

ON UNIQUENESS OF INVERSE CONDUCTIVE SCATTERING PROBLEM WITH UNKNOWN EMBEDDED OBSTACLES

CHENGYU WU* AND JIAQING YANG†

Abstract. This paper is concerning the inverse conductive scattering of acoustic waves by a bounded inhomogeneous object with possibly embedded obstacles inside. A new uniqueness theorem is proved that the conductive object is uniquely determined by the fixed frequency far-field measurements, ignoring its contents. Meanwhile, the boundary informations of several related physical coefficients are also uniquely determined. The proof is mainly based on a detailed singularity analysis of solutions near the interface associated with a family of point sources or hypersingular point sources, which is deduced by the potential theory. Moreover, the other key ingredient in the proof is the well-posedness of the interior transmission problem with the conductivity boundary condition in the L^2 sense, where several sufficient conditions depending on the domain and physical coefficients are provided.

Key words. inverse scattering, conductive boundary, singularity analysis, interior transmission problem, uniqueness.

AMS subject classifications. 35R30.

1. Introduction. In this paper, we consider the inverse conductive scattering problem of determining penetrable object with possibly embedded obstacles. Such kind of problems can find applications in various fields, such as remote sensing, radar and sonar, medical imaging and nondestructive testing.

Mathematically, denote by D and D_b the bounded penetrable object in \mathbb{R}^3 and the embedded obstacles, respectively, where we assume that $D, D_b \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ are both bounded domains such that $\partial D \in C^{2,\alpha_0}$ and $D_b \subset\subset D$, $D_b = \bigcup_{j=1}^m D_b^{(j)}$ with $D_b^{(j_1)} \cap D_b^{(j_2)} = \emptyset$ if $j_1 \neq j_2$. Denote by n the refractive index in the inhomogeneous medium $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \overline{D_b}$, which is assumed that $n = 1$ in $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \overline{D}$, $n \in L^\infty(D \setminus \overline{D_b})$, $\text{Re}(n) > 0$ and $\text{Im}(n) \geq 0$ in $D \setminus \overline{D_b}$. Consider an incident wave u^i satisfying the Helmholtz equation $\Delta u^i + k^2 u^i = 0$ in \mathbb{R}^3 with the wave number $k > 0$ given by $k = \omega/c$, where $\omega > 0$ is the frequency and $c > 0$ is the sound speed. Then the scattering problem corresponding to the scatterer $(D, \lambda, \gamma, n, D_b)$ is modeled by the following transmission problem

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u + k^2 u = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \overline{D}, \\ \text{div}(\lambda \nabla v) + k^2 n v = 0 & \text{in } D \setminus \overline{D_b}, \\ u - v = 0 & \text{on } \partial D, \\ \partial_\nu u = \lambda \partial_\nu v + \gamma v & \text{on } \partial D, \\ \mathcal{B}(v) = 0 & \text{on } \partial D_b, \\ \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} r(\partial_r u^s - iku^s) = 0, & r = |x|, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where $\lambda \in C^1(\overline{D} \setminus D_b)$ with $\lambda > 0$ in $\overline{D} \setminus D_b$ is the transmission coefficient related to the medium $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \overline{D_b}$, $\gamma \in C(\partial D)$ is the conductive coefficient with $\text{Im}(\gamma) \leq 0$, u^s is the scattered wave, $u = u^i + u^s$ denotes the total field in $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \overline{D}$, and ν is the unit exterior normal to ∂D . Furthermore, \mathcal{B} stands for the boundary condition imposed on ∂D_b satisfying $\mathcal{B}(v) = v$, provided that D_b is a sound-soft obstacle, and

*School of Mathematics and Statistics, Xi'an Jiaotong University, Xi'an 710049, Shaanxi, China (wucy99@stu.xjtu.edu.cn)

†School of Mathematics and Statistics, Xi'an Jiaotong University, Xi'an 710049, Shaanxi, China (jiaq.yang@xjtu.edu.cn)

$\mathcal{B}(v) = \partial_\nu v$ with ν the unit exterior normal to ∂D_b , provided that D_b is a sound-hard obstacle. Moreover, if D_b is a mixed-type obstacle then $\mathcal{B}(v) = \partial_\nu v + \beta v$ on an open set $\Gamma_b \subset \partial D_b$ (with the impedance coefficient β such that $\text{Im}(\beta) \geq 0$) and $\mathcal{B}(v) = v$ on $\partial D_b \setminus \overline{\Gamma}_b$.

The Sommerfeld radiation condition leads to the following asymptotic behavior

$$u^s(x) = \frac{e^{ikr}}{4\pi r} \left\{ u_\infty(\hat{x}) + O\left(\frac{1}{r}\right) \right\}, \quad r = |x| \rightarrow \infty,$$

for the scattered field u^s uniformly in all directions $\hat{x} = x/r \in \mathbb{S}^2$, where u_∞ is the far-field pattern defined on the unit sphere. The well-posedness has been extensively studied in the literature, and we refer to e.g. [4, 5, 16, 17, 27]. In this paper, we study the inverse problem to determine D, λ, n, γ and D_b from a knowledge of the far-field pattern at a fixed frequency.

Many uniqueness theorems are available in the literature for the case of $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $\gamma = 0$ and $D_b = \emptyset$. The first result is initiated by Isakov [13] with the variational method by constructing special singular solutions for two groups of Helmholtz equations. Then Kirsch & Kress [15] simplified Isakov's approach by utilizing the potential theory in the classical continuous function spaces. From then on, lots of inverse problems for different mathematical models have been investigated (see, e.g., [3, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 17–19, 19, 24, 26] and the references therein). However, it is noted that among these work, there are rare that can handle the case $D_b \neq \emptyset$ with no other strong assumptions, and their methods are usually complicated. For example, the penetrable obstacle D and the embedded object D_b can be determined simultaneously in [17] but under the condition that n is a known constant in $D \setminus \overline{D}_b$. In [10], Hähner get the uniqueness of D and D_b by considering the completeness of the products of the harmonic functions, which is, however, with the knowledge of the scattered waves corresponding to an interval of wave numbers. It should also be reminded that the majority of the above uniqueness results were under the hypothesis $\lambda \neq 1$ near the boundary ∂D .

When focusing on the conductive boundary condition, that is, $\gamma \neq 0$, the related work are much less and almost all are only considering constant λ . In [11], also based on Isakov's idea, Hettlich obtained the uniqueness of D, n, λ and $\gamma|_{\partial D}$, under the assumptions that n, λ are constant in D and $D_b = \emptyset$ with other certain conditions. For the case $\lambda = 1$, Hettlich gave an additional assumption that γ has a positive distance from 0 on ∂D in order to get the uniqueness, which is not necessary in our results. Later, Gerlach & Kress [7] applied the same approach in [15] to shorten the analysis of Hettlich. For the case $D_b \neq \emptyset$ or n, λ are not constant, there is barely no scientific literature. We here only mention that Mitrea and Mitrea [19] get the uniqueness of ∂D with possibly $D_b \neq \emptyset$ but also with constant n and λ , whose methods are based on boundary integral techniques and Calderón-Zygmund theory.

As discussed above, the singular solution for the scattering problem plays a key role in the inverse problem. Thus in the present paper we study in detail the solutions to problem (1.1) with point source or hypersingular point source incident waves. It is a natural thought that the solutions possess a same singularity as the singular incidence when the singular positions approach the interface. Here we give the first rigorous proof for such thought. We show that the solutions have the same singularity as the singular incidence multiplying by a constant relative to the transmission coefficient λ and conductive coefficient γ . We establish these results by splicing the singular solution into several parts. Different methods have been applied to analyze different

parts, such as the variational method and the integral equation method, and for the key part it requires an elaborate mathematical analysis. The detailed singularity for singular solutions, besides the uniqueness results of the inverse problem, is another ingredient of this paper.

For the inverse problem, it is well known that $D_b \neq \emptyset$ or $\lambda = 1$ can bring great difficulties in the uniqueness proof of the inverse problem. But recently, a much simpler method for the inverse transmission problem is proposed in [27], which can recover the boundary ∂D in situations that $D_b \neq \emptyset$ or $\lambda = 1$. This method is applied in the present paper and extended to many other cases, like in [23] for the inverse fluid-solid interaction problem and in [25] for the inverse boundary value problem. It is expected to be used in more cases. Our method is mainly based on constructing a well-posed modified interior transmission problem in a sufficiently small domain inside D near the boundary ∂D . We use the smallness of the domain to eliminate the difficulties generated by $D_b \neq \emptyset$ or $\lambda = 1$ near the boundary ∂D . Further, our uniqueness results contain the identification of the derivatives of the coefficients on the boundary. The proof is greatly relied on the aforementioned complete description of the singularity of the solutions to the scattering problem with singular incidence. We note that these estimates are possible to be generalized to determine the higher order derivatives of the coefficients. And it is also possible to extend our methods to other types inverse scattering problems, such as the electromagnetic and elastic scattering.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we propose a novel perspective to derive the singularity of solutions with point source or hypersingular point source incident waves in the H^1 sense, which plays a key role in the uniqueness proof of the inverse problem. In Section 3.1, we introduce two types interior transmission problem corresponding to the case $\lambda \neq 1$ and $\lambda = 1$ near the boundary, respectively. The new type interior transmission problem for the case $\lambda = 1$ is then investigated carefully and several sufficient conditions for it to be well-posed are given. In particular, we find that this interior transmission problem is always uniquely solvable in domain sufficiently small, which is essential for later proof. Finally, Section 3.2 is all about the proof of the uniqueness result. A novel and simple method is employed here for the unique determination of the penetrable object from the measurement of the far-field pattern at a fixed frequency, disregarding its contents. Furthermore, we also identify the coefficients in the scattering problem at the boundary of the penetrable object utilizing the singularity of the solutions.

2. Singularity analysis. This section is devoted to the study of the singularity of the solutions to problem (1.1), as the source position approaching the interface. It will be proved that the solutions admit the same singularity to the singular incidence multiplying by certain constants related to λ and γ . These singularities play a key role in proving the uniqueness results of the inverse problem and are also interesting on their own rights.

For the sake of simplicity, we just consider the case with an impedance condition on ∂D_b , which is $\mathcal{B}(v) = \partial_\nu v + i\rho v$ with $\rho \geq 0$. Other cases can be handled analogously. We start by presenting some useful notations.

For $x_0 \in \partial D$ and $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small, define $x_j := x_0 + (\delta/j)\nu(x_0) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \overline{D}$ and $y_j := x_0 - (\delta/j)\nu(x_0) \in D \setminus \overline{D}_b$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Now we introduce the single- and

double-layer boundary operators

$$\begin{aligned}(S_{ee}\varphi)(x) &= \int_{\partial D} \Phi(x, y)\varphi(y)ds(y), \quad x \in \partial D, \\ (K_{ee}\varphi)(x) &= \int_{\partial D} \frac{\partial\Phi(x, y)}{\partial\nu(y)}\varphi(y)ds(y), \quad x \in \partial D,\end{aligned}$$

and their normal derivative operators

$$\begin{aligned}(K'_{ee}\varphi)(x) &= \int_{\partial D} \frac{\partial\Phi(x, y)}{\partial\nu(x)}\varphi(y)ds(y), \quad x \in \partial D, \\ (T_{ee}\varphi)(x) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial\nu(x)} \int_{\partial D} \frac{\partial\Phi(x, y)}{\partial\nu(y)}\varphi(y)ds(y), \quad x \in \partial D.\end{aligned}$$

where $\Phi(x, y) = \exp(ik|x-y|)/(4\pi|x-y|)$ is the fundamental solution to the Helmholtz equation in \mathbb{R}^3 . We also introduce the boundary operators S_{ii}, K_{ii}, K'_{ii} and T_{ii} defined on ∂D_b as well as S_{th}, K_{th}, K'_{th} and T_{th} with $t, h = e, i$, respectively, where, for example, S_{ei} is defined similarly as S_{ee} but with $x \in \partial D_b$. It is known that S_{tt}, K_{tt} and K'_{tt} with $t = e, i$ are all bounded and compact in $L^q(\partial D)$ ($1 < q < \infty$). We refer the readers to [20, 21] for the properties of these operators in L^p spaces.

THEOREM 2.1. *Denote by (u_j^s, v_j) the solution for problem (1.1) with the incident wave $u_j^i(x) = \Phi(x, x_j)$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Then,*

$$\left\| v_j - \frac{2}{\lambda(x_0) + 1} \Phi_0(x, x_j) \right\|_{H^1(D \setminus \overline{D}_b)} \leq C$$

uniformly for $j \in \mathbb{N}$ with $C > 0$ a constant, where $\Phi_0(x, y) = 1/(4\pi|x-y|)$ is the fundamental solution for the Laplacian.

Proof. We prove by spitting the solutions (u_j^s, v_j) into two parts. First, we consider the case with constant λ and n . Define (\hat{u}_j^s, \hat{v}_j) to be the unique solution of the following equations

$$\begin{cases} \Delta \hat{u}_j^s + k^2 \hat{u}_j^s = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \overline{D}, \\ \operatorname{div}(\lambda_0 \nabla \hat{v}_j) + k^2 \hat{v}_j = 0 & \text{in } D \setminus \overline{D}_b, \\ \hat{u}_j^s - \hat{v}_j = f_{1,j} & \text{on } \partial D, \\ \partial_\nu \hat{u}_j^s - (\lambda_0 \partial_\nu \hat{v}_j + \gamma \hat{v}_j) = f_{2,j} & \text{on } \partial D, \\ \mathcal{B}(\hat{v}_j) = 0 & \text{on } \partial D_b, \\ \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} r (\partial_r \hat{u}_j^s - ik \hat{u}_j^s) = 0, & r = |x|, \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

where $\lambda_0 = \lambda(x_0)$ and the boundary datas

$$\begin{aligned}f_{1,j}(x) &= -(\Phi(x, x_j) + \Phi(x, y_j)), \\ f_{2,j}(x) &= -\left(\frac{\partial\Phi(x, x_j)}{\partial\nu(x)} + \frac{\partial\Phi(x, y_j)}{\partial\nu(x)} \right).\end{aligned}$$

Clearly, $(u_j^s - \Phi(\cdot, y_j), v_j)$ solves problem (2.1) replacing λ_0 and k^2 by λ and k^2n . We will analyze \hat{v}_j and $v_j - \hat{v}_j$ separately.

Before going further, we note that $f_{1,j} \in L^p(\partial D)$ with $1 \leq p < 2$ is uniformly bounded for $j \in \mathbb{N}$, and by [6, Lemma 4.2] $f_{2,j}$ is uniformly bounded in $C(\partial D)$ for $j \in \mathbb{N}$.

Set $k_1^2 = k^2/\lambda_0 > 0$. Now let (\hat{u}_j^s, \hat{v}_j) be in the form of

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{u}_j^s(x) &= \int_{\partial D} \Phi(x, y) \varphi_j(y) ds(y) + \lambda_0 \int_{\partial D} \frac{\partial \Phi(x, y)}{\partial \nu(y)} \psi_j(y) ds(y), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \overline{D} \\ \hat{v}_j(x) &= \int_{\partial D} \Phi_1(x, y) \varphi_j(y) ds(y) + \int_{\partial D} \frac{\partial \Phi_1(x, y)}{\partial \nu(y)} \psi_j(y) ds(y) \\ &\quad + \int_{\partial D_b} \Phi_1(x, y) \eta_j(y) ds(y), \quad x \in D \setminus \overline{D}_b\end{aligned}\quad (2.3)$$

with $\Phi_1(x, y) = \exp(ik_1|x-y|)/(4\pi|x-y|)$. Then by the jump relations of these operators, it is equivalently reduced to the following system of boundary integral equations

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -h\gamma & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \psi_j \\ \varphi_j \\ \eta_j \end{pmatrix} + L \begin{pmatrix} \psi_j \\ \varphi_j \\ \eta_j \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 2hf_{1,j} \\ -2hf_{2,j} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.4)$$

in $L^p(\partial D) \times L^p(\partial D) \times C(\partial D_b)$ with $p < 2$, where $L = (L_1, L_2, L_3)$ with

$$\begin{aligned}L_1 &= \left(2h(\lambda_0 K_{ee} - K_{ee}^{(1)}), 2h\gamma K_{ee}^{(1)} - 2h\lambda_0(T_{ee} - T_{ee}^{(1)}), -2(T_{ei}^{(1)} + i\rho K_{ei}^{(1)}) \right)^T, \\ L_2 &= \left(2h(S_{ee} - S_{ee}^{(1)}), 2h(\lambda_0 K_{ee}'^{(1)} + \gamma S_{ee}^{(1)} - K_{ee}'), -2(K_{ei}'^{(1)} + i\rho S_{ei}^{(1)}) \right)^T, \\ L_3 &= \left(-2hS_{ie}^{(1)}, 2h(\lambda_0 K_{ie}' + \gamma S_{ie}^{(1)}), -2(K_{ii}'^{(1)} + i\rho S_{ii}^{(1)}) \right)^T\end{aligned}$$

and $h = 1/(\lambda_0 + 1)$. The operators above $S_{th}^{(1)}$, $K_{th}^{(1)}$, $K_{th}'^{(1)}$ and $T_{th}^{(1)}$ with $t, h = e, i$ are defined similarly as S_{th} , K_{th} , K_{th}' and T_{th} with the kernel function $\Phi_1(x, y)$. Since the operators in L are all compact in corresponding Banach spaces, we have that (2.4) is of Fredholm type. Thus, the existence of solution $(\psi_j, \varphi_j, \eta_j)^T \in L^p(\partial D) \times L^p(\partial D) \times C(\partial D_b)$ to (2.4) follows from the uniqueness of the direct problem (1.1) with the estimate that

$$\|\psi_j\|_{L^p(\partial D)} + \|\varphi_j\|_{L^p(\partial D)} + \|\eta_j\|_{L^\infty(\partial D_b)} \leq C(\|f_{1,j}\|_{L^p(\partial D)} + \|f_{2,j}\|_{L^p(\partial D)}) \leq C.$$

Since $L^p(\partial D)$ is bounded embedded into $H^{-1/2}(\partial D)$ for $p > 4/3$ in the two-dimensional case, by the first equation in (2.4) and [5, Corollary 3.7], we see that

$$\left\| \psi_j - \frac{2}{\lambda_0 + 1} f_{1,j} \right\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial D)} \leq C. \quad (2.5)$$

Moreover, applying [5, Corollary 3.8] we can derive from (2.3) and (2.5) that

$$\begin{aligned}\left\| \hat{v}_j - \int_{\partial D} \frac{\partial \Phi_1(x, y)}{\partial \nu(y)} \psi_j(y) ds(y) \right\|_{H^1(D \setminus \overline{D}_b)} &\leq C, \\ \left\| \int_{\partial D} \frac{\partial \Phi_1(x, y)}{\partial \nu(y)} \left(\psi_j(y) - \frac{2}{\lambda_0 + 1} f_{1,j}(y) \right) ds(y) \right\|_{H^1(D \setminus \overline{D}_b)} &\leq C,\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\left\| \hat{v}_j - \frac{2}{\lambda_0 + 1} \int_{\partial D} \frac{\partial \Phi_1(x, y)}{\partial \nu(y)} f_{1,j}(y) ds(y) \right\|_{H^1(D \setminus \overline{D}_b)} \leq C \quad (2.6)$$

uniformly for $j \in \mathbb{N}$.

Clearly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\partial D} \frac{\partial \Phi_1(x, y)}{\partial \nu(y)} f_{1,j}(y) ds(y) + 2 \int_{\partial D} \frac{\partial \Phi_0(x, y)}{\partial \nu(y)} \Phi_0(y, x_j) ds(y) \\
&= \int_{\partial D} \frac{\partial(\Phi_1 - \Phi_0)(x, y)}{\partial \nu(y)} f_{1,j}(y) ds(y) + \int_{\partial D} \frac{\partial \Phi_0(x, y)}{\partial \nu(y)} (\Phi_0(y, x_j) - \Phi_0(y, y_j)) ds(y) \\
& \quad + \int_{\partial D} \frac{\partial \Phi_0(x, y)}{\partial \nu(y)} (f_{1,j}(y) + \Phi_0(y, x_j) + \Phi_0(y, y_j)) ds(y). \tag{2.7}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\Phi_0(\cdot, x_j) - \Phi_0(\cdot, y_j) \in C(\partial D)$ uniformly for $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Denote by Grad the surface gradient, consider

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{Grad}(\Phi_0(x, x_j) - \Phi_0(x, y_j)) \\
&= \nabla_x[\Phi_0(x, x_j) - \Phi_0(x, y_j)] - (\nu(x) \cdot \nabla_x[\Phi_0(x, x_j) - \Phi_0(x, y_j)])\nu(x) \\
&= \nabla_x[\Phi_0(x, x_j) - \Phi_0(x, y_j)] - (\nu(x_0) \cdot \nabla_x[\Phi_0(x, x_j) - \Phi_0(x, y_j)])\nu(x_0) \\
& \quad - ((\nu(x) - \nu(x_0)) \cdot \nabla_x[\Phi_0(x, x_j) - \Phi_0(x, y_j)])\nu(x) \\
& \quad - (\nu(x_0) \cdot \nabla_x[\Phi_0(x, x_j) - \Phi_0(x, y_j)])(\nu(x) - \nu(x_0)). \tag{2.8}
\end{aligned}$$

Direct calculation yields that

$$|\nabla_x(\Phi_0(x, x_j) - \Phi_0(x, y_j))| \leq \frac{C}{|x - x_0|^2}, \quad x \in \partial D.$$

Since $\partial D \in C^2$, we have $|\nu(x) - \nu(x_0)| \leq C|x - x_0|$ for all $x \in \partial D$, which implies the last two terms in the right hand side of (2.8) are bounded by $C/|x - x_0|$ on ∂D . Without loss of generality, we assume that $x_0 = (0, 0, 0)$ and $\nu(x_0) = (0, 0, 1)$, which further indicates that $|x_{(3)}| \leq C(x_{(1)}^2 + x_{(2)}^2)$ for all $x = (x_{(1)}, x_{(2)}, x_{(3)}) \in \partial D$ by the Taylor's expansion. Then we deduce that

$$\frac{|x_{(i)}|}{|x - x_j|} \leq C \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{|x_{(3)}|}{|x - y_j|^2} \leq C$$

uniformly for $j \in \mathbb{N}$ on ∂D with $i = 1, 2$. Moreover, it is derived that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{j^2|x - y_j|^2} &= \frac{1}{j^2(x_{(1)}^2 + x_{(2)}^2) + j^2x_{(3)}^2 - 2j\delta x_{(3)} + \delta^2} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{Cj^2|x_{(3)}| + j^2x_{(3)}^2 - 2j\delta x_{(3)} + \delta^2} \\
&\leq C, \quad x \in \partial D,
\end{aligned}$$

since $\delta > 0$ is sufficiently small. Now for $x = (x_{(1)}, x_{(2)}, x_{(3)}) \in \partial D$ we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \nabla_x[\Phi_0(x, x_j) - \Phi_0(x, y_j)] - (\nu(x_0) \cdot \nabla_x[\Phi_0(x, x_j) - \Phi_0(x, y_j)])\nu(x_0) \\
&= \left(\left(\frac{1}{|x - y_j|^3} - \frac{1}{|x - x_j|^3} \right) x_{(1)}, \left(\frac{1}{|x - y_j|^3} - \frac{1}{|x - x_j|^3} \right) x_{(2)}, 0 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

It is seen that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \left(\frac{1}{|x-y_j|^3} - \frac{1}{|x-x_j|^3} \right) x^{(i)} \right| \\ &= \frac{2\delta}{j|x-y_j|} \frac{|x^{(i)}|}{|x-x_j|} \frac{|x^{(3)}|}{|x-y_j|^2} \left(\frac{|x-y_j|}{|x-x_j|^2} + \frac{1}{|x-x_j|+|x-y_j|} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{C}{|x-x_0|} \end{aligned}$$

on ∂D with $i = 1, 2$. Hence, we get

$$|\text{Grad}(\Phi_0(x, x_j) - \Phi_0(x, y_j))| \leq \frac{C}{|x-x_0|}, \quad x \in \partial D,$$

which implies $\text{Grad}(\Phi_0(x, x_j) - \Phi_0(x, y_j)) \in L^p(\partial D)$ uniformly for $j \in \mathbb{N}$ with $1 \leq p < 2$ and thus $\Phi_0(x, x_j) - \Phi_0(x, y_j)$ is uniformly bounded in $W^{1,p}(\partial D)$ for $j \in \mathbb{N}$ with $1 \leq p < 2$. By the classic Sobolev embeddings theorem, we know that the identical map from $W^{1,q}(\partial D)$ into $H^{1/2}(\partial D)$ is bounded for $q > 4/3$. Therefore, we derive that the right hand side of (2.7) is uniformly bounded in $H^1(D \setminus \overline{D_b})$ from the regularity of $\Phi_1 - \Phi_0$ and [5, Corollary 3.8].

Set

$$\tilde{f}_j(x) = 2 \int_{\partial D} \frac{\partial \Phi_0(x, y)}{\partial \nu(y)} \Phi_0(y, x_j) ds(y), \quad x \in D.$$

It is deduced that

$$\begin{cases} \Delta(\tilde{f}_j + h_j) = 0 & \text{in } D, \\ \tilde{f}_j(x) + h_j(x) = 2 \int_{\partial D} \frac{\partial \Phi_0(x, y)}{\partial \nu(y)} \Phi_0(y, x_j) ds(y) & \text{on } \partial D, \end{cases}$$

where $h_j(x) = \Phi_0(x, x_j)$. Again by [5, Corollary 3.7], we know that the trace of $\tilde{f}_j + h_j$ on ∂D is uniformly bounded in $H^{1/2}(\partial D)$. Thus the standard elliptic regularity gives $\|\tilde{f}_j + h_j\|_{H^1(D)} \leq C$ uniformly for $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Then we have

$$\left\| \hat{v}_j - \frac{2}{\lambda(x_0) + 1} \Phi_0(x, x_j) \right\|_{H^1(D \setminus \overline{D_b})} \leq C \quad (2.9)$$

for problem (2.1) with $k^2/\lambda_0 = k_1^2 > 0$.

Finally we focus on the difference between v_j and \hat{v}_j . Define $(\tilde{u}_j^s, \tilde{v}_j) := (u_j - \Phi(\cdot, y_j), v_j) - (\hat{u}_j^s, \hat{v}_j)$, it then follows that

$$\begin{cases} \Delta \tilde{u}_j^s + k^2 \tilde{u}_j^s = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \overline{D}, \\ \text{div}(\lambda \nabla \tilde{v}_j) + k^2 n \tilde{v}_j = \text{div}((\lambda(x_0) - \lambda) \nabla \hat{v}_j) + k^2(1-n) \hat{v}_j & \text{in } D \setminus \overline{D_b}, \\ \tilde{u}_j^s - \tilde{v}_j = 0 & \text{on } \partial D, \\ \partial_\nu \tilde{u}_j^s - (\lambda \partial_\nu \tilde{v}_j + \gamma \tilde{v}_j) = (\lambda - \lambda(x_0)) \partial_\nu \hat{v}_j & \text{on } \partial D, \\ \mathcal{B}(\tilde{v}_j) = 0 & \text{on } \partial D_b, \\ \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} r (\partial_r \tilde{u}_j^s - ik \tilde{u}_j^s) = 0, & r = |x|. \end{cases} \quad (2.10)$$

Since

$$\hat{v}_j = \left(\hat{v}_j - \frac{2}{\lambda(x_0) + 1} \Phi_0(x, x_j) \right) + \frac{2}{\lambda(x_0) + 1} \Phi_0(x, x_j),$$

we obtain from (2.9) that

$$\|\operatorname{div}((\lambda(x_0) - \lambda)\nabla\hat{v}_j) + k^2(1 - n)\hat{v}_j\|_{H^{-1}(D\setminus\overline{D}_b)} + \|(\lambda - \lambda(x_0))\partial_\nu\hat{v}_j\|_{H^{-1/2}(\partial D)} \leq C$$

uniformly for $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence, by the variational method we derive that

$$\|\tilde{u}_j^s\|_{H^1(B_R\setminus\overline{D})} + \|\tilde{v}_j\|_{H^1(D\setminus\overline{D}_b)} \leq C \quad (2.11)$$

The proof is then finished by combining (2.9) and (2.11). \square

Moreover, if $\lambda = 1$ near the boundary ∂D , we need to consider the hypersingular point source incidence. To this end, we refer the following theorem (see [27, Theorem 2.7]).

THEOREM 2.2. *With $u^i(x) = \nabla_x\Phi(x, z) \cdot \vec{a}$, $\lambda \equiv 1$ and $\gamma \equiv 0$ for problem (1.1), where $z \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \overline{D}$ and $\vec{a} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is fixed, the unique solution (u^s, v) satisfies*

$$\|v\|_{L^p(D\setminus\overline{D}_b)} + \|v - u^i\|_{H^1(D\setminus\overline{D}_b)} \leq C(\|u^i\|_{L^p(D\setminus\overline{D}_b)} + \|\mathcal{B}(u^i)\|_{L^\infty(\partial D_b)}),$$

where $6/5 \leq p < 3/2$.

Based on Theorems 2.1 and 2.2, we can further prove the following result for the case $\gamma \neq 0$.

THEOREM 2.3. *Suppose $\gamma \in C^{0, \alpha_1}(\partial D)$ with $1/2 < \alpha_1 \leq 1$ and there exists an open neighborhood $O_1(\partial D)$ of ∂D such that $\lambda = 1$ in $O_1(\partial D)$. Let (u_j^s, v_j) be the unique solution for problem (1.1) with the incident wave $u_j^i(x) = \nabla_x\Phi(x, x_j) \cdot \nu(x_0)$. Then we have*

$$\|v_j - u_j^i + (\gamma(x_0)/2)\Phi_0(x, x_j)\|_{H^1(D\setminus\overline{D}_b)} \leq C$$

uniformly for $j \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. By Theorem 2.2, there exists a unique solution (\hat{u}_j^s, \hat{v}_j) for problem (1.1) with $\lambda \equiv 1, \gamma \equiv 0$ and incident waves u_j^i such that

$$\|\hat{v}_j - u_j^i\|_{H^1(D\setminus\overline{D}_b)} \leq C(\|u_j^i\|_{L^p(D\setminus\overline{D}_b)} + \|\mathcal{B}(u_j^i)\|_{L^\infty(\partial D_b)}) \leq C. \quad (2.12)$$

From Theorem 2.1, the unique solution (\hat{U}_j^s, \hat{V}_j) for problem (1.1) with $\lambda \equiv 1$ and the incident waves $-\gamma(x_0)\Phi(\cdot, x_j)$ satisfies

$$\|\hat{V}_j + \gamma(x_0)\Phi(x, x_j)\|_{H^1(D\setminus\overline{D}_b)} \leq C. \quad (2.13)$$

Now consider the following problem

$$\begin{cases} \Delta\tilde{u}_j^s + k^2\tilde{u}_j^s = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \overline{D}, \\ \Delta\tilde{v}_j + k^2n\tilde{v}_j = 0 & \text{in } D \setminus \overline{D}_b, \\ \tilde{u}_j^s - \tilde{v}_j = -\gamma(x_0)\Phi(x, x_j) & \text{on } \partial D, \\ \partial_\nu\tilde{u}_j^s - (\partial_\nu\tilde{v}_j + \gamma\tilde{v}_j) = \gamma(\hat{v}_j + \hat{V}_j) - \gamma(x_0)\partial_\nu\Phi(x, x_j) & \text{on } \partial D, \\ \mathcal{B}(\tilde{v}_j) = 0 & \text{on } \partial D_b, \\ \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} r(\partial_r\tilde{u}_j^s - ik\tilde{u}_j^s) = 0, & r = |x|. \end{cases} \quad (2.14)$$

Clearly, $\Phi(x, x_j) \in L^p(\partial D)$ for $1 \leq p < 2$ and $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Further, it can be verified that

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(\hat{v}_j + \hat{V}_j) - \gamma(x_0)\partial_\nu\Phi(x, x_j) &= \gamma(\hat{v}_j - u_j^i) + \gamma(\hat{V}_j + \gamma(x_0)\Phi(x, x_j)) \\ &\quad - \gamma(x_0)\gamma\Phi(x, x_j) + (\gamma(x) - \gamma(x_0))u_j^i \\ &\quad + \gamma(x_0)\nabla_x\Phi(x, x_j) \cdot (\nu(x_0) - \nu(x)), \end{aligned} \quad (2.15)$$

which implies that the right hand side of (2.15) is uniformly bounded in $L^p(\partial D)$ with $4/3 \leq p < 2/(2 - \alpha_1)$ due to (2.12), (2.13) as well as the regularity of the boundary ∂D and γ . Therefore, arguing similarly as in the proof of Theorem 2.1, we can obtain that

$$\|\tilde{v}_j - (\gamma(x_0)/2)\Phi_0(x, x_j)\|_{H^1(D \setminus \overline{D}_b)} \leq C. \quad (2.16)$$

Let $U_j^s = \hat{u}_j^s + \hat{U}_j^s + \tilde{u}_j^s$ and $V_j = \hat{v}_j + \hat{V}_j + \tilde{v}_j$. Finally, we define $(\tilde{U}_j^s, \tilde{V}_j)$ by

$$\begin{cases} \Delta \tilde{U}_j^s + k^2 \tilde{U}_j^s = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \overline{D}, \\ \operatorname{div}(\lambda \nabla \tilde{V}_j) + k^2 n \tilde{V}_j = \operatorname{div}((1 - \lambda) \nabla V_j) & \text{in } D \setminus \overline{D}_b, \\ \tilde{U}_j^s - \tilde{V}_j = 0 & \text{on } \partial D, \\ \partial_\nu \tilde{U}_j^s - (\partial_\nu \tilde{V}_j + \gamma \tilde{V}_j) = 0 & \text{on } \partial D, \\ \mathcal{B}(\tilde{V}_j) = 0 & \text{on } \partial D_b, \\ \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} r (\partial_r \tilde{U}_j^s - ik \tilde{U}_j^s) = 0, & r = |x|. \end{cases} \quad (2.17)$$

It is easily checked that $u_j^s = U_j^s + \tilde{U}_j^s$ and $v_j = V_j + \tilde{V}_j$. Since $\lambda = 1$ in $O_1(\partial D)$, it follows that $\|\operatorname{div}((1 - \lambda) \nabla V_j)\|_{H^{-1}(D \setminus \overline{D}_b)} \leq C$, which implies by the variational method that $(\tilde{U}_j^s, \tilde{V}_j)$ is well defined and $\|\tilde{V}_j\|_{H^1(D \setminus \overline{D}_b)} \leq C$ uniformly for $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, combining (2.12), (2.13) and (2.16), we obtain the desired estimate and the proof is complete. \square

REMARK 2.4. *The estimates in Theorems 2.1 and 2.3 are of great significance in the uniqueness proof of the inverse problem. We hope that these kinds estimates can be extended to other cases and gearlized to derive a better uniqueness results for the inverse problem.*

3. The inverse problem. In this section, we shall study two interior transmission problems and then apply a novel technique to prove the uniqueness theorem in determination of the object and relating coefficients. We show that the object D , the transmission coefficient λ , the conductive coefficient γ , the refractive index n and also some of their derivatives can be uniquely recovered, for which the proof is greatly relied on the singularity of the solutions and the aforementioned interior transmission problems.

3.1. The interior transmission problem. In this subsection, we introduce two types of interior transmission problems corresponding to the case $\lambda \neq 1$ and $\lambda = 1$ near the boundary ∂D , respectively.

Denote by Ω a bounded and simply connected domain in \mathbb{R}^3 with $\partial\Omega \in C^2$. For the case $\lambda \neq 1$, we consider the following interior transmission problem

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(\lambda_1 \nabla U) - b_1 U = g_1 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \operatorname{div}(\lambda_2 \nabla V) - b_2 V = g_2 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ U - V = h_1 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ \lambda_1 \partial_\nu U - \lambda_2 \partial_\nu V = h_2 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

with $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in C(\overline{\Omega})$, $g_1, g_2 \in L^2(\Omega)$, $h_1 \in H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)$, $h_2 \in H^{-1/2}(\partial\Omega)$ and b_1, b_2 positive constants. This problem was studied in [25], and we have the result below (see [25, Corollary 2.2]).

LEMMA 3.1. Assume $\lambda_i > 0$ in $\overline{\Omega}$ with $i = 1, 2$. If there exists a positive constant $\varepsilon < \min\{b_2, 1\}$ such that

$$\varepsilon b_1 > \left(\frac{1+b_2}{2}\right)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon \left(\inf_{\Omega} \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2}\right) > \left(\frac{1+b_2}{2}\right)^2,$$

then the problem (3.1) has a unique solution (U, V) satisfying that

$$\|U\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|V\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C(\|g_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|g_2\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|h_1\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)} + \|h_2\|_{H^{-1/2}(\partial\Omega)}).$$

REMARK 3.2. The condition $\varepsilon < b_2$ excludes the case that $\inf_{\Omega}(\lambda_1/\lambda_2) \leq 1$ since $[(1+b_2)/2]^2 \geq b_2$. But sometimes we may exchange λ_1 and λ_2 to make the conditions can be satisfied.

For the case $\lambda = 1$, we introduce the interior transmission problem of the following type

$$\begin{cases} \Delta v + k^2 n_1 v = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \Delta w + k^2 n_2 w = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ v - w = f_1 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ \partial_\nu v + \eta w - \partial_\nu w = f_2 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

where $f_1 \in H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)$, $f_2 \in H^{-1/2}(\partial\Omega)$, $n_1, n_2 \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and $\eta \in L^\infty(\partial\Omega)$. To get the well-posedness of the problem (3.2), we give a lemma first.

LEMMA 3.3. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n (n \geq 2)$ be a bounded domain with $\partial\Omega \in C^2$. Define

$$C_1(\Omega) := \sup_{\substack{u \in \tilde{H}_0^2(\Omega) \\ u \neq 0}} \frac{\int_{\partial\Omega} |\partial_\nu u|^2 ds}{\int_{\Omega} |\Delta u|^2 dx},$$

where $\tilde{H}_0^2(\Omega) = H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$. Then $C_1(\Omega) \rightarrow 0$ as $\text{diam}(\Omega) \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. The standard elliptic regularity gives

$$\|u\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \leq C \|\Delta u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad \forall u \in \tilde{H}_0^2(\Omega).$$

Then by the trace theorem we obtain that $C_1(\Omega) < \infty$ for any bounded domain Ω with $\partial\Omega \in C^2$.

Without loss of generality, we only consider the case that Ω are open balls in \mathbb{R}^n . Set $C_0 = C_1(B_1)$, in other words,

$$\int_{\partial B_1} |\partial_\nu u|^2 ds \leq C_0 \int_{B_1} |\Delta u|^2 dx, \quad \forall u \in \tilde{H}_0^2(B_1).$$

Now for fixed $B_R(x_0) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, for any $u \in \tilde{H}_0^2(B_R(x_0))$, let $v(y) = u(x_0 + Ry)$, $y \in B_1$. Then $v(y) \in \tilde{H}_0^2(B_1)$. Hence, we have

$$\int_{\partial B_1} |\partial_\nu v|^2 ds \leq C_0 \int_{B_1} |\Delta v|^2 dx.$$

Changing the integral variable gives that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial B_1} |\partial_\nu v|^2 ds &= R^{3-n} \int_{\partial B_R(x_0)} |\partial_\nu u|^2 ds, \\ \int_{B_1} |\Delta v|^2 dx &= R^{4-n} \int_{B_R(x_0)} |\Delta u|^2 dx, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\int_{\partial B_R(x_0)} |\partial_\nu u|^2 ds \leq C_0 R \int_{B_R(x_0)} |\Delta u|^2 dx, \quad \forall u \in \tilde{H}_0^2(B_R(x_0)).$$

Thus we obtain $C_1(B_R(x_0)) \leq C_0 R$ and the conclusion follows. \square

Denote by $\lambda_1(\Omega)$ the first Dirichlet eigenvalue of $-\Delta$ in Ω . We recall that

$$\lambda_1(\Omega) = \inf_{\substack{u \in H_0^1(\Omega) \\ u \neq 0}} \frac{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 dx}{\int_{\Omega} |u|^2 dx}$$

and $\lambda_1(\Omega) \rightarrow \infty$ as $\text{diam}(\Omega) \rightarrow 0$. Define the Hilbert space

$$H_{\Delta}^1(\Omega) := \{u \in H^1(\Omega), \Delta u \in L^2(\Omega)\}$$

with the inner product $(u, v)_{H_{\Delta}^1(\Omega)} = (u, v)_{H^1(\Omega)} + (\Delta u, \Delta v)_{L^2(\Omega)}$. Clearly, for $u \in H_{\Delta}^1(\Omega)$ we have that $u|_{\partial\Omega} \in H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)$ and $\partial_\nu u \in H^{-1/2}(\partial\Omega)$. In particular, if $u = \partial_\nu u = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$ for some $u \in H_{\Delta}^1(\Omega)$, then $u \in H_0^2(\Omega)$. Now we give the following uniqueness and existence theorem for problem (3.2).

THEOREM 3.4. *Suppose there exists a $u_0 \in H_{\Delta}^1(\Omega)$ such that $u_0 = f_1$ and $\partial_\nu u_0 = f_2$ on $\partial\Omega$. Assume in addition that $n_1, n_2 > \delta_1$ with $|n_1 - n_2| > \delta_1$ for some constant $\delta_1 > 0$. Then problem (3.2) has a unique solution $(v, w) \in L^2(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$ such that*

$$\|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|w\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C \|u_0\|_{H_{\Delta}^1(\Omega)},$$

provided $(k, n_1, n_2, \eta, \Omega)$ satisfying one of the following conditions

1. $n_1 - n_2 < 0, \eta > \delta_2$ and $k^2 < \frac{\lambda_1(\Omega) \inf_{\Omega} n_2}{(\sup_{\Omega} n_2)^2}$,
2. $n_1 - n_2 > 0, \eta < -\delta_2$ and $k^2 < \frac{\lambda_1(\Omega) \inf_{\Omega} n_1}{(\sup_{\Omega} n_1)^2}$,
3. $n_1 - n_2 > 0, \eta > \delta_2$, and

$$0 < \frac{C' C_1(\Omega) k^2}{C' \inf_{\Omega} |\eta| - C_1(\Omega) k^2} < \frac{\lambda_1(\Omega)}{k^2 (\sup_{\Omega} n_1)^2} - \frac{1}{\inf_{\Omega} n_1},$$

4. $n_1 - n_2 < 0, \eta < -\delta_2$, and

$$0 < \frac{C' C_1(\Omega) k^2}{C' \inf_{\Omega} |\eta| - C_1(\Omega) k^2} < \frac{\lambda_1(\Omega)}{k^2 (\sup_{\Omega} n_2)^2} - \frac{1}{\inf_{\Omega} n_2},$$

5. $n_1 - n_2 < 0, \eta = 0$ and $k^2 < \frac{\lambda_1(\Omega) \inf_{\Omega} n_2}{(\sup_{\Omega} n_2)^2}$,
6. $n_1 - n_2 > 0, \eta = 0$ and $k^2 < \frac{\lambda_1(\Omega) \inf_{\Omega} n_1}{(\sup_{\Omega} n_1)^2}$,

for some positive constant δ_2 and $C' := 1/\sup_{\Omega} |n_1 - n_2|$.

Proof. First we consider the case $\eta \neq 0$ corresponding to conditions 1-4. Set $u = v - w$, then it can be verified that

$$\begin{cases} (\Delta + k^2 n_2) \frac{1}{n_2 - n_1} (\Delta + k^2 n_1) u = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = f_1 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ \partial_\nu u = f_2 - \frac{\eta}{k^2(n_2 - n_1)} (\Delta u + k^2 n_1 u) & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (3.3)$$

Define $u' = u - u_0 \in \tilde{H}_0^2(\Omega)$. By Green's formula we get that the variational formulation of (3.3) is to find a $u' \in \tilde{H}_0^2(\Omega)$ such that

$$B(u', \varphi) = F(\varphi) \quad \forall \varphi \in \tilde{H}_0^2(\Omega),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} B(u', \varphi) &:= \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{n_2 - n_1} (\Delta u' + k^2 n_1 u') (\Delta \bar{\varphi} + k^2 n_2 \bar{\varphi}) dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{k^2}{\eta} \partial_\nu u' \partial_\nu \bar{\varphi} ds, \\ F(\varphi) &:= \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{n_1 - n_2} (\Delta u_0 + k^2 n_1 u_0) (\Delta \bar{\varphi} + k^2 n_2 \bar{\varphi}) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, by the Hölder's inequality and the trace theorem, we have that $B(u', \varphi)$ and $F(\varphi)$ are both bounded on $\tilde{H}_0^2(\Omega)$.

Note that $\|u'\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \leq C \|\Delta u'\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ for all $u' \in \tilde{H}_0^2(\Omega)$. Now for $(k, n_1, n_2, \eta, \Omega)$ satisfying condition 1, we deduce the following

$$\begin{aligned} B(u', u') &= \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{n_2 - n_1} |\Delta u' + k^2 n_2 u'|^2 dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{k^2}{\eta} |\partial_\nu u'|^2 ds + k^2 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u'|^2 dx \\ &\quad - k^4 \int_{\Omega} n_2 |u'|^2 dx \\ &\geq \left(C' - \frac{C'^2}{\varepsilon_1} \right) \|\Delta u'\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \varepsilon_1 \left(\frac{C'}{\varepsilon_1} \|\Delta u'\|_{L^2(\Omega)} - k^2 \|n_2 u'\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \right)^2 \\ &\quad + k^4 \left(C' + \frac{\lambda_1(\Omega)}{k^2 (\sup_{\Omega} n_2)^2} - \frac{1}{\inf_{\Omega} n_2} - \varepsilon_1 \right) \|n_2 u'\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ &\geq C \|\Delta u'\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \end{aligned}$$

for all $u' \in \tilde{H}_0^2(\Omega)$ with the constant ε_1 satisfying that $0 < \varepsilon_1 - C' < \lambda_1(\Omega)/[k^2(\sup_{\Omega} n_2)^2] - 1/\inf_{\Omega} n_2$. Thus we obtain that $B(u', \varphi)$ is coercive on $\tilde{H}_0^2(\Omega)$ when $(k, n_1, n_2, \eta, \Omega)$ satisfies condition 1. Similar calculation also yields that $B(u', \varphi)$ is coercive with condition 2.

Under condition 3, we choose a positive constant ε_2 such that $C' C_1(\Omega) k^2 / (C' \inf_{\Omega} |\eta| - C_1(\Omega) k^2) < \varepsilon_2 < \lambda_1(\Omega)/[k^2(\sup_{\Omega} n_1)^2] - 1/\inf_{\Omega} n_1$.

Then for all $u' \in \tilde{H}_0^2(\Omega)$ we derive

$$\begin{aligned}
-B(u', u') &= \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{n_1 - n_2} |\Delta u' + k^2 n_1 u'|^2 dx + k^2 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u'|^2 dx - k^4 \int_{\Omega} n_1 |u'|^2 dx \\
&\quad - \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{k^2}{\eta} |\partial_{\nu} u'|^2 ds \\
&\geq \left(C' - \frac{k^2 C_1(\Omega)}{\inf_{\Omega} |\eta|} - \frac{C'^2}{\varepsilon_2 + C'} \right) \|\Delta u'\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
&\quad + (\varepsilon_2 + C') \left(\frac{C'}{\varepsilon_2 + C'} \|\Delta u'\|_{L^2(\Omega)} - k^2 \|n_1 u'\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \right)^2 \\
&\quad + k^4 \left(\frac{\lambda_1(\Omega)}{k^2 (\sup_{\Omega} n_1)^2} - \frac{1}{\inf_{\Omega} n_1} - \varepsilon_2 \right) \|n_1 u'\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
&\geq C \|\Delta u'\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

The coercivity of $B(u', \varphi)$ under condition 4 follows analogously as above.

Then we consider the case $\eta = 0$, which corresponds to conditions 5 and 6. We see that $u = v - w$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} (\Delta + k^2 n_2) \frac{1}{n_2 - n_1} (\Delta + k^2 n_1) u = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = f_1 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ \partial_{\nu} u = f_2 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (3.4)$$

Set $u' = u - u_0 \in H_0^2(\Omega)$. Also we can get the variational problem of (3.4): finding $u' \in H_0^2(\Omega)$ such that

$$\tilde{B}(u', \varphi) = F(\varphi) \quad \forall \varphi \in H_0^2(\Omega),$$

where

$$\tilde{B}(u', \varphi) := \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{n_2 - n_1} (\Delta u' + k^2 n_1 u') (\Delta \bar{\varphi} + k^2 n_2 \bar{\varphi}) dx.$$

Obviously, $\tilde{B}(u', \varphi)$ is still bounded on $H_0^2(\Omega)$. Following the previous calculation closely, it can be shown that $\tilde{B}(u', \varphi)$ is coercive under conditions 5 and 6.

Now by the Lax-Milgram theorem, with conditions 1-6, there exists a unique solution $u' \in \tilde{H}_0^2(\Omega)$ or $H_0^2(\Omega)$ such that

$$\|u'\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \leq C \|u_0\|_{H_{\Delta}^1(\Omega)}.$$

Define $v = [1/k^2(n_2 - n_1)](\Delta u + k^2 n_2 u)$ and $w = v - u$. Then it can be verified that $(v, w) \in L^2(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$ is the unique solution to problem (3.2) and the desired a priori estimate holds. \square

REMARK 3.5. *Since $\lambda_1(\Omega) \rightarrow \infty$ and $C_1(\Omega) \rightarrow 0$ as $\text{diam}(\Omega) \rightarrow 0$, we see that conditions 1-6 will hold for fixed k, n_1, n_2 and η with Ω sufficiently small. In other words, problem (3.2) is always well-posed in small domains.*

3.2. Uniqueness of the inverse problem. With all the preceding preparations, we are ready to prove the uniqueness theorem of the inverse problem. To this end, we first give an assumption for some functions f in D .

ASSUMPTION 3.6. *There exists an open neighborhood $O_2(\partial D)$ of ∂D , $O_2(\partial D) \subset \subset D \setminus \overline{D}_b$, and a constant $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $f(x) > 1 + \varepsilon$ or $\varepsilon < f(x) < 1 - \varepsilon$ for a.e. $x \in O_2(\partial D)$.*

THEOREM 3.7. *Suppose $(D_1, \lambda_1, \gamma_1, n_1, D_b^1)$ and $(D_2, \lambda_2, \gamma_2, n_2, D_b^2)$ are two scatterers. Denote by $u_\infty^m(\hat{x}; d)$ the far-field pattern of the scattered field $u_m^s(x; d)$ to transmission problem (1.1) corresponding to the scatterer $(D_m, D_b^m, n_m, \lambda_m, \gamma_m)$ with the incident wave $u^i(x) = e^{ikx \cdot d}$, $d \in \mathbb{S}^2$, $m = 1, 2$. Assume that $u_\infty^1(\hat{x}; d) = u_\infty^2(\hat{x}; d)$ for all $\hat{x}, d \in \mathbb{S}^2$.*

(i) *If Assumption 3.6 holds for λ_m in D_m with $m = 1, 2$, then $D_1 = D_2 = D$ and $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$ on ∂D . Suppose in addition that $\lambda_m \in C^2(\overline{D}_m \setminus D_b^m)$ and $\gamma_m \in C(\partial D_m)$, $m = 1, 2$, then $(\partial_\nu \lambda_1 - \partial_\nu \lambda_2) + 2(\gamma_2 - \gamma_1) = 0$ on ∂D . Define*

$$a_m = \frac{\Delta \sqrt{\lambda_m}}{\sqrt{\lambda_m}} - \frac{k^2 n_m}{\lambda_m}, \quad m = 1, 2.$$

If further $a_m \in C^1(\overline{D}_m \setminus D_b^m)$, $m = 1, 2$, then $a_1 = a_2$ on ∂D .

(ii) *If $\lambda_m = 1$ in $O_1(\partial D_m)$, $\gamma_m \in C^{0, \alpha_1}(\partial D_m)$ is real-valued and n_m satisfies Assumption 3.6 in D_m with $m = 1, 2$, then $D_1 = D_2 = D$ and $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2$ on ∂D . Further suppose that $n_m \in C^2(\overline{D}_m \setminus D_b^m)$ is real-valued, $m = 1, 2$, then $D^\alpha n_1 = D^\alpha n_2$ on ∂D for $|\alpha| \leq 2$.*

Proof. (i) Suppose $D_1 \neq D_2$. Denote by G the unbounded connected part of $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus (\overline{D}_1 \cup \overline{D}_2)$. Then we can find a point $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and a small ball B centered at x_0 such that $x_0 \in \partial G \cap \partial D_1$, $x_0 \notin \partial D_2$ and $B \cap (\overline{D}_2 \cup \overline{D}_b^1) = \emptyset$. Define

$$x_j := x_0 + \frac{\delta}{j} n(x_0), \quad j = 1, 2, \dots$$

with $\delta > 0$ small enough such that $x_j \in B$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\partial D_1 \in C^{2, \alpha_0}$, we can further find a small C^{2, α_0} domain D_0 such that $B \cap D_1 \subset D_0 \subset (D_1 \setminus (\overline{D}_2 \cup \overline{D}_b^1)) \cap O_2(\partial D_1)$.

Denote by $(u_m^s(x; y), v_m(x; y))$ the unique solution of problem (1.1) corresponding to the scatterer $(D_m, \lambda_m, \gamma_m, n_m, D_b^m)$ and the incident wave $u^i = \Phi(x, y)$ with $m = 1, 2$ and $y \in G$. Let $u_\infty^m(\hat{x}; y)$ be the far-field pattern of $u_m^s(x; y)$. Then by Rellich's Lemma, we have $u_1^s(x; d) = u_2^s(x; d)$, $\forall x \in \overline{G}$, $d \in \mathbb{S}^2$. Arguing similarly as in the proof of [5, Theorem 3.16], we can obtain the mixed reciprocity relation $4\pi u_\infty^m(-d; x) = u_m^s(x; d)$, $\forall x \in \overline{G}$, $d \in \mathbb{S}^2$ and $m = 1, 2$. Thus we further have $u_\infty^1(\hat{x}; x_j) = u_\infty^2(\hat{x}; x_j)$, $\forall \hat{x} \in \mathbb{S}^2$ and $j \in \mathbb{N}$, which implies that $u_1^s(x; x_j) = u_2^s(x; x_j)$, $\forall x \in \overline{G}$ and $j \in \mathbb{N}$.

Hereafter, we set $u_{m,j}^s = u_m^s(x; x_j)$, $v_{m,j} = v_m(x; x_j)$ and $u_{m,j} = \Phi(\cdot, x_j) + u_{m,j}^s$ with $m = 1, 2$. It can be verified that $(v_{1,j}, u_{2,j})$ solves the following interior transmission problem

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(\lambda_1 \nabla v_{1,j}) - b_1 v_{1,j} = g_{1,j} & \text{in } D_0, \\ \Delta u_{2,j} - b_2 u_{2,j} = g_{2,j} & \text{in } D_0, \\ v_{1,j} - u_{2,j} = h_{1,j} & \text{on } \partial D_0, \\ \lambda_1 \partial_\nu v_{1,j} - \partial_\nu u_{2,j} = h_{2,j} & \text{on } \partial D_0, \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} g_{1,j} &= -(k^2 n_1 + b_1) v_{1,j}, & g_{2,j} &= -(k^2 + b_2) u_{2,j}, \\ h_{1,j} &= (v_{1,j} - u_{2,j})|_{\partial D_0}, & h_{2,j} &= (\lambda_1 \partial_\nu v_{1,j} - \partial_\nu u_{2,j})|_{\partial D_0}, \end{aligned}$$

and b_1, b_2 are positive constants to be chosen such that the conditions in Lemma 3.1 are satisfied. We note that such b_1, b_2 exist because Assumption 3.6 holds for λ_1 . Clearly, $h_{1,j} = 0$ and $h_{2,j} = -\gamma_1 u_{2,j}$ on $\Gamma := \partial D_0 \cap \partial D_1$. By Theorem 2.1, we have that $g_{1,j}$ are uniformly bounded in $L^2(D_0)$ for $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Due to the positive distance between x_j and D_2 , it follows that $\|u_{2,j}^s\|_{H^1(D_0)} \leq C$ from the well-posedness of problem (1.1), which indicates that $g_{2,j} \in L^2(D_0)$ are uniformly bounded for $j \in \mathbb{N}$ since $u_j^i = \Phi(x, x_j) \in L^2(D_0)$ are uniformly bounded.

Next we show that $h_{1,j}$ and $h_{2,j}$ are uniformly bounded in $H^{1/2}(\partial D_0)$ and $H^{-1/2}(\partial D_0)$ for $j \in \mathbb{N}$, respectively. By Theorem 2.1, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|h_{1,j}\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial D_0)} &= \|v_{1,j} - u_{2,j}\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial D_0 \setminus \Gamma)} \\ &\leq C(\|v_{1,j}\|_{H^1(D_0 \setminus \overline{B})} + \|u_{2,j}^s\|_{H^1(D_0)} + \|\Phi(\cdot, x_j)\|_{H^1(D_0 \setminus \overline{B})}) \\ &\leq C \end{aligned}$$

uniformly for $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Further, it is derived that

$$\begin{aligned} \|h_{2,j}\|_{H^{-1/2}(\partial D_0)} &\leq (\|h_{2,j}\|_{H^{-1/2}(\partial D_0 \setminus \Gamma)} + \|\gamma_1 u_{2,j}\|_{H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)}) \\ &\leq C \left(\|v_{1,j}\|_{H^1(D_0 \setminus \overline{B})} + \|u_{2,j}^s\|_{H^1(D_0)} + \|\Phi(\cdot, x_j)\|_{H^1(D_0 \setminus \overline{B})} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|u_{2,j}\|_{H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)} \right) \\ &\leq C \left(\|v_{1,j}\|_{H^1(D_0 \setminus \overline{B})} + \|u_{2,j}^s\|_{H^1(D_0)} + \|\Phi(\cdot, x_j)\|_{H^1(D_0 \setminus \overline{B})} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|\Phi(\cdot, x_j)\|_{L^p(\Gamma)} \right) \\ &\leq C \end{aligned}$$

with $4/3 < p < 2$ due to the fact that $L^p(\Gamma)$ is bounded embedded into $H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)$ for $p > 4/3$ and $\Phi(\cdot, x_j)$ are uniformly bounded in $L^p(\Gamma)$ for $p < 2$.

Therefore, we obtain that $\|u_{2,j}\|_{H^1(D_0)} \leq C$ by Lemma 3.1, which is however a contradiction since $\|u_{2,j}^s\|_{H^1(D_0)} \leq C$ and $\|\Phi(x, x_j)\|_{H^1(D_0)} \rightarrow \infty$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$. Thus $D_1 = D_2 = D$.

Now we show $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$ on ∂D . Suppose not, then we can assume that $\lambda_1/\lambda_2 > 1$ in $\overline{D_0}$. It is deduced that $(v_{1,j}, v_{2,j})$ is the solution to the following problem

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(\lambda_1 \nabla v_{1,j}) - b_1 v_{1,j} = \tilde{g}_{1,j} & \text{in } D_0, \\ \operatorname{div}(\lambda_2 \nabla v_{2,j}) - b_2 v_{2,j} = \tilde{g}_{2,j} & \text{in } D_0, \\ v_{1,j} - v_{2,j} = \tilde{h}_{1,j} & \text{on } \partial D_0, \\ \lambda_1 \partial_\nu v_{1,j} - \lambda_2 \partial_\nu v_{2,j} = \tilde{h}_{2,j} & \text{on } \partial D_0, \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{g}_{1,j} &= -(k^2 n_1 + b_1) v_{1,j}, & \tilde{g}_{2,j} &= -(k^2 n_2 + b_2) v_{2,j}, \\ \tilde{h}_{1,j} &= (v_{1,j} - v_{2,j})|_{\partial D_0}, & \tilde{h}_{2,j} &= (\lambda_1 \partial_\nu v_{1,j} - \lambda_2 \partial_\nu v_{2,j})|_{\partial D_0}, \end{aligned}$$

and also b_1, b_2 are positive constants satisfying the conditions in Lemma 3.1. We see that $\tilde{h}_{1,j} = 0$ and $\tilde{h}_{2,j} = (\gamma_2 - \gamma_1) v_{2,j}$ on Γ . By Theorem 2.1 we obtain that $\tilde{g}_{1,j}$ and $g_{2,j}$ are uniformly bounded in $L^2(D_0)$. Further, it can be derived from Theorem 2.1

that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\tilde{h}_{1,j}\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial D_0)} &= \|v_{1,j} - v_{2,j}\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial D_0 \setminus \Gamma)} \\
&\leq \|v_{1,j}\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial D_0 \setminus \Gamma)} + \|v_{2,j}\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial D_0 \setminus \Gamma)} \\
&\leq C \left(\|v_{1,j}\|_{H^1(D_0 \setminus \overline{B})} + \|v_{2,j}\|_{H^1(D_0 \setminus \overline{B})} \right) \\
&\leq C
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\tilde{h}_{2,j}\|_{H^{-1/2}(\partial D_0)} &\leq \|\tilde{h}_{2,j}\|_{H^{-1/2}(\partial D_0 \setminus \Gamma)} + \|(\gamma_2 - \gamma_1)v_{2,j}\|_{H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)} \\
&\leq C \left(\|v_{1,j}\|_{H^1(D_0 \setminus \overline{B})} + \|v_{2,j}\|_{H^1(D_0 \setminus \overline{B})} + \|v_{2,j}\|_{L^p(\Gamma)} \right) \\
&\leq C.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, by Lemma 3.1 we obtain $\|v_{2,j}\|_{H^1(D_0)} \leq C$ uniformly for $j \in \mathbb{N}$, which contradicts with

$$\left\| v_{2,j} - \frac{2}{\lambda_2(x_0) + 1} \Phi(x, x_j) \right\|_{H^1(D \setminus \overline{D}_b)} \leq C, \quad (3.3)$$

Thus we get $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$ on ∂D .

Now if $(\partial_\nu \lambda_1 - \partial_\nu \lambda_2) + 2(\gamma_2 - \gamma_1) \neq 0$ on ∂D , we can assume that $(\partial_\nu \lambda_1 - \partial_\nu \lambda_2) + 2(\gamma_2 - \gamma_1) > 0$ on Γ . (Note that if γ has a imaginary part, we just consider the real or imaginary part of $(\partial_\nu \lambda_1 - \partial_\nu \lambda_2) + 2(\gamma_2 - \gamma_1)$.) Then we see that $(w_{1,j}, w_{2,j}) = (\sqrt{\lambda_1}v_{1,j}, \sqrt{\lambda_2}v_{2,j})$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \Delta w_{1,j} - a_1 w_{1,j} = 0 & \text{in } D_0, \\ \Delta w_{2,j} - a_2 w_{2,j} = 0 & \text{in } D_0, \\ w_{1,j} - w_{2,j} = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma, \\ \partial_\nu w_{1,j} - \partial_\nu w_{2,j} = \left(\partial_\nu \sqrt{\lambda_1} - \partial_\nu \sqrt{\lambda_2} \right) v_{2,j} + \frac{\gamma_2 - \gamma_1}{\sqrt{\lambda_1}} v_{2,j} & \text{on } \Gamma. \end{cases} \quad (3.4)$$

Integration by parts yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\partial D_0} \partial_\nu w_{1,j} \overline{w}_{2,j} ds - \int_{D_0} \nabla w_{1,j} \cdot \nabla \overline{w}_{2,j} dx - \int_{D_0} a_1 w_{1,j} \overline{w}_{2,j} dx &= 0, \\
\int_{\partial D_0} \partial_\nu w_{2,j} \overline{w}_{1,j} ds - \int_{D_0} \nabla w_{2,j} \cdot \nabla \overline{w}_{1,j} dx - \int_{D_0} a_2 w_{2,j} \overline{w}_{1,j} dx &= 0,
\end{aligned}$$

which leads to

$$\int_{\partial D_0} (\partial_\nu w_{1,j} \overline{w}_{2,j} - \partial_\nu \overline{w}_{2,j} w_{1,j}) ds + \int_{D_0} (\overline{a}_2 - a_1) w_{1,j} \overline{w}_{2,j} dx = 0.$$

Utilizing the boundary conditions in (3.4), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Gamma} (\partial_\nu \lambda_1 - \partial_\nu \lambda_2 + 2(\gamma_2 - \gamma_1)) |v_{2,j}|^2 ds &= \int_{\Gamma} (\partial_\nu \overline{w}_{2,j} w_{2,j} - \partial_\nu w_{2,j} \overline{w}_{2,j}) ds \\
&+ \int_{\partial D_0 \setminus \Gamma} (\partial_\nu \overline{w}_{2,j} w_{1,j} - \partial_\nu w_{1,j} \overline{w}_{2,j}) ds \\
&+ \int_{D_0} (a_1 - \overline{a}_2) w_{1,j} \overline{w}_{2,j} dx. \quad (3.5)
\end{aligned}$$

Further, it can be deduced that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\Gamma} (\partial_{\nu} \bar{w}_{2,j} w_{2,j} - \partial_{\nu} w_{2,j} \bar{w}_{2,j}) ds &= \left(\int_{\partial D_0} - \int_{\partial D_0 \setminus \Gamma} \right) (\partial_{\nu} \bar{w}_{2,j} w_{2,j} - \partial_{\nu} w_{2,j} \bar{w}_{2,j}) ds \\
&= - \int_{\partial D_0 \setminus \Gamma} (\partial_{\nu} \bar{w}_{2,j} w_{2,j} - \partial_{\nu} w_{2,j} \bar{w}_{2,j}) ds \\
&\quad + \int_{D_0} (\bar{a}_2 - a_2) |w_{2,j}|^2 dx, \tag{3.6}
\end{aligned}$$

which indicates that the right hand side of (3.5) is bounded for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ by Theorem 2.1. Thus we get $\|v_{2,j}\|_{L^2(\Gamma)} \leq C$ uniformly for $j \in \mathbb{N}$ from the assumption, which is a contradiction since $\|\Phi_0(x, x_j)\|_{L^2(\Gamma)} \rightarrow \infty$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, $(\partial_{\nu} \lambda_1 - \partial_{\nu} \lambda_2) + 2(\gamma_2 - \gamma_1) = 0$ on ∂D . We leave our proof for $a_1 = a_2$ on ∂D to the last.

(ii) Suppose $D_1 \neq D_2$. Since $\gamma_1 \in C(\bar{D}_1)$, we can find a small C^{2,α_0} smooth domain $D_0 \subset (D_1 \setminus (\bar{D}_2 \cup \bar{D}_b^1)) \cap O_1(\partial D_1) \cap O_2(\partial D_1)$ such that $\Gamma := \partial D_0 \cap \partial D_1 \neq \emptyset$ is an open subset of ∂D_1 and one of the following is satisfied

(a) $\gamma_1 = 0$ on Γ ,

(b) $\gamma_1 > \delta_0$ or $\gamma_1 < -\delta_0$ on Γ for some positive constant δ_0 .

Then there exists a point $x_0 \in \Gamma$ and a small ball B centered at x_0 such that $D_1 \cap B \subset D_0$. Define

$$x_j := x_0 + \frac{\delta}{j} n(x_0), \quad j = 1, 2, \dots$$

with $\delta > 0$ small enough such that $x_j \in B$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Still denote by G the unbounded connected part of $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus (\bar{D}_1 \cup \bar{D}_2)$. Moreover, by Remark 3.5 we can let D_0 be sufficiently small such that $(k, n_1, 1, \eta, D_0)$ satisfies one of the conditions 1-6 in Theorem 3.4, where $\eta = 0$ in case (a) and $\eta = \gamma_1$ in case (b).

Now consider the incident wave $\tilde{u}_j^i = \nabla_x \Phi(x, x_j) \cdot \nu(x_0)$. Let $(\tilde{u}_m^s(x; x_j), \tilde{v}_m(x; x_j))$ be the unique solution of the transmission problem (1.1) corresponding to the scatter $(D_m, \lambda_m, \gamma_m, n_m, D_b^m)$ with the incident wave u_j^i , $m = 1, 2$. Similarly as in the proof of [22, Theorem 3.1], by Rellich's Lemma we have $\tilde{u}_1^s(x; x_j) = \tilde{u}_2^s(x; x_j)$, $\forall x \in \bar{G}$ and $j \in \mathbb{N}$.

Set $\tilde{u}_{m,j}^s = \tilde{u}_m^s(x; x_j)$, $\tilde{v}_{m,j} = \tilde{v}_m(x; x_j)$ and $\tilde{u}_{m,j} = \tilde{u}_j^i + \tilde{u}_{m,j}^s$ with $m = 1, 2$. We see that $(\tilde{v}_{1,j}, \tilde{u}_{2,j})$ solves the following interior transmission problem

$$\begin{cases} \Delta \tilde{v}_{1,j} + k^2 n_1 \tilde{v}_{1,j} = 0 & \text{in } D_0, \\ \Delta \tilde{u}_{2,j} + k^2 \tilde{u}_{2,j} = 0 & \text{in } D_0, \\ \tilde{v}_{1,j} - \tilde{u}_{2,j} = f_1^j & \text{on } \partial D_0, \\ \partial_{\nu} \tilde{v}_{1,j} + \eta \tilde{u}_{2,j} - \partial_{\nu} \tilde{u}_{2,j} = f_2^j & \text{on } \partial D_0 \end{cases} \tag{3.7}$$

with the boundary data

$$f_1^j = (\tilde{v}_{1,j} - \tilde{u}_{2,j})|_{\partial D_0}, \quad f_2^j = (\partial_{\nu} \tilde{v}_{1,j} + \eta \tilde{u}_{2,j} - \partial_{\nu} \tilde{u}_{2,j})|_{\partial D_0}.$$

Clearly, we have $f_1^j = f_2^j = 0$ on Γ . By the trace theorem, there exists a function $\chi_2 \in H^2(D_0)$ such that $\chi_2 = 0$ and $\partial \chi_2 / \partial \nu = \eta$ on ∂D_0 . Define $u_0^j = (1 - \chi_1)(\tilde{v}_{1,j} - \tilde{u}_{2,j} + \chi_2 \tilde{u}_{2,j})$ with $\chi_1 \in C_0^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and

$$\chi_1(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \bar{B}, \\ 1, & \text{in } B_0, \end{cases}$$

where B_0 is also a small ball centered at x_0 such that $\overline{B_0} \subset B$. Then we see that $u_0^j \in H_{\Delta}^1(D_0)$ with $u_0^j = f_1^j$ and $\partial u_0^j / \partial \nu = f_2^j$ on ∂D_0 . Thus by Theorem 3.4, it is obtained that

$$\|\tilde{v}_{1,j}\|_{L^2(D_0)} + \|\tilde{u}_{2,j}\|_{L^2(D_0)} \leq C \|u_0^j\|_{H_{\Delta}^1(D_0)}.$$

We claim that $\|u_0^j\|_{H_{\Delta}^1(D_0)} \leq C$ uniformly for $j \in \mathbb{N}$. To this end, first we have $\|\tilde{u}_{2,j}^s\|_{H_{\Delta}^1(D_0)} \leq C$ because of the well-posedness of problem (1.1) and the positive distance between x_j and D_2 . Then by Theorem 2.3 we derive the following

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_0^j\|_{H^1(D_0)} &= \|u_0^j\|_{H^1(D_0 \setminus \overline{B_0})} \\ &\leq C \|\tilde{v}_{1,j} - \tilde{u}_{2,j} + \chi_2 \tilde{u}_{2,j}\|_{H^1(D_0 \setminus \overline{B_0})} \\ &\leq C (\|\tilde{v}_{1,j}\|_{H^1(D_0 \setminus \overline{B_1})} + \|\tilde{u}_{2,j}^s\|_{H^1(D_0)} + \|\tilde{u}_j^i\|_{H^1(D_0 \setminus \overline{B_0})}) \\ &\leq C, \end{aligned}$$

since $\chi_2 \in H^2(D_0)$. Next we show Δu_0^j are uniformly bounded in $L^2(D_0)$. It can be verified that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta u_0^j &= \Delta(1 - \chi_1)(\tilde{v}_{1,j} - \tilde{u}_{2,j} + \chi_2 \tilde{u}_{2,j}) + 2\nabla(1 - \chi_1) \cdot \nabla(\tilde{v}_{1,j} - \tilde{u}_{2,j} + \chi_2 \tilde{u}_{2,j}) \\ &\quad + (1 - \chi_1)\Delta(\tilde{v}_{1,j} - \tilde{u}_{2,j} + \chi_2 \tilde{u}_{2,j}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we only need to prove that the last term in above equation is uniformly bounded in $L^2(D_0)$. Since $\tilde{v}_{1,j}$ and $\tilde{u}_{2,j}$ are solutions to problem (3.7), we have

$$\Delta(\tilde{v}_{1,j} - \tilde{u}_{2,j} + \chi_2 \tilde{u}_{2,j}) = -k^2 n_1 \tilde{v}_{1,j} - k^2 \tilde{u}_{2,j} + \Delta \chi_2 \tilde{u}_{2,j} + 2\nabla \chi_2 \cdot \nabla \tilde{u}_{2,j} - k^2 \chi_2 \tilde{u}_{2,j},$$

which clearly implies $\|(1 - \chi_1)\Delta(\tilde{v}_{1,j} - \tilde{u}_{2,j} + \chi_2 \tilde{u}_{2,j})\|_{L^2(D_0)} \leq C$ uniformly for $j \in \mathbb{N}$.

Therefore, we obtain that $\|\tilde{u}_{2,j}\|_{L^2(D_0)} \leq C$, which indicates that

$$\|\tilde{u}_j^i\|_{L^2(D_0)} \leq \|\tilde{u}_{2,j}\|_{L^2(D_0)} + \|\tilde{u}_{2,j}^s\|_{L^2(D_0)} \leq C.$$

But by direct calculation we see that

$$\|\tilde{u}_j^i\|_{L^2(D_0)}^2 = \int_{D_0} |\nabla_x \Phi(\cdot, x_j) \cdot \nu(x_0)|^2 dx \geq \frac{C}{j^2} \int_{D_0} \frac{1}{|x - x_j|^6} dx = O(j),$$

which is a contradiction. Hence, we get $D_1 = D_2 = D$.

For the proof of the uniqueness of γ on ∂D , note that Theorem 2.1 is still valid for the case $\lambda = 1$ near the boundary ∂D , we then follow closely the proof of $(\partial \lambda_1 / \partial \nu - \partial \lambda_2 / \partial \nu) + 2(\gamma_2 - \gamma_1) = 0$ on ∂D in (i). The detailed proof is thus omitted here.

Now assume that $n_1 - n_2 \neq 0$ on ∂D . We let $n_1 - n_2 > 0$ in $\overline{D_0}$. It follows that $(\tilde{v}_{1,j}, \tilde{v}_{2,j})$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \Delta \tilde{v}_{1,j} + k^2 n_1 \tilde{v}_{1,j} = 0 & \text{in } D_0, \\ \Delta \tilde{v}_{2,j} + k^2 n_2 \tilde{v}_{2,j} = 0 & \text{in } D_0, \\ \tilde{v}_{1,j} - \tilde{v}_{2,j} = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma, \\ \partial_\nu \tilde{v}_{1,j} - \partial_\nu \tilde{v}_{2,j} = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma. \end{cases} \quad (3.8)$$

By Remark 3.5, we can further let D_0 be small enough such that $(k, n_1, n_2, 0, D_0)$ satisfies the condition 6 in Theorem 3.4. Then estimating analogously as the first part

of the proof in (ii), we can also derive a contradiction, which implies that $n_1 = n_2$ on ∂D .

Furthermore, from (3.8) we notice that

$$\begin{cases} \Delta(\tilde{v}_{1,j} - \tilde{v}_{2,j}) + k^2 n_1(\tilde{v}_{1,j} - \tilde{v}_{2,j}) = k^2(n_2 - n_1)\tilde{v}_{2,j} & \text{in } D_0, \\ \tilde{v}_{1,j} - \tilde{v}_{2,j} = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma. \end{cases}$$

By Theorem 2.3, since $n_1 = n_2$ on Γ , we see

$$\begin{aligned} \|(n_2 - n_1)\tilde{v}_{2,j}\|_{L^2(D_0)} &\leq C (\|\tilde{v}_{2,j} - \tilde{u}_j^i + (\gamma(x_0)/2)\Phi_0(x, x_j)\|_{L^2(D_0)} \\ &\quad + \|(n_2 - n_1)(\tilde{u}_j^i - (\gamma(x_0)/2)\Phi_0(x, x_j))\|_{L^2(D_0)}) \\ &\leq C. \end{aligned}$$

It is known that $\tilde{v}_{1,j}, \tilde{v}_{2,j} \in H^2(D_0)$ for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$ since $x_j \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \bar{D}$. Thus, we deduce from [8, Theorem 9.13] that for any domain $\Omega' \subset\subset D_0 \cup \Gamma$,

$$\|\tilde{v}_{1,j} - \tilde{v}_{2,j}\|_{H^2(\Omega')} \leq C(\|\tilde{v}_{1,j} - \tilde{v}_{2,j}\|_{L^2(D_0)} + \|(n_2 - n_1)\tilde{v}_{2,j}\|_{L^2(D_0)}) \leq C. \quad (3.9)$$

We choose Ω' such that $D \cap B \subset \Omega'$ and $\Gamma' := \partial\Omega' \cap \partial D_0$ is an open subset of Γ . For simplicity, set $\partial_i := \partial/\partial x_i$ with $i = 1, 2, 3$. Then for $i = 1, 2, 3$ and $j \in \mathbb{N}$, it follows that

$$\begin{cases} \Delta\partial_i\tilde{v}_{1,j} + k^2\partial_i n_1\tilde{v}_{1,j} + k^2 n_1\partial_i\tilde{v}_{1,j} = 0 & \text{in } \Omega', \\ \Delta\partial_i\tilde{v}_{2,j} + k^2\partial_i n_2\tilde{v}_{2,j} + k^2 n_2\partial_i\tilde{v}_{2,j} = 0 & \text{in } \Omega', \\ \partial_i\tilde{v}_{1,j} - \partial_i\tilde{v}_{2,j} = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma'. \end{cases} \quad (3.10)$$

Now we integrate by parts over Ω' and yield that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial\Omega'} (\partial_\nu(\partial_i\tilde{v}_{1,j})\tilde{v}_{2,j} - \partial_i\tilde{v}_{1,j}\partial_\nu\tilde{v}_{2,j}) ds &= \int_{\Omega'} k^2 (n_2\tilde{v}_{2,j}\partial_i\tilde{v}_{1,j} - \partial_i(n_1\tilde{v}_{1,j})\tilde{v}_{2,j}) dx, \\ \int_{\partial\Omega'} (\partial_\nu(\partial_i\tilde{v}_{2,j})\tilde{v}_{1,j} - \partial_i\tilde{v}_{2,j}\partial_\nu\tilde{v}_{1,j}) ds &= \int_{\Omega'} k^2 (n_1\tilde{v}_{1,j}\partial_i\tilde{v}_{2,j} - \partial_i(n_2\tilde{v}_{2,j})\tilde{v}_{1,j}) dx, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\partial\Omega'} (\partial_\nu(\partial_i\tilde{v}_{1,j})\tilde{v}_{2,j} - \partial_\nu(\partial_i\tilde{v}_{2,j})\tilde{v}_{1,j}) ds \\ &= \int_{\Omega'} k^2\partial_i((n_2 - n_1)\tilde{v}_{1,j}\tilde{v}_{2,j}) dx + \int_{\partial\Omega' \setminus \Gamma'} (\partial_i\tilde{v}_{1,j}\partial_\nu\tilde{v}_{2,j} - \partial_i\tilde{v}_{2,j}\partial_\nu\tilde{v}_{1,j}) ds \\ &= \int_{\partial\Omega' \setminus \Gamma'} k^2(n_2 - n_1)\tilde{v}_{1,j}\tilde{v}_{2,j}\nu_i ds + \int_{\partial\Omega' \setminus \Gamma'} (\partial_i\tilde{v}_{1,j}\partial_\nu\tilde{v}_{2,j} - \partial_i\tilde{v}_{2,j}\partial_\nu\tilde{v}_{1,j}) ds \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

since $n_1 = n_2$ on Γ' . On the other hand, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Gamma'} (\partial_\nu(\partial_i\tilde{v}_{1,j}) - \partial_\nu(\partial_i\tilde{v}_{2,j}))\tilde{v}_{1,j} ds \\ &= \int_{\partial\Omega'} (\partial_\nu(\partial_i\tilde{v}_{1,j}) - \partial_\nu(\partial_i\tilde{v}_{2,j}))\tilde{v}_{1,j} ds - \int_{\partial\Omega' \setminus \Gamma'} (\partial_\nu(\partial_i\tilde{v}_{1,j}) - \partial_\nu(\partial_i\tilde{v}_{2,j}))\tilde{v}_{1,j} ds \\ &= \int_{\partial\Omega' \setminus \Gamma'} (\partial_i\tilde{v}_{1,j} - \partial_i\tilde{v}_{2,j})\partial_\nu\tilde{v}_{1,j} - \int_{\partial\Omega' \setminus \Gamma'} (\partial_\nu(\partial_i\tilde{v}_{1,j}) - \partial_\nu(\partial_i\tilde{v}_{2,j}))\tilde{v}_{1,j} ds \\ &\quad + \int_{\Omega'} k^2\partial_i[(n_2 - n_1)\tilde{v}_{2,j}]\tilde{v}_{1,j} dx + \int_{\Omega'} k^2\partial_i n_1(\tilde{v}_{2,j} - \tilde{v}_{1,j})\tilde{v}_{1,j} dx. \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

Again integrating by parts, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega'} k^2 \partial_i [(n_2 - n_1) \tilde{v}_{2,j}] \tilde{v}_{1,j} dx \\
= & \int_{\partial\Omega' \setminus \Gamma'} k^2 (n_2 - n_1) \tilde{v}_{1,j} \tilde{v}_{2,j} \nu_i ds + \int_{\Omega'} k^2 (n_1 - n_2) \tilde{v}_{2,j} \partial_i \tilde{v}_{1,j} dx \\
= & \int_{\partial\Omega' \setminus \Gamma'} k^2 (n_2 - n_1) \tilde{v}_{1,j} \tilde{v}_{2,j} \nu_i ds + \int_{\Omega'} k^2 (n_1 - n_2) (\tilde{v}_{2,j} - \tilde{v}_{1,j}) \partial_i \tilde{v}_{1,j} dx \\
& + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega'} k^2 (n_1 - n_2) \partial_i (\tilde{v}_{1,j}^2) dx \\
= & \int_{\partial\Omega' \setminus \Gamma'} k^2 (n_2 - n_1) \tilde{v}_{1,j} \tilde{v}_{2,j} \nu_i ds + \int_{\Omega'} k^2 (n_1 - n_2) (\tilde{v}_{2,j} - \tilde{v}_{1,j}) \partial_i \tilde{v}_{1,j} dx \\
& + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial\Omega' \setminus \Gamma'} k^2 (n_1 - n_2) \tilde{v}_{1,j}^2 \nu_i ds + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega'} k^2 (\partial_i n_2 - \partial_i n_1) \tilde{v}_{1,j}^2 dx. \quad (3.13)
\end{aligned}$$

Combinbing (3.11)-(3.13), we finally derive the following equation

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega'} k^2 (\partial_i n_2 - \partial_i n_1) \tilde{v}_{1,j}^2 dx \\
= & \int_{\partial\Omega' \setminus \Gamma'} k^2 (n_2 - n_1) \tilde{v}_{1,j}^2 \nu_i ds + 2 \int_{\Omega'} k^2 \partial_i n_1 (\tilde{v}_{1,j} - \tilde{v}_{2,j}) \tilde{v}_{1,j} dx \\
& + 2 \int_{\Omega'} k^2 (n_2 - n_1) (\tilde{v}_{2,j} - \tilde{v}_{1,j}) \partial_i \tilde{v}_{1,j} dx + 2 \int_{\partial\Omega' \setminus \Gamma'} \partial_\nu (\partial_i \tilde{v}_{1,j}) (\tilde{v}_{1,j} - \tilde{v}_{2,j}) ds \\
& + 2 \int_{\partial\Omega' \setminus \Gamma'} \partial_i \tilde{v}_{1,j} (\partial_\nu \tilde{v}_{2,j} - \partial_\nu \tilde{v}_{1,j}) ds \quad (3.14)
\end{aligned}$$

for $i = 1, 2, 3$. By [2, Lemma 1.1], Theorem 2.3 and (3.9), it is deduced that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \int_{\partial\Omega' \setminus \Gamma'} \partial_\nu (\partial_i \tilde{v}_{1,j}) (\tilde{v}_{1,j} - \tilde{v}_{2,j}) ds \right| & \leq \|\partial_\nu (\partial_i \tilde{v}_{1,j})\|_{H^{-3/2}(\partial\Omega' \setminus \Gamma')} \|\tilde{v}_{1,j} - \tilde{v}_{2,j}\|_{H^2(\Omega')} \\
& \leq C \|\partial_i \tilde{v}_{1,j}\|_{H_\Delta(\Omega' \setminus \overline{B})} \|\tilde{v}_{1,j} - \tilde{v}_{2,j}\|_{H^2(\Omega')} \\
& \leq C \|\tilde{v}_{1,j}\|_{H^1(\Omega' \setminus \overline{B})} \|\tilde{v}_{1,j} - \tilde{v}_{2,j}\|_{H^2(\Omega')} \leq C
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \int_{\partial\Omega' \setminus \Gamma'} \partial_i \tilde{v}_{1,j} (\partial_\nu \tilde{v}_{2,j} - \partial_\nu \tilde{v}_{1,j}) \right| & \leq \|\partial_i \tilde{v}_{1,j}\|_{H^{-1/2}(\partial\Omega' \setminus \Gamma')} \|\tilde{v}_{1,j} - \tilde{v}_{2,j}\|_{H^2(\Omega')} \\
& \leq C \|\partial_i \tilde{v}_{1,j}\|_{H_\Delta(\Omega' \setminus \overline{B})} \|\tilde{v}_{1,j} - \tilde{v}_{2,j}\|_{H^2(\Omega')} \leq C.
\end{aligned}$$

We can further get that the remained terms in the right hand side of (3.14) are uniformly bounded for $j \in \mathbb{N}$ again from Theorem 2.3 and (3.9), which implies

$$\left| \int_{\Omega'} k^2 (\partial_i n_2 - \partial_i n_1) \tilde{v}_{1,j}^2 dx \right| \leq C$$

and thus

$$\left| \int_{\Omega'} (\partial_i n_2 - \partial_i n_1) |\nabla_x \Phi_0(x, x_j) \cdot \nu(x_0)|^2 dx \right| \leq C. \quad (3.15)$$

But the singularity of Φ_0 yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega'} |\nabla_x \Phi_0(x, x_j) \cdot \nu(x_0)|^2 dx &\geq Cj, \\ \int_{\Omega'} |x - x_0| |\nabla_x \Phi_0(x, x_j) \cdot \nu(x_0)|^2 dx &\geq C \ln j \end{aligned}$$

as $j \rightarrow \infty$ with the constant $C > 0$ independent of $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, the regularity of n (i.e., $n_m \in C^2(\overline{D} \setminus D_b^m)$, $m = 1, 2$) together with (3.15) forces $D^\alpha n_1 = D^\alpha n_2$ on ∂D for $|\alpha| = 1, 2$.

(iii) We continue the proof of part (i) for $a_1 = a_2$ on ∂D . Since $(\partial_\nu \lambda_1 - \partial_\nu \lambda_2) + 2(\gamma_2 - \gamma_1) = 0$ on ∂D , we see that (3.4) becomes

$$\begin{cases} \Delta w_{1,j} - a_1 w_{1,j} = 0 & \text{in } D_0, \\ \Delta w_{2,j} - a_2 w_{2,j} = 0 & \text{in } D_0, \\ w_{1,j} - w_{2,j} = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma, \\ \partial_\nu w_{1,j} - \partial_\nu w_{2,j} = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma. \end{cases} \quad (3.16)$$

Similar to (3.9), by Theorem 2.1 and $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$ on ∂D we can also get $\|w_{1,j} - w_{2,j}\|_{H^2(\Omega')} \leq C$. Following the similar procedure from (3.11) to (3.14), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\partial\Omega'} (a_1 - a_2) w_{1,j}^2 \nu_i ds \\ = &\int_{\Omega'} (\partial_i a_1 - \partial_i a_2) w_{1,j}^2 dx + 2 \int_{\Omega'} \partial_i a_1 (w_{1,j} - w_{2,j}) w_{1,j} dx \\ &+ 2 \int_{\Omega'} (a_2 - a_1) (w_{2,j} - w_{1,j}) \partial_i w_{1,j} dx + 2 \int_{\partial\Omega' \setminus \Gamma'} \partial_\nu (\partial_i w_{1,j}) (w_{1,j} - w_{2,j}) ds \\ &+ 2 \int_{\partial\Omega' \setminus \Gamma'} \partial_i w_{1,j} (\partial_\nu w_{2,j} - \partial_\nu w_{1,j}) ds \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

with $i = 1, 2, 3$. Again we can derive that

$$\left| \int_{\partial\Omega'} (a_1 - a_2) w_{1,j}^2 \nu_i ds \right| \leq C,$$

which indicates by Theorem 2.1 that

$$\left| \int_{\Gamma'} (a_1 - a_2) \lambda_1 |\Phi_0(x, x_j)|^2 \nu_i ds \right| \leq C.$$

Now suppose $(a_1 - a_2)(x_0) \neq 0$ for $x_0 \in \partial D$. Then we can assume that $a_1 - a_2 > 0$ in $\overline{\Omega'}$ (or the real or imaginary part of $a_1 - a_2$). We know that there exists $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ such that $\nu_i(x_0) \neq 0$. Hence, we can further assume that $\nu_i \geq \varepsilon > 0$ on Γ' , which implies $\|\Phi_0(x, x_j)\|_{L^2(\Gamma')} \leq C$. This is however a contradiction. Therefore, $a_1 = a_2$ on ∂D , and the proof is finally finished. \square

REMARK 3.8. *Note that the regularity requirements on the coefficients in this theorem can be relaxed to only in the neighborhood of the boundary ∂D . Thus if λ is a constant near the boundary ∂D , we immediately get the uniqueness of γ and n at the boundary. Furthermore, if $\lambda \equiv 1$ and n is a polynomial of degree 2, then by the standard arguments we can recover D_b and n simultaneously. We also note that there is a possibility to extend our methods to recover D_b and analytical n .*

Acknowledgements. This work is partly supported by NSF of China under No. 12122114.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Adams and J.F. Fournier, *Sobolev Spaces* (2nd Ed.), Elsevier, Singapore, 2003.
- [2] A. L. Bukhgeim and G. Uhlmann, Recovering a potential from partial Cauchy data, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* **27**(2002), 653-668.
- [3] F. Cakoni and D. Colton, A uniqueness theorem for an inverse electromagnetic scattering problem in inhomogeneous anisotropic media, *Proc. Edinb. Math. Soc.* **46**(2003), 293-314.
- [4] F. Cakoni and D. Colton, *Qualitative Methods in Inverse Scattering Theory*, Springer, Berlin, 2006.
- [5] D. Colton and R. Kress, *Inverse Acoustic and Electromagnetic Scattering Theory* (3rd Ed.), Springer, New York, 2013.
- [6] D. Colton, R. Kress and P. Monk, Inverse scattering from an orthotropic medium, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* **81**(1997), 269-298.
- [7] T. Gerlach and R. Kress, Uniqueness in inverse obstacle scattering with conductive boundary condition, *Inverse Probl.* **12**(1996), 619-625.
- [8] D. Gilbarg and N.S. Trudinger, *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order* (2nd Ed.), Springer, New York, 1998.
- [9] P. Hähner, A uniqueness theorem for a transmission problem in inverse electromagnetic scattering, *Inverse Probl.* **9**(1993), 667-678.
- [10] P. Hähner, A uniqueness theorem for an inverse scattering problem in an exterior domain, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **29**(1998), 1118-1128.
- [11] F. Hettlich, On the uniqueness of the inverse conductive scattering problem for the Helmholtz equation, *Inverse Probl.* **10**(1994), 129-144.
- [12] F. Hettlich, Uniqueness of the inverse conductive scattering problem for time-harmonic electromagnetic waves, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **56**(1996), 588-601.
- [13] V. Isakov, On uniqueness in the inverse transmission scattering problem, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* **15**(1990), 1565-1587.
- [14] V. Isakov, On uniqueness in the general inverse transmission scattering problem, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **280**(2008), 843-858.
- [15] A. Kirsch and R. Kress, Uniqueness in inverse obstacle scattering, *Inverse Probl.* **9**(1993), 285-299.
- [16] A. Kirsch and L. Päiväranta, On recovering obstacles inside inhomogeneities, *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.* **21**(1998), 619-651.
- [17] X. Liu and B. Zhang, Direct and inverse obstacle scattering problems in a piecewise homogeneous medium, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **70**(2010), 3105-3120.
- [18] X. Liu, B. Zhang and J. Yang, The inverse electromagnetic scattering problem in a piecewise homogeneous medium, *Inverse Probl.* **26**(2010)125001, 19pp.
- [19] D. Mitrea and M. Mitrea, Uniqueness for inverse conductivity and transmission problems in the class of Lipschitz domains, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* **23**(1998), 1419-1448.
- [20] R. Potthast, A point-source method for inverse acoustic and electromagnetic obstacle scattering problems, *IMA J. Appl. Math.* **61**(1998), 119-140.
- [21] R. Potthast, On the convergence of a new Newton-type method in inverse scattering, *Inverse Probl.* **17**(2001), 1419-1434.
- [22] F. Qu and J. Yang, On recovery of an inhomogeneous cavity in inverse acoustic scattering, *Inverse Probl. Imaging* **12**(2018), 281-291.
- [23] F. Qu, J. Yang and B. Zhang, Recovering an elastic obstacle containing embedded objects by the acoustic far-field measurements, *Inverse Probl.* **34**(2017)015002, 8pp.
- [24] N. Valdivia, Uniqueness in inverse obstacle scattering with conductive boundary conditions, *Appl. Anal.* **83**(2004), 825-853.
- [25] J. Yang, Determining conductivity and embedded obstacles from partial boundary measurements, (arXiv:2104.13552v1).
- [26] J. Yang and B. Zhang, An inverse scattering problem for periodic media, *Inverse Probl.* **27**(2011)125010, 22pp.
- [27] J. Yang, B. Zhang and H. Zhang, Uniqueness in inverse acoustic and electromagnetic scattering by penetrable obstacle with embedded objects, *J. Differ. Equations* **265**(2018), 6352-6383.