

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/268552722>

A counterexample in the vectorial calculus of variations

Article · December 1988

CITATIONS

21

READS

79

2 authors:



Bernard Dacorogna

École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne

166 PUBLICATIONS 4,171 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



Paolo Marcellini

University of Florence

135 PUBLICATIONS 3,189 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



Nonlinear elliptic systems with general growth [View project](#)

A COUNTEREXAMPLE IN THE VECTORIAL CALCULUS OF VARIATIONS

BERNARD DACOROGNA and PAOLO MARCELLINI

Let us consider the integral

$$I(u) = \int_{\Omega} f(\nabla u(x)) dx, \quad (1)$$

where Ω is a bounded open set of \mathbb{R}^n , $u: \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$, ∇u is the $n \times m$ matrix of the gradient of u , and $f: \mathbb{R}^{nm} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous function.

When one studies the weak lower semicontinuity of I in a Sobolev space $W^{1,p}$, one is led to consider a necessary condition for f , called *rank one convexity*, and a sufficient condition known as *polyconvexity* (cf. below for the definitions).

Both conditions reduce to the ordinary convexity of f if either $m=1$ or $n=1$. The two conditions are known not to be equivalent if $m \geq 3$ and $n \geq 3$ (see, Terpstra [4], Serre [3]). Recently Aubert [1] gave an example showing that these conditions are not equivalent if $m=n=2$; the example is expressed in terms of isotropic functions, i.e.:

$$f(\nabla u) = g(\lambda, \mu), \quad (2)$$

where λ and μ are the eigenvalues of $(\nabla u^T \nabla u)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, the function g being defined (and finite) only if $\lambda, \mu > 0$.

We show here that the example remains valid even if one suppresses the condition of positivity of λ and μ . Moreover, we do not need to consider the representation of f in terms of

g like in (2); therefore we have a direct proof.

First let us define precisely the notions of rank one convexity and polyconvexity; we limit ourselves to the case $m=n=2$.

We denote \mathbb{R}^4 the set of 2×2 matrices ξ . We will use for the matrix ξ also the vectorial notation in terms of components:

$$\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3, \xi_4). \quad (3)$$

The scalar product and the norm are defined as usual:

$$(\xi, \lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^4 \xi_i \lambda_i, \quad |\xi| = \left(\sum_{i=1}^4 \xi_i^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (4)$$

Finally, the determinant of the matrix ξ is

$$\det \xi = \xi_1 \xi_4 - \xi_2 \xi_3. \quad (5)$$

DEFINITION 1: A function $f: \mathbb{R}^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be rank one convex if

$$f(t\xi + (1-t)\lambda) \leq tf(\xi) + (1-t)f(\lambda) \quad (6)$$

for every $t \in [0, 1]$ and for every $\xi, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^4$ with rank $\{\xi - \lambda\} \leq 1$, i.e. with $\det(\xi - \lambda) = 0$.

If $f \in C^2$ then (6) is equivalent to the well known Legendre-Hadamard (or ellipticity) condition:

$$\sum_{i,j,\alpha,\beta=1}^2 f_{\xi_i \xi_j}^{\alpha \beta}(\xi) \mu_\alpha \mu_\beta \eta^i \eta^j \geq 0 \quad (7)$$

for every $\xi = (\xi_\alpha^i) \in \mathbb{R}^4$ (here we use the matricial notation) and for every $\mu, \eta \in \mathbb{R}^2$.

Since a matrix $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^4$ can be represented in the form $(\mu_1 \eta_1, \mu_1 \eta_2, \mu_2 \eta_1, \mu_2 \eta_2)$ if and only if $\det \lambda = 0$, the Legendre-Hadamard condition (7) is equivalent to:

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^4 f_{\xi_i \xi_j}(\xi) \lambda_i \lambda_j \geq 0 \quad (8)$$

for every $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^4$ and for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^4$ with $\det \lambda = 0$.

Ball in [2] proposed the following:

DEFINITION 2: A function $f: \mathbb{R}^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be polyconvex if there exists a convex function $g: \mathbb{R}^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $f(\xi) \geq g(\xi)$ for every $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^4$:

We note that in

THEOREM: Let f be defined on \mathbb{R}^4 and let $g: \mathbb{R}^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a convex function such that $f(\xi) \geq g(\xi)$ for every $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^4$. Then f is rank one convex.

REMARKS

(i) The function f is not necessarily convex. For example if we restrict ourselves to the values λ such that $\det \lambda = 0$.

(ii) It is not known whether the condition $f(\xi) \geq g(\xi)$ for every $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^4$ implies that f is weakly p -convex for $p \geq 1$.

PROOF: - Part 1: The proof is based on the fact that a rank one convex function is seen. To this end, let us prove that a rank one convex function is polyconvex and that the difference between a rank one convex function f and a convex function g , like every convex function, can be approximated from below by an affine function \tilde{f} such that $\tilde{f}(\xi) \geq f(\xi)$ for every $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^4$.

$$g(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3, \xi_4)$$

for some $a_i \in \mathbb{R}$ ($i=1, 2, 3, 4$)

Since $\delta = \det \xi$ and (9) there exists a real number c such that

This is absurd. Since $\delta = \det \xi$ and (9) there exists a real parameter, we can choose c such that

DEFINITION 2: A function $f: \mathbb{R}^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be polyconvex if there exists a convex function $g: \mathbb{R}^5 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ so that, for every $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^4$:

$$f(\xi) = g(\xi, \det \xi). \quad (9)$$

We note that in general we have:

$$f \text{ polyconvex} \Rightarrow f \text{ rank one convex}. \quad (10)$$

THEOREM: Let f be defined, for $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^4$, by

$$f(\xi) = |\xi|^4 - \frac{4}{\sqrt{3}} |\xi|^2 \det \xi. \quad (11)$$

Then f is rank one convex but not polyconvex.

REMARKS

- (i) The function f defined in (11) gives essentially Aubert's example if we restrict to diagonal matrices with positive eigenvalues.
- (ii) It is not known if the integral $I(u)$ defined in (1), with f as in (11), is weakly lower semicontinuous in $W^{1,p}$ for some $p > 1$.

PROOF: — Part 1: The fact that f is not polyconvex can be easily seen. To this end, let us assume, for contradiction, that f is polyconvex and that the representation formula in (9) holds. The function g , like every proper convex function, must be bounded from below by an affine function; that is

$$g(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3, \xi_4, \delta) \geq a_0 + \sum_{i=1}^4 a_i \xi_i + a_5 \delta \quad (12)$$

for some $a_i \in \mathbb{R}$ ($i=0, \dots, 5$) and for every $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^4$, $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$.

Since $\delta = \det \xi$ is quadratic with respect to ξ , by (12) and (9) there exists a constant c such that

$$\frac{f(\xi)}{1 + |\xi|^2} \geq c, \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^4. \quad (13)$$

This is absurd; in fact, for $\xi \equiv (t, 0, 0, t)$, with t a real parameter, we have $|\xi|^2 = 2t^2$, $\det \xi = t^2$, and thus

$$\frac{f(\xi)}{1+|\xi|^2} = \frac{4t^4 - (8/\sqrt{3})t^4}{1+2t^2} = \frac{4(\sqrt{3}-2)}{\sqrt{3}} \frac{t^4}{1+2t^2}, \quad (14)$$

which goes to $-\infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

Part 2: To prove that f is rank one convex is more involved and we decompose the proof into three steps. We will show that f satisfies the Legendre-Hadamard condition as in (8).

Step 1: With the aim of computing the quadratic form in (8) we introduce some notation. To every $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^4$ we associate $\hat{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^4$ defined by:

$$\text{if } \xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3, \xi_4) \text{ then } \hat{\xi} = (\xi_4, -\xi_3, -\xi_2, \xi_1). \quad (15)$$

The components of $\hat{\xi}$ will be denoted by $\hat{\xi}_i$, $i = 1, \dots, 4$. We observe that:

$$\begin{cases} |\xi| = |\hat{\xi}| \\ \det \xi = \det \hat{\xi} \\ (\xi, \hat{\xi}) = 2 \det \xi \\ (\xi, \lambda) = (\hat{\xi}, \lambda). \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

With this notation we can easily express the gradient of the determinant of ξ :

$$(\det \xi)_{\xi_i} = \hat{\xi}_i \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, 4; \text{ i.e. } \nabla(\det \xi) = \hat{\xi}. \quad (17)$$

For the second derivatives of the determinant we use the notation

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \xi_i \partial \xi_j} (\det \xi) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi_j} (\hat{\xi}_i) = \hat{\delta}_{ij}. \quad (18)$$

Since the quadratic form associated to the matrix of the second derivatives is equal to twice the original quadratic form, we have

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^4 \hat{\delta}_{ij} \lambda_i \lambda_j = \sum_{i,j=1}^4 (\det \xi)_{\xi_i \xi_j} \lambda_i \lambda_j = 2 \det \lambda. \quad (19)$$

Finally

Step 2: We
with the der

$f_{\xi_i} =$

$=$

$f_{\xi_i \xi_j} =$

Then the quad
 $\sum_{i,j=1}^4 f_{\xi_i \xi_j}$

In the

$\psi(\xi, \lambda) \text{ de}$

Step 3: The
the nonnegati
Observe
 ξ (and in λ)
tive, it is s

min

ξ

It is c
fold $|\xi| = 1$.
 $\psi(\xi_0, \lambda) \geq 0$ f

(14) Finally, as usual, we denote $\delta_{ij} = 0$ if $i \neq j$ and $\delta_{ii} = 1$.

Step 2: We compute the quadratic form in (8). Let us begin with the derivatives of f :

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\xi_i} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi_i} \left(|\xi|^4 - \frac{4}{\sqrt{3}} |\xi|^2 \det \xi \right) \\ &= 4|\xi|^2 \xi_i - \frac{8}{\sqrt{3}} \xi_i \det \xi - \frac{4}{\sqrt{3}} |\xi|^2 \hat{\xi}_i. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\xi_i \xi_j} &= 8 \xi_i \xi_j + 4|\xi|^2 \delta_{ij} - \frac{8}{\sqrt{3}} (\delta_{ij} \det \xi + \xi_i \hat{\xi}_j) \\ &\quad - \frac{4}{\sqrt{3}} (2 \hat{\xi}_i \xi_j + |\xi|^2 \hat{\delta}_{ij}). \end{aligned}$$

Then the quadratic form in (8) is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i,j=1}^4 f_{\xi_i \xi_j} \lambda_i \lambda_j &= 8(\xi, \lambda)^2 + 4|\xi|^2 |\lambda|^2 - \frac{8}{\sqrt{3}} \det \xi |\lambda|^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{16}{\sqrt{3}} (\xi, \lambda)(\hat{\xi}, \lambda) - \frac{8}{\sqrt{3}} |\xi|^2 \det \lambda. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

In the case of interest ($\det \lambda = 0$) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(\xi, \lambda) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i,j=1}^4 f_{\xi_i \xi_j} \lambda_i \lambda_j = \\ &= |\xi|^2 |\lambda|^2 + 2(\xi, \lambda)^2 - \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}} \det \xi |\lambda|^2 - \frac{4}{\sqrt{3}} (\xi, \lambda)(\hat{\xi}, \lambda). \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Step 3: The rank one convexity of $f(\xi)$ is reduced to showing the nonnegativity of $\psi(\xi, \lambda)$ for every ξ, λ , with $\det \lambda = 0$.

Observe first that $\psi(\xi, \lambda)$ is homogeneous of degree 2 in ξ (and in λ). Therefore, in order to show that ψ is nonnegative, it is sufficient to prove that

$$\min_{\xi} \left\{ \psi(\xi, \lambda) : |\xi| = 1 \right\} \geq 0, \quad \forall \lambda : \det \lambda = 0. \quad (23)$$

It is clear that the minimum of $\psi(\cdot, \lambda)$ exists on the manifold $|\xi| = 1$. Let α be a Lagrange multiplier; we will prove that $\psi(\xi_0, \lambda) \geq 0$ for every critical point ξ_0 of the function of ξ :

$$\psi(\xi, \lambda) - \alpha(|\xi|^2 - 1). \quad (24)$$

The gradient (with respect to ξ) of the above function is equal to zero when:

$$\begin{aligned} |\lambda|^2 \xi_0 + 2(\xi_0, \lambda) \lambda - \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} |\lambda|^2 \hat{\xi}_0 \\ - \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}} [(\hat{\xi}_0, \lambda) \lambda + (\xi_0, \lambda) \hat{\lambda}] = \alpha \xi_0 . \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Upon multiplication by ξ_0 , bearing in mind that $|\xi_0|^2 = 1$ and that $(\hat{\xi}_0, \xi_0) = 2 \det \xi_0$, we obtain

$$\psi(\xi_0, \lambda) = \alpha . \quad (26)$$

Upon multiplication of (25) first by λ , then by $\hat{\lambda}$, bearing in mind that $(\hat{\lambda}, \lambda) = 2 \det \lambda = 0$ and that $(\hat{\xi}, \hat{\lambda}) = (\xi, \lambda)$, we have

$$\begin{cases} (3|\lambda|^2 - \alpha)(\xi_0, \lambda) - \sqrt{3}|\lambda|^2(\hat{\xi}_0, \lambda) = 0 \\ -\sqrt{3}|\lambda|^2(\xi_0, \lambda) + (|\lambda|^2 - \alpha)(\hat{\xi}_0, \lambda) = 0 , \end{cases} \quad (27)$$

which leads to either $(\xi_0, \lambda) = (\hat{\xi}_0, \lambda) = 0$, or

$$(3|\lambda|^2 - \alpha)(|\lambda|^2 - \alpha) - 3|\lambda|^4 = \alpha^2 - 4|\lambda|^2\alpha = 0 . \quad (28)$$

In this second case we would have either $\alpha = 0$ or $\alpha = 4|\lambda|^2$, and thus $\psi(\xi_0, \lambda) = \alpha \geq 0$. In the first case $(\xi_0, \lambda) = (\hat{\xi}_0, \lambda) = 0$ we would have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(\xi_0, \lambda) &= |\lambda|^2 \left(|\xi_0|^2 - \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}} \det \xi_0 \right) \\ &\geq |\lambda|^2 |\xi_0|^2 \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \right) \geq 0 , \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

since $2|\det \xi| \leq |\xi|^2$ for every $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^4$. This completes the proof.

REFERENCES

1. G. Aubert, "Solutions et Applications des équations elliptiques et paraboliques", Doctorat, Paris (1977).
2. J.M. Ball, "A geometric approach to nonlinear elasticity theory of incompressible isotropic elastic materials", *J. Math. Pure Appl.* 63 (1984), 253-78.
3. D. Serre, "Sur la stabilité des fluides parfaits", *J. Math. Pure Appl.* 63 (1984), 259-78.
4. F.J. Terpstra, "Summen von reellen Polynomen", *Math. Ann.* 196 (1971), 243-55.

REFERENCES

1. G. Aubert, *Contributions aux Problèmes du Calcul des Variations et Application à l'Élasticité Nonlinéaire*, Thèse de Doctorat, Paris VI, 1986.
2. J.M. Ball, "Convexity conditions and existence theorems in nonlinear elasticity", *Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal.* **67**, pp.337-403, (1977).
3. D. Serre, "Formes quadratiques et calcul des variations", *J. Math. Pures et Appl.* **62**, pp.177-196, (1983).
4. F.J. Terpstra, "Die Darstellung biquadratischer Formen als Summen von Quadraten mit Anwendung auf die Variations-rechnung", *Math. Ann.* **116**, pp.116-180, (1938).