

Stability of the Von Kármán regime for thin plates under Neumann boundary conditions

Edoardo Giovanni Tolotti[†] 

Abstract

We analyze the stability of the Von Kármán model for thin plates subject to pure Neumann conditions and to dead loads, with no restriction on their direction. We prove a stability alternative, which extends previous results by Lecumberry and Müller in the Dirichlet case. Because of the rotation invariance of the problem, their notions of stability have to be modified and combined with the concept of optimal rotations due to Maor and Mora. Finally, we prove that the Von Kármán model is not compatible with some specific types of forces. Thus, for such, only the Kirchhoff model applies.

Keywords: Dimension reduction · Thin plates · Nonlinear elasticity · Γ -convergence

AMS Classification: 74K20 · 74B20 · 74G65 · 49J45

1 Introduction

The Von Kármán model for plates was introduced in the early years of the XX century in the works of Föppl and Von Kármán [5, 10]. Despite being widely used by engineers, it took almost a century to see a rigorous mathematical derivation, obtained by Friesecke, James and Müller in [8], building on their pioneering rigidity estimate [7]. In that work, the authors derived the Von Kármán model computing the Γ -limit of a suitable rescaling of the three-dimensional nonlinear elastic energy, as the thickness h of the plate vanishes. Then, new mathematical questions naturally arose. Without attempting to be exhaustive, we recall some lines of research: derivation of viscoelastic Von Kármán models for plates [6], homogenization of Von Kármán plates models [16, 15], and analysis in the dynamic case of the Von Kármán equations [1, 2]. Furthermore, one may wonder whether, and how, boundary conditions and applied forces may change the energy scaling and the behavior of quasi-minimizers.

In this work, we are interested in dead loads, both of surface and body type. To simplify the exposition we will treat only the latter case, but the same analysis can be carried out for the former one. In this framework, the main difficulty to overcome is the loss of compactness for sequences whose total energy scales like the elastic energy in the Von Kármán regime. To better understand this issue, let us briefly describe it. In the Von Kármán setting, the elastic energy E_h per unit volume scales like h^4 . Since the in-plane displacement scales as h^2 , it is natural to assume the planar forces to scale like h^2 so that the work done by the forces is consistent with the Von Kármán regime. However, such a choice is also compatible with the Kirchhoff regime

[†]Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Pavia, Italy.

Email address: edoardogiovann.tolotti01@universitadipavia.it

(firstly introduced in [11] and rigorously derived in [7]) and with the so-called constrained Von Kármán regime (derived as a Γ -limit in [8]). In these two cases, we have, respectively,

- (i) displacement of order 1 and energy per unit volume of order h^2 ,
- (ii) displacement of order $h^{\alpha-2}$ and energy per unit volume of order h^α for some $2 < \alpha < 4$.

Note that in both scenarios the scaling of the work done by the forces is compatible with the corresponding elastic energy regime. Thus, a sequence of deformations y_h with total energy of order h^4 may have elastic energy that scales as h^α for any $2 \leq \alpha \leq 4$. In particular, if $\alpha < 4$, then such a sequence has unbounded elastic energy in the Von Kármán regime, resulting in the aforementioned loss of compactness. This phenomenon can be interpreted as an instability of the Von Kármán model (see [12]).

The situation is different when the applied forces are purely normal. Indeed, in this case, the natural scaling for forces is h^3 (that pairs with the normal displacement of order h). As a consequence, there is no ambiguity between the elastic energy regimes. This setting was studied in the original work of Friesecke, James and Müller [8]. Further analysis in the sole presence of normal forces was carried out in the dynamic setting in [1, 2].

The more general case with planar forces has been treated by Lecumberry and Müller in [12] using a clever exclusion principle. They noted that there is a critical load f that leads to the loss of validity of the Von Kármán model. Under some additional assumptions, they also proved that beyond this critical load, the infimum of the total Von Kármán energy is $-\infty$ (see also [13] for a further analysis of critical points of the Von Kármán energy). However, to avoid the mix-up of planar and normal components (of both forces and displacement) due to rotation invariance, they had to assume that part of the boundary was subject to a Dirichlet condition.

In the present work we extend this analysis to the purely Neumann case. Since the body is free to rotate, one cannot distinguish between normal and planar components of the applied forces. Thus, we suppose to have a sequence of forces f_h that scale in all directions as h^2 . For simplicity, we further assume the sequence to be of the form $f_h = h^2 f$ for some given f .

The first question to understand is how the load affects the rotation invariance of the plate. In general, one can not expect the body to prefer just one specific rotation as in the case of clamped boundary conditions. It turns out that the concept of optimal rotations introduced by Maor and Mora in [14] is exactly the one needed. The set \mathcal{R} of such rotations is a submanifold of $\text{SO}(3)$ that in our framework enjoys some additional properties which follow by the two-dimensional nature of the problem.

Secondly, we investigate how the stability conditions defined in [12] can be extended and how they relate to the rotational degree of freedom that the plate enjoys. We prove that one of the following alternatives holds (see [Theorem 2.2](#) for a precise statement):

- either the load is strong enough to have a nontrivial minimizer of the Kirchhoff model (failure of the stability condition [\(S1\)](#)),
- or the load is strong enough to have a nontrivial minimizer of the constrained Von Kármán model (failure of the stability condition [\(S2\)](#)),
- or the Von Kármán model is valid.

This result is similar in spirit to [12, Theorem 4]. Moreover, we show that the stability condition [\(S1\)](#) implies condition [\(S2\)](#) as soon as the intensity of the load decreases (see [Theorem 2.3](#)).

Compared to the analysis in [12], we observe a new phenomenon, which is one of the main novelties of this work: if for some optimal rotation R we have $R^T f \cdot e_3 \neq 0$, then the stability condition [\(S1\)](#) must fail and both the Von Kármán model and its constrained version do not

apply. More precisely, whenever $R^T f \cdot e_3 \neq 0$, every sequence of quasi-minimizers, whose total energy scales like h^4 , has unbounded elastic energy in both the Von Kármán and the constrained Von Kármán regimes. Note that e_3 has a privileged role since it is the direction along which the plate is thin. The precise statement is given in [Theorem 2.1](#). One can interpret this result in the following way: it is possible to have a nontrivial minimizer of the Kirchhoff model either increasing the load (as already shown by Lecumberry and Müller in [\[12\]](#)) or applying a force whose direction leads to an optimal rotation R of the plate such that $R^T f \cdot e_3 \neq 0$.

Lastly, in a similar fashion to [\[12, Theorem 27\]](#), we prove that if [\(S2\)](#) holds and $R^T f \cdot e_3 = 0$ for every optimal rotation, the total Von Kármán energy attains its infimum. Conversely, if [\(S2\)](#) fails, the Von Kármán total energy is unbounded as soon as the load undergoes a slight increase (i.e., f is the critical load). These results are proved in [Theorem 2.4](#).

The paper is organized as follows. In [Section 2](#) we introduce the notation and state the main results, while in [Section 3](#) we recall, for the convenience of the reader, the Γ -convergence results of [\[8\]](#). In [Section 4](#) we prove [Theorem 2.1–2.3](#), while [Theorem 2.4](#) is proved in [Section 5](#). Lastly, the properties of the set of optimal rotations are studied in [Appendix A](#).

2 Notations and main results

2.1 Notations and functional setting

We denote by $W: \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$ the elastic energy density. We assume W to be Borel measurable and to satisfy the following standard hypotheses:

$$(W1) \quad W(F) = 0 \iff F \in \text{SO}(3),$$

$$(W2) \quad W \text{ is } C^2 \text{ in a neighborhood of } \text{SO}(3),$$

$$(W3) \quad W \text{ is frame indifferent, i.e., } W(RF) = W(F) \text{ for every } R \in \text{SO}(3) \text{ and for every } F \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3},$$

$$(W4) \quad W(F) \geq C \text{ dist}^2(F, \text{SO}(3)) \text{ for every } F \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}, \text{ for some } C > 0.$$

We will denote by $Q: \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the quadratic form $D^2W(\text{Id})$ and by $\bar{Q}: \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the reduced quadratic form

$$\bar{Q}(F) = \min_{a \in \mathbb{R}^3} Q(F + a \otimes e_3 + e_3 \otimes a).$$

By [\(W4\)](#) both Q and \bar{Q} are coercive over the set of symmetric matrices.

We consider a thin plate $\Omega_h = S \times (-\frac{h}{2}, \frac{h}{2}) = S \times hI$ where $S \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is an open, simply connected and bounded set and $I = (-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$. In terms of regularity of ∂S , we assume the following condition:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{there is a closed subset } \Sigma \subset \partial S \text{ with } \mathcal{H}^1(\Sigma) = 0 \text{ such that} \\ & \text{the outer unit normal } \vec{n} \text{ to } S \text{ exists and is continuous on } \partial S \setminus \Sigma. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

This property is called *condition (*)* in [\[9\]](#). We write Ω for the rescaled plate, that is, $\Omega = \Omega_1$. The symbol $\nabla_h y$ denotes the rescaled gradient of y and it is defined as follows:

$$(\nabla_h y)_{ij} = \begin{cases} \partial_j y_i & \text{if } j \neq 3, \\ \frac{1}{h} \partial_3 y_i & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The elastic energy is written in terms of Ω via a change of variable and then rescaled by the unit volume h , i.e.,

$$E_h(y) = \int_{\Omega} W(\nabla_h y) dx \quad \text{for } y \in W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3).$$

Given a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ we will write A' to denote the 2×2 submatrix obtained by removing the third row and column. Similarly, we will often write x' in place of (x_1, x_2) and ∇' instead of ∇_{x_1, x_2} . Whenever we will sum or multiply matrices and vectors with different dimensions we will imply that the smaller one is naturally embedded in the bigger space by adding zeros in the missing entries. For example, if $F \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ and $G \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ the expression $F + G$ means $\iota(F) + G$ where

$$\iota : \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}, \quad F \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} F & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We will assume the applied forces to be of the form

$$f_h = h^2 f, \tag{2}$$

with $f \in L^2(S; \mathbb{R}^3)$, f not identically equal to 0.

Following [14], we introduce the set \mathcal{R} of optimal rotations, defined as

$$\mathcal{R} = \operatorname{argmax}_{R \in \text{SO}(3)} F(R),$$

where

$$F(A) = \int_S f \cdot A \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx'.$$

The set \mathcal{R} is a closed, connected, boundaryless and totally geodesic submanifold of $\text{SO}(3)$ [14, Proposition 4.1]. We refer to [Appendix A](#) for further properties of \mathcal{R} .

The total energy for a deformation $y \in W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$ can be written as

$$J_h(y) = E_h(y) - \int_{\Omega} f_h \cdot y \, dx = E_h(y) - h^2 \int_{\Omega} f \cdot y \, dx.$$

We suppose that

$$\int_S f \, dx' = 0 \tag{3}$$

to avoid the trivial case in which the total energy has no lower bound. For a pair $(u, v) \in W^{1,2}(S; \mathbb{R}^2) \times W^{2,2}(S)$ we define the Von Kármán energy

$$E^{\text{VK}}(u, v) = \frac{1}{8} \int_S \bar{Q}(\nabla u^T + \nabla u + \nabla v \otimes \nabla v) \, dx' + \frac{1}{24} \int_S \bar{Q}(\nabla^2 v) \, dx'.$$

We will often consider E^{VK} restricted to the set of geometrically linearized isometries, namely

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{iso}}^{\text{lin}} = \{(u, v) \in W^{1,2}(S; \mathbb{R}^2) \times W^{2,2}(S) : \nabla u^T + \nabla u + \nabla v \otimes \nabla v = 0 \text{ a.e. in } S\}.$$

On this set E^{VK} only depends on v and we have

$$E^{\text{VK}}(u, v) = \frac{1}{24} \int_S \bar{Q}(\nabla^2 v) \, dx' \quad \forall (u, v) \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{iso}}^{\text{lin}}.$$

We define the set of isometric embeddings of S as

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{iso}} = \{y \in W^{2,2}(S; \mathbb{R}^3) : \nabla y^T \nabla y = \text{Id} \text{ a.e. in } S\}.$$

For $y \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{iso}}$ we introduce the Kirchhoff energy,

$$E^{\text{K}}(y) = \frac{1}{24} \int_S \bar{Q}(\nabla y^T \nabla y) \, dx',$$

where $\nu = \partial_1 y \wedge \partial_2 y$. Finally, we define the total energy in the Von Kármán and Kirchhoff regimes, respectively, as

$$\begin{aligned} J^{\text{VK}}(u, v, R, W) &= E^{\text{VK}}(u, v) - \int_S f \cdot R \begin{pmatrix} u \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx' - \int_S f \cdot RW \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v \end{pmatrix} dx' \\ &\quad - \int_S f \cdot RW^2 \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx', \\ J^{\text{K}}(y) &= E^{\text{K}}(y) - \int_S f \cdot y dx'. \end{aligned}$$

The first functional is defined for every $(u, v) \in W^{1,2}(S; \mathbb{R}^2) \times W^{2,2}(S)$, $R \in \mathcal{R}$ and $W \in \mathcal{NR}_R$ (see (32) in Appendix A for the definition of \mathcal{NR}_R). A quadruplet (u, v, R, W) as above will be called admissible. The Kirchhoff functional is defined for every $y \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{iso}}$.

2.2 Main results

Similarly to the Dirichlet case treated in [12], an exclusion principle involving the stability of J^{VK} and J^{K} can be used to study the limit of minimizing sequences in the Von Kármán regime. In our setting, these stability conditions read as follows:

- (S1) $J^{\text{K}}(y) \geq 0$ for every $y \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{iso}}$ and, if $J^{\text{K}}(y) = 0$, then $y = \hat{R} \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ for some $\hat{R} \in \text{SO}(3)$,
- (S2) $J^{\text{VK}}(u, v, R, W) \geq 0$ for every admissible quadruplet (u, v, R, W) with $(u, v) \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{iso}}^{\text{lin}}$ and, if $J^{\text{VK}}(u, v, R, W) = 0$ for some $(u, v) \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{iso}}^{\text{lin}}$, then v is affine.

Conditions (S1)–(S2) have to be interpreted as follows: whenever a deformation minimizes the (nonnegative) total energy then it must be a deformation with zero elastic energy. The first result we will prove is the following.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $(y_h) \subset W^{1,2}(S; \mathbb{R}^3)$ be a quasi-minimizing sequence for $\frac{1}{h^4} J_h$, namely*

$$\limsup_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h^4} \left(J_h(y_h) - \inf_y J_h(y) \right) = 0.$$

If $R^T f \cdot e_3 \neq 0$ for some $R \in \mathcal{R}$, then the stability condition (S1) must fail and

$$0 < \liminf_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h^2} E_h(y_h) \leq \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h^2} E_h(y_h) < +\infty.$$

In particular, up to a subsequence, we have $y_h \rightarrow \bar{y}$ in $W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$ with $\bar{y} \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{iso}}$ and $\bar{y} \neq R \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ for every $R \in \text{SO}(3)$. Moreover, \bar{y} minimizes J^{K} .

Theorem 2.1 shows that in the purely Neumann case, some forces are incompatible with the Von Kármán regime.

Next, we state the stability alternative analog to [12, Theorem 4].

Theorem 2.2. *Let $(y_h) \subset W^{1,2}(S; \mathbb{R}^3)$ be a sequence as in Theorem 2.1. Suppose that conditions (S1)–(S2) hold true. Then $\limsup_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h^4} E_h(y_h) \leq C$ and there are sequences $(R_h) \subset \text{SO}(3)$ and $(c_h) \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ such that, setting \tilde{y}_h as $\tilde{y}_h = R_h^T y_h + c_h$, we have the following convergences (up to a subsequence):*

- (a) $u_h = \frac{1}{h^2} \int_I (\tilde{y}'_h - x') dx_3 \rightarrow \bar{u}$ in $W^{1,2}(S; \mathbb{R}^2)$,
- (b) $v_h = \frac{1}{h} \int_I \tilde{y}_{h,3} dx_3 \rightarrow \bar{v}$ in $W^{1,2}(S)$ with $\bar{v} \in W^{2,2}(S)$,
- (c) $R_h \rightarrow \bar{R} \in \mathcal{R}$,
- (d) $\frac{1}{h}(P(R_h) - R_h) \rightarrow \bar{R}\bar{W}$ with $\bar{W} \in N\mathcal{R}_R$,

where $P : \text{SO}(3) \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ is the projection onto \mathcal{R} . Finally, the quadruplet $(\bar{u}, \bar{v}, \bar{R}, \bar{W})$ minimizes J^{VK} .

Similarly to [12, Theorem 6] we can show that (S1) and (S2) are in a relationship, with the former being essentially stronger than the latter.

Theorem 2.3. *Suppose that (S1) holds. Then $J^{\text{VK}}(u, v, R, W) \geq 0$ for every admissible quadruplet with $(u, v) \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{iso}}^{\text{lin}}$. Moreover, (S2) holds for the functional*

$$J_\varepsilon^{\text{VK}}(u, v, R, W) = E^{\text{VK}}(u, v) - (1 - \varepsilon) \int_S f \cdot R \begin{pmatrix} u \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx' \\ - (1 - \varepsilon) \int_S f \cdot RW \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v \end{pmatrix} dx' - (1 - \varepsilon) \int_S f \cdot RW^2 \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx'$$

for every $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$.

The stability conditions are deeply linked to the attainment of the infimum of J^{VK} . Indeed, we will prove the following.

Theorem 2.4. *Suppose that the stability condition (S2) holds true, $R^T f \cdot e_3 = 0$ for every $R \in \mathcal{R}$, and $\dim \mathcal{R} = 1$. Then J^{VK} attains its minimum over all admissible quadruplets (u, v, R, W) . Instead, if (S2) fails, then for every $\varepsilon > 0$ the infimum of the functional*

$$J_\varepsilon^{\text{VK}}(u, v, R, W) = E^{\text{VK}}(u, v) - (1 + \varepsilon) \int_S f \cdot R \begin{pmatrix} u \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx' \\ - (1 + \varepsilon) \int_S f \cdot RW \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v \end{pmatrix} dx' - (1 + \varepsilon) \int_S f \cdot RW^2 \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx'$$

is $-\infty$.

Remark 2.5. In Lemma A.2 it is proved that the dimension of \mathcal{R} is either zero or one. Theorem 2.4 holds also in the case $\dim \mathcal{R} = 0$. However, if \mathcal{R} is a singleton, our setting reduces to the one in [12]. For this reason, we will only give a sketch of the proof for the case $\dim \mathcal{R} = 0$ (see Remark 5.6).

To prove this result a careful analysis of the invariance of J^{VK} along affine perturbations will be needed.

3 Γ -convergence of the elastic energy

The Γ -convergence of $\frac{1}{h^\alpha} E_h$ when $2 \leq \alpha \leq 4$ is due to Friesecke, James, and Müller in a series of works [7, 8]. For the convenience of the reader, we will state here their main results. All the proofs can be found in the aforementioned papers. The key ingredient is the well-known rigidity estimate proved by the same authors in [7].

Theorem 3.1 (Rigidity estimate). *Let $(y_h) \subset W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$ and define*

$$D_h = \|\text{dist}(\nabla_h y_h, \text{SO}(3))\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

There are two maps $R_h \in L^\infty(S; \text{SO}(3))$ and $\tilde{R}_h \in W^{1,2}(S; \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}) \cap L^\infty(S; \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3})$ such that

$$(R1) \quad \|\nabla_h y_h - R_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq CD_h,$$

$$(R2) \quad \|\nabla \tilde{R}_h\|_{L^2(S)} \leq Ch^{-1}D_h,$$

$$(R3) \quad \|\tilde{R}_h - R_h\|_{L^2(S)} \leq CD_h,$$

$$(R4) \quad \|\tilde{R}_h - R_h\|_{L^\infty(S)} \leq Ch^{-1}D_h.$$

Moreover, there exist constant rotations $Q_h \in \text{SO}(3)$ such that

$$\|R_h - Q_h\|_{L^2(S)} \leq Ch^{-1}D_h.$$

Finally, if $h^{-1}D_h \rightarrow 0$, then for $h \ll 1$ one can take $\tilde{R}_h = R_h$.

First, we recall the compactness properties of sequences with bounded rescaled energy. We split the results into two cases, one for the Kirchhoff regime and one for the (constrained) Von Kármán regime.

Proposition 3.2 (Compactness in the Kirchhoff regime). *Let $(y_h) \subset W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$ be a sequence such that $\frac{1}{h^2} E_h(y_h) \leq C$. Then there is $y \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{iso}}$ such that, up to a subsequence, $y_h \rightarrow y$ in $W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$ and*

$$\nabla_h y_h \rightarrow (\nabla y, \nu) \quad \text{in } L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}),$$

where $\nu = \partial_1 y \wedge \partial_2 y$.

Proposition 3.3 (Compactness in the Von Kármán regime). *Let $(y_h) \subset W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$ be a sequence of deformations and let $(D_h) \subset \mathbb{R}^+$ be a sequence such that:*

$$(i) \quad \frac{D_h}{h^2} \rightarrow 0,$$

$$(ii) \quad \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{D_h} E_h(y_h) \leq C.$$

Then there are constant rotations $R_h \in \text{SO}(3)$ and constant vectors $c_h \in \mathbb{R}^3$ such that, setting

$$\tilde{y}_h = R_h^T y_h + c_h,$$

we have

$$(a) \quad u_h \rightharpoonup u \text{ in } W^{1,2}(S; \mathbb{R}^2),$$

$$(b) \quad v_h \rightarrow v \text{ in } W^{1,2}(S) \text{ with } v \in W^{2,2}(S),$$

where

$$u_h : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2 \quad x' \mapsto \min \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{D_h}}, \frac{h^2}{D_h} \right\} \int_I (\tilde{y}'_h - x') dx_3, \quad (4)$$

$$v_h : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \quad x' \mapsto \frac{h}{\sqrt{D_h}} \int_I \tilde{y}_{h,3} dx_3. \quad (5)$$

Lastly, if $\frac{D_h}{h^4} \rightarrow +\infty$, then $(u, v) \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{iso}}^{\text{lin}}$.

To conclude, we recall the Γ -convergence results.

Theorem 3.4 (Γ -convergence for the Kirchhoff regime). *We have the following.*

(i) For any sequence $(y_h) \subset W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$ such that $y_h \rightarrow y$ in $W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$ for some $y \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{iso}}$ it holds

$$\liminf_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h^2} E_h(y_h) \geq E^K(y).$$

(ii) For any $y \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{iso}}$ there exists a sequence $(y_h) \subset W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$ such that $y_h \rightarrow y$ in $W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$,

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h^2} E_h(y_h) = E^K(y),$$

and $\nabla_h y_h \rightarrow (\nabla y, \nu)$ in $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3})$.

Theorem 3.5 (Γ -convergence for the Von Kármán regime). *Let $(D_h) \subset \mathbb{R}^+$ be a sequence such that $\frac{D_h}{h^2} \rightarrow 0$ and $D_h \geq Ch^4$ for $h \ll 1$. We have the following results.*

(i) For any sequence $(y_h) \subset W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$ such that

$$(a) \quad u_h \rightharpoonup u \text{ in } W^{1,2}(S; \mathbb{R}^2),$$

$$(b) \quad v_h \rightarrow v \text{ in } W^{1,2}(S) \text{ with } v \in W^{2,2}(S),$$

where u_h, v_h are defined as in (4)–(5) with y_h in place of \tilde{y}_h we have

$$\liminf_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{D_h} E_h(y_h) \geq E^{\text{VK}}(u, v).$$

(ii) Assume that $\frac{D_h}{h^4} \rightarrow +\infty$. Then for any $(u, v) \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{iso}}^{\text{lin}}$ there exists a sequence $(y_h) \subset W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$ such that

$$(a) \quad u_h \rightharpoonup u \text{ in } W^{1,2}(S; \mathbb{R}^2),$$

$$(b) \quad v_h \rightarrow v \text{ in } W^{1,2}(S) \text{ with } v \in W^{2,2}(S),$$

and

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{D_h} E_h(y_h) = E^{\text{VK}}(u, v),$$

where u_h and v_h are defined as in (4)–(5) with y_h in place of \tilde{y} .

(iii) Assume that $\frac{D_h}{h^4} \rightarrow 1$. Then for any $(u, v) \in W^{1,2}(S; \mathbb{R}^2) \times W^{2,2}(S)$ there exists a sequence $(y_h) \subset W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$ such that

$$(a) \quad u_h \rightharpoonup u \text{ in } W^{1,2}(S; \mathbb{R}^2),$$

(b) $v_h \rightarrow v$ in $W^{1,2}(S)$ with $v \in W^{2,2}(S)$,

and

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{D_h} E_h(y_h) = E^{\text{VK}}(u, v),$$

where u_h and v_h are defined as in (4)–(5) with y_h in place of \tilde{y} .

4 Stability alternative

In this section $(y_h) \subset W^{1,2}(S; \mathbb{R}^3)$ will denote a quasi-minimizing sequence for J_h in the Von Kármán regime, i.e.,

$$\limsup_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h^4} \left(J_h(y_h) - \inf_y J_h(y) \right) = 0.$$

This implies that for any sequence $(\hat{y}_h) \subset W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$ we have

$$J_h(y_h) - J_h(\hat{y}_h) = \inf_y J_h(y) - J_h(\hat{y}_h) + o(h^4) = o(h^4). \quad (6)$$

We will denote by $(D_h) \subset \mathbb{R}^+$ an infinitesimal sequence.

Proposition 4.1. *Suppose that $E_h(y_h) \leq CD_h$ and $\frac{D_h}{h^2} \rightarrow 0$. Let $(R_h) \subset \text{SO}(3)$ be the sequence provided by [Proposition 3.3](#). Then, up to a subsequence, $R_h \rightarrow \bar{R} \in \mathcal{R}$.*

Proof. Up to a subsequence, $R_h \rightarrow \bar{R}$ for some $\bar{R} \in \text{SO}(3)$. To prove that $\bar{R} \in \mathcal{R}$ pick a rotation $R \in \text{SO}(3)$ and consider the test deformation

$$\hat{y}_h(x', x_3) = R \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ hx_3 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (7)$$

The elastic energy of \hat{y}_h is zero, so using the notation of [Proposition 3.3](#) we have

$$\begin{aligned} J_h(y_h) - J_h(\hat{y}_h) &\geq \int_{\Omega} f_h \cdot \hat{y}_h \, dx - \int_{\Omega} f_h \cdot y_h \, dx \\ &= -h^2 \int_S f \cdot R_h \left(\max \left\{ \sqrt{D_h}, \frac{D_h}{h^2} \right\} u_h \right) \, dx' \\ &\quad + h^2 \int_S f \cdot (R - R_h) \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \, dx'. \end{aligned}$$

Dividing everything by h^2 and passing to the limit we deduce by (6) and [Proposition 3.3](#)

$$0 \geq \int_S f \cdot (R - \bar{R}) \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \, dx',$$

which gives $\bar{R} \in \mathcal{R}$. ■

We will need the following lemmas.

Lemma 4.2. *Let*

$$\mathcal{A}_{\det} = \{v \in W^{2,2}(S) : \det(\nabla^2 v) = 0 \text{ a.e. in } S\}. \quad (8)$$

Then $\text{span } \mathcal{A}_{\det}$ is dense in $L^2(S)$.

This result follows from the well-known universal approximation theorem of single-layer neural networks. For the convenience of the reader, we will recall here the main ideas needed in our setting. We borrow the notation from [4], but a similar result can also be found in [3].

Proof of Lemma 4.2. Step 1. Let $\sigma(x) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-x}}$. We will show that σ is discriminatory, i.e., the only signed bounded regular Borel measure μ on \bar{S} such that

$$\int_{\bar{S}} \sigma(y^T x + \theta) d\mu(x) = 0 \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^2, \forall \theta \in \mathbb{R} \quad (9)$$

is $\mu = 0$.

Let μ be such that (9) holds. We argue as in [4, Lemma 1]. Let $y \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $\lambda, \theta, k \in \mathbb{R}$, and define

$$\sigma_\lambda(x) = \sigma(\lambda(y^T x + \theta) + k).$$

Let

$$\phi(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } y^T x + \theta > 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } y^T x + \theta < 0, \\ \sigma(k) & \text{if } y^T x + \theta = 0. \end{cases}$$

Clearly, $\sigma_\lambda \rightarrow \phi$ pointwise as $\lambda \rightarrow +\infty$. Moreover, $\|\sigma_\lambda\|_{C^0} \leq 1$ uniformly. Hence, by (9) and dominated convergence

$$0 = \int_{\bar{S}} \sigma_\lambda d\mu \rightarrow \int_{\bar{S}} \phi d\mu = \sigma(k)\mu(\Pi_{y,\theta}) + \mu(H_{y,\theta}) \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^2 \forall \theta, k \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (10)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{y,\theta} &= \{x \in S : y^T x + \theta = 0\}, \\ H_{y,\theta} &= \{x \in S : y^T x + \theta > 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Passing to the limit as $k \rightarrow +\infty$ in (10), we deduce that

$$\mu(\Pi_{y,\theta}) + \mu(H_{y,\theta}) = 0 \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^2 \forall \theta \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Similarly, letting $k \rightarrow -\infty$ we get

$$\mu(H_{y,\theta}) = 0 \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^2 \forall \theta \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Fix $y \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and define

$$F_y(h) = \int_{\bar{S}} h(y^T x) d\mu(x),$$

for every bounded Borel function $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Let $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$. Then,

$$F_y(\chi_{[-\theta, +\infty)}) = \mu(\Pi_{y,\theta}) + \mu(H_{y,\theta}) = 0,$$

where $\chi_{[-\theta, +\infty)}$ is the indicator function of $[-\theta, +\infty)$. Similarly, $F_y(\chi_{(-\theta, +\infty)}) = 0$. By the linearity of F_y , we deduce that F_y is zero on the indicator function of every interval. By approximation, $F_y(h) = 0$ for every continuous and bounded function $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and for every $y \in \mathbb{R}^2$. In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mu}(\xi) &= \int_{\bar{S}} e^{-i\xi^T x} d\mu(x) = \int_{\bar{S}} (\cos(\xi^T x) + i \sin(\xi^T x)) d\mu(x) \\ &= F_\xi(\cos(x)) + iF_\xi(\sin(x)) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{\mu}$ is the Fourier transform of μ . Since $\hat{\mu} = 0$, it follows that $\mu = 0$.

Step 2. Let

$$\Sigma = \{x \mapsto \sigma(y^T x + \theta) : \theta \in \mathbb{R}, y \in \mathbb{R}^2\}.$$

We show that $\text{span } \Sigma$ is dense in $C^0(\bar{S})$ with respect to the C^0 norm. Suppose by contradiction that $R = \overline{\text{span } \Sigma} \subsetneq C^0(\bar{S})$. Then, by the Hahn-Banach Theorem, there is $L \in (C^0(\bar{S}))^*$ such that $L \neq 0$ and $L(R) = 0$. By the Riesz Representation Theorem, there is a signed bounded regular Borel measure $\mu \neq 0$ on \bar{S} such that

$$L(h) = \int_{\bar{S}} h d\mu \quad \forall h \in C^0(\bar{S}).$$

Since σ is discriminatory by Step 1, we have the desired contradiction.

Step 3. To conclude it is sufficient to show that $\Sigma \subset \mathcal{A}_{\text{det}}$. Let $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^2$. We have

$$\nabla_x^2 \sigma(y^T x + \theta) = \sigma''(y^T x + \theta) \begin{pmatrix} y_1^2 & y_1 y_2 \\ y_1 y_2 & y_2^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus, $\det(\nabla_x^2 \sigma(y^T x + \theta)) = 0$, concluding the proof. \blacksquare

Lemma 4.3. *Let $v \in W^{2,\infty}(S) \cap \mathcal{A}_{\text{det}}$. Then there is $u \in W^{2,\infty}(S; \mathbb{R}^2)$ such that the map*

$$y(x') = \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} u(x') \\ v(x') \end{pmatrix}$$

is an isometric embedding, i.e., $\nabla y^T \nabla y = \text{Id}$ almost everywhere. Moreover, if $\|\nabla v\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{2}$, we have

$$\|u\|_{W^{2,\infty}} \leq C(\|\nabla^2 v\|_\infty \|\nabla v\|_\infty + \|\nabla v\|_\infty^2). \quad (11)$$

Proof. The existence of $u \in W^{2,2}(S; \mathbb{R}^2)$ such that y is an isometric embedding is proved in [8, Theorem 7]. We are left to show that $u \in W^{2,\infty}(S; \mathbb{R}^2)$ and (11) holds. In order to do so, we need to analyze the construction of u . We borrow the notation from [8, Theorem 7]. Let

$$F = \sqrt{\text{Id} - \nabla v \otimes \nabla v},$$

and

$$h_F = \frac{1}{\det(F)} F^T \text{curl}(F).$$

Then, u is defined as $u(x') = \phi(x') - x'$, where $\phi \in W^{2,2}(S; \mathbb{R}^2)$ is such that $\nabla \phi = e^{i\theta} F$ and $\theta \in W^{1,1}(S)$ has zero mean and satisfies $\nabla \theta = h_F$. Here, $e^{i\theta}$ stands for the rotation matrix of angle θ :

$$e^{i\theta} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & -\sin \theta \\ \sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that

$$\det(F) = \sqrt{\det(\text{Id} - \nabla v \otimes \nabla v)} = \sqrt{1 - |\nabla v|^2} \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

It is well-known that the matrix square root is differentiable and Lipschitz on the set of matrices whose determinant is positive and bounded away from 0. Thus, $F \in W^{1,\infty}(S; \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2})$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \|F\|_\infty &\leq C, \\ \|\nabla F\|_\infty &\leq C \|\nabla^2 v\|_\infty \|\nabla v\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $h_F \in L^\infty(S; \mathbb{R}^2)$ and $\|\nabla\theta\|_\infty = \|h_F\|_\infty \leq C\|\nabla^2v\|_\infty\|\nabla v\|_\infty$. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla^2u\|_\infty &= \|\nabla^2\phi\|_\infty \leq C(\|\nabla\theta\|_\infty\|F\|_\infty + \|\nabla F\|_\infty) \leq C\|\nabla^2v\|_\infty\|\nabla v\|_\infty, \\ \|\nabla u\|_\infty &= \|\nabla\phi - \text{Id}\|_\infty \leq C\|F - \text{Id}\|_\infty + \|e^{i\theta} - \text{Id}\|_\infty \\ &\leq C\|F - \text{Id}\|_\infty + \|\theta\|_\infty \leq C(\|\nabla v\|_\infty^2 + \|\nabla\theta\|_\infty) \\ &\leq C(\|\nabla^2v\|_\infty\|\nabla v\|_\infty + \|\nabla v\|_\infty^2),\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the Poincaré-Wirtinger inequality on the term $\|\theta\|_\infty$ and a Taylor expansion of the matrix square root to treat the term $F - \text{Id}$ (recall that the matrix square root has bounded derivative). Since u is defined up to translation, we conclude by applying the Poincaré-Wirtinger inequality. \blacksquare

We now show that some forces are incompatible with the Von Kármán regime and with its constrained version. This behavior is consistent with the usual assumption on the scaling of the normal component of the forces, see [8]. Indeed, the standard assumption $f_h \cdot e_3 = O(h^3)$ in our setting translates to $f \cdot e_3 = 0$ (see (2)).

Theorem 4.4. *Suppose that $\limsup_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{D_h} E_h(y_h) \leq C$ with $\frac{D_h}{h^2} \rightarrow 0$. Then $R^T f \cdot e_3 = 0$ for every $R \in \mathcal{R}$.*

Proof. We start by considering the case where $D_h h^{-4} \rightarrow 0$. Take $R \in \mathcal{R}$ and $v \in C^\infty(\bar{S})$. Consider the test deformation

$$\hat{y}_h(x', x_3) = R \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ hx_3 \end{pmatrix} + R \begin{pmatrix} -h^2 x_3 \nabla v^T \\ hv \end{pmatrix}. \quad (12)$$

We have

$$\nabla_h \hat{y}_h = R \left(\text{Id} + \begin{pmatrix} -h^2 x_3 \nabla^2 v & -h \nabla v^T \\ h \nabla v & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right).$$

Hence,

$$\nabla_h \hat{y}_h^T \nabla_h \hat{y}_h = \text{Id} - 2h^2 x_3 \begin{pmatrix} \nabla^2 v & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} - h^2 \nabla v \otimes \nabla v + O(h^3).$$

Expanding the square root around the identity we get

$$\sqrt{\nabla_h \hat{y}_h^T \nabla_h \hat{y}_h} = \text{Id} - h^2 x_3 \begin{pmatrix} \nabla^2 v & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} - \frac{h^2}{2} \nabla v \otimes \nabla v + O(h^3).$$

Finally, since by frame-indifference $W(\nabla_h \hat{y}_h) = W\left(\sqrt{\nabla_h \hat{y}_h^T \nabla_h \hat{y}_h}\right)$, expanding the energy W we have

$$W(\nabla_h \hat{y}_h) = \frac{1}{2} h^4 Q \left(x_3 \begin{pmatrix} \nabla^2 v & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \frac{1}{2} \nabla v \otimes \nabla v \right) + o(h^4).$$

In particular, we have proved that $E_h(\hat{y}_h) = O(h^4)$. By comparing the quasi-minimizing sequence

with the test deformations and using that $R \in \mathcal{R}$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}
J_h(y_h) - J_h(\hat{y}_h) &\geq O(h^4) + \int_{\Omega} f_h \cdot \hat{y}_h \, dx - \int_{\Omega} f_h \cdot y_h \, dx \\
&= O(h^4) - \int_S f_h \cdot R_h \left(\frac{\sqrt{D_h} u_h}{h^{-1} \sqrt{D_h} v_h} \right) \, dx' \\
&\quad + \int_S f_h \cdot (R - R_h) \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \, dx' + \int_S f_h \cdot R \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ hv \end{pmatrix} \, dx' \\
&\geq O(h^4) + h^3 \int_S f \cdot R \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v \end{pmatrix} \, dx' \\
&\quad - h \sqrt{D_h} \int_S f \cdot R_h \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v_h \end{pmatrix} \, dx',
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where v_h, u_h, R_h are the ones given by [Proposition 3.3](#). Dividing by h^3 and passing to the limit we deduce by [\(6\)](#) that

$$0 \geq \int_S f \cdot R \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v \end{pmatrix} \, dx' \quad \forall R \in \mathcal{R}, \forall v \in C^\infty(\bar{S}),$$

and by density

$$0 \geq \int_S f \cdot R \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v \end{pmatrix} \, dx' \quad \forall R \in \mathcal{R}, \forall v \in L^2(S).$$

Since the map

$$v \in L^2(S) \mapsto \int_S R^T f \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v \end{pmatrix} \, dx'$$

is linear it must be identically zero, that is, $R^T f \cdot e_3 = 0$ for any $R \in \mathcal{R}$.

We move now to the case where $D_h h^{-4} \rightarrow D > 0$. Let $R \in \mathcal{R}$ and $v \in C^\infty(\bar{S})$ and consider again the test deformation \hat{y}_h as in [\(12\)](#). Arguing as in [\(13\)](#), we deduce that

$$J_h(y_h) - J_h(\hat{y}_h) \geq h^3 \int_S f \cdot R \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v \end{pmatrix} \, dx' - h \sqrt{D_h} \int_S f \cdot R_h \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v_h \end{pmatrix} \, dx' + O(h^4),$$

where v_h, u_h, R_h are the ones given by [Proposition 3.3](#). Let \bar{v} be the limit of v_h and \bar{R} the limit of R_h . Dividing by h^3 and passing to the limit we deduce by [\(6\)](#) that

$$0 \geq \int_S f \cdot R \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v \end{pmatrix} \, dx' - \sqrt{D} \int_S f \cdot \bar{R} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \bar{v} \end{pmatrix} \, dx' \quad \forall R \in \mathcal{R}, \forall v \in C^\infty(\bar{S}),$$

and by density

$$0 \geq \int_S f \cdot R \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v \end{pmatrix} \, dx' - \sqrt{D} \int_S f \cdot \bar{R} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \bar{v} \end{pmatrix} \, dx' \quad \forall R \in \mathcal{R}, \forall v \in L^2(S). \tag{14}$$

By [Proposition 4.1](#) we have $\bar{R} \in \mathcal{R}$, thus we can choose $R = \bar{R}$ and $v = \sqrt{D} \bar{v} + \eta$ for some $\eta \in L^2(S)$ to deduce that

$$0 \geq \int_S f \cdot \bar{R} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \eta \end{pmatrix} \, dx' \quad \forall \eta \in L^2(S).$$

Reasoning as in the previous case, we conclude that $\bar{R}^T f \cdot e_3 = 0$. Thus, [\(14\)](#) becomes

$$0 \geq \int_S f \cdot R \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v \end{pmatrix} \, dx' \quad \forall R \in \mathcal{R}, \forall v \in L^2(S),$$

that gives the desired conclusion.

Finally, we discuss the case $D_h h^{-4} \rightarrow +\infty$. Consider $v \in C^\infty(\bar{S})$ such that $\det(\nabla^2 v) = 0$ in S . By [Lemma 4.3](#) we can construct $\tilde{u}_h \in W^{2,\infty}(\bar{S}; \mathbb{R}^2)$ such that

$$\tilde{y}_h(x') = \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} h^{-2} D_h \tilde{u}_h \\ h^{-1} \sqrt{D_h} v \end{pmatrix}$$

is an isometric embedding and [\(11\)](#) holds with \tilde{u}_h in place of u . Then, pick $R \in \mathcal{R}$ and define

$$\hat{y}_h = R \tilde{y}_h + h x_3 R \nu_h, \quad (15)$$

where $\nu_h = \partial_1 \tilde{y}_h \wedge \partial_2 \tilde{y}_h$. Setting

$$\hat{R}_h = (\nabla \tilde{y}_h \quad \nu_h),$$

we have

$$\nabla_h \hat{y}_h = R \hat{R}_h (\text{Id} + h x_3 \hat{R}_h^T \nabla \nu_h).$$

It is easily found that

$$\nabla \nu_h = -h^{-1} \sqrt{D_h} \nabla^2 v + O(h^{-2} D_h),$$

thus

$$\nabla_h \hat{y}_h = R \hat{R}_h \left(\text{Id} + \sqrt{D_h} x_3 \hat{R}_h^T \nabla^2 v + O(h^{-1} D_h) \right).$$

Expanding W near the identity, one gets by frame-indifference that $E_h(\hat{y}_h) = O(D_h)$. Comparing the test deformation \hat{y}_h with the minimizing sequence, using that $R \in \mathcal{R}$, and that [\(11\)](#) holds true, we get

$$\begin{aligned} J_h(y_h) - J_h(\hat{y}_h) &\geq \int_{\Omega} f_h \cdot \hat{y}_h \, dx - \int_{\Omega} f_h \cdot y_h \, dx + O(D_h) \\ &= - \int_S f_h \cdot R_h \begin{pmatrix} h^{-2} D_h u_h \\ h^{-1} \sqrt{D_h} v_h \end{pmatrix} \, dx' + \int_S f_h \cdot (R - R_h) \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \, dx' \\ &\quad + \int_S f_h \cdot R \begin{pmatrix} h^{-2} D_h \tilde{u}_h \\ h^{-1} \sqrt{D_h} v \end{pmatrix} \, dx' + O(D_h) \\ &\geq h \sqrt{D_h} \int_S f \cdot R \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v \end{pmatrix} \, dx' - h \sqrt{D_h} \int_S f \cdot R_h \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v_h \end{pmatrix} \, dx' \\ &\quad + O(D_h), \end{aligned}$$

where v_h, u_h, R_h are the ones given by [Proposition 3.3](#). Let \bar{v} and \bar{R} be the limits of v_h and R_h , respectively. Dividing by $h \sqrt{D_h}$ and passing to the limit we obtain that for every $R \in \mathcal{R}$ and for every $v \in C^\infty(\bar{S})$ such that $\det(\nabla^2 v) = 0$ we have

$$0 \geq \int_S f \cdot R \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v \end{pmatrix} \, dx' - \int_S f \cdot \bar{R} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \bar{v} \end{pmatrix} \, dx'. \quad (16)$$

Since S satisfies condition [\(1\)](#), the density result given by [\[9, Theorem 1\]](#) ensues that [\(16\)](#) actually holds for any $v \in \mathcal{A}_{\det}$ (see [\(8\)](#) for the definition of \mathcal{A}_{\det}). By [Proposition 4.1](#) $\bar{R} \in \mathcal{R}$, hence, choosing $R = \bar{R}$ we have once again that \bar{v} maximizes the linear map

$$v \mapsto \int_S \bar{R}^T f \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v \end{pmatrix} \, dx'$$

on \mathcal{A}_{\det} . We note that \mathcal{A}_{\det} is not a linear space. However, if $v \in \mathcal{A}_{\det}$, then $\lambda v \in \mathcal{A}_{\det}$ for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Therefore, we conclude that

$$\int_S \bar{R}^T f \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v \end{pmatrix} dx' = 0 \quad \forall v \in \mathcal{A}_{\det}.$$

Going back to (16), we deduce that

$$0 \geq \int_S f \cdot R \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v \end{pmatrix} dx' \quad \forall R \in \mathcal{R}, \forall v \in \mathcal{A}_{\det}.$$

By the linearity of the right-hand side with respect to v we get

$$\int_S f \cdot R \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v \end{pmatrix} dx' = 0 \quad \forall R \in \mathcal{R}, \forall v \in \mathcal{A}_{\det},$$

which is equivalent to the stronger condition

$$\int_S f \cdot R \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v \end{pmatrix} dx' = 0 \quad \forall R \in \mathcal{R}, \forall v \in \overline{\text{span } \mathcal{A}_{\det}},$$

where the closure of $\text{span } \mathcal{A}_{\det}$ is in the sense of $L^2(S)$. The conclusion follows from [Lemma 4.2](#). \blacksquare

We are now in a position to prove our first main result.

Proof of [Theorem 2.1](#). First of all, observe that $J_h(y_h) \leq Ch^2$. Indeed, using the test deformation (7) we have

$$\inf_y J_h(y) \leq J_h(\hat{y}_h) = h^2 \int_S f \cdot R \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx' \leq Ch^2.$$

By [Theorem 3.1](#) there is a constant rotation $\tilde{R}_h \in \text{SO}(3)$ such that

$$\|\nabla_h y_h - \tilde{R}_h\|_{L^2}^2 \leq Ch^{-2} E_h(y_h).$$

We now define

$$\tilde{y}_h = \tilde{R}_h^T y_h - \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ hx_3 \end{pmatrix} + c_h$$

where c_h is chosen so that \tilde{y}_h has zero average. By Poincaré-Wirtinger inequality, one obtains a bound from above on the elastic energy as follows

$$\begin{aligned} E_h(y_h) &= J_h(y_h) + \int_{\Omega} f_h \cdot y_h dx \\ &\leq Ch^2 + h^2 \int_{\Omega} f \cdot \tilde{R}_h \tilde{y}_h dx + h^2 \int_S f \cdot \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx' \\ &\leq Ch^2 + Ch^2 \|\nabla_h y_h - \tilde{R}_h\|_{L^2} \leq Ch^2 + Ch(E_h(y_h))^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by a simple application of the Young inequality, we get $E_h(y_h) \leq Ch^2$. Assume now that $R^T f \cdot e_3 \neq 0$ for some $R \in \mathcal{R}$. It follows that

$$\liminf_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{E_h(y_h)}{h^2} = e > 0,$$

otherwise, defining $D_h = E_h(y_h)$, by [Theorem 4.4](#) we would conclude that $R^T f \cdot e_3 = 0$ for every optimal rotation $R \in \mathcal{R}$, contradicting the assumption. By [Proposition 3.2](#) there exists $\bar{y} \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{iso}}$

such that, up to a subsequence, $y_h \rightarrow \bar{y}$ in $W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$ and $\nabla_h y_h \rightarrow (\nabla \bar{y}, \nu)$, where $\nu = \partial_1 \bar{y} \wedge \partial_2 \bar{y}$. Moreover by [Theorem 3.4–\(i\)](#) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h^2} J_h(y_h) &= \liminf_{h \rightarrow 0} \left(\frac{1}{h^2} E_h(y_h) - \int_S f \cdot y_h \, dx \right) \\ &= e - \int_S f \cdot \bar{y} \, dx \geq E^K(\bar{y}) - \int_S f \cdot \bar{y} \, dx = J^K(\bar{y}). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Pick $R \in \mathcal{R}$, $v \in C^\infty(\bar{S})$ and consider again the test deformation [\(12\)](#). Recalling that $E_h(\hat{y}_h) = O(h^4)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{h^2} J_h(\hat{y}_h) &= \frac{1}{h^2} E_h(\hat{y}_h) - \int_S f \cdot \hat{y}_h \, dx' \\ &= - \int_S f \cdot R \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \, dx' - h \int_S f \cdot R \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v \end{pmatrix} \, dx' + O(h^2) \\ &= - \int_S f \cdot R \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \, dx' + O(h). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by [Lemma A.3](#) we have

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h^2} J_h(\hat{y}_h) = - \int_S f \cdot R \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \, dx' \leq 0.$$

It follows by the quasi-minimizing property of y_h that

$$\limsup_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h^2} J_h(y_h) \leq \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h^2} (J_h(y_h) - J_h(\hat{y}_h)) \leq 0. \quad (18)$$

In particular by [\(17\)](#) we get that $J^K(\bar{y}) \leq 0$. If $J^K(\bar{y})$ is strictly negative, the stability condition [\(S1\)](#) is false, so we can suppose $J^K(\bar{y}) = 0$. Thus, by [\(18\)](#), the inequality in [\(17\)](#) is an equality and $E^{KL}(\bar{y}) = e > 0$. This implies that $\bar{y} \neq R \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ for every $R \in \text{SO}(3)$, so condition [\(S1\)](#) is not satisfied.

We are left to prove that \bar{y} minimizes J^K . Pick a generic $y \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{iso}}$ and let (\tilde{y}_h) be the recovery sequence provided by [Theorem 3.4–\(ii\)](#). We have that $\tilde{y}_h \rightarrow y$ in $W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} J^K(\bar{y}) &= \liminf_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h^2} J_h(y_h) \leq \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h^2} \inf_y J_h(y) \leq \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h^2} J_h(\tilde{y}_h) \\ &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \left(\frac{1}{h^2} E_h(\tilde{y}_h) - \int_S f \cdot \tilde{y}_h \, dx' \right) = J^K(y), \end{aligned}$$

concluding the proof. ■

We move now to the proof of [Theorem 2.2](#).

Proof of [Theorem 2.2](#). The proof follows the steps of [[12](#), Theorem 4]. Arguing as in the proof of [Theorem 2.1](#) we get $E_h(y_h) \leq Ch^2$.

Step 1. Firstly, suppose by contradiction that $h^{-2} E_h(y_h) \rightarrow e > 0$. In this case we can argue as in the proof of [Theorem 2.1](#) to deduce that $y_h \rightarrow \bar{y}$ in $W^{1,2}(S; \mathbb{R}^3)$, $E^K(\bar{y}) = e > 0$ and $J^K(\bar{y}) = 0$ contradicting the stability condition [\(S1\)](#).

Step 2. Suppose now that $h^{-2} E_h(y_h) \rightarrow 0$ and $h^{-4} E_h(y_h) \rightarrow +\infty$. We will show that this gives a contradiction. Set $D_h = E_h(y_h)$ and apply [Proposition 3.3](#) to construct the sequences

R_h, u_h and v_h and their corresponding limits. By [Proposition 4.1](#) $R_h \rightarrow \bar{R} \in \mathcal{R}$ thus, at least for $h \ll 1$, the projection $P(R_h)$ of R_h onto \mathcal{R} is well defined. Define $d_h = \text{dist}_{\text{SO}(3)}(R_h, \mathcal{R})$ (see [\(29\)](#) for the definition of $\text{dist}_{\text{SO}(3)}$). Let $W_h \in \text{NR}_{P(R_h)}$ be such that $|W_h| = 1$ and $R_h = P(R_h)e^{d_h W_h}$. Recall that $\text{NR}_{P(R_h)}$ is the normal space to \mathcal{R} at the point $P(R_h)$ (see [\(32\)](#) for the definition). Clearly, up to a subsequence, $W_h \rightarrow \bar{W}_1$ with $|\bar{W}_1| = 1$. Moreover, by the definition of NR it is easy to prove that $\bar{W}_1 \in \text{NR}_{\bar{R}}$.

We now show that $d_h = O(h^{-1}\sqrt{D_h})$. Let $v \in C^\infty(\bar{S})$ with $\det(\nabla^2 v) = 0$ in S and $\tilde{u}_h \in W^{2,\infty}(\bar{S})$ given by [Lemma 4.3](#) so that the map

$$\tilde{y}_h(x') = \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} h^{-2} D_h \tilde{u}_h \\ h^{-1} \sqrt{D_h} v \end{pmatrix}$$

is an isometric embedding and [\(11\)](#) holds true with \tilde{u}_h in place of u . Consider the test deformation [\(15\)](#) with the choice $R = P(R_h)$. We have $E_h(\hat{y}_h) = O(D_h)$, thus, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} J_h(y_h) - J_h(\hat{y}_h) &\geq \int_{\Omega} f_h \cdot \hat{y}_h \, dx - \int_{\Omega} f_h \cdot y_h \, dx + O(D_h) \\ &= - \int_S f \cdot R_h \begin{pmatrix} D_h u_h \\ h \sqrt{D_h} v_h \end{pmatrix} \, dx' + h^2 \int_S f \cdot (P(R_h) - R_h) \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \, dx' \\ &\quad + \int_S f \cdot P(R_h) \begin{pmatrix} D_h \tilde{u}_h \\ h \sqrt{D_h} v \end{pmatrix} \, dx' + O(D_h). \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

As showed in [\(31\)](#), we have that

$$\int_S f \cdot P(R_h) W \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \, dx' = 0 \quad \forall W \in \mathbb{R}_{\text{skew}}^{3 \times 3}. \tag{20}$$

Expanding the exponential $e^{d_h W_h}$, recalling that by [Theorem 4.4](#) we have $P(R_h)^T f \cdot e_3 = 0$. and using both [\(11\)](#) and [\(20\)](#), we get from [\(19\)](#)

$$\begin{aligned} J_h(y_h) - J_h(\hat{y}_h) &\geq -h^2 d_h^2 \int_S f \cdot P(R_h) W_h^2 \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \, dx' \\ &\quad + h \sqrt{D_h} \int_S f \cdot (P(R_h) - R_h) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v_h \end{pmatrix} \, dx' + O(D_h, h^2 d_h^3) \\ &\geq -h^2 d_h^2 \int_S f \cdot P(R_h) W_h^2 \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \, dx' \\ &\quad - h d_h \sqrt{D_h} \int_S f \cdot P(R_h) W_h \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v_h \end{pmatrix} \, dx' + O(D_h, h^2 d_h^3, h \sqrt{D_h} d_h^2). \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

Suppose by contradiction that $\frac{h d_h}{\sqrt{D_h}} \rightarrow +\infty$. Then dividing [\(21\)](#) by $h^2 d_h^2$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{h^2 d_h^2} (J_h(y_h) - J_h(\hat{y}_h)) &\geq - \int_S f \cdot P(R_h) W_h^2 \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \, dx' \\ &\quad - \frac{\sqrt{D_h}}{h d_h} \int_S f \cdot P(R_h) W_h \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v_h \end{pmatrix} \, dx' + O\left(d_h, \frac{D_h}{h^2 d_h^2}, \frac{\sqrt{D_h}}{h}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

Note that, by [\(6\)](#) we have

$$\limsup_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h^2 d_h^2} (J_h(y_h) - J_h(\hat{y}_h)) = \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{D_h}{h^2 d_h^2} \frac{h^4}{D_h} \frac{1}{h^4} (J_h(y_h) - J_h(\hat{y}_h)) = 0.$$

Passing to the limit in (22) we deduce that

$$0 \geq - \int_S f \cdot \bar{R} \bar{W}_1^2 \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx' > 0,$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that $W_1 \in N\mathcal{R}_{\bar{R}}$ and $\bar{W}_1 \neq 0$ (see Appendix A). This gives a contradiction and proves that $d_h = O(h^{-1}\sqrt{D_h})$.

To conclude the proof of Step 2 we show now that condition (S2) is violated, getting a contradiction. Set

$$\bar{W} = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{h}{\sqrt{D_h}} d_h W_h.$$

Since $\bar{W}_1 \in N\mathcal{R}_{\bar{R}}$ we have $\bar{W} \in N\mathcal{R}_{\bar{R}}$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{D_h}(J_h(y_h) + h^2 F(P(R_h))) &= \frac{1}{D_h} E_h(y_h) - \frac{h^2}{D_h} \int_{\Omega} f \cdot y_h dx' \\ &\quad + \frac{h^2}{D_h} \int_S f \cdot P(R_h) \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx' \\ &= \frac{1}{D_h} E_h(y_h) + \frac{h^2}{D_h} \int_S f \cdot (P(R_h) - R_h) \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx' \\ &\quad - \frac{h^2}{D_h} \int_S f \cdot R_h \begin{pmatrix} h^{-2} D_h u_h \\ h^{-1} \sqrt{D_h} v_h \end{pmatrix} dx'. \end{aligned}$$

Expanding twice the exponential map and recalling that $P(R_h)^T f \cdot e_3 = 0$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{D_h}(J_h(y_h) + h^2 F(P(R_h))) &= \frac{1}{D_h} E_h(y_h) \\ &\quad - \frac{h^2 d_h^2}{D_h} \int_S f \cdot P(R_h) W_h^2 \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx' - \int_S f \cdot R_h \begin{pmatrix} u_h \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx' \\ &\quad + \frac{h}{\sqrt{D_h}} \int_S f \cdot (P(R_h) - R_h) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v_h \end{pmatrix} dx' + O\left(\frac{h^2 d_h^3}{D_h}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{D_h} E_h(y_h) - \frac{h^2 d_h^2}{D_h} \int_S f \cdot P(R_h) W_h^2 \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx' - \int_S f \cdot R_h \begin{pmatrix} u_h \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx' \\ &\quad - \frac{h d_h}{\sqrt{D_h}} \int_S f \cdot P(R_h) W_h \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v_h \end{pmatrix} dx' + O\left(\frac{h^2 d_h^3}{D_h}, \frac{h d_h^2}{\sqrt{D_h}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

We denote by \bar{v} and \bar{u} the limits of v_h and u_h , respectively. Note that by Proposition 3.3, $(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{iso}}^{\text{lim}}$. Since by definition $\frac{1}{D_h} E_h(y_h) \rightarrow 1$, passing to the limit we get by Theorem 3.5-(i)

$$\begin{aligned} &\liminf_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{D_h}(J_h(y_h) + h^2 F(P(R_h))) \\ &= 1 - \int_S f \cdot \bar{R} \begin{pmatrix} \bar{u} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx' - \int_S f \cdot \bar{R} \bar{W} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \bar{v} \end{pmatrix} dx' \\ &\quad - \int_S f \cdot \bar{R} \bar{W}^2 \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx' \geq J^{\text{VK}}(\bar{u}, \bar{v}, \bar{R}, \bar{W}) \geq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

where the last inequality follows from (S2).

Let \hat{y}_h be the test deformation in (12) with $v \in C^\infty(\bar{S})$ and $R \in \mathcal{R}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{D_h}(J_h(\hat{y}_h) + h^2 F(P(R_h))) &\leq -\frac{h^3}{D_h} \int_S f \cdot R \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v \end{pmatrix} dx' + O\left(\frac{h^4}{D_h}\right) \\ &= O\left(\frac{h^4}{D_h}\right) \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $F(P(R_h)) = F(R)$ for every $R \in \mathcal{R}$ and that $R^T f \cdot e_3 = 0$. In particular, by the quasi-minimizing property of y_h

$$\limsup_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{D_h}(J_h(y_h) + h^2 F(P(R_h))) \leq \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{D_h}(J_h(y_h) - J_h(\hat{y}_h)) = 0.$$

Hence, all the inequalities in (23) are in fact equalities and we have both $J^{\text{VK}}(\bar{u}, \bar{v}, \bar{R}, \bar{W}) = 0$ and $E^{\text{VK}}(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) = 1$. Since $(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{iso}}^{\text{lin}}$, this contradicts (S2).

Step 3. By the previous steps, we obtain that $E_h(y_h) \leq Ch^4$. We now apply Proposition 3.3 with $D_h = h^4$ to construct the sequences R_h, u_h, v_h . We define d_h and W_h as in Step 2. We prove now that $d_h = O(h)$. The argument is similar to the one already seen. Consider the test deformation (12) with $v \in C^\infty(\bar{S})$ and $R = P(R_h)$. We have $E_h(\hat{y}_h) = O(h^4)$, thus, expanding the exponential and recalling that $F(RW) = 0$ for every $R \in \mathcal{R}$ and $W \in \mathbb{R}_{\text{skew}}^{3 \times 3}$

$$\begin{aligned} J_h(y_h) - J_h(\hat{y}_h) &\geq \int_\Omega f_h \cdot \hat{y}_h dx - \int_\Omega f_h \cdot y_h dx + O(h^4) \\ &= -h^2 \int_S f \cdot R_h \begin{pmatrix} h^2 u_h \\ h v_h \end{pmatrix} dx' + h^2 \int_S f \cdot (P(R_h) - R_h) \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx' \\ &\quad + h^2 \int_S f \cdot P(R_h) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ h v \end{pmatrix} dx' + O(h^4) \\ &\geq -h^2 d_h^2 \int_S f \cdot P(R_h) W_h^2 \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx' \\ &\quad + h^3 \int_S f \cdot (P(R_h) - R_h) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v_h \end{pmatrix} dx' + O(h^4, h^2 d_h^3) \\ &\geq -h^2 d_h^2 \int_S f \cdot P(R_h) W_h^2 \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx' \\ &\quad - h^3 d_h \int_S f \cdot P(R_h) W_h \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v_h \end{pmatrix} dx' + O(h^4, h^2 d_h^3, h^3 d_h^2). \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Suppose by contradiction that $\frac{d_h}{h} \rightarrow +\infty$. Then, dividing (24) by $h^2 d_h^2$ and passing to the limit we deduce that

$$0 \geq \int_S f \cdot \bar{R} \bar{W}_1^2 \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx' > 0,$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that $0 \neq \bar{W}_1 \in N\mathcal{R}_{\bar{R}}$. This provides the desired contradiction.

Define as before

$$\bar{W} = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{d_h}{h} W_h.$$

Finally, expanding the exponential map

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{h^4}(J_h(y_h) + h^2 F(P(R_h))) = \\
&= \frac{1}{h^4} E_h(y_h) - \frac{1}{h^2} \int_{\Omega} f \cdot y_h \, dx' + \frac{1}{h^2} \int_S f \cdot P(R_h) \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \, dx' \\
&= \frac{1}{h^4} E_h(y_h) + \frac{1}{h^2} \int_S f \cdot (P(R_h) - R_h) \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \, dx' - \frac{1}{h^2} \int_S f \cdot R_h \begin{pmatrix} h^2 u_h \\ h v_h \end{pmatrix} \, dx' \\
&= \frac{1}{h^4} E_h(y_h) - \frac{d_h^2}{h^2} \int_S f \cdot P(R_h) W_h^2 \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \, dx' - \int_S f \cdot R_h \begin{pmatrix} u_h \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \, dx' \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{h} \int_S f \cdot (P(R_h) - R_h) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v_h \end{pmatrix} \, dx' + O\left(\frac{d_h^3}{h^2}\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{h^4} E_h(y_h) - \frac{d_h^2}{h^2} \int_S f \cdot P(R_h) W_h^2 \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \, dx' \\
&\quad - \int_S f \cdot R_h \begin{pmatrix} u_h \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \, dx' - \frac{d_h}{h} \int_S f \cdot P(R_h) W_h \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v_h \end{pmatrix} \, dx' + O\left(\frac{d_h^3}{h^2}, \frac{d_h^2}{h}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\liminf_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h^4}(J_h(y_h) + h^2 F(P(R_h))) \geq J^{\text{VK}}(\bar{u}, \bar{v}, \bar{R}, \bar{W}).$$

Let (u, v, R, W) be an admissible quadruplet. Construct a recovery sequence (\tilde{y}_h) for u and v as in [Theorem 3.5–\(iii\)](#). The sequences of rescaled displacements for the recovery sequence, defined as in [\(4\)–\(5\)](#), will be denoted by \tilde{u}_h and \tilde{v}_h . We have

$$\begin{aligned}
J^{\text{VK}}(\bar{u}, \bar{v}, \bar{R}, \bar{W}) &\leq \liminf_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h^4}(J_h(y_h) + h^2 F(P(R_h))) \\
&\leq \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h^4}(\inf_y J_h(y) + h^2 F(P(R_h))) \\
&\leq \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h^4}(J_h(Re^{hW} \tilde{y}_h) + h^2 F(R)).
\end{aligned}$$

To conclude it is sufficient to prove that

$$\limsup_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h^4}(J_h(Re^{hW} \tilde{y}_h) + F(R)) = J^{\text{VK}}(u, v, R, W).$$

Expanding the expression of J_h we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{h^4}(J_h(Re^{hW} \tilde{y}_h) + h^2 F(R)) = \frac{1}{h^4} E_h(Re^{hW} \tilde{y}_h) - \frac{1}{h^2} \int_{\Omega} f \cdot Re^{hW} \tilde{y}_h \, dx \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{h^2} \int_S f \cdot R \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \, dx' \\
&= \frac{1}{h^4} E_h(\tilde{y}_h) - \frac{1}{h^2} \int_S f \cdot Re^{hW} \begin{pmatrix} h^2 \tilde{u}_h \\ h \tilde{v}_h \end{pmatrix} \, dx' + \frac{1}{h^2} \int_S f \cdot (R - Re^{hW}) \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \, dx' \\
&= \frac{1}{h^4} E_h(\tilde{y}_h) - \int_S f \cdot Re^{hW} \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{u}_h \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \, dx' - \int_S f \cdot RW \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \tilde{v}_h \end{pmatrix} \, dx' \\
&\quad - \int_S f \cdot RW^2 \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \, dx' + O(h) \rightarrow J^{\text{VK}}(u, v, R, W),
\end{aligned}$$

concluding the proof of the minimality. ■

We conclude the section by proving **Theorem 2.3**.

Proof of Theorem 2.3. Suppose by contradiction that there exists an admissible quadruplet (u', v', R', W') such that $(u', v') \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{iso}}^{\text{lin}}$ and $J^{\text{VK}}(u', v', R', W') < 0$. Let $\delta > 0$ and $\tilde{v} \in C^\infty(\bar{S})$ such that $\|v' - \tilde{v}\|_{W^{2,2}} \leq \delta$. Let $1 \gg \varepsilon > 0$. By [8, Theorem 7], there is $u_\varepsilon \in W^{2,2}(S; \mathbb{R}^2)$ such that

$$y_\varepsilon(x') = \begin{pmatrix} x' + \varepsilon^2 u_\varepsilon \\ \varepsilon \tilde{v} \end{pmatrix}$$

is an isometric embedding and

$$\|u_\varepsilon\|_{W^{2,2}} \leq C (\|\nabla \tilde{v}\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla^2 \tilde{v}\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \tilde{v}\|_{L^2}^2).$$

It follows that along a non-reabeled subsequence $u_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup u$ in $W^{2,2}(S; \mathbb{R}^2)$ for some $u \in W^{2,2}(S; \mathbb{R}^2)$. Moreover, since $\nabla y_\varepsilon^T \nabla y_\varepsilon = \text{Id}$, we have

$$0 = \varepsilon^2 (\nabla u_\varepsilon^T + \nabla u_\varepsilon + \nabla \tilde{v} \otimes \nabla \tilde{v}) + o(\varepsilon^2),$$

where $o(\varepsilon^2)$ has to be intended in the L^2 sense. Dividing by ε^2 and passing to the limit we deduce that $(u, \tilde{v}) \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{iso}}^{\text{lin}}$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sym}(\nabla u - \nabla u') &= 2(\nabla \tilde{v} \otimes \nabla \tilde{v} - \nabla v' \otimes \nabla v') \\ &= 2(\nabla(\tilde{v} - v') \otimes \nabla \tilde{v} - \nabla v' \otimes \nabla(v' - \tilde{v})). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by Korn's inequality, there exists $A \in \mathbb{R}_{\text{skew}}^{2 \times 2}$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\|u - u' - Ax' - \eta\|_{L^2} \leq C\delta. \quad (25)$$

Consider the deformation

$$y'_\varepsilon(x') = R' e^{\varepsilon W'} y_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{iso}}.$$

We have

$$\nabla y'_\varepsilon = R' e^{\varepsilon W'} \left(\begin{pmatrix} e_1 & e_2 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon^2 \nabla u_\varepsilon \\ \varepsilon \nabla \tilde{v} \end{pmatrix} \right)$$

and

$$\nu_\varepsilon = \partial_1 y'_\varepsilon \wedge \partial_2 y'_\varepsilon = R' e^{\varepsilon W'} \left(e_3 - \varepsilon \begin{pmatrix} \nabla \tilde{v}^T \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right) + O(\varepsilon^2),$$

where $O(\varepsilon^2)$ is in the L^2 sense. It follows that

$$\nabla \nu_\varepsilon = -\varepsilon R' e^{\varepsilon W'} \begin{pmatrix} \nabla^2 \tilde{v} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + O(\varepsilon^2)$$

and

$$(\nabla y'_\varepsilon)^T \nabla \nu_\varepsilon = -\varepsilon \begin{pmatrix} \nabla^2 \tilde{v} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + O(\varepsilon^2).$$

Thus, by condition **(S1)**,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq J^{\text{K}}(y'_\varepsilon) = \int_S \bar{Q}((\nabla y'_\varepsilon)^T \nabla \nu_\varepsilon) dx' - \int_S f \cdot y'_\varepsilon dx' \\ &= \varepsilon^2 \int_S \bar{Q}(\nabla^2 \tilde{v}) dx' - \int_S f \cdot R' e^{\varepsilon W'} \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx' - \varepsilon \int_S f \cdot R' e^{\varepsilon W'} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \tilde{v} \end{pmatrix} dx' \\ &\quad - \varepsilon^2 \int_S f \cdot R' e^{\varepsilon W'} \begin{pmatrix} u_\varepsilon \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx' + o(\varepsilon^2). \end{aligned}$$

By [Theorem 2.1](#) we have $(R')^T f \cdot e_3 = 0$. Expanding the exponential around the identity and recalling that $F(R'W) = 0$ for every $W \in \mathbb{R}_{\text{skew}}^{3 \times 3}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq J^K(y'_\varepsilon) &\leq \varepsilon^2 \int_S \bar{Q}(\nabla^2 \tilde{v}) dx' - F(R') - \varepsilon^2 \int_S f \cdot R'(W')^2 \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx' \\ &\quad - \varepsilon^2 \int_S f \cdot R'W' \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \tilde{v} \end{pmatrix} dx' - \varepsilon^2 \int_S f \cdot R' \begin{pmatrix} u_\varepsilon \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx' + o(\varepsilon^2). \end{aligned}$$

Dividing by ε^2 and using the fact that $F(R') \geq 0$ by [Lemma A.3](#), passing to the limit we deduce that $0 \leq J^{\text{VK}}(u, \tilde{v}, R', W')$. Hence, by definition of \tilde{v} and [\(25\)](#) we get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq J^{\text{VK}}(u', v', R', W') + \int_S f \cdot R' \begin{pmatrix} Ax' + \eta \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx' + C\delta \\ &= J^{\text{VK}}(u', v', R', W') + C\delta, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality we have used [\(3\)](#) and the fact that $F(R'W) = 0$ for every $W \in \mathbb{R}_{\text{skew}}^{3 \times 3}$. Since δ is arbitrary we reach a contradiction.

We now prove that [\(S2\)](#) holds for $J_\varepsilon^{\text{VK}}$. Suppose that there is an admissible quadruplet (u', v', R', W') such that $(u', v') \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{iso}}^{\text{lin}}$ and $J_\varepsilon^{\text{VK}}(u', v', R', W') \leq 0$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$. We will show that v' is affine. Let

$$K = \int_S f \cdot R' \begin{pmatrix} u' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx' + \int_S f \cdot R'W' \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v' \end{pmatrix} dx' + \int_S R'(W')^2 \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx'.$$

If $K \leq 0$, since

$$0 \geq J_\varepsilon^{\text{VK}}(u', v', R', W') = E^{\text{VK}}(u', v') - (1 - \varepsilon)K \geq E^{\text{VK}}(u', v'),$$

we get that $E^{\text{VK}}(u', v') = 0$, thus, v' is affine. Conversely, if $K > 0$ we deduce that

$$J^{\text{VK}}(u', v', R', W') = J_\varepsilon^{\text{VK}}(u', v', R', W') - \varepsilon K < 0,$$

which gives a contradiction. ■

5 Attainment of the infimum of J^{VK}

In this last section, we will prove [Theorem 2.4](#). The stability condition [\(S2\)](#) assures that all configurations in $\mathcal{A}_{\text{iso}}^{\text{lin}}$ with zero total energy have zero Von Kármán elastic energy, i.e., v is affine. However, we do not expect that all affine functions have zero total energy, unless $f = 0$. In the following series of results, we study the specific structure of such affine minimizers. We recall that we assume f not to be identically zero.

Proposition 5.1. *Suppose that [\(S2\)](#) holds, $R^T f \cdot e_3 = 0$ for every $R \in \mathcal{R}$, and $\dim \mathcal{R} = 1$. Let (u, v, R, W) be an admissible quadruplet such that $(u, v) \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{iso}}^{\text{lin}}$ and $J^{\text{VK}}(u, v, R, W) = 0$. Then $W = 0$ and there are $\lambda, \delta \in \mathbb{R}$, $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^2$, and $A \in \mathbb{R}_{\text{skew}}^{2 \times 2}$ such that, if $a(R) > 0$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} v(x') &= -\lambda \frac{c(R)}{a(R)} x_1 + \lambda x_2 + \delta, \\ u(x') &= -\frac{\lambda^2}{2} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{b(R)}{a(R)} x_1 - \frac{c(R)}{a(R)} x_2 \\ -\frac{c(R)}{a(R)} x_1 + x_2 \end{pmatrix} + Ax' + \eta, \end{aligned}$$

whereas, if $b(R) > 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} v(x') &= \lambda x_1 - \lambda \frac{c(R)}{b(R)} x_2 + \delta, \\ u(x') &= -\frac{\lambda^2}{2} \begin{pmatrix} x_1 - \frac{c(R)}{b(R)} x_2 \\ -\frac{c(R)}{b(R)} x_1 + \frac{a(R)}{b(R)} x_2 \end{pmatrix} + Ax' + \eta, \end{aligned}$$

where $a(R)$, $b(R)$, and $c(R)$ are defined as in (34)–(35).

Proof. The stability condition (S2) implies that $v = \lambda_1 x_1 + \lambda_2 x_2 + \delta$. Since $(u, v) \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{iso}}^{\text{lin}}$, we deduce that

$$u(x') = -\frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1^2 & \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \\ \lambda_1 \lambda_2 & \lambda_2^2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix} + Ax' + \eta,$$

for some $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $A \in \mathbb{R}_{\text{skew}}^{2 \times 2}$. Now for any $A' \in \mathbb{R}_{\text{skew}}^{2 \times 2}$, $\eta' \in \mathbb{R}^2$, and $\delta' \in \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$J^{\text{VK}}(u + A'x' + \eta', v + \delta', R, W) = J^{\text{VK}}(u, v, R, W).$$

This follows from assumption (3) and the fact that $F(RW) = 0$ for any $W \in \mathbb{R}_{\text{skew}}^{3 \times 3}$. In particular, we can suppose A , δ , and η to be zero.

Suppose $a(R) \neq 0$ (the proof for the case $b(R) \neq 0$ is analogous). We will write a, b, c in place of $a(R), b(R), c(R)$ in order to streamline the exposition. By Corollary A.6 in this case W is of the form

$$W = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & W_{12} & W_{13} \\ -W_{12} & 0 & \frac{c}{a} W_{13} \\ -W_{13} & -\frac{c}{a} W_{13} & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let us define $K(W) = F(RW^2)$ and $J_{\min} = J^{\text{VK}}(u, v, R, W)$. With some simple expansion (recall that $ab - c^2 = 0$ by Proposition A.5, since $f \neq 0$) we have

$$\begin{aligned} J_{\min} &= \frac{1}{2} \int_S f \cdot R \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1^2 x_1 + \lambda_1 \lambda_2 x_2 \\ \lambda_1 \lambda_2 x_1 + \lambda_2^2 x_2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx' \\ &\quad - \int_S f \cdot R \begin{pmatrix} 0 & W_{12} & W_{13} \\ -W_{12} & 0 & \frac{c}{a} W_{13} \\ -W_{13} & -\frac{c}{a} W_{13} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \lambda_1 x_1 + \lambda_2 x_2 \end{pmatrix} dx' - K(W) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (\lambda_1^2 a + 2\lambda_1 \lambda_2 c + \lambda_2^2 b) - \lambda_1 W_{13} (a + b) - \lambda_2 W_{13} c \left(1 + \frac{b}{a}\right) - K(W). \end{aligned}$$

If we define

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} a & c \\ c & b \end{pmatrix}, \quad B = W_{13} \begin{pmatrix} a + b \\ c \left(1 + \frac{b}{a}\right) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Lambda = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 \\ \lambda_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

then we have

$$J_{\min} = \frac{1}{2} \Lambda^T M \Lambda - B \cdot \Lambda - K(W).$$

By Lemma A.4 and Proposition A.5 M is positive semidefinite and by (S2) the expression above, as a function of Λ , is minimized at Λ . Thus, $M\Lambda = B$. Solving this system one easily gets that

$$\lambda_1 = -\frac{c}{a} \lambda_2 + W_{13} \left(1 + \frac{b}{a}\right).$$

To conclude we just need to prove that $W = 0$. Observe that

$$(W^2)' = - \begin{pmatrix} W_{12}^2 + W_{13}^2 & \frac{c}{a}W_{13}^2 \\ \frac{c}{a}W_{13}^2 & W_{12}^2 + \frac{b}{a}W_{13}^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus, by definition of $K(W)$,

$$K(W) = -(W_{12}^2 + W_{13}^2)a - 2bW_{13}^2 - bW_{12}^2 - \frac{b^2}{a}W_{13}^2.$$

Substituting the expression of λ_1 and $K(W)$ in J_{\min} we get

$$J_{\min} = W_{12}^2(a+b) + W_{13}^2 \frac{1}{2a}(a+b)^2,$$

so that by $J_{\min} = 0$ we deduce $W = 0$. ■

To simplify the exposition, given f such that $R^T f \cdot e_3 = 0$ for every R optimal rotation and $R \in \mathcal{R}$ let us define

$$\mathcal{V}_R = \begin{cases} \left\{ v \in W^{2,2}(S) : v(x') = -\lambda \frac{c(R)}{a(R)} x_1 + \lambda x_2, \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \right\} & \text{if } a(R) \neq 0, \\ \left\{ v \in W^{2,2}(S) : v(x') = \lambda x_1 - \lambda \frac{c(R)}{b(R)} x_2, \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \right\} & \text{if } b(R) \neq 0, \end{cases}$$

$$\mathcal{U}_R = \left\{ u \in W^{1,2}(S; \mathbb{R}^2) : u(x') = -\frac{1}{2}(\nabla v \otimes \nabla v)x', v \in \mathcal{V}_R \right\}.$$

Lemma 5.2. *Suppose $R^T f \cdot e_3 = 0$ for every $R \in \mathcal{R}$ and $\dim \mathcal{R} = 1$. Let $R \in \mathcal{R}$. Then*

$$\int_S f \cdot R \begin{pmatrix} u \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx' = 0,$$

for every $u \in \mathcal{U}_R$.

Proof. Let $u \in \mathcal{U}_R$ and $v \in \mathcal{V}_R$ be such that $u(x') = -\frac{1}{2}(\nabla v \otimes \nabla v)x'$. By (30) it is sufficient to prove that $\nabla v \otimes \nabla v = -(W^2)'$ for some $W \in \text{TR}_R$.

Suppose $a(R) \neq 0$. Then $v(x') = -\lambda \frac{c(R)}{a(R)} x_1 + \lambda x_2$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, so

$$\nabla v \otimes \nabla v = \lambda^2 \begin{pmatrix} \frac{b(R)}{a(R)} & -\frac{c(R)}{a(R)} \\ -\frac{c(R)}{a(R)} & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where we used [Proposition A.5](#). Then, defining

$$W = \lambda \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \frac{c(R)}{a(R)} \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \\ -\frac{c(R)}{a(R)} & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

we easily get $\nabla v \otimes \nabla v = -(W^2)'$ and $W \in \text{TR}_R$ by [Proposition A.5](#). The case $b(R) \neq 0$ can be treated similarly. ■

Lemma 5.3. *Suppose that $R^T f \cdot e_3 = 0$ for every $R \in \mathcal{R}$ and $\dim \mathcal{R} = 1$. Let $R \in \mathcal{R}$ and $v \in \mathcal{V}_R$. Then for any $v' \in W^{2,2}(S)$ there is $\xi \in W^{1,2}(S; \mathbb{R}^2)$ such that*

$$\nabla \xi^T + \nabla \xi + \nabla v' \otimes \nabla v + \nabla v \otimes \nabla v' = 0$$

and

$$\int_S f \cdot R \begin{pmatrix} \xi \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx' = 0.$$

Proof. Suppose $a(R) \neq 0$ and let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $v(x') = -\lambda \frac{c(R)}{a(R)} x_1 + \lambda x_2$. For $v' \in W^{2,2}(S)$ it is sufficient to define

$$\xi(x') = \lambda v'(x') \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{c(R)}{a(R)} \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that

$$\begin{pmatrix} \xi \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \lambda W \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ v' \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{with} \quad W = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -\frac{c(R)}{a(R)} \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ \frac{c(R)}{a(R)} & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{T}\mathcal{R}_R$$

by [Proposition A.5](#). In particular,

$$\int_S f \cdot R \begin{pmatrix} \xi \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx' = \lambda \int_S f \cdot RW \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ v' \end{pmatrix} dx'. \quad (26)$$

Define the map $\Phi(t) = Re^{tW}$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}$. By [\[14, Lemma 4.4\]](#), $\Phi(t) \in \mathcal{R}$ for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, therefore

$$\int_S f \cdot \Phi(t) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v' \end{pmatrix} dx' = 0 \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R},$$

since $\Phi(t)^T f \cdot e_3 = 0$. Differentiating with respect to t at $t = 0$, we deduce

$$\int_S f \cdot RW \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v' \end{pmatrix} dx' = 0,$$

which gives the thesis by [\(26\)](#). ■

Having all the previous results at our disposal we can show that J^{VK} enjoys some invariance properties.

Proposition 5.4. *Suppose $R^T f \cdot e_3 = 0$ for every $R \in \mathcal{R}$ and $\dim \mathcal{R} = 1$. Let $v \in \mathcal{V}_{R'}$ and $u \in \mathcal{U}_{R'}$ be such that*

$$\nabla u^T + \nabla u + \nabla v \otimes \nabla v = 0.$$

Then $J^{\text{VK}}(u' + u + \xi, v' + v, R', W') = J^{\text{VK}}(u', v', R', W')$ for every admissible quadruplet (u', v', R', W') , where ξ is defined as in [Lemma 5.3](#).

Proof. Since v is affine we immediately have that $\nabla^2(v' + v) = \nabla^2 v'$. Moreover, by definition of ξ

$$\begin{aligned} & (\nabla(u' + u + \xi))^T + \nabla(u' + u + \xi) + \nabla(v' + v) \otimes \nabla(v' + v) \\ &= (\nabla u')^T + \nabla u' + \nabla v' \otimes \nabla v'. \end{aligned}$$

By [Lemmas 5.2](#) and [5.3](#), to conclude we just need to show that

$$\int_S f \cdot R'W' \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v \end{pmatrix} dx' = 0.$$

This easily follows from the specific structure of v . Indeed, suppose $a(R') \neq 0$ and let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $v(x') = -\lambda \frac{c(R')}{a(R')}x_1 + \lambda x_2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_S f \cdot R'W' \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v \end{pmatrix} dx' &= \lambda \left(-W'_{13}c(R') + W'_{13}c(R') - W'_{23} \frac{c^2(R')}{a(R')} + W'_{23}b(R') \right) \\ &= \lambda \left(-W'_{23} \frac{c^2(R')}{a(R')} + W'_{23}b(R') \right), \end{aligned}$$

since $a(R')b(R') = c^2(R')$ by [Proposition A.5](#). ■

We are finally ready to give the proof of [Theorem 2.4](#).

Proof of [Theorem 2.4](#). Let (u_n, v_n, R_n, W_n) be a minimizing sequence for J^{VK} . Let $P_n^{\mathcal{V}}$ be the projection of $W^{2,2}(S)$ onto \mathcal{V}_{R_n} . By [Proposition 5.4](#) and the fact that

$$J(u_n + Ax' + \eta, v_n + \delta, R_n, W_n) = J(u_n, v_n, R_n, W_n) \quad \forall A \in \mathbb{R}_{\text{skew}}^{2 \times 2}, \eta \in \mathbb{R}^2, \delta \in \mathbb{R},$$

we can suppose that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$

- (i) $\int_S u_n dx' = 0$
- (ii) $\int_S v_n dx' = 0$
- (iii) $P_n^{\mathcal{V}}(v_n) = 0$,
- (iv) $\int_S \text{skew}(\nabla u_n) dx' = 0$.

Up to a subsequence, we can always assume that $R_n \rightarrow R \in \mathcal{R}$.

Assume first that $\|u_n\|_{W^{1,2}} + \|v_n\|_{W^{2,2}}^2 + |W_n|^2 \leq C$. Then, up to a subsequence we have $u_n \rightharpoonup u$ in $W^{1,2}(S; \mathbb{R}^2)$, $v_n \rightharpoonup v$ in $W^{2,2}(S)$ and $W_n \rightarrow W$ with $W \in \mathcal{NR}_R$. By lower semicontinuity of J^{VK} we deduce that (u, v, R, W) is a minimizer of J^{VK} via the direct method of the Calculus of Variations.

Suppose now by contradiction that

$$\|u_n\|_{W^{1,2}} + \|v_n\|_{W^{2,2}}^2 + |W_n|^2 = \gamma_n^2 \rightarrow +\infty$$

and define $u'_n = \frac{1}{\gamma_n^2}u_n$, $v'_n = \frac{1}{\gamma_n}v_n$ and $W'_n = \frac{1}{\gamma_n}W_n$. Then, up to a subsequence, we have $u'_n \rightharpoonup u'$ in $W^{1,2}(S; \mathbb{R}^2)$, $v'_n \rightharpoonup v'$ in $W^{2,2}(S)$ and $W'_n \rightarrow W'$ with $W' \in \mathcal{NR}_R$. Since $J^{\text{VK}}(u_n, v_n, R_n, W_n) \leq C$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} C &\geq \gamma_n^4 \int_S \bar{Q}((\nabla u'_n)^T + \nabla u'_n + \nabla v'_n \otimes \nabla v'_n) dx' + \gamma_n^2 \int_S \bar{Q}(\nabla^2 v'_n) dx' \\ &\quad - \gamma_n^2 \int_S f \cdot R_n \begin{pmatrix} u'_n \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx' - \gamma_n^2 \int_S f \cdot R_n W'_n \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v'_n \end{pmatrix} dx' \\ &\quad - \gamma_n^2 \int_S f \cdot R_n (W'_n)^2 \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx'. \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

Dividing by γ_n^4 we get by the coercivity of \bar{Q}

$$\|(\nabla u'_n)^T + \nabla u'_n + \nabla v'_n \otimes \nabla v'_n\|_{L^2} \leq \frac{C}{\gamma_n} \quad (28)$$

and passing to the limit we deduce that $(u', v') \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{iso}}^{\text{lin}}$. Moreover, dividing (27) by γ_n^2 and passing to the limit we get by lower semicontinuity that $0 \geq J^{\text{VK}}(u', v', R', W')$. The stability condition (S2) implies that $J^{\text{VK}}(u', v', R', W')$ is zero and v' is affine. By Proposition 5.1 and the properties (i)–(iii) we deduce that $u' = Ax'$, $v' = 0$ and $W' = 0$ for some $A \in \mathbb{R}_{\text{skew}}^{2 \times 2}$. Thus, by (iv) we get $u' = 0$. If we prove that u'_n and v'_n are strongly converging, then the proof is concluded since we would have

$$\|u'\|_{W^{1,2}} + \|v'\|_{W^{2,2}}^2 + |W'|^2 = 1.$$

Dividing (27) by γ_n^2 and passing to the lim sup we have

$$0 \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_S \bar{Q}(\nabla^2 v'_n) dx'.$$

In particular, by the coercivity of Q we get $\nabla^2 v'_n \rightarrow 0$ in $L^2(S; \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2})$, giving the strong convergence of v_n in $W^{2,2}(S)$. By (28) we have that $\text{sym}(\nabla u'_n) \rightarrow 0$ in $L^2(S; \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2})$. By (iv) we can apply Korn inequality to deduce that $u'_n \rightarrow 0$ strongly in $W^{1,2}(S; \mathbb{R}^2)$, concluding the proof of the first part.

Suppose now that (S2) fails. Let $(\bar{v}, \bar{u}) \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{iso}}^{\text{lin}}$ such that for some $\bar{R} \in \mathcal{R}$ and $\bar{W} \in \text{NR}_{\bar{R}}$ either $J^{\text{VK}}(\bar{y}, \bar{v}, \bar{R}, \bar{W}) < 0$ or $J^{\text{VK}}(\bar{y}, \bar{v}, \bar{R}, \bar{W}) = 0$ and \bar{v} is not affine. In any of these two cases, we have

$$-\int_S f \cdot \bar{R} \begin{pmatrix} \bar{u} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx' - \int_S f \cdot \bar{R} \bar{W} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \bar{v} \end{pmatrix} dx' - \int_S f \cdot \bar{R} \bar{W}^2 \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx' < 0.$$

In particular we have that $J_\varepsilon^{\text{VK}}(\bar{u}, \bar{v}, \bar{R}, \bar{W}) < 0$ for every choice of $\varepsilon > 0$. Since for every $\gamma > 0$ we have that $(\gamma^2 \bar{u}, \gamma \bar{v}) \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{iso}}^{\text{lin}}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} J_\varepsilon^{\text{VK}}(\gamma^2 \bar{u}, \gamma \bar{v}, \bar{R}, \gamma \bar{W}) &= \gamma^2 \int_S \bar{Q}(\nabla^2 v) dx' - \gamma^2(1 + \varepsilon) \int_S f \cdot \bar{R} \begin{pmatrix} \bar{u} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx' \\ &\quad - \gamma^2(1 + \varepsilon) \int_S f \cdot \bar{R} \bar{W} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \bar{v} \end{pmatrix} dx' - \gamma^2(1 + \varepsilon) \int_S f \cdot \bar{R} \bar{W}^2 \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx', \end{aligned}$$

we deduce that

$$\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{\gamma^2} J_\varepsilon^{\text{VK}}(\gamma^2 \bar{u}, \gamma \bar{v}, \bar{R}, \gamma \bar{W}) = J_\varepsilon^{\text{VK}}(\bar{u}, \bar{v}, \bar{R}, \bar{W}) < 0.$$

This implies that

$$\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow +\infty} J_\varepsilon^{\text{VK}}(\gamma^2 \bar{u}, \gamma \bar{v}, \bar{R}, \gamma \bar{W}) = -\infty,$$

as desired. ■

Remark 5.5. From the proof it follows that $\inf J^{\text{VK}} = -\infty$ if there is an admissible quadruplet $(\bar{u}, \bar{v}, \bar{R}, \bar{W})$ such that $(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{iso}}^{\text{lin}}$ and $J^{\text{VK}}(\bar{u}, \bar{v}, \bar{R}, \bar{W}) < 0$. In this case, one can repeat the same argument with $\varepsilon = 0$.

Remark 5.6. We give a short sketch of the proof of Theorem 2.4 in the case $\dim \mathcal{R} = 0$. First of all, we can assume without loss of generality that $\mathcal{R} = \{\text{Id}\}$. Reasoning as in Proposition A.5, since $\text{NR}_{\text{Id}} = \mathbb{R}_{\text{skew}}^{3 \times 3}$, one can show that $ab - c^2 > 0$, where we have written a, b , and c in place of $a(\text{Id}), b(\text{Id}),$ and $c(\text{Id})$. Then, arguing as in Proposition 5.1, one can prove that, when (S2) holds, any minimizer (u, v, R, W) of J^{VK} with $(u, v) \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{iso}}^{\text{lin}}$ is of the form $(\eta, \delta, \text{Id}, 0)$, with $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$. Note that, in this setting, stability condition (S2) basically reduces to the *linearized stability* of [12] without imposing any additional Dirichlet condition on the boundary. Finally, one can argue as in the proof of Theorem 2.4 to conclude.

A Fine properties of optimal rotations

In this appendix, we recall some properties of optimal rotations and we further analyze their structure in our specific setting. We will restrict ourselves to dead loads of body type. However, the same analysis can be carried out for surface dead loads. Consider a nonzero force $f \in L^2(S; \mathbb{R}^3)$ and suppose that

$$\int_S f \, dx' = 0.$$

We define the set of optimal rotations as

$$\mathcal{R} = \operatorname{argmax}_{R \in \mathrm{SO}(3)} F(R),$$

where

$$F(A) = \int_S f \cdot A \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx' = \int_\Omega f \cdot A \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ x_3 \end{pmatrix} dx.$$

For the convenience of the reader, we recall here some properties of \mathcal{R} proved in [14]. The set \mathcal{R} is a closed, connected, boundaryless, and totally geodesic submanifold of $\mathrm{SO}(3)$ (see [14, Proposition 4.1]).

The set of rotations can be equipped with its intrinsic distance

$$\operatorname{dist}_{\mathrm{SO}(3)}(Q, R) = \min \{ |W| : W \in \mathbb{R}_{\text{skew}}^{3 \times 3}, Q = Re^W \}, \quad (29)$$

for every $Q, R \in \mathrm{SO}(3)$. The tangent space to \mathcal{R} at the point R is denoted with TR_R and is given by

$$\mathrm{TR}_R = \{ W \in \mathbb{R}_{\text{skew}}^{3 \times 3} : F(RW^2) = 0 \}. \quad (30)$$

Note that by differentiating the map $t \mapsto F(Re^{tW})$ and evaluating it at $t = 0$ we obtain

$$F(RW) = 0, F(RW^2) \leq 0 \quad \forall R \in \mathcal{R} \quad \forall W \in \mathbb{R}_{\text{skew}}^{3 \times 3}. \quad (31)$$

The normal space to \mathcal{R} at the point R is denoted by NR_R and is given by

$$\mathrm{NR}_R = \{ W \in \mathbb{R}_{\text{skew}}^{3 \times 3} : W : W' = 0 \quad \forall W' \in \mathrm{TR}_R \}. \quad (32)$$

Observe that for any nonzero skew-symmetric matrix W in NR_R one has $F(RW^2) < 0$.

We now deduce some additional properties of \mathcal{R} . For some results we will suppose that

$$R^T f \cdot e_3 = 0 \quad \forall R \in \mathcal{R}. \quad (33)$$

This may seem a strong assumption when \mathcal{R} is not a singleton, however, one can easily find examples of forces for which this condition is verified.

Example A.1. Consider $S = [0, 1]^2$ and $f = (x_1 - \frac{1}{2})e_3$. A quick computation gives

$$F(R) = \frac{1}{12} R_{31},$$

thus, $\mathcal{R} = \{ R \in \mathrm{SO}(3) : R_{31} = 1 \}$. In particular for any optimal rotation $R \in \mathcal{R}$ we have $R^T e_3 = e_1$, so that $R^T f \cdot e_3 = (x_1 - \frac{1}{2})e_1 \cdot e_3 = 0$.

As proved in [14, Example 6.4] $\mathcal{R} = \mathrm{SO}(3)$ does not imply $f = 0$. However, it is clearly implied when (33) holds.

Lemma A.2. Assume (33). Then either \mathcal{R} is a singleton or $\dim \mathcal{R} = 1$.

Proof. Let $\bar{R} \in \mathcal{R}$ and suppose $\mathcal{R} \neq \{\bar{R}\}$. Define

$$\tilde{F}(A) = \int_{\Omega} f \cdot \bar{R}A \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ x_3 \end{pmatrix} dx = \int_{\Omega} \bar{R}^T f \cdot A \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ x_3 \end{pmatrix} dx.$$

Similarly, define

$$\tilde{\mathcal{R}} = \operatorname{argmax}_{R \in \text{SO}(3)} \tilde{F}(R).$$

Note that $\mathcal{R} = \bar{R} \cdot \tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ so it is enough to prove that $\dim \tilde{\mathcal{R}} = 1$. Clearly $\text{Id} \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}$, so we can use the classification of [14, Proposition 6.2]. Since \tilde{F} and F are linear on the space of 3×3 matrices, we can represent them by 3×3 matrices, that we will still denote, with a slight abuse of notation, by \tilde{F} and F . Since f is not identically zero, by (33) we can exclude that $\mathcal{R} = \text{SO}(3)$. Hence, we just need to show that $\dim \tilde{\mathcal{R}} \neq 2$. By [14, Proposition 6.2], \mathcal{R} is two dimensional when the eigenvalues of \tilde{F} are of the form $a, a, -a$ for some $a > 0$. Note first of all that

$$\tilde{F}: A = F : \bar{R}A \quad \forall A \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3},$$

so that $\tilde{F} = \bar{R}^T F$. Moreover

$$F_{i3} = F : E^{i3} = F(E^{i3}) = 0 \quad i = 1, 2, 3,$$

where E^{ij} is the matrix such that $E_{km}^{ij} = \delta_{ki}\delta_{mj}$ and δ_{ij} is the usual Kronecker symbol. It follows that $\det(\tilde{F}) = \det(F) = 0$ and 0 is an eigenvalue of \tilde{F} , concluding the proof. ■

The previous lemma, combined with [14, Proposition 6.2], guarantees in particular, that if \mathcal{R} is not a singleton and f is not trivial, \mathcal{R} is always a single closed geodesic.

The set of rotations is not linear. However, the 2-dimensional structure of the integral that defines F gives us the freedom to perform some change of sign to the columns of a rotation while keeping the sign of its determinant. A few simple results follow from this observation.

Lemma A.3. If (33) holds, then $\max_{R \in \text{SO}(3)} F(R) > 0$. Otherwise, $\max_{R \in \text{SO}(3)} F(R) \geq 0$.

Proof. Assume (33) and suppose by contradiction that $F(R) \leq 0$ for any rotation $R \in \text{SO}(3)$. By (33) we have $\mathcal{R} \neq \text{SO}(3)$, hence the map F can not vanish on the whole $\text{SO}(3)$. Thus, there is a rotation R such that $F(R) < 0$. Now consider the matrix

$$\hat{R} = \begin{pmatrix} -R^1 & -R^2 & R^3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that $\hat{R} \in \text{SO}(3)$ and $F(\hat{R}) = -F(R) > 0$. This gives the desired contradiction. The same argument applies to the second part of the statement. ■

Consider now $R \in \mathcal{R}$ and the skew-symmetric matrix

$$W = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since $F(RW) = 0$, we get

$$\int_S f \cdot R \begin{pmatrix} x_2 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx' = \int_S f \cdot R \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ x_1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx'.$$

For a given $R \in \mathcal{R}$ we then define

$$a(R) = \int_S f \cdot R \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx', \quad (34)$$

$$b(R) = \int_S f \cdot R \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ x_2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx',$$

$$c(R) = \int_S f \cdot R \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ x_1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx' = \int_S f \cdot R \begin{pmatrix} x_2 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dx. \quad (35)$$

Note that by [Lemma A.3](#) we have that $a(R) + b(R) = F(R) \geq 0$. Moreover, $a(R)$ and $b(R)$ can not be negative, as proved in the following lemma. In particular, when [\(33\)](#) holds, $a(R)$ and $b(R)$ cannot be both zero by [Lemma A.3](#).

Lemma A.4. *It holds that $a(R), b(R) \geq 0$ for any $R \in \mathcal{R}$.*

Proof. Suppose by contradiction that $a(R) < 0$ for some $R \in \mathcal{R}$. Then by [Lemma A.3](#) we have $b(R) = F(R) - a(R) \geq 0$. Consider the rotation

$$\hat{R} = \begin{pmatrix} -R^1 & R^2 & -R^3 \end{pmatrix} \in \text{SO}(3).$$

Then $F(R) \geq F(\hat{R}) = -a(R) + b(R) > a(R) + b(R) = F(R)$, which gives a contradiction. A similar proof can be done for $b(R)$. \blacksquare

We can now give an explicit characterization of the tangent space $\text{T}\mathcal{R}_R$ in terms of the quantities $a(R), b(R)$ and $c(R)$.

Proposition A.5. *Assume [\(33\)](#) and suppose that $\dim \mathcal{R} = 1$. Let $R \in \mathcal{R}$. Then*

$$a(R)b(R) - c^2(R) = 0.$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{T}\mathcal{R}_R &= \left\{ W \in \mathbb{R}_{\text{skew}}^{3 \times 3} : W_{12} = 0, W_{13} = -\frac{c(R)}{a(R)} W_{23} \right\} && \text{if } a(R) \neq 0, \\ \text{T}\mathcal{R}_R &= \left\{ W \in \mathbb{R}_{\text{skew}}^{3 \times 3} : W_{12} = 0, W_{23} = -\frac{c(R)}{b(R)} W_{13} \right\} && \text{if } b(R) \neq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By [\(30\)](#) the tangent space to \mathcal{R} at R is the set of zeros of the map $W \in \mathbb{R}_{\text{skew}}^{3 \times 3} \mapsto F(RW^2)$. For a general skew-symmetric matrix W , we have

$$(W^2)' = - \begin{pmatrix} W_{12}^2 + W_{13}^2 & W_{13}W_{23} \\ W_{13}W_{23} & W_{12}^2 + W_{23}^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Hence, by [\(33\)](#) we have

$$F(RW^2) = -(W_{12}^2 + W_{13}^2)a(R) - 2W_{13}W_{23}c(R) - (W_{12}^2 + W_{23}^2)b(R)$$

This expression can be considered as a quadratic form $q : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ computed at the vector (W_{12}, W_{13}, W_{23}) . We can identify q with a symmetric matrix and study its sign. We have

$$q = - \begin{pmatrix} a(R) + b(R) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & a(R) & c(R) \\ 0 & c(R) & b(R) \end{pmatrix},$$

so by [Lemma A.3–A.4](#) the sign of q depends solely on the minor $a(R)b(R) - c^2(R)$. If $a(R)b(R) - c^2(R) > 0$, the only zero of q is at 0, contradicting the hypothesis on the dimension of \mathcal{R} . If $a(R)b(R) - c^2(R) < 0$, the set of zeros of q contains two lines that span a subset of dimension 2 in \mathbb{R}^3 , contradicting again the assumption $\dim \mathcal{R} = 1$. Therefore, it must hold that $a(R)b(R) - c^2(R) = 0$. In this case, we have

$$q(W) = -W_{12}^2 F(R) - \left(W_{13} \sqrt{a(R)} + W_{23} \frac{c(R)}{\sqrt{a(R)}} \right)^2 \quad \text{if } a(R) \neq 0,$$

$$q(W) = -W_{12}^2 F(R) - \left(W_{23} \sqrt{b(R)} + W_{13} \frac{c(R)}{\sqrt{b(R)}} \right)^2 \quad \text{if } b(R) \neq 0,$$

concluding the characterization of the tangent space by [Lemma A.3](#) ($F(R) > 0$). ■

Corollary A.6. *Assume (33) and suppose that $\dim \mathcal{R} = 1$ and let $R \in \mathcal{R}$. Then*

$$\mathcal{N}\mathcal{R}_R = \left\{ W \in \mathbb{R}_{\text{skew}}^{3 \times 3} : W_{23} = \frac{c(R)}{a(R)} W_{13} \right\} \quad \text{if } a(R) \neq 0,$$

$$\mathcal{N}\mathcal{R}_R = \left\{ W \in \mathbb{R}_{\text{skew}}^{3 \times 3} : W_{13} = \frac{c(R)}{b(R)} W_{23} \right\} \quad \text{if } b(R) \neq 0.$$

Acknowledgments. The author acknowledges support by PRIN2022 number 2022J4FYNJ funded by MUR, Italy, and by the European Union - Next Generation EU.

References

- [1] Helmut Abels, Maria Giovanna Mora, and Stefan Müller. “The time-dependent von Kármán plate equation as a limit of 3d nonlinear elasticity”. In: *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations* 41.1–2 (Aug. 2010), pp. 241–259.
- [2] Helmut Abels, Maria Giovanna Mora, and Stefan Müller. “Thin vibrating plates: long time existence and convergence to the von Kármán plate equations”. In: *GAMM-Mitteilungen* 34.1 (Apr. 2011), pp. 97–101.
- [3] Sean Michael Carroll and Bradley William Dickinson. “Construction of neural nets using the radon transform”. In: *International 1989 Joint Conference on Neural Networks* (1989), 607–611 vol.1.
- [4] George Cybenko. “Approximation by superpositions of a sigmoidal function”. In: *Mathematics of Control, Signals, and Systems* 2.4 (1989), pp. 303–314.
- [5] August Föppl. *Vorlesung über technische Mechanik*. Vol. 5. Leipzig, 1907.
- [6] Manuel Friedrich and Martin Kružík. “Derivation of von Kármán Plate Theory in the Framework of Three-Dimensional Viscoelasticity”. In: *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis* 238.1 (June 2020), pp. 489–540.
- [7] Gero Friesecke, Richard D. James, and Stefan Müller. “A theorem on geometric rigidity and the derivation of nonlinear plate theory from three-dimensional elasticity”. In: *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* 55.11 (2002), pp. 1461–1506.
- [8] Gero Friesecke, Richard D. James, and Stefan Müller. “A hierarchy of plate models derived from nonlinear elasticity by Γ -convergence”. In: *Archive for rational mechanics and analysis* 180 (2006), pp. 183–236.

- [9] Peter Hornung. “Approximation of Flat $W^{2,2}$ Isometric Immersions by Smooth Ones”. In: *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis* 199.3 (2011), pp. 1015–1067.
- [10] Theodore Von Kármán. *Encyclopädie der Mathematischen Wissenschaften*. Vol. IV/4: *Festigkeitsprobleme im Maschinenbau*. Leipzig, 1910, pp. 311–385.
- [11] Gustav Kirchhoff. “Über das Gleichgewicht und die Bewegung einer elastischen Scheibe.” In: *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik (Crelles Journal)* 1850.40 (1850), pp. 51–88.
- [12] Myriam Lecumberry and Stefan Müller. “Stability of Slender Bodies under Compression and Validity of the von Kármán Theory”. In: *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis* 193.2 (2009), pp. 255–310.
- [13] Francesco Maddalena, Danilo Percivale, and Franco Tomarelli. “Variational problems for Föppl–von Kármán plates”. In: *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* 50.1 (2018), pp. 251–282.
- [14] Cy Maor and Maria Giovanna Mora. “Reference Configurations Versus Optimal Rotations: A Derivation of Linear Elasticity from Finite Elasticity for all Traction Forces”. In: *Journal of Nonlinear Science* 31.3 (2021).
- [15] Stefan Neukamm and Igor Velčić. “Derivation of a homogenized Von Kármán plate theory from 3D nonlinear elasticity”. In: *Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences* 23.14 (Oct. 2013), pp. 2701–2748.
- [16] Igor Velčić. “On the general homogenization of von Kármán plate equations from three-dimensional nonlinear elasticity”. In: *Analysis and Applications* 15.01 (Nov. 2016), pp. 1–49.