

A quasistatic evolution model for perfectly plastic plates derived by Γ -convergence

Elisa Davoli^a, Maria Giovanna Mora^{b,*}

^a *Scuola Internazionale Superiore di Studi Avanzati, via Bonomea 265, 34136 Trieste, Italy*

^b *Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Pavia, via Ferrata 1, 27100 Pavia, Italy*

Received 3 April 2012; received in revised form 16 October 2012; accepted 16 November 2012

Available online 20 November 2012

Abstract

The subject of this paper is the rigorous derivation of a quasistatic evolution model for a linearly elastic–perfectly plastic thin plate. As the thickness of the plate tends to zero, we prove via Γ -convergence techniques that solutions to the three-dimensional quasistatic evolution problem of Prandtl–Reuss elastoplasticity converge to a quasistatic evolution of a suitable reduced model. In this limiting model the admissible displacements are of Kirchhoff–Love type and the stretching and bending components of the stress are coupled through a plastic flow rule. Some equivalent formulations of the limiting problem in rate form are derived, together with some two-dimensional characterizations for suitable choices of the data.

© 2012 L'Association Publications de l'Institut Henri Poincaré. Published by Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

MSC: 74C05; 74G65; 74K20; 49J45

Keywords: Quasistatic evolution; Rate-independent processes; Perfect plasticity; Thin plates; Prandtl–Reuss plasticity; Γ -convergence

1. Introduction

The rigorous derivation of lower dimensional models for thin structures is a question of great interest in mechanics and its applications. In the early 90's a rigorous approach to dimension reduction has emerged in the stationary framework and in the context of nonlinear elasticity [3,23]. This approach is based on Γ -convergence and, starting from the seminal paper [19], has led to establish a hierarchy of limit models for plates [19,20], rods [31,32,34,35], and shells [18,24,25]. More recently, the Γ -convergence approach to dimension reduction has gained attention also in the evolutionary framework: in nonlinear elasticity [1,2], crack propagation [7,17], elastoplasticity with hardening [26,27], and delamination problems [30].

In this paper we focus on the rigorous justification of a quasistatic evolution model for a thin plate in perfect plasticity. More precisely, we shall consider a three-dimensional plate of small thickness, whose elastic behaviour is linear and isotropic and whose plastic response is governed by the Prandtl–Reuss flow rule (without hardening), and

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: davoli@sissa.it (E. Davoli), mariagiovanna.mora@unipv.it (M.G. Mora).

derive via Γ -convergence techniques a reduced quasistatic evolution model, by sending the thickness parameter to zero.

Let ω be a domain in \mathbb{R}^2 with a C^2 boundary and let $\varepsilon > 0$. For a plate of reference configuration

$$\Omega_\varepsilon := \omega \times \left(-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right)$$

the quasistatic evolution problem in perfect plasticity can be formulated as follows. Let $u^\varepsilon(t)$ denote the displacement field at time t and let $Eu^\varepsilon(t)$ denote the infinitesimal strain tensor at t , that is, the symmetric part of $Du^\varepsilon(t)$. Let $\sigma^\varepsilon(t)$ be the stress tensor at t and let $e^\varepsilon(t)$ and $p^\varepsilon(t)$ (a deviatoric symmetric matrix) be the elastic and plastic strain tensors at t . Assume that the plate is subjected to a time-dependent boundary condition $w^\varepsilon(t)$ prescribed on a subset $\Gamma_\varepsilon := \gamma_d \times (-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \frac{\varepsilon}{2})$ of the lateral boundary of Ω_ε and that for simplicity there are no applied loads. The classical formulation of the quasistatic evolution problem on a time interval $[0, T]$ consists in finding $u^\varepsilon(t)$, $e^\varepsilon(t)$, $p^\varepsilon(t)$, and $\sigma^\varepsilon(t)$ such that the following conditions are satisfied for every $t \in [0, T]$:

- (cf1) *kinematic admissibility*: $Eu^\varepsilon(t) = e^\varepsilon(t) + p^\varepsilon(t)$ in Ω_ε and $u^\varepsilon(t) = w^\varepsilon(t)$ on Γ_ε ;
- (cf2) *constitutive law*: $\sigma^\varepsilon(t) = \mathbb{C}e^\varepsilon(t)$ in Ω_ε , where \mathbb{C} is the elasticity tensor;
- (cf3) *equilibrium*: $\operatorname{div} \sigma^\varepsilon(t) = 0$ in Ω_ε and $\sigma^\varepsilon(t) \nu_{\partial\Omega_\varepsilon} = 0$ on $\partial\Omega_\varepsilon \setminus \Gamma_\varepsilon$, where $\nu_{\partial\Omega_\varepsilon}$ is the outer unit normal to $\partial\Omega_\varepsilon$;
- (cf4) *stress constraint*: $\sigma_D^\varepsilon(t) \in K$, where σ_D^ε is the deviatoric part of σ^ε and K is a given convex and compact subset of deviatoric 3×3 matrices, representing the set of admissible stresses;
- (cf5) *flow rule*: $\dot{p}^\varepsilon(t) = 0$ if $\sigma_D^\varepsilon(t) \in \operatorname{int} K$, while $\dot{p}^\varepsilon(t)$ belongs to the normal cone to K at $\sigma_D^\varepsilon(t)$ if $\sigma_D^\varepsilon(t) \in \partial K$.

Condition (cf5) can also be written in the equivalent form:

- (cf5') *maximum dissipation principle*: $H(\dot{p}^\varepsilon(t)) = \sigma_D^\varepsilon(t) : \dot{p}^\varepsilon(t)$, where H is the support function of K , i.e., $H(p) := \sup\{\sigma : p : \sigma \in K\}$.

The first existence result of a quasistatic evolution in perfect plasticity has been proved in [36] by means of viscoplastic approximations. More recently, in [10] the problem has been reformulated within the framework of the variational theory for rate-independent processes, developed in [28]. The variational formulation reads as follows: to find a triple $(u^\varepsilon(t), e^\varepsilon(t), p^\varepsilon(t))$ such that for every $t \in [0, T]$ we have

- (qs1) *global stability*: $(u^\varepsilon(t), e^\varepsilon(t), p^\varepsilon(t))$ satisfies $Eu^\varepsilon(t) = e^\varepsilon(t) + p^\varepsilon(t)$ in Ω_ε , $u^\varepsilon(t) = w^\varepsilon(t)$ on Γ_ε , and minimizes

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \mathbb{C}f : f \, dx + \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} H(q - p^\varepsilon(t)) \, dx$$

among all kinematically admissible triples (v, f, q) ;

- (qs2) *energy balance*:

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \mathbb{C}e^\varepsilon(t) : e^\varepsilon(t) \, dx + \int_0^t \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} H(\dot{p}^\varepsilon(s)) \, dx \, ds = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \mathbb{C}e^\varepsilon(0) : e^\varepsilon(0) \, dx + \int_0^t \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \mathbb{C}e^\varepsilon(s) : E\dot{w}^\varepsilon(s) \, dx \, ds.$$

The existence of a quasistatic evolution according to the previous formulation and the extent to which this is equivalent to the original formulation is the main focus of [10].

The main purpose of this paper is to characterize the limiting behaviour of a sequence of solutions $(u^\varepsilon(t), e^\varepsilon(t), p^\varepsilon(t))$, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. We observe that the abstract theory of evolutionary Γ -convergence for rate-independent systems developed in [29] cannot be directly applied here. Indeed, it consists in studying separately the Γ -limit of the stored-energy functionals and that of the dissipation distances and in coupling them through the construction of a joint recovery sequence. This technique has been applied, e.g., in [26,27], where the presence of hardening gives rise to a stored-energy functional that is coercive in the L^2 norm both with respect to e and p . This approach is not suited to our case, since the elastic energy is coercive only with respect to the elastic strain e , while

the plastic strain p can be controlled only through the dissipation. For this reason, to identify the correct limiting energy we first study the Γ -convergence of the total energy functional, given by the sum of the stored energy with the dissipation distance. More precisely, we focus on the static case, that is, we consider a boundary displacement w^ε independent of time, we introduce the functional

$$\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon(u, e, p) := \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \mathbb{C}e : e \, dx + \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} H(p) \, dx$$

defined on the class $\mathcal{A}(\Omega_\varepsilon, w^\varepsilon)$ of all triples (u, e, p) satisfying $Eu = e + p$ in Ω_ε and $u = w^\varepsilon$ on Γ_ε , and we study its limit, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, in the sense of Γ -convergence.

As pointed out in [10], because of the linear growth of H , the functional \mathcal{E}_ε is not coercive in any Sobolev norm. The natural setting for a weak formulation is the space $BD(\Omega_\varepsilon)$ of functions with bounded deformation in Ω_ε for the displacement u and the space $M_b(\Omega_\varepsilon \cup \Gamma_\varepsilon; \mathbb{M}_D^{3 \times 3})$ of $\mathbb{M}_D^{3 \times 3}$ -valued bounded Borel measures on $\Omega_\varepsilon \cup \Gamma_\varepsilon$ for the plastic strain p . This is also natural from a mechanical point of view, because it is well known that in absence of hardening displacements may develop jump discontinuities along so-called slip surfaces, on which plastic strain concentrates.

Since $p \in M_b(\Omega_\varepsilon \cup \Gamma_\varepsilon; \mathbb{M}_D^{3 \times 3})$, the functional

$$\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} H(p) \, dx$$

has to be interpreted according to the theory of convex functions of measures, developed in [21,37] (see also Section 2), as

$$\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon \cup \Gamma_\varepsilon} H\left(\frac{dp}{d|p|}\right) d|p|,$$

where $dp/d|p|$ is the Radon–Nicolym derivative of p with respect to its total variation $|p|$. Moreover, the boundary condition is relaxed by requiring that

$$p = (w^\varepsilon - u) \odot \nu_{\partial\Omega_\varepsilon} \mathcal{H}^2 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_\varepsilon, \tag{1.1}$$

where \odot denotes the symmetric tensor product. The mechanical interpretation of (1.1) is that u may not attain the boundary condition: in this case a plastic slip is developed along Γ_ε , whose amount is proportional to the difference between the prescribed boundary value and the actual value.

The Γ -convergence of \mathcal{E}_ε (rescaled to the domain $\Omega := \omega \times (-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ independent of ε) is the subject of Section 5. For simplicity we assume that the prescribed boundary datum w^ε is a displacement of Kirchhoff–Love type of Sobolev regularity (see (3.5) below).

Setting $\Gamma_d := \gamma_d \times (-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$, we show that the Γ -limit of \mathcal{E}_ε is finite only on the class $\mathcal{A}_{KL}(w)$ of triples (u, e, p) such that $u \in BD(\Omega)$, $e \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$, $p \in M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$, and

$$Eu = e + p \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad p = (w - u) \odot \nu_{\partial\Omega} \mathcal{H}^2 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_d, \tag{1.2}$$

$$e_{i3} = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad p_{i3} = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \cup \Gamma_d, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \tag{1.3}$$

where w is a suitable limit boundary datum and $\nu_{\partial\Omega}$ is the outer unit normal to $\partial\Omega$. Note that, owing to (1.3), we can identify e with a function in $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ and p with a measure in $M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$. On this class the Γ -limit is given by the functional

$$\mathcal{J}(u, e, p) := \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C}_r e : e \, dx + \mathcal{H}_r(p) \tag{1.4}$$

where

$$\mathcal{H}_r(p) := \int_{\Omega \cup \Gamma_d} H_r\left(\frac{dp}{d|p|}\right) d|p|, \tag{1.5}$$

and the tensor \mathbb{C}_r and the function H_r are defined through pointwise minimization formulas (see (3.11), (3.15), and (3.17)).

Conditions (1.2)–(1.3) imply that u is a Kirchhoff–Love displacement in $BD(\Omega)$, that is, u_3 belongs to the space $BH(\omega)$ of functions with bounded Hessian in ω and there exists $\bar{u} \in BD(\omega)$ such that

$$u(x) = (\bar{u}_1(x') - x_3 \partial_1 u_3(x'), \bar{u}_2(x') - x_3 \partial_2 u_3(x'), u_3(x')) \quad \text{for a.e. } x = (x', x_3) \in \Omega.$$

Moreover,

$$(Eu)_{\alpha\beta} = (E\bar{u})_{\alpha\beta} - x_3 \partial_{\alpha\beta}^2 u_3 \quad \text{for } \alpha, \beta = 1, 2.$$

We note that the averaged tangential displacement \bar{u} may exhibit jump discontinuities, while, because of the embedding of $BH(\omega)$ into $C(\bar{\omega})$, the normal displacement u_3 is continuous, but its gradient may have jump discontinuities. Moreover, the second equality in (1.2), together with the second condition in (1.3), implies that u_3 satisfies the boundary condition $u_3 = w_3$ on γ_d . Since the dependence of u on x_3 is affine, we can conclude that in the limit model slip surfaces are vertical surfaces whose projection on ω is the union of the jump set of \bar{u} and the jump set of ∇u_3 .

Conditions (1.2)–(1.3) do not imply, in general, that e and p are affine with respect to x_3 . However, one can prove (Proposition 4.3) that e and p admit the following decomposition:

$$e = \bar{e} + x_3 \hat{e} + e_{\perp}, \quad p = \bar{p} \otimes \mathcal{L}^1 + \hat{p} \otimes x_3 \mathcal{L}^1 - e_{\perp},$$

where $\bar{e}, \hat{e} \in L^2(\omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$, $e_{\perp} \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$, and $\bar{p}, \hat{p} \in M_b(\omega \cup \gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$. Moreover, the zeroth order moments \bar{e} and \bar{p} satisfy

$$E\bar{u} = \bar{e} + \bar{p} \quad \text{in } \omega, \quad \bar{p} = (\bar{w} - \bar{u}) \odot \nu_{\partial\omega} \mathcal{H}^1 \quad \text{on } \gamma_d,$$

while the first order moments \hat{e} and \hat{p} are such that

$$D^2 u_3 = -(\hat{e} + \hat{p}) \quad \text{in } \omega, \quad \hat{p} = (\nabla u_3 - \nabla w_3) \odot \nu_{\partial\omega} \mathcal{H}^1 \quad \text{on } \gamma_d,$$

where $\nu_{\partial\omega}$ is the outer unit normal to $\partial\omega$. Since it may be energetically convenient to have $e_{\perp} \neq 0$, we cannot in general express the limit functional \mathcal{J} in terms of two-dimensional quantities only. This is in contrast with the case of linearized elasticity [6,8].

The main technical ingredient in the Γ -convergence result is Theorem 4.7, which ensures the density of smooth enough triples in the class $\mathcal{A}_{KL}(w)$ and is the key argument in the construction of a recovery sequence (Theorem 5.4). A first difficulty in the proof of Theorem 4.7 is due to the fact that one has to preserve the Kirchhoff–Love structure. This can be done by mollifying separately the Kirchhoff–Love components \bar{u} and u_3 of u and the zeroth and first order moments of e and p . A more delicate issue comes from the fact that the boundary conditions are imposed on a portion of the lateral boundary of Ω and not on the whole $\partial\omega \times (-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$. In particular, to have that mollifications satisfy the boundary datum, we need first to approximate u_3 in such a way that the equality $u_3 = w_3$ holds on an open subset of $\partial\omega$ strictly containing γ_d . To do that we use in a crucial way that the boundary of ω is of class C^2 , as well as the additional assumption that the relative boundary of γ_d in $\partial\omega$ is made of two points. A similar approximation has to be applied to \bar{u} and to the moments of e and p to guarantee the strict convergence of the full plastic strains in the sense of measures, which is needed to ensure convergence of the energies.

A related dimension reduction problem for perfectly plastic plates in the stationary case has been studied in [33]. In that paper the elastic strain e is assumed a priori to coincide with $\text{tr } Eu = \text{div } u$ and the plastic strain with the deviatoric part of Eu . Moreover, the set K is supposed to be symmetric with respect to the origin. This last assumption allows one, via minimization arguments, to express the Γ -limit in terms of the normal displacement u_3 and the first order moments \hat{e} and \hat{p} , only, so that the limit model turns out to be two-dimensional. Another crucial difference is that in [33] the boundary conditions are prescribed on the whole lateral boundary of Ω_{ε} and, as explained above, this makes the approximation arguments much easier.

In Section 6 we introduce time and study the convergence of quasistatic evolutions. We prescribe on Γ_{ε} a boundary datum $w^{\varepsilon}(t)$ of Kirchhoff–Love type and we consider a sequence of initial data $(u_0^{\varepsilon}, e_0^{\varepsilon}, p_0^{\varepsilon})$, that is compact in a suitable sense. In Theorem 6.4 we show that, if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ the triple $(u^{\varepsilon}(t), e^{\varepsilon}(t), p^{\varepsilon}(t))$ is a quasistatic evolution in the sense of (qs1)–(qs2) for the boundary datum $w^{\varepsilon}(t)$ and the initial datum $(u_0^{\varepsilon}, e_0^{\varepsilon}, p_0^{\varepsilon})$, then, up to a suitable scaling, $(u^{\varepsilon}(t), e^{\varepsilon}(t), p^{\varepsilon}(t))$ converges, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, to a limit triple $(u(t), e(t), p(t))$ that satisfies:

(qs1)_r *global stability*: for every $t \in [0, T]$ $(u(t), e(t), p(t)) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w(t))$ and minimizes

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C}_r f : f \, dx + \mathcal{H}_r(q - p(t))$$

among all triples (v, f, q) in $\mathcal{A}_{KL}(w(t))$;

(qs2)_r *energy balance*: for every $t \in [0, T]$

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C}_r e(t) : e(t) \, dx + \int_0^t \mathcal{H}_r(\dot{p}(s)) \, ds = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C}_r e(0) : e(0) \, dx + \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C}_r e(s) : E \dot{w}(s) \, dx \, ds.$$

We call a triple satisfying (qs1)_r–(qs2)_r a reduced quasistatic evolution.

The proof of Theorem 6.4 mainly relies on the Γ -convergence result of Section 5. Even if the abstract theory of [29] cannot be directly applied, we follow the general scheme proposed in that paper. In particular, the role of the so-called joint recovery sequence is played in our case by the recovery sequence provided by Theorem 5.4.

In the last part of the paper we show some equivalent formulations in rate form for the reduced quasistatic evolution problem (qs1)_r–(qs2)_r. In the smooth case, a formulation in rate form of (qs1)_r–(qs2)_r reads as follows: to find $u(t)$, $e(t)$, $p(t)$, and $\sigma(t)$ such that for every $t \in [0, T]$ we have

(cf1)_r *reduced kinematic admissibility*: $u(t)$ is a Kirchhoff–Love displacement, that is,

$$u(t, x) = (\bar{u}_1(t, x') - x_3 \partial_1 u_3(t, x'), \bar{u}_2(t, x') - x_3 \partial_2 u_3(t, x'), u_3(t, x'))$$

for every $x = (x', x_3) \in \Omega$, satisfying the boundary conditions

$$\bar{u}(t, x) = \bar{w}(t, x), \quad u_3(t, x) = w_3(t, x), \quad \nabla u_3(t, x) = \nabla w_3(t, x) \quad \text{on } \gamma_d,$$

while $e(t)$ and $p(t)$ satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} e(t, x) &= \bar{e}(t, x') + x_3 \hat{e}(t, x') + e_{\perp}(t, x), \\ p(t, x) &= \bar{p}(t, x') + x_3 \hat{p}(t, x') - e_{\perp}(t, x), \\ \bar{e}_{i3}(t, x') &= \hat{e}_{i3}(t, x') = (e_{\perp})_{i3}(t, x) = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \\ \bar{p}_{i3}(t, x') &= \hat{p}_{i3}(t, x') = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, 3 \end{aligned}$$

for every $x = (x', x_3) \in \Omega$; moreover, the following additive decompositions hold:

$$\begin{aligned} E \bar{u}(t, x') &= \bar{e}(t, x') + \bar{p}(t, x'), \\ D^2 u_3(t, x') &= -(\hat{e}(t, x') + \hat{p}(t, x')) \end{aligned}$$

for every $x' \in \omega$;

(cf2)_r *reduced constitutive law*: the stress decomposes as

$$\sigma(t, x) = \bar{\sigma}(t, x') + x_3 \hat{\sigma}(t, x') + \sigma_{\perp}(t, x)$$

with

$$\bar{\sigma}(t, x') = \mathbb{C}_r \bar{e}(t, x'), \quad \hat{\sigma}(t, x') = \mathbb{C}_r \hat{e}(t, x'), \quad \sigma_{\perp}(t, x) = \mathbb{C}_r e_{\perp}(t, x)$$

for every $x = (x', x_3) \in \Omega$;

(cf3)_r *reduced equilibrium*: $\operatorname{div}_{x'} \bar{\sigma}(t, x') = 0$ in ω and $\operatorname{div}_{x'} \operatorname{div}_{x'} \hat{\sigma}(t, x') = 0$ in ω , together with corresponding Neumann boundary conditions on $\partial \omega \setminus \gamma_d$;

(cf4)_r *reduced stress constraint*: $\sigma(t, x) \in K_r$ for every $x \in \Omega$, where $K_r := \partial H_r(0)$ is the subdifferential of H_r at 0;

(cf5)_r *reduced maximum dissipation principle*:

$$\int_{\bar{\Omega}} H_r(\dot{p}(t)) \, dx = \int_{\omega} \bar{\sigma}(t, x') : \dot{\bar{p}}(t, x') \, dx' + \frac{1}{12} \int_{\omega} \hat{\sigma}(t, x') : \dot{\hat{p}}(t, x') \, dx' - \int_{\Omega} \sigma_{\perp}(t, x) : \dot{e}_{\perp}(t, x) \, dx.$$

In the conditions stated above \bar{w} and w_3 are the Kirchhoff–Love components of w , while \mathbb{C}_r and H_r are the tensor and the function introduced in (1.4)–(1.5). Owing to (cf1)_r, the moments of $e(t)$ and $p(t)$ have been identified with functions taking values in the set $\mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}$.

To express conditions (cf1)_r–(cf5)_r in the nonsmooth case, we need in particular to give a meaning to the scalar products in (cf5)_r when the stress $\sigma(t)$ is a function in $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ and the plastic strain $p(t)$ is only a measure in $M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$. To this purpose, we introduce a suitable notion of duality between stresses and plastic strains in the footsteps of [22] and [11]. The construction of this notion of duality and its main properties are detailed in Section 7.1.

We note that the stretching component $\bar{\sigma}(t)$ and the bending component $\hat{\sigma}(t)$ of $\sigma(t)$ decouple only in the equilibrium condition (cf3)_r, while in the stress constraint (cf4)_r and in the maximum dissipation principle (cf5)_r the whole stress $\sigma(t)$ is involved. Thus, as in the static case, also in the evolutionary setting the limit problem has in general a genuinely three-dimensional nature, unless specific data are prescribed. This last issue is discussed in the last subsection of the paper: we exhibit two sets of data, for which the corresponding reduced quasistatic evolutions can be characterized in terms of two-dimensional quantities. In particular, in Proposition 7.17 we show that, if the set K is symmetric with respect to the origin and the boundary datum and the initial data are properly chosen, our notion of reduced quasistatic evolution coincides with the classical theory of perfectly plastic plates studied in [9,13,14].

The paper is organized as follows: in Section 2 we recall some preliminary results. In Section 3 we describe the formulation of the three-dimensional problem and of the limit problem. In Section 4 we discuss the properties of Kirchhoff–Love admissible triples and prove some approximation results. Section 5 is devoted to the Γ -convergence result in the stationary case, while Section 6 concerns the convergence of quasistatic evolutions. Finally, in Section 7 we show some equivalent formulations of the reduced quasistatic evolution problem and discuss some examples.

2. Mathematical preliminaries

In this section we recall some notions from measure theory that we will use throughout the article.

Measures. Given a Borel set $B \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ and a finite dimensional Hilbert space X , $M_b(B; X)$ denotes the space of all bounded Borel measures on B with values in X , endowed with the norm $\|\mu\|_{M_b} := |\mu|(B)$, where $|\mu| \in M_b(B; \mathbb{R})$ is the variation of the measure μ . For every $\mu \in M_b(B; X)$ we consider the Lebesgue decomposition $\mu = \mu^a + \mu^s$, where μ^a is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure \mathcal{L}^N and μ^s is singular with respect to \mathcal{L}^N . If $\mu^s = 0$, we always identify μ with its density with respect to \mathcal{L}^N , which is a function in $L^1(B; X)$.

If the relative topology of B is locally compact, by Riesz representation Theorem the space $M_b(B; X)$ can be identified with the dual of $C_0(B; X)$, which is the space of all continuous functions $\varphi: B \rightarrow X$ such that the set $\{|\varphi| \geq \delta\}$ is compact for every $\delta > 0$. The weak* topology on $M_b(B; X)$ is defined using this duality.

Convex functions of measures. For every $\mu \in M_b(B; X)$ let $d\mu/d|\mu|$ be the Radon–Nicolodym derivative of μ with respect to its variation $|\mu|$. Let $H_0: X \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ be a convex and positively one-homogeneous function such that

$$r_0|\xi| \leq H_0(\xi) \leq R_0|\xi| \quad \text{for every } \xi \in X,$$

where r_0 and R_0 are two constants, with $0 < r_0 \leq R_0$. According to the theory of convex functions of measures, developed in [21], we introduce the nonnegative Radon measure $H_0(\mu) \in M_b(B)$ defined by

$$H_0(\mu)(A) := \int_A H_0\left(\frac{d\mu}{d|\mu|}\right) d|\mu|$$

for every Borel set $A \subset B$. We also consider the functional $\mathcal{H}_0: M_b(B; X) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ defined by

$$\mathcal{H}_0(\mu) := H_0(\mu)(B) = \int_B H_0\left(\frac{d\mu}{d|\mu|}\right) d|\mu|$$

for every $\mu \in M_b(B; X)$. One can prove that $H_0(\mu)$ coincides with the measure studied in [37, Chapter II, Section 4]. Hence,

$$\mathcal{H}_0(\mu) = \sup \left\{ \int_B \varphi : d\mu : \varphi \in C_0(B; X), \varphi(x) \in K_0 \text{ for every } x \in B \right\}, \tag{2.1}$$

where $K_0 := \partial H_0(0)$ is the subdifferential of H_0 at 0. Moreover, \mathcal{H}_0 is lower semicontinuous on $M_b(B; X)$ with respect to weak* convergence.

Functions with bounded deformation. Let U be an open set of \mathbb{R}^N . The space $BD(U)$ of functions with *bounded deformation* is the space of all functions $u \in L^1(U; \mathbb{R}^N)$ whose symmetric gradient $Eu := \text{sym } Du$ (in the sense of distributions) belongs to $M_b(U; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{N \times N})$. It is easy to see that $BD(U)$ is a Banach space endowed with the norm

$$\|u\|_{L^1} + \|Eu\|_{M_b}.$$

We say that a sequence (u^k) converges to u weakly* in $BD(U)$ if $u^k \rightharpoonup u$ weakly in $L^1(U; \mathbb{R}^N)$ and $Eu^k \rightharpoonup Eu$ weakly* in $M_b(U; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{N \times N})$. Every bounded sequence in $BD(U)$ has a weakly* converging subsequence. If U is bounded and has a Lipschitz boundary, $BD(U)$ can be embedded into $L^{N/(N-1)}(U; \mathbb{R}^N)$ and every function $u \in BD(U)$ has a trace, still denoted by u , which belongs to $L^1(\partial U; \mathbb{R}^N)$. Moreover, if Γ is a nonempty open subset of ∂U , there exists a constant $C > 0$, depending on U and Γ , such that

$$\|u\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq C \|u\|_{L^1(\Gamma)} + C \|Eu\|_{M_b} \tag{2.2}$$

(see [37, Chapter II, Proposition 2.4 and Remark 2.5]). For the general properties of the space $BD(U)$ we refer to [37].

Functions with bounded Hessian. The space $BH(U)$ of functions with *bounded Hessian* is the space of all functions $u \in W^{1,1}(U)$ whose Hessian D^2u (in the sense of distributions) belongs to $M_b(U; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{N \times N})$. It is easy to see that $BH(U)$ is a Banach space endowed with the norm

$$\|u\|_{L^1} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^1} + \|D^2u\|_{M_b}.$$

If U has the cone property, then $BH(U)$ coincides with the space of functions in $L^1(U)$ whose Hessian belongs to $M_b(U; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{N \times N})$. If U is bounded and has a Lipschitz boundary, $BH(U)$ can be embedded into $W^{1,N/(N-1)}(U)$. If U is bounded and has a C^2 boundary, then for every function $u \in BH(U)$ one can define the traces of u and of ∇u , still denoted by u and ∇u ; they satisfy $u \in W^{1,1}(\partial U)$, $\nabla u \in L^1(\partial U; \mathbb{R}^N)$, and $\frac{\partial u}{\partial \tau} = \nabla u \cdot \tau$ in $L^1(\partial U)$, where τ is any tangent vector to ∂U . If, in addition, $N = 2$, then $BH(U)$ embeds into $C(\bar{U})$, which is the space of all continuous functions on \bar{U} . For the general properties of the space $BH(U)$ we refer to [12].

3. Setting of the problem

Throughout the paper ω is a bounded and connected open set of \mathbb{R}^2 with a C^2 boundary. We suppose that the boundary $\partial\omega$ is partitioned into two disjoint open subsets γ_d, γ_n and their common boundary $\partial|_{\partial\omega}\gamma_d = \partial|_{\partial\omega}\gamma_n$ (topological notions refer here to the relative topology of $\partial\omega$). We assume that $\gamma_d \neq \emptyset$ and that $\partial|_{\partial\omega}\gamma_d = \{P_1, P_2\}$, where P_1, P_2 are two points in $\partial\omega$.

The reference configuration of the plate is given by the set

$$\Omega_\varepsilon := \omega \times \left(-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right),$$

where $\varepsilon > 0$. We denote by Γ_ε the Dirichlet part of the boundary, given by $\Gamma_\varepsilon := \gamma_d \times (-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \frac{\varepsilon}{2})$, and by $\nu_{\partial\Omega_\varepsilon}$ the outer unit normal to $\partial\Omega_\varepsilon$.

The elasticity tensor. Let \mathbb{C} be the *elasticity tensor*, considered as a symmetric positive definite linear operator $\mathbb{C} : \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3} \rightarrow \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}$ and let $Q : \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ be the quadratic form associated with \mathbb{C} , given by

$$Q(\xi) := \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{C} \xi : \xi \quad \text{for every } \xi \in \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}.$$

It follows that there exist two constants $r_{\mathbb{C}}$ and $R_{\mathbb{C}}$, with $0 < r_{\mathbb{C}} \leq R_{\mathbb{C}}$, such that

$$r_{\mathbb{C}}|\xi|^2 \leq Q(\xi) \leq R_{\mathbb{C}}|\xi|^2 \quad \text{for every } \xi \in \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}. \quad (3.1)$$

These inequalities imply

$$|\mathbb{C}\xi| \leq 2R_{\mathbb{C}}|\xi| \quad \text{for every } \xi \in \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}. \quad (3.2)$$

The dissipation potential. Let $\mathbb{M}_D^{3 \times 3}$ be the space of all matrices in $\mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}$ with zero trace. Let K be a closed convex set of $\mathbb{M}_D^{3 \times 3}$ such that there exist two constants r_K and R_K , with $0 < r_K \leq R_K$, such that

$$\{\xi \in \mathbb{M}_D^{3 \times 3} : |\xi| \leq r_K\} \subset K \subset \{\xi \in \mathbb{M}_D^{3 \times 3} : |\xi| \leq R_K\}.$$

The boundary of K is interpreted as the *yield surface*. The *plastic dissipation potential* is given by the support function $H : \mathbb{M}_D^{3 \times 3} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ of K , defined as

$$H(\xi) := \sup_{\sigma \in K} \sigma : \xi.$$

It follows that H is a convex and positively one-homogeneous function such that

$$r_K|\xi| \leq H(\xi) \leq R_K|\xi| \quad \text{for every } \xi \in \mathbb{M}_D^{3 \times 3}. \quad (3.3)$$

In particular, H satisfies the triangle inequality

$$H(\xi + \zeta) \leq H(\xi) + H(\zeta) \quad \text{for every } \xi, \zeta \in \mathbb{M}_D^{3 \times 3}. \quad (3.4)$$

Admissible triples and energy. On Γ_ε we prescribe a boundary datum $w^\varepsilon \in W^{1,2}(\Omega_\varepsilon; \mathbb{R}^3)$ of the following form:

$$w^\varepsilon(z) := \left(\bar{w}_1(z') - \frac{z_3}{\varepsilon} \partial_1 w_3(z'), \bar{w}_2(z') - \frac{z_3}{\varepsilon} \partial_2 w_3(z'), \frac{1}{\varepsilon} w_3(z') \right) \quad \text{for a.e. } z = (z', z_3) \in \Omega_\varepsilon, \quad (3.5)$$

where $\bar{w}_\alpha \in W^{1,2}(\omega)$, $\alpha = 1, 2$, and $w_3 \in W^{2,2}(\omega)$. The *set of admissible displacements and strains* for the boundary datum w^ε is denoted by $\mathcal{A}(\Omega_\varepsilon, w^\varepsilon)$ and is defined as the class of all triples $(v, f, q) \in BD(\Omega_\varepsilon) \times L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}) \times M_b(\Omega_\varepsilon; \mathbb{M}_D^{3 \times 3})$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} Ev &= f + q \quad \text{in } \Omega_\varepsilon, \\ q &= (w^\varepsilon - v) \odot \nu_{\partial\Omega_\varepsilon} \mathcal{H}^2 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_\varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where \odot stands for the symmetrized tensor product and \mathcal{H}^2 is the two-dimensional Hausdorff measure. The function v represents the *displacement* of the plate, while f and q are called the *elastic* and *plastic strain*, respectively.

For every admissible triple $(v, f, q) \in \mathcal{A}(\Omega_\varepsilon, w^\varepsilon)$ we define the associated *energy* as

$$\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon(v, f, q) := \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} Q(f(z)) dz + \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon \cup \Gamma_\varepsilon} H\left(\frac{dq}{d|q|}\right) d|q|. \quad (3.6)$$

The first term represents the elastic energy, while the second term accounts for plastic dissipation.

3.1. The rescaled problem

As usual in dimension reduction problems, it is convenient to perform a change of variable in such a way to rewrite the system on a fixed domain independent of ε . To this purpose, we set

$$\Omega := \omega \times \left(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right), \quad \Gamma_d := \gamma_d \times \left(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right), \quad \Gamma_n := \gamma_n \times \left(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right),$$

and we denote by $\nu_{\partial\Omega}$ the outer unit normal to $\partial\Omega$. We consider the change of variable $\psi_\varepsilon : \bar{\Omega} \rightarrow \bar{\Omega}_\varepsilon$ given by

$$\psi_\varepsilon(x) := (x', \varepsilon x_3) \quad \text{for every } x = (x', x_3) \in \bar{\Omega}$$

and the linear operator $\Lambda_\varepsilon : \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3} \rightarrow \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}$ given by

$$\Lambda_\varepsilon \xi := \begin{pmatrix} \xi_{11} & \xi_{12} & \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \xi_{13} \\ \xi_{21} & \xi_{22} & \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \xi_{23} \\ \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \xi_{31} & \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \xi_{32} & \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \xi_{33} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{for every } \xi \in \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}.$$

To any triple $(v, f, q) \in \mathcal{A}(\Omega_\varepsilon, w^\varepsilon)$ we associate a triple $(u, e, p) \in BD(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}) \times M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$ defined as follows:

$$u := (v_1 \circ \psi_\varepsilon, v_2 \circ \psi_\varepsilon, \varepsilon v_3 \circ \psi_\varepsilon), \quad e := \Lambda_\varepsilon^{-1} f \circ \psi_\varepsilon, \quad p := \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \Lambda_\varepsilon^{-1} \psi_\varepsilon^\#(q).$$

Here the measure $\psi_\varepsilon^\#(q) \in M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_D^{3 \times 3})$ is the pull-back measure of q , satisfying

$$\int_{\Omega \cup \Gamma_d} \varphi : d\psi_\varepsilon^\#(q) = \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon \cup \Gamma_\varepsilon} \varphi \circ \psi_\varepsilon^{-1} : dq \quad \text{for every } \varphi \in C_0(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_D^{3 \times 3}).$$

According to this change of variable we have

$$\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon(v, f, q) = \varepsilon \mathcal{Q}(\Lambda_\varepsilon e) + \varepsilon \mathcal{H}(\Lambda_\varepsilon p),$$

where

$$\mathcal{Q}(\Lambda_\varepsilon e) := \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{Q}(\Lambda_\varepsilon e(x)) dx, \quad \mathcal{H}(\Lambda_\varepsilon p) := \int_{\Omega \cup \Gamma_d} H\left(\frac{d\Lambda_\varepsilon p}{|d\Lambda_\varepsilon p|}\right) d|\Lambda_\varepsilon p|.$$

We also introduce the scaled Dirichlet boundary datum $w \in W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$, given by

$$w(x) := (\bar{w}_1(x') - x_3 \partial_1 w_3(x'), \bar{w}_2(x') - x_3 \partial_2 w_3(x'), w_3(x')) \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega.$$

From the definition of the class $\mathcal{A}(\Omega_\varepsilon, w^\varepsilon)$ it immediately follows that the scaled triple (u, e, p) satisfies the equalities

$$Eu = e + p \quad \text{in } \Omega, \tag{3.7}$$

$$p = (w - u) \odot \nu_{\partial\Omega} \mathcal{H}^2 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_d, \tag{3.8}$$

$$p_{11} + p_{22} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} p_{33} = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \cup \Gamma_d. \tag{3.9}$$

We are thus led to introduce the class $\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon(w)$ of all triples $(u, e, p) \in BD(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}) \times M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$ satisfying (3.7)–(3.9), and to define the functional

$$\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u, e, p) := \mathcal{Q}(\Lambda_\varepsilon e) + \mathcal{H}(\Lambda_\varepsilon p) \tag{3.10}$$

for every $(u, e, p) \in \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon(w)$. In the following we shall study the asymptotic behaviour of the minimizers of \mathcal{J}_ε and of the quasistatic evolution associated with \mathcal{J}_ε , as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

3.2. The limit problem

In this subsection we introduce the limit functional, that describes the asymptotic behaviour of the rescaled energies \mathcal{J}_ε , as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

The reduced elasticity tensor. Let $\mathbb{M} : \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2} \rightarrow \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}$ be the operator given by

$$\mathbb{M}\xi := \begin{pmatrix} \xi_{11} & \xi_{12} & \lambda_1(\xi) \\ \xi_{12} & \xi_{22} & \lambda_2(\xi) \\ \lambda_1(\xi) & \lambda_2(\xi) & \lambda_3(\xi) \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{for every } \xi \in \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}, \tag{3.11}$$

where for every $\xi \in \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}$ the triple $(\lambda_1(\xi), \lambda_2(\xi), \lambda_3(\xi))$ is the unique solution to the minimum problem

$$\min_{\lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}} Q \begin{pmatrix} \xi_{11} & \xi_{12} & \lambda_1 \\ \xi_{12} & \xi_{22} & \lambda_2 \\ \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 & \lambda_3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We observe that the triple $(\lambda_1(\xi), \lambda_2(\xi), \lambda_3(\xi))$ can be characterized as the unique solution of the linear system

$$\mathbb{M}\xi : \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \zeta_1 \\ 0 & 0 & \zeta_2 \\ \zeta_1 & \zeta_2 & \zeta_3 \end{pmatrix} = 0 \quad (3.12)$$

for every $\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3 \in \mathbb{R}$. This implies that \mathbb{M} is a linear map.

Let $Q_r : \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ be the quadratic form given by

$$Q_r(\xi) := Q(\mathbb{M}\xi) \quad \text{for every } \xi \in \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}. \quad (3.13)$$

By (3.1) it satisfies the estimates

$$r_C |\xi|^2 \leq Q_r(\xi) \leq R_C |\xi|^2 \quad \text{for every } \xi \in \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}. \quad (3.14)$$

We also consider the linear operator $\mathbb{C}_r : \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2} \rightarrow \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}$ defined as

$$\mathbb{C}_r \xi := \mathbb{C}\mathbb{M}\xi \quad \text{for every } \xi \in \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}. \quad (3.15)$$

By (3.12) we have

$$\mathbb{C}_r \xi : \zeta = \mathbb{C}\mathbb{M}\xi : \zeta = \mathbb{C}\mathbb{M}\xi : \mathbb{M}\zeta'' \quad \text{for every } \xi \in \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}, \zeta \in \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}, \quad (3.16)$$

where $\zeta'' \in \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}$ satisfies $\zeta''_{\alpha\beta} = \zeta_{\alpha\beta}$ for $\alpha, \beta = 1, 2$. This implies that

$$Q_r(\xi) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{C}_r \xi : \begin{pmatrix} \xi_{11} & \xi_{12} & 0 \\ \xi_{12} & \xi_{22} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{for every } \xi \in \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}.$$

We introduce the functional $Q_r : L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$, defined as

$$Q_r(f) := \int_{\Omega} Q_r(f(z)) dz \quad \text{for every } f \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}).$$

It describes the limiting elastic energy of a configuration of the plate whose elastic strain is given by f .

The reduced dissipation potential. We define $H_r : \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ as

$$H_r(\xi) := \min_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R}} H \begin{pmatrix} \xi_{11} & \xi_{12} & \lambda_1 \\ \xi_{12} & \xi_{22} & \lambda_2 \\ \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 & -(\xi_{11} + \xi_{22}) \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{for every } \xi \in \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}. \quad (3.17)$$

It turns out that H_r is convex, positively one-homogeneous, and satisfies

$$r_K |\xi| \leq H_r(\xi) \leq \sqrt{3} R_K |\xi| \quad \text{for every } \xi \in \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}. \quad (3.18)$$

For every $\mu \in M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ we define

$$\mathcal{H}_r(\mu) := \int_{\Omega \cup \Gamma_d} H_r \left(\frac{d\mu}{d|\mu|} \right) d|\mu|. \quad (3.19)$$

It describes the limiting plastic dissipation rate of a plate configuration whose plastic strain is given by μ . The set $K_r := \partial H_r(0) \subset \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}$ represents the set of admissible stresses in the limit problem. In particular, one can prove that

$$\xi \in K_r \Leftrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} \xi_{11} & \xi_{12} & 0 \\ \xi_{12} & \xi_{22} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} - \frac{1}{3} (\text{tr } \xi) I_{3 \times 3} \in K,$$

where $I_{3 \times 3}$ is the identity matrix in $\mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}$.

Kirchhoff–Love admissible triples and limit energy. We consider the set of *Kirchhoff–Love displacements*, defined as

$$KL(\Omega) := \{u \in BD(\Omega) : (Eu)_{i3} = 0 \text{ for } i = 1, 2, 3\}. \tag{3.20}$$

We note that $u \in KL(\Omega)$ if and only if $u_3 \in BH(\omega)$ and there exists $\bar{u} \in BD(\omega)$ such that

$$u_\alpha = \bar{u}_\alpha - x_3 \partial_\alpha u_3, \quad \alpha = 1, 2. \tag{3.21}$$

In particular, if $u \in KL(\Omega)$, then $(Eu)_{\alpha\beta} = (E\bar{u})_{\alpha\beta} - x_3 \partial_{\alpha\beta}^2 u_3$ for $\alpha, \beta = 1, 2$. If, in addition, $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$, then $\bar{u} \in W^{1,p}(\omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$ and $u_3 \in W^{2,p}(\omega)$. We call \bar{u}, u_3 the *Kirchhoff–Love components* of u .

For every $w \in W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \cap KL(\Omega)$ we define the class $\mathcal{A}_{KL}(w)$ of *Kirchhoff–Love admissible triples* for the boundary datum w as the set of all triples $(u, e, p) \in KL(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}) \times M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$ satisfying

$$Eu = e + p \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad p = (w - u) \odot \nu_{\partial\Omega} \mathcal{H}^2 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_d, \tag{3.22}$$

$$e_{i3} = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad p_{i3} = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \cup \Gamma_d, \quad i = 1, 2, 3. \tag{3.23}$$

Note that the space

$$\{\xi \in \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3} : \xi_{i3} = 0 \text{ for } i = 1, 2, 3\}$$

is canonically isomorphic to $\mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}$. Therefore, in the following, given a triple $(u, e, p) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w)$ we will usually identify e with a function in $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ and p with a measure in $M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$. Note also that the class $\mathcal{A}_{KL}(w)$ is always nonempty as it contains the triple $(w, Ew, 0)$.

With the previous notation, we introduce the functional $\mathcal{J} : \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$, defined as

$$\mathcal{J}(u, e, p) := \mathcal{Q}_r(e) + \mathcal{H}_r(p) \tag{3.24}$$

for every $(u, e, p) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w)$. In Sections 5 and 6 we shall investigate the relation between the functionals \mathcal{J}_ε and \mathcal{J} .

4. The class of Kirchhoff–Love admissible triples

In this section we study the class of Kirchhoff–Love admissible triples, introduced in (3.22)–(3.23).

Let $(u, e, p) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w)$. By definition u is a Kirchhoff–Love displacement, hence $u_3 \in BH(\omega)$ and $u_\alpha, \alpha = 1, 2$, is affine in the x_3 variable (see (3.21)). In general, one cannot conclude that e and p are affine in x_3 , too. However, some conditions on the structure of e and p can be deduced. To this purpose, we introduce the following definitions.

Definition 4.1. Let $f \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$. We denote by $\bar{f}, \hat{f} \in L^2(\omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$ and by $f_\perp \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$ the following orthogonal components (in the sense of $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$) of f :

$$\bar{f}(x') := \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} f(x', x_3) dx_3, \quad \hat{f}(x') := 12 \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} x_3 f(x', x_3) dx_3$$

for a.e. $x' \in \omega$, and

$$f_\perp(x) := f(x) - \bar{f}(x') - x_3 \hat{f}(x')$$

for a.e. $x \in \Omega$. The component \bar{f} is called the *zeroth order moment* of f , while \hat{f} is called the *first order moment* of f .

Definition 4.2. Let $q \in M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$. The *zeroth order moment* of q is the measure $\bar{q} \in M_b(\omega \cup \gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$ defined by

$$\int_{\omega \cup \gamma_d} \varphi : d\bar{q} := \int_{\Omega \cup \Gamma_d} \varphi : dq$$

for every $\varphi \in C_0(\omega \cup \gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$, while the *first order moment* of q is the measure $\hat{q} \in M_b(\omega \cup \gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$ defined by

$$\int_{\omega \cup \gamma_d} \varphi : d\hat{q} := 12 \int_{\Omega \cup \Gamma_d} x_3 \varphi : dq$$

for every $\varphi \in C_0(\omega \cup \gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$. We also define $q_{\perp} \in M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$ as the measure given by

$$q_{\perp} := q - \bar{q} \otimes \mathcal{L}^1 - \hat{q} \otimes x_3 \mathcal{L}^1,$$

where the symbol \otimes denotes the usual product of measures.

With these definitions at hand one can easily prove the following characterization of the class $\mathcal{A}_{KL}(w)$.

Proposition 4.3. *Let $w \in W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \cap KL(\Omega)$ and $(u, e, p) \in KL(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}) \times M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$ with $e_{i3} = 0$ in Ω and $p_{i3} = 0$ in $\Omega \cup \Gamma_d$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Let $\bar{u} \in BD(\omega)$, $u_3 \in BH(\omega)$, and $\bar{w} \in W^{1,2}(\omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$, $w_3 \in W^{2,2}(\omega)$ be the Kirchhoff–Love components of u and w , respectively. Finally, let $\bar{e}, \hat{e} \in L^2(\omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$, $e_{\perp} \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$, $\bar{p}, \hat{p} \in M_b(\omega \cup \gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$, and $p_{\perp} \in M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$ be the moments of e and p , according to Definitions 4.1 and 4.2. Then $(u, e, p) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w)$ if and only if the following three conditions are satisfied:*

- (i) $E\bar{u} = \bar{e} + \bar{p}$ in ω and $\bar{p} = (\bar{w} - \bar{u}) \odot \nu_{\partial\omega} \mathcal{H}^1$ on γ_d ;
- (ii) $D^2 u_3 = -(\hat{e} + \hat{p})$ in ω , $u_3 = w_3$ on γ_d , and $\hat{p} = (\nabla u_3 - \nabla w_3) \odot \nu_{\partial\omega} \mathcal{H}^1$ on γ_d ;
- (iii) $p_{\perp} = -e_{\perp}$ in Ω and $p_{\perp} = 0$ on Γ_d ,

where we have identified \bar{e}, \hat{e} with functions in $L^2(\omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ and \bar{p}, \hat{p} with measures in $M_b(\omega \cup \gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$. Here $\nu_{\partial\omega}$ denotes the outer unit normal to $\partial\omega$ and \mathcal{H}^1 is the one-dimensional Hausdorff measure.

We now prove some approximation results for Kirchhoff–Love admissible triples. We first need a technical lemma.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $\mu \in M_b(\bar{\omega} \times (-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}); \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ be such that*

$$\mu = \bar{\mu} \otimes \mathcal{L}^1 + \hat{\mu} \otimes x_3 \mathcal{L}^1 + \mu_{\perp},$$

where $\bar{\mu}, \hat{\mu} \in M_b(\bar{\omega}; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ with $|\bar{\mu}|(\partial\omega) = |\hat{\mu}|(\partial\omega) = 0$ and $\mu_{\perp} \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$. Let $(\rho_{\delta}) \subset C_c^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ be a sequence of mollifiers with $\text{supp } \rho_{\delta} \subset B_{\delta}(0)$ for every $\delta > 0$. Then

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\omega} |\rho_{\delta} * \mu_{x_3}| dx' \right) dx_3 = |\mu|(\Omega),$$

where we have set $\mu_{x_3} := \bar{\mu} + x_3 \hat{\mu} + \mu_{\perp}(\cdot, x_3) \in M_b(\bar{\omega}; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ for \mathcal{L}^1 -a.e. $x_3 \in (-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$.

Proof. We first observe that, from the assumption $\mu_{\perp} \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^a &= \bar{\mu}^a + x_3 \hat{\mu}^a + \mu_{\perp}, \\ \mu^s &= \bar{\mu}^s \otimes \mathcal{L}^1 + \hat{\mu}^s \otimes x_3 \mathcal{L}^1. \end{aligned}$$

Since $x_3 \mapsto \bar{\mu}^s + x_3 \hat{\mu}^s$ belongs to $L^{\infty}((-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}); M_b(\bar{\omega}; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}))$, by [5, Corollary 2.29] we have

$$|\mu^s| = |\bar{\mu}^s + x_3 \hat{\mu}^s|^{\text{gen.}} \otimes \mathcal{L}^1,$$

where $\otimes^{\text{gen.}}$ denotes the generalized product of measures (see, e.g., [5, Definition 2.27]). The equalities above imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\mu|(\Omega) &= \int_{\Omega} |\mu^a(x)| dx + |\mu^s|(\Omega) \\
 &= \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\omega} |\bar{\mu}^a(x') + x_3 \hat{\mu}^a(x') + \mu_{\perp}(x)| dx' dx_3 + \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} |\bar{\mu}^s + x_3 \hat{\mu}^s|(\omega) dx_3 \\
 &= \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} |\mu_{x_3}|(\omega) dx_3.
 \end{aligned}$$

We now extend μ_{x_3} to 0 outside $\bar{\omega}$, so that the convolutions $\rho_{\delta} * \mu_{x_3}$ are well defined on \mathbb{R}^2 . By the Fubini–Tonelli Theorem and the assumption $|\bar{\mu}|(\partial\omega) = |\hat{\mu}|(\partial\omega) = 0$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \int_{\omega} |\rho_{\delta} * \mu_{x_3}| dx' &= \int_{\omega} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \rho_{\delta}(x' - y') d\mu_{x_3}(y') \right| dx' \\
 &\leq \int_{\omega} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \rho_{\delta}(x' - y') d|\mu_{x_3}|(y') dx' \leq |\mu_{x_3}|(\omega)
 \end{aligned}$$

for \mathcal{L}^1 -a.e. $x_3 \in (-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$. By integrating with respect to x_3 we deduce

$$\int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\omega} |\rho_{\delta} * \mu_{x_3}| dx' \right) dx_3 \leq \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} |\mu_{x_3}|(\omega) dx_3 = |\mu|(\Omega).$$

On the other hand, we have that $\rho_{\delta} * \mu_{x_3} \rightharpoonup \mu_{x_3}$ weakly* in $M_b(\omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ for \mathcal{L}^1 -a.e. $x_3 \in (-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$. Hence, by lower semicontinuity

$$|\mu_{x_3}|(\omega) \leq \liminf_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\omega} |\rho_{\delta} * \mu_{x_3}| dx'$$

for \mathcal{L}^1 -a.e. $x_3 \in (-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$. Integration with respect to x_3 and Fatou’s Lemma yield the thesis. \square

The next lemma is an approximation result for Kirchoff–Love admissible triples by means of triples $(u^k, e^k, p^k) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w)$ with u^k smooth. The proof is based on an adaptation of [12, Proposition 1.4].

Lemma 4.5. *Let $w \in W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \cap KL(\Omega)$ and let $(u, e, p) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w)$. Then, there exists a sequence of triples $(u^k, e^k, p^k) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w)$ such that*

$$u^k \in C^{\infty}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \cap W^{1,1}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$$

and the following properties hold:

$$u^k \rightharpoonup u \text{ weakly* in } BD(\Omega), \tag{4.1}$$

$$e^k \rightarrow e \text{ strongly in } L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}), \tag{4.2}$$

$$p^k \rightharpoonup p \text{ weakly* in } M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}), \tag{4.3}$$

$$\|p^k\|_{M_b} \rightarrow \|p\|_{M_b}, \tag{4.4}$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. Step 1. We first show that any triple $(u, e, p) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w)$ can be approximated in the sense of (4.1)–(4.4) by a sequence of triples $(u^k, e^k, p^k) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w)$ with $u^k \in C^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \cap BD(\Omega)$.

Let $w \in W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \cap KL(\Omega)$ and let $(u, e, p) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w)$. By Proposition 4.3 the Kirchhoff–Love components $\bar{u} \in BD(\omega)$ and $u_3 \in BH(\omega)$ of u satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} E\bar{u} &= \bar{e} + \bar{p} \quad \text{in } \omega, & \bar{p} &= (\bar{w} - \bar{u}) \odot \nu_{\partial\omega} \mathcal{H}^1 \quad \text{on } \gamma_d, \\ D^2u_3 &= -(\hat{e} + \hat{p}) \quad \text{in } \omega, & u_3 &= w_3 \quad \text{on } \gamma_d, & \hat{p} &= (\nabla u_3 - \nabla w_3) \odot \nu_{\partial\omega} \mathcal{H}^1 \quad \text{on } \gamma_d, \end{aligned}$$

where \bar{e}, \hat{e} have been identified with functions in $L^2(\omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ and \bar{p}, \hat{p} with measures in $M_b(\omega \cup \gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$. Moreover,

$$p_\perp = -e_\perp \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad p_\perp = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_d.$$

Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $r > 0$ be such that the set

$$\omega_0 := \{x' \in \omega : \text{dist}(x', \partial\omega) > r^{-1}\}$$

is not empty. We set

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_j &:= \{x' \in \omega : \text{dist}(x', \partial\omega) > (j+r)^{-1}\} \quad \text{for every } j \in \mathbb{N}, \\ A_j &:= \omega_{j+1} \setminus \bar{\omega}_{j-1} \quad \text{for } j \geq 2, \quad A_1 := \omega_2. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\{\varphi_j\}$ be a C^∞ partition of unity for ω subordinate to the covering $\{A_j\}$, that is, $\varphi_j \in C_c^\infty(A_j)$, $0 \leq \varphi_j \leq 1$ for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$, and

$$\sum_{j=1}^\infty \varphi_j = 1 \quad \text{in } \omega. \tag{4.5}$$

Let (ρ_δ) be a sequence of convolution kernels with $\rho_\delta \in C_0^\infty(B_\delta(0))$ for every $\delta > 0$. For every $j \in \mathbb{N}$ we choose δ_j such that

$$\{x' \in \omega : \text{dist}(x', \text{supp } \varphi_j) < \delta_j\} \Subset A_j, \tag{4.6}$$

$$\|(\varphi_j u_3) * \rho_{\delta_j} - \varphi_j u_3\|_{W^{1,2}} + \|(\varphi_j \bar{u}) * \rho_{\delta_j} - \varphi_j \bar{u}\|_{L^2} \leq k^{-1} 2^{-j}, \tag{4.7}$$

$$\|(\varphi_j \bar{e}) * \rho_{\delta_j} - \varphi_j \bar{e}\|_{L^2} + \|(\varphi_j \hat{e}) * \rho_{\delta_j} - \varphi_j \hat{e}\|_{L^2} \leq k^{-1} 2^{-j}, \tag{4.8}$$

$$\|(u_3 D^2 \varphi_j) * \rho_{\delta_j} - u_3 D^2 \varphi_j\|_{L^2} + \|(\nabla u_3 \odot \nabla \varphi_j) * \rho_{\delta_j} - \nabla u_3 \odot \nabla \varphi_j\|_{L^2} \leq k^{-1} 2^{-j}, \tag{4.9}$$

$$\|(\bar{u} \odot \nabla \varphi_j) * \rho_{\delta_j} - \bar{u} \odot \nabla \varphi_j\|_{L^2} \leq k^{-1} 2^{-j}. \tag{4.10}$$

Moreover, we extend the function $\varphi_j e_\perp$ to 0 outside $A_j \times (-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ and consider the convolution

$$(\varphi_j e_\perp) * \rho_{\delta_j}(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \rho_{\delta_j}(x' - y') \varphi_j(y') e_\perp(y', x_3) dy'$$

defined for every $x \in \Omega$. Since $\varphi_j p = \varphi_j \bar{p} \otimes \mathcal{L}^1 + \varphi_j \hat{p} \otimes x_3 \mathcal{L}^1 - \varphi_j e_\perp$, by Lemma 4.4 we can assume δ_j to be so small that

$$\|(\varphi_j e_\perp) * \rho_{\delta_j} - \varphi_j e_\perp\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq k^{-1} 2^{-j}, \tag{4.11}$$

$$\left| \int_\Omega |(\varphi_j \bar{p}) * \rho_{\delta_j} + x_3 (\varphi_j \hat{p}) * \rho_{\delta_j} - (\varphi_j e_\perp) * \rho_{\delta_j}| dx - |\varphi_j p|(\Omega) \right| \leq k^{-1} 2^{-j}. \tag{4.12}$$

Finally, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u}^k &:= \sum_{j=1}^\infty (\varphi_j \bar{u}) * \rho_{\delta_j}, & u_3^k &:= \sum_{j=1}^\infty (\varphi_j u_3) * \rho_{\delta_j}, & u_\alpha^k &:= \bar{u}_\alpha^k - x_3 \partial_\alpha u_3^k \quad (\alpha = 1, 2), \\ e^k &:= \bar{e}^k + x_3 \hat{e}^k + e_\perp^k, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{e}^k &:= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} [(\varphi_j \bar{e}) * \rho_{\delta_j} + (\bar{u} \odot \nabla \varphi_j) * \rho_{\delta_j}], \\ \hat{e}^k &:= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} [(\varphi_j \hat{e}) * \rho_{\delta_j} - (u_3 D^2 \varphi_j) * \rho_{\delta_j} - 2(\nabla u_3 \odot \nabla \varphi_j) * \rho_{\delta_j}], \quad e_{\perp}^k := \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (\varphi_j e_{\perp}) * \rho_{\delta_j}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$p^k := \begin{cases} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} [(\varphi_j \bar{p}) * \rho_{\delta_j} + x_3(\varphi_j \hat{p}) * \rho_{\delta_j} - (\varphi_j e_{\perp}) * \rho_{\delta_j}] & \text{in } \Omega, \\ (w - u) \odot \nu_{\partial\Omega} \mathcal{H}^2 & \text{on } \Gamma_d. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see that $\bar{u}^k \in C^{\infty}(\omega; \mathbb{R}^2) \cap BD(\omega)$, $u_3^k \in C^{\infty}(\omega) \cap W^{2,1}(\omega)$, hence $u^k \in C^{\infty}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \cap BD(\Omega)$. Moreover,

$$E\bar{u}^k = \bar{e}^k + \bar{p}^k \quad \text{and} \quad D^2 u_3^k = -(\hat{e}^k + \hat{p}^k) \quad \text{in } \Omega \tag{4.13}$$

for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Arguing as in [12, Proof of Proposition 1.4], one can also show that $u_3^k = u_3$, $\nabla u_3^k = \nabla u_3$, and $\bar{u}^k = \bar{u}$ on $\partial\omega$. By Proposition 4.3 this implies that $(u^k, e^k, p^k) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w)$.

By (4.5) and (4.7) we deduce that

$$u^k \rightarrow u \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3), \tag{4.14}$$

while by (4.8)–(4.11) we obtain (4.2). By (4.5) and (4.12) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|p^k\|_{M_b} &= |p^k|(\Omega) + |p|(\Gamma_d) \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \int_{\Omega} |(\varphi_j \bar{p}) * \rho_{\delta_j} + x_3(\varphi_j \hat{p}) * \rho_{\delta_j} - (\varphi_j e_{\perp}) * \rho_{\delta_j}| dx + |p|(\Gamma_d) \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |\varphi_j p|(\Omega) + |p|(\Gamma_d) + \frac{1}{k} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \int_{\Omega} \varphi_j(x') d|p|(x) + |p|(\Gamma_d) + \frac{1}{k} = \|p\|_{M_b} + \frac{1}{k}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

This implies that (p^k) is weakly* converging in $M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$ to some limit, that must coincide with p owing to (4.2), (4.13), and (4.14). This proves (4.1) and (4.3). Since by lower semicontinuity we have

$$\|p\|_{M_b} \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|p^k\|_{M_b},$$

convergence (4.4) follows now from (4.15).

Step 2. To conclude the proof of the lemma we shall prove that any triple $(u, e, p) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w)$ with $u \in C^{\infty}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \cap BD(\Omega)$ can be approximated in the sense of (4.1)–(4.4) by a sequence of triples $(u^k, e^k, p^k) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w)$ with $u^k \in C^{\infty}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \cap W^{1,1}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$.

Let $(u, e, p) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w)$ with $u \in C^{\infty}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \cap BD(\Omega)$. The Kirchhoff–Love components of u satisfy $\bar{u} \in C^{\infty}(\omega; \mathbb{R}^2) \cap BD(\omega)$ and $u_3 \in C^{\infty}(\omega) \cap W^{2,1}(\omega)$. By [37, Chapter I, Proposition 1.3] and the regularity of $\partial\omega$ we can construct a sequence $(\bar{u}^k) \subset C^{\infty}(\bar{\omega}; \mathbb{R}^2)$ such that

$$\bar{u}^k \rightarrow \bar{u} \quad \text{strongly in } L^1(\omega; \mathbb{R}^2) \quad \text{and} \quad E\bar{u}^k \rightarrow E\bar{u} \quad \text{strongly in } L^1(\omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}). \tag{4.16}$$

This implies, in particular, that $\bar{u}^k \rightarrow \bar{u}$ strongly in $L^1(\gamma_d; \mathbb{R}^2)$. The sequence of triples (u^k, e^k, p^k) defined by

$$u_{\alpha}^k := \bar{u}_{\alpha}^k - x_3 \partial_{\alpha} u_3 \quad (\alpha = 1, 2), \quad u_3^k := u_3, \quad e^k := e,$$

and

$$p^k := \begin{cases} E\bar{u}^k - e - x_3 D^2 u_3 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ (w - u^k) \odot \nu_{\partial\Omega} \mathcal{H}^2 & \text{on } \Gamma_d, \end{cases}$$

satisfies all the required properties. \square

Remark 4.6. We observe that by (4.14) and (4.16) and the continuous embedding of $BD(\omega)$ into $L^2(\omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$ the approximating sequence (u^k, e^k, p^k) in Lemma 4.5 satisfies also

$$\bar{u}^k \rightarrow \bar{u} \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(\omega; \mathbb{R}^2). \tag{4.17}$$

Moreover, the construction of (u^k, e^k, p^k) can be modified in such a way to satisfy also the following convergence properties:

$$\|E\bar{u}^k\|_{L^1} \rightarrow \|E\bar{u}\|_{M_b}, \tag{4.18}$$

$$\|D^2 u_3^k\|_{L^1} \rightarrow \|D^2 u_3\|_{M_b}, \tag{4.19}$$

$$u_3^k \rightarrow u_3 \quad \text{in } C(\bar{\omega}), \tag{4.20}$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Indeed, let us denote by \bar{p}^a, \hat{p}^a and \bar{p}^s, \hat{p}^s the absolutely continuous parts and the singular parts of \bar{p} and \hat{p} , respectively. In Step 1 we can choose δ_j in such a way to satisfy also the following estimates:

$$\|(\varphi_j \bar{p}^a) * \rho_{\delta_j} - \varphi_j \bar{p}^a\|_{L^1} + \|(\varphi_j \hat{p}^a) * \rho_{\delta_j} - \varphi_j \hat{p}^a\|_{L^1} \leq k^{-1} 2^{-j}, \tag{4.21}$$

$$\|(\varphi_j \bar{p}^s) * \rho_{\delta_j}\|_{L^1} - \|\varphi_j \bar{p}^s\|_{M_b} + \|(\varphi_j \hat{p}^s) * \rho_{\delta_j}\|_{L^1} - \|\varphi_j \hat{p}^s\|_{M_b} \leq k^{-1} 2^{-j}, \tag{4.22}$$

$$\|(\varphi_j u_3) * \rho_{\delta_j} - \varphi_j u_3\|_{L^\infty} \leq k^{-1} 2^{-j}, \tag{4.23}$$

where we used the continuous embedding of $BH(\omega)$ into $C(\bar{\omega})$. By (4.23) we immediately deduce (4.20). By (4.21) we have that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (\varphi_j \bar{p}^a) * \rho_{\delta_j} \rightarrow \bar{p}^a \quad \text{strongly in } L^1(\omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}),$$

while by (4.22) we obtain that

$$\left\| \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (\varphi_j \bar{p}^s) * \rho_{\delta_j} \right\|_{L^1} \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \|\varphi_j \bar{p}^s\|_{M_b} + \frac{1}{k} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \int_{\omega} \varphi_j d|\bar{p}^s| + \frac{1}{k} = |\bar{p}^s|(\omega) + \frac{1}{k}.$$

These two facts, together with (4.2), yield

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|E\bar{u}^k\|_{L^1} \leq \|\bar{e} + \bar{p}^a\|_{L^1} + |\bar{p}^s|(\omega) = \|E\bar{u}\|_{M_b}.$$

The opposite inequality follows from (4.1) by lower semicontinuity. A similar argument applies to (4.19). Finally, it is easy to see that (4.18)–(4.20) are preserved by the construction of Step 2, since the approximation result for \bar{u} entails strong convergence of $(E\bar{u}^k)$ in $L^1(\omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$.

We now prove an approximation result for Kirchhoff–Love admissible triples in terms of smooth triples. We denote by $C_c^\infty(\omega \cup \gamma_n; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ the set of smooth maps whose support is a compact subset of $\omega \cup \gamma_n$. Moreover, we introduce the set $L_{\infty,c}^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ of all $p \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ satisfying the following two conditions:

- (i) $\partial_\alpha^i \partial_\beta^j p \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ for every $i, j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}, \alpha, \beta = 1, 2$;
- (ii) there exists $U \Subset \omega \cup \gamma_n$ such that $p = 0$ a.e. on $(\omega \setminus \bar{U}) \times (-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$.

Note that functions in $L_{\infty,c}^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ have a smooth dependence on the variable x' : indeed, if $p \in L_{\infty,c}^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$, then $p(\cdot, x_3) \in C_c^\infty(\omega \cup \gamma_n; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ for a.e. $x_3 \in (-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$.

Theorem 4.7. *Let $w \in W^{1,2}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^3) \cap KL(\Omega)$ and let $(u, e, p) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w)$. Then, there exists a sequence of triples*

$$(u^k, e^k, p^k) \in (W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \times L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}) \times L_{\infty,c}^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})) \cap \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w)$$

such that

$$u^k \rightharpoonup u \text{ weakly* in } BD(\Omega), \tag{4.24}$$

$$e^k \rightarrow e \text{ strongly in } L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}), \tag{4.25}$$

$$p^k \rightharpoonup p \text{ weakly* in } M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}), \tag{4.26}$$

$$\|p^k\|_{L^1} \rightarrow \|p\|_{M_b}, \tag{4.27}$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. Up to translating u by w , it is enough to prove the theorem for $w \equiv 0$. Moreover, by Lemma 4.5 and by the metrizable of the weak* topology on bounded subsets of $M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$ we can reduce to the case where $u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \cap KL(\Omega)$ and there exists $q \in L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$ such that

$$p = q \text{ in } \Omega, \quad p = -u \odot \nu_{\partial\Omega} \mathcal{H}^2 \text{ on } \Gamma_d. \tag{4.28}$$

As usual, we identify e and p with a function in $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ and a measure in $M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$, respectively, and we perform the decomposition of Proposition 4.3. Since $u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$, we have that $\bar{u} \in W^{1,1}(\omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$ and $u_3 \in W^{2,1}(\omega)$, while by (4.28) there exist $\bar{q}, \hat{q} \in L^1(\omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ such that

$$\bar{p} = \bar{q} \text{ in } \omega, \quad \bar{p} = -\bar{u} \odot \nu_{\partial\omega} \mathcal{H}^1 \text{ on } \gamma_d, \tag{4.29}$$

and

$$\hat{p} = \hat{q} \text{ in } \omega, \quad \hat{p} = \nabla u_3 \odot \nu_{\partial\omega} \mathcal{H}^1 \text{ on } \gamma_d. \tag{4.30}$$

Note also that $u_3 = 0$ on γ_d .

The proof is subdivided into two steps.

Step 1. We claim that we can always reduce to the case where there exists an open set $J \subset \partial\omega$ such that γ_d is compactly contained in J and $u_3 = 0$ on J (topological notions refer here to the relative topology of $\partial\omega$).

To prove the claim, it is enough to show that the triple (u, e, p) can be approximated in the sense of (4.24)–(4.27) by a sequence of triples $(u^\delta, e^\delta, p^\delta)$ in $\mathcal{A}_{KL}(w)$ satisfying the following property: for every $\delta > 0$ there exists an open set $J^\delta \subset \partial\omega$ such that γ_d is compactly contained in J^δ and $u_3^\delta = 0$ on J^δ .

We recall that by assumption $\partial|_{\partial\omega} \gamma_d = \{P_1, P_2\}$. For $\alpha = 1, 2$ let U_α be an open neighbourhood of P_α such that, up to a C^2 change of coordinates, $\partial\omega \cap U_\alpha$ is the graph of a C^2 map and $\omega \cap U_\alpha$ is the related subgraph. We also require $U_1 \cap U_2 = \emptyset$. The approximating sequence will be constructed by modifying u only in the sets U_1 and U_2 . More precisely, using the C^2 regularity, we shall straighten the boundary of ω in U_1 and U_2 , and shift the function u along the tangential direction in such a way to have the boundary condition satisfied on a set larger than γ_d .

We first consider the set U_1 . By our choice of the covering there exist a map $\phi \in C^2(U_1; \mathbb{R}^2)$ and a rectangle $R_1 := (-a, a) \times (-b, b)$ such that $\phi(U_1) = R_1$, $\phi^{-1} \in C^2(R_1; U_1)$, and

$$\phi(U_1 \cap \partial\omega) = \{(s, 0) : s \in (-a, a)\}, \quad \phi(U_1 \cap \omega) := \{(s, t) \in R_1 : t < 0\}.$$

We can also assume that

$$\phi(U_1 \cap \gamma_d) = \{(s, 0) : s \in (0, a)\}.$$

Let $\varphi_1 \in C_c^\infty(U_1)$ be a cut-off function with $\varphi_1 = 1$ on a neighbourhood of P_1 and let V_1 be an open set in \mathbb{R}^2 such that $\text{supp } \varphi_1 \subset V_1 \Subset U_1$. For δ small enough we define $\psi^\delta : \phi(V_1) \rightarrow R_1$ as

$$\psi^\delta(s, t) = (s + \delta, t)$$

and $\phi^\delta : V_1 \rightarrow U_1$ as

$$\phi^\delta := \phi^{-1} \circ \psi_\delta \circ \phi.$$

It is easy to see that for δ small enough

$$\phi^\delta(V_1 \cap \omega) \subset U_1 \cap \omega, \quad \phi^\delta(V_1 \setminus \bar{\omega}) \subset U_1 \setminus \bar{\omega},$$

and

$$\phi^\delta(V_1 \cap \partial\omega) \subset U_1 \cap \partial\omega.$$

Moreover, setting $K_1 := \text{supp } \varphi_1$, we have that

$$\|\phi^\delta - \text{id}\|_{C^2(K_1)} \rightarrow 0, \quad \|(\phi^\delta)^{-1} - \text{id}\|_{C^2(K_1)} \rightarrow 0, \quad (4.31)$$

as $\delta \rightarrow 0$.

We consider the functions $\bar{u}^{\delta,1} := \varphi_1(\bar{u} \circ \phi^\delta)$ and $u_3^{\delta,1} := \varphi_1(u_3 \circ \phi^\delta)$, which are well defined on $V_1 \cap \omega$ and are extended to zero on $\omega \setminus V_1$. By construction $\bar{u}^{\delta,1} \in W^{1,1}(\omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$, $u_3^{\delta,1} \in W^{2,1}(\omega)$, and

$$u_3^{\delta,1} = 0 \quad \text{on } J^{\delta,1}, \quad (4.32)$$

where $J^{\delta,1} := (U_1 \cap \gamma_d) \cup (\phi^\delta)^{-1}(U_1 \cap \gamma_d)$. Moreover, by (4.31) we obtain

$$\bar{u}^{\delta,1} \rightarrow \varphi_1 \bar{u} \quad \text{strongly in } W^{1,1}(\omega; \mathbb{R}^2), \quad (4.33)$$

$$u_3^{\delta,1} \rightarrow \varphi_1 u_3 \quad \text{strongly in } W^{2,1}(\omega). \quad (4.34)$$

Straightforward computations yield the equalities

$$E\bar{u}^{\delta,1} = (\bar{u} \circ \phi^\delta) \odot \nabla \varphi_1 + \varphi_1 \text{sym}((D\bar{u} \circ \phi^\delta)D\phi^\delta), \quad (4.35)$$

$$\begin{aligned} D^2 u_3^{\delta,1} &= (u_3 \circ \phi^\delta) D^2 \varphi_1 + 2\nabla \varphi_1 \odot ((D\phi^\delta)^T (\nabla u_3 \circ \phi^\delta)) \\ &\quad + \varphi_1 \sum_{\alpha=1,2} (\partial_\alpha u_3 \circ \phi^\delta) D^2 \phi_\alpha^\delta + \varphi_1 (D\phi^\delta)^T (D^2 u_3 \circ \phi^\delta) D\phi^\delta. \end{aligned} \quad (4.36)$$

It is therefore natural to introduce the functions $\bar{e}^{\delta,1}, \hat{e}^{\delta,1} \in L^2(\omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$, defined as

$$\bar{e}^{\delta,1} := (\bar{u} \circ \phi^\delta) \odot \nabla \varphi_1 + \varphi_1 \text{sym}((\bar{e} \circ \phi^\delta)D\phi^\delta),$$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{e}^{\delta,1} &:= -(u_3 \circ \phi^\delta) D^2 \varphi_1 - 2\nabla \varphi_1 \odot ((D\phi^\delta)^T (\nabla u_3 \circ \phi^\delta)) \\ &\quad - \varphi_1 \sum_{\alpha=1,2} (\partial_\alpha u_3 \circ \phi^\delta) D^2 \phi_\alpha^\delta + \varphi_1 (D\phi^\delta)^T (\hat{e} \circ \phi^\delta) D\phi^\delta \end{aligned}$$

and the functions $\bar{q}^{\delta,1}, \hat{q}^{\delta,1} \in L^1(\omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$, defined as

$$\bar{q}^{\delta,1} := \varphi_1 \text{sym}((\bar{q} \circ \phi^\delta)D\phi^\delta) + \varphi_1 \text{sym}([(D\bar{u} - E\bar{u}) \circ \phi^\delta]D\phi^\delta),$$

$$\hat{q}^{\delta,1} := \varphi_1 (D\phi^\delta)^T (\hat{q} \circ \phi^\delta) D\phi^\delta.$$

By (4.35) and (4.36) there hold

$$E\bar{u}^{\delta,1} = \bar{e}^{\delta,1} + \bar{q}^{\delta,1} \quad \text{in } \omega, \quad D^2 u_3^{\delta,1} = -(\hat{e}^{\delta,1} + \hat{q}^{\delta,1}) \quad \text{in } \omega. \quad (4.37)$$

By (4.31) we deduce the following convergence properties:

$$\bar{e}^{\delta,1} \rightarrow \bar{u} \odot \nabla \varphi_1 + \varphi_1 \bar{e} \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(\omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}), \quad (4.38)$$

$$\hat{e}^{\delta,1} \rightarrow -u_3 D^2 \varphi_1 - 2\nabla \varphi_1 \odot \nabla u_3 + \varphi_1 \hat{e} \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(\omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}), \quad (4.39)$$

$$\bar{q}^{\delta,1} \rightarrow \varphi_1 \bar{q} \quad \text{strongly in } L^1(\omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}), \quad (4.40)$$

$$\hat{q}^{\delta,1} \rightarrow \varphi_1 \hat{q} \quad \text{strongly in } L^1(\omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}). \quad (4.41)$$

An analogous construction in the set U_2 provides us with two triples

$$(\bar{u}^{\delta,2}, \bar{e}^{\delta,2}, \bar{q}^{\delta,2}) \in W^{1,1}(\omega; \mathbb{R}^2) \times L^2(\omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}) \times L^1(\omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}),$$

$$(u_3^{\delta,2}, \hat{e}^{\delta,2}, \hat{q}^{\delta,2}) \in W^{2,1}(\omega) \times L^2(\omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}) \times L^1(\omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}),$$

such that

$$E\bar{u}^{\delta,2} = \bar{e}^{\delta,2} + \bar{q}^{\delta,2} \quad \text{in } \omega, \quad D^2u_3^{\delta,2} = -(\hat{e}^{\delta,2} + \hat{q}^{\delta,2}) \quad \text{in } \omega, \tag{4.42}$$

and the following convergence properties hold:

$$\bar{u}^{\delta,2} \rightarrow \varphi_2\bar{u} \quad \text{strongly in } W^{1,1}(\omega; \mathbb{R}^2), \tag{4.43}$$

$$u_3^{\delta,2} \rightarrow \varphi_2u_3 \quad \text{strongly in } W^{2,1}(\omega), \tag{4.44}$$

$$\bar{e}^{\delta,2} \rightarrow \bar{u} \odot \nabla\varphi_2 + \varphi_2\bar{e} \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(\omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}), \tag{4.45}$$

$$\hat{e}^{\delta,2} \rightarrow -u_3D^2\varphi_2 - 2\nabla\varphi_2 \odot \nabla u_3 + \varphi_2\hat{e} \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(\omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}), \tag{4.46}$$

$$\bar{q}^{\delta,2} \rightarrow \varphi_2\bar{q} \quad \text{strongly in } L^1(\omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}), \tag{4.47}$$

$$\hat{q}^{\delta,2} \rightarrow \varphi_2\hat{q} \quad \text{strongly in } L^1(\omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}), \tag{4.48}$$

where $\varphi_2 \in C_c^\infty(U_1)$ is a cut-off function with $\varphi_2 = 1$ on a neighbourhood of P_2 . Moreover, the following boundary condition is satisfied:

$$u_3^{\delta,2} = 0 \quad \text{on } J^{\delta,2}, \tag{4.49}$$

where $J^{\delta,2}$ is an open subset of $\partial\omega$ strictly containing $U_2 \cap \gamma_d$.

To complete the construction of the approximating sequence we set

$$\bar{u}^\delta := \bar{u} - (\varphi_1 + \varphi_2)\bar{u} + \bar{u}^{\delta,1} + \bar{u}^{\delta,2}, \quad u_3^\delta := u_3 - (\varphi_1 + \varphi_2)u_3 + u_3^{\delta,1} + u_3^{\delta,2},$$

and

$$u_\alpha^\delta := \bar{u}_\alpha^\delta - x_3\partial_\alpha u_3^\delta \quad (\alpha = 1, 2).$$

Since u^δ satisfies (3.21), it is immediate to see that $u^\delta \in W^{1,1}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \cap KL(\Omega)$; moreover, by (4.32) and (4.49) we have

$$u_3^\delta = 0 \quad \text{on } J^\delta,$$

where $J^\delta := J^{\delta,1} \cup J^{\delta,2} \cup \gamma_d$ is an open subset of $\partial\omega$ and satisfies $\gamma_d \Subset J^\delta$. By (4.33), (4.34), (4.43), and (4.44) we also have

$$u^\delta \rightarrow u \quad \text{strongly in } W^{1,1}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3). \tag{4.50}$$

By the continuity of the trace operator the previous convergence entails

$$u^\delta \rightarrow u \quad \text{strongly in } L^1(\partial\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3). \tag{4.51}$$

Finally, we introduce the functions $e^\delta \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ and $q^\delta \in L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$, defined as

$$\begin{aligned} e^\delta &:= e - (\varphi_1 + \varphi_2)(\bar{e} + x_3\hat{e}) + \bar{e}^{\delta,1} + x_3\hat{e}^{\delta,1} + \bar{e}^{\delta,2} + x_3\hat{e}^{\delta,2} \\ &\quad - \sum_{\alpha=1}^2 (\bar{u} \odot \nabla\varphi_\alpha - x_3u_3D^2\varphi_\alpha - 2x_3\nabla\varphi_\alpha \odot \nabla u_3), \\ q^\delta &:= q - (\varphi_1 + \varphi_2)(\bar{q} + x_3\hat{q}) + \bar{q}^{\delta,1} + x_3\hat{q}^{\delta,1} + \bar{q}^{\delta,2} + x_3\hat{q}^{\delta,2}, \end{aligned}$$

and the measure $p^\delta \in M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$, defined as

$$p^\delta := q^\delta \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad p^\delta := -u^\delta \odot \nu_{\partial\Omega} \mathcal{H}^2 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_d.$$

Clearly, $(u^\delta, e^\delta, p^\delta) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w)$. Moreover, by (4.38)–(4.41) and (4.45)–(4.48) we obtain

$$e^\delta \rightarrow e \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}), \tag{4.52}$$

$$q^\delta \rightarrow q \quad \text{strongly in } L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}). \tag{4.53}$$

From (4.51) and (4.53) it follows immediately that

$$p^\delta \rightharpoonup p \text{ weakly* in } M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$$

and

$$\|p^\delta\|_{M_b} \rightarrow \|p\|_{M_b}.$$

Step 2. By Step 1 we can assume that there exists an open set $J \subset \partial\omega$ such that γ_d is compactly contained in J and $u_3 = 0$ on J .

Let us consider a finite covering $\{Q_i\}_{i=1, \dots, m_0}$ of $\partial\omega$ made of open squares centred at points on $\partial\omega$, with a face orthogonal to some vector $n_i \in \mathbb{S}^1$ and such that, for every $i = 1, \dots, m_0$, the set $Q_i \cap \omega$ is a C^2 subgraph in the direction n_i . We also require that for some $m_0 \in \{1, \dots, m\}$

$$\gamma_d \Subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{m_0} Q_i \cap \partial\omega \Subset J$$

and

$$\text{dist}(Q_i, \gamma_d) > 0 \text{ for every } i = m_0 + 1, \dots, m.$$

Let Q_0 be an open set compactly contained in ω such that the family of open sets $\{Q_i\}_{i=0, \dots, m}$ is a finite covering of $\bar{\omega}$. We consider a subordinate partition of unity $\{\varphi_i\}_{i=0, \dots, m}$, with $0 \leq \varphi_i \leq 1$, $\varphi_i \in C_c^\infty(Q_i)$ for every $i = 0, \dots, m$, and $\sum_{i=0}^m \varphi_i = 1$ on $\bar{\omega}$.

Denoting by $\tilde{\Omega}$ the set

$$\tilde{\Omega} := \Omega \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{m_0} \left(Q_i \times \left(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} \right) \right),$$

we extend the triple (u, e, p) to $\tilde{\Omega}$ by setting

$$u := 0 \text{ in } \tilde{\Omega} \setminus \Omega, \quad e := 0 \text{ in } \tilde{\Omega} \setminus \Omega, \quad p := \begin{cases} -u \odot \nu_{\partial\Omega} \mathcal{H}^2 & \text{on } \tilde{\Omega} \cap \partial\Omega, \\ 0 & \text{in } \tilde{\Omega} \setminus \bar{\Omega}. \end{cases}$$

The extended maps satisfy

$$u \in BD(\tilde{\Omega}) \cap KL(\tilde{\Omega}), \quad e \in L^2(\tilde{\Omega}; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}), \quad p \in M_b(\tilde{\Omega}; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$$

and

$$Eu = e + p \text{ in } \tilde{\Omega}.$$

Note, in particular, that since $u_3 = 0$ and $\nu_{\partial\Omega} = (\nu_{\partial\omega}, 0)$ on $\tilde{\Omega} \cap \partial\Omega$, we have that $p_{i3} = 0$ in $\tilde{\Omega}$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Thus, we can as usual identify e with a function in $L^2(\tilde{\Omega}; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ and p with a measure in $M_b(\tilde{\Omega}; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$.

For every $i = 1, \dots, m_0$ we introduce the outward translations

$$\tau_{i,k}(x') := x' + a_k n_i \text{ for } x' \in \mathbb{R}^2,$$

while for $i = m_0 + 1, \dots, m$ we consider the inward translations

$$\tau_{i,k}(x') := x' - a_k n_i \text{ for } x' \in \mathbb{R}^2,$$

where (a_k) is a sequence converging to 0^+ , as $k \rightarrow \infty$. We define

$$\bar{u}^k := \sum_{i=1}^m (\varphi_i \bar{u}) \circ \tau_{i,k} + \varphi_0 \bar{u}, \tag{4.54}$$

$$\bar{e}^k := \sum_{i=1}^m (\varphi_i \bar{e}) \circ \tau_{i,k} + \varphi_0 \bar{e} + \sum_{i=1}^m (\nabla \varphi_i \odot \bar{u}) \circ \tau_{i,k} + \nabla \varphi_0 \odot \bar{u}, \tag{4.55}$$

$$\bar{p}^k := \sum_{i=1}^m \tau_{i,k}^\# (\varphi_i \bar{p}) + \varphi_0 \bar{p}, \tag{4.56}$$

where $\tau_{i,k}^\#(\varphi_i \bar{p})$ denotes the pull-back measure of $\varphi_i \bar{p}$. Note that $(\bar{u}^k, \bar{e}^k, \bar{p}^k)$ is well defined in an open neighbourhood ω_k of ω , that is, $\bar{u}^k \in BD(\omega_k)$, $\bar{e}^k \in L^2(\omega_k; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$, $\bar{p}^k \in M_b(\omega_k; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$, and

$$E\bar{u}^k = \bar{e}^k + \bar{p}^k \quad \text{in } \omega_k.$$

Moreover, by construction there exists an open set $U_k \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $\gamma_d \Subset U_k$ and $u^k = 0$, $e^k = 0$, and $p^k = 0$ in U_k . Finally, we can choose $a_k \rightarrow 0$ in such a way that

$$\tau_{i,k}^\#(\varphi_i \bar{p})(\partial\omega \cap Q_i) = 0 \quad \text{for } i = m_0 + 1, \dots, m,$$

so that

$$|\bar{p}^k|(\partial\omega) = 0 \quad \text{for every } k. \tag{4.57}$$

Let now $(\rho_\delta) \subset C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ be a sequence of convolution kernels. For $\delta < a_k$ we consider the functions

$$\bar{u}^{k,\delta} := \bar{u}^k * \rho_\delta, \quad \bar{e}^{k,\delta} := \bar{e}^k * \rho_\delta, \quad \bar{p}^{k,\delta} := \bar{p}^k * \rho_\delta.$$

Clearly, we have $\bar{u}^{k,\delta} \in C^\infty(\bar{\omega}; \mathbb{R}^2)$ and $\bar{e}^{k,\delta}, \bar{p}^{k,\delta} \in C^\infty(\bar{\omega}; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$, and

$$E\bar{u}^{k,\delta} = \bar{e}^{k,\delta} + \bar{p}^{k,\delta} \quad \text{in } \omega.$$

Moreover, for δ small enough there hold

$$\bar{u}^{k,\delta} = 0 \quad \text{on } \gamma_d \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{e}^{k,\delta}, \bar{p}^{k,\delta} \in C_c^\infty(\omega \cup \gamma_n; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}). \tag{4.58}$$

We apply a similar construction to the normal component of u and to the first moments of e and p . We first introduce

$$\begin{aligned} u_3^k &:= \sum_{i=1}^m (\varphi_i u_3) \circ \tau_{i,k} + \varphi_0 u_3, \\ \hat{e}^k &:= \sum_{i=1}^m (\varphi_i \hat{e}) \circ \tau_{i,k} + \varphi_0 \hat{e} - 2 \sum_{i=1}^m (\nabla \varphi_i \odot \nabla u_3) \circ \tau_{i,k} - 2 \nabla \varphi_0 \odot \nabla u_3 - \sum_{i=1}^m (D^2 \varphi_i u_3) \circ \tau_{i,k} - D^2 \varphi_0 u_3, \\ \hat{p}^k &:= \sum_{i=1}^m \tau_{i,k}^\#(\varphi_i \hat{p}) + \varphi_0 \hat{p}, \end{aligned}$$

and we then define for $\delta < a_k$

$$u_3^{k,\delta} := u_3^k * \rho_\delta, \quad \hat{e}^{k,\delta} := \hat{e}^k * \rho_\delta, \quad \hat{p}^{k,\delta} := \hat{p}^k * \rho_\delta.$$

As before, we can modify the choice of $a_k \rightarrow 0$ in such a way that

$$|\hat{p}^k|(\partial\omega) = 0. \tag{4.59}$$

Moreover, for δ small enough we have that $u_3^{k,\delta} \in C^\infty(\bar{\omega})$, $\hat{e}^{k,\delta}, \hat{p}^{k,\delta} \in C_c^\infty(\omega \cup \gamma_n; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$, and $u_3^{k,\delta} = 0$ on γ_d , $\nabla u_3^{k,\delta} = 0$ on γ_d . Finally, there holds

$$D^2 u_3^{k,\delta} = -(\hat{e}^{k,\delta} + \hat{p}^{k,\delta}) \quad \text{in } \omega.$$

Analogously, we define

$$e_\perp^k := \sum_{i=1}^m (\varphi_i e_\perp) \circ \tau_{i,k} + \varphi_0 e_\perp, \quad e_\perp^{k,\delta} := e_\perp^k * \rho_\delta,$$

where, with an abuse of notation, the composition $(\varphi_i e_\perp) \circ \tau_{i,k}$ stands for the function

$$(\varphi_i e_\perp) \circ \tau_{i,k}(x) = \varphi_i(\tau_{i,k}(x')) e_\perp(\tau_{i,k}(x'), x_3) \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega,$$

and the convolution is intended with respect to the variable $x' \in \mathbb{R}^2$. It is immediate to see that $e_\perp^{k,\delta} \in L_{\infty,c}^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$. We now set

$$\begin{aligned} u_\alpha^{k,\delta} &:= \bar{u}_\alpha^{k,\delta} - x_3 \partial_\alpha u_3^{k,\delta} \quad (\alpha = 1, 2), \\ e^{k,\delta} &:= \bar{e}^{k,\delta} + x_3 \hat{e}^{k,\delta} + e_\perp^{k,\delta}, \\ p^{k,\delta} &:= \bar{p}^{k,\delta} + x_3 \hat{p}^{k,\delta} - e_\perp^{k,\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

By construction we have

$$(u^{k,\delta}, e^{k,\delta}, p^{k,\delta}) \in (W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \times L^2_{\infty,c}(\Omega; \mathbb{M}^{2 \times 2}_{\text{sym}}) \times L^2_{\infty,c}(\Omega; \mathbb{M}^{2 \times 2}_{\text{sym}})) \cap \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w).$$

It is convenient to introduce also the measure $p^k \in M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}^{2 \times 2}_{\text{sym}})$, defined as

$$p^k := \bar{p}^k \otimes \mathcal{L}^1 + \hat{p}^k \otimes x_3 \mathcal{L}^1 - e_\perp^k.$$

Lemma 4.4, together with equalities (4.57) and (4.59), guarantees that we can choose $\delta = \delta_k$ small enough, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{u}^{k,\delta_k} - \bar{u}^k\|_{L^2} &< k^{-1}, & \|u_3^{k,\delta_k} - u_3^k\|_{W^{1,2}} &< k^{-1}, \\ \|\bar{e}^{k,\delta_k} - \bar{e}^k\|_{L^2} &< k^{-1}, & \|\hat{e}^{k,\delta_k} - \hat{e}^k\|_{L^2} &< k^{-1}, & \|e_\perp^{k,\delta_k} - e_\perp^k\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &< k^{-1}, \\ \|\bar{p}^{k,\delta_k}\|_{L^1(\Omega)} - |p^k|(\Omega) &< k^{-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.60}$$

From the convergence properties above we deduce (4.25) and that

$$u^{k,\delta_k} \rightarrow u \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3).$$

To conclude the proof of the theorem it is enough to show that

$$\|p^{k,\delta_k}\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq \|p\|_{M_b} + \frac{1}{k} \tag{4.61}$$

for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. By (4.60) we have

$$\|p^{k,\delta_k}\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq |p^k|(\Omega) + \frac{1}{k}. \tag{4.62}$$

On the other hand, since p has been extended to zero on the set $\bigcup_{i=1}^{m_0} (Q_i \setminus \bar{\omega}) \times (-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$, while for $i = m_0 + 1, \dots, m$ the map $\tau_{i,k}$ is an inward translations, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |p^k|(\Omega) &\leq |\varphi_0 p|(\Omega) + \sum_{i=1}^m \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} |\tau_{i,k}^\#(\varphi_i \bar{p} + x_3 \varphi_i \hat{p} + \varphi_i e_\perp(\cdot, x_3))|(\omega) dx_3 \\ &\leq |\varphi_0 p|(\Omega) + \sum_{i=1}^m \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} |\varphi_i(\bar{p} + x_3 \hat{p} + e_\perp(\cdot, x_3))|(\omega \cup \gamma_d) dx_3 \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^m |\varphi_i p|(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d) = \sum_{i=0}^m \int_{\Omega \cup \Gamma_d} \varphi_i d|p| = \|p\|_{M_b}. \end{aligned}$$

This, together with (4.62), completes the proof of (4.61) and of the theorem. \square

Remark 4.8. Arguing as in Remark 4.6, one can modify the construction of the sequence (u^k, e^k, p^k) in Theorem 4.7 in such a way that the convergence properties (4.17)–(4.20) are also satisfied. In particular, (4.20) is preserved, since the approximation argument for u_3 involves only local translations and convolutions.

Remark 4.9. We point out that the approximation result provided by Lemma 4.5 is crucial in Step 1 of the proof of Theorem 4.7. Indeed, it is not in general true that, if $v \in BD(\omega)$ and $\Psi : U \rightarrow \omega$ is a smooth bijection with smooth inverse, the composition $v \circ \Psi$ belongs to $BD(U)$. Lemma 4.5 allows us to assume $\bar{u} \in W^{1,1}(\omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$ and this regularity guarantees that $\bar{u} \circ \phi^\delta \in W^{1,1}(V_1; \mathbb{R}^2)$, hence, in particular, $\bar{u} \circ \phi^\delta \in BD(V_1)$.

5. Γ -convergence of the static functionals

In this section we study the asymptotic behaviour of minimizers of the rescaled energies \mathcal{J}_ε , as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, and we show that it can be characterized in terms of the functional \mathcal{J} . More precisely, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 5.1. *Let \mathcal{J}_ε and \mathcal{J} be the functionals defined in (3.10) and (3.24). Let $w \in W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \cap KL(\Omega)$ and for every $\varepsilon > 0$ let $(u_\varepsilon, e_\varepsilon, p_\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon(w)$ be a minimizer of \mathcal{J}_ε . Then there exist a subsequence (not relabelled) and a triple $(u, e, p) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w)$ such that*

$$u^\varepsilon \rightharpoonup u \quad \text{weakly* in } BD(\Omega), \tag{5.1}$$

$$e^\varepsilon \rightarrow e \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}), \tag{5.2}$$

$$\Lambda_\varepsilon e^\varepsilon \rightarrow \mathbb{M}e \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}), \tag{5.3}$$

$$p^\varepsilon \rightharpoonup p \quad \text{weakly* in } M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}), \tag{5.4}$$

$$\mathcal{H}(\Lambda_\varepsilon p^\varepsilon) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_r(p), \tag{5.5}$$

where \mathbb{M} is the tensor introduced in (3.11). Moreover, (u, e, p) is a minimizer of \mathcal{J} and

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon, e_\varepsilon, p_\varepsilon) = \mathcal{J}(u, e, p). \tag{5.6}$$

Remark 5.2. The existence of a minimizer of \mathcal{J}_ε is guaranteed by [10, Theorem 3.3].

The proof of Theorem 5.1 is in the spirit of Γ -convergence. We first prove a compactness result and a lim inf inequality for sequences of triples with equibounded energies.

Theorem 5.3. *Let $w \in W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \cap KL(\Omega)$ and let $(u_\varepsilon, e_\varepsilon, p_\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon(w)$ be such that*

$$\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon, e_\varepsilon, p_\varepsilon) \leq C \quad \text{for every } \varepsilon > 0, \tag{5.7}$$

where C is a constant independent of ε . Then, there exist $\tilde{e} \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$ and $\tilde{p} \in M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_D^{3 \times 3})$ such that, up to subsequences,

$$\Lambda_\varepsilon e_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup \tilde{e} \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}), \tag{5.8}$$

$$\Lambda_\varepsilon p_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup \tilde{p} \quad \text{weakly* in } M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_D^{3 \times 3}). \tag{5.9}$$

Moreover, there exists $(u, e, p) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w)$, with $e_{\alpha\beta} = \tilde{e}_{\alpha\beta}$ and $p_{\alpha\beta} = \tilde{p}_{\alpha\beta}$ for $\alpha, \beta = 1, 2$, such that, up to subsequences,

$$u_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup u \quad \text{weakly* in } BD(\Omega), \tag{5.10}$$

$$e_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup e \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}), \tag{5.11}$$

$$p_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup p \quad \text{weakly* in } M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}), \tag{5.12}$$

and

$$\mathcal{J}(u, e, p) \leq \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon, e_\varepsilon, p_\varepsilon). \tag{5.13}$$

Proof. By the energy estimate (5.7) and by (3.1) we deduce the bounds

$$\|e_\varepsilon\|_{L^2} \leq \|\Lambda_\varepsilon e_\varepsilon\|_{L^2} \leq C \quad \text{for every } \varepsilon. \tag{5.14}$$

Hence, there exist $\tilde{e}, e \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$ such that (5.8) and (5.11) hold up to subsequences, with $e_{\alpha\beta} = \tilde{e}_{\alpha\beta}$ for $\alpha, \beta = 1, 2$ and $e_{i3} = 0$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. By the lower semicontinuity of \mathcal{Q} with respect to weak convergence in $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$ and by the definition (3.13) of \mathcal{Q}_r we also deduce

$$\mathcal{Q}_r(e) \leq \mathcal{Q}(\tilde{e}) \leq \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{Q}(\Lambda_\varepsilon e_\varepsilon). \tag{5.15}$$

By (5.7) and (3.3) we obtain analogously

$$\|p_\varepsilon\|_{M_b} \leq \|\Lambda_\varepsilon p_\varepsilon\|_{M_b} \leq C. \quad (5.16)$$

Therefore, there exist $\tilde{p} \in M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_D^{3 \times 3})$ and $p \in M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$ such that (5.9) and (5.12) hold up to subsequences, with $p_{\alpha\beta} = \tilde{p}_{\alpha\beta}$ for $\alpha, \beta = 1, 2$ and $p_{i3} = 0$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. By the lower semicontinuity of \mathcal{H} with respect to weak* convergence in $M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_D^{3 \times 3})$ and by the definition (3.17) of \mathcal{H}_r , we have

$$\mathcal{H}_r(p) \leq \mathcal{H}(\tilde{p}) \leq \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{H}(\Lambda_\varepsilon p_\varepsilon), \quad (5.17)$$

which, together with (5.15), gives (5.13).

Since $(u_\varepsilon, e_\varepsilon, p_\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon(w)$, for every ε there hold

$$Eu_\varepsilon = e_\varepsilon + p_\varepsilon \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad (5.18)$$

and

$$p_\varepsilon = (w - u_\varepsilon) \odot \nu_{\partial\Omega} \mathcal{H}^2 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_d. \quad (5.19)$$

By (5.14), (5.16), and (5.18), the sequence (Eu_ε) is bounded in $M_b(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$. By (5.16) and (5.19), the traces of (u_ε) are uniformly bounded in $L^1(\Gamma_d; \mathbb{R}^3)$. Hence, by (2.2) the sequence (u_ε) is bounded in $BD(\Omega)$ and (5.10) holds up to subsequences. Moreover, it is immediate to see that $Eu = e + p$ in Ω , hence $u \in KL(\Omega)$.

To conclude the proof, it remains to check that $p = (w - u) \odot \nu_{\partial\Omega} \mathcal{H}^2$ on Γ_d . To this purpose we argue as in [10, Lemma 2.1]. Since γ_d is an open subset of $\partial\omega$, there exists an open set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $\gamma_d = A \cap \partial\omega$. We set $U := (\omega \cup A) \times (-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ and we extend the triples $(u_\varepsilon, e_\varepsilon, p_\varepsilon)$ to the set U in the following way:

$$v_\varepsilon := \begin{cases} u_\varepsilon & \text{in } \Omega, \\ w & \text{in } U \setminus \Omega, \end{cases} \quad f_\varepsilon := \begin{cases} e_\varepsilon & \text{in } \Omega, \\ Ew & \text{in } U \setminus \Omega, \end{cases} \quad q_\varepsilon := \begin{cases} p_\varepsilon & \text{in } \Omega \cup \Gamma_d, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The symmetric part of the gradient of v_ε satisfies

$$Ev_\varepsilon = \begin{cases} Eu_\varepsilon & \text{in } \Omega, \\ (w - u_\varepsilon) \odot \nu_{\partial\Omega} \mathcal{H}^2 & \text{on } \Gamma_d, \\ Ew & \text{in } U \setminus \overline{\Omega}. \end{cases}$$

Therefore, by (5.10), up to subsequences, $v_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup v$ weakly* in $BD(U)$, where

$$v := \begin{cases} u & \text{in } \Omega, \\ w & \text{in } U \setminus \Omega, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad Ev = \begin{cases} Eu & \text{in } \Omega, \\ (w - u) \odot \nu_{\partial\Omega} \mathcal{H}^2 & \text{on } \Gamma_d, \\ Ew & \text{in } U \setminus \overline{\Omega}. \end{cases} \quad (5.20)$$

Analogously, up to subsequences, $f_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup f$ weakly in $L^2(U; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$ and, since the restrictions to $\Omega \cup \Gamma_d$ of functions in $C_0(U; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$ belong to $C_0(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$, there holds $q_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup q$ weakly* in $M_b(U; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$, where

$$f := \begin{cases} e & \text{in } \Omega, \\ Ew & \text{in } U \setminus \Omega, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad q := \begin{cases} p & \text{in } \Omega \cup \Gamma_d, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since $Ev_\varepsilon = f_\varepsilon + q_\varepsilon$ in U for every ε , we deduce that $Ev = f + q$ in U . The thesis follows now from (5.20). \square

In the next theorem we show that the lower bound established in Theorem 5.3 is optimal by exhibiting a recovery sequence.

Theorem 5.4. *Let $w \in W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \cap KL(\Omega)$ and let $(u, e, p) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w)$. Then, there exists a sequence of triples $(u_\varepsilon, e_\varepsilon, p_\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon(w)$ such that*

$$u^\varepsilon \rightharpoonup u \quad \text{weakly* in } BD(\Omega), \quad (5.21)$$

$$e^\varepsilon \rightarrow e \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}), \quad (5.22)$$

$$p^\varepsilon \rightharpoonup p \quad \text{weakly* in } M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}), \quad (5.23)$$

$$\Lambda_\varepsilon e^\varepsilon \rightarrow \mathbb{M}e \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}), \quad (5.24)$$

$$\mathcal{H}(\Lambda_\varepsilon p^\varepsilon) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_r(p), \quad (5.25)$$

and

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon, e^\varepsilon, p^\varepsilon) = \mathcal{J}(u, e, p). \tag{5.26}$$

Proof. Assume first that $(u, e, p) \in (W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \times L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}) \times L^2_{\infty,c}(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})) \cap \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w)$. In particular, $p = 0$ on Γ_d and $u = w$ \mathcal{H}^2 -a.e. on Γ_d . Let $\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3 \in L^2(\Omega)$ be such that

$$\mathbb{M}e = \begin{pmatrix} e_{11} & e_{12} & \phi_1 \\ e_{12} & e_{22} & \phi_2 \\ \phi_1 & \phi_2 & \phi_3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since $p \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$, by the measurable selection lemma (see, e.g., [15]) and by (3.3) and (3.18) there exist $\eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3 \in L^2(\Omega)$ such that

$$\mathcal{H}_r(p) = \mathcal{H} \begin{pmatrix} p_{11} & p_{12} & \eta_1 \\ p_{12} & p_{22} & \eta_2 \\ \eta_1 & \eta_2 & -(p_{11} + p_{22}) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{5.27}$$

We argue as in [26, Proposition 4.1] and we approximate the maps ϕ_i and η_i by means of elliptic regularizations. For every ε we define $\phi_i^\varepsilon \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, as the solution of the elliptic boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} -\varepsilon \Delta \phi_i^\varepsilon + \phi_i^\varepsilon = \phi_i & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \phi_i^\varepsilon = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

and $\eta_\alpha^\varepsilon \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$, $\alpha = 1, 2$, as the solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\varepsilon \Delta \eta_\alpha^\varepsilon + \eta_\alpha^\varepsilon = \eta_\alpha & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \eta_\alpha^\varepsilon = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

The standard theory of elliptic equations gives

$$\phi_i^\varepsilon \rightarrow \phi_i \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(\Omega), \tag{5.28}$$

$$\eta_\alpha^\varepsilon \rightarrow \eta_\alpha \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(\Omega), \tag{5.29}$$

as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, and

$$\|\nabla \phi_i^\varepsilon\|_{L^2} \leq C\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \|\nabla \eta_\alpha^\varepsilon\|_{L^2} \leq C\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{5.30}$$

We also introduce the function $f^\varepsilon \in L^2(\omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$, defined componentwise as

$$f_{\alpha\alpha}^\varepsilon(x') := 2\varepsilon \int_0^{x_3} (\partial_\alpha \phi_\alpha^\varepsilon(x', s) + \partial_\alpha \eta_\alpha^\varepsilon(x', s)) ds \quad (\alpha = 1, 2), \quad f_{33}^\varepsilon(x') := 0,$$

$$f_{12}^\varepsilon(x') := \varepsilon \int_0^{x_3} (\partial_2 \phi_1^\varepsilon(x', s) + \partial_2 \eta_1^\varepsilon(x', s) + \partial_1 \phi_2^\varepsilon(x', s) + \partial_1 \eta_2^\varepsilon(x', s)) ds,$$

$$f_{\alpha 3}^\varepsilon(x') := \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \int_0^{x_3} (\partial_\alpha \phi_3^\varepsilon(x', s) - \partial_\alpha p_{11}(x', s) - \partial_\alpha p_{22}(x', s)) ds \quad (\alpha = 1, 2)$$

for a.e. $x' \in \omega$.

We are now in a position to define the recovery sequence. Let

$$u_\alpha^\varepsilon := u_\alpha + 2\varepsilon \int_0^{x_3} (\phi_\alpha^\varepsilon(x', s) + \eta_\alpha^\varepsilon(x', s)) ds \quad (\alpha = 1, 2),$$

$$u_3^\varepsilon := u_3 + \varepsilon^2 \int_0^{x_3} (\phi_3^\varepsilon(x', s) - p_{11}(x', s) - p_{22}(x', s)) ds,$$

and

$$e^\varepsilon := e + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \varepsilon\phi_1^\varepsilon \\ 0 & 0 & \varepsilon\phi_2^\varepsilon \\ \varepsilon\phi_1^\varepsilon & \varepsilon\phi_2^\varepsilon & \varepsilon^2\phi_3^\varepsilon \end{pmatrix} + f^\varepsilon, \quad p^\varepsilon := p + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \varepsilon\eta_1^\varepsilon \\ 0 & 0 & \varepsilon\eta_2^\varepsilon \\ \varepsilon\eta_1^\varepsilon & \varepsilon\eta_2^\varepsilon & -\varepsilon^2(p_{11} + p_{22}) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since $u = w$ on Γ_d , $p \in L^2_{\infty,c}(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$, and $\phi_i^\varepsilon, \eta_\alpha^\varepsilon \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$, we have that $u_\varepsilon = w$ on Γ_d . It is also easy to check that $(u_\varepsilon, e_\varepsilon, p_\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon(w)$. From (5.28) and (5.29) it follows that $u^\varepsilon \rightarrow u$ strongly in $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$. By (5.28) and (5.30) we deduce (5.22) and (5.24), while by (5.29) we obtain

$$p^\varepsilon \rightarrow p \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}),$$

hence (5.23) and (5.21) follow. Finally, by (5.27) we have (5.25), which, together with (5.24), implies the convergence of the energies.

Let now $(u, e, p) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w)$. By Theorem 4.7 there exists a sequence of triples (u^k, e^k, p^k) in $(W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \times L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}) \times L^2_{\infty,c}(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})) \cap \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w)$ converging to (u, e, p) in the sense of (4.24)–(4.27). These convergence properties, together with the linearity of the map \mathbb{M} and Reshetnyak Continuity Theorem (see, e.g., [5, Theorem 2.39]), imply

$$\mathbb{M}e^k \rightarrow \mathbb{M}e \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}),$$

$$\mathcal{H}_r(p^k) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_r(p).$$

In particular, by the dominated convergence theorem we also have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{J}(u^k, e^k, p^k) = \mathcal{J}(u, e, p).$$

For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we can apply the previous argument to construct a recovery sequence for (u^k, e^k, p^k) . A diagonal argument and the metrizable topology on bounded subsets of $M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$ allow us to conclude. \square

We are now in a position to prove Theorem 5.1.

Proof of Theorem 5.1. Since $(w, Ew, 0) \in \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon(w)$ for every $\varepsilon > 0$, by minimality we have that

$$\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon, e^\varepsilon, p^\varepsilon) \leq \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(w, Ew, 0) \leq R_{\mathbb{C}} \|Ew\|_{L^2}^2,$$

where the last inequality follows from the definition (3.10) of \mathcal{J}_ε , the inequality (3.1), and the fact that $w \in KL(\Omega)$. By Theorem 5.3 we deduce that there exists $(u, e, p) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w)$ such that, up to subsequences,

$$u^\varepsilon \rightharpoonup u \quad \text{weakly* in } BD(\Omega),$$

$$e^\varepsilon \rightharpoonup e \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}),$$

$$p^\varepsilon \rightharpoonup p \quad \text{weakly* in } M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}),$$

and

$$\mathcal{J}(u, e, p) \leq \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon, e^\varepsilon, p^\varepsilon). \quad (5.31)$$

Let now $(v, f, q) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w)$. By Theorem 5.4 there exists a sequence of triples $(v^\varepsilon, f^\varepsilon, q^\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon(w)$ such that

$$\mathcal{J}(v, f, q) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v^\varepsilon, f^\varepsilon, q^\varepsilon) \geq \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon, e^\varepsilon, p^\varepsilon), \quad (5.32)$$

where the last inequality follows from the minimality of $(u_\varepsilon, e_\varepsilon, p_\varepsilon)$. Combining (5.32) with (5.31), we deduce that (u, e, p) is a minimizer of \mathcal{J} and by choosing $(v, f, q) = (u, e, p)$ in (5.32) we obtain (5.6).

It remains to prove (5.2), (5.3), and (5.5). By the lower semicontinuity of \mathcal{Q} and \mathcal{H} with respect to weak convergence in $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$ and weak* convergence in $M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$, respectively, and by the definition of \mathcal{Q}_r and \mathcal{H}_r we have

$$\mathcal{Q}_r(e) \leq \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{Q}(\Lambda_\varepsilon e^\varepsilon), \quad \mathcal{H}_r(p) \leq \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{H}(\Lambda_\varepsilon p^\varepsilon). \quad (5.33)$$

Combining (5.6) and (5.33) yields

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{Q}(\Lambda_\varepsilon e^\varepsilon) = \mathcal{Q}_r(e), \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{H}(\Lambda_\varepsilon p^\varepsilon) = \mathcal{H}_r(p),$$

so that (5.5) is proved. On the other hand, we remark that by (3.16)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}(\Lambda_\varepsilon e^\varepsilon - \mathbb{M}e) &= \mathcal{Q}(\Lambda_\varepsilon e^\varepsilon) + \mathcal{Q}_r(e) - \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C}\mathbb{M}e : \Lambda_\varepsilon e^\varepsilon \, dx \\ &= \mathcal{Q}(\Lambda_\varepsilon e^\varepsilon) + \mathcal{Q}_r(e) - \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C}\mathbb{M}e : e^\varepsilon \, dx. \end{aligned} \tag{5.34}$$

Therefore, passing to the limit in (5.34) and applying again (3.16), we obtain

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{Q}(\Lambda_\varepsilon e^\varepsilon - \mathbb{M}e) = 0,$$

so that (5.3) follows now from (3.1). Finally, convergence (5.2) is an immediate consequence of (5.3). \square

6. Convergence of quasistatic evolutions

In this section we focus on the quasistatic evolution problems associated with the functionals \mathcal{J}_ε and \mathcal{J} . For every $t \in [0, T]$ we prescribe a boundary datum $w(t) \in W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \cap KL(\Omega)$ and we assume the map $t \mapsto w(t)$ to be absolutely continuous from $[0, T]$ into $W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$.

Let $s_1, s_2 \in [0, T], s_1 \leq s_2$. For every function $t \mapsto \mu(t)$ of bounded variation from $[0, T]$ into $M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_D^{3 \times 3})$, we define the *dissipation* of $t \mapsto \mu(t)$ in $[s_1, s_2]$ as

$$\mathcal{D}(\mu; s_1, s_2) := \sup \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^n \mathcal{H}(\mu(t_j) - \mu(t_{j-1})): s_1 = t_0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \leq t_n = s_2, n \in \mathbb{N} \right\}.$$

Analogously, for every function $t \mapsto \mu(t)$ of bounded variation from $[0, T]$ into $M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ we define the *reduced dissipation* of $t \mapsto \mu(t)$ in $[s_1, s_2]$ as

$$\mathcal{D}_r(\mu; s_1, s_2) := \sup \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^n \mathcal{H}_r(\mu(t_j) - \mu(t_{j-1})): s_1 = t_0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \leq t_n = s_2, n \in \mathbb{N} \right\}$$

for every $s_1, s_2 \in [0, T], s_1 \leq s_2$.

Definition 6.1. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. An ε -*quasistatic evolution* for the boundary datum $w(t)$ is a function $t \mapsto (u^\varepsilon(t), e^\varepsilon(t), p^\varepsilon(t))$ from $[0, T]$ into $BD(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}) \times M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$ that satisfies the following conditions:

(qs1) for every $t \in [0, T]$ we have $(u^\varepsilon(t), e^\varepsilon(t), p^\varepsilon(t)) \in \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon(w(t))$ and

$$\mathcal{Q}(\Lambda_\varepsilon e^\varepsilon(t)) \leq \mathcal{Q}(\Lambda_\varepsilon f) + \mathcal{H}(\Lambda_\varepsilon q - \Lambda_\varepsilon p^\varepsilon(t)) \tag{6.1}$$

for every $(v, f, q) \in \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon(w(t))$;

(qs2) the function $t \mapsto p^\varepsilon(t)$ from $[0, T]$ into $M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$ has bounded variation and for every $t \in [0, T]$

$$\mathcal{Q}(\Lambda_\varepsilon e^\varepsilon(t)) + \mathcal{D}(\Lambda_\varepsilon p^\varepsilon; 0, t) = \mathcal{Q}(\Lambda_\varepsilon e^\varepsilon(0)) + \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C}\Lambda_\varepsilon e^\varepsilon(s) : E\dot{w}(s) \, dx \, ds. \tag{6.2}$$

Definition 6.2. A *reduced quasistatic evolution* for the boundary datum $w(t)$ is a function $t \mapsto (u(t), e(t), p(t))$ from $[0, T]$ into $BD(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}) \times M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$ that satisfies the following conditions:

(qs1)_r for every $t \in [0, T]$ we have $(u(t), e(t), p(t)) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w(t))$ and

$$\mathcal{Q}_r(e(t)) \leq \mathcal{Q}_r(f) + \mathcal{H}_r(q - p(t)) \tag{6.3}$$

for every $(v, f, q) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w(t))$;

(qs2)_r, the function $t \mapsto p(t)$ from $[0, T]$ into $M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$ has bounded variation and for every $t \in [0, T]$

$$\mathcal{Q}_r(e(t)) + \mathcal{D}_r(p; 0, t) = \mathcal{Q}_r(e(0)) + \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C}_r e(s) : E \dot{w}(s) \, dx \, ds. \tag{6.4}$$

Remark 6.3. Since the functions $t \mapsto p^\varepsilon(t)$ and $t \mapsto p(t)$ from $[0, T]$ into $M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$ have bounded variation, they are bounded and the set of their discontinuity points (in the strong topology) is at most countable. By [10, Theorem 3.8] and by Lemma 6.9 below the same properties hold for the functions $t \mapsto e^\varepsilon(t)$ and $t \mapsto e(t)$ from $[0, T]$ into $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$, and for the functions $t \mapsto u^\varepsilon(t)$ and $t \mapsto u(t)$ from $[0, T]$ into $BD(\Omega)$. Therefore, $t \mapsto e^\varepsilon(t)$ and $t \mapsto e(t)$ belong to $L^\infty([0, T]; L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}))$, while $t \mapsto u^\varepsilon(t)$ and $t \mapsto u(t)$ belong to $L^\infty([0, T]; BD(\Omega))$. As $t \mapsto E \dot{w}(t)$ belongs to $L^1([0, T]; L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}))$, the integrals on the right-hand side of (6.2) and (6.4) are well defined.

We are now in a position to state the main result of the article.

Theorem 6.4. *Let $t \mapsto w(t)$ be absolutely continuous from $[0, T]$ into $W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \cap KL(\Omega)$. Assume there exists a sequence of triples $(u_0^\varepsilon, e_0^\varepsilon, p_0^\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon(w(0))$ such that*

$$\mathcal{Q}(\Lambda_\varepsilon e_0^\varepsilon) \leq \mathcal{Q}(\Lambda_\varepsilon f) + \mathcal{H}(\Lambda_\varepsilon q - \Lambda_\varepsilon p_0^\varepsilon) \tag{6.5}$$

for every $(v, f, q) \in \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon(w(0))$ and every $\varepsilon > 0$, and

$$\Lambda_\varepsilon e_0^\varepsilon \rightarrow \tilde{e}_0 \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}), \tag{6.6}$$

$$\|\Lambda_\varepsilon p_0^\varepsilon\|_{M_b} \leq C \tag{6.7}$$

for some $\tilde{e}_0 \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$ and some constant $C > 0$ independent of ε . For every $\varepsilon > 0$ let $t \mapsto (u^\varepsilon(t), e^\varepsilon(t), p^\varepsilon(t))$ be an ε -quasistatic evolution for the boundary datum $w(t)$ such that $u^\varepsilon(0) = u_0^\varepsilon$, $e^\varepsilon(0) = e_0^\varepsilon$, and $p^\varepsilon(0) = p_0^\varepsilon$. Then, there exists a reduced quasistatic evolution $t \mapsto (u(t), e(t), p(t))$ for the boundary datum $w(t)$ such that, up to subsequences,

$$u^\varepsilon(t) \rightharpoonup u(t) \quad \text{weakly* in } BD(\Omega), \tag{6.8}$$

$$e^\varepsilon(t) \rightarrow e(t) \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}), \tag{6.9}$$

$$\Lambda_\varepsilon e^\varepsilon(t) \rightarrow \mathbb{M}e(t) \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}), \tag{6.10}$$

$$p^\varepsilon(t) \rightharpoonup p(t) \quad \text{weakly* in } M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}) \tag{6.11}$$

for every $t \in [0, T]$, where \mathbb{M} is the tensor introduced in (3.11). Moreover, the functions $t \mapsto u(t)$, $t \mapsto e(t)$, and $t \mapsto p(t)$ are absolutely continuous from $[0, T]$ into $BD(\Omega)$, $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$, and $M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$, respectively.

Remark 6.5. From [10, Theorem 4.5] it follows that for every triple $(u_0^\varepsilon, e_0^\varepsilon, p_0^\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon(w(0))$ satisfying (6.5) there exists an ε -quasistatic evolution $t \mapsto (u^\varepsilon(t), e^\varepsilon(t), p^\varepsilon(t))$ such that $u^\varepsilon(0) = u_0^\varepsilon$, $e^\varepsilon(0) = e_0^\varepsilon$, and $p^\varepsilon(0) = p_0^\varepsilon$. Moreover, by [10, Theorem 5.2] the functions $t \mapsto u^\varepsilon(t)$, $t \mapsto e^\varepsilon(t)$, and $t \mapsto p^\varepsilon(t)$ are absolutely continuous from $[0, T]$ into $BD(\Omega)$, $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$, and $M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$, respectively, and for a.e. $t \in [0, T]$ we have

$$\|\Lambda_\varepsilon \dot{e}^\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2} \leq C_1 \|E \dot{w}(t)\|_{L^2}, \tag{6.12}$$

$$\|\Lambda_\varepsilon \dot{p}^\varepsilon(t)\|_{M_b} \leq C_2 \|E \dot{w}(t)\|_{L^2}, \tag{6.13}$$

where C_1 and C_2 are positive constants depending on R_K , r_C , R_C , $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\Lambda_\varepsilon e^\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}$, and $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\Lambda_\varepsilon p^\varepsilon(t)\|_{M_b}$. We note that these results are proven in [10] under the assumption of a reference configuration of class C^2 , but, as observed in [16], Lipschitz regularity is enough in the absence of external loads.

Remark 6.6. The set of admissible initial data for Theorem 6.4 is nonempty. Indeed, for every $\varepsilon > 0$ let $(u_0^\varepsilon, e_0^\varepsilon, p_0^\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon(w(0))$ be a minimizer of the functional \mathcal{J}_ε on $\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon(w(0))$, that is,

$$\mathcal{Q}(\Lambda_\varepsilon e_0^\varepsilon) + \mathcal{H}(\Lambda_\varepsilon p_0^\varepsilon) \leq \mathcal{Q}(\Lambda_\varepsilon f) + \mathcal{H}(\Lambda_\varepsilon q)$$

for every $(v, f, q) \in \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon(w(0))$. Since by (3.4)

$$\mathcal{H}(\Lambda_\varepsilon q) \leq \mathcal{H}(\Lambda_\varepsilon q - \Lambda_\varepsilon p_0^\varepsilon) + \mathcal{H}(\Lambda_\varepsilon p_0^\varepsilon),$$

we deduce that $(u_0^\varepsilon, e_0^\varepsilon, p_0^\varepsilon)$ satisfies (6.5) for every $\varepsilon > 0$. Moreover, by Theorem 5.1 we infer the existence of a triple $(u_0, e_0, p_0) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w(0))$ such that (6.6) is satisfied with $\tilde{e}_0 = \mathbb{M}e_0$ and

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{H}(\Lambda_\varepsilon p_0^\varepsilon) = \mathcal{H}_r(p_0).$$

This last convergence implies (6.7) by (3.3).

Remark 6.7. Theorem 6.4 ensures, in particular, the existence of an absolutely continuous reduced quasistatic evolution for every initial datum $(u_0, e_0, p_0) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w(0))$ that is approximable in the sense of (6.8)–(6.11) by a sequence of triples $(u_0^\varepsilon, e_0^\varepsilon, p_0^\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon(w(0))$ satisfying (6.5). Note that, again by Theorem 6.4 and by $(qs1)_r$ at time $t = 0$, every such datum satisfies

$$\mathcal{Q}_r(e_0) \leq \mathcal{Q}_r(f) + \mathcal{H}_r(q - p_0) \tag{6.14}$$

for every $(v, f, q) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w(0))$.

We mention here that the existence of a reduced quasistatic evolution can be actually proved for every initial datum $(u_0, e_0, p_0) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w(0))$ satisfying (6.14) by applying the abstract method for rate-independent processes developed in [28], namely by discretizing time and by solving suitable incremental minimum problems. Moreover, arguing as in [10, Theorem 5.2], one can show that every reduced quasistatic evolution is absolutely continuous from $[0, T]$ into $BD(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}) \times M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$.

To prove Theorem 6.4 we need two technical lemmas concerning some consequences of the minimality condition $(qs1)_r$.

Lemma 6.8. *Let $w \in W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \cap KL(\Omega)$. A triple $(u, e, p) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w)$ is a solution of the minimum problem*

$$\min\{\mathcal{Q}_r(f) + \mathcal{H}_r(q - p) : (v, f, q) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w)\} \tag{6.15}$$

if and only if

$$-\mathcal{H}_r(q) \leq \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C}_r e : f \, dx \tag{6.16}$$

for every $(v, f, q) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(0)$.

Proof. Let $(u, e, p) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w)$ be a solution to (6.15) and let $(v, f, q) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(0)$. For every $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$ the triple $(u + \eta v, e + \eta f, p + \eta q)$ belongs to $\mathcal{A}_{KL}(w)$, hence

$$\mathcal{Q}_r(e) \leq \mathcal{Q}_r(e + \eta f) + \mathcal{H}_r(\eta q).$$

Using the positive homogeneity of H_r , we obtain

$$0 \leq \pm \eta \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C}_r e : f \, dx + \eta^2 \mathcal{Q}_r(f) + \eta \mathcal{H}_r(\pm q),$$

for every $\eta > 0$. Dividing by η and sending η to 0 yield (6.16).

The converse implication is true by convexity. \square

Lemma 6.9. Let $w_1, w_2 \in W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \cap KL(\Omega)$ and for $\alpha = 1, 2$ let $(u_\alpha, e_\alpha, p_\alpha) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w_\alpha)$ be a solution of the minimum problem

$$\min\{\mathcal{Q}_r(f) + \mathcal{H}_r(q - p_\alpha) : (v, f, q) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w_\alpha)\}. \tag{6.17}$$

Then there exists a positive constant C , depending only on R_K, r_C, R_C, Ω , and Γ_d , such that

$$\|e_2 - e_1\|_{L^2} \leq C\theta_{12}, \tag{6.18}$$

$$\|Eu_1 - Eu_2\|_{M_b} \leq C\theta_{12}, \tag{6.19}$$

$$\|u_1 - u_2\|_{L^1} \leq C(\theta_{12} + \|w_1 - w_2\|_{L^2}), \tag{6.20}$$

where θ_{12} is given by

$$\theta_{12} := \|p_1 - p_2\|_{M_b} + \|p_1 - p_2\|_{M_b}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \|Ew_1 - Ew_2\|_{L^2}.$$

Proof. Since $(u_2 - u_1 - w_2 + w_1, e_2 - e_1 - Ew_2 + Ew_1, p_2 - p_1) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(0)$, we can choose $v = u_2 - u_1 - w_2 + w_1$, $f = e_2 - e_1 - Ew_2 + Ew_1$, and $q = p_2 - p_1$ in (6.16); thus, by the minimality of $(u_\alpha, e_\alpha, p_\alpha)$, with $\alpha = 1, 2$, and Lemma 6.8 we have

$$\begin{aligned} -\mathcal{H}_r(p_2 - p_1) &\leq \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C}_r e_1 : (e_2 - e_1 - Ew_2 + Ew_1) dx, \\ -\mathcal{H}_r(p_1 - p_2) &\leq \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C}_r e_2 : (e_1 - e_2 - Ew_1 + Ew_2) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Adding term by term, changing sign, and applying (3.18) yield

$$\int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C}_r (e_2 - e_1) : (e_2 - e_1) dx \leq \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C}_r (e_2 - e_1) : (Ew_2 - Ew_1) dx + 2\sqrt{3}R_K \|p_2 - p_1\|_{M_b}.$$

By (3.14) we deduce

$$r_C \|e_2 - e_1\|_{L^2}^2 \leq R_C \|e_2 - e_1\|_{L^2} \|Ew_2 - Ew_1\|_{L^2} + 2\sqrt{3}R_K \|p_2 - p_1\|_{M_b},$$

which implies (6.18) by the Cauchy inequality. Since $Eu_i = e_i + p_i$ in Ω , Hölder’s inequality gives

$$\|Eu_2 - Eu_1\|_{M_b} \leq \mathcal{L}^3(\Omega)^{1/2} \|e_2 - e_1\|_{L^2} + \|p_2 - p_1\|_{M_b},$$

so that (6.19) follows from (6.18). Finally, since $p_2 - p_1 = (w_2 - w_1 - u_2 + u_1) \odot \nu_{\partial\Omega} \mathcal{H}^2$ on Γ_d , we have

$$\|u_2 - u_1\|_{L^1(\Gamma_d)} \leq \|w_2 - w_1\|_{L^1(\Gamma_d)} + \|p_2 - p_1\|_{M_b} \leq C \|w_2 - w_1\|_{W^{1,2}} + \|p_2 - p_1\|_{M_b}$$

where we used the continuity of the trace operator from $W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$ into $L^1(\partial\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$. Inequality (6.20) now follows from (2.2) and (6.19). \square

We are now in a position to prove Theorem 6.4.

Proof of Theorem 6.4. The proof is subdivided into four steps.

Step 1 (Compactness estimates). Let us prove that there exists a constant C , depending only on the data, such that

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|A_\varepsilon e^\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2} \leq C, \quad \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|A_\varepsilon p^\varepsilon(t)\|_{M_b} \leq C \tag{6.21}$$

for every ε . As $t \mapsto w(t)$ is absolutely continuous with values in $W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$, the function $t \mapsto \|E\dot{w}(t)\|_2$ is integrable on $[0, T]$. This fact, together with (3.1), (3.2), and (6.2), implies that

$$r_C \|A_\varepsilon e^\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq R_C \|A_\varepsilon e^\varepsilon(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + 2R_C \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|A_\varepsilon e^\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2} \int_0^t \|E\dot{w}(s)\|_{L^2} ds \tag{6.22}$$

for every $t \in [0, T]$. The former inequality in (6.21) follows now from (6.6) and Cauchy inequality. As for the latter, by (6.2), (6.22), and (6.6) we deduce that

$$\mathcal{D}(\Lambda_\varepsilon p^\varepsilon; 0, T) \leq C.$$

By the definition of \mathcal{D} and (3.3) we infer that

$$r_K \|\Lambda_\varepsilon p^\varepsilon(t) - \Lambda_\varepsilon p_0^\varepsilon\|_{M_b} \leq \mathcal{H}(\Lambda_\varepsilon p^\varepsilon(t) - \Lambda_\varepsilon p^\varepsilon(0)) \leq \mathcal{D}(\Lambda_\varepsilon p^\varepsilon; 0, t) \leq C$$

for every $t \in [0, T]$, which implies the second inequality in (6.21) by (6.7).

Combining (6.12), (6.13), and (6.21), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Lambda_\varepsilon e^\varepsilon(t_1) - \Lambda_\varepsilon e^\varepsilon(t_2)\|_{L^2} &\leq C \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \|E\dot{w}(s)\|_{L^2} ds, \\ \|\Lambda_\varepsilon p^\varepsilon(t_1) - \Lambda_\varepsilon p^\varepsilon(t_2)\|_{M_b} &\leq C \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \|E\dot{w}(s)\|_{L^2} ds \end{aligned}$$

for every $0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq T$, where C is a constant depending only on the data. Therefore, by the Ascoli–Arzelà Theorem there exist two subsequences, still denoted $\Lambda_\varepsilon e^\varepsilon$ and $\Lambda_\varepsilon p^\varepsilon$, and two absolutely continuous functions $\tilde{e}: [0, T] \rightarrow L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$ and $\tilde{p}: [0, T] \rightarrow M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_D^{3 \times 3})$ such that

$$\Lambda_\varepsilon e^\varepsilon(t) \rightharpoonup \tilde{e}(t) \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}), \tag{6.23}$$

$$\Lambda_\varepsilon p^\varepsilon(t) \rightharpoonup \tilde{p}(t) \quad \text{weakly* in } M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_D^{3 \times 3}) \tag{6.24}$$

for every $t \in [0, T]$.

Let $e: [0, T] \rightarrow L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$ be defined as

$$e_{\alpha\beta}(t) = \tilde{e}_{\alpha\beta}(t) \quad (\alpha, \beta = 1, 2) \quad \text{and} \quad e_{i3}(t) = 0 \quad (i = 1, 2, 3)$$

for every $t \in [0, T]$ and let $p: [0, T] \rightarrow M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$ be defined as

$$p_{\alpha\beta}(t) = \tilde{p}_{\alpha\beta}(t) \quad (\alpha, \beta = 1, 2) \quad \text{and} \quad p_{i3}(t) = 0 \quad (i = 1, 2, 3) \tag{6.25}$$

for every $t \in [0, T]$. Then $t \mapsto e(t)$ is absolutely continuous from $[0, T]$ into $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$, $t \mapsto p(t)$ is absolutely continuous from $[0, T]$ into $M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$, and by (6.23) and (6.24) we have

$$e^\varepsilon(t) \rightharpoonup e(t) \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}), \tag{6.26}$$

$$p^\varepsilon(t) \rightharpoonup p(t) \quad \text{weakly* in } M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}) \tag{6.27}$$

for every $t \in [0, T]$. Using (2.2) and the fact that $(u^\varepsilon(t), e^\varepsilon(t), p^\varepsilon(t)) \in \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon(w(t))$ for every $\varepsilon > 0$, it is easy to see that there exists an absolutely continuous function $u: [0, T] \rightarrow BD(\Omega)$ such that

$$u^\varepsilon(t) \rightharpoonup u(t) \quad \text{weakly* in } BD(\Omega)$$

for every $t \in [0, T]$. Moreover, arguing as in the proof of Theorem 5.3, one can show that $(u(t), e(t), p(t)) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w(t))$.

Step 2 (Reduced stability). We now show that the triple $(u(t), e(t), p(t))$ is a solution to the minimum problem

$$\min\{\mathcal{Q}_r(f) + \mathcal{H}_r(q - p(t)): (v, f, q) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w(t))\} \tag{6.28}$$

for every $t \in [0, T]$.

Let us fix $t \in [0, T]$. By Lemma 6.8 it is enough to prove condition (6.16). Let $(v, f, q) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(0)$. By Theorem 5.4 there exists a sequence of triples $(v^\varepsilon, f^\varepsilon, q^\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon(0)$ such that

$$\Lambda_\varepsilon f^\varepsilon \rightarrow \mathbb{M}f \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}) \tag{6.29}$$

and

$$\mathcal{H}(\Lambda_\varepsilon q^\varepsilon) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_r(q). \tag{6.30}$$

By [10, Theorem 3.6] the minimality condition (6.1) is equivalent to

$$-\mathcal{H}(\Lambda_\varepsilon \check{q}) \leq \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C} \Lambda_\varepsilon e^\varepsilon(t) : \Lambda_\varepsilon \check{f} \, dx \tag{6.31}$$

for every $(\check{v}, \check{f}, \check{q}) \in \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon(0)$. Therefore, we have that

$$-\mathcal{H}(\Lambda_\varepsilon q^\varepsilon) \leq \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C} \Lambda_\varepsilon e^\varepsilon(t) : \Lambda_\varepsilon f^\varepsilon \, dx$$

for every $\varepsilon > 0$; hence, combining (6.23), (6.29), and (6.30), we obtain

$$-\mathcal{H}_r(q) \leq \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C} \tilde{e}(t) : \mathbb{M} f \, dx.$$

Since $\mathbb{C} \tilde{e}(t) : \mathbb{M} f = \mathbb{C} \mathbb{M} e(t) : \mathbb{M} f = \mathbb{C}_r e(t) : f$ a.e. in Ω by (3.16), the inequality above reduces to (6.16).

Step 3 (Identification of the limiting scaled elastic strain). We shall prove that the function $\tilde{e}(t)$ in (6.23) satisfies

$$\tilde{e}(t) = \mathbb{M} e(t) \tag{6.32}$$

for every $t \in [0, T]$.

For every $\psi \in W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$ with $\psi = 0$ on Γ_d we can consider the triples $(\pm\psi, \pm E\psi, 0)$ as test functions in (6.31). This leads to the condition

$$\int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C} \Lambda_\varepsilon e^\varepsilon(t) : \Lambda_\varepsilon E\psi \, dx = 0 \tag{6.33}$$

for every $\psi \in W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$ with $\psi = 0$ on Γ_d and for every ε .

Let now $U \subset \omega$, $(a, b) \subset (-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$, and $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. Let us denote the characteristic functions of the sets U and (a, b) by χ_U and $\chi_{(a,b)}$, respectively. Finally, let $(\varphi_i^k) \subset C_c^1(\omega)$ and $(\xi^k) \subset C^1([-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}])$ be such that $\varphi_i^k \rightarrow \lambda_i \chi_U$ strongly in $L^4(\omega)$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, and $(\xi^k)' \rightarrow \chi_{(a,b)}$ strongly in $L^4(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$. For every ε and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we consider the function

$$\psi^{\varepsilon,k}(x) := \begin{pmatrix} 2\varepsilon \xi^k(x_3) \varphi_1^k(x') \\ 2\varepsilon \xi^k(x_3) \varphi_2^k(x') \\ \varepsilon^2 \xi^k(x_3) \varphi_3^k(x') \end{pmatrix}$$

for every $x \in \Omega$. Since $\psi^{\varepsilon,k} \in W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$ and $\psi^{\varepsilon,k} = 0$ on Γ_d , by (6.33) we have

$$\int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C} \Lambda_\varepsilon e^\varepsilon(t) : \Lambda_\varepsilon E\psi^{\varepsilon,k} \, dx = 0$$

for every ε . Passing to the limit with respect to $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ and then to $k \rightarrow \infty$, we deduce

$$\int_{U \times (a,b)} \mathbb{C} \tilde{e}(t) : \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \lambda_1 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_2 \\ \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 & \lambda_3 \end{pmatrix} \, dx = 0.$$

Since U and (a, b) are arbitrary, we conclude that for every $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\mathbb{C} \tilde{e}(t) : \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \lambda_1 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_2 \\ \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 & \lambda_3 \end{pmatrix} = 0,$$

a.e. in Ω . This implies (6.32) by (3.12).

Step 4 (Reduced energy balance). By (6.2) and lower semicontinuity we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_r(e(t)) + \mathcal{D}(\tilde{p}; 0, t) &\leq \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \mathcal{Q}(\Lambda_\varepsilon e^\varepsilon(0)) + \int_0^t \int_\Omega \mathbb{C} \Lambda_\varepsilon e^\varepsilon(s) : E \dot{w}(s) \, dx \, ds \right\} \\ &= \mathcal{Q}_r(e_0) + \int_0^t \int_\Omega \mathbb{C}_r e(s) : E \dot{w}(s) \, dx \, ds, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from (6.6), (6.21), (6.23), (6.32), and the dominated convergence theorem. Since by (6.25) and the definition of \mathcal{H}_r there holds

$$\mathcal{D}_r(p; 0, t) \leq \mathcal{D}(\tilde{p}; 0, t) \tag{6.34}$$

for every $t \in [0, T]$, we conclude that

$$\mathcal{Q}_r(e(t)) + \mathcal{D}_r(p; 0, t) \leq \mathcal{Q}_r(e_0) + \int_0^t \int_\Omega \mathbb{C}_r e(s) : E \dot{w}(s) \, dx \, ds. \tag{6.35}$$

As it is standard in the variational theory for rate-independent processes, the converse energy inequality follows from the minimality condition (qs1)_r. We omit the proof as it follows closely those of [10, Theorem 4.7] and of [28, Theorem 4.4].

Combining (qs2), (qs2)_r, and the fact that the right-hand side of (qs2) converges to the right-hand side of (qs2)_r, we deduce that

$$\mathcal{Q}(\Lambda_\varepsilon e^\varepsilon(t)) + \mathcal{D}(\Lambda_\varepsilon p^\varepsilon; 0, t) \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_r(e(t)) + \mathcal{D}_r(p; 0, t) \tag{6.36}$$

for every $t \in [0, T]$. On the other hand, by lower semicontinuity of \mathcal{Q}_r and of \mathcal{D}_r we have

$$\mathcal{Q}_r(e(t)) \leq \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{Q}(\Lambda_\varepsilon e^\varepsilon(t)) \tag{6.37}$$

and

$$\mathcal{D}_r(p; 0, t) \leq \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{D}(\Lambda_\varepsilon p^\varepsilon; 0, t) \tag{6.38}$$

for every $t \in [0, T]$. From (6.36)–(6.38) it follows that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{Q}(\Lambda_\varepsilon e^\varepsilon(t)) = \mathcal{Q}_r(e(t)) = \mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{M}e(t))$$

for every $t \in [0, T]$. This, together with (6.23) and (6.32), implies strong convergence of the scaled strains $\Lambda_\varepsilon e_\varepsilon(t)$, and consequently of the strains $e_\varepsilon(t)$, for every $t \in [0, T]$. This concludes the proof of the theorem. \square

7. Characterization of reduced quasistatic evolutions

In the following we shall consider the space $\Pi_{\Gamma_d}(\Omega)$ of admissible plastic strains, defined as the class of all $p \in M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ for which there exist $u \in BD(\Omega)$, $e \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$, and $w \in W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \cap KL(\Omega)$ such that $(u, e, p) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w)$.

We shall also use the set

$$\Sigma(\Omega) := \left\{ \sigma \in L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}) : \text{div}_{x'} \bar{\sigma} \in L^2(\omega; \mathbb{R}^2), \text{div}_{x'} \text{div}_{x'} \hat{\sigma} \in M_b(\omega) \right\},$$

where $\bar{\sigma}, \hat{\sigma} \in L^\infty(\omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ are the zeroth and first order moments of σ , defined according to Definition 4.1. In the first subsection we shall introduce a duality pairing between stresses $\sigma \in \Sigma(\Omega)$ and plastic strains $p \in \Pi_{\Gamma_d}(\Omega)$. In the second subsection we shall use this duality pairing to deduce a weak formulation of the classical flow rule for a reduced quasistatic evolution. In the last subsection we discuss some examples, where reduced quasistatic evolutions can be characterized in terms of two-dimensional quantities.

7.1. *Stress–strain duality*

We first introduce a notion of duality for the zeroth order moments of the stress and the plastic strain. We essentially follow the theory developed in [22] and [10, Section 2.3].

For every $\sigma \in \Sigma(\Omega)$ we can define the trace $[\bar{\sigma} \nu_{\partial\omega}] \in L^\infty(\partial\omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$ of its zeroth order moment $\bar{\sigma}$ through the formula

$$\int_{\partial\omega} [\bar{\sigma} \nu_{\partial\omega}] \cdot \varphi \, d\mathcal{H}^1 := \int_{\omega} \operatorname{div}_{x'} \bar{\sigma} \cdot \varphi \, dx' + \int_{\omega} \bar{\sigma} : E\varphi \, dx' \tag{7.1}$$

for every $\varphi \in W^{1,1}(\omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$. This is well defined since $W^{1,1}(\omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$ is embedded into $L^2(\omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$.

Let $\sigma \in \Sigma(\Omega)$ and $\xi \in BD(\omega)$. We define the distribution $[\bar{\sigma} : E\xi]$ on ω by

$$\langle [\bar{\sigma} : E\xi], \varphi \rangle := - \int_{\omega} \varphi \operatorname{div}_{x'} \bar{\sigma} \cdot \xi \, dx' - \int_{\omega} \bar{\sigma} : (\nabla\varphi \odot \xi) \, dx' \tag{7.2}$$

for every $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\omega)$. From [22, Theorem 3.2] it follows that $[\bar{\sigma} : E\xi]$ is a bounded measure on ω , whose variation satisfies

$$|[\bar{\sigma} : E\xi]| \leq \|\bar{\sigma}\|_{L^\infty} |E\xi| \quad \text{in } \omega. \tag{7.3}$$

We can now define a duality between the zeroth order moments of elements in $\Sigma(\Omega)$ and $\Pi_{\Gamma_d}(\Omega)$. Given $\sigma \in \Sigma(\Omega)$ and $p \in \Pi_{\Gamma_d}(\Omega)$, we fix $(u, e, w) \in BD(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}) \times (W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \cap KL(\Omega))$ such that $(u, e, p) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w)$. Let $\bar{u} \in BD(\omega)$, $u_3 \in BH(\omega)$ and $\bar{w} \in W^{1,2}(\omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$, $w_3 \in W^{2,2}(\omega)$ be the Kirchhoff–Love components of u and w , respectively. We then define the measure $[\bar{\sigma} : \bar{p}] \in M_b(\omega \cup \gamma_d)$ by setting

$$[\bar{\sigma} : \bar{p}] := \begin{cases} [\bar{\sigma} : E\bar{u}] - \bar{\sigma} : \bar{e} & \text{in } \omega, \\ [\bar{\sigma} \nu_{\partial\omega}] \cdot (\bar{w} - \bar{u}) \mathcal{H}^1 & \text{on } \gamma_d, \end{cases}$$

so that

$$\int_{\omega \cup \gamma_d} \varphi \, d[\bar{\sigma} : \bar{p}] = \int_{\omega} \varphi \, d[\bar{\sigma} : E\bar{u}] - \int_{\omega} \varphi \bar{\sigma} : \bar{e} \, dx' + \int_{\gamma_d} [\bar{\sigma} \nu_{\partial\omega}] \cdot \varphi (\bar{w} - \bar{u}) \, d\mathcal{H}^1 \tag{7.4}$$

for every $\varphi \in C(\bar{\omega})$.

Remark 7.1. Arguing as in [10], one can prove that the definition of $[\bar{\sigma} : \bar{p}]$ is independent of the choice of the triple (u, e, w) . Moreover, if $\bar{\sigma} \in C^1(\bar{\omega}; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$, then

$$\int_{\omega \cup \gamma_d} \varphi \, d[\bar{\sigma} : \bar{p}] = \int_{\omega \cup \gamma_d} \varphi \bar{\sigma} : d\bar{p}$$

for every $\varphi \in C^1(\bar{\omega})$. One can prove by approximation that the same equality is true for every $\bar{\sigma} \in C(\bar{\omega}; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ and $\varphi \in C(\bar{\omega})$.

The following integration by parts formula can be proved.

Proposition 7.2. *Let $\sigma \in \Sigma(\Omega)$, $w \in W^{1,2}(\omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \cap KL(\Omega)$, and $(u, e, p) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w)$. Let also $\bar{u} \in BD(\omega)$ and $\bar{w} \in W^{1,2}(\omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$ be the tangential Kirchhoff–Love components of u and w . Then*

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\omega \cup \gamma_d} \varphi \, d[\bar{\sigma} : \bar{p}] + \int_{\omega} \varphi \bar{\sigma} : (\bar{e} - E\bar{w}) \, dx' + \int_{\omega} \bar{\sigma} : (\nabla\varphi \odot (\bar{u} - \bar{w})) \, dx' \\ &= - \int_{\omega} \operatorname{div}_{x'} \bar{\sigma} \cdot \varphi (\bar{u} - \bar{w}) \, dx' + \int_{\gamma_n} [\bar{\sigma} \nu_{\partial\omega}] \cdot \varphi (\bar{u} - \bar{w}) \, d\mathcal{H}^1 \end{aligned} \tag{7.5}$$

for every $\varphi \in C^1(\bar{\omega})$.

Proof. The result is a corollary of [10, Proposition 2.2]. \square

We now introduce a notion of duality for the first order moments of the stress and of the plastic strain. We follow the lines of [11, Section 3.2] and [13, Section 2.3].

We start with a proposition concerning the traces of the first order moment of a stress in $\Sigma(\Omega)$. To this purpose we introduce the space

$$\hat{\Sigma}(\omega) := \{\vartheta \in L^\infty(\omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}) : \text{div}_{x'} \text{div}_{x'} \vartheta \in M_b(\omega)\},$$

endowed with the norm $\|\vartheta\|_{L^\infty} + \|\text{div}_{x'} \text{div}_{x'} \vartheta\|_{M_b}$. We also denote by $T_{\partial\omega} : W^{2,1}(\omega) \rightarrow W^{1,1}(\partial\omega)$ the trace operator on $W^{2,1}(\omega)$. We recall that $T_{\partial\omega}(W^{2,1}(\omega)) \neq W^{1,1}(\partial\omega)$, see [12, Théorème 2].

Proposition 7.3. *There exists a surjective continuous linear operator*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} : \hat{\Sigma}(\omega) &\rightarrow (T_{\partial\omega}(W^{2,1}(\omega)))' \times L^\infty(\partial\omega) \\ \vartheta &\mapsto (b_0(\vartheta), b_1(\vartheta)) \end{aligned}$$

such that for every $\vartheta \in \hat{\Sigma}(\omega)$ and $v \in W^{2,1}(\omega)$ there holds

$$\int_{\omega} \vartheta : D^2 v \, dx' - \int_{\omega} v \, d(\text{div}_{x'} \text{div}_{x'} \vartheta) = -(b_0(\vartheta), v) + \int_{\partial\omega} b_1(\vartheta) \frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu_{\partial\omega}} \, d\mathcal{H}^1, \tag{7.6}$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the duality pairing between $(T_{\partial\omega}(W^{2,1}(\omega)))'$ and $T_{\partial\omega}(W^{2,1}(\omega))$. Moreover, if $\vartheta \in C^2(\bar{\omega}; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$, then

$$b_0(\vartheta) = \text{div}_{x'} \vartheta \cdot \nu_{\partial\omega} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_{\partial\omega}} (\vartheta \nu_{\partial\omega} \cdot \tau_{\partial\omega}), \tag{7.7}$$

$$b_1(\vartheta) = \vartheta \nu_{\partial\omega} \cdot \nu_{\partial\omega}, \tag{7.8}$$

where $\tau_{\partial\omega}$ is the tangent vector to $\partial\omega$.

Proof. See [11, Théorème 2.3]. \square

Remark 7.4. The second integral on the left-hand side of (7.6) is well defined because of the embedding of $W^{2,1}(\omega)$ into $C(\bar{\omega})$ (see [4, Theorem 4.12]).

Let $\sigma \in \Sigma(\Omega)$ and $v \in BH(\omega)$. We define the distribution $[\hat{\sigma} : D^2 v]$ on ω by

$$[[\hat{\sigma} : D^2 v], \varphi] := \int_{\omega} \varphi v \, d(\text{div}_{x'} \text{div}_{x'} \hat{\sigma}) - 2 \int_{\omega} \hat{\sigma} : (\nabla \varphi \odot \nabla v) \, dx' - \int_{\omega} v \hat{\sigma} : \nabla^2 \varphi \, dx'$$

for every $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\omega)$. From [13, Proposition 2.1] it follows that $[\hat{\sigma} : D^2 v]$ is a bounded measure on ω , whose variation satisfies

$$|[[\hat{\sigma} : D^2 v]]| \leq \|\hat{\sigma}\|_{L^\infty} |D^2 v| \quad \text{in } \omega.$$

We can now define a duality between the first order moments of elements in $\Sigma(\Omega)$ and $\Pi_{\Gamma_d}(\Omega)$. Given $\sigma \in \Sigma(\Omega)$ and $p \in \Pi_{\Gamma_d}(\Omega)$, we fix $(u, e, w) \in BD(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}) \times (W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \cap KL(\Omega))$ such that $(u, e, p) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w)$. We then define the measure $[\hat{\sigma} : \hat{p}] \in M_b(\omega \cup \gamma_d)$ by setting

$$[\hat{\sigma} : \hat{p}] := \begin{cases} -[\hat{\sigma} : D^2 u_3] - \hat{\sigma} : \hat{e} & \text{in } \omega, \\ b_1(\hat{\sigma}) \frac{\partial(u_3 - w_3)}{\partial \nu_{\partial\omega}} \mathcal{H}^1 & \text{on } \gamma_d, \end{cases}$$

so that

$$\int_{\omega \cup \gamma_d} \varphi \, d[\hat{\sigma} : \hat{p}] = - \int_{\omega} \varphi \, d[\hat{\sigma} : D^2 u_3] - \int_{\omega} \varphi \hat{\sigma} : \hat{e} \, dx' + \int_{\gamma_d} \varphi b_1(\hat{\sigma}) \frac{\partial(u_3 - w_3)}{\partial \nu_{\partial\omega}} \, d\mathcal{H}^1$$

for every $\varphi \in C(\bar{\omega})$.

Remark 7.5. The definition of $[\hat{\sigma} : \hat{p}]$ does not depend on the choice of the triple (u, e, w) . Moreover, if $\hat{\sigma} \in C^2(\bar{\omega}; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ and $p \in \Pi_{\Gamma_d}(\Omega)$, then

$$\int_{\omega \cup \gamma_d} \varphi d[\hat{\sigma} : \hat{p}] = \int_{\omega \cup \gamma_d} \varphi \hat{\sigma} : d\hat{p} \tag{7.9}$$

for every $\varphi \in C^2(\bar{\omega})$. This follows from the equality

$$\int_{\gamma_d} \varphi b_1(\hat{\sigma}) \frac{\partial(u_3 - w_3)}{\partial \nu_{\partial\omega}} d\mathcal{H}^1 = \int_{\gamma_d} \varphi \hat{\sigma} : (\nabla(u_3 - w_3) \odot \nu_{\partial\omega}) d\mathcal{H}^1,$$

which, in turn, is a consequence of (7.8). By an approximation argument one can show that (7.9) holds true for every $\hat{\sigma} \in C(\bar{\omega}; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ and $\varphi \in C(\bar{\omega})$.

As a corollary of [13, Proposition 2.1], we have the following integration by parts formula.

Proposition 7.6. Let $\sigma \in \Sigma(\Omega)$, $w \in W^{1,2}(\omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \cap KL(\Omega)$, and $(u, e, p) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\omega \cup \gamma_d} \varphi d[\hat{\sigma} : \hat{p}] + \int_{\omega} \varphi \hat{\sigma} : (\hat{e} + D^2 w_3) dx' \\ & - 2 \int_{\omega} \hat{\sigma} : (\nabla \varphi \odot \nabla(u_3 - w_3)) dx' - \int_{\omega} (u_3 - w_3) \hat{\sigma} : \nabla^2 \varphi dx' \\ & = - \int_{\omega} \varphi (u_3 - w_3) d(\text{div}_{x'} \text{div}_{x'} \hat{\sigma}) + \langle b_0(\hat{\sigma}), \varphi(u_3 - w_3) \rangle - \int_{\gamma_n} b_1(\hat{\sigma}) \frac{\partial(\varphi(u_3 - w_3))}{\partial \nu_{\partial\omega}} d\mathcal{H}^1 \end{aligned} \tag{7.10}$$

for every $\varphi \in C^2(\bar{\omega})$, where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the duality pairing between $(T_{\partial\omega}(W^{2,1}(\omega)))'$ and $T_{\partial\omega}(W^{2,1}(\omega))$.

Remark 7.7. The duality product $\langle b_0(\hat{\sigma}), \varphi(u_3 - w_3) \rangle$ in (7.10) is well defined, since one can show that $T_{\partial\omega}(BH(\omega)) = T_{\partial\omega}(W^{2,1}(\omega))$ (see, e.g., [12, Section 2]).

We are now in a position to introduce a duality pairing between $\Sigma(\Omega)$ and $\Pi_{\Gamma_d}(\Omega)$. For every $\sigma \in \Sigma(\Omega)$ and $p \in \Pi_{\Gamma_d}(\Omega)$ we define the measure $[\sigma : p] \in M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d)$ as

$$[\sigma : p] := [\bar{\sigma} : \bar{p}] \otimes \mathcal{L}^1 + \frac{1}{12} [\hat{\sigma} : \hat{p}] \otimes \mathcal{L}^1 - \sigma_{\perp} : e_{\perp}. \tag{7.11}$$

By Remarks 7.1 and 7.5 we have that

$$\int_{\Omega \cup \Gamma_d} \varphi d[\sigma : p] = \int_{\omega} \varphi \bar{\sigma} : d\bar{p} + \frac{1}{12} \int_{\omega} \varphi \hat{\sigma} : d\hat{p} - \int_{\Omega} \varphi \sigma_{\perp} : e_{\perp} dx \tag{7.12}$$

for every $\sigma \in \Sigma(\Omega)$ with $\bar{\sigma}, \hat{\sigma} \in C(\bar{\omega}; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ and every $\varphi \in C(\bar{\omega})$. In particular, this implies that

$$\int_{\Omega \cup \Gamma_d} \varphi d[\sigma : p] = \int_{\Omega} \varphi \sigma : dp \tag{7.13}$$

for every $\sigma \in \Sigma(\Omega) \cap C(\bar{\Omega}; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ and every $\varphi \in C(\bar{\omega})$.

Following [10], for every $\sigma \in \Sigma(\Omega)$ and $p \in \Pi_{\Gamma_d}(\Omega)$ we consider the duality pairings

$$\langle \bar{\sigma}, \bar{p} \rangle := [\bar{\sigma} : \bar{p}](\omega \cup \gamma_d), \quad \langle \hat{\sigma}, \hat{p} \rangle := [\hat{\sigma} : \hat{p}](\omega \cup \gamma_d),$$

and

$$\langle \sigma, p \rangle := [\sigma : p](\Omega \cup \Gamma_d) = \langle \bar{\sigma}, \bar{p} \rangle + \frac{1}{12} \langle \hat{\sigma}, \hat{p} \rangle - \int_{\Omega} \sigma_{\perp} : e_{\perp} dx. \tag{7.14}$$

We shall now discuss the connection between the duality (7.14) and the functional \mathcal{H}_r introduced in (3.19). To this purpose, we consider the convex set

$$K_r := \left\{ \sigma \in \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2} : \sigma : \xi \leq H_r(\xi) \text{ for every } \xi \in \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2} \right\},$$

which coincides with the subdifferential of H_r at the origin. We also set

$$\mathcal{K}_r(\Omega) := \left\{ \sigma \in L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}) : \sigma(x) \in K_r \text{ for a.e. } x \in \Omega \right\}.$$

By (2.1) we have that for every $\mu \in M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$

$$\mathcal{H}_r(\mu) = \sup \left\{ \int_{\Omega \cup \Gamma_d} \tau : d\mu : \tau \in C_0(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}) \cap \mathcal{K}_r(\Omega) \right\}.$$

A variant of this equality can be proved using the duality defined in (7.14).

Proposition 7.8. *Let $p \in \Pi_{\Gamma_d}(\Omega)$. Then the following equalities hold:*

$$\mathcal{H}_r(p) = \sup \{ \langle \sigma, p \rangle : \sigma \in \Sigma(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{K}_r(\Omega) \} \tag{7.15}$$

$$= \sup \{ \langle \sigma, p \rangle : \sigma \in \Theta(\Omega) \}, \tag{7.16}$$

where $\Theta(\Omega)$ is the set of all $\sigma \in \Sigma(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{K}_r(\Omega)$ such that $[\bar{\sigma} v_{\partial\omega}] = 0$ on γ_n , $b_1(\hat{\sigma}) = 0$ on γ_n , and $\langle b_0(\hat{\sigma}), v \rangle = 0$ for every $v \in W^{2,1}(\omega)$ with $v = 0$ on γ_d .

Proof. Let us set $\Gamma_0 := \Gamma_n \cup (\omega \times \{\pm \frac{1}{2}\})$. By [37, Chapter II, Section 4] and (7.13) we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_r(p) &= \sup \left\{ \int_{\Omega \cup \Gamma_d} \sigma : dp : \sigma \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}) \cap \mathcal{K}_r(\Omega), \text{ supp } \sigma \cap \Gamma_0 = \emptyset \right\} \\ &\leq \sup \{ \langle \sigma, p \rangle : \sigma \in \Theta(\Omega) \} \\ &\leq \sup \{ \langle \sigma, p \rangle : \sigma \in \Sigma(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{K}_r(\Omega) \}. \end{aligned} \tag{7.17}$$

To prove the converse inequality, let $w \in W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \cap KL(\Omega)$, $u \in KL(\Omega)$, and $e \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ be such that $(u, e, p) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w)$. By Theorem 4.7 and the Reshetnyak Continuity Theorem (see, e.g., [5, Theorem 2.39]) we can construct a sequence of triples $(u^k, e^k, p^k) \in (W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \times L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}) \times L^2_{\infty,c}(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})) \cap \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w)$ such that

$$u^k \rightharpoonup u \text{ weakly* in } BD(\Omega), \tag{7.18}$$

$$e^k \rightarrow e \text{ strongly in } L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}), \tag{7.19}$$

$$\mathcal{H}_r(p^k) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_r(p). \tag{7.20}$$

By Remark 4.8 we can also assume that

$$\bar{u}^k \rightarrow \bar{u} \text{ strongly in } L^2(\omega; \mathbb{R}^2), \quad \|E\bar{u}^k\|_{L^1} \rightarrow \|E\bar{u}\|_{M_b}, \tag{7.21}$$

$$u_3^k \rightarrow u_3 \text{ in } C(\bar{\omega}), \quad \|D^2 u_3^k\|_{L^1} \rightarrow \|D^2 u_3\|_{M_b}. \tag{7.22}$$

Let now $\sigma \in \mathcal{K}_r(\Omega) \cap \Sigma(\Omega)$. It is clear that

$$\int_{\Omega} \sigma : p^k dx \leq \mathcal{H}_r(p^k). \tag{7.23}$$

We now claim that

$$\int_{\Omega} \sigma : p^k dx \rightarrow \langle \sigma, p \rangle. \tag{7.24}$$

If the claim is proved, then passing to the limit in (7.23) and using (7.20) yield

$$\langle \sigma, p \rangle \leq \mathcal{H}_r(p),$$

which, together with (7.17), implies the thesis.

We now prove (7.24). Since $\bar{u}^k \in W^{1,2}(\omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$ and $E\bar{u}^k = \bar{e}^k + \bar{p}^k$ in ω , the following equalities hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\omega} \bar{\sigma} : \bar{p}^k dx' &= - \int_{\omega} \bar{\sigma} : (\bar{e}^k - E\bar{w}) dx' + \int_{\omega} \bar{\sigma} : (E\bar{u}^k - E\bar{w}) dx' \\ &= - \int_{\omega} \bar{\sigma} : (\bar{e}^k - E\bar{w}) dx' - \int_{\omega} \operatorname{div}_{x'} \bar{\sigma} \cdot (\bar{u}^k - \bar{w}) dx' + \int_{\gamma_n} [\bar{\sigma} \nu_{\partial\omega}] \cdot (\bar{u}^k - \bar{w}) d\mathcal{H}^1, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (7.1) and the fact that $\bar{u}^k = \bar{w}$ on γ_d . From (7.21) it follows that $\bar{u}^k \rightarrow \bar{u}$ strongly in $L^1(\partial\omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$ (see, e.g., [37, Chapter II, Theorem 3.1]). By (7.19) and (7.21) we can therefore pass to the limit in the identity above and by (7.5) we deduce that

$$\int_{\omega} \bar{\sigma} : \bar{p}^k dx' \rightarrow \langle \bar{\sigma}, \bar{p} \rangle. \tag{7.25}$$

Similarly, since $u_3^k \in W^{2,2}(\omega)$ and $D^2u_3^k = -(\hat{e}^k + \hat{p}^k)$ in ω , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\omega} \hat{\sigma} : \hat{p}^k dx' &= - \int_{\omega} \hat{\sigma} : (\hat{e}^k + D^2w_3) dx' - \int_{\omega} \hat{\sigma} : (D^2u_3^k - D^2w_3) dx' \\ &= - \int_{\omega} \hat{\sigma} : (\hat{e}^k + D^2w_3) dx' - \int_{\omega} (u_3^k - w_3) d(\operatorname{div}_{x'} \operatorname{div}_{x'} \hat{\sigma}) \\ &\quad + \langle b_0(\hat{\sigma}), u_3^k - w_3 \rangle - \int_{\gamma_n} b_1(\hat{\sigma}) \frac{\partial(u_3^k - w_3)}{\partial \nu_{\partial\omega}} d\mathcal{H}^1, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (7.6) and the fact that $\nabla u_3^k = \nabla w_3$ on γ_d . By (7.22) and [11, Theorem 3.4] we can pass to the limit in the boundary terms. Therefore, by (7.19), (7.22), and (7.10), we conclude that

$$\int_{\omega} \hat{\sigma} : \hat{p}^k dx' \rightarrow \langle \hat{\sigma}, \hat{p} \rangle. \tag{7.26}$$

Claim (7.24) follows now by combining the identity

$$\int_{\Omega} \sigma : p^k dx = \int_{\omega} \bar{\sigma} : \bar{p}^k dx' + \frac{1}{12} \int_{\omega} \hat{\sigma} : \hat{p}^k dx' - \int_{\Omega} \sigma_{\perp} : e_{\perp}^k dx$$

with (7.14) and the convergence properties (7.19), (7.25), and (7.26). \square

We are now in a position to show a further equivalent characterization of the minimality condition (qs1)_r.

Proposition 7.9. *Let $\sigma \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (a) $-\mathcal{H}_r(q) \leq \int_{\Omega} \sigma : f dx$ for every $(v, f, q) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(0)$,
- (b) $\sigma \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega)$, $\operatorname{div}_{x'} \bar{\sigma} = 0$ in ω , and $\operatorname{div}_{x'} \operatorname{div}_{x'} \hat{\sigma} = 0$ in ω .

Proof. Assume (a). Let $B \subset \Omega$ be a Borel set and let χ_B denote its characteristic function. Let $\xi \in \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}$ and let $f := \chi_B \xi$. Since $(0, -f, f) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(0)$, by (a) we obtain

$$\sigma(x) : \xi \leq H_r(\xi) \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in B.$$

Since B is arbitrary, we deduce that $\sigma \in \mathcal{K}_r(\Omega)$.

We observe that $(\pm v, \pm E v, 0) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(0)$ for every $v \in W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \cap KL(\Omega)$ such that $v = 0$ on Γ_d . Hence, by (a) we have that

$$\int_{\Omega} \sigma : E v dx = 0 \tag{7.27}$$

for every $v \in W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \cap KL(\Omega)$ with $v = 0$ on Γ_d . Let now $\bar{v} \in W^{1,2}(\omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$ with $\bar{v} = 0$ on γ_d . Choosing $v_\alpha = \bar{v}_\alpha$ for $\alpha = 1, 2$ and $v_3 = 0$, we deduce by (7.27) that

$$\int_{\omega} \bar{\sigma} : E \bar{v} \, dx' = 0 \tag{7.28}$$

for every $\bar{v} \in W^{1,2}(\omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$ with $\bar{v} = 0$ on γ_d . Since this is true, in particular, for $\bar{v} \in C_c^\infty(\omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$, we conclude that $\text{div}_{x'} \bar{\sigma} = 0$ in ω . Moreover, by (7.1), (7.28), and the subsequent Lemma 7.10, we obtain that $[\bar{\sigma} \nu_{\partial\omega}] = 0$ on γ_n .

Let us now consider the function

$$v(x) = \begin{pmatrix} -x_3 \nabla v_3(x') \\ v_3(x') \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega,$$

where $v_3 \in W^{2,2}(\omega)$ is such that $v_3 = 0$ and $\nabla v_3 = 0$ on γ_d . Eq. (7.27) yields

$$\int_{\omega} \hat{\sigma} : D^2 v_3 \, dx' = 0 \tag{7.29}$$

for every $v_3 \in W^{2,2}(\omega)$ with $v_3 = 0$ and $\nabla v_3 = 0$ on γ_d . Since (7.29) is satisfied, in particular, for every $v_3 \in C_c^\infty(\omega)$, we deduce that $\text{div}_{x'} \text{div}_{x'} \hat{\sigma} = 0$ in ω . Moreover, by (7.6), (7.29), and Lemma 7.10, we obtain that

$$-\langle b_0(\hat{\sigma}), v_3 \rangle + \int_{\gamma_n} b_1(\hat{\sigma}) \frac{\partial v_3}{\partial \nu_{\partial\omega}} \, d\mathcal{H}^1 = 0$$

for every $v_3 \in W^{2,1}(\omega)$ such that $v_3 = 0$ and $\nabla v_3 = 0$ on γ_d . By [12, Théorème 1] the trace operator from $W^{2,1}(\omega)$ into $T_{\partial\omega}(W^{2,1}(\omega)) \times L^1(\partial\omega)$ that associates to u the traces of u and of $\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_{\partial\omega}}$ on $\partial\omega$ is surjective. We deduce that $b_1(\hat{\sigma}) = 0$ on γ_n and $\langle b_0(\hat{\sigma}), v_3 \rangle = 0$ for every $v_3 \in W^{2,1}(\omega)$ with $v_3 = 0$ on γ_d , hence $\sigma \in \Theta(\Omega)$. This concludes the proof of (b).

Assume now (b). Choosing $\varphi \equiv 1$ in (7.5) and (7.10) yields

$$\langle \bar{\sigma}, \bar{q} \rangle = - \int_{\omega} \bar{\sigma} : \bar{f} \, dx', \quad \langle \hat{\sigma}, \hat{q} \rangle = - \int_{\omega} \hat{\sigma} : \hat{f} \, dx'$$

for every $(v, f, q) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(0)$. Therefore, by (7.14)

$$\langle \sigma, q \rangle = - \int_{\Omega} \sigma : f \, dx.$$

Condition (a) follows now from Proposition 7.8. \square

We conclude this subsection with an approximation lemma, that was needed in the proof of Proposition 7.9.

Lemma 7.10.

- (i) Let $\bar{v} \in W^{1,1}(\omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$ with $\bar{v} = 0$ on γ_d . Then there exists a sequence $(\bar{v}^\varepsilon) \subset W^{1,2}(\omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$ such that $\bar{v}^\varepsilon = 0$ on γ_d for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\bar{v}^\varepsilon \rightarrow \bar{v}$ strongly in $W^{1,1}(\omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$.
- (ii) Let $v \in W^{2,1}(\omega)$ with $v = 0$ and $\nabla v = 0$ on γ_d . Then there exists a sequence $(v^\varepsilon) \subset W^{2,2}(\omega)$ such that $v^\varepsilon = 0$ and $\nabla v^\varepsilon = 0$ on γ_d , and $v^\varepsilon \rightarrow v$ strongly in $W^{2,1}(\omega)$.

Proof. We only sketch the proof of (i). Statement (ii) can be proved by similar arguments.

Arguing as in Step 1 of the proof of Theorem 4.7, we can reduce, without loss of generality, to the case where there exists an open set $J \subset \partial\omega$ such that γ_d is compactly contained in J and $\bar{v} = 0$ on J . As in Step 2 of the proof of Theorem 4.7 we consider the open covering $\{Q_i\}_{i=0,\dots,m}$ of $\bar{\omega}$, a subordinate partition of unity $\{\varphi_i\}_{i=0,\dots,m}$, and the outward and inward translations $\tau_{i,\varepsilon}$ with $a_\varepsilon = \varepsilon$. We set

$$\tilde{\omega} := \omega \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{m_0} Q_i$$

and we extend \bar{v} to $\bar{\omega}$ by setting $\bar{v} = 0$ outside $\bar{\omega}$, so that $\bar{v} \in W^{1,1}(\bar{\omega}; \mathbb{R}^2)$. We define

$$\bar{v}^\varepsilon := \left(\sum_{i=1}^m (\varphi_i \bar{v}) \circ \tau_{i,k} + \varphi_0 \bar{v} \right) * \rho_{\delta(\varepsilon)},$$

where $\rho_{\delta(\varepsilon)}$ is a mollifier and $\delta(\varepsilon) < \varepsilon$ is chosen small enough in such a way that $\bar{v}^\varepsilon = 0$ on γ_d . It is now easy to check that the sequence (\bar{v}^ε) has all the required properties. \square

7.2. Equivalent formulations in rate form

From here to the end of the section we will assume $t \mapsto w(t)$ to be absolutely continuous from $[0, T]$ into $W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \cap KL(\Omega)$. This implies that the maps $t \mapsto \bar{w}(t)$ and $t \mapsto w_3(t)$ are absolutely continuous from $[0, T]$ into $W^{1,2}(\omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$ and $W^{2,2}(\omega)$, respectively.

We first prove some preliminary results. An easy adaptation of [10, Lemma 5.5] provides us with the following lemma.

Lemma 7.11. *Let $t \mapsto (u(t), e(t), p(t))$ be an absolutely continuous function from $[0, T]$ into $BD(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}) \times M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ with $(u(t), e(t), p(t)) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w(t))$ for every $t \in [0, T]$. Then $(\dot{u}(t), \dot{e}(t), \dot{p}(t)) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(\dot{w}(t))$ for a.e. $t \in [0, T]$.*

For absolutely continuous triples the energy balance can be equivalently written as a balance of powers, as shown in the next proposition.

Proposition 7.12. *Let $t \mapsto (u(t), e(t), p(t))$ be an absolutely continuous function from $[0, T]$ into $BD(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}) \times M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ and let $\sigma(t) := \mathbb{C}_r e(t)$. Then, the following conditions are equivalent:*

(a) for every $t \in [0, T]$

$$\mathcal{Q}_r(e(t)) + \mathcal{D}_r(p; 0, t) = \mathcal{Q}_r(e(0)) + \int_0^t \int_\Omega \sigma(s) : E \dot{w}(s) \, dx \, ds;$$

(b) for a.e. $t \in [0, T]$

$$\int_\Omega \sigma(t) : \dot{e}(t) \, dx + \mathcal{H}_r(\dot{p}(t)) = \int_\Omega \sigma(t) : E \dot{w}(t) \, dx.$$

Proof. Since $t \mapsto p(t)$ is absolutely continuous, by [10, Theorem 7.1] we have

$$\mathcal{D}_r(p; 0, t) = \int_0^t \mathcal{H}_r(\dot{p}(s)) \, ds.$$

The equivalence of (a) and (b) follows now by differentiation of (a) and integration of (b). \square

We are finally in a position to state the main result of this section.

Theorem 7.13. *Let $t \mapsto (u(t), e(t), p(t))$ be a function from $[0, T]$ into $BD(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}) \times M_b(\Omega \cup \Gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ and let $\sigma(t) := \mathbb{C}_r e(t)$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (a) $t \mapsto (u(t), e(t), p(t))$ is a reduced quasistatic evolution for the boundary datum $w(t)$;
- (b) $t \mapsto (u(t), e(t), p(t))$ is absolutely continuous and
 - (b1) for every $t \in [0, T]$ we have $(u(t), e(t), p(t)) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w(t))$, $\sigma(t) \in \Theta(\Omega)$, $\text{div}_{x'} \bar{\sigma}(t) = 0$ in ω , and $\text{div}_{x'} \text{div}_{x'} \hat{\sigma}(t) = 0$ in ω ,

(b2) for a.e. $t \in [0, T]$ there holds

$$\mathcal{H}_r(\dot{p}(t)) = \langle \sigma(t), \dot{p}(t) \rangle = \langle \bar{\sigma}(t), \dot{\bar{p}}(t) \rangle + \frac{1}{12} \langle \hat{\sigma}(t), \dot{\hat{p}}(t) \rangle - \int_{\Omega} \sigma_{\perp}(t) : \dot{e}_{\perp}(t);$$

(c) $t \mapsto (u(t), e(t), p(t))$ is absolutely continuous and

(c1) for every $t \in [0, T]$ we have $(u(t), e(t), p(t)) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w(t))$, $\sigma(t) \in \Theta(\Omega)$, $\operatorname{div}_{x'} \bar{\sigma}(t) = 0$ in ω , and $\operatorname{div}_{x'} \operatorname{div}_{x'} \hat{\sigma}(t) = 0$ in ω ,

(c2) for a.e. $t \in [0, T]$ and for every $\tau \in \Theta(\Omega)$ there holds

$$\langle \sigma(t) - \tau, \dot{p}(t) \rangle \geq 0;$$

(d) $t \mapsto (u(t), e(t))$ is absolutely continuous and

(d1) for every $t \in [0, T]$ we have $\sigma(t) \in \Theta(\Omega)$, $\operatorname{div}_{x'} \bar{\sigma}(t) = 0$ in ω , and $\operatorname{div}_{x'} \operatorname{div}_{x'} \hat{\sigma}(t) = 0$ in ω ,

(d2) for a.e. $t \in [0, T]$ and for every $\tau \in \Theta(\Omega)$ there holds

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} (\tau - \sigma(t)) : \dot{e}(t) \, dx + \int_{\omega} \operatorname{div}_{x'} \bar{\tau} \cdot \dot{u}(t) \, dx' + \frac{1}{12} \int_{\omega} \dot{u}_3(t) \, d(\operatorname{div}_{x'} \operatorname{div}_{x'} \hat{\tau}) \\ & \geq \int_{\gamma_d} [(\bar{\tau} - \bar{\sigma}) \nu_{\partial\omega}] \cdot \dot{w}(t) \, d\mathcal{H}^1 + \frac{1}{12} \langle b_0(\hat{\tau} - \hat{\sigma}(t)), \dot{w}_3(t) \rangle - \frac{1}{12} \int_{\gamma_d} b_1(\hat{\tau} - \hat{\sigma}(t)) \frac{\partial \dot{w}_3(t)}{\partial \nu_{\partial\omega}} \, d\mathcal{H}^1, \end{aligned}$$

(d3) for every $t \in [0, T]$, $p(t) = Eu(t) - e(t)$ on Ω and $p(t) = (w(t) - u(t)) \odot \nu_{\partial\Omega} \mathcal{H}^2$ on Γ_d .

Remark 7.14. The duality products $\langle \sigma(t), \dot{p}(t) \rangle$ and $\langle \sigma(t) - \tau, \dot{p}(t) \rangle$ in conditions (b) and (c) are well defined since $\dot{p}(t) \in \Pi_{\Gamma_d}(\Omega)$ by Lemma 7.11.

Remark 7.15. Condition (d2) is a variational inequality for the stress variable, that can be viewed as the analogue of the formulation considered in [36] in the case of three-dimensional perfect plasticity.

Proof of Theorem 7.13. We first show that (a) is equivalent to (b). By Remark 6.7 every reduced quasistatic evolution is absolutely continuous, while Proposition 7.9 and Lemma 6.8 yield the equivalence of $(\text{qs1})_r$ and (b1). Hence, by Proposition 7.12 it is enough to show that for every absolutely continuous function satisfying either (b1) or $(\text{qs1})_r$, (b2) is equivalent to the following condition: for a.e. $t \in [0, T]$

$$\int_{\Omega} \sigma(t) : \dot{e}(t) \, dx + \mathcal{H}_r(\dot{p}(t)) = \int_{\Omega} \sigma(t) : E \dot{w}(t) \, dx.$$

This follows from Propositions 7.2 and 7.6, once we note that $(\dot{u}(t), \dot{e}(t), \dot{p}(t)) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(\dot{w}(t))$ by Lemma 7.11.

To show that (b) and (c) are equivalent, it is enough to prove that, if (b1) holds, then (b2) is equivalent to (c2). Indeed, condition (c2) is equivalent to

$$\langle \sigma(t), \dot{p}(t) \rangle \geq \sup_{\tau \in \Theta(\Omega)} \langle \tau, \dot{p}(t) \rangle.$$

On the other hand, by (b1) there holds

$$\langle \sigma(t), \dot{p}(t) \rangle \leq \sup_{\tau \in \Theta(\Omega)} \langle \tau, \dot{p}(t) \rangle.$$

By Proposition 7.8 we deduce the thesis.

To conclude the proof of the theorem, we show that (c) is equivalent to (d). We first remark that if $t \mapsto (u(t), e(t))$ is absolutely continuous and (d3) holds, then $t \mapsto p(t)$ is absolutely continuous and $(u(t), e(t), p(t)) \in \mathcal{A}_{KL}(w(t))$ for every $t \in [0, T]$. Hence, it remains only to prove that, if (c1) holds, then (c2) is equivalent to (d2). By Propositions 7.2 and 7.6 there holds

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \sigma(t) - \tau, \dot{p}(t) \rangle &= \int_{\Omega} (\tau - \sigma(t)) : (\dot{e}(t) - E\dot{w}(t)) dx + \int_{\omega} \operatorname{div}_{x'} \bar{\tau} \cdot (\dot{u} - \dot{w}) dx' \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{12} \int_{\omega} (\dot{u}_3 - \dot{w}_3) d(\operatorname{div}_{x'} \operatorname{div}_{x'} \hat{\tau}), \end{aligned}$$

therefore (c2) is equivalent to

$$\int_{\Omega} (\tau - \sigma(t)) : (\dot{e}(t) - E\dot{w}(t)) dx + \int_{\omega} \operatorname{div}_{x'} \bar{\tau} \cdot (\dot{u} - \dot{w}) dx' + \frac{1}{12} \int_{\omega} (\dot{u}_3 - \dot{w}_3) d(\operatorname{div}_{x'} \operatorname{div}_{x'} \hat{\tau}) \geq 0 \tag{7.30}$$

for a.e. $t \in [0, T]$ and every $\tau \in \Theta(\Omega)$. By (c1), (7.1), and (7.6) we deduce that

$$\int_{\omega} (\bar{\tau} - \bar{\sigma}(t)) : E\dot{w}(t) dx' = \int_{\gamma_d} [(\bar{\tau} - \bar{\sigma}(t))\nu_{\partial\omega}] \cdot \dot{w}(t) d\mathcal{H}^1 - \int_{\omega} \operatorname{div}_{x'} \bar{\tau} \cdot \dot{w}(t) dx',$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\omega} (\hat{\tau} - \hat{\sigma}(t)) : D^2\dot{w}_3(t) dx' \\ &= -\langle b_0(\hat{\tau} - \hat{\sigma}(t)), \dot{w}_3(t) \rangle + \int_{\gamma_d} b_1(\hat{\tau} - \hat{\sigma}(t)) \frac{\partial \dot{w}_3(t)}{\partial \nu_{\partial\omega}} d\mathcal{H}^1 + \int_{\omega} \dot{w}_3 d(\operatorname{div}_{x'} \operatorname{div}_{x'} \hat{\tau}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (7.30) is in turn equivalent to (d2) and the proof of the theorem is complete. \square

7.3. Two-dimensional characterizations

In this subsection we show that, under some additional hypotheses on the boundary datum and the initial data, a reduced quasistatic evolution can be written in terms of two-dimensional quantities only. The first proposition concerns a quasistatic evolution $(u(t), e(t), p(t))$ with “in-plane” boundary datum and initial data. In this case, the triple given by the tangential component of $u(t)$ and the zeroth order moments of $e(t)$ and $p(t)$ is a two-dimensional quasistatic evolution in ω in the sense of [10].

It is convenient to introduce the following notation: for every $\bar{w} \in W^{1,2}(\omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$ we denote by $\bar{\mathcal{A}}_{KL}(\bar{w})$ the class of all triples (v, f, q) in $BD(\omega) \times L^2(\omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}) \times M_b(\omega \cup \gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ such that $E v = f + q$ in ω and $q = (\bar{w} - v) \odot \nu_{\partial\omega} \mathcal{H}^1$ on γ_d . Moreover, we introduce the space

$$\bar{\Sigma}(\omega) := \{ \sigma \in L^\infty(\omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}) : \operatorname{div}_{x'} \sigma \in L^2(\omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}) \}$$

and the set

$$\mathcal{K}_r(\omega) := \{ \sigma \in L^\infty(\omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}) : \sigma(x') \in K_r \text{ for a.e. } x' \in \omega \}.$$

Proposition 7.16. *Let $t \mapsto \bar{w}(t)$ be absolutely continuous from $[0, T]$ into $W^{1,2}(\omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$ and let*

$$w(t, x) := \begin{pmatrix} \bar{w}(t, x') \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{for every } t \in [0, T] \text{ and a.e. } x \in \Omega.$$

Let $(\bar{u}_0, \bar{e}_0, \bar{p}_0) \in \bar{\mathcal{A}}_{KL}(\bar{w}(0))$ and let

$$u_0(x) := \begin{pmatrix} \bar{u}_0(x') \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad e_0(x) := \bar{e}_0(x') \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega, \quad p_0 := \bar{p}_0 \otimes \mathcal{L}^1.$$

Finally, let $t \mapsto (u(t), e(t), p(t))$ be a reduced quasistatic evolution for the boundary value $w(t)$ such that $u(0) = u_0$, $e(0) = e_0$, and $p(0) = p_0$, and let $\sigma(t) := \mathcal{C}_r e(t)$. Then the map $t \mapsto (\bar{u}(t), \bar{e}(t), \bar{p}(t))$ satisfies the following conditions:

- (i) $t \mapsto (\bar{u}(t), \bar{e}(t), \bar{p}(t))$ is absolutely continuous from $[0, T]$ into $BD(\omega) \times L^2(\omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}) \times M_b(\omega \cup \gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ and $\bar{u}(0) = \bar{u}_0$, $\bar{e}(0) = \bar{e}_0$, and $\bar{p}(0) = \bar{p}_0$;
- (ii) for every $t \in [0, T]$ we have $(\bar{u}(t), \bar{e}(t), \bar{p}(t)) \in \bar{A}_{KL}(\bar{w}(t))$, $\bar{\sigma}(t) \in \bar{\Sigma}(\omega) \cap \mathcal{K}_r(\omega)$, $\text{div}_{x'} \bar{\sigma}(t) = 0$ in ω , and $[\bar{\sigma} \nu_{\partial\omega}] = 0$ on γ_n ;
- (iii) for a.e. $t \in [0, T]$ there holds

$$\mathcal{H}_r(\dot{\bar{p}}(t)) = \langle \bar{\sigma}(t), \dot{\bar{p}}(t) \rangle. \tag{7.31}$$

Moreover, $\hat{\sigma}(t) = \sigma_{\perp}(t) = 0$ for every $t \in [0, T]$.

Proof. Condition (i) follows from Remark 6.7. By condition (b1) of Theorem 7.13 and the convexity of K_r we deduce condition (ii).

By property (b2) of Theorem 7.13 and Proposition 7.8 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_r(\dot{p}(t)) &= \langle \bar{\sigma}(t), \dot{\bar{p}}(t) \rangle + \frac{1}{12} \langle \hat{\sigma}(t), \dot{\hat{p}}(t) \rangle - \int_{\Omega} \sigma_{\perp}(t) : \dot{e}_{\perp}(t) \, dx \\ &\leq \mathcal{H}_r(\dot{\bar{p}}(t)) + \frac{1}{12} \langle \hat{\sigma}(t), \dot{\hat{p}}(t) \rangle - \int_{\Omega} \sigma_{\perp}(t) : \dot{e}_{\perp}(t) \, dx \\ &= \mathcal{H}_r(\dot{\bar{p}}(t)) - \frac{1}{12} \int_{\omega} \hat{\sigma}(t) : \dot{e}(t) \, dx - \int_{\Omega} \sigma_{\perp}(t) : \dot{e}_{\perp}(t) \, dx, \end{aligned} \tag{7.32}$$

where the last equality follows from (7.10) with $\varphi \equiv 1$ and from the fact that $\sigma(t) \in \Theta(\Omega)$, $\text{div}_{x'} \text{div}_{x'} \hat{\sigma}(t) = 0$ in ω , and $w_3(t) = 0$ for every $t \in [0, T]$. On the other hand, we have

$$\mathcal{H}_r(\dot{p}(t)) = \mathcal{H}_r(\dot{p}^a(t)) + \mathcal{H}_r(\dot{p}^s(t)). \tag{7.33}$$

By the Fubini Theorem and Jensen’s inequality we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_r(\dot{p}^a(t)) &= \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\omega \cup \gamma_d} H_r(\dot{\bar{p}}^a(t) + x_3 \dot{\hat{p}}^a(t) - \dot{e}_{\perp}(t)) \, dx' \, dx_3 \\ &\geq \int_{\omega \cup \gamma_d} H_r \left(\int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} (\dot{\bar{p}}^a(t) + x_3 \dot{\hat{p}}^a(t) - \dot{e}_{\perp}(t)) \, dx_3 \right) \, dx' \\ &= \int_{\omega \cup \gamma_d} H_r(\dot{\bar{p}}^a(t)) \, dx' = \mathcal{H}_r(\dot{\bar{p}}^a(t)) \end{aligned} \tag{7.34}$$

for a.e. $t \in [0, T]$. Setting

$$\lambda(t) := |\dot{\bar{p}}^s(t)| + |\dot{\hat{p}}^s(t)|$$

for a.e. $t \in [0, T]$, we have that the measure $\dot{\bar{p}}^s(t) + x_3 \dot{\hat{p}}^s(t)$ on $\omega \cup \gamma_d$ is absolutely continuous with respect to $\lambda(t)$ for every $x_3 \in (-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$, so that we can write

$$\dot{p}^s(t) = \left(\frac{d\dot{\bar{p}}^s(t)}{d\lambda(t)} + x_3 \frac{d\dot{\hat{p}}^s(t)}{d\lambda(t)} \right) \lambda(t) \stackrel{\text{gen.}}{\otimes} \mathcal{L}^1.$$

Therefore, by the Fubini Theorem and Jensen’s inequality we obtain

$$\mathcal{H}_r(\dot{p}^s(t)) = \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\omega \cup \gamma_d} H_r \left(\frac{d\dot{\bar{p}}^s(t)}{d\lambda(t)} + x_3 \frac{d\dot{\hat{p}}^s(t)}{d\lambda(t)} \right) \, d\lambda(t) \, dx_3$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq \int_{\omega \cup \gamma_d} H_r \left(\int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{d\dot{p}^s(t)}{d\lambda(t)} + x_3 \frac{d\dot{p}^s(t)}{d\lambda(t)} \right) dx_3 \right) d\lambda(t) \\ &= \int_{\omega \cup \gamma_d} H_r \left(\frac{d\dot{p}^s(t)}{d\lambda(t)} \right) d\lambda(t) = \mathcal{H}_r(\dot{p}^s(t)) \end{aligned} \tag{7.35}$$

for a.e. $t \in [0, T]$. Combining (7.32)–(7.35), we deduce that

$$-\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{1}{12} \mathcal{Q}_r(\hat{e}(t)) + \mathcal{Q}_r(e_{\perp}(t)) \right) = -\frac{1}{12} \int_{\omega} \hat{\sigma}(t) : \dot{e}(t) dx - \int_{\Omega} \sigma_{\perp}(t) : \dot{e}_{\perp}(t) dx \geq 0.$$

In particular, this implies that

$$\frac{1}{12} \mathcal{Q}_r(\hat{e}(t)) + \mathcal{Q}_r(e_{\perp}(t)) \leq \frac{1}{12} \mathcal{Q}_r(\hat{e}(0)) + \mathcal{Q}_r(e_{\perp}(0)) = 0,$$

hence $\hat{e}(t) = 0$ and $e_{\perp}(t) = 0$ for every $t \in [0, T]$. This, together with (7.32)–(7.35), yields (7.31). \square

In this last proposition we consider a quasistatic evolution $(u(t), e(t), p(t))$ with “out-of-plane” boundary datum and initial data and we prove that the triple given by the normal component of $u(t)$ and the first order moments of $e(t)$ and $p(t)$ is a two-dimensional quasistatic evolution in ω in the sense of [13, Definition 4.1]. To this purpose, for every $w_3 \in W^{2,2}(\omega)$ we define the class $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{KL}(w_3)$ as the set of all triples $(v, f, q) \in BH(\omega) \times L^2(\omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}) \times M_b(\omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ such that $D^2v = -(f + q)$ in ω , $v = w_3$ on γ_d , and $q = (\nabla v - \nabla w_3) \odot \nu_{\partial\omega} \mathcal{H}^1$ on γ_d .

Proposition 7.17. *Assume the function H to be homogeneous of degree one, i.e.,*

$$H(\lambda\xi) = |\lambda|H(\xi) \quad \text{for every } \lambda \in \mathbb{R}, \xi \in \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}. \tag{7.36}$$

Let $t \mapsto w_3(t)$ be absolutely continuous from $[0, T]$ into $W^{2,2}(\omega)$ and let

$$w(t, x) := \begin{pmatrix} -x_3 \nabla w_3(t, x') \\ w_3(t, x') \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{for every } t \in [0, T] \text{ and a.e. } x \in \Omega.$$

Let $(v_0, \hat{e}_0, \hat{p}_0) \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{KL}(w_3(0))$ and let

$$u_0(x) := \begin{pmatrix} -x_3 \nabla v_0(x') \\ v_0(x') \end{pmatrix}, \quad e_0(x) := x_3 \hat{e}_0(x') \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega, \quad p_0 := \hat{p}_0 \otimes x_3 \mathcal{L}^1.$$

Finally, let $t \mapsto (u(t), e(t), p(t))$ be a reduced quasistatic evolution for the boundary value $w(t)$ such that $u(0) = u_0$, $e(0) = e_0$, and $p(0) = p_0$, and let $\sigma(t) := \mathbb{C}_r e(t)$. Then the map $t \mapsto (u_3(t), \hat{e}(t), \hat{p}(t))$ satisfies the following conditions:

- (i) $t \mapsto (u_3(t), \hat{e}(t), \hat{p}(t))$ is absolutely continuous from $[0, T]$ into $BH(\omega) \times L^2(\omega; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2}) \times M_b(\omega \cup \gamma_d; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2})$ and $u_3(0) = v_0$, $\hat{e}(0) = \hat{e}_0$, and $\hat{p}(0) = \hat{p}_0$;
- (ii) for every $t \in [0, T]$ we have $(u_3(t), \hat{e}(t), \hat{p}(t)) \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{KL}(w_3(t))$, $\hat{\sigma}(t) \in \hat{\Sigma}(\omega) \cap \mathcal{K}_r(\omega)$, $\text{div}_{x'} \text{div}_{x'} \hat{\sigma}(t) = 0$ in ω , $b_1(\hat{\sigma}(t)) = 0$ on γ_n , and $\langle b_0(\hat{\sigma}(t)), v \rangle = 0$ for every $v \in W^{2,1}(\omega)$ with $v = 0$ on γ_d ;
- (iii) for a.e. $t \in [0, T]$ there holds

$$\mathcal{H}_r(\dot{\hat{p}}(t)) = \langle \hat{\sigma}(t), \dot{\hat{p}}(t) \rangle. \tag{7.37}$$

Moreover, $\bar{\sigma}(t) = \sigma_{\perp}(t) = 0$ for every $t \in [0, T]$.

Proof. We first remark that (7.36) implies that the same property is fulfilled by H_r . This latter condition is in turn equivalent to saying that the set K_r is symmetric with respect to the origin.

Condition (i) follows from Remark 6.7. By property (b1) of Theorem 7.13 we have that $\sigma(t) \in \mathcal{K}_r(\Omega)$ for every $t \in [0, T]$. Since K_r is convex and symmetric with respect with the origin, this implies that $\hat{\sigma}(t) \in \mathcal{K}_r(\omega)$ for every $t \in [0, T]$. All the other conditions in (ii) follow from Theorem 7.13.

By property (b2) of Theorem 7.13 and Proposition 7.8 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_r(\dot{p}(t)) &= \langle \bar{\sigma}(t), \dot{p}(t) \rangle + \frac{1}{12} \langle \hat{\sigma}(t), \dot{p}(t) \rangle - \int_{\Omega} \sigma_{\perp}(t) : \dot{e}_{\perp}(t) dx \\ &\leq \frac{1}{12} \mathcal{H}_r(\dot{p}(t)) + \langle \bar{\sigma}(t), \dot{p}(t) \rangle - \int_{\Omega} \sigma_{\perp}(t) : \dot{e}_{\perp}(t) dx \\ &= \frac{1}{12} \mathcal{H}_r(\dot{p}(t)) - \int_{\omega} \bar{\sigma}(t) : \dot{e}(t) dx - \int_{\Omega} \sigma_{\perp}(t) : \dot{e}_{\perp}(t) dx, \end{aligned} \tag{7.38}$$

where the last equality follows from (7.5) with $\varphi \equiv 1$ and from the fact that $\sigma(t) \in \Theta(\Omega)$, $\operatorname{div}_{x'} \bar{\sigma}(t) = 0$ in ω , and $\bar{w}(t) = 0$ for every $t \in [0, T]$. On the other hand, by (7.36), Fubini’s Theorem, and Jensen’s inequality we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_r(\dot{p}^a(t)) &\geq \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\omega \cup \gamma_d} |x_3| H_r(\dot{p}^a(t) + x_3 \dot{p}^a(t) - \dot{e}_{\perp}(t)) dx' dx_3 \\ &\geq \int_{\omega \cup \gamma_d} H_r \left(\int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} x_3 (\dot{p}^a(t) + x_3 \dot{p}^a(t) - \dot{e}_{\perp}(t)) dx_3 \right) dx' \\ &= \frac{1}{12} \mathcal{H}_r(\dot{p}^a(t)) \end{aligned} \tag{7.39}$$

for a.e. $t \in [0, T]$. Setting

$$\lambda(t) := |\dot{p}^s(t)| + |\dot{p}^s(t)|$$

for a.e. $t \in [0, T]$ and applying again (7.36), Fubini’s Theorem, and Jensen’s inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_r(\dot{p}^s(t)) &\geq \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\omega \cup \gamma_d} |x_3| H_r \left(\frac{d\dot{p}^s(t)}{d\lambda(t)} + x_3 \frac{d\dot{p}^s(t)}{d\lambda(t)} \right) d\lambda(t) dx_3 \\ &\geq \int_{\omega \cup \gamma_d} H_r \left(\int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} x_3 \left(\frac{d\dot{p}^s(t)}{d\lambda(t)} + x_3 \frac{d\dot{p}^s(t)}{d\lambda(t)} \right) dx_3 \right) d\lambda(t) \\ &= \frac{1}{12} \mathcal{H}_r(\dot{p}^s(t)) \end{aligned} \tag{7.40}$$

for a.e. $t \in [0, T]$. Combining (7.38)–(7.40), we deduce that

$$-\frac{d}{dt} (\mathcal{Q}_r(\bar{e}(t)) + \mathcal{Q}_r(e_{\perp}(t))) = - \int_{\omega} \bar{\sigma}(t) : \dot{e}(t) dx - \int_{\Omega} \sigma_{\perp}(t) : \dot{e}_{\perp}(t) dx \geq 0.$$

In particular, this implies that

$$\mathcal{Q}_r(\bar{e}(t)) + \mathcal{Q}_r(e_{\perp}(t)) \leq \mathcal{Q}_r(\bar{e}(0)) + \mathcal{Q}_r(e_{\perp}(0)) = 0,$$

hence $\bar{e}(t) = 0$ and $e_{\perp}(t) = 0$ for every $t \in [0, T]$. This, together with (7.38)–(7.40), yields (7.37). \square

Acknowledgements

This material is based on work supported by the European Research Council under Grant No. 290888 “Quasistatic and Dynamic Evolution Problems in Plasticity and Fracture”. The authors also acknowledge support by INdAM and by MIUR.

References

- [1] H. Abels, M.G. Mora, S. Müller, The time-dependent von Kármán plate equation as a limit of 3d nonlinear elasticity, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 41 (2011) 241–259.
- [2] H. Abels, M.G. Mora, S. Müller, Large time existence for thin vibrating plates, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* 36 (2011) 2062–2102.
- [3] E. Acerbi, G. Buttazzo, D. Percivale, A variational definition for the strain energy of an elastic string, *J. Elasticity* 25 (1991) 137–148.
- [4] R.A. Adams, J.J.F. Fournier, *Sobolev Spaces*, second ed., Elsevier/Academic Press, Amsterdam, 2003.
- [5] L. Ambrosio, N. Fusco, D. Pallara, *Functions of Bounded Variation and Free Discontinuity Problems*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2000.
- [6] G. Anzellotti, S. Baldo, D. Percivale, Dimension reduction in variational problems, asymptotic development in Γ -convergence and thin structures in elasticity, *Asymptot. Anal.* 9 (1994) 61–100.
- [7] J.-F. Babadjian, Quasistatic evolution of a brittle thin film, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 26 (2006) 69–118.
- [8] F. Bourquin, P.G. Ciarlet, G. Geymonat, A. Raoult, Γ -convergence et analyse asymptotique des plaques minces, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.* 315 (1992) 1017–1024.
- [9] M. Brokate, A.M. Khludnev, Existence of solutions in the Prandtl–Reuss theory of elastoplastic plates, *Adv. Math. Sci. Appl.* 10 (2000) 399–415.
- [10] G. Dal Maso, A. DeSimone, M.G. Mora, Quasistatic evolution problems for linearly elastic–perfectly plastic materials, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 180 (2006) 237–291.
- [11] F. Demengel, Problèmes variationnels en plasticité parfaite des plaques, *Numer. Funct. Anal. Optim.* 6 (1983) 73–119.
- [12] F. Demengel, Fonctions à hessien borné, *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* 34 (1984) 155–190.
- [13] A. Demyanov, Quasistatic evolution in the theory of perfectly elasto-plastic plates. I. Existence of a weak solution, *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* 19 (2009) 229–256.
- [14] A. Demyanov, Quasistatic evolution in the theory of perfect elasto-plastic plates. II. Regularity of bending moments, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire* 26 (2009) 2137–2163.
- [15] I. Ekeland, R. Temam, *Convex Analysis and Variational Problems*, Classics Appl. Math., vol. 28, SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 1999.
- [16] G.A. Francfort, A. Giacomini, Small strain heterogeneous elasto-plasticity revisited, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 65 (2012) 1185–1241.
- [17] L. Freddi, R. Paroni, C. Zanini, Dimension reduction of a crack evolution problem in a linearly elastic plate, *Asymptot. Anal.* 70 (2010) 101–123.
- [18] G. Friesecke, R.D. James, M.G. Mora, S. Müller, Derivation of nonlinear bending theory for shells from three-dimensional nonlinear elasticity by Gamma-convergence, *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* 336 (2003) 697–702.
- [19] G. Friesecke, R.D. James, S. Müller, A theorem on geometric rigidity and the derivation of nonlinear plate theory from three-dimensional elasticity, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 55 (2002) 1461–1506.
- [20] G. Friesecke, R.D. James, S. Müller, A hierarchy of plate models derived from nonlinear elasticity by Gamma-convergence, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 180 (2006) 183–236.
- [21] C. Goffman, J. Serrin, Sublinear functions of measures and variational integrals, *Duke Math. J.* 31 (1964) 159–178.
- [22] R.V. Kohn, R. Temam, Dual spaces of stresses and strains, with applications to Hencky plasticity, *Appl. Math. Optim.* 10 (1983) 1–35.
- [23] H. Le Dret, A. Raoult, The nonlinear membrane model as variational limit of nonlinear three-dimensional elasticity, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* 74 (1995) 549–578.
- [24] M. Lewicka, M.G. Mora, M.R. Pakzad, Shell theories arising as low-energy Γ -limit of 3d nonlinear elasticity, *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci.* 9 (2010) 253–295.
- [25] M. Lewicka, M.G. Mora, M.R. Pakzad, The matching property of infinitesimal isometries on elliptic surfaces and elasticity of thin shells, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 200 (2011) 1023–1050.
- [26] M. Liero, A. Mielke, An evolutionary elasto-plastic plate model derived via Γ -convergence, *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* 21 (2011) 1961–1986.
- [27] M. Liero, T. Roche, Rigorous derivation of a plate theory in linear elasto-plasticity via Γ -convergence, *NoDEA Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl.* 19 (2012) 437–457.
- [28] A. Mainik, A. Mielke, Existence results for energetic models for rate-independent systems, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 22 (2005) 73–99.
- [29] A. Mielke, T. Roubíček, U. Stefanelli, Γ -limits and relaxations for rate-independent evolutionary problems, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 31 (2008) 387–416.
- [30] A. Mielke, T. Roubíček, M. Thomas, From damage to delamination in nonlinearly elastic materials at small strains, Preprint WIAS 1542, Berlin, 2010.
- [31] M.G. Mora, S. Müller, Derivation of the nonlinear bending-torsion theory for inextensible rods by Γ -convergence, *Calc. Var.* 18 (2003) 287–305.
- [32] M.G. Mora, S. Müller, A nonlinear model for inextensible rods as low energy Γ -limit of three-dimensional nonlinear elasticity, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire* 21 (2004) 271–293.
- [33] D. Percivale, Perfectly plastic plates: a variational definition, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 411 (1990) 39–50.
- [34] L. Scardia, The nonlinear bending-torsion theory for curved rods as Γ -limit of three-dimensional elasticity, *Asymptot. Anal.* 47 (2006) 317–343.
- [35] L. Scardia, Asymptotic models for curved rods derived from nonlinear elasticity by Gamma-convergence, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A* 139 (2009) 1037–1070.
- [36] P.-M. Suquet, Sur les équations de la plasticité: existence et régularité des solutions, *J. Mécanique* 20 (1981) 3–39.
- [37] R. Temam, *Mathematical Problems in Plasticity*, Gauthier–Villars, Paris, 1985.