

An inverse obstacle problem with a single pair of Cauchy data: Laplace's equation case

Xiaoxu Xu* Guanghui Hu†

Abstract

This paper is concerned with an inverse obstacle problem for the Laplace's equation. The aim is to recover the constant conductivity coefficient in the equation and the boundary of a Dirichlet polygonal obstacle from a single pair of Cauchy data. Uniqueness results are established under some a priori assumptions on the input boundary value data. A domain-defined sampling method, based on the factorization method originating from inverse acoustic scattering, has been proposed to recover both the constant conductivity coefficient and the polygonal obstacle. A hybrid strategy, which combines the sampling method and iterative scheme, is employed to reconstruct the location and shape of the obstacle. Numerical examples indicate that our method is efficient.

Keywords: inverse problem, uniqueness, single pair of Cauchy data, coefficient recovery, polygonal obstacle, factorization method.

1 Introduction

Suppose that D is a convex polygon contained in the interior of a disk B . We consider the following elliptic boundary value problem:

$$\operatorname{div}(\gamma \nabla u) = 0 \quad \text{in } B \setminus \overline{D}, \quad (1.1)$$

$$u = f \quad \text{on } \partial B, \quad (1.2)$$

$$u = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial D. \quad (1.3)$$

Here, f is called the Dirichlet boundary value of u on ∂B and D is assumed to be an obstacle with the homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition $u = 0$ on ∂D . In this paper the conductivity

*School of Mathematics and Statistics, Xi'an Jiaotong University, Xi'an, Shaanxi, 710049, China (xuxiao-xu@xjtu.edu.cn)

†Corresponding author: School of Mathematical Sciences and LPMC, Nankai University, Tianjin, 300071, China (ghhu@nankai.edu.cn).

coefficient $\gamma > 0$ in (1.1) is assumed to be a constant in $B \setminus \overline{D}$, which implies that u is harmonic and analytic in $B \setminus \overline{D}$ (see [18, Definition 6.1 and Theorem 6.6]). The existence of a unique solution to (1.1)–(1.3) (including the case when (1.3) is replaced by $u = g$ for some Dirichlet boundary value g on ∂D) has been established by the variational method (see [23, Example 3.14]). Moreover, the well-posedness of (1.1)–(1.3) can also be established by the integral equation method (see Section 4 below, see also [18, Section 6.5] for boundary value problems in domains with corners). Given a proper Dirichlet boundary value f , the Cauchy data $(u|_{\partial B}, \gamma \partial_\nu u|_{\partial B})$ are uniquely determined since the boundary value problem (1.1)–(1.3) is well-posed. Here, ν denotes the unit normal vector to ∂B directed into the exterior of B . The inverse problem we consider in this paper is to determine γ and D from a single pair of Cauchy data $(u|_{\partial B}, \gamma \partial_\nu u|_{\partial B})$. Both uniqueness results and numerical methods of this inverse problem will be considered in the sequel.

Our studies are close to the existing references [10, 11, 19, 27] where the enclosure method, range test and no-response test were applied to inverse conductivity problems with a polygonal interface (see also [25] for inverse electromagnetic scattering from polyhedral scatterers). The idea of this paper is motivated by the one-wave factorization method proposed in [6, 9, 20, 21] for inverse time-harmonic scattering problems. While the classical factorization method by Kirsch [14] makes use of the scattering data over all incident and observation directions, the one-wave factorization method only requires the far-field data of a single incident plane wave for reconstructing scatterers of polygonal/polyhedral type. It is particularly interesting within this paper that the constant conductivity coefficient can be also recovered by the one-wave factorization method. All of the above-mentioned methods belong to the class of domain-defined sampling methods and are closely related to the analytical continuation of the solution (see [24, Chapter 15]). After finding a rough shape of the obstacle by the one-wave factorization method, we then employ a Newton-type iterative scheme to get a more precise reconstruction of the shape, which however relies heavily on proper initial guesses and efficient forward solvers.

The remaining part of this paper is organized as follows. Some preliminary results from factorization method based on Dirichlet-to-Neumann operators will be given in Section 2. Section 3 is devoted to the uniqueness results and numerical methods of the inverse problem from a single pair of Cauchy data. Details about numerical simulation of the forward problem will be described in Section 4. Section 5 is concerned with the numerical implementation of Newton’s iteration method. Numerical examples will be reported in Section 6. Finally, a conclusion will be described in Section 7.

2 Preliminary results

In this section, we will introduce the factorization method for an elliptic boundary value problem [15, Chapter 6]. To circumvent the use of modified Sobolev spaces (see [15, (6.6)–(6.8)]), we will develop the factorization method based on Dirichlet-to-Neumann operators.

We begin with the following single- and double-layer potentials with density φ :

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{S}_{k,\partial\Omega}\varphi)(x) &= \int_{\partial\Omega} \Phi_k(x,y)\varphi(y)ds(y), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \partial\Omega, \\ (\mathcal{D}_{k,\partial\Omega}\varphi)(x) &= \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{\partial\Phi_k(x,y)}{\partial\nu(y)}\varphi(y)ds(y), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \partial\Omega, \end{aligned}$$

where Ω is a domain in \mathbb{R}^2 with boundary $\partial\Omega$, $\Phi_k(x,y)$ is the fundamental solution to the equation $\Delta u + k^2 u = 0$ (see [18, Theorem 6.2] for $k = 0$ and [4, (3.106)] for $k \neq 0$), i.e.,

$$\Delta_x \Phi_k(x,y) + k^2 \Phi_k(x,y) = -\delta(x-y).$$

Define the following boundary integral operators with density φ :

$$\begin{aligned} (S_{k,\partial\Omega \rightarrow \partial\tilde{\Omega}}\varphi)(x) &= 2 \int_{\partial\Omega} \Phi_k(x,y)\varphi(y)ds(y), \quad x \in \partial\tilde{\Omega}, \\ (K_{k,\partial\Omega \rightarrow \partial\tilde{\Omega}}\varphi)(x) &= 2 \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{\partial\Phi_k(x,y)}{\partial\nu(y)}\varphi(y)ds(y), \quad x \in \partial\tilde{\Omega}, \\ (K'_{k,\partial\Omega \rightarrow \partial\tilde{\Omega}}\varphi)(x) &= 2 \frac{\partial}{\partial\nu(x)} \int_{\partial\Omega} \Phi_k(x,y)\varphi(y)ds(y), \quad x \in \partial\tilde{\Omega}, \\ (T_{k,\partial\Omega \rightarrow \partial\tilde{\Omega}}\varphi)(x) &= 2 \frac{\partial}{\partial\nu(x)} \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{\partial\Phi_k(x,y)}{\partial\nu(y)}\varphi(y)ds(y), \quad x \in \partial\tilde{\Omega}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\Omega}$ is also a domain in \mathbb{R}^2 with boundary $\partial\tilde{\Omega}$. For the case when $\partial\Omega = \partial\tilde{\Omega}$, we define $S_{k,\partial\Omega} := S_{k,\partial\Omega \rightarrow \partial\Omega}$, $K_{k,\partial\Omega} := K_{k,\partial\Omega \rightarrow \partial\Omega}$, $K'_{k,\partial\Omega} := K'_{k,\partial\Omega \rightarrow \partial\Omega}$ and $T_{k,\partial\Omega} := T_{k,\partial\Omega \rightarrow \partial\Omega}$. In the sequel, we will use the above notations with $\partial\Omega \in \{\partial B, \partial D\}$, $\partial\tilde{\Omega} \in \{\partial B, \partial D\}$, and $k \in \{0, i\}$. Here, B and D are given as in (1.1)–(1.3).

2.1 Boundary value problems and Dirichlet-to-Neumann operators

Consider the Dirichlet boundary value problem

$$\Delta u_0 = 0 \quad \text{in } B, \tag{2.1}$$

$$u_0 = f \quad \text{on } \partial B. \tag{2.2}$$

The well-posedness of (2.1)–(2.2) for $f \in H^{1/2}(\partial B)$ can be established by the variational method (see [23, Theorem 3.14]). However, we still need to investigate the well-posedness of (2.1)–(2.2) for $f \in H^{-1/2}(\partial B)$ (e.g., [4, Section 10.2]) in order to establish the factorization method based on Dirichlet-to-Neumann operators. To this end, we introduce several Sobolev spaces. Let Ω be a bounded domain with C^2 boundary $\partial\Omega$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\Delta}^1(\Omega) &:= \{u \in H^1(\Omega) : \Delta u \in L^2(\Omega)\}, \\ L_{\Delta}^2(\Omega) &:= \{u \in L^2(\Omega) : \Delta u \in L^2(\Omega)\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the Laplacian Δ is understood in the distributional sense. Define the norms

$$\begin{aligned}\|u\|_{H_\Delta^1(\Omega)}^2 &= \|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + \|\Delta u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2, \quad \forall u \in H_\Delta^1(\Omega), \\ \|u\|_{L_\Delta^2(\Omega)}^2 &= \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\Delta u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2, \quad \forall u \in L_\Delta^2(\Omega).\end{aligned}$$

Then we have the following trace theorem for $H_\Delta^1(\Omega)$ and $L_\Delta^2(\Omega)$.

Theorem 2.1. *There exist constants $C_1, C_2, C_3 > 0$ such that*

$$\|\partial_\nu u\|_{H^{-1/2}(\partial\Omega)} \leq C_1 \|u\|_{H_\Delta^1(\Omega)}, \quad \forall u \in H_\Delta^1(\Omega), \quad (2.3)$$

$$\|u\|_{H^{-1/2}(\partial\Omega)} \leq C_2 \|u\|_{L_\Delta^2(\Omega)}, \quad \forall u \in L_\Delta^2(\Omega), \quad (2.4)$$

$$\|\partial_\nu u\|_{H^{-3/2}(\partial\Omega)} \leq C_3 \|u\|_{L_\Delta^2(\Omega)}, \quad \forall u \in L_\Delta^2(\Omega). \quad (2.5)$$

Moreover, for any $f \in H^{-1/2}(\partial\Omega)$ the following statements are true:

(a) *There exists $u_f \in H_\Delta^1(\Omega)$ such that $\partial_\nu u_f = f$ in $H^{-1/2}(\partial\Omega)$ and*

$$\|u_f\|_{H_\Delta^1(\Omega)} \leq C_4 \|f\|_{H^{-1/2}(\partial\Omega)},$$

where $C_4 > 0$ is a constant independent of f ;

(b) *There exists $v_f \in L_\Delta^2(\Omega)$ such that $v_f = f$ in $H^{-1/2}(\partial\Omega)$ and*

$$\|v_f\|_{L_\Delta^2(\Omega)} \leq C_5 \|f\|_{H^{-1/2}(\partial\Omega)},$$

where $C_5 > 0$ is a constant independent of f .

Proof. For the proof of (2.3) we refer the reader to [4, Page 53], and for the proofs of (2.4) and (2.5) we refer the reader to [4, Section 10.2]. Statement (a) follows directly from the existence of a unique solution $u_f \in H^1(\Omega)$ to the Neumann boundary value problem ([23, Theorem 3.15])

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta u_f - u_f &= 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \partial_\nu u_f &= f & \text{on } \Omega.\end{aligned}$$

It remains to prove statement (b). Since $C^{0,\alpha}(\partial\Omega)$ is dense in $H^{-1/2}(\partial\Omega)$, there exists a sequence $\{f_j\} \subset C^{0,\alpha}(\partial\Omega)$ such that $\|f_j - f\|_{H^{-1/2}(\partial\Omega)} \rightarrow 0$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$. Note that $\mathcal{S}_{i,\partial\Omega} : H^{-3/2}(\partial\Omega) \rightarrow H^{-1/2}(\partial\Omega)$ has a bounded inverse (see [4, Page 391]). By the jump relations [4, Theorem 3.1], it holds that $\mathcal{S}_{i,\partial\Omega}(\mathcal{S}_{i,\partial\Omega}^{-1} f_j) = f_j$ in $C^{0,\alpha}(\partial\Omega)$ and thus $\mathcal{S}_{i,\partial\Omega}(\mathcal{S}_{i,\partial\Omega}^{-1} f_j) = f_j$ in $H^{-1/2}(\partial\Omega)$. Passing to the limit $j \rightarrow \infty$, we conclude from [4, Theorem 10.12] that $v_f := \mathcal{S}_{i,\partial\Omega}(\mathcal{S}_{i,\partial\Omega}^{-1} f) \in L_\Delta^2(\Omega)$ satisfies $v_f = f$ in $H^{-1/2}(\partial\Omega)$ and $\|v_f\|_{L_\Delta^2(\Omega)} \leq C_5 \|f\|_{H^{-1/2}(\partial\Omega)}$. \square

By Theorem 2.1, we can establish the well-posedness of (2.1)–(2.2) for $f \in H^{-1/2}(\partial B)$.

Theorem 2.2. (i) *For any $f \in H^{1/2}(\partial B)$, the boundary value problem (2.1)–(2.2) has a unique solution $u_0 \in H_\Delta^1(B)$ satisfying*

$$\|u_0\|_{H_\Delta^1(B)} \leq C \|f\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial B)},$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant independent of f .

(ii) For any $f \in H^{-1/2}(\partial B)$, the boundary value problem (2.1)–(2.2) has a unique solution $u_0 \in L^2_\Delta(B)$ satisfying

$$\|u_0\|_{L^2_\Delta(B)} \leq C\|f\|_{H^{-1/2}(\partial B)},$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant independent of f .

Proof. Statement (i) follows directly from [2, Example 5.15]. It suffices to prove statement (ii). By Theorem 2.1 (b), there exists $v_f \in L^2_\Delta(B)$ such that $v_f = f$ in $H^{-1/2}(\partial B)$ and $\|v_f\|_{L^2_\Delta(B)} \leq C_5\|f\|_{H^{-1/2}(\partial B)}$. Then $w := u_0 - v_f$ satisfies the following boundary problem

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta w &= -\Delta v_f & \text{in } B, \\ w &= 0 & \text{on } \partial B. \end{aligned}$$

According to [2, Example 5.15], there exists a constant $\tilde{C} > 0$ such that

$$\|w\|_{H^1(B)} \leq \tilde{C}\|\Delta v_f\|_{L^2(B)}.$$

Therefore,

$$\|u_0\|_{L^2_\Delta(B)} \leq \|w\|_{L^2_\Delta(B)} + \|v_f\|_{L^2_\Delta(B)} \leq \sqrt{\tilde{C}^2 + 1}\|\Delta v_f\|_{L^2(D)} + \|v_f\|_{L^2_\Delta(B)} \leq C\|f\|_{H^{-1/2}(\partial B)},$$

where $C = C_5(\sqrt{\tilde{C}^2 + 1} + 1) > 0$ is a constant independent of f . The proof is now complete. \square

Next, consider the following boundary value problem

$$\Delta u = 0 \quad \text{in } B \setminus \overline{D}, \tag{2.6}$$

$$u = f \quad \text{on } \partial B, \tag{2.7}$$

$$u = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial D. \tag{2.8}$$

The proof of Theorem 2.2 cannot be directly employed for the well-posedness of (2.6)–(2.8) since D is a polygon but Theorem 2.1 is valid for domain Ω of class C^2 (see [4, Section 10.2]).

Theorem 2.3. (i) For any $f \in H^{1/2}(\partial B)$, the boundary value problem (2.6)–(2.8) has a unique solution $u \in H^1_\Delta(B \setminus \overline{D})$ satisfying

$$\|u\|_{H^1_\Delta(B \setminus \overline{D})} \leq C\|f\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial B)},$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant independent of f .

(ii) Assume B_0 is an open subset of B such that $\overline{D} \subset B_0 \subset \overline{B_0} \subset B$. For any $f \in H^{-1/2}(\partial B)$, the boundary value problem (2.6)–(2.8) has a unique solution $u \in L^2_\Delta(B \setminus \overline{D})$ satisfying

$$\|u\|_{H^1_\Delta(B_0 \setminus \overline{D})} + \|u\|_{L^2_\Delta(B \setminus \overline{B_0})} \leq C\|f\|_{H^{-1/2}(\partial B)},$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant independent of f .

Proof. Statement (i) follows directly from [23, Theorem 3.14]. It suffices to prove statement (ii). Let $\chi \in C^\infty(\overline{B})$ be a cut-off function such that $\chi(x) = 0$ for $x \in B_0$ and $\chi(x) = 1$ for x in the vicinity of ∂B . By Theorem 2.1 (b), there exists $v_f \in L^2_\Delta(B)$ such that $v_f = f$ in $H^{-1/2}(\partial B)$ and

$$\|v_f\|_{L^2_\Delta(B)} \leq C_5 \|f\|_{H^{-1/2}(\partial B)}. \quad (2.9)$$

Set $w := u - \chi v_f$, then $w = u$ in $B_0 \setminus \overline{D}$. Moreover, w satisfies the boundary value problem

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta w &= -\Delta(\chi v_f) && \text{in } B \setminus \overline{D}, \\ w &= 0 && \text{on } \partial B, \\ w &= 0 && \text{on } \partial D. \end{aligned}$$

Noting that $\Delta(\chi v_f) = v_f \Delta \chi + 2\nabla \chi \cdot \nabla v_f + \chi \Delta v_f \in H^{-1}(B \setminus \overline{D})$, we conclude from [23, Theorem 3.14] that

$$\|w\|_{H^1(B \setminus \overline{D})} \leq \tilde{C} \|\Delta(\chi v_f)\|_{H^{-1}(B \setminus \overline{D})} \leq \widehat{C} \|v_f\|_{L^2_\Delta(B \setminus \overline{D})},$$

where $\tilde{C}, \widehat{C} > 0$ are constants independent of f . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{H^1_\Delta(B_0 \setminus \overline{D})} &= \|u\|_{H^1(B_0 \setminus \overline{D})} = \|w\|_{H^1(B_0 \setminus \overline{D})} \leq \|w\|_{H^1(B \setminus \overline{D})} \leq \widehat{C} \|v_f\|_{L^2_\Delta(B \setminus \overline{D})}, \\ \|u\|_{L^2_\Delta(B \setminus \overline{B_0})} &= \|u\|_{L^2(B \setminus \overline{B_0})} \leq \|w\|_{L^2(B \setminus \overline{B_0})} + \|\chi v_f\|_{L^2(B \setminus \overline{B_0})} \leq \widehat{C} \|v_f\|_{L^2_\Delta(B \setminus \overline{D})}. \end{aligned}$$

In view of (2.9), the proof is complete. \square

Remark 2.4. (i) u_0 and u are harmonic and analytic in B and $B \setminus \overline{D}$, respectively; see [18, Definition 6.1 and Theorem 6.6].

(ii) Let B_0 , χ and v_f be given as in the proof of Theorem 2.3 (ii). For any $f \in H^{-1/2}(\partial B)$ and $g \in H^{1/2}(\partial D)$, the boundary value problem

$$\Delta u = 0 \quad \text{in } B \setminus \overline{D}, \quad (2.10)$$

$$u = f \quad \text{on } \partial B, \quad (2.11)$$

$$u = g \quad \text{on } \partial D, \quad (2.12)$$

has a unique solution $u \in L^2_\Delta(B \setminus \overline{D})$ satisfying

$$\|u\|_{H^1_\Delta(B_0 \setminus \overline{D})} + \|u\|_{L^2_\Delta(B \setminus \overline{B_0})} \leq C (\|f\|_{H^{-1/2}(\partial B)} + \|g\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial D)}),$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant independent of f and g . Actually, by [23, Theorem 3.12] there exists $u_g \in H^1_\Delta(B \setminus \overline{D})$ such that $u_g = g$ in $H^{1/2}(\partial D)$ and $\|u_g\|_{H^1_\Delta(\Omega)} \leq c \|g\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial \Omega)}$ for a constant $c > 0$ independent of g . Therefore, the assertion follows by setting $w := u - [(1 - \chi)u_g + \chi v_f]$ and a similar argument as above. Obviously, the solution u to (2.10)–(2.12) is also harmonic and analytic in $B \setminus \overline{D}$.

(iii) In view of Theorem 2.2, define the Dirichlet-to-Neumann operator Λ_0 corresponding to (2.1)–(2.2) by $\Lambda_0 f := \partial_\nu u_0$. By Theorems 2.1 and 2.2, we know $\Lambda_0 : H^{1/2}(\partial B) \rightarrow H^{-1/2}(\partial B)$ and $\Lambda_0 : H^{-1/2}(\partial B) \rightarrow H^{-3/2}(\partial B)$ are bounded. By the interpolation property of the Sobolev spaces (see [18, Theorem 8.13]), $\Lambda_0 : H^s(\partial B) \rightarrow H^{s-1}(\partial B)$ is bounded for $s \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$.

(iv) In view of Theorem 2.3, define the Dirichlet-to-Neumann operator Λ_D corresponding to (2.6)–(2.8) by $\Lambda_D f := \partial_\nu u$. By Theorems 2.1 and 2.3, we know $\Lambda_D : H^{1/2}(\partial B) \rightarrow H^{-1/2}(\partial B)$ and $\Lambda_D : H^{-1/2}(\partial B) \rightarrow H^{-3/2}(\partial B)$ are bounded. By the interpolation property of the Sobolev spaces (see [18, Theorem 8.13]), $\Lambda_D : H^s(\partial B) \rightarrow H^{s-1}(\partial B)$ is bounded for $s \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$.

Now we return to the boundary value problem (1.1)–(1.3). We define the Dirichlet-to-Neumann operator $\Lambda_{\gamma,D}$ by $\Lambda_{\gamma,D} f := \gamma \partial_\nu u$ on ∂B , where u solves (1.1)–(1.3). Obviously, (2.6)–(2.8) is a special case of (1.1)–(1.3) with $\gamma = 1$ and thus $\Lambda_{\gamma,D} = \gamma \Lambda_D$. With this notation, the Cauchy data $(u|_{\partial B}, \gamma \partial_\nu u|_{\partial B})$ to (1.1)–(1.3) can be represented as $(f, \gamma \Lambda_D f)$.

2.2 Factorization method

Below we shall derive a factorization of $\Lambda_D - \Lambda_0$. To this end, we define the operator G_D by $G_D g = \partial_\nu w$, where w is the unique solution to the following boundary value problem:

$$\Delta w = 0 \quad \text{in } B \setminus \overline{D}, \quad (2.13)$$

$$w = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial B, \quad (2.14)$$

$$w = g \quad \text{on } \partial D. \quad (2.15)$$

Theorem 2.5. *The operator $G_D : H^{1/2}(\partial D) \rightarrow L^2(\partial B)$ is well-defined, bounded and compact.*

Proof. Let $g \in H^{1/2}(\partial D)$ in (2.15). According to [23, Theorem 3.14], (2.13)–(2.15) has a unique solution $w \in H^1(B \setminus \overline{D})$ satisfying

$$\|w\|_{H^1(B \setminus \overline{D})} \leq C \|g\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial D)}, \quad (2.16)$$

where the constant $C > 0$ is independent of g . Since D is contained in the interior of B , for any $J \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ there exists a set of domains $\{\Omega_j\}_{j=1}^J$ with boundaries $\partial\Omega_j \in C^\infty$, $j = 1, \dots, J$, such that

$$D \subset \overline{D} \subset \Omega_1 \subset \overline{\Omega_1} \subset \Omega_2 \subset \overline{\Omega_2} \subset \dots \subset \Omega_J \subset \overline{\Omega_J} \subset B.$$

We claim that for any $m \in \{1, 2, \dots, J\}$ there exists a constant $C_m > 0$ independent of g such that $\|w\|_{H^m(B \setminus \overline{\Omega_m})} \leq C_m \|g\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial D)}$. Actually, by setting $\chi_1 \in C^\infty(\overline{B})$ to be a cut-off function such that $\chi_1(x) = 0$ for $x \in \Omega_1$ and $\chi_1(x) = 1$ for $x \in B \setminus \overline{\Omega_2}$, we know $\tilde{w}_1 := w \chi_1$ is the unique solution to

$$\Delta \tilde{w}_1 = \tilde{p}_1 \quad \text{in } B \setminus \overline{\Omega_1}, \quad \tilde{w}_1 = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial B \cup \partial\Omega_1,$$

where $\tilde{p}_1 := w\Delta\chi_1 + 2\nabla w \cdot \nabla\chi_1$ satisfies $\|\tilde{p}_1\|_{L^2(B\setminus\overline{\Omega_1})} \leq \tilde{C}_1\|g\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial B)}$ due to (2.16). Here $\tilde{C}_1 > 0$ is a constant independent of g . It follows from the regularity of elliptic equation (see [7, Theorem 8.12]) that $\|w\|_{H^2(B\setminus\overline{\Omega_2})} \leq \|\tilde{w}_1\|_{H^2(B\setminus\overline{\Omega_1})} \leq C_2\|g\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial B)}$.

Now, suppose that $\|w\|_{H^m(B\setminus\overline{\Omega_m})} \leq C_m\|g\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial D)}$ for some $m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Set $\chi_m \in C^\infty(\overline{B})$ to be a cut-off function such that $\chi_m(x) = 0$ for $x \in \Omega_m$ and $\chi_m(x) = 1$ for $x \in B\setminus\overline{\Omega_{m+1}}$. Then $\tilde{w}_m := w\chi_m$ is the unique solution to

$$\Delta\tilde{w}_m = \tilde{p}_m \quad \text{in } B\setminus\overline{\Omega_m}, \quad \tilde{w}_m = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial B \cup \partial\Omega_m,$$

where $\tilde{p}_m := w\Delta\chi_m + 2\nabla w \cdot \nabla\chi_m$ satisfies $\|\tilde{p}_m\|_{H^{m-1}(B\setminus\overline{\Omega_m})} \leq \tilde{C}_m\|g\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial D)}$ due to the inductive hypothesis. Here $\tilde{C}_m > 0$ is a constant independent of g . It follows from the regularity of elliptic equation (see [7, Theorem 8.13]) that $\|w\|_{H^{m+1}(B\setminus\overline{\Omega_{m+1}})} \leq \|\tilde{w}_m\|_{H^{m+1}(B\setminus\overline{\Omega_m})} \leq C_{m+1}\|g\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial D)}$.

By induction, we have $\|w\|_{H^m(B\setminus\overline{\Omega_m})} \leq C_m\|g\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial D)}$ for all $m \in \{1, 2, \dots, J\}$ and thus $\|\partial_\nu w\|_{H^{m-3/2}(\partial B)} \leq c_m\|g\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial D)}$ for all $m \in \{1, 2, \dots, J\}$. Here $c_m > 0$ is a constant independent of g for all $m \in \{1, 2, \dots, J\}$. Finally, the compactness of $G_D : H^{1/2}(\partial D) \rightarrow L^2(\partial B)$ follows from the compact embedding of $H^{m-3/2}(\partial B)$ into $L^2(\partial B)$ provided $J \geq m \geq 2$. \square

To obtain a factorization of $\Lambda_D - \Lambda_0$, we need to introduce the boundary integral operators defined on ∂D . We begin with the Green's function $K(x, y)$ to the Laplace's equation in B with the Dirichlet boundary condition:

$$K(x, y) := \Phi_0(x, y) + k(x, y), \quad x, y \in B, \quad x \neq y,$$

where $\Phi_0(x, y)$ is the fundamental solution to the Laplace's equation in \mathbb{R}^2 (see [18, Theorem 6.2]) and $u_0 = k(\cdot, y)$ solves (2.1)–(2.2) with $f := -\Phi_0(\cdot, y)$ on ∂B . We note that $K(x, y)$ is harmonic and analytic in $x \in B \setminus \{y\}$ and $K(\cdot, y) = 0$ on ∂B . Moreover, we have the reciprocity relation (symmetric property) for $K(x, y)$ as follows.

Lemma 2.6. $k(x, y) = k(y, x)$ and $K(x, y) = K(y, x)$ for all $x, y \in B, x \neq y$.

Proof. It suffices to prove $k(x, y) = k(y, x)$ for all $x, y \in B$. Setting B_R to be a disk centered at origin with radius $R > 0$ large enough and using Green's second theorem (see [18, (6.2)]) in $B_R \setminus \overline{B}$, we have for $x, y \in B$ that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\partial B} \left\{ \frac{\partial\Phi_0(z, y)}{\partial\nu(z)}\Phi_0(z, x) - \Phi_0(z, y)\frac{\partial\Phi_0(z, x)}{\partial\nu(z)} \right\} ds(z) \\ &= \int_{\partial B_R} \left\{ \frac{\partial\Phi_0(z, y)}{\partial\nu(z)}\Phi_0(z, x) - \Phi_0(z, y)\frac{\partial\Phi_0(z, x)}{\partial\nu(z)} \right\} ds(z), \end{aligned} \quad (2.17)$$

where ν denotes the unit normal vector to ∂B or ∂B_R directed into the exterior of B or B_R , respectively. Note that for $x, y \in B$ and $|z|$ large enough there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi_0(x, z) - \Phi_0(y, z)| &\leq |x - y| \max_{x \in B} |\nabla_x \Phi_0(x, z)| \leq C/|z|, \\ |\partial_{\nu(z)}\Phi_0(x, z) - \partial_{\nu(z)}\Phi_0(y, z)| &\leq |x - y| \max_{x \in B} |\nabla_x [\partial_{\nu(z)}\Phi_0(x, z)]| \leq C/|z|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\partial B_R} \left\{ \frac{\partial \Phi_0(z, y)}{\partial \nu(z)} [\Phi_0(z, x) - \Phi_0(z, y)] - \Phi_0(z, y) \left[\frac{\partial \Phi_0(z, x)}{\partial \nu(z)} - \frac{\partial \Phi_0(z, y)}{\partial \nu(z)} \right] \right\} ds(z) \right| \\ & \leq 2\pi R \left(\frac{C}{R} \cdot \frac{C}{R} + \ln R \cdot \frac{C}{R^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Passing to the limit $R \rightarrow \infty$, we deduce from (2.17) that

$$\int_{\partial B} \left\{ \frac{\partial \Phi_0(z, y)}{\partial \nu(z)} \Phi_0(z, x) - \Phi_0(z, y) \frac{\partial \Phi_0(z, x)}{\partial \nu(z)} \right\} ds(z) = 0.$$

Applying Green's second theorem over B to $k(\cdot, y)$ and $k(\cdot, x)$, we have for $x, y \in B$ that

$$\int_{\partial B} \left\{ \frac{\partial k(z, y)}{\partial \nu(z)} k(z, x) - k(z, y) \frac{\partial k(z, x)}{\partial \nu(z)} \right\} ds(z) = 0.$$

Using the Green's formula (see [18, Theorem 6.5]) we have for $x, y \in B$ that

$$\begin{aligned} k(x, y) &= \int_{\partial B} \left\{ \frac{\partial k(z, y)}{\partial \nu(z)} \Phi_0(z, x) - k(z, y) \frac{\partial \Phi_0(z, x)}{\partial \nu(z)} \right\} ds(z), \\ -k(y, x) &= - \int_{\partial B} \left\{ \frac{\partial k(z, x)}{\partial \nu(z)} \Phi_0(z, y) - k(z, x) \frac{\partial \Phi_0(z, y)}{\partial \nu(z)} \right\} ds(z). \end{aligned}$$

Taking the sum of the above four equalities gives

$$k(x, y) - k(y, x) = \int_{\partial B} \left\{ \frac{\partial K(z, y)}{\partial \nu(z)} K(z, x) - K(z, y) \frac{\partial K(z, x)}{\partial \nu(z)} \right\} ds(z), \quad x, y \in B.$$

Now the proof is completed by using the boundary condition $K(\cdot, x) = K(\cdot, y) = 0$ on ∂B . \square

Using the Green's function $K(x, y)$ one may represent the solution u_0 to (2.1)–(2.2) in terms of the boundary data f .

Lemma 2.7. *For $f \in H^s(\partial B)$ with $s \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$, the solution $u_0 \in L^2_\Delta(B)$ to (2.1)–(2.2) is given by*

$$u_0(x) = - \int_{\partial B} \frac{\partial K(x, y)}{\partial \nu(y)} f(y) ds(y), \quad x \in B. \quad (2.18)$$

In particular, $u_0 \in H^1_\Delta(B)$ provided $f \in H^{1/2}(\partial B)$.

Proof. First, we assume that $f \in C^2(\overline{B})$. For any fixed $x \in B$, we observe that u_0 and $k(\cdot, x)$ are harmonic in B and $k(x, \cdot) = k(\cdot, x)$ (see Lemma 2.6). Applying Green's second theorem (see [18, (6.2)]) over B to u_0 and $k(x, \cdot)$ shows that

$$0 = \int_{\partial B} \left\{ \frac{\partial u_0}{\partial \nu}(y) k(x, y) - \frac{\partial k(x, y)}{\partial \nu(y)} u_0(y) \right\} ds(y), \quad x \in B.$$

Using the Green's formula (see [18, Theorem 6.5]) we have

$$u_0(x) = \int_{\partial B} \left\{ \frac{\partial u_0}{\partial \nu}(y) \Phi_0(x, y) - \frac{\partial \Phi_0(x, y)}{\partial \nu(y)} u_0(y) \right\} ds(y), \quad x \in B.$$

Since $u_0 = f$ on ∂B and $K(x, \cdot) = K(\cdot, x) = 0$ on ∂B , the representation (2.18) follows by taking the sum of the above two equalities.

Finally, in view of Theorem 2.2, Remark 2.4 (iii) and [4, Theorem 10.12], we can obtain the results for $f \in H^s(\partial B)$ with $s \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$ by denseness arguments. \square

For $f \in L^2(\partial B)$ and $\varphi \in H^{-1/2}(\partial D)$, define the following integral operators

$$\begin{aligned} (Hf)(x) &:= - \int_{\partial B} \frac{\partial K(x, y)}{\partial \nu(y)} f(y) ds(y), \quad x \in \partial D, \\ (S_{\partial D}\varphi)(x) &:= \int_{\partial D} K(x, y) \varphi(y) ds(y), \quad x \in \partial D. \end{aligned}$$

The properties of the above integral operators are given in the following theorem.

Theorem 2.8. (i) $H : L^2(\partial B) \rightarrow H^{1/2}(\partial D)$ is bounded, compact and injective.

(ii) $S_{\partial D} : H^{-1/2}(\partial D) \rightarrow H^{1/2}(\partial D)$ is bounded, self-adjoint and coercive, i.e., there exists a constant $c > 0$ independent of φ such that

$$\langle S_{\partial D}\varphi, \varphi \rangle \geq c \|\varphi\|_{H^{-1/2}(\partial D)}^2 \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in H^{-1/2}(\partial D), \quad (2.19)$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ represents the sesquilinear duality pairing $\langle H^{1/2}(\partial D), H^{-1/2}(\partial D) \rangle$.

Proof. (i). Assume $f \in L^2(\partial B)$. In view of Lemma 2.7, Hf is the trace of u_0 on ∂D (see [22, Theorem 3.38]). Since u_0 defined by (2.18) is harmonic and analytic in B , we conclude that $H : L^2(\partial B) \rightarrow H^{1/2}(\partial D)$ is bounded and compact. Now assume $Hf = 0$ on ∂D , then u_0 defined by (2.18) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta u_0 &= 0 && \text{in } D, \\ u_0 &= 0 && \text{on } \partial D. \end{aligned}$$

The uniqueness of the above boundary value problem implies $u_0 = 0$ in D . Hence, $u_0 = 0$ in B by analyticity. Then $f = 0$ on ∂B follows from Lemma 2.7. This shows the injectivity of H .

(ii). Noting that $K(x, y)$ has the same type of singularity for $x = y$ as $\Phi_0(x, y)$ and $\Phi_i(x, y)$, we deduce from the jump relations and regularity properties of boundary integral operators (see [3, 4] for domains of class C^2 and [5, 22] for Lipschitz domains) that $S_{\partial D} : H^{-1/2}(\partial D) \rightarrow H^{1/2}(\partial D)$ is bounded for any $\varphi \in H^{-1/2}(\partial D)$ and the function w defined by

$$w(x) := \int_{\partial D} K(x, y) \varphi(y) ds(y), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \partial D, \quad (2.20)$$

satisfies the following jump relations:

$$w_{\pm} = S_{\partial D}\varphi, \quad \partial_{\nu}w_{+} - \partial_{\nu}w_{-} = -\varphi \quad \text{on } \partial D, \quad (2.21)$$

where the subindex $+$ ($-$) indicates the limit as x approaches ∂D from outside (inside) of D , respectively.

It is easy to deduce from Lemma 2.6 that $S_{\partial D} : H^{-1/2}(\partial D) \rightarrow H^{1/2}(\partial D)$ is self-adjoint.

To show that $S_{\partial D} : H^{-1/2}(\partial D) \rightarrow H^{1/2}(\partial D)$ is injective, we assume $S_{\partial D}\varphi = 0$ on ∂D . Then the function w defined by (2.20) satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \Delta w = 0 & \text{in } B \setminus \overline{D}, \\ w = 0 & \text{on } \partial D \cup \partial B, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} \Delta w = 0 & \text{in } D, \\ w = 0 & \text{on } \partial D. \end{cases}$$

It follows from the uniqueness of above boundary value problems that $w = 0$ in D and thus, by (2.21), we get $\varphi = \partial_{\nu}w_{-} - \partial_{\nu}w_{+} = 0$ on ∂D .

We claim that $S_{\partial D} : H^{-1/2}(\partial D) \rightarrow H^{1/2}(\partial D)$ has a bounded inverse. Note that the operator $S_{\partial D} - S_{i,\partial D} : H^{-1/2}(\partial D) \rightarrow H^{1/2}(\partial D)$ is compact due to the increased smoothness of the integral kernel as compared with that of $S_{i,\partial D}$. It follows that $S_{\partial D} = S_{i,\partial D} + (S_{\partial D} - S_{i,\partial D})$ is a Fredholm operator of index zero since the inverse $S_{i,\partial D}^{-1} : H^{1/2}(\partial D) \rightarrow H^{-1/2}(\partial D)$ is bounded (see [16, Theorem 5.44]). We also refer the reader to [22, Theorem 7.6] for another proof that an integral operator, whose integral kernel has the same type of singularity for $x = y$ as $K(x, y)$, is a Fredholm operator of index zero. Recall that $S_{\partial D}$ is injective. By the Riesz-Fredholm theory we know that the inverse $S_{\partial D}^{-1} : H^{1/2}(\partial D) \rightarrow H^{-1/2}(\partial D)$ is bounded.

We are now ready to prove the coercivity of $S_{\partial D}$. Let w be defined by (2.20). By the jump relations (2.21) and using Green's first theorem (see [18, Theorem 6.3]) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle S_{\partial D}\varphi, \varphi \rangle &= \int_{\partial D} w(\partial_{\nu}w_{-} - \partial_{\nu}w_{+})ds \\ &= \int_D \{w\Delta w + |\nabla w|^2\} dx + \int_{B \setminus \overline{D}} \{w\Delta w + |\nabla w|^2\} dx - \int_{\partial B} w\partial_{\nu}w ds \\ &= \int_D |\nabla w|^2 dx + \int_{B \setminus \overline{D}} |\nabla w|^2 dx, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that $\Delta w = 0$ in $B \setminus \partial D$ and $w = 0$ on ∂B . By the Poincaré inequality (see [23, Lemma 3.13]) and the trace theorem (see [23, Theorem 3.9]), we get

$$\langle S_{\partial D}\varphi, \varphi \rangle \geq \|\nabla w\|_{L^2(B \setminus \overline{D})}^2 \geq c_1 \|w\|_{H^1(B \setminus \overline{D})}^2 \geq c_2 \|S_{\partial D}\varphi\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial D)}^2$$

for some constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ independent of φ and w . Noting that $S_{\partial D}^{-1} : H^{1/2}(\partial D) \rightarrow H^{-1/2}(\partial D)$ is bounded, we finally arrive at (2.19). \square

We are now in a position to derive a factorization of $\Lambda_D - \Lambda_0$.

Theorem 2.9. *The following relation between $\Lambda_D - \Lambda_0$, G_D and $S_{\partial D}$ holds:*

$$\Lambda_D - \Lambda_0 = G_D S_{\partial D}^* G_D^*, \quad (2.22)$$

where $G_D^* : L^2(\partial B) \rightarrow H^{-1/2}(\partial D)$ and $S_{\partial D}^* : H^{-1/2}(\partial D) \rightarrow H^{1/2}(\partial D)$ are the adjoint operators of G_D and $S_{\partial D}$, respectively.

Proof. Given $f \in L^2(\partial B)$, we have $\Lambda_D f - \Lambda_0 f = \partial_\nu u - \partial_\nu u_0 \in H^{-1}(\partial B)$, where $u \in L^2_\Delta(B \setminus \overline{D})$ solves (1.1)–(1.3) and $u_0 \in L^2_\Delta(B)$ solves (2.1)–(2.2), respectively. Noting that $w = u - u_0$ solves (2.13)–(2.15) with $g = -u_0$ on ∂D and using Remark 2.4 (i) and Lemma 2.7, we obtain

$$(\Lambda_D - \Lambda_0)f = G_D(-u_0|_{\partial D}) = -G_D H f. \quad (2.23)$$

The L^2 adjoint $H^* : H^{-1/2}(\partial D) \rightarrow L^2(\partial B)$ is given by

$$(H^* \varphi)(x) := - \int_{\partial D} \frac{\partial K(x, y)}{\partial \nu(x)} \varphi(y) ds(y), \quad x \in \partial B.$$

We observe that $H^* \varphi = \partial_\nu v$ on ∂B , where v is defined by

$$v(x) = - \int_{\partial D} K(x, y) \varphi(y) ds(y), \quad x \in B \setminus \overline{D}.$$

Since v solves (2.13)–(2.15) with $g = -S_{\partial D} \varphi$, we have $H^* = -G_D S_{\partial D}$ and consequently

$$H = -S_{\partial D}^* G_D^*. \quad (2.24)$$

Now, the factorization form (2.22) follows by combining (2.23) and (2.24). \square

Remark 2.10. (i) *It follows from Remark 2.4 (iii) and (iv) that $\Lambda_D - \Lambda_0$ is bounded from $H^s(\partial B)$ to $H^{s-1}(\partial B)$ for any $s \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$. Further, since $w = u - u_0$ solves (2.13)–(2.15) with $g = -u_0$ on ∂D , we conclude from the proof of Theorem 2.5 that $\Lambda_D - \Lambda_0 : H^s(\partial B) \rightarrow H^{m-3/2}(\partial B)$ is bounded for any $s \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. In particular, $\Lambda_D - \Lambda_0 : L^2(\partial B) \rightarrow L^2(\partial B)$ is bounded.*

(ii) *Noting that $H : L^2(\partial B) \rightarrow H^{1/2}(\partial D)$ is injective, we conclude from (2.24) that $G_D^* : L^2(\partial B) \rightarrow H^{-1/2}(\partial D)$ is also injective and thus $G_D : H^{1/2}(\partial D) \rightarrow L^2(\partial B)$ has a dense range.*

Since $G_D : H^{1/2}(\partial D) \rightarrow L^2(\partial B)$ is compact (see Theorem 2.5) and $S_{\partial D} : H^{-1/2}(\partial D) \rightarrow H^{1/2}(\partial D)$ is self-adjoint (see Theorem 2.8), it follows from (2.22) that $\Lambda_D - \Lambda_0 : L^2(\partial B) \rightarrow L^2(\partial B)$ is compact and self-adjoint. Combining Theorems 2.8, 2.9 and [15, Corollary 1.22]) we immediately obtain the following important result.

Theorem 2.11. *The ranges of G_D and $(\Lambda_D - \Lambda_0)^{1/2}$ coincide, i.e., $\text{Ran } G_D = \text{Ran } (\Lambda_D - \Lambda_0)^{1/2}$.*

For a numerical implementation of factorization method, we need the following theorem.

Theorem 2.12. *Let $z \in B$. Then $\partial_\nu K(\cdot, z)|_{\partial B} \in \text{Ran } G_D$ if and only if $z \in D$.*

Proof. If $z \in D$, then $K(\cdot, z)$ is harmonic in $B \setminus \{z\}$ and $K(\cdot, z)|_{\partial D} \in H^{1/2}(\partial D)$. Therefore, it follows from $K(\cdot, z) = 0$ on ∂B that $\partial_\nu K(\cdot, z)|_{\partial B} = G_D(K(\cdot, z)|_{\partial D}) \in \text{Ran } G_D$.

If $\partial_\nu K(\cdot, z) \in \text{Ran } G_D$, then there exists $g \in H^{1/2}(\partial D)$ such that $\partial_\nu K(\cdot, z)|_{\partial B} = G_D g = \partial_\nu w$ on ∂B , where $w \in H^1(B \setminus \overline{D})$ solves (2.13)–(2.15). Noting that $K(\cdot, z) = 0 = w$ on ∂B , we conclude from Holmgren’s theorem (see [18, Theorem 6.7]) that $K(\cdot, z) = w$ in $B \setminus \overline{D}$. Due to the singularity of $K(\cdot, z)$ at $z \in B$, we know $K(\cdot, z) = w \in H^1(B \setminus \overline{D})$ if and only if $z \in D$. \square

Combining Remark 2.10 (ii), Theorems 2.11 and 2.12, and Picard’s theorem ([4, Theorem 4.8]), we immediately obtain the following result.

Theorem 2.13. *Denote by (λ_n, φ_n) an eigensystem of $\Lambda_D - \Lambda_0$. Define*

$$I(z) := \left[\sum_n \frac{|(\partial_\nu K(\cdot, z), \varphi_n)|^2}{|\lambda_n|} \right]^{-1}, \quad z \in B, \quad (2.25)$$

where (\cdot, \cdot) denotes the inner product in $L^2(\partial B)$. Then $z \in D$ if and only if $I(z) > 0$.

We remark that, the knowledge of the operators Λ_D and Λ_0 is equivalent with the Cauchy data $(f, \partial_\nu u|_{\partial B})$ and $(f, \partial_\nu u_0|_{\partial B})$ for sufficiently many input data f , where u solves (2.6)–(2.8) and u_0 solves (2.1)–(2.2). The measurement data set can be used to reconstruct the shape of a general obstacle D (e.g., [15, Chapter 6] and Example 6.1 below). In the next section, we will show that, when D is a convex polygon, both ∂D and γ can be reconstructed from a single pair of Cauchy data.

3 Uniqueness with a single Cauchy data

This section is devoted to the uniqueness results and numerical methods of the inverse problem of determining the constant conductivity coefficient γ in (1.1) and the boundary ∂D from a single pair of Cauchy data to (1.1)–(1.3).

3.1 Reconstruct the constant conductivity coefficient.

Let Ω be a Lipschitz bounded domain that contained in the interior of B . Denote by G_Ω the operator G_D with D replaced by Ω and by $\text{Ran } G_\Omega$ the range of G_Ω .

Theorem 3.1. *Let u solve (1.1)–(1.3) and u_0 solve (2.1)–(2.2) with the same boundary value f on ∂B . Assume that $D \subset \Omega \subset \overline{\Omega} \subset B$. For $\tau > 0$ define $g_\tau := (\gamma \partial_\nu u - \tau \partial_\nu u_0)|_{\partial B}$. Then the following statements are true:*

- (i) *If $\tau = \gamma$, then $g_\tau \in \text{Ran } G_\Omega$;*
- (ii) *If $\tau \neq \gamma$, then $g_\tau \in \text{Ran } G_\Omega$ if and only if $\Lambda_0 f \in \text{Ran } G_\Omega$.*

Proof. (i). If $\tau = \gamma$, then $g_\tau = g_\gamma = \gamma \partial_\nu(u - u_0)|_{\partial B}$. Noting that $u - u_0$ is harmonic in $B \setminus \overline{D}$ and $u - u_0 = f - f = 0$ on ∂B , we have $g_\tau = G_\Omega[\gamma(u - u_0)|_{\partial\Omega}]$.

(ii). Since $g_\gamma \in \text{Ran } G_\Omega$, the statement follows easily from

$$g_\tau - g_\gamma = (\gamma \partial_\nu u - \tau \partial_\nu u_0) - (\gamma \partial_\nu u - \gamma \partial_\nu u_0) = (\gamma - \tau) \partial_\nu u_0 = (\gamma - \tau) \Lambda_0 f \quad \text{on } \partial B.$$

□

According to Theorem 3.1, the constant conductivity coefficient γ can be uniquely determined by a single pair of Cauchy data $(f, \partial_\nu u|_{\partial B})$ to (1.1)–(1.3) provided $\Lambda_0 f \notin \text{Ran } G_\Omega$. Moreover, based on Theorem 3.1 we can propose a numerical approach for recovering γ by taking $\tau > 0$ as a testing parameter. Our method for recovering γ consists of the following three steps:

Step 1: Find a Lipschitz domain Ω such that $D \subset \Omega \subset \overline{\Omega} \subset B$ and calculate $\text{Ran } G_\Omega$;

Step 2: Find a boundary value f on ∂B such that $\Lambda_0 f \notin \text{Ran } G_\Omega$;

Step 3: Test the values of $\tau > 0$ till $g_\tau \in \text{Ran } G_\Omega$.

Remark 3.2. *Instead of by calculating G_Ω directly, we obtain $\text{Ran } G_\Omega$ indirectly by calculating Λ_0 and Λ_Ω (i.e., Λ_D with D replaced by Ω). More precisely, we have $\text{Ran } G_\Omega = \text{Ran}(\Lambda_\Omega - \Lambda_0)^{1/2}$ (see Theorem 2.11). Noting that Λ_Ω , Λ_0 and g_τ are equivalent to corresponding Cauchy data, we are able to recover the coefficient γ in a data-to-data manner.*

For the purpose of recovering γ in Step 3, we employ the indicator function

$$I_1(\tau) := \left[\sum_n \frac{|(g_\tau, f_n)|^2}{|\lambda_n|} \right]^{-1}, \quad (3.1)$$

where (\cdot, \cdot) denotes the inner product in $L^2(\partial B)$ and (λ_n, f_n) is an eigensystem of $(\Lambda_\Omega - \Lambda_0)$. In view of Theorem 3.1 and Remark 3.2, we conclude from Picard's theorem (see [4, Theorem 4.8]) and Remark 2.10 (ii) that

$$I_1(\tau) \begin{cases} > 0 & \text{if } \tau = \gamma, \\ = 0 & \text{if } \tau \neq \gamma. \end{cases}$$

For convenience of numerical implementation, we provide several explicit examples of the boundary value f on ∂B such that $\Lambda_0 f \notin \text{Ran } G_\Omega$, as shown in the following theorem.

Theorem 3.3. *Let u solve (1.1)–(1.3) and u_0 solve (2.1)–(2.2) with the same boundary value f on ∂B . Assume that $D \subset \Omega \subset \overline{\Omega} \subset B$. For $\tau > 0$, define $g_\tau := (\gamma \partial_\nu u - \tau \partial_\nu u_0)|_{\partial B}$. Assume further that $\tau \neq \gamma$. Then $\Lambda_0 f \notin \text{Ran } G_\Omega$ provided one of the following conditions holds:*

- (i) f is not identically zero but vanishes in an open subset Γ of ∂B ;
- (ii) $f = \tilde{f} + c$ with c being an arbitrary constant and \tilde{f} satisfying condition (i);
- (iii) $f \in H^s(\partial B) \setminus H^{s+\epsilon}(\partial B)$ for any $s \geq -\frac{1}{2}$ and $\epsilon > 0$.

Proof. (i). Assume to the contrary that $\Lambda_0 f \in \text{Ran } G_\Omega$. Then by Theorem 3.1 (ii) it follows that $g_\tau \in \text{Ran } G_\Omega$, i.e., there exists $g \in H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)$ such that $g_\tau = G_\Omega g$. By the definition of G_Ω the boundary value problem

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta w &= 0 && \text{in } B \setminus \overline{\Omega}, \\ w &= 0 && \text{on } \partial B, \\ w &= g && \text{on } \partial\Omega,\end{aligned}$$

admits a unique solution w such that $\partial_\nu w = g_\tau$ on ∂B . From (1.1)–(1.3) and (2.1)–(2.2) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta(\gamma u - \tau u_0) &= 0 && \text{in } B \setminus \overline{\Omega}, \\ (\gamma u - \tau u_0) &= (\gamma - \tau)f && \text{on } \partial B.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\partial_\nu(\gamma u - \tau u_0) = g_\tau$ on ∂B and f vanishes on Γ , the Cauchy data of $(\gamma u - \tau u_0)$ and w coincide on Γ . Now it follows from Holmgren's theorem (see [18, Theorem 6.7]) that $w = \gamma u - \tau u_0$ in $B \setminus \overline{\Omega}$. Consequently, w and $\gamma u - \tau u_0$ must coincide on ∂B by trace theorem. However, this is impossible, because $w = 0$ on ∂B and $(\gamma u - \tau u_0) = (\gamma - \tau)f$ is not identically zero on ∂B .

(ii). It suffices to show $\Lambda_0(f - c) \notin \text{Ran } G_\Omega$ since constant functions belong to the nullspace of Λ_0 . Now the proof is completed by statement (i).

(iii). Without loss of generality, we assume that B is a disk with radius R and center at the origin. From the following Fourier series expansion

$$f(x) = f(R(\cos \theta, \sin \theta)) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} c_n e^{in\theta}, \quad x \in \partial B,$$

we conclude that

$$\|f\|_{H^s(\partial B)}^2 := \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} (1 + n^2)^s |c_n|^2 < \infty, \quad (3.2)$$

but the series

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} (1 + n^2)^{s+\epsilon} |c_n|^2 \quad (3.3)$$

diverges. Analogously to [16, Theorem 2.22], it can be shown that the solution to (2.1)–(2.2) is given by the series

$$u_0(x) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} c_n \frac{|x|^{|n|}}{R^{|n|}} e^{in\theta}, \quad x \in B.$$

Therefore,

$$(\Lambda_0 f)(x) = \partial_\nu u_0(x) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}} |n| c_n \frac{|x|^{|n|-1}}{R^{|n|}} e^{in\theta}, \quad x \in \partial B.$$

If $\sigma \leq s$, then $\Lambda_0 f \in H^{\sigma-1}(\partial B)$ since from (3.2) we deduce

$$\|\Lambda_0 f\|_{H^{\sigma-1}(\partial B)}^2 = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}} (1+n^2)^{\sigma-1} \frac{n^2 |c_n|^2}{R^2} \leq \frac{1}{R^2} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}} (1+n^2)^\sigma |c_n|^2 \leq \frac{1}{R^2} \|f\|_{H^s(\partial B)}^2.$$

If $\sigma \geq s + \epsilon$, then $\Lambda_0 f \notin H^{\sigma-1}(\partial B)$ since from (3.2) and (3.3) we know the series

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}} (1+n^2)^{\sigma-1} \frac{n^2 |c_n|^2}{R^2} \geq \frac{1}{2R^2} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}} (1+n^2)^\sigma |c_n|^2 \geq \frac{1}{2R^2} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} (1+n^2)^{s+\epsilon} |c_n|^2 - \frac{\|f\|_{H^s(\partial B)}^2}{2R^2}$$

diverges. However, it follows from the proof of Theorem 2.5 that $\text{Ran } G_\Omega \subset H^{m-3/2}(\partial B)$ for any $m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Consequently, $\Lambda_0 f \notin \text{Ran } G_\Omega$. \square

Remark 3.4. *Using the notations introduced in the above proof, an explicit example of condition (iii) in Theorem 3.3 is as follows. For any $\theta_0 \in (0, 2\pi)$ set*

$$f(R(\cos \theta, \sin \theta)) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \theta \in [0, \theta_0], \\ 0, & \text{if } \theta \in (\theta_0, 2\pi). \end{cases}$$

Then

$$c_n = \left(f, \frac{e^{in\theta}}{2\pi R} \right)_{L^2(\partial B)} = \frac{1}{2\pi R} \int_0^{\theta_0} e^{-in\theta} d\theta = \begin{cases} \frac{\theta_0}{2\pi R}, & n = 0, \\ \frac{1-e^{-in\theta_0}}{2\pi R in}, & n \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

It can be easily seen that $f \in H^s(\partial B) \setminus H^{1/2}(\partial B)$ provided $s < \frac{1}{2}$. We also have $f + f_0 \in H^s(\partial B) \setminus H^{1/2}(\partial B)$ provided $s < \frac{1}{2}$ and $f_0 \in H^{1/2}(\partial B)$.

3.2 Reconstruct the boundary of the obstacle.

Having determined γ in the previous subsection, we shall proceed with the inverse problem of finding ∂D .

Theorem 3.5. *Assume that the constant coefficient $\gamma > 0$ is known and D is a Dirichlet domain contained in B . Then D can be uniquely determined by the single pair of Cauchy data $(f, \gamma \partial_\nu u|_{\partial B})$ to (1.1)–(1.3) provided f is not identically zero.*

Proof. Following the proof of [4, Theorem 5.1], we assume that $D_1 \neq D_2$ and the Cauchy data corresponding to (1.1)–(1.3) with $D = D_1$ and $D = D_2$ coincide. Let G be the component of $B \setminus \{\overline{D_1} \cup \overline{D_2}\}$ whose boundary contains ∂B . Without loss of generality, we assume $D^* := (B \setminus G) \setminus \overline{D_2}$ is nonempty. For $j = 1, 2$, let u_j solve

$$\begin{aligned} \text{div}(\gamma \nabla u_j) &= 0 && \text{in } B \setminus \overline{D_j}, \\ u_j &= f && \text{on } \partial B, \\ u_j &= 0 && \text{on } \partial D_j. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose u_1 and u_2 have the same Cauchy data on ∂B , i.e., $(f, \gamma \partial_\nu u_1|_{\partial B}) = (f, \gamma \partial_\nu u_2|_{\partial B})$. It follows from Holmgren's theorem (see [18, Theorem 6.7]) that $u_1 = u_2$ in G . Since $u_j = 0$ on ∂D_j , $j = 1, 2$, we know that $u_2 = 0$ on ∂D^* . By the Maximum-Minimum Principle of harmonic functions (see [18, Corollary 6.10]), we have $u_2 = 0$ in D^* . Hence, $u_2 = 0$ in G by analyticity. This leads to a contradiction since $f = u_2|_{\partial B}$ is not identically zero. \square

Remark 3.6. *If f is not identically zero, the solution u to (2.6)–(2.8) cannot be analytically extended from $B \setminus \overline{D}$ into B . Actually, if u can be analytically extended into B , then u is harmonic in B . Proceeding as above, we can conclude from $u = 0$ on ∂D that u vanishes identically in B . This is a contradiction to the assumption on f .*

In what follows we shall design a domain-defined sampling method for imaging a convex polygonal obstacle D . Below we show that the analytical extension across a corner of ∂D is impossible.

Theorem 3.7. *Assume that the constant coefficient $\gamma > 0$ is known, f is not identically zero, and D is a Dirichlet convex polygon. Assume further that one of the following statement holds:*

- (i) *All the corners of D are irrational angles;*
- (ii) *$\text{dist}(\partial B, D) > \text{diam}(D)$;*
- (iii) *$f \in C(\partial B)$ and $f(x) \neq 0$ for all $x \in \partial B$.*

Then u cannot be analytically extended across the corners of D .

Proof. For the proof of statements (i) and (ii), we refer the reader to [27, Lemma 2.4].

It remains to show statement (iii). Since $f \in C(\partial B)$, one can show $u \in C^2(B \setminus \overline{B_0}) \cap C(\overline{B} \setminus B_0)$, where B_0 is an open subset of B such that $\overline{D} \subset B_0 \subset \overline{B_0} \subset B$. Assume to the contrary that u can be analytically extended across a corner z of D . Consider an edge Γ of D that has z as one of its endpoints. Since u vanishes on Γ and analytic in a neighborhood of z and $B \setminus \overline{D}$, we conclude that u vanishes on the extended line of Γ that containing z as an interior point. Because of convexity, the extended line must intersect with ∂B at a point x_0 . Therefore, $f(x_0) = u(x_0) = 0$. This is a contradiction to the assumption on f . \square

By Theorem 3.7 we can characterize D by sampling domains Ω and the testing function g_γ .

Theorem 3.8. *Let u solve (1.1)–(1.3) and u_0 solve (2.1)–(2.2) with the same boundary value f on ∂B . Set $g_\gamma := (\gamma \partial_\nu u - \gamma \partial_\nu u_0)|_{\partial B}$. Let the assumptions of Theorem 3.7 be fulfilled. Assume further that Ω is a convex domain. Then $D \subset \Omega$ if and only if $g_\gamma \in \text{Ran } G_\Omega$.*

Proof. If $D \subset \Omega$, then $(B \setminus \overline{\Omega}) \subset (B \setminus \overline{D})$ and thus $g_\gamma = G_\Omega [\gamma(u - u_0)|_{\partial \Omega}]$ on ∂B .

Now, we consider the case when $D \not\subset \Omega$. Assume to the contrary that $\partial_\nu(u - u_0)|_{\partial B} \in \text{Ran } G_\Omega$, i.e., there exists $g \in H^{1/2}(\partial \Omega)$ such that $g_\gamma = G_\Omega g$ on ∂B . Therefore, the unique

solution w of the boundary value problem

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta w &= 0 && \text{in } B \setminus \overline{\Omega}, \\ w &= 0 && \text{on } \partial B, \\ w &= g && \text{on } \partial\Omega,\end{aligned}$$

must satisfy $\partial_\nu w = g_\gamma$ on ∂B . From (1.1)–(1.3) and (2.1)–(2.2) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta(u - u_0) &= 0 && \text{in } B \setminus \overline{\Omega}, \\ (u - u_0) &= 0 && \text{on } \partial B.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\gamma \partial_\nu(u - u_0) = g_\gamma$ on ∂B , the Cauchy data of $\gamma(u - u_0)$ and w coincide on ∂B . It follows from Holmgren's theorem (see [18, Theorem 6.7]) that

$$w = \gamma(u - u_0) \quad \text{in } B \setminus (\overline{D} \cup \overline{\Omega}). \quad (3.4)$$

Noting that $D \not\subset \Omega$ and Ω is convex, we can find a corner z of D and an open neighbourhood V of z such that V does not intersect with the closure of Ω . We deduce from (3.4) that u can be extended as a harmonic function in V , which contradicts the result of Theorem 3.7. \square

Remark 3.9. Denote by \mathcal{O} the set of all convex Lipschitz domains that contained in B . Let the assumptions of Theorem 3.7 be fulfilled. By Theorems 2.11 and 3.8 we have

$$D = \bigcap_{\Omega \in \{\tilde{\Omega} \in \mathcal{O} : g_\gamma \in \text{Ran } G_{\tilde{\Omega}}\}} \Omega = \bigcap_{\Omega \in \{\tilde{\Omega} \in \mathcal{O} : g_\gamma \in \text{Ran } (\Lambda_{\tilde{\Omega}} - \Lambda_0)^{1/2}\}} \Omega.$$

According to the above analysis (see also [19, Theorems 6.2 and 6.3]), we defined the following indicator function to recover the location and rough profile of D :

$$I_2(\Omega) := \left[\sum_n \frac{|(g_\gamma, f_n)|^2}{|\lambda_n|} \right]^{-1}, \quad (3.5)$$

where $\Omega \in \mathcal{O}$ with \mathcal{O} introduced in Remark 3.9, (\cdot, \cdot) denotes the inner product in $L^2(\partial B)$ and (λ_n, f_n) is an eigensystem of $(\Lambda_\Omega - \Lambda_0)$. Under the assumptions of Theorems 3.7 and 3.8, we conclude from Remark 3.2, Picard's theorem (see [4, Theorem 4.8]) and Remark 2.10 (ii) that

$$I_2(\Omega) \begin{cases} > 0 & \text{if } D \subset \Omega, \\ = 0 & \text{if } D \not\subset \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, in view of Remark 3.6, a rough location of D can be recovered by (3.5) even if the assumptions of Theorem 3.7 cannot be fulfilled.

4 Numerical simulation of forward problems

We note that the boundary value problems (1.1)–(1.3) (including (2.6)–(2.8)) and (2.1)–(2.2) can be reduced to boundary integral equations (see [18, Chapter 6]), which can be numerically calculated by Nyström’s method (see [18, Chapter 12] and [4, Section 3.6]). To calculate Λ_0 , Λ_Ω and Λ_D , it suffices to represent these Dirichlet-to-Neumann operators in terms of boundary integral boundary operators introduced at the beginning of Section 2.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $f \in H^s(\partial B)$ with $s \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$. The double-layer potential $u_0 := \mathcal{D}_{0,\partial B}\varphi_{\partial B}$ with density $\varphi_{\partial B} \in H^s(\partial B)$ is a solution of the Dirichlet boundary value problem (2.1)–(2.2), provided that $\varphi_{\partial B}$ is a solution of the boundary integral equation*

$$(K_{0,\partial B} - I)\varphi_{\partial B} = 2f, \quad (4.1)$$

where I denotes the identity operator. Furthermore, (4.1) is uniquely solvable for all $f \in H^s(\partial B)$ and the Dirichlet-to-Neumann operator Λ_0 can be represented by

$$\Lambda_0 = T_{0,\partial B}(K_{0,\partial B} - I)^{-1}.$$

Moreover, $\Lambda_0 : H^s(\partial B) \rightarrow H^{s-1}(\partial B)$ is bounded.

Proof. By denseness arguments as in the proof of Theorem 2.1, the jump relations and regularity properties for the boundary trace and the normal derivative trace of the single- and double-layer potential remain valid in the Sobolev space setting (see [5, 22]). Therefore, $K_{0,\partial B} : H^s(\partial B) \rightarrow H^{s+1}(\partial B)$ is bounded, and thus $K_{0,\partial B} : H^s(\partial B) \rightarrow H^s(\partial B)$ is compact. Proceeding as in the proofs of [18, Theorems 6.22 and 6.23], we can prove this theorem.

Moreover, it follows from [4, Theorem 3.6 and Corollary 10.13] and the interpolation property of the Sobolev spaces (see [18, Theorem 8.13]) that $T_{0,\partial B} : H^s(\partial B) \rightarrow H^{s-1}(\partial B)$ is bounded. In view of Theorem 2.2, Remark 2.4 (iv), by the denseness argument as in the proof of Theorem 2.1 and jump relations, we conclude from [4, Theorem 10.12] that $\Lambda_0 = T_{0,\partial B}(K_{0,\partial B} - I)^{-1}$ and $\Lambda_0 : H^s(\partial B) \rightarrow H^{s-1}(\partial B)$ is bounded. \square

Theorem 4.2. *Let $f \in H^s(\partial B)$ with $s \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$. The combined layer potential*

$$u = \mathcal{D}_{0,\partial B}\varphi_{\partial B} + \mathcal{S}_{0,\partial D}\varphi_{\partial D} \quad (4.2)$$

with densities $\varphi_{\partial B} \in H^s(\partial B)$ and $\varphi_{\partial D} \in H^{-1/2}(\partial D)$ is a solution of the Dirichlet problem (2.6)–(2.8) provided that $\varphi_{\partial B}$ and $\varphi_{\partial D}$ satisfy the boundary integral equations

$$\begin{pmatrix} K_{0,\partial B} - I & S_{0,\partial D \rightarrow \partial B} \\ K_{0,\partial B \rightarrow \partial D} & S_{0,\partial D} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_{\partial B} \\ \varphi_{\partial D} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 2f \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.3)$$

Furthermore, (4.3) is uniquely solvable for all $f \in H^s(\partial B)$ and the Dirichlet-to-Neumann operator Λ_D can be represented by

$$\Lambda_D f = \begin{pmatrix} T_{0,\partial B} & K'_{0,\partial D \rightarrow \partial B} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} K_{0,\partial B} - I & S_{0,\partial D \rightarrow \partial B} \\ K_{0,\partial B \rightarrow \partial D} & S_{0,\partial D} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} f \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.4)$$

Moreover, $\Lambda_D : H^s(\partial B) \rightarrow H^{s-1}(\partial B)$ is bounded.

Proof. By the jump relations and regularity properties in the Sobolev space setting (see [5, 22]), it is easy to see that the combined layer potential (4.2) with densities $\varphi_{\partial B}$ and $\varphi_{\partial D}$ satisfying (4.3) is a solution to the Dirichlet problem (2.6)–(2.8).

From the proof of Theorem 4.1 we know $K_{0,\partial B} - I : H^s(\partial B) \rightarrow H^s(\partial B)$ has a bounded inverse. The operator $S_{i,\partial D} : H^{-1/2}(\partial D) \rightarrow H^{1/2}(\partial D)$ also has a bounded inverse (see [16, Theorem 5.44]). Moreover, $S_{0,\partial D \rightarrow \partial B} : H^{-1/2}(\partial D) \rightarrow H^s(\partial B)$ and $K_{0,\partial B \rightarrow \partial D} : H^s(\partial B) \rightarrow H^{1/2}(\partial D)$ are compact due to the regularity properties of surface potentials, and $S_{0,\partial D} - S_{i,\partial D} : H^{-1/2}(\partial D) \rightarrow H^{1/2}(\partial D)$ is also compact due to the increased smoothness of the integral kernel as compared with that of $S_{i,\partial D}$. By the Riesz-Fredholm theory we conclude from

$$\begin{pmatrix} K_{0,\partial B} - I & S_{0,\partial D \rightarrow \partial B} \\ K_{0,\partial B \rightarrow \partial D} & S_{0,\partial D} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} K_{0,\partial B} - I & 0 \\ 0 & S_{i,\partial D} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & S_{0,\partial D \rightarrow \partial B} \\ K_{0,\partial B \rightarrow \partial D} & S_{0,\partial D} - S_{i,\partial D} \end{pmatrix} \quad (4.5)$$

that (4.3) is uniquely solvable if and only if (4.5) is injective.

Let u be given by (4.2) with $\varphi_{\partial B}$ and $\varphi_{\partial D}$ satisfy (4.3) with $f = 0$ on ∂B . By the uniqueness for the interior Dirichlet problem in $B \setminus \overline{D}$ and in D , respectively, we have $u = 0$ in $B \setminus \overline{D}$ and in D , respectively. By the jump relation we have

$$\varphi_{\partial D} = \partial_\nu u_- - \partial_\nu u_+ = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial D. \quad (4.6)$$

Therefore, it follows from (4.2) that

$$u = \mathcal{D}_{0,\partial B} \varphi_{\partial B}. \quad (4.7)$$

The jump relation now yields $\partial_\nu u_\pm = 0$ on ∂B . Note that (4.7) implies $u(x) = o(1)$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$. It follows from the uniqueness of the exterior Neumann problem (see [18, Theorem 6.13]) that $u = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \overline{B}$. By the jump relation we have

$$\varphi_{\partial B} = u_+ - u_- = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial B. \quad (4.8)$$

Combining (4.6) and (4.8) we thus obtain the injectivity of (4.5).

Finally, by noting that

$$\partial_\nu u_0 = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} T_{0,\partial B} & K'_{0,\partial D \rightarrow \partial B} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_{\partial B} \\ \varphi_{\partial D} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{on } \partial B,$$

we arrive at (4.4). Since $K'_{0,\partial D \rightarrow \partial B} : H^{-1/2}(\partial D) \rightarrow H^{s-1}(\partial B)$ and $T_0 : H^s(\partial B) \rightarrow H^{s-1}(\partial B)$ are bounded, we know $\Lambda_D : H^s(\partial B) \rightarrow H^{s-1}(\partial B)$ is bounded. \square

Remark 4.3. (i) In contrast to the invertible operator $S_{\partial D} : H^{-1/2}(\partial D) \rightarrow H^{1/2}(\partial D)$ defined in Theorem 2.8, the operator $S_{0,\partial D} : H^{-1/2}(\partial D) \rightarrow H^{1/2}(\partial D)$ is in general not injective in two dimensions (see [18, Theorem 7.38]). A modified operator of $S_{0,\partial D}$ has been proposed to overcome this difficulty (see [18, Theorem 7.41]). Here, we avoid this difficulty by using the combined layer potential (4.2).

(ii) Let $s \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$. By Theorems 4.1 and 4.2, we immediately obtain $(\Lambda_D - \Lambda_0)f \in H^{s-1}(\partial B)$ for all $f \in H^s(\partial B)$. Furthermore, Remark 2.10 (i) implies $(\Lambda_D - \Lambda_0)f \in H^{m-3/2}(\partial B)$ for all $f \in H^s(\partial B)$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$.

Below we will consider numerical approaches for computing Λ_0 and Λ_D . The same scheme can be applied to handle Λ_Ω for any Lipschitz domain Ω satisfying $\overline{\Omega} \subset B$. We begin with the necessary parametrization of (4.1) and (4.3). Note that a uniform mesh for ∂D yields only poor convergence due to the corners of polygon D . To take proper care of the corner singularities, we may use a graded mesh as shown in (4.11) below (for details see [4, Section 3.6] and [26]). Assume that ∂B possesses a regular analytic 2π -periodic representation of the form

$$\tilde{x}(\tilde{t}) = (\tilde{x}_1(\tilde{t}), \tilde{x}_2(\tilde{t})), \quad 0 \leq \tilde{t} \leq 2\pi. \quad (4.9)$$

Moreover, the boundary ∂D of polygon D with corners given in order by $\{P_\ell := (P_{\ell,1}, P_{\ell,2})\}_{\ell=1}^N$ possesses a parametric representation of the form $x(t) := (x_1(t), x_2(t))$ for $0 \leq t \leq 2\pi$, where

$$x_j(t) = \left(\frac{2\ell\pi}{N} - t\right)P_{\ell,j} + \left(t - \frac{2(\ell-1)\pi}{N}\right)P_{(\ell \bmod N)+1,j}, \quad t \in \left[\frac{2(\ell-1)\pi}{N}, \frac{2\ell\pi}{N}\right), \ell = 1, \dots, N \quad (4.10)$$

for $j = 1, 2$. To introduce the uniform mesh on ∂B and the graded mesh on ∂D , we choose $\tilde{n}, n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that $n/N \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. For simplicity let there be n/N knots on each smooth segment. The knots on ∂B and ∂D are $\{\tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_j)\}$ and $\{x(t_j)\}$, respectively, where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{t}_j &= \frac{j\pi}{\tilde{n}}, \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, 2\tilde{n} - 1, \\ t_j &= w(s_j) \text{ with } s_j = \frac{\pi}{2n} + \frac{j\pi}{n}, \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, 2n - 1, \\ w(s) &= \tilde{w}(Ns - 2\ell\pi + 2\pi), \quad s \in \left[\frac{2(\ell-1)\pi}{N}, \frac{2\ell\pi}{N}\right), \ell = 1, \dots, N, \\ \tilde{w}(s) &= 2\pi \frac{[v(s)]^p}{[v(s)]^p + [v(2\pi - s)]^p}, \quad 0 \leq s \leq 2\pi, \\ v(s) &= \left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{2}\right) \left(\frac{\pi - s}{\pi}\right)^3 + \frac{1}{p} \frac{s - \pi}{\pi} + \frac{1}{2}, \quad p \geq 2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

Following the Nyström method (see [18, Chapter 12]) and the idea of graded mesh (see [4, Section 3.6]), the boundary integral equations (4.1) and (4.3) can be approximated by

$$(L_{\partial B} - I)\Psi_{\partial B} = F$$

and

$$\begin{pmatrix} L_{\partial B} - I & M_{\partial D \rightarrow \partial B} \\ L_{\partial B \rightarrow \partial D} & M_{\partial D} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Psi_{\partial B} \\ W \Psi_{\partial D} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} F \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.12)$$

respectively, where I denotes the identity matrix and

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\partial B} &:= \left(\frac{\pi}{\tilde{n}} \tilde{L}_{\partial B}(\tilde{t}_i, \tilde{t}_j) \right)_{i,j=0,1,\dots,2\tilde{n}-1}, \\ \tilde{L}_{\partial B}(\tilde{t}, \tilde{\tau}) &:= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{[\tilde{x}(\tilde{t}) - \tilde{x}(\tilde{\tau})] \cdot (\tilde{x}'_2(\tilde{\tau}), -\tilde{x}'_1(\tilde{\tau}))}{|\tilde{x}(\tilde{t}) - \tilde{x}(\tilde{\tau})|^2}, & \tilde{t} \neq \tilde{\tau}, \\ \frac{\tilde{x}''(\tilde{t}) \cdot (\tilde{x}'_2(\tilde{t}), -\tilde{x}'_1(\tilde{t}))}{2\pi |\tilde{x}'(\tilde{t})|^2}, & \tilde{t} = \tilde{\tau}, \end{cases} \\ \Psi_{\partial B} &:= (\varphi_{\partial B}(\tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_0)), \varphi_{\partial B}(\tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_1)), \dots, \varphi_{\partial B}(\tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_{2\tilde{n}-1})))^\top, \\ F &:= 2(f(\tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_0)), f(\tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_1)), \dots, f(\tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_{2\tilde{n}-1})))^\top, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\partial D \rightarrow \partial B} &:= \left(\frac{\pi}{n} \tilde{M}_{\partial D \rightarrow \partial B}(\tilde{t}_i, \tau_j) \right)_{i=0,1,\dots,2\tilde{n}-1, j=0,1,\dots,2n-1}, \\ \tilde{M}_{\partial D \rightarrow \partial B}(\tilde{t}, \tau) &:= \frac{|x'(\tau)|}{\pi} \ln \frac{1}{|\tilde{x}(\tilde{t}) - x(\tau)|}, \\ L_{\partial B \rightarrow \partial D} &:= \left(\frac{\pi}{\tilde{n}} \tilde{L}_{\partial B \rightarrow \partial D}(t_i, \tilde{t}_j) \right)_{i=0,1,\dots,2n-1, j=0,1,\dots,2\tilde{n}-1}, \\ \tilde{L}_{\partial B \rightarrow \partial D}(t, \tilde{\tau}) &:= \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{[x(t) - \tilde{x}(\tilde{\tau})] \cdot (\tilde{x}'_2(\tilde{\tau}), -\tilde{x}'_1(\tilde{\tau}))}{|x(t) - \tilde{x}(\tilde{\tau})|^2}, \\ M_{\partial D} &:= \left(R_j^{(n)}(s_i) \tilde{M}_{\partial D,1}(s_i, \sigma_j) + \frac{\pi}{n} \tilde{M}_{\partial D,2}(s_i, \sigma_j) \right)_{i=0,1,\dots,2n-1}, \\ R_j^{(n)}(s) &:= -\frac{2\pi}{n} \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{m} \cos m(s - s_j) - \frac{\pi}{n^2} \cos n(s - s_j), \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, 2n-1, \\ \tilde{M}_{\partial D,1}(s, \sigma) &:= M_{\partial D,1}(w(s), w(\sigma)), \\ \tilde{M}_{\partial D,2}(s, \sigma) &:= \begin{cases} M_{\partial D,2}(w(s), w(\sigma)), & s \neq \sigma, \\ 2M_{\partial D,1}(w(s), w(s)) \ln w'(s) + M_{\partial D,2}(w(s), w(s)), & s = \sigma, \end{cases} \\ M_{\partial D,1}(t, \tau) &:= -\frac{1}{2\pi} |x'(\tau)|, \\ M_{\partial D,2}(t, \tau) &:= \begin{cases} \frac{|x'(\tau)|}{\pi} \ln \frac{1}{|x(t) - x(\tau)|} - M_{\partial D,1}(t, \tau) \ln \left(4 \sin^2 \frac{t-\tau}{2} \right), & t \neq \tau, \\ \frac{|x'(t)|}{\pi} \ln \frac{1}{|x'(t)|}, & t = \tau, \end{cases} \\ W &:= \text{diag}(w'(s_0), w'(s_1), \dots, w'(s_{2n-1})), \\ \Psi_{\partial D} &:= (\varphi_{\partial D}(x(t_0)), \varphi_{\partial D}(x(t_1)), \dots, \varphi_{\partial D}(x(t_{2n-1})))^\top. \end{aligned}$$

With the notations in discrete form, the solution to (2.1)–(2.2) can be approximated by

$$u_0(x) \approx \frac{\pi}{\tilde{n}} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial \Phi_0(x, \tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_0))}{\partial \nu(\tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_0))} & \frac{\partial \Phi_0(x, \tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_1))}{\partial \nu(\tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_1))} & \dots & \frac{\partial \Phi_0(x, \tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_{2\tilde{n}-1}))}{\partial \nu(\tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_{2\tilde{n}-1}))} \end{pmatrix} Y_{\partial B} \Psi_{\partial B}, \quad x \in B,$$

and the solution to (2.6)–(2.8) can be approximated by

$$u(x) \approx \frac{\pi}{\tilde{n}} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial \Phi_0(x, \tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_0))}{\partial \nu(\tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_0))} & \frac{\partial \Phi_0(x, \tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_1))}{\partial \nu(\tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_1))} & \cdots & \frac{\partial \Phi_0(x, \tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_{2\tilde{n}-1}))}{\partial \nu(\tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_{2\tilde{n}-1}))} \end{pmatrix} Y_{\partial B} \Psi_{\partial B} \\ + \frac{\pi}{n} \begin{pmatrix} \Phi_0(x, x(t_0)) & \Phi_0(x, x(t_1)) & \cdots & \Phi_0(x, x(t_{2n-1})) \end{pmatrix} Y_{\partial D} W \Psi_{\partial D}, \quad x \in B \setminus \bar{D},$$

where

$$Y_{\partial B} = \text{diag}(|\tilde{x}'(\tilde{t}_0)|, |\tilde{x}'(\tilde{t}_1)|, \dots, |\tilde{x}'(\tilde{t}_{2\tilde{n}-1})|), \\ Y_{\partial D} = \text{diag}(|x'(t_0)|, |x'(t_1)|, \dots, |x'(t_{2n-1})|). \quad (4.13)$$

Remark 4.4. Since $w'(s_j)$ takes a very small value if the knot $x(w(s_j))$ is close to the corners of ∂D , it is not stable to calculate $\Psi_{\partial D}$ from (4.12). From the above approximation for the solution u to (2.6)–(2.8), we see $W\Psi_{\partial D}$ can be viewed as an unknown vector and it is sufficient to calculate $W\Psi_{\partial D}$ from (4.12).

In view of Remark 4.4, the Dirichlet-to-Neumann operators Λ_0 and Λ_D are approximated by

$$\Lambda_0 \approx Y_{\partial B}^{-1} T_{\partial B} \Psi_{\partial B} = Y_{\partial B}^{-1} T_{\partial B} (L_{\partial B} - I)^{-1}$$

and

$$\Lambda_D f \approx \frac{1}{2} Y_{\partial B}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} T_{\partial B} & H_{\partial D \rightarrow \partial B} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Psi_{\partial B} \\ W\Psi_{\partial D} \end{pmatrix} \\ = Y_{\partial B}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} T_{\partial B} & H_{\partial D \rightarrow \partial B} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} L_{\partial B} - I & M_{\partial D \rightarrow \partial B} \\ L_{\partial B \rightarrow \partial D} & M_{\partial D} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} F/2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (4.14)$$

respectively, where

$$T_{\partial B} := \left(\tilde{T}_{\partial B}(\tilde{t}_i, \tilde{t}_j) \right)_{i,j=0,1,\dots,2\tilde{n}-1}, \\ \tilde{T}_{\partial B}(\tilde{t}_i, \tilde{t}_j) := T_j^{(\tilde{n})}(\tilde{t}_i) + \frac{\pi}{\tilde{n}} \left[k_A(\tilde{t}_i, \tilde{t}_j) + k_2(\tilde{t}_i, \tilde{t}_j) - \frac{1}{2\pi} \right], \\ T_j^{(\tilde{n})}(\tilde{t}) := -\frac{1}{\tilde{n}} \sum_{m=1}^{\tilde{n}-1} m \cos m(\tilde{t} - \tilde{t}_j) - \frac{1}{2} \cos \tilde{n}(\tilde{t} - \tilde{t}_j), \\ k_A(\tilde{t}, \tilde{\tau}) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{2(1-\cos(\tilde{t}-\tilde{\tau}))\tilde{x}'(\tilde{t})\cdot\tilde{x}'(\tilde{\tau}) - \cos(\tilde{t}-\tilde{\tau})|\tilde{x}(\tilde{t})-\tilde{x}(\tilde{\tau})|^2}{(1-\cos(\tilde{t}-\tilde{\tau}))|\tilde{x}(\tilde{t})-\tilde{x}(\tilde{\tau})|^2}, & \tilde{t} \neq \tilde{\tau}, \\ \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{\frac{1}{6}\tilde{x}'(\tilde{t})\cdot\tilde{x}'''(\tilde{t}) - \frac{1}{4}|\tilde{x}''(\tilde{t})|^2 + \frac{5}{12}|\tilde{x}'(\tilde{t})|^2}{|\tilde{x}'(\tilde{t})|^2}, & \tilde{t} = \tilde{\tau}, \end{cases} \\ k_2(\tilde{t}, \tilde{\tau}) := \begin{cases} -\frac{2}{\pi} \frac{\{[\tilde{x}(\tilde{t})-\tilde{x}(\tilde{\tau})]\cdot(\tilde{x}'_2(\tilde{t}), -\tilde{x}'_1(\tilde{t}))\} \{[\tilde{x}(\tilde{t})-\tilde{x}(\tilde{\tau})]\cdot(\tilde{x}'_2(\tilde{\tau}), -\tilde{x}'_1(\tilde{\tau}))\}}{|\tilde{x}(\tilde{t})-\tilde{x}(\tilde{\tau})|^4}, & \tilde{t} \neq \tilde{\tau}, \\ \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{|\tilde{x}''(\tilde{t})\cdot(\tilde{x}'_2(\tilde{t}), -\tilde{x}'_1(\tilde{t}))|^2}{|\tilde{x}'(\tilde{t})|^4}, & \tilde{t} = \tilde{\tau}, \end{cases} \\ H_{\partial D \rightarrow \partial B} := \left(\frac{\pi}{n} \tilde{H}_{\partial D \rightarrow \partial B}(\tilde{t}_i, \tau_j) \right)_{i=0,1,\dots,2\tilde{n}-1, j=0,1,\dots,2n-1}, \\ H_{\partial D \rightarrow \partial B}(\tilde{t}, \tau) := \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{[x(\tau) - \tilde{x}(\tilde{t})] \cdot (\tilde{x}'_2(\tilde{t}), -\tilde{x}'_1(\tilde{t}))}{|\tilde{x}(\tilde{t}) - x(\tau)|^2} |x'(\tau)|.$$

For the calculation of the hypersingular operator $T_{0,\partial B}$ we refer to [12, 17].

5 Iteration method for a precise reconstruction

In numerical implementation, it is impossible to calculate $I_2(\Omega)$ defined by (3.5) for all $\Omega \subset \mathcal{O}$ with \mathcal{O} introduced in Remark 3.9. For a more precise result of recovering the shape of D , we will use Newton's iteration method with an appropriate initial guess based on the result of the method introduced in Section 3. We refer to [1, 13] for the details on iteration method in the case of scattering problem.

To introduce the iteration method, we consider the polygon D with boundary $\partial D := \{h(t) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : t \in [0, 2\pi)\}$, where h is a 2π -periodic function analogous to (4.10). For any fixed boundary value $f \in H^s(\partial B)$ with $s \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$, we define the mapping \mathcal{F} by

$$\mathcal{F}h = \partial_\nu u \quad \text{on } \partial B, \quad (5.1)$$

where u solves (2.6)–(2.8). By Remark 2.4 (iv), we know $\mathcal{F}h \in H^{s-1}(\partial B)$. The inverse problem is to solve (5.1), while the iteration method is to approximately solve (5.1) in a Newton type iterative manner. Precisely, for a proper initial guess $h = h_0$ we compute

$$h_{n+1} = h_n + q_n, \quad n = 0, 1, \dots,$$

where q_n solves the linearized equation of (5.1):

$$\mathcal{F}h_n + \mathcal{F}'_{h_n} q_n = \partial_\nu u \quad \text{on } \partial B. \quad (5.2)$$

The domain derivative in (5.2) is defined by

$$\mathcal{F}'_h q = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{F}(h + tq) - \mathcal{F}(h)}{t}.$$

Analogously to [1, (28), (39) and Theorem 5.1], the domain derivative is given by

$$\mathcal{F}'_h q = \partial_\nu v|_{\partial B}, \quad (5.3)$$

where v solves the following boundary value problem

$$\Delta v = 0 \quad \text{in } B \setminus \overline{D}, \quad (5.4)$$

$$v = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial B, \quad (5.5)$$

$$v = -(\nu \cdot q) \partial_\nu u \quad \text{on } \partial D. \quad (5.6)$$

In [1, Corollary 4.2], the existence of the shape derivative was justified for the Helmholtz equation in a proper function space near each corner point of ∂D . The arguments there can be easily adapted to the boundary value problem of Laplace equation under consideration.

Due to the regularity of elliptic equations, the operator equation (5.2) is ill-posed. For a more stable numerical implementation, we may apply the Tikhonov regularization scheme to obtain

$$q_n \approx (\alpha I + [\mathcal{F}'_{h_n}]^* \mathcal{F}'_{h_n})^{-1} [\mathcal{F}'_{h_n}]^* (\partial_\nu u|_{\partial B} - \mathcal{F}h_n), \quad (5.7)$$

where the regularization parameter $\alpha > 0$ is appropriately chosen (see [4, Section 4.5]).

It is difficult to calculate the values of $\partial_\nu u$ near the corners of ∂D due to the singularities of elliptic boundary value problems in nonsmooth domains (see Theorem 3.7 and [8]). To deal with this difficulty, we approximate the values of $\partial_\nu u$ near the corners of ∂D in the following manner. In view of Theorem 4.2, we can easily deduce that

$$\partial_\nu u = \begin{pmatrix} T_{0,\partial B \rightarrow \partial D} & K'_{0,\partial D} - I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_{\partial B} \\ \varphi_{\partial D} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{on } \partial D.$$

Therefore, $2|x'(t)|\partial_\nu u(x(t))$ can be approximated by

$$Y_{\partial D}U = \begin{pmatrix} T_{\partial B \rightarrow \partial D} & H_{\partial D}W - Y_{\partial D} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Psi_{\partial B} \\ \Psi_{\partial D} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5.8)$$

where $Y_{\partial D}$ is given in (4.13) and

$$\begin{aligned} U &:= 2(\partial_\nu u(x(t_0)), \partial_\nu u(x(t_1)), \dots, \partial_\nu u(x(t_{2n-1})))^\top, \\ T_{\partial B \rightarrow \partial D} &:= \left(\frac{\pi}{n} \tilde{T}_{\partial B \rightarrow \partial D}(t_i, \tilde{\tau}_j) \right)_{i=0,1,\dots,2n-1, j=0,1,\dots,2\tilde{n}-1}, \\ \tilde{T}_{\partial B \rightarrow \partial D}(t, \tilde{\tau}) &:= -\frac{2}{\pi} \frac{\{[x(t) - \tilde{x}(\tilde{\tau})] \cdot (x'_2(t), -x'_1(t))\} \{[x(t) - \tilde{x}(\tilde{\tau})] \cdot (\tilde{x}'_2(\tilde{\tau}), -\tilde{x}'_1(\tilde{\tau}))\}}{|x(t) - \tilde{x}(\tilde{\tau})|^4} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{(x'_2(t), -x'_1(t)) \cdot (\tilde{x}'_2(\tilde{\tau}), -\tilde{x}'_1(\tilde{\tau}))}{|x(t) - \tilde{x}(\tilde{\tau})|^2}, \\ H_{\partial D} &:= \left(\frac{\pi}{n} \tilde{H}_{\partial D}(t_i, \tau_j) \right)_{i,j=0,1,\dots,2n-1}, \\ \tilde{H}_{\partial D}(t, \tau) &:= \begin{cases} \frac{|x'(\tau)|}{\pi} \frac{[x(\tau) - x(t)] \cdot (x'_2(t), -x'_1(t))}{|x(t) - x(\tau)|^2}, & t \neq \tau, \\ \frac{x''(t) \cdot (x'_2(t), -x'_1(t))}{2\pi|x'(t)|}, & t = \tau. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

As pointed out in Remark 4.4, $W\Psi_{\partial D}$ is viewed as an unknown vector to avoid the calculation of the inverse of W . Applying W on both sides of (5.8), we obtain

$$Y_{\partial D}WU = \begin{pmatrix} WT_{\partial B \rightarrow \partial D} & WH_{\partial D} - Y_{\partial D} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Psi_{\partial B} \\ W\Psi_{\partial D} \end{pmatrix},$$

where we have used the equality $WY_{\partial D} = Y_{\partial D}W$. In view of (4.12), $2w'(s)|x'(w(s))\partial_\nu u(x(w(s)))$ on ∂D can be approximated by

$$Y_{\partial D}WU = \begin{pmatrix} WT_{\partial B \rightarrow \partial D} & WH_{\partial D} - Y_{\partial D} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} L_{\partial B} - I & M_{\partial D \rightarrow \partial B} \\ L_{\partial B \rightarrow \partial D} & M_{\partial D} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} F \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Therefore, we may approximate $\partial_\nu u$ on ∂D by

$$U \approx (\alpha_0 I + W)^{-1}(WU) = (\alpha_0 I + W)^{-1}Y_{\partial D}^{-1}(Y_{\partial D}WU), \quad (5.9)$$

where the parameter $\alpha_0 > 0$ is appropriately chosen.

Analogously to Theorem 4.2, we can easily deduce that

$$\partial_\nu v = \begin{pmatrix} T_{0,\partial B} & K'_{0,\partial D \rightarrow \partial B} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} K_{0,\partial B} - I & S_{0,\partial D \rightarrow \partial B} \\ K_{0,\partial B \rightarrow \partial D} & S_{0,\partial D} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ -(\nu \cdot q)\partial_\nu u \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{on } \partial B,$$

where v solves (5.4)–(5.6). The above equations can be approximated by

$$V = Y_{\partial B}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} T_{\partial B} & H_{\partial D \rightarrow \partial B} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} L_{\partial B} - I & M_{\partial D \rightarrow \partial B} \\ L_{\partial B \rightarrow \partial D} & M_{\partial D} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ -QU \end{pmatrix},$$

where $Y_{\partial B}, T_{\partial B}, H_{\partial D \rightarrow \partial B}, L_{\partial B}, M_{\partial D \rightarrow \partial B}, L_{\partial B \rightarrow \partial D}, M_{\partial D}$ are given in (4.14) and

$$\begin{aligned} V &:= (\partial_\nu v(x(t_0)), \partial_\nu v(x(t_0)), \dots, \partial_\nu v(x(t_{2n-1})))^\top, \\ Q &:= \text{diag}(\nu(x(t_0)) \cdot q(t_0), \nu(x(t_1)) \cdot q(t_1), \dots, \nu(x(t_{2n-1})) \cdot q(t_{2n-1})). \end{aligned}$$

In view of (5.3), the domain derivative $\mathcal{F}'_h q = \partial_\nu v|_{\partial B}$ is thus approximated by V .

Noting that this paper focuses on polygon obstacles, we update the location of corners $\{P_\ell : \ell = 1, \dots, N\}$ of the polygon in (4.10) at each iteration step, instead of the coefficients of basis shape functions such as trigonometric polynomials in [13]. Precisely, in the m -th iteration step the updated corners $\{P_\ell^{(m)} = (P_{\ell,1}^{(m)}, P_{\ell,2}^{(m)}) : \ell = 1, \dots, N\}$ are given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} P_{1,1}^{(m)} \\ \vdots \\ P_{N,1}^{(m)} \\ P_{1,2}^{(m)} \\ \vdots \\ P_{N,2}^{(m)} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} P_{1,1}^{(m-1)} \\ \vdots \\ P_{N,1}^{(m-1)} \\ P_{1,2}^{(m-1)} \\ \vdots \\ P_{N,2}^{(m-1)} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \Delta P_{1,1}^{(m)} \\ \vdots \\ \Delta P_{N,1}^{(m)} \\ \Delta P_{1,2}^{(m)} \\ \vdots \\ \Delta P_{N,2}^{(m)} \end{pmatrix}, \quad m = 1, 2, \dots,$$

where $\{P_\ell^{(m)} = (P_{\ell,1}^{(m)}, P_{\ell,2}^{(m)}) : \ell = 1, \dots, N\}$ are the corners in the $(m-1)$ -th iteration step, and $\{\Delta P_\ell^{(m)} = (\Delta P_{\ell,1}^{(m)}, \Delta P_{\ell,2}^{(m)}) : \ell = 1, \dots, N\}$ are given by (5.7) in terms of (4.10).

6 Numerical examples

In this section, we will display some numerical examples.

Example 6.1 (Factorization method based on Dirichlet-to-Neumann operators). *Let B be a disk centered at the origin with radius 5 (i.e., $\tilde{x}(\tilde{t}) = 5(\cos \tilde{t}, \sin \tilde{t})$ in (4.9)). The Dirichlet-to-Neumann operator Λ_D is approximated by a 128×128 matrix. The numerical results of indicator function $I(z)$ defined by (2.25) for different obstacles are shown in Figure 1, where the red solid line and black solid line representing the disk B and the true obstacle D . The obstacle D in Figure 1 (a) is a disk centered at $(2, 3)$ with radius 0.5. The boundary ∂D of obstacle D in*




Figure 1: Numerical results for Example 6.1.

Figure 1 (b) is given by $x(t) = 0.5(\cos t + 0.65 \cos 2t - 0.65, 1.5 \sin t) + (2, 1)$ for $0 \leq t \leq 2\pi$. The obstacle D in Figure 1 (c) is a polygon with corners given in order by $(0.25, -0.75)$, $(1.5, -0.5)$, $(1.5, 0.5)$ and $(0.5, 0.5)$.

Example 6.2 (Determination of γ). Let B be a disk centered at the origin with radius 5 and D be a polygon with corners given in order by $(0.25, -0.75)$, $(1.5, -0.5)$, $(1.5, 0.5)$ and $(0.5, 0.5)$. We set Ω to be a disk centered at the origin with radius 3. The number of knots on ∂B is set to be 64, i.e., the Dirichlet-to-Neumann operator Λ_D is approximated by a 64×64 matrix. The noisy single pair of Cauchy data is given by $(f, \partial_\nu u_\delta)$ with $\partial_\nu u_\delta(x) := \partial_\nu u(x)(1 + \delta\zeta)$. Here, $\delta > 0$ is the noise ratio and ζ is a uniformly distributed random number in $[-1, 1]$. The sampling knots for τ is set to be $\tau_\ell = \ell/20$ for $\ell = 0, 1, \dots, 40$. The numerical examples of $I_1(\tau)$ defined by (3.1) for




Figure 2: Numerical results for Example 6.2 with different values of γ and noise ratios.

different conductivity coefficients γ and noise ratios δ with the same boundary value f are shown in Figure 2. The geometries of the problems are shown in Figure 2 (a)–(e), where the black line represents ∂D , the small red circle represents $\partial\Omega$, and the large red circle represents ∂B . The

boundary value f takes value 0 and 1 at grey and black knots on ∂B , respectively. The numerical results for $I_1(\tau)$ corresponding to Figure 2 (a)–(e) are shown in Figure 2 (f)–(j), respectively, where the red line represents the true value of γ and black knots represent the points $(\tau_\ell, I_1(\tau_\ell))$, $\ell = 0, 1, \dots, 40$. The numerical examples of $I_1(\tau)$ defined by (3.1) for different boundary values f and noise ratios δ with the same conductivity coefficient $\gamma = 1$ are shown in Figure 3. The geometries of the problems are shown in Figure 3 (a)–(e), where the black line represents ∂D , the small red circle represents $\partial\Omega$, and the large red circle represents ∂B . The boundary value f takes value 0, 1, 2 at grey, black, blue knots on ∂B in Figure 3 (a)–(c), respectively. The boundary value of Figure 3 (d), (e), (i) and (j) is given by $f(x) = f(5(\cos \theta, \sin \theta)) = \cos \theta$ on ∂B . The numerical results for $I_1(\tau)$ corresponding to Figure 3 (a)–(e) are shown in Figure 3 (f)–(j), respectively, where the red line represents the true value of γ and black knots represent the points $(\tau_\ell, I_1(\tau_\ell))$, $\ell = 0, 1, \dots, 40$.




Figure 3: Numerical results for Example 6.2 with different boundary values f and noise ratios.

Example 6.3 (Detection of location). *Let D and B be the same as in Example 6.2 and suppose that the conductivity coefficient $\gamma = 1$ is known. The boundary data f and $\Lambda_D f$ are approximated by two 128×1 vectors. We determine the location of D in the following two different approaches.*

Approach 1. *Let $\Omega_P^{(\ell)}$ be a disk centered at P with radius $\ell/10$ for $\ell = 5, 6, \dots, 30$. The number of knots on ∂B is set to be 128, i.e., the Dirichlet-to-Neumann operator Λ_D is approximated by a 128×128 matrix. To indicate the value of $I_2(\Omega_P^{(\ell)})$ defined by (3.5), we plot $\partial\Omega_P^{(\ell)}$ in the color given in terms of RGB values in $[0, 1] \times [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ as follows:*

$$\begin{cases} (V^{(\ell)}, 1 - V^{(\ell)}, 0) & \text{if } V^{(\ell)} \geq 0, \\ (0, 1 + V^{(\ell)}, -V^{(\ell)}) & \text{if } V^{(\ell)} < 0, \end{cases} \quad \text{with } V^{(\ell)} := 2 \times \frac{I_2(\Omega_P^{(\ell)}) - I_{\min}}{I_{\max} - I_{\min}} - 1, \quad (6.1)$$

where $I_{\max} := \max_{\ell} \{I(\Omega^{(\ell)})\}$ and $I_{\min} := \min_{\ell} \{I(\Omega^{(\ell)})\}$. The numerical results for $I_2(\Omega_P^{(\ell)})$

defined by (3.5) with different P are shown in Figure 4, where the black line represents ∂D , the circle with knots represents ∂B , the boundary value f takes value 0 and 1 at grey and black knots on ∂B , respectively, and the colored circles represent $\partial\Omega_P^{(\ell)}$ for different P and ℓ with its color indicating the value of $I_2(\Omega_P^{(\ell)})$ in the sense of (6.1). From the numerical results shown in Figure 4, we see that the rough location of D can be found from a single pair of Cauchy data to (1.1)–(1.3). Moreover, we can imagine that Remark 3.9 can be numerically verified if the values of $I_2(\Omega)$ for all possible domains Ω in \mathcal{O} are calculated.




Figure 4: Numerical results for Approach 1 of Example 6.3.

Approach 2. Let $r \in \{1, 1/2, 1/4, 1/8\}$. We set Ω_P^r to be a disk centered at P with radius r , where the center is set to be $P = P_{pq} = (-2 + 2pr, -2 + 2qr)$ for $p, q = 0, 1, \dots, 2/r$. The numerical results for $I_2(\Omega_{P_{pq}}^r)$ defined by (3.5) are shown in Figure 5 (a)–(c), while the numerical results for $\ln(I_2(\Omega_{P_{pq}}^r))$ are shown in Figure 5 (d)–(e). In Figure 5, the black line represents ∂D , the circle with knots represents ∂B , the boundary value f takes value 0 and 1 at grey and black knots on ∂B , respectively. The colored circles represent $\partial\Omega_{P_{pq}}^r$ with its color indicating the value of $I_2(\Omega_{P_{pq}}^r)$ in the sense similar to (6.1) in Figure 5 (a)–(c), while the colored circles represent $\partial\Omega_{P_{pq}}^r$ with its color indicating the value of $\ln(I_2(\Omega_{P_{pq}}^r))$ in the sense similar to (6.1) in Figure 5 (d)–(e).




Figure 5: Numerical results for Approach 2 of Example 6.3.

Note that D is contained in none of the disks shown in Figure 5. Nevertheless, it can be seen from Figure 5 that the rough location of D can be found in the way given by Approach 2 of Example 6.3. Intuitively, we think that in some sense the distance between the Cauchy data to D and the graph of the Dirichlet-to-Neumann operator to the disks close to D may be nearer than the disks far away from D . So far, we cannot explain why a rough location of D can be identified by Approach 2 of Example 6.3.

Example 6.4 (Iteration method). Let D , B and γ be the same as in Example 6.3. The boundary data f and $\Lambda_D f$ are approximated by two 64×1 vectors.




Figure 6: Numerical results for Example 6.4 (i).

(i) The initial guess is given by the location of corners in order by $(0.3, -0.7)$, $(1.7, -0.7)$, $(1.7, 0.7)$, $(0.3, 0.7)$. The total iteration number for each figure is 20. The parameters in (5.7)

and (5.9) are set to be $\alpha = 10^{-3}$ and $\alpha_0 = 10^{-4}$, respectively. The shape of the polygon in the m -th iteration step will be plotted in the color given in terms of RGB values:

$$\begin{cases} (V^{(m)}, 1 - V^{(m)}, 0) & \text{if } V^{(m)} \geq 0, \\ (0, 1 + V^{(m)}, -V^{(m)}) & \text{if } V^{(m)} < 0, \end{cases} \quad \text{with } V^{(m)} := \frac{2m}{\text{Total iteration number}} - 1. \quad (6.2)$$

The numerical results of iteration method based on a single pair of Cauchy data to different boundary values $f = f_j$, for $j = 1, 2, 3, 4$, on ∂B are shown in Figure 6, where the black dots represent ∂D , the red circle represents ∂B , the dashed line represents the initial guess, the boundary value $f = f_j$ takes value 0 and 1 at grey and black knots on ∂B , respectively. Moreover, the colored lines represent the shape in each iteration step with its color indicating the current step number in the sense of (6.2).




Figure 7: Numerical results for Example 6.4 (ii).

(ii) Note that we cannot take it for grant that the polygon D has four corners. The numerical results of iteration method based on a single pair of Cauchy data to initial guesses of different corner numbers are shown in Figure 7, where the black dots represent ∂D , the red circle represents ∂B , the dashed line represents the initial guess, the boundary value f takes value 0 and 1 at grey and black knots on ∂B , respectively, and the colored lines represent the shape in each iteration step with its color indicating the current step number in the sense of (6.2). The initial guess in Figure 7 (a) and (e) is given by the location of corners in order by $(0, -0.8)$, $(0.9, -1)$, $(1.6, -0.9)$, $(1.5, 0.8)$, $(0.3, 0.5)$ and corresponding number of knots on ∂D is 130. The initial

guess in Figure 7 (b) and (f) is given by $(0, -0.8)$, $(0.9, -1)$, $(1.6, -0.9)$, $(1.3, 0.2)$, $(1.5, 0.8)$, $(0.3, 0.5)$ and corresponding number of knots on ∂D is 132. The initial guess in Figure 7 (c) and (g) is given by $(0, -0.8)$, $(0.9, -1)$, $(1.6, -0.9)$, $(1.3, 0.2)$, $(1.5, 0.8)$, $(0.9, 0.6)$, $(0.3, 0.5)$ and corresponding number of knots on ∂D is 196. The initial guess in Figure 7 (d) and (h) is given by $(0, -0.8)$, $(0.9, -1)$, $(1.6, -0.9)$, $(1.3, 0.2)$, $(1.5, 0.8)$, $(0.9, 0.6)$, $(0.3, 0.5)$, $(0.1, -0.1)$ and corresponding number of knots on ∂D is 256. The total iteration number for each figure are 50. The parameters in (5.7) and (5.9) are set to be $\alpha = 10^{-4}$ and $\alpha_0 = 10^{-5}$, respectively.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we have established the uniqueness of the inverse problem to determine the coefficient γ and the Dirichlet polygon D from a single pair of Cauchy data to the boundary value problem (1.1)–(1.3) under some a priori assumption on the Dirichlet boundary value f on ∂B . A domain-defined sampling method was proposed to determine γ and a modified factorization method was established to roughly recover the location and shape of D . An iteration method is then used to improve the reconstruction of the geometry of D . All these numerical methods are based on a single pair of Cauchy data. We note that similar uniqueness results can be established for Neumann obstacles and Robin obstacles with a constant Robin coefficient. Similarly, the hybrid method proposed in this paper carries over to Neumann and Robin obstacles with minor modifications. As an ongoing work, we will extend the above results from the Laplace's equation to the Helmholtz equation.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Professor Ikehata Masaru from Hiroshima University for helpful and stimulating discussions on the recovery of constant conductivity coefficient by a single pair of Cauchy data. The work of Xiaoxu Xu is partially supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China grant 12201489, Shaanxi Fundamental Science Research Project for Mathematics and Physics (Grant No.23JSQ025), Young Talent Fund of Association for Science and Technology in Shaanxi, China (Grant No.20240504), the Young Talent Support Plan of Xi'an Jiaotong University, the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities grant zxy012022009. The work of Guanghui Hu is partially supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China grant 12071236 and the Fundamental Research Funds for Central Universities in China grant 63213025.

References

- [1] M. Bochniak and F. Cakoni. Domain sensitivity analysis of the acoustic far-field pattern. *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.*, 25(7):595–613, 2002.
- [2] F. Cakoni and D. Colton. *A qualitative approach to inverse scattering theory*. Springer, New York, 2014.
- [3] D. Colton and R. Kress. *Integral equation methods in scattering theory*. SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 2013.
- [4] D. Colton and R. Kress. *Inverse acoustic and electromagnetic scattering theory*. Springer, Switzerland AG, fourth edition, 2019.
- [5] M. Costabel. Boundary integral operators on Lipschitz domains: elementary results. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 19(3):613–626, 1988.
- [6] J. Elschner and G. Hu. Uniqueness and factorization method for inverse elastic scattering with a single incoming wave. *Inverse Problems*, 35(9):094002, 2019.
- [7] D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger. *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001.
- [8] P. Grisvard. *Elliptic problems in nonsmooth domains*. Pitman, Boston, 1985.
- [9] G. Hu and J. Li. Inverse source problems in an inhomogeneous medium with a single far-field pattern. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 52(5):5213–5231, 2020.
- [10] M. Ikehata. Reconstruction of the shape of the inclusion by boundary measurements. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 23(7-8):1459–1474, 1998.
- [11] M. Ikehata and T. Ohe. A numerical method for finding the convex hull of polygonal cavities using the enclosure method. *Inverse Problems*, 18(1):111–124, 2002.
- [12] R. Kieser, B. Kleemann, and A. Rathsfeld. On a full discretization scheme for a hypersingular boundary integral equation over smooth curves. *Z. Anal. Anwendungen*, 11(3):385–396, 1992.
- [13] A. Kirsch. The domain derivative and two applications in inverse scattering theory. *Inverse Problems*, 9(1):81–96, 1993.
- [14] A. Kirsch. Characterization of the shape of a scattering obstacle using the spectral data of the far field operator. *Inverse Problems*, 14(6):1489–1512, 1998.
- [15] A. Kirsch and N. Grinberg. *The factorization method for inverse problems*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2008.

- [16] A. Kirsch and F. Hettlich. *The mathematical theory of time-harmonic Maxwell's equations*. Springer, Cham, 2015.
- [17] R. Kress. On the numerical solution of a hypersingular integral equation in scattering theory. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 61(3):345–360, 1995.
- [18] R. Kress. *Linear integral equations*, volume 82 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer, New York, third edition, 2014.
- [19] Y.-H. Lin, G. Nakamura, R. Potthast, and H. Wang. Duality between range and no-response tests and its application for inverse problems. *Inverse Probl. Imaging*, 15(2):367–386, 2021.
- [20] G. Ma and G. Hu. Factorization method for inverse time-harmonic elastic scattering with a single plane wave. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B*, 27(12):7469–7492, 2022.
- [21] G. Ma and G. Hu. Factorization method with one plane wave: from model-driven and data-driven perspectives. *Inverse Problems*, 38 (1): 015003, 2022.
- [22] W. McLean. *Strongly elliptic systems and boundary integral equations*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.
- [23] P. Monk. *Finite element methods for Maxwell's equations*. Numerical Mathematics and Scientific Computation. Oxford University Press, New York, 2003.
- [24] G. Nakamura and R. Potthast. *Inverse modeling*. IOP Publishing, Bristol, 2015.
- [25] R. Potthast and M. Sini. The no response test for the reconstruction of polyhedral objects in electromagnetics. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 234(6):1739–1746, 2010.
- [26] F. Qu, B. Zhang, and H. Zhang. A novel integral equation for scattering by locally rough surfaces and application to the inverse problem: the Neumann case. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 41(6):A3673–A3702, 2019.
- [27] S. Sun, G. Nakamura, and H. Wang. Numerical studies of domain sampling methods for inverse boundary value problems by one measurement. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 485:Paper No. 112099, 18, 2023.