t) \in \partial D_t$  such that  $s(f_n(z_1), f_n(\zeta_n(t))) < s(f_n(z_1), f_n(z_2))$ . Moreover, there is a subsequence  $\zeta_{n_k}(t) \rightarrow \zeta_0(t) \in \partial D_t$ , because the circle  $\partial D_t$  is a compact set. However, the locally uniform convergence  $f_{n_k} \rightarrow f$  implies that  $f_{n_k}(\zeta_{n_k}(t)) \rightarrow f(\zeta_0(t))$  (see, e.g., [2, p. 268]). Consequently,  $s(f(z_1), f(\zeta_0(t))) \leq s(f(z_1), f(z_2))$ . Then, since  $f(z_1) = f(z_2)$ , there is a point  $z_t = \zeta_0(t)$  on  $\partial D_t$  such that  $f(z_1) = f(z_t)$  for every small  $t$  contradicting the discreteness of  $f$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 3.1.** *Let  $D$  be a domain in  $\mathbb{C}$  and  $f_n : D \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{C}}$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , a sequence of quasiconformal mappings which satisfy (3.1). If  $f_n \rightarrow f$  locally uniformly, then either  $f$  is constant or  $f$  is an ACL homeomorphism, and  $\partial f_n$  and  $\bar{\partial} f_n$  converge weakly in  $L^1_{loc}(D \setminus \{f^{-1}(\infty)\})$  to  $\partial f$  and  $\bar{\partial} f$ , respectively. If, in addition,  $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$  a.e., then  $\bar{\partial} f = \mu \partial f$  a.e.*

*Proof.* Consider the case where  $f$  is not constant in  $D$ . Let us show that then no point in  $D$  has a neighborhood of the constancy for  $f$ . Indeed, assume that there is at least one point  $z_0 \in D$  such that  $f(z) \equiv c$  for some  $c \in \overline{\mathbb{C}}$  in a neighborhood of  $z_0$ . Note that the set  $\Omega_0$  of such points  $z_0$  is open. The set  $E_c = \{z \in D : s(f(z), c) > 0\}$ , where  $s$  is the spherical (chordal) distance in  $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$ , is also open in view of continuity of  $f$  and not empty in the considered case. Thus, there is a point  $z_0 \in \partial \Omega_0 \cap D$  because  $D$  is connected. By continuity of  $f$ , we have  $f(z_0) = c$ . However, by construction, there is a point  $z_1 \in E_c = D \setminus \overline{\Omega_0}$  such that  $|z_0 - z_1| < r_0 = \text{dist}(z_0, \partial D)$  and, thus, by the lower estimate of the distance  $s(f(z_0), f(z))$  in Lemma 3.12 from [11], we obtain a contradiction for  $z \in \Omega_0$ . Then, again by Lemma 3.12 in [11], we obtain that  $f$  is discrete, and  $f$  is a homeomorphism by Proposition 3.1. All other assertions follow from Theorem 3.1.  $\square$

#### 4. On convergence of ring $Q$ -homeomorphisms

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $f_n : D \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{C}}$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , be a sequence of ring  $Q$ -homeomorphisms at a point  $z_0 \in \overline{D}$ . If  $f_n$  converges locally uniformly to a homeomorphism  $f : D \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{C}}$ , then  $f$  is also a ring  $Q$ -homeomorphism at  $z_0$ .*

*Proof.* Note first that every point  $\underline{w_0} \in D' = fD$  belongs to  $D'_n = f_n D$  for all  $n \geq N$  together with  $\overline{D(w_0, \varepsilon)}$ , where  $D(w_0, \varepsilon) = \{w \in \overline{\mathbb{C}} : s(w, w_0) < \varepsilon\}$  for some  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Indeed, set  $\delta = \frac{1}{2} s(z_0, \partial D)$ , where

$z_0 = f^{-1}(w_0)$  and  $\varepsilon_n = s(w_0, \partial f_n D(z_0, \delta))$ . Note that the sets  $f_n D(z_0, \delta)$  are open, and  $\varepsilon_n > 0$  is the radius of the maximal closed disk centered at  $w_0$  which is inside of  $\overline{f_n D(z_0, \delta)}$ . Assume that  $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Since  $\partial D(z_0, \delta)$  and  $\partial f_n D(z_0, \delta) = f_n \partial D(z_0, \delta)$  are compact, there exist  $z_n \in \partial D(z_0, \delta)$ ,  $s(z_n, z_0) = \delta$ , such that  $\varepsilon_n = s(w_0, f_n(z_n))$ , and we may assume that  $z_n \rightarrow z_* \in \partial D(z_0, \delta)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and then  $f_n(z_n) \rightarrow f(z_*)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  (see, e.g., [2, p. 268]). However, by construction,  $s(w_0, f_n(z_n)) = \varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , and, hence,  $f(z_*) = f(z_0)$ , i.e.,  $z = z_*$ . This contradiction disproves the above assumption. Thus, we obtain also that every compact set  $C \subset D'$  belongs to  $D'_n$  for all  $n \geq N$  for some  $N$ .

Now remark that  $D' = \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} C_m$ , where  $C_m = \overline{D_m^*}$ ,  $D_m^*$  is a connected component of the open set  $\Omega_m = \{w \in D' : s(w, \partial D') > 1/m\}$ ,  $m = 1, 2, \dots$ , including a fixed point  $w_0 \in D'$ . Indeed, every point  $w \in D'$  can be joined with  $w_0$  by a path  $\gamma$  in  $D'$ . Because  $|\gamma|$  is compact, we have  $s(|\gamma|, \partial D') > 0$  and, consequently,  $w \in D_m^*$  for large enough  $m = 1, 2, \dots$

Next, take an arbitrary pair of continua  $E$  and  $F$  in  $D$  which belong to the different connected components of the complement of a ring  $A = A(z_0, r_1, r_2) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : r_1 < |z - z_0| < r_2\}$ ,  $z_0 \in \overline{D}$ ,  $0 < r_1 < r_2 < r_0 \leq \sup_{z \in D} |z - z_0|$ . For  $m \geq m_0$ , the continua  $fE$  and  $fF$  belong to  $D_m^*$ . Fix one of such  $m$ . Then the continua  $f_n E$  and  $f_n F$  also belong to  $D_m^*$  for large enough  $n$ . As well known,

$$M(\Delta(f_n E, f_n F; D_m^*)) \rightarrow M(\Delta(fE, fF; D_m^*))$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , see [14, Theorem 1]. However,  $D_m^* \subset f_n D$  for large enough  $n$ , and hence

$$M(\Delta(f_n E, f_n F; D_m^*)) \leq M(\Delta(f_n E, f_n F; f_n D))$$

and, thus, by (1.5),

$$M(\Delta(fE, fF; D_m^*)) \leq \int_{A \cap D} Q(z) \cdot \eta^2(|z - z_0|) dx dy$$

for every measurable function  $\eta : (r_1, r_2) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  such that

$$\int_{r_1}^{r_2} \eta(r) dr = 1.$$

Finally, since  $\Gamma = \bigcup_{m=m_0}^{\infty} \Gamma_m$  where  $\Gamma = \Delta(fE, fF; fD)$  and  $\Gamma_m := \Delta(fE, fF; D_m^*)$  is increasing in  $m = 1, 2, \dots$ , we obtain that  $M(\Gamma) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} M(\Gamma_m)$  (see, e.g., [5, Theorem 7]), and, thus,

$$M(\Delta(fE, fF; fD)) \leq \int_{A \cap D} Q(z) \cdot \eta^2(|z - z_0|) dx dy,$$

i.e.,  $f$  is a ring  $Q$ -homeomorphism at  $z_0$ . □

**Acknowledgements.** The research of the first author was partially supported by grants from the University of Helsinki, from Technion — Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa, and Holon Institute of Technology, Israel, from Institute of Mathematics of PAN, Warsaw, Poland, and by Grant F25.1/055 of the State Foundation of Fundamental Researches of Ukraine; the research of the second author was partially supported by a grant from the Israel Science Foundation (grant no. 198/00) and by Technion Fund for the Promotion of Research, and the third author was partially supported by a grant from the Israel Science Foundation (grant no. 198/00).

### References

- [1] B. Bojarski, V. Gutlyanskii, and V. Ryazanov, *General Beltrami equations and BMO* // Ukrainian Math. Bull. **5** (2008), N 3, 305–326.
- [2] J. Dugundji, *Topology*, Allyn and Bacon, Boston, 1966.
- [3] N. Dunford and J. T. Schwartz, *Linear Operators, Part I: General Theory*, Interscience Publishers, New York, 1957.
- [4] L. C. Evans and R. F. Gapiery, *Measure Theory and Fine Properties of Functions*, CRC Press, Boca Raton, 1992.
- [5] F. W. Gehring, *Quasiconformal mappings, in Complex Analysis and its Applications, V. 2.*, International Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna, 1976.
- [6] F. W. Gehring, *Rings and quasiconformal mappings in space* // Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **103** (1962), 353–393.
- [7] L. Hörmander, *The Analysis of Linear Partial Differential Operators I. Distribution Theory and Fourier Analysis*, Springer, Berlin, 1983.
- [8] O. Lehto and K. Virtanen, *Quasiconformal Mappings in the Plane*, Springer, New York, 1973.
- [9] V. G. Maz'ya and S. V. Poborchi, *Differentiable Functions on Bad Domains*, World Scientific, Singapore, 1997.
- [10] Yu. G. Reshetnyak, *Space Mappings with Bounded Distortion*, Transl. of Math. Monographs 73, AMS, 1989.
- [11] V. Ryazanov, U. Srebro and E. Yakubov, *BMO-quasiconformal mappings* // J. d'Analyse Math. **83** (2001), 1–20.
- [12] S. Saks, *Theory of the Integral*, Dover, New York, 1964.

- [13] S. L. Sobolev, *Applications of Functional Analysis in Mathematical Physics*, Izdat. LGU, Leningrad, 1950; English transl, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I., 1963.
- [14] P. M. Tamrazov, *Continuity of certain conformal invariants*, Ukrain. Mat. Zh. **18** (1966), N 6, 78–84 (Russian).

## CONTACT INFORMATION

- Vladimir Ryazanov** Institute of Applied Mathematics  
and Mechanics, NAS of Ukraine,  
R. Luxemburg Str. 74,  
83114, Donetsk,  
Ukraine  
*E-Mail:* vlryazanov1@rambler.ru
- Uri Srebro** Technion — Israel Institute of Technology,  
Haifa 32000,  
Israel  
*E-Mail:* srebro@math.technion.ac.il
- Eduard Yakubov** Holon Institute of Technology,  
52 Golomb St., P.O.Box 305,  
Holon 58102,  
Israel  
*E-Mail:* yakubov@hit.ac.il