

QUASISTATIC EVOLUTION FOR DISLOCATION-FREE FINITE PLASTICITY

MARTIN KRUŽÍK, DAVID MELCHING, AND ULISSE STEFANELLI

ABSTRACT. We investigate quasistatic evolution in finite plasticity under the assumption that the plastic strain is compatible. This assumption is well-suited to describe the special case of dislocation-free plasticity and entails that the plastic strain is the gradient of a plastic deformation map. The total deformation can be then seen as the composition of a plastic and an elastic deformation. This opens the way to an existence theory for the quasistatic evolution problem featuring both Lagrangian and Eulerian variables. A remarkable trait of the result is that it does not require second-order gradients.

1. INTRODUCTION

The elastoplastic behavior of a crystalline solid under the action of external loads results from a combination of reversible elastic and irreversible plastic effects [42]. The state of the body is specified in terms of its deformation $y : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ from a reference configuration $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$. Elastic and plastic effect are classically assumed to combine via the *Kröner-Lee-Liu multiplicative decomposition* of the total strain $\nabla y = F_e F_p$ [35, 37, 38]. Here, the elastic strain F_e describes the elastic response of the medium, whereas the plastic strain F_p records the accumulation of plastic distortion [29]. In metals, it is usually assumed that plastic effects induce no volume change, namely $\det F_p = 1$ [56].

Elastoplastic evolution results from the competition of elastic-energy storage and plastic-dissipation mechanisms. As such, a common and successful approach to the description of elastoplasticity of crystalline materials is via variational methods [50]. The energy of the specimen is often assumed to be of the form

$$\int_{\Omega} W_e(\nabla y F_p^{-1}) \, dx + \int_{\Omega} W_p(F_p) \, dx, \quad (1.1)$$

where W_e is the elastic-energy density, a function of the elastic strain $F_e = \nabla y F_p^{-1}$, and W_p is a hardening-energy density. In the *incremental* setting of the elastoplastic evolution problem, given external loads and boundary conditions, one minimizes the energy, augmented by a dissipation term $\mathcal{D}(F_{p0}, F_p)$ [44]. The latter measures the distance of the actual plastic strain F_p from the previous F_{p0} . This inspires different solution notions on the time-continuous, *quasistatic* evolution level [47].

In view of the mathematical treatment of finite plasticity, one is hence confronted with the necessity of controlling the product $\nabla y F_p^{-1}$. This is indeed a critical point, for weak topologies are not sufficient in order to identify this product within a corresponding limit passage. Such observation has sparked the interest for so-called *second-order* theories, where a term featuring the gradient ∇F_p is included in the energy. This gradient term models nonlocal effects caused by short-range interactions among dislocations [14, 27, 28]. From a

Date: October 7, 2019.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 35Q74, 49J40, 74C15.

Key words and phrases. Elasticity, Plasticity, Quasistatic evolution.

mathematical standpoint, the presence of the gradient ∇F_p in the energy contributes strong compactness for F_p , which then allows to pass to the limit in the product $\nabla y F_p^{-1}$.

To date, multidimensional existence results for incremental and quasistatic evolutions are just a few and all hinge on second-order theories [13, 25, 26, 39, 46, 48]. However, in finite plasticity these second-order gradient theories are still debated from the modeling standpoint. In particular, it is not clear which function of the gradient should be used. We refer to [1, 34, 62] for attempts to derive it from statistical physics, revealing the complexity of this issue. A related approach to nonlocal models in damage and plasticity was undertaken in [6], see also [16, 17, 20, 42].

Our aim is to investigate existence for quasistatic evolutions not relying on second-order theories, namely in absence of a regularizing gradient term ∇F_p . This follows the analysis of [57], where the same issue was considered at the incremental level. The price to pay for allowing such an existence result is that of restricting the analysis to the case of *compatible* plastic strains F_p , namely to impose $\text{curl } F_p = 0$. This case corresponds to *dislocation-free* elastoplastic evolution. Albeit not generic, such situation still includes plastic slips [51] and may actually occur in ductile metals [32, 41]. This is particularly relevant in case of small bodies. Indeed, dislocation dynamics is strongly size-dependent [21, 61] so that very small dislocation-free bodies may plasticize without nucleating dislocations.

In case of compatibility, one can identify the plastic strain F_p with a gradient of a *plastic deformation* $y_p : \Omega \rightarrow y_p(\Omega) \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, mapping indeed the reference configuration to the so-called *intermediate* one. At the same time, this defines an *elastic deformation* $y_e : y_p(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ from the intermediate to the actual configuration such that the decomposition

$$y = y_e \circ y_p \tag{1.2}$$

holds. The latter of course entails the multiplicative decomposition $\nabla y = \nabla y_e \nabla y_p$ via the classical chain rule. On the other hand, by assuming y_p to be injective, it allows for rewriting the energy in (1.1), by a change of variables, as

$$\int_{y_p(\Omega)} W_e(\nabla y_e) \, d\xi + \int_{\Omega} W_p(\nabla y_p) \, dx. \tag{1.3}$$

This reformulation of the energy is particularly advantageous from the mathematical viewpoint, for it does not feature the product term $\nabla y F_p^{-1}$ anymore. This in turn allows for an existence theory via classical variational methods, even in absence of strong compactness for $F_p = \nabla y_p$. Indeed, in two space dimensions, by assuming $F_p = \nabla y_p$ one would even be able to directly identify the limit in $\nabla y (\nabla y_p)^{-1}$ via the classical div-curl lemma as ∇y is curl-free and $\text{div} (\nabla y_p)^{-T} = 0$ if $\det \nabla y_p = 1$, see also [10].

Arguing via reformulation (1.3) calls for the treatment of both *Lagrangian* and *Eulerian* terms, respectively defined on the reference and on the intermediate configuration, which itself depends on part of the solution. This kind of mixed Lagrangian-Eulerian problems has to be traced back at least to [11, 19] for the case of defective crystals and has recently attracted attention in connection with nematic elastomers [4, 5], magnetoelasticity [5, 36, 53, 55, 60], solid-solid phase change [24, 59] and, as already mentioned, incremental finite plasticity [57]. A decomposition of type (1.2) has recently also been used as a starting point to model dissolution-precipitation creep [33].

The main result of this paper is the existence of *incrementally approximable quasistatic evolutions*, see Theorem 2.4. This notion of solution features stability and energy balance on the time-discrete level as well as *semistability* relation with respect to elastic deformations and an *energy inequality* in the time-continuous limit. A similar notion has been considered in [12] in the quasistatic setting and in [54] for viscoplasticity and is weaker than the concept

of *energetic solutions* [47]. Still, it implies the validity of the quasistatic equilibrium system as well as the dissipative character of the evolution.

The existence proof follows the classical time-discretization strategy. Discrete-in-time solutions are found by solving incremental problems on a given time partition and a quasistatic evolution is then recovered as the fineness of the partitions tends to zero. In order to check for the energy inequality, the lower semicontinuity of the energy and dissipation functionals plays a crucial role. This results from the *weak compactness* of the minors of ∇y_e and ∇y_p (see (1.3)) under the assumption of *polyconvex* densities [2]. The passage to the limit in the discrete semistability requires an ad hoc recovery-sequence construction, which in turn hinges upon the possibility of extending elastic deformations to a neighborhood of the intermediate configuration. In order to be able to achieve this, intermediate configurations are asked to have regular boundaries. More precisely, they are restricted to belong to a certain uniform subclass of Jones domains [31], see Subsection 2.3.

The mechanical model and its variational formulation are introduced in Section 2 and the main result is stated in Subsection 2.7. The existence proof is then detailed in Section 3.

2. MAIN RESULT

This section brings us to the formulation of our main result, Theorem 2.4. We start by introducing our assumptions and basic framework in Subsections 2.1-2.6 and end with our main statement in Subsection 2.7.

2.1. Notation. In what follows, we denote by $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ the Euclidean space of $d \times d$ real matrices and by $\text{SL}(d)$, $\text{GL}(d)$, and $\text{SO}(d)$ its subspaces of matrices with unit determinant, invertible matrices, and proper rotations, respectively. Using \mathcal{L}^d and \mathcal{H}^{d-1} we refer to the d -dimensional Lebesgue measure and the $(d-1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure. The norm on a generic Banach space E is denoted by $\|\cdot\|_E$ and we use the standard notation for Sobolev and Lebesgue spaces. By default, we denote by $f_n \rightarrow f$ strong convergence, whereas $f_n \rightharpoonup f$ means weak convergence.

2.2. Deformations. Let $d \geq 2$ and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a non-empty, open, simply connected, bounded domain with Lipschitz boundary. The boundary is essentially split into a Dirichlet part Γ_D and a Neumann part Γ_N , namely $\partial\Omega = \bar{\Gamma}_D \cup \bar{\Gamma}_N$ with Γ_D and Γ_N open in $\partial\Omega$ and $\Gamma_D \cap \Gamma_N = \emptyset$ where $\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\Gamma_D) > 0$. We indicate by $y : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ the deformation of the body Ω .

The crucial assumption of our theory is that the deformation y can be decomposed into elastic and plastic deformations y_e and y_p as in (1.2). As mentioned, this follows from the standard multiplicative decomposition $\nabla y = F_e F_p$ in case F_p is curl-free. Indeed, if $F_p = \nabla y_p$ for some plastic deformation y_p one can easily check [57] that $F_e = \nabla y_e$ for some elastic deformation y_e , so that the multiplicative decomposition $\nabla y = \nabla y_e \nabla y_p$ follows by (1.2) and the classical chain rule. We now detail our assumptions on y_p and y_e .

Plastic deformations. We assume that the plastic deformation fulfills

$$y_p \in W^{1,q_p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \quad \text{for some } q_p \geq d^2$$

and that it is locally volume preserving, namely, $\det \nabla y_p = 1$ almost everywhere (a.e.) in Ω [40, 56]. This implies that y_p is Hölder continuous with exponent $1 - d/q_p$ and almost everywhere differentiable [18, Lemma 2.7]. From now on, when writing y_p we always mean its continuous representative.

The map y_p possesses the so-called Lusin's N -property, namely $\mathcal{L}^d(E) = 0 \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}^d(y_p(E)) = 0$ for all measurable $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, as well as the corresponding N^{-1} -property, i.e. $\mathcal{L}^d(E') = 0 \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}^d(y_p^{-1}(E')) = 0$ for all measurable $E' \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, see [23, p. 296]. Moreover, y_p is *locally invertible almost everywhere* [18, Thm. 3.1, Cor. 3.3]. This means that for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ there exists a ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ centered at $y_p(x)$, an open neighborhood $U \subset \Omega$ of x , and a local inverse $y_p^{-1} : B \rightarrow U$ with $y_p^{-1} \in W^{1, q_p/(d-1)}(B; \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $y_p|_U$ and y_p^{-1} are onto, $y_p^{-1} \circ y_p = \text{id}$ a.e. in U , $y_p \circ y_p^{-1} = \text{id}$ a.e. in B , and $\nabla y_p^{-1} = (\nabla y_p)^{-1} \circ y_p^{-1}$ a.e. in B .

In view of changing from Lagrangian to Eulerian variables, we require y_p to be *injective almost everywhere*, namely, that there exists a negligible set N such that y_p is injective on $\Omega \setminus N$. This property is implemented by imposing the classical *Ciarlet-Nečas condition* [9]

$$\mathcal{L}^d(\Omega) = \int_{\Omega} \det(\nabla y_p(x)) \, dx \leq \mathcal{L}^d(y_p(\Omega)). \quad (2.1)$$

In this setting, (2.1) and injectivity almost everywhere are actually equivalent [22, Prop. 15]. Using injectivity almost everywhere, we get the change of variables formula

$$\int_E \phi(y_p(x)) \, dx = \int_{y_p(E)} \phi(\xi) \, d\xi \quad (2.2)$$

for every measurable function $\phi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and all measurable $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, see [18, Lem. 2.4]. Note that, here and in the following, we use the shorthand dx for $d\mathcal{L}^d(x)$ when integrating with respect to Lagrangian coordinates $x \in \Omega$, and $d\xi$ for $d\mathcal{L}^d(\xi)$ in case of Eulerian coordinates, namely for integration on the intermediate configuration $y_p(\Omega)$.

If $y_p \in W^{1,d}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ with distortion $K := |\nabla y_p|^d / \det \nabla y_p \in L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$ for $p > d - 1$, then y_p is either constant or open, [30, Theorem 3.4]. Since in our setting $q_p \geq d^2$ and $\det \nabla y_p = 1$, this integrability requirement is fulfilled. Moreover, by the Ciarlet-Nečas condition (2.1), y_p cannot be constant, which shows that y_p is open and injective almost everywhere. This implies that y_p is (globally) injective [24, Lemma 3.3], and that y_p is actually a *homeomorphism* having inverse y_p^{-1} of regularity

$$y_p^{-1} \in W^{1, q_p/(d-1)}(y_p(\Omega); \mathbb{R}^d).$$

Note that, if the plastic deformation y_p at the boundary $\partial\Omega$ was coinciding with that of a homeomorphism on $\bar{\Omega}$, given the integrability of the distortion one could resort to the invertibility theory by Ball [3] to deduce that y_p is actually a homeomorphism, even without asking for the Ciarlet-Nečas condition (2.1). In our case however, we cannot assume to be able to prescribe $y_p(\partial\Omega)$, for y_p is an internal variable. In fact, since the problem is formulated in terms of ∇y_p only, we later ask for the normalization condition $\int_{\Omega} y_p(x) \, dx = 0$.

Elastic deformations. Given a plastic deformation y_p , we assume the elastic deformation y_e , defined on the intermediate configuration $y_p(\Omega)$, to satisfy

$$y_e \in W^{1, q_e}(y_p(\Omega); \mathbb{R}^d) \quad \text{for some } q_e > d.$$

By using the local invertibility of y_p , one checks that the chain rule

$$\nabla y(x) = \nabla y_e(y_p(x)) \nabla y_p(x) \quad (2.3)$$

holds for almost every $x \in \Omega$, see [57] for details. We can use the change of variables formula (2.2) together with the chain rule (2.3) and Hölder's inequality to estimate

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla y(x)|^q \, dx \leq \left(\int_{y_p(\Omega)} |\nabla y_e(\xi)|^{q_e} \, d\xi \right)^{q/q_e} \left(\int_{\Omega} |\nabla y_p(x)|^{q_p} \, dx \right)^{q/q_p}, \quad (2.4)$$

where q is defined by

$$\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{q_e} + \frac{1}{q_p}.$$

2.3. Domains. In order to carry on our existence proof, some regularity for the intermediate configurations $y_p(\Omega)$ is needed. Our goal is to find conditions under which $y_p(\Omega)$ is a *Sobolev extension domain*. These are open subsets of \mathbb{R}^d allowing the extension of Sobolev functions to the whole space. More precisely, $\omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a $W^{1,p}$ -*extension domain*, if and only if one can define a bounded linear operator

$$E : W^{1,p}(\omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$$

such that

$$Eu = u \quad \text{in } \omega$$

for every $u \in W^{1,p}(\omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$. Additionally, we need to ensure that the class of intermediate domains is closed under Hausdorff convergence of sets, in order to guarantee that the state space is closed. The Hausdorff distance of two non-empty, compact subsets X, Y of \mathbb{R}^d is defined as

$$d_H(X, Y) := \inf\{\nu \geq 0 : X \subset B_\nu(Y), Y \subset B_\nu(X)\},$$

where $B_\nu(X) := \{z \in \mathbb{R}^d : \text{there exists } x \in X \text{ such that } |x - z| < \nu\} = X + B_\nu(0)$ is an ν -fattening of the set X . It is easy to see that

$$d_H(X, Y) = \max\left\{ \sup_{x \in X} \text{dist}(x, Y), \sup_{y \in Y} \text{dist}(y, X) \right\},$$

where $\text{dist}(x, Y) := \inf_{y \in Y} |x - y|$. We remark that, if $y_p^n \rightharpoonup y_p$ in $W^{1,q_p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$, then y_p^n converges uniformly to y_p on $\overline{\Omega}$ by the compact Sobolev embedding $W^{1,q_p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \subset\subset C^0(\overline{\Omega}; \mathbb{R}^d)$. This implies Hausdorff convergence of the intermediate configurations, namely

$$d_H(\overline{y_p^n(\Omega)}, \overline{y_p(\Omega)}) \rightarrow 0, \quad d_H(\partial y_p^n(\Omega), \partial y_p(\Omega)) \rightarrow 0 \quad (2.5)$$

as n tends to ∞ , see Lemma 3.1 below.

It is well-known that Lipschitz domains are $W^{1,p}$ -extension domains for every $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ [8, 58]. However, the class of Lipschitz domains is not closed under Hausdorff convergence. We hence focus here on a larger class of domains, the (ε, δ) -*domains* introduced by Jones in [31] and defined below. These possess the extension property [31, Theorem 1] and include Lipschitz domains. By restricting to the subclass of uniform (ε, δ) -domains, we obtain uniformly bounded extension operators as well as closedness with respect to Hausdorff convergence.

Definition 2.1 ($\mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon, \delta}$ domains). We say that a bounded, open set $\omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is an (ε, δ) -domain, denoted $\omega \in \mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon, \delta}$, if for every $x, y \in \omega$ with $|x - y| < \delta$ there exists a Lipschitz curve $\gamma \in W^{1,\infty}([0, 1]; \omega)$ with $\gamma(0) = x$, and $\gamma(1) = y$ satisfying the following two conditions:

$$\ell(\gamma) := \int_0^1 |\dot{\gamma}(s)| \, ds \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} |x - y| \quad (2.6)$$

and

$$\text{dist}(\gamma(t), \partial\omega) \geq \varepsilon \frac{|x - \gamma(t)| |\gamma(t) - y|}{|x - y|} \quad \forall t \in [0, 1]. \quad (2.7)$$

One can immediately see that these classes of domains are nicely ordered in the sense that if ω is an (ε', δ') -domain for some $\varepsilon' \geq \varepsilon$ and $\delta' \geq \delta$, then ω is also an (ε, δ) -domain. More precisely,

$$\mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon, \delta} = \bigcup_{\varepsilon' \geq \varepsilon, \delta' \geq \delta} \mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon', \delta'}.$$

2.4. States. Let $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$. We define the set of admissible states as

$$\mathcal{Q} := \left\{ (y_e, y_p) \in W^{1, q_e}(y_p(\Omega); \mathbb{R}^d) \times W^{1, q_p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) : \right. \\ \left. y_p(\Omega) \in \mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon, \delta}, \quad \int_{\Omega} y_p \, dx = 0, \quad \det \nabla y_p = 1 \text{ a.e. in } \Omega, \quad \mathcal{L}^d(\Omega) \leq \mathcal{L}^d(y_p(\Omega)) \right\}.$$

The state space \mathcal{Q} is equipped with the weak topology of $W_{\text{loc}}^{1, q_e}(y_p(\Omega); \mathbb{R}^d) \times W^{1, q_p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$. More precisely, we write that $(y_e^n, y_p^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{Q}$ converges to (y_e, y_p) in \mathcal{Q} , if

$$y_p^n \rightharpoonup y_p \text{ in } W^{1, q_p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d), \\ y_e^n \rightharpoonup y_e \text{ in } W^{1, q_e}(K; \mathbb{R}^d) \text{ for every } K \subset\subset y_p(\Omega).$$

Note that, since $W^{1, q_p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \subset\subset C^0(\bar{\Omega}; \mathbb{R}^d)$, for every $K \subset\subset y_p(\Omega)$ there exists $n_K \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $K \subset y_p^n(\Omega)$ for all $n \geq n_K$. In Section 3.1 below, we prove (sequential) closedness of \mathcal{Q} under this convergence. The constraint $y_p(\Omega) \in \mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon, \delta}$ is global in nature and is expected to be not restrictive in most practical cases.

2.5. Energy. The stored energy corresponding to the state $(y_e, y_p) \in \mathcal{Q}$ consists of three parts: an elastic energy, which is defined on the intermediate configuration $y_p(\Omega)$ and depends on the elastic strain ∇y_e , a kinematic hardening energy, depending solely on the plastic strain ∇y_p , and a soft elastic boundary condition defined on the Dirichlet boundary Γ_D . More precisely, the stored energy of the system reads

$$\mathcal{W}(y_e, y_p) = \int_{y_p(\Omega)} W_e(\nabla y_e(\xi)) \, d\xi + \int_{\Omega} W_p(\nabla y_p(x)) \, dx + \int_{\Gamma_D} |y_e(y_p(x)) - x|^2 \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x).$$

The system is driven by a time-dependent body force $f : [0, T] \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and a boundary traction $g : [0, T] \times \Gamma_N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ (provided $\Gamma_N \neq \emptyset$) which result in an external loading ℓ , and loading energy defined as

$$\langle \ell(t), y \rangle = \int_{\Omega} f(t, x) \cdot y(x) \, dx + \int_{\Gamma_N} g(t, x) \cdot y(x) \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x).$$

The total energy of the system is then given by

$$\mathcal{E}(t, y_e, y_p) = \mathcal{W}(y_e, y_p) - \langle \ell(t), y_e \circ y_p \rangle.$$

We assume the elastic energy to have q_e -growth and the plastic energy density to be *coercive*, i.e.

$$c|F_e|^{q_e} - \frac{1}{c} \leq W_e(F_e) \leq \frac{1}{c}(1 + |F_e|^{q_e}), \quad (2.8a)$$

$$c|F_p|^{q_p} - \frac{1}{c} \leq W_p(F_p) \quad (2.8b)$$

for some constant $c > 0$ and every $F_e \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, $F_p \in \text{SL}(d)$. This is combined with the structural assumption of *polyconvexity*, namely

$$W_e(F_e) = \widehat{W}_e(F_e, \text{cof } F_e, \det F_e), \quad (2.9a)$$

$$W_p(F_p) = \widehat{W}_p(F_p, \text{cof } F_p) \quad (2.9b)$$

where $\widehat{W}_e : \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\widehat{W}_p : \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are convex. We remark that the notation corresponds to space dimension $d = 3$, as the minors of a matrix are then given by determinant, cofactor, and the matrix itself. For $d = 2$ the dependence on the cofactor

matrix could be dropped and in dimensions $d > 3$ the definition of polyconvexity could be generalized by including further minors. Although not directly needed for the analysis, we may assume the energy to be frame-indifferent. This corresponds to asking the elastic energy density to satisfy the assumption $W_e(RF_e) = W_e(F_e)$ for all $R \in \text{SO}(d), F_e \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$. We further assume

$$f \in W^{1,1}(0, T; L^{(q^*)'}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)), \quad g \in W^{1,1}(0, T; L^{(q^\#)'}(\Gamma_N; \mathbb{R}^d)),$$

where q^* and $q^\#$ denote the *Sobolev exponent* and the *trace exponent*, respectively, and prime stands for conjugation [52]. Let us remark that the assumptions on q_e and q_p contribute the following lower bounds on the mentioned exponents:

$$q > d - 1, \quad q^* > d^2, \quad q^\# > d(d - 1).$$

These assumptions ensure that the loading is absolutely continuous in time, namely,

$$\ell \in W^{1,1}(0, T; (W^{1,q}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d))^*) \quad (2.10)$$

where $*$ denotes the dual space.

Remark 2.2. *Locking materials* may also be considered. These materials are characterized by a tolerance $M > 0$ and internal energy defined as above if $\|\nabla y_p\|_{L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)} \leq M$, and $\mathcal{W}(y_e, y_p) = \infty$ otherwise. This would force the plastic deformations to be (uniformly) Lipschitz continuous.

2.6. Dissipation. Following MIELKE [43–45], we define the (local) *dissipation distance* $\Delta : (\text{SL}(d))^2 \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ as

$$\Delta(F_{p0}, F_{p1}) = \inf \left\{ \int_0^1 R(P(t), \dot{P}(t)) dt : P \in C^1([0, 1]; \text{SL}(d)), P(i) = F_{pi}, \text{ for } i = 0, 1 \right\},$$

where the *dissipation potential*

$$R : \text{SL}(d) \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \rightarrow [0, \infty],$$

is convex and positively 1-homogeneous in the rate, namely,

$$R(P, \lambda \dot{P}) = \lambda R(P, \dot{P}) \quad \text{for all } \lambda \geq 0,$$

and satisfies the *plastic indifference* assumption [44]

$$R(PQ, \dot{P}Q) = R(P, \dot{P}) \quad \text{for all } Q \in \text{SL}(d).$$

These properties imply that there exists a convex, positively 1-homogeneous function $\widehat{R} : \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ such that

$$R(P, \dot{P}) = \widehat{R}(\dot{P}P^{-1}),$$

see [44] or [47, Section 4.2.1.1] and that Δ satisfies the *triangle inequality*

$$\Delta(F_{p0}, F_{p2}) \leq \Delta(F_{p0}, F_{p1}) + \Delta(F_{p1}, F_{p2}),$$

as well as

$$\Delta(F_{p0}, F_{p1}) = \Delta(I, F_{p1}F_{p0}^{-1})$$

for all $F_{pi} \in \text{SL}(d), i = 0, 1, 2$, where I is the identity matrix.

We assume the function $D : \text{SL}(d) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ defined as

$$D(F_p) := \Delta(I, F_p)$$

to be *polyconvex*. Namely, we suppose that there exists a convex function $\widehat{D} : \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ such that

$$D(F_p) = \widehat{D}(F_p, \text{cof } F_p). \quad (2.11)$$

We refer to [46, Sec. 4] for a discussion about such polyconvex dissipation potentials. Let us however mention that this is a delicate point, for a complete characterization of polyconvex functions D is presently available in the case of 2d isotropic hardening only.

Eventually, we define the (global) *dissipation distance* between plastic strain states $F_{p0}, F_{p1} : \Omega \rightarrow \text{SL}(d)$ as

$$\mathcal{D}(F_{p0}, F_{p1}) = \int_{\Omega} D(F_{p1}(x)(F_{p0}(x))^{-1}) dx$$

and the *total dissipation* of a plastic evolution $y_p : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$ from s to t as

$$\text{Diss}_{\mathcal{D}}(\nabla y_p; s, t) = \sup \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^N \mathcal{D}(\nabla y_p(t_{i-1}), \nabla y_p(t_i)) : s = t_0 < \dots < t_N = t, N \in \mathbb{N} \right\}.$$

2.7. Main results. Let a partition $\Pi = \{0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_N = T\}$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and an initial condition $(y_{e0}, y_{p0}) \in \mathcal{Q}$ be given and let $(y_{ei}, y_{pi}) \in \mathcal{Q}$, $i = 1, \dots, N$ solve the incremental minimization problem

$$(y_{ei}, y_{pi}) \in \underset{(y_e, y_p) \in \mathcal{Q}}{\text{argmin}} \left(\mathcal{E}(t_i, y_e, y_p) + \mathcal{D}(\nabla y_{p(i-1)}, \nabla y_p) \right). \quad (2.12)$$

Define the right-continuous, piecewise-constant interpolant

$$\begin{aligned} (y_e, y_p)(t) &= (y_{e(i-1)}, y_{p(i-1)}) \quad \text{for } t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i), \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \\ (y_e, y_p)(T) &= (y_{eN}, y_{pN}) \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

and set

$$y(t) = y_e(t) \circ y_p(t).$$

We refer to any such interpolation $(y_e, y_p) : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$ as to an *incremental solution*. This solution depends on the choice of minimizers in (2.12) and on the partition Π . The following definition is inspired by [12, Def. 2.12].

Definition 2.3 (Incrementally approximable solutions). We call $(y_e, y_p) : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$ an *incrementally approximable quasistatic evolution* if the following conditions are satisfied: There a sequence of partitions $(\Pi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with fineness $\max_{i=1, \dots, N(n)} (t_i^n - t_{i-1}^n)$ tending to 0 as n goes to ∞ and a corresponding sequence of incremental solutions $(y_e^n, y_p^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{Q}$, such that, along not relabeled subsequences,

$$y_p^n(t) \rightharpoonup y_p(t) \text{ in } W^{1, q_p}(\Omega), \quad (2.14a)$$

$$\text{Diss}_{\mathcal{D}}(\nabla y_p^n; 0, t) \rightarrow \delta(t), \quad (2.14b)$$

$$\text{Diss}_{\mathcal{D}}(\nabla y_p; s, t) \leq \delta(t) - \delta(s) \quad (2.14c)$$

for some nondecreasing function $\delta : [0, T] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ and for every $s, t \in [0, T]$, and for every $t \in [0, T]$ there exists a t -dependent subsequence n_k^t and $y_e(t)$ such that $(y_e^{n_k^t}(t), y_p^{n_k^t}(t))$ converges to $(y_e(t), y_p(t))$ in \mathcal{Q} . Moreover, for all $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\mathcal{E}(t, y_e^n(t), y_p^n(t)) \leq \mathcal{E}(t, \hat{y}_e, \hat{y}_p) + \mathcal{D}(\nabla y_p^n(t), \nabla \hat{y}_p) \quad \text{for all } (\hat{y}_e, \hat{y}_p) \in \mathcal{Q}, \quad (\text{S}_{\text{discr}})$$

and for every $s, t \in \Pi_n$, $s \leq t$,

$$\mathcal{E}(t, y_e^n(t), y_p^n(t)) - \mathcal{E}(s, y_e^n(s), y_p^n(s)) + \text{Diss}_{\mathcal{D}}(\nabla y_p^{n_k}; s, t) \leq - \int_s^t \langle \dot{\ell}(r), (y_e \circ y_p)(r) \rangle dr. \quad (\text{E}_{\text{discr}})$$

Theorem 2.4 (Existence of incrementally approximable solutions). *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be as in Section 2.2. Let $q_e > d$, $q_p \geq d^2$ and define \mathcal{Q} as in Section 2.4, \mathcal{E} as in Section 2.5, and \mathcal{D} as in Section 2.6. Assume $W_e : \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $W_p : \text{SL}(d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $D : \text{SL}(d) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ to be polyconvex, see (2.9) and (2.11). Moreover, let W_e satisfy the growth condition (2.8a) and*

W_p satisfy the coercivity bound (2.8b). Further, assume that ℓ fulfills regularity assumption (2.10). Let $(y_{e0}, y_{p0}) \in \mathcal{Q}$ be initial data satisfying the semistability condition at time 0, namely

$$\mathcal{E}(0, y_{e0}, y_{p0}) \leq \mathcal{E}(0, \widehat{y}_e, \widehat{y}_p) + \mathcal{D}(\nabla y_{p0}, \nabla \widehat{y}_p) \quad \text{for all } (\widehat{y}_e, \widehat{y}_p) \in \mathcal{Q}.$$

Then, there exists an incrementally approximable quasistatic evolution $(y_e, y_p) : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$ with $(y_e(0), y_p(0)) = (y_{e0}, y_{p0})$ satisfying the following properties

$$\mathcal{E}(t, y_e(t), y_p(t)) \leq \mathcal{E}(t, \widehat{y}_e, y_p(t)) \quad \text{for all } \widehat{y}_e \text{ such that } (\widehat{y}_e, y_p(t)) \in \mathcal{Q}, \quad (\text{S}_{\text{semi}})$$

$$\mathcal{E}(t, y_e(t), y_p(t)) + \delta(t) \leq \mathcal{E}(0, y_e(0), y_p(0)) - \int_0^t \langle \dot{\ell}(s), (y_e \circ y_p)(s) \rangle ds \quad (\text{E})$$

Incrementally approximable quasistatic evolutions fulfill the *semistability* condition (S_{semi}) with respect to elastic deformations, as well as an *energy inequality* (E). These properties are close to the solution concept discussed in [54] in the context of viscoplasticity but considerably weaker than the classical notion of *energetic solutions* [47]. There, the trajectory is required to be stable with respect to *both* plastic and elastic deformation and energy equality holds. We refer to [47, Chapter 3] for a detailed discussion about different solution concepts for rate-independent systems.

Despite the weakness of the solution concept, the fact that incrementally approximable solutions are indeed limits of incremental solutions guarantees that plasticity actually occurs, whenever necessary. In particular, the purely elastic evolution $\nabla y_p(t) = I$, which fulfills (S_{semi})-(E) for compatible initial data, may fail to be incrementally approximable for loadings exceeding the plastic-activation threshold.

In order to give an elementary example of this fact, we present a simplified argument, by reducing to one space dimension and to a single material point. In this frame, by choosing energy densities to be quadratic and setting all constants to 1, the incremental problem (2.12) can be recast in terms of the deformation strain $f \in \mathbb{R}$ and the plastic strain $p > 0$ (we neglect the isochoric constraint, as necessary in one space dimension) as

$$(f_i, p_i) \in \operatorname{argmin}_{f \in \mathbb{R}, p > 0} \left(\frac{1}{2} |fp^{-1}|^2 + \frac{1}{2} p^2 - \ell(t_i) f + |\log p - \log p_{i-1}| \right) \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, N$$

where the initial values (f_0, p_0) with $p_0 = 1$ and the loading $\ell(t_i) = \lambda t_i$ for $\lambda > 0$ are given. One can prove that $p_i = 1$ as long as $|\lambda t_i| \leq 1$. In particular, all incrementally approximable solutions will be such that $p(t) \neq 1$ for $|\ell(t)| > 1$. In this case, the purely elastic solution $p(t) = 1$ is not incrementally approximable.

3. PROOFS

The proof of Theorem 2.4 is detailed along the whole section and consist of several parts. In Subsection 3.1 we discuss the closure of the state space \mathcal{Q} . In Subsection 3.2 we show the existence of incrementally approximable solutions. In Subsections 3.3-3.4 the validity of energy inequality (E) and semistability (S_{semi}) is checked by passing the corresponding approximate properties of the incremental scheme to the limit.

3.1. Closedness of the state space. Consider a sequence $(y_e^n, y_p^n) \in \mathcal{Q}$ converging to (y_e, y_p) in \mathcal{Q} in the sense of Subsection 2.4. Then $y_p^n \rightharpoonup y_p$ in $W^{1, q_p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ implies the weak convergence of $\det \nabla y_p^n$ to $\det \nabla y_p$ in $L^{q_p/d}(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$. Hence $\det \nabla y_p = 1$ almost everywhere and $\mathcal{L}^d(\Omega) \leq \mathcal{L}^d(y_p(\Omega))$ by [9]. Moreover, strong convergence in $L^{q_p}(\Omega)$ implies $\int_{\Omega} y_p(x) dx = 0$. The fact that $y_p(\Omega) \in \mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon, \delta}$ follows from Lemmas 3.1-3.2 below. In Lemma 3.1 we show the set

convergence (2.5) by exploiting the fact that the plastic deformations are homeomorphisms, see Subsection 2.2. In Lemma 3.2 we show that $\mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ is closed under this convergence.

Lemma 3.1 (Hausdorff convergence of intermediate configurations). *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be open and bounded. Let $y, y_n \in C^0(\overline{\Omega}; \mathbb{R}^d)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, be such that y_n converges to y uniformly on $\overline{\Omega}$ and $y|_{\Omega} : \Omega \rightarrow y(\Omega), y_n|_{\Omega} : \Omega \rightarrow y_n(\Omega)$ are homeomorphisms for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then*

$$d_{\text{H}}(\overline{y_n(\Omega)}, \overline{y(\Omega)}) \rightarrow 0, \quad d_{\text{H}}(\partial y_n(\Omega), \partial y(\Omega)) \rightarrow 0$$

as n tends to ∞ .

Proof of Lemma 3.1. By uniform convergence, we get that $d_{\text{H}}(y_n(\overline{\Omega}), y(\overline{\Omega}))$ and $d_{\text{H}}(y_n(\partial\Omega), y(\partial\Omega))$ tend to 0. One is left to show that $y(\overline{\Omega}) = \overline{y(\Omega)}$ and $y(\partial\Omega) = \partial y(\Omega)$.

Ad $y(\overline{\Omega}) = \overline{y(\Omega)}$: we observe that, by continuity of y and compactness of $\overline{\Omega}$, the set $y(\overline{\Omega})$ is closed. Therefore $\overline{y(\Omega)} \subset y(\overline{\Omega})$. In order to check the opposite inclusion, let $z \in y(\overline{\Omega})$ and choose $x \in y^{-1}(z) \subset \overline{\Omega}$ and $x_n \in \Omega$ converging to x . Then, $y(x_n) \in y(\Omega)$ and by the continuity of y up to the boundary, $y(x_n)$ converges to $y(x)$, showing that $z = y(x) \in \overline{y(\Omega)}$.

Ad $y(\partial\Omega) = \partial y(\Omega)$: we use the fact that, as y is a homeomorphism, the set $y(\Omega)$ is open. Thus, $\partial y(\Omega) = y(\overline{\Omega}) \setminus y(\Omega)$. We claim that $y(\overline{\Omega}) \setminus y(\Omega) = y(\partial\Omega)$. Indeed, if $z \in y(\Omega)$, then there exists an open neighborhood U of z such that $U \subset y(\Omega)$. Since y is a homeomorphism, $V = y^{-1}(U)$ is an open neighborhood of $y^{-1}(z)$ such that $V \subset \Omega$, implying that $y^{-1}(z) \notin \partial\Omega$, i.e. $z \notin y(\partial\Omega)$. This shows $y(\overline{\Omega}) \setminus y(\Omega) \supset y(\partial\Omega)$. On the other hand, $y(\overline{\Omega}) \setminus y(\Omega) \subset y(\overline{\Omega} \setminus \Omega) = y(\partial\Omega)$. This concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 3.2 (Closedness of $\mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ under Hausdorff convergence). *Let $\omega_n \in \mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ converge to ω in the sense that*

$$d_{\text{H}}(\overline{\omega}, \overline{\omega_n}) \rightarrow 0 \tag{3.1}$$

and

$$d_{\text{H}}(\partial\omega, \partial\omega_n) \rightarrow 0 \tag{3.2}$$

as n tends to ∞ . Then $\omega \in \mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon,\delta}$.

Proof of Lemma 3.2. Let $x, y \in \omega$ with $|x - y| < \delta$. By convergence (3.1), for every $\nu > 0$ there exists $N_\nu \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq N_\nu$ we have $\omega \subset \overline{\omega} \subset B_\nu(\overline{\omega_n}) = B_\nu(\omega_n)$. Therefore, we can choose a (not relabeled) subsequence and $x_n, y_n \in \omega_n$ such that x_n and y_n converge to x and y , respectively, and $|x_n - y_n| < \delta$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We now use the assumption that $\omega_n \in \mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ and find $\gamma_n \in W^{1,\infty}([0, 1]; \omega_n)$ such that $\gamma_n(0) = x_n, \gamma_n(1) = y_n$,

$$\ell(\gamma_n) \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} |x_n - y_n| < \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}, \tag{3.3}$$

and

$$\text{dist}(\gamma_n(t), \partial\omega_n) \geq \varepsilon \frac{|x_n - \gamma_n(t)| |\gamma_n(t) - y_n|}{|x_n - y_n|} \quad \forall t \in [0, 1]. \tag{3.4}$$

Set $L := \delta/\varepsilon$. From condition (3.3) we see that $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \ell(\gamma_n) \leq L$. Now consider the parametrizations by arclength with constant extension at the endpoint denoted by $\tilde{\gamma}_n : [0, L] \rightarrow \omega_n$. By definition, these satisfy

$$|\dot{\tilde{\gamma}}_n(s)| = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } s \in [0, \ell(\gamma_n)], \\ 0, & \text{if } s \in (\ell(\gamma_n), L]. \end{cases}$$

We use the Arzelà-Ascoli Theorem to extract a (not relabeled) subsequence and find $\tilde{\gamma} \in W^{1,\infty}([0, L]; \bar{\omega})$ such that

$$\dot{\tilde{\gamma}}_n \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \dot{\tilde{\gamma}} \quad \text{in } L^\infty(0, L), \quad (3.5)$$

$$\tilde{\gamma}_n \rightarrow \tilde{\gamma} \quad \text{in } C^0([0, L]). \quad (3.6)$$

Define now $\gamma(t) := \tilde{\gamma}(t/L)$. Then $\gamma \in W^{1,\infty}([0, 1]; \bar{\omega})$ and by weak lower-semicontinuity we get

$$\ell(\gamma) = \int_0^L |\dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(s)| ds \stackrel{(3.5)}{\leq} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^L |\dot{\tilde{\gamma}}_n(s)| ds = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \ell(\gamma_n) \stackrel{(3.3)}{\leq} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |x_n - y_n| = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} |x - y|.$$

Notice that, as soon as we prove condition (2.7), $\gamma([0, 1]) \subset \omega$ follows. In order to show (2.7), we fix $s \in [0, L]$. By compactness of the boundary $\partial\omega$ we can choose $z \in \partial\omega$ such that

$$\text{dist}(\tilde{\gamma}(s), \partial\omega) = |\tilde{\gamma}(s) - z|. \quad (3.7)$$

We further choose $z_n \in \partial\omega_n$ such that

$$|z_n - z| \leq d_H(\partial\omega, \partial\omega_n)$$

for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, by the triangle inequality

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{\gamma}(s) - z| &\geq |\tilde{\gamma}_n(s) - z_n| - |\tilde{\gamma}(s) - \tilde{\gamma}_n(s)| - |z_n - z| \\ &\geq \text{dist}(\tilde{\gamma}_n(s), \partial\omega_n) - \|\tilde{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}_n\|_{C^0([0,1])} - d_H(\partial\omega, \partial\omega_n). \end{aligned}$$

Using assumption (3.2), condition (3.4), and convergence (3.6), we deduce that

$$|\tilde{\gamma}(s) - z| \geq \varepsilon \frac{|x_n - \tilde{\gamma}_n(s)| |\tilde{\gamma}_n(s) - y_n|}{|x_n - y_n|}.$$

Passage to the limit on the right-hand side concludes the proof of (2.7). \square

3.2. Existence of incremental solutions. In the following $C > 0$ denotes a positive real constant which may change from line to line, whereas $c > 0$ denotes the constant used in assumptions (2.8a)-(2.8b). For the purpose of readability, we abbreviate $\|f\|_{L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)}$ by $\|f\|_{L^p(\Omega)}$ and $\|g\|_{L^p(\Gamma_D; \mathbb{R}^d)}$ by $\|g\|_{L^p(\Gamma_D)}$.

Let $\Pi = \{0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_N = T\}$ be a partition of $[0, T]$. Given $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ and $(y_{e(i-1)}, y_{p(i-1)}) \in \mathcal{Q}$ we aim at proving that minimizers of the *incremental problem*

$$(y_{ei}, y_{pi}) \in \underset{(y_e, y_p) \in \mathcal{Q}}{\text{argmin}} \left(\mathcal{E}(t_i, y_e, y_p) + \mathcal{D}(\nabla y_{p(i-1)}, \nabla y_p) \right) \quad (3.8)$$

exist.

We follow the Direct Method of the Calculus of Variations: Let $(y_e^n, y_p^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{Q}$ be an infimizing sequence for (3.8). Here, we use that \mathcal{Q} is non-empty, since $(T^{-1}, T) \in \mathcal{Q}$, where $T(x) = x - \bar{x}$ is a translation and \bar{x} is the barycenter of Ω . As \mathcal{D} is nonnegative, we can assume without loss of generality that $\mathcal{E}(t_i, y_e^n, y_p^n) \leq C$. We aim at showing the following compactness result:

$$\mathcal{E}(t_i, y_e^n, y_p^n) \leq C \implies (y_e^n, y_p^n) \rightarrow (y_e, y_p) \text{ in } \mathcal{Q} \quad (3.9)$$

along a not relabeled subsequence. Indeed, the energy bound $\mathcal{E}(t_i, y_e^n, y_p^n) \leq C$ together with the growth assumption (2.8a) and the coercivity (2.8b) entails

$$c \|\nabla y_e^n\|_{L^{q_e}(y_p^n(\Omega))}^{q_e} + \|\nabla y_p^n\|_{L^{q_p}(\Omega)}^{q_p} + c \|y_e^n \circ y_p^n - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\Gamma_D)}^2 \leq C + \langle \ell(t), y_e^n \circ y_p^n \rangle.$$

By the regularity assumption (2.10) and the chain rule estimate (2.4), we can bound

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \ell(t), y_e^n \circ y_p^n \rangle| &\leq \|\ell(t)\|_{(W^{1,q}(\Omega))^*} \|y_e^n \circ y_p^n\|_{W^{1,q}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C \|\nabla y_e^n\|_{L^{q_e}(y_p^n(\Omega))} \|\nabla y_p^n\|_{L^{q_p}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \frac{C}{2} \|\nabla y_e^n\|_{L^{q_e}(y_p^n(\Omega))}^{q_e} + \frac{C}{2} \|\nabla y_p^n\|_{L^{q_p}(\Omega)}^{q_p} + C \end{aligned}$$

and conclude that

$$\|\nabla y_e^n\|_{L^{q_e}(y_p^n(\Omega))}^{q_e} + \|\nabla y_p^n\|_{L^{q_p}(\Omega)}^{q_p} + \|y_e^n \circ y_p^n - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\Gamma_D)}^2 \leq C. \quad (3.10)$$

Since y_p^n has zero mean, the Poincaré-Wirtinger inequality implies that y_p^n is bounded in $W^{1,q_p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$. On the other hand $y^n := y_e^n \circ y_p^n$ is subject to the elastic Dirichlet boundary condition on Γ_D and we have the following result.

Lemma 3.3 (Generalized Poincaré inequality). *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be as in Section 2.2 and $q \geq 1$. Then, there exists a constant $C_{\text{Poincaré}} > 0$ such that*

$$\|y\|_{W^{1,q}(\Omega)} \leq C_{\text{Poincaré}} \left(\|\nabla y\|_{L^q(\Omega)} + \|y - \text{id}\|_{L^1(\Gamma_D)} \right)$$

for every $y \in W^{1,q}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$.

Proof of Lemma 3.3. We argue by contradiction. Let the sequence $(y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset W^{1,q}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ be such that

$$\|\nabla y_k\|_{L^q(\Omega)} + \|y_k - \text{id}\|_{L^1(\Gamma_D)} < \frac{1}{k} \|y_k\|_{L^q(\Omega)}. \quad (3.11)$$

We claim that $\|y_k\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \rightarrow \infty$. If this would not be the case, we would have $\|y_k\|_{W^{1,q}(\Omega)} \leq C$ and can pick a (not relabeled) subsequence y_k converging to y weakly in $W^{1,q}(\Omega)$. By the trace theorem, the traces would also converge strongly in $L^1(\partial\Omega)$. Moreover, by (3.11),

$$\|\nabla y\|_{L^q(\Omega)} + \|y - \text{id}\|_{L^1(\Gamma_D)} \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(\|\nabla y_k\|_{L^q(\Omega)} + \|y_k - \text{id}\|_{L^1(\Gamma_D)} \right) = 0.$$

This would imply $\nabla y = 0$ in Ω and $y = \text{id}$ on Γ_D . A contradiction. Hence $\|y_k\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \rightarrow \infty$. We now rescale the sequence by setting

$$w_k := \frac{y_k}{\|y_k\|_{L^q(\Omega)}}$$

and note that

$$\|w_k\|_{L^q(\Omega)} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\nabla w_k\|_{L^q(\Omega)} + \|w_k - \lambda_k \text{id}\|_{L^1(\Gamma_D)} < \frac{1}{k}$$

where $\lambda_k = \|y_k\|_{L^q(\Omega)}^{-1}$ tends to 0. Then, we choose a (not relabeled) subsequence w_k converging to some w weakly in $W^{1,q}(\Omega)$, strongly in $L^q(\Omega)$, and such that the traces converge strongly in $L^1(\partial\Omega)$. This leads to $\nabla w = 0$ in Ω and $w = 0$ on Γ_D . Since Ω is connected, this forces $w = 0$ in Ω and contradicts the fact that $\|w\|_{L^q(\Omega)} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|w_k\|_{L^q(\Omega)} = 1$. \square

We use Lemma 3.3 in combination with the chain rule (2.3) and Hölder's inequality to estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|y^n\|_{W^{1,q}(\Omega)}^q &\leq C \left(\|\nabla y_e^n\|_{L^{q_e}(y_p^n(\Omega))}^{q_e} + \|\nabla y_p^n\|_{L^{q_p}(\Omega)}^{q_p} + \|y_e^n \circ y_p^n - \text{id}\|_{L^1(\Gamma_D)}^q \right) \\ &\leq C \left(\|\nabla y_e^n\|_{L^{q_e}(y_p^n(\Omega))}^{q_e} + \|\nabla y_p^n\|_{L^{q_p}(\Omega)}^{q_p} + |\Gamma_D|^{q/2} \|y_e^n \circ y_p^n - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\Gamma_D)}^q \right) \\ &\stackrel{(3.10)}{\leq} C. \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

We further remark that $W^{1,q}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ embeds into $L^{q^*}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ with $q^* > q_e$. This leads to

$$\|y_e^n\|_{L^{q_e}(y_p^n(\Omega))} = \|y^n\|_{L^{q_e}(\Omega)} \leq C \|y^n\|_{W^{1,q}(\Omega)} \leq C.$$

Altogether, we conclude that

$$\|y^n\|_{W^{1,q}(\Omega)} + \|y_e^n\|_{W^{1,q_e}(y_p^n(\Omega))} + \|y_p^n\|_{W^{1,q_p}(\Omega)} \leq C.$$

This bound implies that there exists a (not relabeled) subsequence such that (y_e^n, y_p^n) converges to (y_e, y_p) in \mathcal{Q} which concludes the proof of (3.9).

In Section 3.1 we have seen that \mathcal{Q} is closed under this convergence, consequently $(y_e, y_p) \in \mathcal{Q}$. Furthermore, by the continuity of the trace operator, we have $y^n \rightarrow y$ strongly in $L^{q^\#}(\partial\Omega)$, where $q^\# > d(d-1) \geq 2$. This yields

$$\int_{\Gamma_D} |y(x) - x|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Gamma_D} |y^n(x) - x|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x). \quad (3.13)$$

By the weak continuity of the loading term, we have that $\langle \ell(t_i), y^n \rangle$ converges to $\langle \ell(t_i), y \rangle$. The weak continuity of the minors entails that $\text{cof } \nabla y_p^n \rightharpoonup \text{cof } \nabla y_p$ in $L^{q_p/(d-1)}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$. In combination with polyconvexity (2.9b), we deduce

$$\int_{\Omega} W_p(\nabla y_p(x)) dx \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} W_p(\nabla y_p^n(x)) dx. \quad (3.14)$$

For every fixed $K \subset\subset y_p(\Omega)$, again by weak continuity of the minors (recall that $q_e > d$) and polyconvexity (2.9a), we have

$$\int_K W_{el}(\nabla y_e(\xi)) d\xi \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{y_p^n(\Omega)} W_{el}(\nabla y_e^n(\xi)) d\xi. \quad (3.15)$$

Letting K tend to $y_p(\Omega)$ in (3.15), together with (3.13) and (3.14) we have shown lower semi-continuity of the energy, namely

$$\mathcal{E}(t_i, y_e, y_p) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}(t_i, y_e^n, y_p^n). \quad (3.16)$$

In a similar way, using polyconvexity of D (2.11), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}(\nabla y_{p(i-1)}, \nabla y_p) &= \int_{\Omega} D(\nabla y_p(\nabla y_{p(i-1)})^{-1}) dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \widehat{D}(\nabla y_p(\nabla y_{p(i-1)})^{-1}, \text{cof } (\nabla y_p(\nabla y_{p(i-1)})^{-1})) dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \widehat{D}(\nabla y_p(\nabla y_{p(i-1)})^{-1}, \text{cof } (\nabla y_p) \text{cof } (\nabla y_{p(i-1)})^{-1}) dx \\ &\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} \widehat{D}(\nabla y_p^n(\nabla y_{p(i-1)})^{-1}, \text{cof } (\nabla y_p^n) \text{cof } (\nabla y_{p(i-1)})^{-1}) dx \\ &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{D}(\nabla y_{p(i-1)}, \nabla y_p^n), \end{aligned}$$

where we also used the fact that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cof } (\nabla y_p^n) \text{cof } (\nabla y_{p(i-1)})^{-1} &= \text{cof } (\nabla y_p^n) \nabla y_{p(i-1)}^T \\ &\rightharpoonup \text{cof } (\nabla y_p) \nabla y_{p(i-1)}^T = \text{cof } (\nabla y_p) \text{cof } (\nabla y_{p(i-1)})^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

in $L^{q_p/d}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{d \times d})$. This shows that (y_e, y_p) is a minimizer of (3.8).

The discrete stability condition (S_{discr}) can be deduced easily by testing (3.8) with a competitor $(\widehat{y}_e, \widehat{y}_p) \in \mathcal{Q}$ and using the triangle inequality for \mathcal{D} . The discrete energy inequality (E_{discr}) is shown below in (3.17).

3.3. Energy inequality. Take a sequence of partitions $\Pi_n = \{0 = t_0^n < t_1^n < \dots < t_{N(n)}^n = T\}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, with fineness $\max_{i=1, \dots, N(n)}(t_i^n - t_{i-1}^n)$ tending to 0 as n goes to ∞ . For fixed n we iteratively choose $(y_{ei}^n, y_{pi}^n) \in \mathcal{Q}$, $i = 1, \dots, N(n)$, solving the incremental minimization problem (3.8), consider the right-continuous, piecewise constant approximation as in (2.13), and set

$$y^n(t) = y_e^n(t) \circ y_p^n(t).$$

Testing (3.8) against $(y_{e(i-1)}^n, y_{p(i-1)}^n)$, we get

$$\mathcal{E}(t_i^n, y_{ei}^n, y_{pi}^n) - \mathcal{E}(t_{i-1}^n, y_{e(i-1)}^n, y_{p(i-1)}^n) + \mathcal{D}(\nabla y_{p(i-1)}^n, \nabla y_{pi}^n) \leq - \int_{t_{i-1}^n}^{t_i^n} \partial_t \mathcal{E}(s, y_{e(i-1)}^n, y_{p(i-1)}^n) ds.$$

Summing over i , we arrive at

$$\mathcal{E}(t_k^n, y_{ek}^n, y_{pk}^n) - \mathcal{E}(t_j^n, y_{ej}^n, y_{pj}^n) + \text{Diss}_{\mathcal{D}}(\nabla y_p^n; t_j^n, t_k^n) \leq - \int_{t_j^n}^{t_k^n} \partial_t \mathcal{E}(s, y^n(s)) ds \quad (3.17)$$

for every $0 \leq j \leq k \leq N(n)$. We estimate the right-hand side by

$$|\partial_t \mathcal{E}(s, y^n(s))| \leq \zeta(s) \|y^n(s)\|_{W^{1,q}(\Omega)},$$

where $\zeta(s) := \|\dot{\ell}(s)\|_{W^{1,q}(\Omega)^*}$, by assumption (2.10), is integrable. By estimate (3.12) and assumptions (2.8a)-(2.8b), we have

$$\|y^n(s)\|_{W^{1,q}(\Omega)} \leq C(1 + \mathcal{E}(s, y_e^n(s), y_p^n(s))).$$

Therefore, altogether

$$\mathcal{E}(t, y_e^n(t), y_p^n(t)) - \mathcal{E}(s, y_e^n(s), y_p^n(s)) + \text{Diss}_{\mathcal{D}}(\nabla y_p^n; s, t) \leq C \int_s^t \zeta(r)(1 + \mathcal{E}(r, y^n(r))) dr$$

for every $s, t \in \Pi_n$, $s \leq t$. By virtue of Gronwall's inequality, using the integrability of ρ , we find

$$\sup_{t \in \Pi_n} \mathcal{E}(t, y_e^n(t), y_p^n(t)) \leq C.$$

Since \mathcal{E} is absolutely continuous in time and the approximate solution (y_e^n, y_p^n) is piecewise constant, we deduce

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathcal{E}(t, y_e^n(t), y_p^n(t)) + \text{Diss}_{\mathcal{D}}(\nabla y_p^n; 0, T) \leq C. \quad (3.18)$$

We now prepare an intermediate result.

Lemma 3.4 (Lower-semicontinuity of \mathcal{D} in both arguments). *Let $y_p^n \rightharpoonup y_p$ and $y_{p0}^n \rightharpoonup y_{p0}$ in $W^{1,q_p}(\Omega)$ with $q_p \geq d^2$ such that $\det \nabla y_{p0}^n = 1$ a.e. and $|\Omega| \leq |y_{p0}^n(\Omega)|$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then,*

$$\mathcal{D}(\nabla y_{p0}, \nabla y_p) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{D}(\nabla y_{p0}^n, \nabla y_p^n).$$

Proof of Lemma 3.4. We rely on the assumption $q_p \geq d^2$ and define

$$v^n = y_p^n \circ (y_{p0}^n)^{-1},$$

where the global inverse $(y_{p0}^n)^{-1}$ is bounded in $W^{1, q_p/(d-1)}(y_{p0}^n(\Omega))$, since we have that $(\nabla y_{p0}^n)^{-1} = (\text{cof } \nabla y_{p0}^n)^T$. We rewrite

$$\mathcal{D}(\nabla y_{p0}^n, \nabla y_p^n) = \int_{y_{p0}^n(\Omega)} D(\nabla v^n(\xi)) d\xi$$

and estimate

$$\|v^n\|_{L^{q_p/d}(y_{p0}^n(\Omega))} = \|y_p^n\|_{L^{q_p/d}(\Omega)} \leq |\Omega|^{(d-1)/q_p} \|y_p^n\|_{L^{q_p}(\Omega)} \leq C, \quad (3.19a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla v^n\|_{L^{q_p/d}(y_{p0}^n(\Omega))} &= \|\nabla y_p^n (\nabla y_{p0}^n)^{-1}\|_{L^{q_p/d}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \|\nabla y_p^n\|_{L^{q_p}(\Omega)} \|\operatorname{cof} \nabla y_{p0}^n\|_{L^{q_p/(d-1)}(\Omega)} \leq C. \end{aligned} \quad (3.19b)$$

Let K be a compact subset of $y_{p0}(\Omega)$. Since $y_{p0}^n \rightarrow y_{p0}$ uniformly in $\bar{\Omega}$, there exists $n_K \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq n_K$, we have $K \subset y_{p0}^n(\Omega)$. Using estimates (3.19), we choose a (not relabeled) subsequence such that

$$v^n \rightharpoonup v \quad \text{in } W^{1,q_p/d}(K),$$

where $v = y_p \circ y_{p0}^{-1}$ on K . As $q_p/d \geq d$, we conclude, by using the polyconvexity of D and the weak continuity of the minors of ∇v , that

$$\int_K D(\nabla v(\xi)) \, d\xi \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_K D(\nabla v^n(\xi)) \, d\xi \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{y_{p0}^n(\Omega)} D(\nabla v^n(\xi)) \, d\xi.$$

Now it suffices to consider an increasing sequence of compact subsets exhausting $y_{p0}(\Omega)$. By further extracting a diagonal sequence, we get that $y_p = v \circ y_{p0}$ on Ω and the statement follows. \square

We proceed with the proof of the energy inequality by noting that (3.18) together with Lemma 3.4 allows us to use Helly's Selection Principle [47, Thm. B.5.13]. Namely, there exists a subsequence $(n_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, a function $y_p : [0, T] \rightarrow W^{1,q_p}(\Omega)$, and a nondecreasing function $\delta : [0, T] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that

$$y_p^{n_k}(t) \rightharpoonup y_p(t) \quad \text{in } W^{1,q_p}(\Omega), \quad (3.20a)$$

$$\operatorname{Diss}_{\mathcal{D}}(\nabla y_p^{n_k}; 0, t) \rightarrow \delta(t), \quad (3.20b)$$

$$\operatorname{Diss}_{\mathcal{D}}(\nabla y_p; s, t) \leq \delta(t) - \delta(s) \quad (3.20c)$$

for every $s, t \in [0, T]$. By defining $\theta_n(s) := -\langle \dot{\ell}(s), y^n(s) \rangle$ and observing that θ_n is equiintegrable, we can use the Dunford-Pettis Theorem (see [15] or [47, Theorem B.3.8]) to extract a further (not relabeled) subsequence satisfying

$$\theta_{n_k} \rightharpoonup \theta \quad \text{in } L^1(0, T). \quad (3.21)$$

Fix now some $t \in [0, T]$ and define

$$\tau^n := \min\{\tau \in \Pi_n : \tau \geq t\}$$

such that $\tau^n \geq t, \tau^n \rightarrow t$. We can directly pass to the lim inf in the dissipation

$$\delta(t) \stackrel{(3.20b)}{=} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \operatorname{Diss}_{\mathcal{D}}(\nabla y_p^{n_k}; 0, t) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \operatorname{Diss}_{\mathcal{D}}(\nabla y_p^{n_k}; 0, \tau^{n_k}).$$

Moreover, by the energy bound (3.18), we can follow the argument leading to (3.9) and choose a t -dependent subsequence $(N_k^t)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of $(n_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $(y_e^{N_k^t}(t), y_p^{N_k^t}(t))$ converges to $(y_e(t), y_p(t))$ in \mathcal{Q} and $y^n(t) \rightharpoonup y_e(t) \circ y_p(t) =: y(t)$ in $W^{1,q}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$. Additionally, by extracting a further subsequence, we guarantee that

$$\theta^{N_k^t}(t) \rightarrow \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \theta^{n_k}(t) := \theta_{\sup}(t).$$

Since $y^{N_k^t}(t) \rightharpoonup y(t)$ in $W^{1,q}(\Omega)$, it easily follows that

$$\theta_{\text{sup}}(t) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \theta^{N_k^t}(t) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \langle \dot{\ell}(t), y^{N_k^t}(t) \rangle = \langle \dot{\ell}(t), y(t) \rangle.$$

Furthermore,

$$\mathcal{E}(t, y_e(t), y_p(t)) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}(\tau^{N_k^t}, y_e^{N_k^t}(t), y_p^{N_k^t}(t)),$$

see the discussion in Section 3.2 leading to (3.16) and notice that $(y_e^n, y_p^n)(t) = (y_e^n, y_p^n)(\tau^n)$. At this point, we can pass to the lim sup on the right-hand side of inequality (3.17), using convergence (3.21) and $\theta \leq \theta_{\text{sup}}$. As the energy is continuous in t , we conclude that

$$\mathcal{E}(t, y_e(t), y_p(t)) - \mathcal{E}(0, y_{e0}, y_{p0}) + \delta(t) \leq - \int_0^t \langle \dot{\ell}(s), y(s) \rangle ds$$

as desired.

3.4. Semistability. In this section, we prove the semistability condition (S_{semi}). Fix $t \in [0, T]$ and define τ^n as above. Let $(y_e^n(t), y_p^n(t))$ be the right-continuous approximation defined in (2.13) and note that $(y_e^n, y_p^n)(t) = (y_e^n, y_p^n)(\tau^n)$. By testing the minimum in (3.8) at time τ^n against competitors $(\widehat{y}_e^n, y_p^n(t))$ having the same plastic component, we get the following *discrete* semistability:

$$\mathcal{E}(\tau_n, y_e^n(t), y_p^n(t)) \leq \mathcal{E}(\tau_n, \widehat{y}_e^n, y_p^n(t)) \quad (3.22)$$

for every \widehat{y}_e^n satisfying $(\widehat{y}_e^n, y_p^n(t)) \in \mathcal{Q}$. By following the discussion of Subsections 3.2-3.3, we can choose a (not relabeled) subsequence such that $(y_e^n(t), y_p^n(t)) \rightarrow (y_e(t), y_p(t))$ in \mathcal{Q} . Note that this subsequence may be t -dependent as in Section 3.3. We aim at showing the corresponding *limit* semistability:

$$\mathcal{E}(t, y_e(t), y_p(t)) \leq \mathcal{E}(t, \widehat{y}_e, y_p(t)) \quad (3.23)$$

for every \widehat{y}_e satisfying $(\widehat{y}_e, y_p(t)) \in \mathcal{Q}$. This is done by passing to the limit in (3.22) with a suitable recovery sequence in the spirit of [49].

Lemma 3.5 (Existence of recovery sequences). *Let $(y_e^n, y_p^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{Q}$ converge to (y_e, y_p) in \mathcal{Q} . Then, for every \widehat{y}_e with $(\widehat{y}_e, y_p) \in \mathcal{Q}$ there exists a sequence \widehat{y}_e^n with $(\widehat{y}_e^n, y_p^n) \in \mathcal{Q}$ satisfying*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\mathcal{E}(\tau_n, \widehat{y}_e^n, y_p^n) - \mathcal{E}(\tau_n, y_e^n, y_p^n) \right) \leq \mathcal{E}(t, \widehat{y}_e, y_p) - \mathcal{E}(t, y_e, y_p). \quad (3.24)$$

Proof of Lemma 3.5. Let \widehat{y}_e be such that $(\widehat{y}_e, y_p) \in \mathcal{Q}$. As the energy \mathcal{E} is absolutely continuous with respect to time (2.10), relation (3.24) follows as soon as we find \widehat{y}_e^n with $(\widehat{y}_e^n, y_p^n) \in \mathcal{Q}$ satisfying

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\mathcal{E}(t, \widehat{y}_e^n, y_p^n) - \mathcal{E}(t, y_e^n, y_p^n) \right) \leq \mathcal{E}(t, \widehat{y}_e, y_p) - \mathcal{E}(t, y_e, y_p) \quad (3.25)$$

where now time is fixed.

In order to check for (3.25), due to the cancellation of the kinematic hardening energy W_p and the weak lower-semicontinuity (3.16), it suffices to show that there exists a sequence $(\widehat{y}_e^n, y_p^n) \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{y_p^n(\Omega)} W_e(\nabla \widehat{y}_e^n(\xi)) d\xi \leq \int_{y_p(\Omega)} W_e(\nabla \widehat{y}_e(\xi)) d\xi \quad (3.26)$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Gamma_D} |\widehat{y}_e^n(y_p^n(x)) - x|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) = \int_{\Gamma_D} |\widehat{y}_e(y_p(x)) - x|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x). \quad (3.27)$$

We may assume without loss of generality that

$$\int_{y_p(\Omega)} W_e(\nabla \widehat{y}_e(\xi)) \, d\xi < \infty.$$

In particular, $\widehat{y}_e \in W^{1,q_e}(y_p(\Omega); \mathbb{R}^d)$ by the growth assumption (2.8a). To define the recovery sequence \widehat{y}_e^n we use the fact that $y_p(\Omega) \in \mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon,\delta}$. By the extension property of (ε, δ) -domains, there exists a bounded linear operator

$$E : W^{1,q_e}(y_p(\Omega); \mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow W^{1,q_e}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d) \quad (3.28)$$

such that $Eu = u$ in $y_p(\Omega)$, and a constant C solely depending on ε, δ, q_e , and d such that

$$\|Eu\|_{W^{1,q_e}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C\|u\|_{W^{1,q_e}(y_p(\Omega))} \quad (3.29)$$

for every $u \in W^{1,q_e}(y_p(\Omega); \mathbb{R}^d)$ [31, Theorem 1].

Set now

$$\widehat{y}_e^n := E\widehat{y}_e|_{y_p^n(\Omega)}$$

and note that this test is admissible, namely $(\widehat{y}_e^n, y_p^n) \in \mathcal{Q}$. Then, we split

$$\int_{y_p^n(\Omega)} W_e(\nabla \widehat{y}_e^n(\xi)) \, d\xi = \int_{y_p^n(\Omega) \cap y_p(\Omega)} W_e(\nabla \widehat{y}_e(\xi)) \, d\xi + \int_{y_p^n(\Omega) \setminus y_p(\Omega)} W_e(\nabla(E\widehat{y}_e)(\xi)) \, d\xi.$$

We use the growth condition (2.8a) to control

$$\left| \int_{y_p^n(\Omega) \setminus y_p(\Omega)} W_e(\nabla(E\widehat{y}_e)(\xi)) \, d\xi \right| \leq \frac{1}{c} \int_{y_p^n(\Omega) \setminus y_p(\Omega)} (1 + |\nabla(E\widehat{y}_e)(\xi)|^{q_e}) \, d\xi \quad (3.30)$$

and use the convergence $\mathcal{L}^d(y_p^n(\Omega) \setminus y_p(\Omega)) \rightarrow 0$ as well as $E\widehat{y}_e \in W^{1,q_e}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$, by bound (3.29), to deduce the convergence to 0 of the right-hand side of (3.30). Since $y_p^n \rightarrow y_p$ uniformly in $\overline{\Omega}$, we have $\mathcal{L}^d(y_p^n(\Omega) \Delta y_p(\Omega)) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where Δ denotes the symmetric difference. Thus,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{y_p^n(\Omega) \cap y_p(\Omega)} W_e(\nabla \widehat{y}_e(\xi)) \, d\xi = \int_{y_p(\Omega)} W_e(\nabla \widehat{y}_e(\xi)) \, d\xi.$$

This proves inequality (3.26) and we are left with checking the convergence (3.27). Observe that by the chain rule (2.3)-(2.4) and the boundedness of the extension (3.29), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{y}_e^n \circ y_p^n\|_{L^q(\Omega)} &= \|E\widehat{y}_e\|_{L^q(y_p^n(\Omega))} \leq |y_p^n(\Omega)|^{1/q_p} \|E\widehat{y}_e\|_{L^{q_e}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C, \\ \|\nabla(\widehat{y}_e^n \circ y_p^n)\|_{L^q(\Omega)} &\leq \|\nabla E\widehat{y}_e\|_{L^{q_e}(y_p^n(\Omega))} \|\nabla y_p^n\|_{L^{q_p}(\Omega)} \leq C. \end{aligned}$$

The latter shows that $\widehat{y}_e^n \circ y_p^n$ is bounded in $W^{1,q}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$. Moreover, we know that y_p^n converges uniformly to y_p on $\overline{\Omega}$. Hence we can choose a (not relabeled) subsequence such that $E\widehat{y}_e \circ y_p^n \rightarrow \widehat{y}_e \circ y_p$ in $W^{1,q}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$. This implies that $E\widehat{y}_e \circ y_p^n \rightarrow \widehat{y}_e \circ y_p$ in $L^{q^\#}(\partial\Omega)$ with $q^\# > d(d-1) \geq 2$, so that the convergence

$$\int_{\Gamma_D} |E\widehat{y}_e(y_p^n(x)) - x|^2 \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \rightarrow \int_{\Gamma_D} |\widehat{y}_e(y_p(x)) - x|^2 \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x)$$

holds. \square

By using Lemma 3.5, starting from the discrete semistability (3.22), we readily check its time-continuous counterpart (3.23) for all times. This concludes the proof of Theorem 2.4.

Remark 3.6. We wish to point out that, to our best knowledge, necessary and (nontrivial) sufficient conditions allowing for an extension of a deformation mapping (as in (3.28)) but respecting additionally the orientation-preservation of the map are not known in general. We refer to [7] for some discussion on this issue.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work has been funded by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) and Czech Science Foundation (GAČR) through the joint international project FWF-GAČR I4052, 19-29646L, and the scientific and technological cooperation project OeAD-MŠMT CZ 17/2016, 8J19AT013. Support by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) projects F 65 and W 1245 is also acknowledged.

REFERENCES

- [1] B. Bakó, I. Groma, Stochastic approach for modeling dislocation patterning, *Phys. Rev. B.* **60** (1999) 122–127.
- [2] J.M. Ball, Convexity conditions and existence theorems in nonlinear elasticity, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **63** (1976), 337–403.
- [3] J.M. Ball, Global invertibility of Sobolev functions and the interpenetration of matter, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A* **88** (1988), 315–328.
- [4] M. Barchiesi, A. DeSimone, Frank energy for nematic elastomers: a nonlinear model, *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.* **21** (2015), 372–377.
- [5] M. Barchiesi, D. Henao, C. Mora-Corral, Local invertibility in Sobolev spaces with applications to nematic elastomers and magnetoelasticity, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **224** (2017), 743–816.
- [6] Z.P. Bažant, M. Jirásek, Nonlocal integral formulation of plasticity and damage: a survey of progress, *J. Engrg. Mech.* **128** (2002), 1119–1149.
- [7] B. Benešová, M. Kružík, Weak lower semicontinuity of integral functionals and applications. *SIAM Rev.* **59** (2017), 703–766.
- [8] A.P. Calderón, Lebesgue spaces of differentiable functions and distributions, *Proc. Symp. Pure Math.* Vol. IV (1961), 33–49.
- [9] P.G. Ciarlet, J. Nečas, Injectivity and self-contact in nonlinear elasticity, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **97** (1987), 171–188.
- [10] S. Conti, G. Dolzmann, S. Müller, The div-curl lemma for sequences whose divergence and curl are compact in $W^{-1,1}$, *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, **349** (2011), 175–178.
- [11] B. Dacorogna, I. Fonseca, A minimization problem involving variation of the domain, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **45** (1992), 871–897.
- [12] G. Dal Maso, G. Lazzaroni, Quasistatic crack growth in finite elasticity with non-interpenetration, *Ann. Henri Poincaré*, **27** (2010), 257–290.
- [13] E. Davoli, G. A. Francfort, A critical revisiting of finite elasto-plasticity, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **47** (2015), 526–565.
- [14] O. W. Dillon, J. Kratochvíl, A strain gradient theory of plasticity, *Int. J. Solid Struct.* **6** (1970), 1513–1533.
- [15] N. Dunford, J.T. Pettis, Linear Operators on summable functions, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **47** (1940), 323–392.
- [16] N. A. Fleck, J. W. Hutchinson, A phenomenological theory for strain gradient effects in plasticity, *J. Mech. Phys. Solids* **41** (1993), 1825–1857.
- [17] N.A. Fleck, G.M. Muller, M.F. Ashby, J.W. Hutchinson, Strain gradient plasticity: theory and experiment, *Acta Metall. Mater.* **42** (1994), 475–487.
- [18] I. Fonseca, W. Gangbo, Local invertibility of Sobolev functions, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **26** (1995), 280–304.
- [19] I. Fonseca, G. Parry, Equilibrium configurations of defective crystals, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **120** (1992), 245–283.
- [20] M. Frémond, *Non-Smooth Thermomechanics*, Springer, Berlin, 2002.
- [21] J.R. Greer, W. C. Oliver, W.D. Nix, Size dependence of mechanical properties of gold at the micron scale in the absence of strain gradients, *Acta Mat.* **53** (2005), 1821–1830
- [22] A. Giacomini, M. Ponsiglione, Non-interpenetration of matter for SBV deformations of hyperelastic brittle materials, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A* **138**(05) (2008), 1019–1041.
- [23] V. M. Gol’dshstein, Yu. G. Reschetnyak, *Quasiconformal mappings and Sobolev spaces*, Vol. 54, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, Germany, 1990.
- [24] D. Grandi, M. Kružík, E. Mainini, U. Stefanelli, A phase-field approach to Eulerian interfacial energies, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **234** (2019), 351–373.
- [25] D. Grandi, U. Stefanelli, Finite plasticity in $P^{\top}P$. Part II: quasistatic evolution and linearization, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **49** (2017), 1356–1384.
- [26] D. Grandi, U. Stefanelli, Existence and linearization for the Souza-Auricchio model at finite strains, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. S*, **10** (2017), 1257–1280.

- [27] M.E. Gurtin, On the plasticity of single crystals: free energy, microforces, plastic-strain gradients, *J. Mech. Phys. Solids*, **48** (2000), 989–1036.
- [28] M.E. Gurtin, L. Anand, A theory of strain-gradient plasticity for isotropic, plastically irrotational materials. I. Small deformations, *J. Mech. Phys. Solids*, **53** (2005), 1624–1649.
- [29] M.E. Gurtin, E. Fried, L. Anand, *The mechanics and Thermodynamics of Continua*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010.
- [30] S. Hencl, P. Koskela, *Lectures on mappings of finite distortion*, Lecture notes in mathematics, Vol. 2096, Springer International Publishing, 2014.
- [31] P.W. Jones, Quasiconformal mappings and extendability of functions in Sobolev spaces, *Acta Math.* **88** (1992), 71–88.
- [32] M. Kiritani, Dislocation-free plastic deformation under high stress, *Mat. Sci. Engrg.* **A350** (2003), 1–7.
- [33] S. Klinge, K. Hackl, J. Renner, A mechanical model for dissolution-precipitation creep based on the minimum principle of the dissipation potential, *Proc. R. Soc. A* **471** (2015), 20140994.
- [34] J. Kratochvíl, R. Sedláček, Statistical foundation of continuum dislocation plasticity, *Phys. Rev. B*, **77** (2008), 134102.
- [35] E. Kröner, Allgemeine Kontinuumstheorie der Versetzungen und Eigenspannungen, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **4** (1959), 273–334.
- [36] M. Kružík, U. Stefanelli, J. Zeman, Existence results for incompressible magnetoelasticity, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* **35** (2015), 2615–2623.
- [37] E.H. Lee, Elastic-plastic deformation at finite strains, *J. Appl. Mech.* **36** (1969), 1–6.
- [38] E.H. Lee and D. T. Liu, Finite strain elastic-plastic theory with application to plane wave analysis, *J. Appl. Phys.* **38** (1967), 19–27.
- [39] A. Mainik, A. Mielke, Global existence for rate-independent gradient plasticity at finite strain, *J. Nonlinear Sci.* **19**(3) (2009), 221–248.
- [40] J. Mandel, *Plasticité classique et viscoplasticité*, CISM Courses and Lectures, Vol. 97, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1972.
- [41] Y. Matsukawa et al., Dynamic observation of dislocation-free plastic deformation in gold thin foils, *Mat. Sci. Engrg.* **A350** (2003), 8–16.
- [42] G.A. Maugin, *The Thermomechanics of Plasticity and Fracture*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1992.
- [43] A. Mielke, Finite elastoplasticity, Lie groups and geodesics on $SL(d)$, In P. Newton, A. Weinstein, and P. J. Holmes, editors, *Geometry, Mechanics, and Dynamics*, Springer-Verlag, New York, (2002), 61–90.
- [44] A. Mielke, Energetic formulation of multiplicative elastoplasticity using dissipation distances, *Contin. Mech. Thermodyn.* **15** (2003), 351–382.
- [45] A. Mielke, Existence of minimizers in incremental elastoplasticity with finite strains, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **36** (2004), 384–404.
- [46] A. Mielke, S. Müller, Lower semicontinuity and existence of minimizers in incremental finite-strain elastoplasticity, *ZAMM Z. Angew. Math. Mech.* **86** (2006), 233–250.
- [47] A. Mielke, T. Roubíček, *Rate-independent Systems. Theory and application*, Applied Mathematical Sciences, 193. Springer, New York, 2015.
- [48] A. Mielke, T. Roubíček, Rate-independent elastoplasticity at finite strains and its numerical approximation, *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* **26** (2016), 2203–2236.
- [49] A. Mielke, T. Roubíček, U. Stefanelli, Γ -limits and relaxations for rate-independent evolutionary problems, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, **31** (2008), 387–416.
- [50] M. Ortiz, E.A. Repetto, Nonconvex energy minimization and dislocation structures in ductile single crystals, *J. Mech. Phys. Solids*, **47** (1999), 397–462.
- [51] C. Reina, S. Conti, Kinematic description of crystal plasticity in the finite kinematic framework: a micromechanical understanding of $F = F^e F^p$, *J. Mech. Phys. Solids*, **67** (2014), 40–61.
- [52] T. Roubíček, *Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations with Applications*, 2nd edition, Birkhäuser, Basel, 2013.
- [53] T. Roubíček, G. Tomassetti, A thermodynamically consistent model of magneto-elastic materials under diffusion at large strains and its analysis, *Z. Angew. Math. Phys.* **69** (2018), Art. 55.
- [54] M. Röger, B. Schweizer, Strain gradient visco-plasticity with dislocation densities contributing to the energy, *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* **27** (2017), 2595–2629.
- [55] P. Rybka, M. Luskin, Existence of energy minimizers for magnetostrictive materials, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **36** (2005), 2004–2019.
- [56] J.C. Simo, T.J.R. Hughes, *Computational Inelasticity*, Interdisciplinary Applied Mathematics, 7. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998.
- [57] U. Stefanelli, Existence for dislocation-free finite plasticity, *ESIAM Control Optim. Calc. Var.* **25** (2019), Art. 21, 20 pp.

- [58] E.M. Stein, *Singular integrals and differentiability properties of functions*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1970.
- [59] M. Šilhavý, Equilibrium of phases with interfacial energy: a variational approach, *J. Elasticity*, **105** (2011), 271–303.
- [60] M. Šilhavý, A variational approach to nonlinear electro-magneto-elasticity: convexity conditions and existence theorems, *Math. Mech. Solids*, **23** (2018), 907–928.
- [61] M.D. Uchic, D.M. Dimiduk, J.N. Florando, W.D. Nix, Sample dimensions influence strength and crystal plasticity, *Science*, **305** (2004), 986–989.
- [62] M. Zaiser, M. Carmen Miguel, I. Groma, Statistical dynamics of dislocation systems: The influence of dislocation-dislocation correlations. *Phys. Rev. B*, **64** (2001), 224102.

(Martin Kružík) INSTITUTE OF INFORMATION THEORY AND AUTOMATION, CZECH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, POD VODÁRENSKOU VEŽÍ 4, 182 08 PRAGUE, CZECHIA AND FACULTY OF CIVIL ENGINEERING, CZECH TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY, THÁKUROVA 7, 166 29 PRAGUE, CZECHIA

E-mail address: `kruzik@utia.cas.cz`

URL: `http://staff.utia.cas.cz/kruzik/`

(David Melching) FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF VIENNA, OSKAR-MORGENSTERN-PLATZ 1, 1090 WIEN, AUSTRIA

E-mail address: `david.melching@univie.ac.at`

URL: `http://www.mat.univie.ac.at/~melching`

(Ulisse Stefanelli) FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF VIENNA, OSKAR-MORGENSTERN-PLATZ 1, 1090 WIEN, AUSTRIA AND ISTITUTO DI MATEMATICA APPLICATA E TECNOLOGIE INFORMATICHE *E. Magenes*, V. FERRATA 1, 27100 PAVIA, ITALY.

E-mail address: `ulisse.stefanelli@univie.ac.at`

URL: `http://www.mat.univie.ac.at/~stefanelli`