

A NEW VARIATIONAL APPROACH TO LINEARIZATION OF TRACTION PROBLEMS IN ELASTICITY

FRANCESCO MADDALENA, DANILO PERCIVALE, FRANCO TOMARELLI

ABSTRACT. A new energy functional for pure traction problems in elasticity has been deduced in [23] as the variational limit of nonlinear elastic energy functional for a material body subject to an equilibrated force field: a sort of Gamma limit with respect to the weak convergence of strains when a suitable small parameter tends to zero. This functional exhibits a gap that makes it different from the classical linear elasticity functional. Nevertheless a suitable compatibility condition on the force field ensures coincidence of related minima and minimizers. Here we show some relevant properties of the new functional and prove stronger convergence of minimizing sequences for suitable choices of nonlinear elastic energies.

DRAFT

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Structural properties of functional \mathcal{F}	5
3.	Preliminary variational convergence results	8
4.	Strong convergence of minimizing sequences of \mathcal{F}_h	13
	References	15

AMS Classification Numbers (2010): 49J45, 74K30, 74K35, 74R10.

Key Words: Calculus of Variations, Pure Traction problems, Linear Elasticity, Nonlinear Elasticity, Finite Elasticity, Critical points, Gamma-convergence, Asymptotic analysis, nonlinear Neumann problems.

1. INTRODUCTION

This article is focussed on the properties of the functional

$$(1.1) \quad \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{v}) := \min_{\mathbf{W} \in \mathcal{M}_{skew}^{N \times N}} \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v}) - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{W}^2) \, d\mathbf{x} - \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{v}) .$$

In (1.1) and in the sequel we set: $N = 2, 3$, $\mathcal{M}_{skew}^{N \times N}$ denotes the set of skew-symmetric $N \times N$ real matrices, $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is a Lipschitz open set representing the reference configuration of an hyperelastic material body undergoing pure traction, $\mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{x}, \cdot)$ are uniformly positive definite quadratic forms on square matrices, the vector field \mathbf{v} in $H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$ denotes a displacement

and $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v}) := \frac{1}{2}(\nabla \mathbf{v}^T + \nabla \mathbf{v})$ denotes the related linearized strain, while $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{v})$ represents the potential energy associated to displacement \mathbf{v} ,

$$(1.2) \quad \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{v}) := \int_{\partial\Omega} \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{v} d\mathcal{H}^{N-1} + \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{g} \cdot \mathbf{v} dx, \quad \mathbf{f} \in L^2(\partial\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N), \mathbf{g} \in L^2(\Omega),$$

here \mathbf{f} and \mathbf{g} are respectively the prescribed boundary and body force fields, moreover we assume that the total load is equilibrated, say

$$(1.3) \quad \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{z}) = 0 \quad \forall \mathbf{z} : \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{z}) \equiv \mathbf{0}.$$

Motivations for studying functional \mathcal{F} and its minimization over \mathbf{v} in $H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$ rely on the variational asymptotic analysis developed in [23], where we proved that for pure traction problems in elasticity a gap arises between the classical linearized elasticity functional \mathcal{E} ,

$$(1.4) \quad \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{v}) := \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v})) dx - \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{v}),$$

and the rigorous variational limit of nonlinear elastic energy of a material body subject to an equilibrated force field, since this limit actually is functional \mathcal{F} , provided the load fulfils a suitable compatibility condition (see (1.12) and Theorem (3.3) below).

The inequality $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{v}) \leq \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{v})$ for every \mathbf{v} is straightforward. nevertheless the two functionals cannot coincide: indeed $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{v}) = -\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{v}) < \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{v})$ whenever $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{W}^2\mathbf{x}$ with $\mathbf{W} \neq \mathbf{0}$ skew symmetric matrix.

Notwithstanding this gap, in [23] we showed that the two functionals \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{E} have the same minimum and same set of minimizers when the loads are equilibrated and compatible (see Theorem (3.3) below).

In the case $N = 2$ the gap between the two functionals can be better clarified as follows (see Remark 2.5 in [23] for more details):

$$(1.5) \quad \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{v}) = \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{v}) - \frac{1}{4} \left(\int_{\Omega} \mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{I}) dx \right)^{-1} \left[\left(\int_{\Omega} D\mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{I}) \cdot \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v}) dx \right)^- \right]^2,$$

where $\alpha^- = \max(-\alpha, 0)$, thus

$$\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{v}) = \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{v}) \quad \text{if } N = 2 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\Omega} D\mathcal{V}_0(x, \mathbf{I}) \cdot \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v}) dx \geq 0.$$

Even more explicitly, if $N = 2$, $\lambda, \mu > 0$ and

$$(1.6) \quad \mathcal{W}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{F}) = \begin{cases} \mu |\mathbf{F}^T \mathbf{F} - \mathbf{I}|^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2} |\text{Tr}(\mathbf{F}^T \mathbf{F} - \mathbf{I})|^2 & \text{if } \det \mathbf{F} > 0, \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

then $\mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{B}) = 4\mu |\mathbf{B}|^2 + 2\lambda |\text{Tr} \mathbf{B}|^2$ and we get

$$(1.7) \quad a_*^2(\mathbf{v}) = |\Omega|^{-1} \left(\int_{\Omega} \text{div} \mathbf{v} dx \right)^-;$$

such evaluation in 2D approximately means that for every displacement \mathbf{v} such that the associated deformed configuration $\mathbf{y}(\Omega)$ is greater than the area of Ω , the global energy $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{v})$ provided by new functional \mathcal{F} is the same as the one provided by classical linearized elasticity, say $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{v})$.

The rigorous derivation of the variational theory of linear elasticity ([17]) from the theory of finite elasticity ([20],[30]) was achieved in [11] through arguments based on De Giorgi Γ -

convergence theory, thus providing a mathematical justification of the classical elasticity in small deformations regime, at least for *Dirichlet or mixed boundary value problem*.

In a more recent paper ([23]) we have focussed the analysis on the analogous variational question related to Neumann type condition, say the *pure traction problem in elasticity*: the case where the elastic body is subject to a system of equilibrated forces and no Dirichlet condition is assigned on the boundary.

Referring to the open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, $N = 2, 3$, as the reference configuration of an hyperelastic material body, the stored energy due to a deformation \mathbf{y} can be expressed as a functional of the deformation gradient $\nabla \mathbf{y}$ as follows

$$\int_{\Omega} \mathcal{W}(\mathbf{x}, \nabla \mathbf{y}) \, d\mathbf{x}$$

where $\mathcal{W} : \Omega \times \mathcal{M}^{N \times N} \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$ is a frame indifferent function, $\mathcal{M}^{N \times N}$ is the set of real $N \times N$ matrices and $\mathcal{W}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{F}) < +\infty$ if and only if $\det \mathbf{F} > 0$.

Then due to frame indifference there exists a function \mathcal{V} such that

$$\mathcal{W}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{F}) = \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x}, \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{F}^T \mathbf{F} - \mathbf{I})), \quad \forall \mathbf{F} \in \mathcal{M}^{N \times N}, \quad \text{a.e. } \mathbf{x} \in \Omega.$$

We set $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{I} + h\mathbf{B}$, where $h > 0$ is an adimensional small parameter and

$$\mathcal{V}_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{B}) := h^{-2} \mathcal{W}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{I} + h\mathbf{B}).$$

We assume that the reference configuration has zero energy and is stress free, i.e.

$$\mathcal{W}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{I}) = 0, \quad D\mathcal{W}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{I}) = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{for a.e. } \mathbf{x} \in \Omega,$$

and that \mathcal{W} is regular enough in the second variable, then Taylor's formula entails

$$\mathcal{V}_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{B}) = \mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{x}, \text{sym } \mathbf{B}) + o(1) \quad \text{as } h \rightarrow 0_+$$

where $\text{sym } \mathbf{B} := \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{B}^T + \mathbf{B})$ and

$$\mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{x}, \text{sym } \mathbf{B}) := \frac{1}{2} \text{sym } \mathbf{B} D^2 \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{0}) \text{sym } \mathbf{B}.$$

If the deformation \mathbf{y} is close to the identity up to a small displacement, say $\mathbf{y}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x} + h\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x})$ with bounded $\nabla \mathbf{v}$ then, by setting $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v}) := \frac{1}{2}(\nabla \mathbf{v}^T + \nabla \mathbf{v})$, one easily obtains

$$(1.8) \quad \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{V}_h(\mathbf{x}, \nabla \mathbf{v}) \, d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v})) \, d\mathbf{x}$$

Right hand side in (1.8) represents the classical linear elastic deformation energy and such a limit was retained to establish a reasonable justification of linearized elasticity. However in [11] it is proved by Γ -convergence techniques that, under standard structural conditions on \mathcal{W} , actually the linear elastic problem is achieved in the limit by exploiting the weak convergence of $H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$, in case of Dirichlet or mixed boundary condition.

The variational limit is different when no Dirichlet boundary condition is present, as we outline briefly here: in [23] we studied the case of Neumann boundary conditions, that is pure traction problem in elasticity, by considering the sequence of energy functionals

$$(1.9) \quad \mathcal{F}_h(\mathbf{v}) = \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{V}_h(\mathbf{x}, \nabla \mathbf{v}) \, d\mathbf{x} - \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{v}), \quad \mathbf{v} \in H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N),$$

and we we inquired whether the asymptotic relationship $\mathcal{F}_h(\mathbf{v}_h) = \inf \mathcal{F}_h + o(1)$ as $h \rightarrow 0_+$ implies, up to subsequences, some kind of weak convergence of \mathbf{v}_h to a minimizer \mathbf{v}_0 of a suitable limit functional in $H^1(\Omega; \mathbf{R}^N)$; to this aim next example is highly explicative: assume

$$(1.10) \quad \mathcal{W}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{F}) = \begin{cases} |\mathbf{F}^T \mathbf{F} - \mathbf{I}|^2 & \text{if } \det \mathbf{F} > 0 \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$\mathbf{g} \equiv \mathbf{f} \equiv \mathbf{0}$, hence $\inf \mathcal{F}_h = 0$ for every $h > 0$, then by choosing a fixed nontrivial $N \times N$ skew-symmetric matrix \mathbf{W} , a real number $0 < 2\alpha < 1$ and setting

$$(1.11) \quad \mathbf{z}_h := h^{-\alpha} \mathbf{W} \mathbf{x},$$

we get $\mathcal{F}_h(\mathbf{z}_h) = \inf \mathcal{F}_h + o(1)$, though \mathbf{z}_h has no subsequence weakly converging in $H^1(\Omega; \mathbf{R}^N)$. Therefore in contrast to [11], one cannot expect weak $H^1(\Omega; \mathbf{R}^N)$ compactness of minimizing sequences for pure traction problem, not even in the simplest case of null external forces: we emphasize that in nonlinear elasticity this difficulty cannot be easily circumvented in general by standard translations since $\mathcal{F}_h(\mathbf{v}_h) \neq \mathcal{F}_h(\mathbf{v}_h - \mathbb{P}\mathbf{v}_h)$, with \mathbb{P} projection on infinitesimal rigid displacements. Nevertheless, we will show in Theorem 4.1 below that, at least for some special \mathcal{W} , if $\mathcal{F}_h(\mathbf{v}_h) = \inf \mathcal{F}_h + o(1)$ then up to subsequences $\mathcal{F}_h(\mathbf{v}_h - \mathbb{P}\mathbf{v}_h) = \inf \mathcal{F}_h + o(1)$.

For this reason, we exploited a much weaker topology: the weak $L^2(\Omega; \mathbf{R}^N)$ convergence of linear strains. Since such convergence does not imply an analogous convergence of the skew symmetric part of the gradient of displacements, one may expect that the Γ limit functional is different from the point-wise limit of \mathcal{F}_h , as actually is the case.

Under some natural assumptions on \mathcal{W} , a careful application of the Rigidity Lemma of [16] together with a suitable tuning of asymptotic analysis with Euler-Rodrigues formula for rotations show that, if $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v}_h)$ are bounded in L^2 , then up to subsequences $\sqrt{h} \nabla \mathbf{v}_h$ converges strongly in L^2 to a constant skew symmetric matrix and the variational limit of the sequence \mathcal{F}_h , with respect to the w- L^2 convergence of linear strains, turns out to be the functional \mathcal{F} defined in (1.1): in [23] it is proved that if loads are equilibrated and fulfil the compatibility condition

$$(1.12) \quad \int_{\partial\Omega} \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{W}^2 \mathbf{x} d\mathcal{H}^{N-1} + \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{g} \cdot \mathbf{W}^2 \mathbf{x} dx < 0 \quad \forall \text{ skew symmetric matrix } \mathbf{W} \neq \mathbf{0}$$

then pure traction problem in linear elasticity is rigorously deduced via Γ -convergence from the corresponding pure traction problem formulated in nonlinear elasticity, referring to weak L^2 convergence of the linear strains; moreover minimizers of \mathcal{F} coincide with the ones of of linearized elasticity functional \mathcal{E} ; thus providing a complete variational justification of pure traction problems in linear elasticity at least if (1.12) is satisfied. In particular, as it is shown in Remark 2.8, this is true when $\mathbf{g} \equiv \mathbf{0}$, $\mathbf{f} = f \mathbf{n}$ with $f > 0$ and \mathbf{n} is the outer unit normal vector to $\partial\Omega$, that is when we are in presence of tension-like surface forces.

In the present paper we prove some relevant properties concerning the structure of the new functional and improve its variational connection for a particular but significant class of non-linear energies.

In section 2 we prove that \mathcal{F} is sequentially lower semicontinuous weak respect to the natural but very weak notion of convergence, e.g. weak L^2 of linearized strains (see Proposition (2.3)), though \mathcal{F} exhibits a kind of "nonlocal" behavior (see Remark 2.5).

In the 2D case we can prove that \mathcal{F} is a convex functional for every choice of the positive

definite quadratic form \mathcal{V}_0 or, equivalently, for the variational limit of every nonlinear stored energy \mathcal{W} fulfilling structural assumptions of general kind in the theory of elasticity: this is shown by making explicit its first variation and showing that the second variation cannot be negative (see (2.11) and Proposition 2.1).

On the other hand in the 3D case the functional \mathcal{F} cannot be convex for whatever choice of the positive definite quadratic form \mathcal{V}_0 or, equivalently for every nonlinear stored energy \mathcal{W} fulfilling the standard structural assumptions: see Proposition 2.2 and the general counterexample to convexity therein.

The dichotomy above relies on the fact that there exist pairs of skew-symmetric matrices $\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2 \in \mathcal{M}_{skew}^{3 \times 3}$ such that $\mathbf{W}_1^2 + \mathbf{W}_2^2$ is not the square of any skew-symmetric matrix: e.g. see (2.7); while in the 2D case the matrix \mathbf{W}^2 is a nonpositive multiple of the identity for every skew-symmetric matrix \mathbf{W} .

Notice that \mathcal{F} is not subadditive: indeed already in dimension $N = 2$ formula (1.5) shows that functional \mathcal{F} cannot be subadditive on disjoint sets.

In Section 3 for reader's convenience we summarize and comment preliminary main results of [23] about the variational convergence of pure traction problems.

Eventually, in Section 4 we refine the convergence properties for *minimizing sequences of the sequence of functionals* \mathcal{F}_h (e.g. $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{v}_h) = \inf \mathcal{F}_h + o(1)$): if \mathcal{W} is the *Green-St. Venant* energy density (1.6) then we show by Theorem 4.1 that there exist subsequences of functionals \mathcal{F}_h and of related minimizing sequence \mathbf{v}_h , such that (without relabeling) $\mathbf{v}_h - \mathbb{P}\mathbf{v}_h$ converges weakly in $H^1(\Omega; \mathbf{R}^N)$ and strongly in $W^{1,q}(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^N)$ ($1 \leq q < 2$) to a minimizer of \mathcal{F} , provided both (1.3) and (1.12) hold true.

On the other hand, if inequality in (1.12) is fulfilled only in a weak sense by the collection of skew symmetric matrices, then still $\text{argmin } \mathcal{F}$ contains $\text{argmin } \mathcal{E}$ and $\min \mathcal{F} = \min \mathcal{E}$, but \mathcal{F} may have infinitely many minimizing critical points which are not minimizers of \mathcal{E} .

Therefore, only two cases are allowed: either $\min \mathcal{F} = \min \mathcal{E}$ or $\inf \mathcal{F} = -\infty$; actually the second case arises in presence of compressive surface load.

We mention several contributions facing issues in elasticity which are strictly connected with the context of present paper: [1], [2], [3], [4] [5], [6], [7], [8], [19] [21], [22], [24], [25], [26], [27], [28].

2. STRUCTURAL PROPERTIES OF FUNCTIONAL \mathcal{F}

In this section we develop further the analysis of structural properties of functional \mathcal{F} defined by (1.1), focussing mainly on convexity and semicontinuity issues.

All along the paper we assume that the reference configuration of the elastic body is a

$$(2.1) \quad \text{bounded, connected open set } \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N \text{ with Lipschitz boundary, } N = 2, 3,$$

and set these notations: the generic point $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$ has components x_j referring to the standard basis vectors \mathbf{e}_j in \mathbb{R}^N ; \mathcal{L}^N and \mathcal{B}^N denote respectively the σ -algebras of Lebesgue measurable and Borel measurable subsets of \mathbb{R}^N .

The notation for vectors $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $N \times N$ real matrices $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{F}$ are as follows: $\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{b} = \sum_j \mathbf{a}_j \mathbf{b}_j$; $\mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{B} = \sum_{i,j} \mathbf{A}_{i,j} \mathbf{B}_{i,j}$; $[\mathbf{AB}]_{i,j} = \sum_k \mathbf{A}_{i,k} \mathbf{B}_{k,j}$; $|\mathbf{F}|^2 = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{F}^T \mathbf{F}) = \sum_{i,j} F_{i,j}^2$ denotes the squared Euclidean norm of \mathbf{F} in the space $\mathcal{M}^{N \times N}$ of $N \times N$ real matrices; $\mathbf{I} \in \mathcal{M}^{N \times N}$ denotes the identity matrix, $SO(N)$ denotes the group of rotation matrices, $\mathcal{M}_{sym}^{N \times N}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{skew}^{N \times N}$ denote respectively the sets of symmetric and skew-symmetric matrices. For every $\mathbf{B} \in \mathcal{M}^{N \times N}$ we define $\text{sym } \mathbf{B} := \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{B}^T)$ and $\text{skew } \mathbf{B} := \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{B}^T)$.

First we recall that the minimum at right-hand side in definition (1.1) of \mathcal{F} exists for every \mathbf{v} in $H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$, so that $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{v})$ is well defined: precisely the finite dimensional minimization problem has exactly two solutions which differs only by the sign, since strict convexity of the positive definite quadratic form $\mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{x}, \cdot)$ entails

$$(2.2) \quad \lim_{|\mathbf{W}| \rightarrow +\infty, \mathbf{W} \in \mathcal{M}_{skew}^{N \times N}} \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v}) - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{W}^2) d\mathbf{x} = +\infty$$

and hence the existence of a unique minimizer \mathbf{W}^2 .

Proposition 2.1. *If $N = 2$ then functional \mathcal{F} is convex for every choice of the positive definite quadratic form \mathcal{V}_0 .*

Proof. For every $\varepsilon > 0$ we define $\varphi_\varepsilon \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$ as

$$(2.3) \quad \varphi_\varepsilon(t) = \begin{cases} t^2 - \varepsilon t + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{3} & \text{if } t \leq 0 \\ (3\varepsilon)^{-1}(\varepsilon - t)^3 & \text{if } 0 \leq t \leq \varepsilon \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and introduce the C^2 functionals \mathcal{F}_ε by setting

$$(2.4) \quad \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{v}) = \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{v}) - \frac{1}{4} \left(\int_{\Omega} \mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{I}) d\mathbf{x} \right)^{-1} \varphi_\varepsilon \left(\int_{\Omega} D\mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{I}) \cdot \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v}) d\mathbf{x} \right) \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N).$$

Then by (2.3), (2.4) and representation

$$\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{v}) = \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{v}) - \frac{1}{4} \left(\int_{\Omega} \mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{I}) d\mathbf{x} \right)^{-1} \left[\left(\int_{\Omega} D\mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{I}) \cdot \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v}) d\mathbf{x} \right)^- \right]^2,$$

we get

$$\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon \leq \mathcal{F}, \quad \mathcal{F} = \sup_{\varepsilon > 0} \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon.$$

Moreover we claim that \mathcal{F}_ε is convex for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and this property entails the convexity of \mathcal{F} since \mathcal{F} is the supremum of a family of convex functions.

Indeed \mathcal{F}_ε is a C^2 functional on the whole space $H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$ therefore its second variation, for every $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$, is

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}^T \delta^2 \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}) \mathbf{v} &= \mathbf{v}^T \delta^2 \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}) \mathbf{v} \\ &- \frac{1}{4} \left(\int_{\Omega} \mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{I}) d\mathbf{x} \right)^{-1} \varphi_\varepsilon'' \left(\int_{\Omega} D\mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{I}) \cdot \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{x} \right) \left(\int_{\Omega} D\mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{I}) \cdot \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v}) d\mathbf{x} \right)^2 = \\ &= 2 \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v})) d\mathbf{x} - \\ &- \frac{1}{4} \left(\int_{\Omega} \mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{I}) d\mathbf{x} \right)^{-1} \varphi_\varepsilon'' \left(\int_{\Omega} D\mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{I}) \cdot \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{x} \right) \left(\int_{\Omega} D\mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{I}) \cdot \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v}) d\mathbf{x} \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

By taking into account that $0 \leq \varphi_\varepsilon'' \leq 2$ we get

$$(2.6) \quad \mathbf{v}^T \delta^2 \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}) \mathbf{v} \geq 2 \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v})) d\mathbf{x} - \frac{1}{2} \left(\int_{\Omega} \mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{I}) d\mathbf{x} \right)^{-1} \left(\int_{\Omega} D\mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{I}) \cdot \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v}) d\mathbf{x} \right)^2.$$

Hence, representation (1.5) entails that the right hand side of (2.6) is $2(\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{v}) + \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{v}))$ if

$$\int_{\Omega} D\mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{I}) \cdot \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v}) \geq 0$$

and is $\mathcal{F}(-\mathbf{v}) + \mathcal{L}(-\mathbf{v})$ else. Therefore in both cases (1.1) entails $\mathbf{v}^T \delta^2 \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}) \mathbf{v} \geq 0$ for every $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$. Therefore \mathcal{F}_ε is convex and claim is proved. \blacksquare

Proposition 2.2. *If $N = 3$ then functional \mathcal{F} is nonconvex for every choice of the positive definite quadratic form \mathcal{V}_0 .*

Proof. Set

$$(2.7) \quad \mathbf{W}_1 = \mathbf{e}_1 \otimes \mathbf{e}_2 - \mathbf{e}_2 \otimes \mathbf{e}_1, \quad \mathbf{W}_2 = \mathbf{e}_2 \otimes \mathbf{e}_3 - \mathbf{e}_3 \otimes \mathbf{e}_2.$$

Then

$$\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{W}_1^2 + \mathbf{W}_2^2) = -\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{e}_1 \otimes \mathbf{e}_1 + \mathbf{e}_3 \otimes \mathbf{e}_3) - \mathbf{e}_2 \otimes \mathbf{e}_2 := \mathbf{A}$$

and by choosing $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}) := \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}$ we get $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbf{A} \notin \{\mathbf{W}^2 : \mathbf{W} \in \mathcal{M}_{skew}^{N \times N}\}$. Hence, due to (3.16), $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{v}) > -\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{v})$ for every choice of \mathcal{V}_0 . By setting

$$\mathbf{v}_1(\mathbf{x}) := \mathbf{W}_1^2 \mathbf{x}, \quad \mathbf{v}_2(\mathbf{x}) := \mathbf{W}_2^2 \mathbf{x}$$

we get $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{v}_1) = -\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{v}_1)$, $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{v}_2) = -\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{v}_2)$ hence

$$\mathcal{F}\left(\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{v}_1 + \mathbf{v}_2)\right) = \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{v}) > -\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{v}) = -\frac{1}{2}(\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{v}_1) + \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{v}_2)) = \frac{1}{2}(\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{v}_1) + \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{v}_2))$$

thus proving that \mathcal{F} is not convex in the 3D case for every choice of \mathcal{V}_0 . \blacksquare

Although existence of minimizers of \mathcal{F} is already a direct consequence of convergence results in [23], in the next Proposition we provide a direct proof of sequential lower semicontinuity of \mathcal{F} with respect to the natural, very weak convergence, for both cases of dimension 2 and 3.

Proposition 2.3. *Assume that the standard structural conditions and (1.3) holds true. Then for every $\mathbf{v}_n, \mathbf{v} \in H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N)$ such that $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v}_n) \rightharpoonup \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v})$ in $L^2(\Omega; \mathcal{M}^{N \times N})$ we have*

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{v}_n) \geq \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{v})$$

Proof. Let \mathbf{v}_n, \mathbf{v} belong to $H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N)$ and fulfil $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v}_n) \rightharpoonup \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v})$ in $L^2(\Omega; \mathcal{M}^{N \times N})$. Then $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v}_n)$ is bounded in $L^2(\Omega; \mathcal{M}^{N \times N})$. If $\liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{v}_n) = +\infty$ then the claim is trivial, so we may also assume without restriction that $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{v}_n) \leq C$. Assumption (1.3) of equilibrated load entails $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{v}_n) = \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{v}_n - \mathbb{P}\mathbf{v}_n)$, so may suppose that $\mathbb{P}\mathbf{v}_n \equiv \mathbf{0}$. We choose

$$(2.8) \quad \mathbf{W}_n \in \operatorname{argmin} \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{V}_0\left(\mathbf{x}, \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v}_n) - \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{W}^2\right) d\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{W} \in \mathcal{M}_{skew}^{N \times N} \right\}.$$

hence, if C_K the Korn-Poincaré inequality in Ω and $\alpha > 0$ is the uniform coercivity constant of \mathcal{V}_0 , say $\mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{M}) \geq \alpha|\mathbf{M}|^2$, we get

$$(2.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \alpha \int_{\Omega} |\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v}_n) - \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{W}_n^2|^2 d\mathbf{x} &\leq C + \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{v}_n) = C + \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{v}_n - \mathbb{P}\mathbf{v}_n) \leq \\ &\leq C + C_K(\|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + \|\mathbf{g}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}) \|\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v})\|_{L^2(\Omega; \mathcal{M}^{N \times N})}, \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $|\mathbf{W}_n^2|$ is bounded and since \mathbf{W}_n is real skew-symmetric we obtain that $|\mathbf{W}_n|$ is bounded too. So we may suppose that, up to subsequences, $\mathbf{W}_n \rightarrow \mathbf{W}$ in $\mathcal{M}_{skew}^{N \times N}$. By taking

into account that $\mathbb{P}\mathbf{v}_n \equiv \mathbf{0}$ we get $\mathbf{v}_n \rightarrow \mathbf{v}$ in $H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$ hence by recalling that $\mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{x}, \cdot)$ is a convex quadratic form

$$(2.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{v}_n) &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{V}_0\left(\mathbf{x}, \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v}_n) - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{W}_n^2\right) d\mathbf{x} - \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{v}_n) \geq \\ &\geq \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{V}_0\left(\mathbf{x}, \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v}) - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{W}^2\right) d\mathbf{x} - \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{v}) \geq \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{v}) \end{aligned}$$

which proves the claimed lower semicontinuity inequality. \blacksquare

Remark 2.4. The first variation of \mathcal{F} can be explicitly evaluated in the 2D case, thanks to (1.5), as follows

$$(2.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \delta\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{v})[\varphi] &= \int_{\Omega} D\mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v})) \cdot \mathbb{E}(\varphi) d\mathbf{x} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \left(\int_{\Omega} \mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{I}) d\mathbf{x} \right)^{-1} \left(\int_{\Omega} D\mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{I}) \cdot \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v}) d\mathbf{x} \right)^{-} \int_{\Omega} D\mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{I}) \cdot \mathbb{E}(\varphi) d\mathbf{x} - \mathcal{L}(\varphi) = \\ &= \delta\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{v})[\varphi] + \frac{1}{2} \left(\int_{\Omega} \mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{I}) d\mathbf{x} \right)^{-1} \left(\int_{\Omega} D\mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{I}) \cdot \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v}) d\mathbf{x} \right)^{-} \int_{\Omega} D\mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{I}) \cdot \mathbb{E}(\varphi) d\mathbf{x} \end{aligned}$$

for every $\mathbf{v}, \varphi \in H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N)$.

Remark 2.5. Functional \mathcal{F} exhibits a nonlocal behavior: precisely in 2D, due to the representations (1.5) and (2.11) respectively of the functional of first variation, $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{v})$ is the sum of a contribution $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{v})$ due to local functional \mathcal{E} related to linear elasticity plus a possibly vanishing contribution with global dependance on \mathbf{v} explicitly evaluated by

$$- \frac{a_*(\mathbf{v})}{4} = - \frac{1}{4} \left(\int_{\Omega} \mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{I}) d\mathbf{x} \right)^{-1} \left[\left(\int_{\Omega} D\mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{I}) \cdot \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v}) d\mathbf{x} \right)^{-} \right]^2,$$

which simplifies as follows in the case of Green-Saint Venant energy:

$$- \frac{1}{4|\Omega|} \left(\int_{\Omega} \operatorname{div} \mathbf{v} d\mathbf{x} \right)^{-},$$

while the nonlocal coefficient $\left(\int_{\Omega} D\mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{I}) \cdot \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v}) d\mathbf{x} \right)^{-}$ appears in Euler equations.

3. PRELIMINARY VARIATIONAL CONVERGENCE RESULTS

In this Section we recall the main results of [23] about the variational convergence of pure traction problems. To this aim basic notation and assumptions for general nonlinear energies is introduced first.

Still we assume that the reference configuration of the elastic body is a

$$(3.1) \quad \text{bounded, connected open set } \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N \text{ with Lipschitz boundary, } N = 2, 3,$$

and set these notations: the generic point $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$ has components x_j referring to the standard basis vectors \mathbf{e}_j in \mathbb{R}^N ; \mathcal{L}^N and \mathcal{B}^N denote respectively the σ -algebras of Lebesgue measurable and Borel measurable subsets of \mathbb{R}^N .

For every $\mathcal{U} : \Omega \times \mathcal{M}^{N \times N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, with $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{x}, \cdot) \in C^2$ a.e. $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$, we denote the gradient and the hessian of g with respect to the second variable by $D\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{x}, \cdot)$ and $D^2\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{x}, \cdot)$ respectively.

For every displacements field $\mathbf{v} \in H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N)$, $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v}) := \operatorname{sym} \nabla \mathbf{v}$ denotes the infinitesimal strain

tensor field, $\mathcal{R} := \{\mathbf{v} \in H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N) : \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbf{0}\}$ the set of infinitesimal rigid displacements and $\mathbb{P}\mathbf{v}$ is the orthogonal projection of \mathbf{v} onto \mathcal{R} .

We consider a body made of an hyperelastic material, say there exists a $\mathcal{L}^N \times \mathcal{B}^{N^2}$ measurable $\mathcal{W} : \Omega \times \mathcal{M}^{N \times N} \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$ such that, for a.e. $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$, $\mathcal{W}(\mathbf{x}, \nabla \mathbf{y}(\mathbf{x}))$ represents the stored energy density, when $\mathbf{y}(x)$ is the deformation and $\nabla \mathbf{y}(\mathbf{x})$ is the deformation gradient. Moreover we assume that for a.e. $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$

$$(3.2) \quad \mathcal{W}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{F}) = +\infty \quad \text{if } \det \mathbf{F} \leq 0 \quad (\text{orientation preserving condition}),$$

$$(3.3) \quad \mathcal{W}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{R}\mathbf{F}) = \mathcal{W}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{F}) \quad \forall \mathbf{R} \in SO(N) \quad \forall \mathbf{F} \in \mathcal{M}^{N \times N} \quad (\text{frame indifference}),$$

$$(3.4) \quad \exists \text{ a neighborhood } \mathcal{A} \text{ of } SO(N) \text{ s.t. } \mathcal{W}(\mathbf{x}, \cdot) \in C^2(\mathcal{A}),$$

$$(3.5) \quad \exists C > 0 \text{ independent of } \mathbf{x} : \mathcal{W}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{F}) \geq C |\mathbf{F}^T \mathbf{F} - \mathbf{I}|^2 \quad \forall \mathbf{F} \in \mathcal{M}^{N \times N} \text{ (coerciveness),}$$

$$(3.6) \quad \mathcal{W}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{I}) = 0, \quad D\mathcal{W}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{I}) = 0, \quad \text{for a.e. } \mathbf{x} \in \Omega,$$

that is the reference configuration has zero energy and is stress free, so by (3.3) we get also

$$\mathcal{W}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{R}) = 0, \quad D\mathcal{W}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{R}) = 0 \quad \forall \mathbf{R} \in SO(N).$$

By frame indifference there exists a $\mathcal{L}^N \times \mathcal{B}^N$ -measurable $\mathcal{V} : \Omega \times \mathcal{M}^{N \times N} \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$ such that for every $\mathbf{F} \in \mathcal{M}^{N \times N}$

$$(3.7) \quad \mathcal{W}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{F}) = \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x}, \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{F}^T \mathbf{F} - \mathbf{I}))$$

and by (3.4)

$$(3.8) \quad \exists \text{ a neighborhood } \mathcal{O} \text{ of } \mathbf{0} \text{ such that } \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x}, \cdot) \in C^2(\mathcal{O}), \text{ a.e. } x \in \Omega.$$

In addition we assume that there exists $\gamma > 0$ independent of \mathbf{x} such that

$$(3.9) \quad |\mathbf{B}^T D^2 \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{D}) \mathbf{B}| \leq 2\gamma |\mathbf{B}|^2 \quad \forall \mathbf{D} \in \mathcal{O}, \quad \forall \mathbf{B} \in \mathcal{M}^{N \times N}.$$

By (3.6) and Taylor expansion with Lagrange remainder we get, for a.e. $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$ and suitable $t \in (0, 1)$ depending on \mathbf{x} and on \mathbf{B} :

$$(3.10) \quad \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{B}) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{B}^T D^2 \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x}, t\mathbf{B}) \mathbf{B}.$$

Hence by (3.9)

$$(3.11) \quad \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{B}) \leq \gamma |\mathbf{B}|^2 \quad \forall \mathbf{B} \in \mathcal{M}^{N \times N} \cap \mathcal{O}.$$

According to (3.7) for a.e. $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$, $h > 0$ and every $\mathbf{B} \in \mathcal{M}^{N \times N}$ we set

$$(3.12) \quad \mathcal{V}_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{B}) := \frac{1}{h^2} \mathcal{W}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{I} + h\mathbf{B}) = \frac{1}{h^2} \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x}, h \text{sym } \mathbf{B} + \frac{1}{2}h^2 \mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{B}).$$

Taylor's formula with (3.6), (3.12) entails $\mathcal{V}_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{B}) = \frac{1}{2} (\text{sym } \mathbf{B}) D^2 \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{0}) (\text{sym } \mathbf{B}) + o(1)$, so

$$(3.13) \quad \mathcal{V}_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{B}) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{x}, \text{sym } \mathbf{B}) \text{ as } h \rightarrow 0_+,$$

where the point-wise limit of integrands is the quadratic form \mathcal{V}_0 defined by

$$(3.14) \quad \mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{B}) := \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{B}^T D^2 \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{0}) \mathbf{B} \quad \text{a.e. } \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, \quad \mathbf{B} \in \mathcal{M}^{N \times N}.$$

The symmetric fourth order tensor $D^2\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{0})$ in (3.14) plays the role of the classical elasticity tensor.

By (3.5) we get

$$(3.15) \quad \mathcal{V}_h(x, \mathbf{B}) = \frac{1}{h^2} \mathcal{W}(x, \mathbf{I} + h\mathbf{B}) \geq C |2 \operatorname{sym} \mathbf{B} + h \mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{B}|^2$$

so that (3.14) and (3.15) imply the ellipticity of \mathcal{V}_0 :

$$(3.16) \quad \mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{x}, \operatorname{sym} \mathbf{B}) \geq 4C |\operatorname{sym} \mathbf{B}|^2 \quad \text{a.e. } \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, \mathbf{B} \in \mathcal{M}^{N \times N}.$$

For a suitable choice of the adimensional parameter $h > 0$, the functional representing the total energy is labeled by $\mathcal{F}_h : H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ and defined as follows

$$(3.17) \quad \mathcal{F}_h(\mathbf{v}) := \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{V}_h(\mathbf{x}, \nabla \mathbf{v}) \, d\mathbf{x} - \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{v}),$$

where \mathcal{L} is defined by (1.2).

In order to describe the asymptotic behavior as $h \rightarrow 0_+$ of functionals \mathcal{F}_h , we refer to the limit energy functional $\mathcal{F} : H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by (1.1).

In this Section we assume (3.1) together with the *standard structural conditions* (3.2)-(3.6),(3.9) as usual in scientific literature concerning elasticity theory and we refer to the notations (3.7),(3.12),(3.14),(3.17).

Definition 3.1. *Given an infinitesimal sequence h_j of positive real numbers, we say that $\mathbf{v}_j \in H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N)$ is a minimizing sequence of the sequence of functionals \mathcal{F}_{h_j} if*

$$(\mathcal{F}_{h_j}(\mathbf{v}_j) - \inf \mathcal{F}_{h_j}) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } h_j \rightarrow 0_+.$$

We proved that for every given infinitesimal sequence h_j actually the minimizing sequences of the sequence of functionals \mathcal{F}_{h_j} exists. For reader's convenience we recall here the main results of [23]: see Lemma 3.1, Theorem 2.2, Theorem 4.1 and Corollary 4.2 therein.

Lemma 3.2. *Assume the standard structural conditions together with (1.3) and (1.12). Then there is a constant K , dependent only on Ω and the coercivity constant of the stored energy density appearing in (3.5), such that*

$$(3.18) \quad \inf_{h>0} \inf_{\mathbf{v} \in H^1} \mathcal{F}_h(\mathbf{v}) > -K (\|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\mathbf{g}\|_{L^2}^2).$$

Theorem 3.3. *Assume that the standard structural conditions and (1.3),(1.12) hold true. Then:*

$$(3.19) \quad \min_{\mathbf{v} \in H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N)} \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{v}) = \min_{\mathbf{w} \in H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N)} \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{w}),$$

$$(3.20) \quad \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{v} \in H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N)} \mathcal{F} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{v} \in H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N)} \mathcal{E};$$

for every sequence of strictly positive real numbers $h_j \rightarrow 0$ there are minimizing sequences of the sequence of functionals \mathcal{F}_{h_j} ;

for every minimizing sequence $\mathbf{v}_j \in H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N)$ of \mathcal{F}_{h_j} there exist a subsequence and a displacement $\mathbf{v}_0 \in H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N)$ such that, without relabeling,

$$(3.21) \quad \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v}_j) \rightharpoonup \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v}_0) \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(\Omega; \mathcal{M}^{N \times N}),$$

$$(3.22) \quad \sqrt{h_j} \nabla \mathbf{v}_j \rightarrow \mathbf{0} \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(\Omega; \mathcal{M}^{N \times N}),$$

$$(3.23) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{F}_{h_j}(\mathbf{v}_j) = \min_{\mathbf{v} \in H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N)} \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{v}) = \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{v}_0) = \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{v}_0).$$

If strong inequality in the compatibility condition (1.12) is replaced by a weak inequality, then the uniform estimate (3.18) still hold true and also minimizing sequences of the sequence of functionals \mathcal{F}_{h_j} exist for every infinitesimal sequence h_j , but the minimizers coincidence (3.20) for \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{E} cannot hold anymore. Nevertheless the following general result holds true.

Proposition 3.4. *If the structural assumptions together with (1.3) are fulfilled, but (1.12) is replaced by*

$$(3.24) \quad \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{W}^2 \mathbf{x}) \leq 0 \quad \forall \mathbf{W} \in \mathcal{M}_{skew}^{N \times N}$$

then $\text{argmin } \mathcal{F}$ is still nonempty and

$$(3.25) \quad \min \mathcal{F} = \min \mathcal{E},$$

but the coincidence of minimizers sets is replaced by the inclusion

$$(3.26) \quad \text{argmin } \mathcal{E} \subset \text{argmin } \mathcal{F}.$$

If (3.24) holds true and there exists $\mathbf{U} \in \mathcal{M}_{skew}^{N \times N}$, $\mathbf{U} \neq \mathbf{0}$ such that $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{U}^2 \mathbf{x}) = 0$, then \mathcal{F} admits infinitely many minimizers which are not minimizers of \mathcal{E} , precisely

$$(3.27) \quad \text{argmin } \mathcal{E} \subsetneq \text{argmin } \mathcal{E} + \left\{ \mathbf{U}^2 \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{U} \in \mathcal{M}_{skew}^{N \times N}, \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{U}^2 \mathbf{x}) = 0 \right\} \subset \text{argmin } \mathcal{F},$$

where the last inclusion is an equality in 2D:

$$(3.28) \quad \text{argmin } \mathcal{E} \subsetneq \text{argmin } \mathcal{E} + \{-t \mathbf{x} : t \geq 0\} = \text{argmin } \mathcal{F}, \quad \text{if } N = 2.$$

Remark 3.5. The compatibility condition (1.12) cannot be dropped in Theorem 3.3 even if the (necessary) condition (1.3) holds true. Moreover plain substitution of strong with weak inequality in (1.12) leads to a lack of compactness for minimizing sequences.

Indeed, if \mathbf{n} denotes the outer unit normal vector to $\partial\Omega$ and we choose $\mathbf{f} = f \mathbf{n}$ with $f < 0$, $\mathbf{g} \equiv \mathbf{0}$ then

$$(3.29) \quad \int_{\partial\Omega} \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{W}^2 \mathbf{x} d\mathcal{H}^{N-1} = 2f(\text{Tr } \mathbf{W}^2)|\Omega| > 0$$

and the strict inequality in (1.12) is reversed in a strong sense by any $\mathbf{W} \in \mathcal{M}_{skew}^{N \times N} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$; fix a sequence of positive real numbers such that $h_j \rightarrow 0$, $\mathbf{W} \in \mathcal{M}_{skew}^{N \times N}$, $\mathbf{W} \neq \mathbf{0}$, and set $\mathbf{v}_j = h_j^{-1}(\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{W}^2 + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\mathbf{W}) \mathbf{x}$, then $\mathbf{I} + (\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{W}^2 + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\mathbf{W}) \in SO(N)$ and

$$(3.30) \quad \mathcal{F}_{h_j}(\mathbf{v}_j) = -\frac{f}{2h_j} \int_{\partial\Omega} \mathbf{W}^2 \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{n} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} = -\frac{f}{2h_j}(\text{Tr } \mathbf{W}^2)|\Omega| \rightarrow -\infty.$$

On the other hand, assume (3.1), \mathcal{W} as in (1.10) and $\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{g} \equiv \mathbf{0}$, so that the compatibility inequality is substituted by the weak inequality; if \mathbf{v}_j are defined as above then, hence by frame indifference,

$$(3.31) \quad \mathcal{F}_{h_j}(\mathbf{v}_j) = 0 = \inf \mathcal{F}_{h_j}$$

but $\mathbb{E}(v_j)$ has no weakly convergent subsequences in $L^2(\Omega; \mathcal{M}^{N \times N})$.

Remark 3.6. It is worth noticing that the compatibility condition (1.12) holds true when $\mathbf{g} \equiv 0$, $\mathbf{f} = f\mathbf{n}$ with $f > 0$ and \mathbf{n} the outer unit normal vector to $\partial\Omega$.

Indeed let $\mathbf{W} \in \mathcal{M}_{skew}^{N \times N}$, $\mathbf{W} \neq \mathbf{0}$: hence by (1.3) and the Divergence Theorem we get

$$(3.32) \quad \int_{\partial\Omega} \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{W}^2 \mathbf{x} d\mathcal{H}^{N-1} = 2f(\text{Tr } \mathbf{W}^2)|\Omega| < 0$$

thus proving (1.12) in this case. This means that in presence of tension-like surface forces and of null body forces the compatibility condition holds true.

It is quite natural to ask whether condition (1.12), which was essential in the proof of Theorem 3.3, may be dropped in order to obtain at least existence of $\min \mathcal{F}$: the answer is negative.

Indeed the next remark shows that, when compatibility inequality in (1.12) is reversed for at least one choice of the skew-symmetric matrix \mathbf{W} , then \mathcal{F} is unbounded from below.

Remark 3.7. *If*

$$(3.33) \quad \exists \mathbf{W}_* \in \mathcal{M}_{skew}^{N \times N} : \quad \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{z}_{\mathbf{W}_*}) > 0, \quad \text{where } \mathbf{z}_{\mathbf{W}_*} = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{W}_*^2 \mathbf{x},$$

then

$$(3.34) \quad \inf_{\mathbf{v} \in H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N)} \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{v}) = -\infty.$$

Indeed we get

$$(3.35) \quad \inf_{H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N)} \mathcal{F} = \min_{H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N)} \mathcal{E} - \sup_{\mathbf{W} \in \mathcal{M}_{skew}^{N \times N}} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{z}_{\mathbf{W}}) \quad \text{where } \mathbf{z}_{\mathbf{W}} = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{W}^2 \mathbf{x}.$$

Hence

$$\inf_{H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N)} \mathcal{F} \leq \min_{H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N)} \mathcal{E} - \tau \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{z}_{\mathbf{W}_*}) \quad \forall \tau > 0,$$

which entails (3.34).

Next example shows that in case of uniform compression along the whole boundary functional \mathcal{F} is unbounded from below, regardless of convexity or nonconvexity of Ω and \mathcal{F} .

Example 3.8. Assume $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is a Lipschitz, connected open set, $N = 2, 3$, $\mathbf{g} \equiv \mathbf{0}$, $\mathbf{f} = -\mathbf{n}$, where \mathbf{n} denotes the outer unit normal vector to $\partial\Omega$.

Then (3.33) holds true hence, by Remark 3.7, $\inf_{\mathbf{v} \in H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N)} \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{v}) = -\infty$.

Indeed, for every $\mathbf{W} \in \mathcal{M}_{skew}^{N \times N}$ such that $|\mathbf{W}|^2 = 2$ we obtain

$$\int_{\partial\Omega} \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{W}^2 \mathbf{x} d\mathcal{H}^{N-1} = - \int_{\partial\Omega} \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{W}^2 \mathbf{x} d\mathcal{H}^{N-1} = - \int_{\Omega} \text{div}(\mathbf{W}^2 \mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = - |\Omega| \text{Tr } \mathbf{W}^2 = 2 |\Omega| > 0.$$

Summarizing, only two cases are allowed: either $\min \mathcal{F} = \min \mathcal{E}$ or $\inf \mathcal{F} = -\infty$: the second case actually arises in presence of compressive surface load.

The new functional \mathcal{F} somehow preserves memory of instabilities which are typical of finite elasticity, while they disappear in the linearized model described by \mathcal{E} . In the light of Theorem 3.3, as far as pure traction problems are considered, it seems reasonable that the range of validity of linear elasticity should be restricted to a certain class of external loads, explicitly those verifying (1.12): a remarkable example in such class is a uniform normal tension load at the boundary as in Remark (3.6); while in the other cases equilibria of a linearly elastic body

could be better described through critical points of \mathcal{F} , whose existence in general seems to be an interesting and open problem.

4. STRONG CONVERGENCE OF MINIMIZING SEQUENCES OF \mathcal{F}_h

In this section we prove that for the special class of Green-Saint Venant energy density it is possible to choose a subsequence of functionals \mathcal{F}_h defined by (3.17) and a corresponding minimizing sequence, according to Definition (3.1), which is weakly converging in $H^1(\Omega; \mathbf{R}^N)$ to a minimizer of \mathcal{F} defined by (1.1). Moreover, thanks to a result of [11], this convergence entails strong convergence in $W^{1,q}(\Omega; \mathbf{R}^N)$ for $1 \leq q < 2$.

Before stating the main result of this section we notice that, by frame indifference (3.3) and equilibrated load condition (1.3), without loss of generality we can assume

$$(4.1) \quad \int_{\Omega} x_i d\mathbf{x} = 0 \quad \forall i = 1 \dots N, \quad \int_{\Omega} x_i x_j d\mathbf{x} = 0 \quad \forall i, j = 1 \dots N, \quad i \neq j.$$

Therefore, if I_k denotes the moment of inertia of Ω with respect to the k -th axis, by (4.1) we get

$$(4.2) \quad \mathbb{P} \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{x}, \quad \mathbf{a}_k = I_k^{-1} \int_{\Omega} (\mathbf{x} \times \mathbf{v})_k d\mathbf{x}$$

so

$$(4.3) \quad (\nabla \mathbb{P} \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}))_k = \mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{e}_k.$$

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\mu, \lambda > 0$,*

$$(4.4) \quad \mathcal{W}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{F}) = \mathcal{W}(\mathbf{F}) := \begin{cases} \mu |\mathbf{F}^T \mathbf{F} - \mathbf{I}|^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2} |\text{Tr}(\mathbf{F}^T \mathbf{F} - \mathbf{I})|^2 & \text{if } \det \mathbf{F} > 0, \\ +\infty & \text{else,} \end{cases}$$

assume (1.3), (1.12) and let h_j be a sequence of strictly positive real numbers with $h_j \rightarrow 0$. Then there exists a (not relabeled) subsequence of functionals \mathcal{F}_{h_j} and a minimizing sequence \mathbf{w}_j weakly converging in $H^1(\Omega; \mathbf{R}^N)$ and strongly converging in $W^{1,q}(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^N)$ to $\mathbf{w}_0 \in \text{argmin } \mathcal{E}$, for $1 \leq q < 2$.

Proof. By recalling Proposition 5.3 of [11] it will be enough to show that there exists a minimizing sequence \mathbf{w}_j for functionals \mathcal{F}_{h_j} (say $\mathcal{F}_{h_j}(\mathbf{w}_j) = \inf \mathcal{F}_{h_j} + o(1)$) weakly converging in $H^1(\Omega; \mathbf{R}^N)$ to $\mathbf{w}_0 \in \text{argmin } \mathcal{F}$ and

$$(4.5) \quad \lim_{h_j \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{F}_{h_j}(\mathbf{v}_j) = \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{V}_0(\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v}_0)) d\mathbf{x} - \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{v}_0) = \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{v}_0)$$

where it is worth noticing that due to (4.4)

$$(4.6) \quad \mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{B}) \equiv \mathcal{V}_0(\mathbf{B}) = 4\mu |\mathbf{B}|^2 + 2\lambda |\text{Tr } \mathbf{B}|^2.$$

To this aim let \mathbf{v}_j be a minimizing sequence for functionals \mathcal{F}_{h_j} : by Theorem 3.3 there exist a (not relabeled) subsequence $\{h_j\}$ and $\mathbf{v}_j, \mathbf{v}_0 \in H^1(\Omega; \mathbf{R}^N)$ such that

$$(4.7) \quad \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v}_j) \rightharpoonup \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v}_0) \text{ in } L^2(\Omega; \mathcal{M}^{N \times N}),$$

$$(4.8) \quad \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{v}_0) = \min_{\mathbf{v} \in H^1(\Omega; \mathbf{R}^N)} \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{v}) = \lim_{h_j \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{F}_{h_j}(\mathbf{v}_j),$$

$$(4.9) \quad \sqrt{h_j} \nabla \mathbf{v}_j \rightarrow \mathbf{0} \text{ in } L^2(\Omega; \mathcal{M}^{N \times N})$$

and by (4.8), (4.9)

$$(4.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{v} \in H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N)} \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{v}) &\geq \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{v}_0) = \min_{\mathbf{v} \in H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N)} \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{v}) = \lim_{h_j \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{F}_{h_j}(\mathbf{v}_j) = \\ &\lim_{h_j \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{V}_0(\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v}_j) + \frac{1}{2}h_j \nabla \mathbf{v}_j^T \nabla \mathbf{v}_j) \, d\mathbf{x} - \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{v}_j) = \\ &\int_{\Omega} \mathcal{V}_0(\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v}_0)) \, d\mathbf{x} - \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{v}_0) = \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{v}_0) \end{aligned}$$

that is $\mathbf{v}_0 \in \operatorname{argmin} \mathcal{E}$.

Thanks to (4.1), (4.2) and (4.3) we get

$$\int_{\Omega} (\mathbf{x} \times \mathbf{v}_{h_j}) \, d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\Omega} (\mathbf{x} \times (\mathbf{v}_{h_j} - \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{v}_{h_j} \, d\mathbf{x})) \, d\mathbf{x}$$

which, thanks to (4.9), implies

$$(4.11) \quad \sqrt{h_j} \nabla(\mathbb{P}\mathbf{v}_j) \rightarrow \mathbf{0}$$

so that

$$(4.12) \quad \mathbf{B}_{h_j} := \frac{h}{2} \{ \nabla(\mathbb{P}\mathbf{v}_j)^T \nabla(\mathbb{P}\mathbf{v}_j) + \nabla \mathbf{v}_j^T \nabla(\mathbb{P}\mathbf{v}_j) - \nabla(\mathbb{P}\mathbf{v}_j)^T \nabla \mathbf{v}_j \} \rightarrow \mathbf{0}$$

strongly in $L^2(\Omega; \mathcal{M}^{N \times N})$. Since \mathbf{v}_j is a minimizing sequence, (3.5) and Poincaré-Korn inequality yield

$$(4.13) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v}_j) + \frac{1}{2}h_j \nabla \mathbf{v}_j^T \nabla \mathbf{v}_j|^2 \, d\mathbf{x} &\leq C + \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{v}_j) = \\ C + \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{v}_j - \mathbb{P}\mathbf{v}_j) &\leq C + C' \left(\int_{\Omega} |\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v}_j)|^2 \, d\mathbf{x} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

hence $\mathbf{D}_{h_j} := \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v}_j) + \frac{1}{2}h_j \nabla \mathbf{v}_j^T \nabla \mathbf{v}_j$ are equibounded in $L^2(\Omega; \mathcal{M}^{N \times N})$ and by setting $\mathbf{w}_j := \mathbf{v}_j - \mathbb{P}\mathbf{v}_j$, by recalling that $\mathbf{B} \rightarrow V_0(\mathbf{B})$ is convex we have

$$(4.14) \quad \mathcal{F}_{h_j}(\mathbf{v}_j) - \mathcal{F}_{h_j}(\mathbf{w}_j) \geq \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{B}_{h_j} \cdot V_0'(\mathbf{D}_{h_j} + \mathbf{B}_{h_j}) \, d\mathbf{x}.$$

Since $|V_0'(\mathbf{B})| \leq C|\mathbf{B}|$ for some $C > 0$, by (4.12) and (4.13) we get

$$(4.15) \quad \left| \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{B}_{h_j} \cdot V_0'(\mathbf{D}_{h_j} + \mathbf{B}_{h_j}) \, d\mathbf{x} \right| \leq C \int_{\Omega} (|\mathbf{B}_{h_j}|^2 + |\mathbf{B}_{h_j}| |\mathbf{D}_{h_j}|) \, d\mathbf{x} \rightarrow 0$$

that is

$$(4.16) \quad \mathcal{F}_{h_j}(\mathbf{v}_j) \geq \mathcal{F}_{h_j}(\mathbf{w}_j) + o(1)$$

which proves that \mathbf{w}_j is a minimizing sequence too. It is now readily seen that \mathbf{w}_j are equibounded in $H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N)$ and (4.5) follows from (4.10) so the claim is proven. \blacksquare

Remark 4.2. By inspection of the proof, Theorem 4.1 holds true also for more general energies: e.g if \mathcal{W} is a convex function of $\mathbf{F}^T \mathbf{F} - \mathbf{I}$ with quadratic growth, which is finite if and only if $\det \mathbf{F} > 0$.

REFERENCES

- [1] V. Agostiniani, G. Dal Maso, A. DeSimone, *Linear elasticity obtained from finite elasticity by Gamma-convergence under weak coerciveness conditions*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire, **29** 5 (2012), 715–735.
- [2] R. Alicandro, G. Dal Maso, G. Lazzaroni, M. Palombaro, *Derivation of a linearised elasticity model from singularly perturbed multiwell energy functionals*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. , (2018) DOI: 10.1007/s00205-018-1240-6
- [3] G. Anzellotti, S. Baldo, D. Percivale, *Dimension reduction in variational problems, asymptotic development in Γ -convergence and thin structures in elasticity*. Asympt. Analysis, vol. 9, (1994) p.61-100, ISSN: 0921-7134.
- [4] B. Audoly, Y. Pomeau, *Elasticity and Geometry*, Oxford University Press, 2010.
- [5] C. Baiocchi, G. Buttazzo, F. Gastaldi, F. Tomarelli, *General existence results for unilateral problems in continuum mechanics*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **100** (1988), 149–189.
- [6] G. Buttazzo, G. Dal Maso, *Singular perturbation problems in the calculus of variations*, Ann.Scuola Normale Sup., Cl.Sci., 4 ser., **11** 3 (1984) 395-430.
- [7] G. Buttazzo, F. Tomarelli, *Compatibility conditions for nonlinear Neumann problems*, Advances in Math. **89** (1991), 127-143.
- [8] M. Carriero, A. Leaci, F. Tomarelli, *Strong solution for an elastic-plastic plate*, Calc.Var.Partial Diff.Eq., **2**, 2, (1994) 219-240.
- [9] P. G. Ciarlet, *Mathematical Elasticity, Volume I: Three-Dimensional Elasticity*, Elsevier, 1988.
- [10] G. Dal Maso, *An Introduction to Gamma Convergence*, Birkhäuser, PNLDE **8** (1993).
- [11] G. Dal Maso, M. Negri, D. Percivale, *Linearized elasticity as Γ -limit of finite elasticity*, Set-Valued Anal. **10** (2002), no. 2-3, 165-183.
- [12] E. De Giorgi, T. Franzoni, *Su un tipo di convergenza variazionale*, Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei Rend. Cl. Sci. Fis. Mat. Natur. (8) 58 (1975), no.6, 842–850.
- [13] D. De Tommasi, S. Marzano, *Small Strain and Moderate Rotation*, J. Elasticity 32, 37-50, (1993).
- [14] D. De Tommasi *On the Kinematics of Deformations with Small Strain and Moderate Rotation* , Math. And Mechanics of Solids **9**: 355-368, 2004.
- [15] G. Frieseke, R.D. James, S. Müller, *A theorem on geometric rigidity and the derivation of non linear plate theory from three dimensional elasticity*, Comm.Pure Appl. Math. 55 (2002), 1461–1506.
- [16] G. Frieseke, R.D. James, S. Müller, *A Hierarchy of Plate Models from Nonlinear Elasticity by Gamma-Convergence*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. 180 (2006), 183-236.
- [17] M.E.Gurtin, *The linear theory of elasticity*, in *Handbuch der Physik*, V1a/2, Springer, Berlin (1972).
- [18] B. Hall, *Lie Groups, Lie Algebras and Representations: An elementary introduction*, Springer Graduate Text in Math. 222 (2015).
- [19] M. Lecumberry, S. Müller, *Stability of slender bodies under compression and validity of von Kármán theory*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. 193 (2009), 255-310.
- [20] A.E. Love, *A Treatise on the Mathematical Theory of Elasticity*, Dover, 1944.
- [21] F. Maddalena, D. Percivale, F. Tomarelli, *Adhesive flexible material structures*, Discr. Continuous Dynamic. Systems B, Vol. 17, Num. 2, March 2012, 553-574.
- [22] F. Maddalena, D. Percivale, F. Tomarelli, *Local and nonlocal energies in adhesive interaction*, IMA Journal of Applied Mathematics, **81**, 6, (2016) 1051–1075.
- [23] F. Maddalena, D. Percivale, F. Tomarelli, *The gap in pure traction problems between linear elasticity and variational limit of finite elasticity*, arXiv:1810.01339 [math.AP], <https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.01339v1>.
- [24] F. Maddalena, D. Percivale, F. Tomarelli, *Variational Problems for Föppl-von Kármán plates*, SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis, **50**, 1, (2018) 251–282, DOI 10.1137/17M1115502.
- [25] D. Percivale, F. Tomarelli, *Scaled Korn-Poincaré inequality in BD and a model of elastic plastic cantilever*, Asymptot. Anal., **23**, 3-4, (2000). 291–311.
- [26] D. Percivale, F. Tomarelli, *From SBD to SBH: the elastic-plastic plate*, Interfaces Free Boundaries, **4**, 2, (2002) 137-165.
- [27] D. Percivale, F. Tomarelli, *A variational principle for plastic hinges in a beam*, Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci., 19, n.12, (2009), 2263-2297.

- [28] D. Percivale, F. Tomarelli, *Smooth and broken minimizers of some free discontinuity problems*, in: P. Colli et al. (eds.), *Solvability, Regularity, and Optimal Control of Boundary Value Problems for PDEs*, Springer INdAM Series, **22**, (2017), 431–468, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-64489-9_17.
- [29] P. Podio-Guidugli, *On the validation of theories of thin elastic structures*, *Meccanica*, **49** (6), (2014), 1343–1352.
- [30] C. Truesdell, W. Noll, *The non-linear field theories of mechanics*, In *Handbuch der Physik* 11113, Springer, Berlin (1965).

POLITECNICO DI BARI, DIPARTIMENTO DI MECCANICA, MATEMATICA, MANAGEMENT, VIA RE DAVID 200, 70125 BARI, ITALY

E-mail address: `francesco.maddalena@poliba.it`

UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI GENOVA, DIPARTIMENTO DI INGEGNERIA MECCANICA, ENERGETICA, GESTIONALE E DEI TRASPORTI (DIME), PIAZZALE KENNEDY, FIERA DEL MARE, PADIGLIONE D, 16129 GENOVA, ITALY

E-mail address: `percivale@diptem.unige.it`

POLITECNICO DI MILANO, DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA, PIAZZA LEONARDO DA VINCI 32, 20133 MILANO, ITALY

E-mail address: `franco.tomarelli@polimi.it`