Journal of Convex Analysis
Volume 4 (1997), No. 2, 305–319

Rank-one-convex and Quasiconvex Envelopes for Functions Depending on Quadratic Forms

M. Bousselsal
Département de Mathématiques, Ecole Normale Supérieure
Vieux Kouba 16050 Algiers, Algeria.

B. Brighi
Centre d'Analyse Non Linéaire, Département de Mathématiques, URA-CNRS 399,
Université de Metz, Ile du Saulcy, 57045 Metz Cedex 01, France.
e-mail: brighi@poncelet.univ-metz.fr

Received April 12, 1995
Revised manuscript received February 5, 1996

In this paper we are interested in functions defined, on a set of matrices, by the mean of quadratic forms and we compute the rank-one-convex, quasiconvex, polyconvex and convex envelopes of these functions. For that, and for a given quadratic form, we prove, in a first part, some general decomposition results for matrices, with a rank-one-compatibility condition. We also study the James-Ericksen stored energy function.

Keywords: rank-one-convex, quasiconvex, envelope, quadratic form, James-Ericksen function, Pipkin's formula.

1. Introduction

Let us denote by $\mathbb{M}^{m\times n}$ the set of $m \times n$ real matrices and by W a function defined on $\mathbb{M}^{m\times n}$ with values in $\mathbb{R}$. Moreover, let Ω be a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$. The Calculus of Variations in the vectorial case addresses problems of the type : minimize

$$I_1(u) = \int_\Omega W(\nabla u(x))\, dx \tag{1.1}$$

over some class of functions. Here ∇u denotes the Jacobian matrix of u -i.e. the matrix defined by

$$\nabla u = \left(\frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_j}\right), \quad i = 1, \dots, m, \quad j = 1, \dots, n$$

where $u_1, \dots, u_m$ denote the components of u. In general $I_1(u)$ is not lower semicontinuous and the direct method of the Calculus of Variations fails for the minimization of (1.1) (see [8]). One way to overcome the situation is to consider the so-called relaxed problem, that is to minimize

$$I_2(u) = \int_\Omega QW(\nabla u(x))\, dx \tag{1.2}$$

ISSN 0944-6532 / $ 2.50

where QW denotes the quasiconvex envelope of W. We refer the reader to [8] for the relationship between (1.1) and (1.2). Before to go on, let us recall the definition of quasiconvexity and related notions.

• W is said to be *polyconvex* if there exists a convex function $\hat{W}$ such that

$$W(F) = \hat{W}(T(F))$$

where $T(F)$ stands for the vector of all minors of F (see [8]).

• W is said to be *quasiconvex* if

$$W(F) \leq \frac{1}{|D|} \int_D W(F + \nabla v(x))\, dx \tag{1.3}$$

for any bounded domain D and any smooth function $v : D \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$, vanishing on the boundary of D.

• W is said to be *rank-one-convex* if

$$W(\lambda F + (1-\lambda)G) \leq \lambda W(F) + (1-\lambda) W(G)$$

for any couple $F,\ G$ such that

$$\mathrm{rank}(F - G) \leq 1$$

and any $\lambda \in [0, 1]$.

The notion of polyconvexity has been introduced by J. Ball (see [1]) to address problems of nonlinear elasticity (see also [5], [6]). Quasiconvexity goes back to Morrey (see [11]) and insures weak lower semi continuity of $I_1(u)$ in some spaces (see [12], [8], [2]). Of course, condition (1.3) is not easy to test.

It is now well known that

$$W \text{ convex} \Longrightarrow W \text{ polyconvex} \Longrightarrow W \text{ quasiconvex} \Longrightarrow W \text{ rank-one-convex.} \tag{1.4}$$

These implications are one way in the sense that the converse implication does not hold in general. It has been an outstanding challenge to decide that

$$W \text{ rank-one-convex} \not\Longrightarrow W \text{ quasiconvex.}$$

This has been established recently by V. Šverák (see [16]) for dimensions $m \geq 3$ and $n \geq 2$. Of course, in the case $m = 1$ or $n = 1$ all these notions are the same (see [8]).

This terminology being precised, one can define the following convex, polyconvex, quasiconvex, rank-one-convex envelopes by setting

$$CW = \sup\{f\ ;\ f \text{ convex and } f \leq W\}$$

$$PW = \sup\{f\ ;\ f \text{ polyconvex and } f \leq W\}$$

$$QW = \sup\{f\ ;\ f \text{ quasiconvex and } f \leq W\}$$

$$RW = \sup\{f\ ;\ f \text{ rank-one-convex and } f \leq W\}.$$

Clearly by (1.4) one has

$$CW \leq PW \leq QW \leq RW \tag{1.5}$$

and these four envelopes coincide in the case $m = 1$ or $n = 1$, but also, in the general case, when RW is convex.
The goal of this paper is to compute some of these envelopes for functions W defined on the set of $m \times n$ matrices through quadratic forms.
In the last section, we will consider a function used, for instance in [7], to study a two-dimensional crystal. This energy density, proposed by Ericksen and James, is given by

$$\phi(F) = \tilde{\phi}(C) = \kappa_1(\mathrm{tr}(C) - 2)^2 + \kappa_2 c_{12}^2 + \kappa_3 \left(\left(\frac{c_{11} - c_{22}}{2} \right)^2 - \varepsilon^2 \right)^2 \tag{1.6}$$

where

$$C = F^T F = \begin{pmatrix} c_{11} & c_{12} \\ c_{21} & c_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$

is the Cauchy-Green strain tensor, where the nonnegative constants κ_1, κ_2, κ_3 are elastic moduli, and where ε is the transformation strain.
In the case where $\kappa_3 = 0$, the function $\tilde{\phi}$ is convex and thus the rank-one-convex envelope of ϕ is convex and can be compute by using the Pipkin formula (see [13], [14], [15] and [10]).
See also [9] for a numerical approach of minimization problems associated to the functionnal ϕ.
Finally, let us recall that, for $a \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we denote by $a \otimes b$ the rank-one-matrix defined by $(a \otimes b)_{ij} = a_i b_j$.

2. Decomposition results for matrices

In this section, we denote by q a quadratic form defined on $\mathbb{M}^{m\times n}$:

$$q : \mathbb{M}^{m\times n} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

and by β the symmetric bilinear form associated to q, that is the function defined on $\mathbb{M}^{m\times n} \times \mathbb{M}^{m\times n}$ by

$$\forall F, G \in \mathbb{M}^{m\times n}\ , \quad \beta(F, G) = \frac{1}{2}\Big(q(F+G) - q(F) - q(G)\Big).$$

We will assume that $q \not\equiv 0$, and thus either the range of q is $\mathbb{R}$, or q is nonnegative, or q is nonpositive.

We have the following decomposition result:

Proposition 2.1. *Let us consider $F \in \mathbb{M}^{m\times n}$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $q(F) \leq \alpha$. Assume there exist $a \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying $q(a \otimes b) > 0$. Then, there exists $\lambda \in [0,1]$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that, if $E = ta \otimes b$, one has*

$$q(F + \lambda E) = q(F - (1-\lambda)E) = \alpha. \tag{2.1}$$

Proof. First, let us remark that, for $F, E \in \mathbb{M}^{m\times n}$ and $\lambda \in [0,1]$, one has

$$q(F+\lambda E) = q(F) + 2\lambda\beta(F,E) + \lambda^2 q(E) \tag{2.2}$$

$$q(F-(1-\lambda)E) = q(F) - 2(1-\lambda)\beta(F,E) + (1-\lambda)^2 q(E) \tag{2.3}$$

If $q(F) = \alpha$, then (2.1) holds with $t = 0$. Now, let us assume that $q(F) < \alpha$. Since $q(a\otimes b) > 0$, we have

$$\frac{\beta(F,a\otimes b)^2}{q(a\otimes b)^2} - \frac{q(F)-\alpha}{q(a\otimes b)} > 0$$

and, if we set

$$t = 2\left(\frac{\beta(F,a\otimes b)^2}{q(a\otimes b)^2} - \frac{q(F)-\alpha}{q(a\otimes b)}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \qquad \text{and} \qquad E = ta\otimes b$$

then

$$\frac{\beta(F,E)^2}{q(E)^2} - \frac{q(F)-\alpha}{q(E)} = \frac{1}{t^2}\left(\frac{\beta(F,a\otimes b)^2}{q(a\otimes b)^2} - \frac{q(F)-\alpha}{q(a\otimes b)}\right) = \frac{1}{4}\,. \tag{2.4}$$

Consequently, by choosing

$$\lambda = \frac{1}{2}\left(1 - \frac{2\beta(F,E)}{q(E)}\right) \tag{2.5}$$

we obtain, with (2.4)

$$\lambda + (\lambda - 1) = \frac{-2\beta(F,E)}{q(E)}$$

and

$$\lambda(\lambda-1) = \frac{\beta(F,E)^2}{q(E)^2} - \frac{1}{4} = \frac{q(F)-\alpha}{q(E)}\,.$$

Therefore, λ and $\lambda - 1$ are the solutions of the following equation

$$q(E)X^2 + 2\beta(F,E)X + q(F) - \alpha = 0.$$

Then (2.2) and (2.3) give (2.1). Moreover, (2.4) and (2.5) imply that $\lambda \in [0,1]$. □

Now, let us consider $\tilde{\Theta} : \mathbb{R}^m \times \ldots \times \mathbb{R}^m \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ an antisymmetric n-linear function, and denote by Θ the function defined on $\mathbb{M}^{m\times n}$ by $\Theta(F) = \tilde{\Theta}(F_1,\ldots,F_n)$, where F_j is the j^{th} column of the matrix F.

Proposition 2.2. *Let us consider $F \in \mathbb{M}^{m\times n}$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $q(F) \le \alpha$. Assume there exist $j \in \{1,\ldots,n\}$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying*

$$q(F_j \otimes b) > 0 \qquad \textit{and} \qquad b_j = 0$$

where b_j is the j^{th} entry of b.

Then, there exist $\lambda \in [0,1]$, $A, B \in \mathbb{M}^{m\times n}$ *such that,*

$$F = (1-\lambda)A + \lambda B \ , \quad rank(A-B) \leq 1 \tag{2.6}$$

$$q(A) = q(B) = \alpha \tag{2.7}$$

$$\Theta(A) = \Theta(B) = \Theta(F) \tag{2.8}$$

Proof. First, we use the previous proposition and so there exists a real t such that, if we set

$$A = F + \lambda t F_j \otimes b \qquad \text{and} \qquad B = F - (1-\lambda) t F_j \otimes b$$

one has (2.6) and (2.7).
Next, since $b_j = 0$ and $\tilde{\Theta}$ is antisymmetric,

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta(A) &= \Theta(F + \lambda t F_j \otimes b)\\ &= \tilde{\Theta}(F_1 + \lambda t b_1 F_j, \dots, F_{j-1} + \lambda t b_{j-1} F_j, F_j, F_{j+1} + \lambda t b_{j+1} F_j, \dots, F_n + \lambda t b_n F_j)\\ &= \tilde{\Theta}(F_1, \dots, F_n).\end{aligned}$$

By same way, we compute $\Theta(B)$ and (2.8) holds. □

Remark 2.3. This last proposition gives, in the case where q is positive definite, some results already obtained in [3] (lemme 3.2 p. 31, lemme 1.2 p. 41) and [4] (theorem 2.1).

3. Rank-one-convex envelope of function depending on a quadratic form

In this section, we still denote by q a quadratic form defined on $\mathbb{M}^{m\times n}$ ($q \not\equiv 0$), by I an interval of $\mathbb{R}$ and by $\varphi : I \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a function satisfying

$$\inf_{t\in I} \varphi(t) = \mu > -\infty. \tag{3.1}$$

Thanks to (3.1), there exist $\alpha \in \bar{I}$ and a sequence $t_k \in I$ such that

$$\lim_{k\to+\infty} t_k = \alpha \qquad \text{and} \qquad \lim_{k\to+\infty} \varphi(t_k) = \mu. \tag{3.2}$$

For instance, if $\varphi^{-1}(\{\mu\}) \neq \emptyset$, we can choose $\alpha \in \varphi^{-1}(\{\mu\})$ and $\forall k$, $t_k = \alpha$.
We have the following result:

Lemma 3.1. *Let us assume that either* $I = \mathbb{R}$ *or* $I = \mathbb{R}_+$, *and consider the function* W *defined on* $\mathbb{M}^{m\times n}$ *by*

$$W(F) = \varphi(q(F)).$$

If there exists a rank-one-matrix $a \otimes b$ *such that*

$$q(a \otimes b) > 0 \tag{3.3}$$

then, for $F \in \mathbb{M}^{m\times n}$*, one has*

$$q(F) \leq \alpha \implies RW(F) = QW(F) = PW(F) = CW(F) = \mu. \tag{3.4}$$

Proof. Let us consider $F \in \mathbb{M}^{m\times n}$ such that $q(F) < \alpha$. Then, by (3.2), there exists $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\forall k \geq k_0 \ , \quad q(F) \leq t_k.$$

So, using proposition 2.1, there exist a rank-one-matrix E_k and $\lambda_k \in [0,1]$ such that

$$q(F + \lambda_k E_k) = q(F - (1-\lambda_k)E_k) = t_k$$

and if we set $A_k = F + \lambda_k E_k$ and $B_k = F - (1-\lambda_k)E_k$ then

$$\begin{aligned} &F = (1-\lambda_k)A_k + \lambda_k B_k \\ &\operatorname{rank}(A_k - B_k) \leq 1 \\ &q(A_k) = q(B_k) = t_k \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} RW(F) &\leq (1-\lambda_k)RW(A_k) + \lambda_k RW(B_k) \\ &\leq (1-\lambda_k)W(A_k) + \lambda_k W(B_k) \\ &= (1-\lambda_k)\varphi(q(A_k)) + \lambda_k \varphi(q(B_k)) \\ &= \varphi(t_k). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, using (3.2) we obtain

$$q(F) < \alpha \implies RW(F) = \mu.$$

Finally, by continuity of q and RW, and thanks to (1.5), (3.4) holds for all the matrices F such that $q(F) \leq \alpha$. □

Theorem 3.2. *Let us assume that* $I = \mathbb{R}_+$*,* q *is nonnegative, and consider the function* W *defined on* $\mathbb{M}^{m\times n}$ *by*

$$W(F) = \varphi(q(F)).$$

Then, for $F \in \mathbb{M}^{m\times n}$*, one has*

$$q(F) \leq \alpha \implies RW(F) = QW(F) = PW(F) = CW(F) = \mu.$$

Proof. In order to apply the previous lemma, we are going to prove that the condition (3.3) is always true.

Since q is nonnegative and $q \not\equiv 0$ then, thanks to the Gauss-decomposition theorem, there exists a linear form $l \not\equiv 0$ on $\mathbb{M}^{m\times n}$ such that

$$\forall F \in \mathbb{M}^{m\times n} \ , \quad q(F) \geq (l(F))^2.$$

Next, $l^{-1}(\{0\})$ is a hyperplane of $\mathbb{M}^{m\times n}$, but the vectorial space spanned by the rank-one-matrices is the whole space $\mathbb{M}^{m\times n}$. Therefore, there exists a rank-one-matrix $a \otimes b$ such that $q(a \otimes b) > 0$.

So, we can apply lemma 3.1 and the proof is complete. □

Theorem 3.3. *Let us assume that $I = \mathbb{R}$, $q : \mathbb{M}^{m\times n} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is onto, and consider the function W defined on $\mathbb{M}^{m\times n}$ by*

$$W(F) = \varphi(q(F)).$$

If there exist two rank-one-matrices $a\otimes b$ and $c\otimes d$ such that

$$q(a\otimes b) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad q(c\otimes d) < 0 \tag{3.5}$$

then, $RW = QW = PW = CW = \mu$.

Proof. Let $F \in \mathbb{M}^{m\times n}$.
First, assume that $q(F) \le \alpha$; then, thanks to (3.5) and lemma 3.1, we obtain

$$RW(F) = QW(F) = PW(F) = CW(F) = \mu.$$

Next, assume that $q(F) \ge \alpha$. Let us consider the function $\check{\varphi} : \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by $\check{\varphi}(t) = \varphi(-t)$. Then

$$W(F) = \check{\varphi}(-q(F))$$

$$-\,q(c\otimes d) > 0$$

and

$$\inf_{t\in I} \check{\varphi}(t) = \mu$$

thus, since $-q(F) \le -\alpha$, we can apply lemma 3.1 and obtain

$$RW(F) = QW(F) = PW(F) = CW(F) = \mu.$$

The proof is now complete. □

Remark 3.4. For a quadratic form with a range equal to $\mathbb{R}$, it is not always possible to have (3.5); indeed, when $m = n = 2$, the quadratic form $F \longmapsto \det F$ is onto and for every $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^2$ one has $\det(a\otimes b) = 0$.

4. Some applications

Example 4.1. Let $\psi : \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be convex and such that $\inf_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \psi(t) = \psi(0)$.
If q is a nonnegative quadratic form on $\mathbb{M}^{m\times n}$, α a positive real number and W the function defined on $\mathbb{M}^{m\times n}$ by

$$W(F) = \psi(q(F) - \alpha)$$

then, for $F \in \mathbb{M}^{m\times n}$, one has

$$RW(F) = \begin{cases} \psi(0) & \text{if} \quad q(F) \le \alpha \\ W(F) & \text{if} \quad q(F) \ge \alpha \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

Indeed, if we set $\varphi(t) = \psi(t-\alpha)$, then

$$\mu = \inf_{t\in\mathbb{R}_+} \varphi(t) = \psi(0) = \varphi(\alpha)$$

and thus, by theorem 3.2, one has

$$q(F) \le \alpha \implies RW(F) = \mu = \psi(0).$$

Moreover, the function $\overline{W}$ defined by

$$\overline{W}(F) = \begin{cases} \psi(0) & \text{if} \quad q(F) \le \alpha \\ W(F) & \text{if} \quad q(F) \ge \alpha \end{cases}$$

is convex (since q is convex, ψ is convex and non decreasing on $\mathbb{R}_+$) and $\le W$; therefore $\overline{W} \le RW$. So, if $q(F) \ge \alpha$ one has

$$W(F) = \overline{W}(F) \le RW(F) \le W(F).$$

Thus (4.1) holds, and since RW is convex, we have

$$RW = QW = PW = CW.$$

Example 4.2. Let $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function satisfying

$$\inf_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \varphi(t) = \mu > -\infty.$$

Let us consider the following quadratic form on $\mathbb{M}^{m\times n}$

$$q(F) = \sum_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{I}} f_{ij}^2 - \sum_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{J}} f_{ij}^2$$

where $\mathcal{I}$ and $\mathcal{J}$ are two disjoint nonempty subsets of $\{1,\dots,m\} \times \{1,\dots,n\}$.
Clearly, the range of q is $\mathbb{R}$ and the conditions (3.5) occur; so, we can apply theorem 3.3, and, if $W : \mathbb{M}^{m\times n} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined by $W(F) = \varphi(q(F))$, then $RW = QW = PW = CW = \mu$.

Example 4.3. Let us consider the quadratic form defined on $\mathbb{M}^{m\times n}$ by

$$q(F) = \sum_{i=1}^{s} |F_i|^2 - \sum_{i=s+1}^{n} |F_i|^2$$

where $1 \le s \le n-1$ and $F_1, \dots, F_n$ denote the columns of the matrix F.
Now, let $\tilde{\Theta} : \mathbb{R}^m \times \ldots \times \mathbb{R}^m \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ be an antisymmetric n-linear function, and denote by Θ the function defined on $\mathbb{M}^{m\times n}$ by $\Theta(F) = \tilde{\Theta}(F_1, \dots, F_n)$. Moreover, assume that Θ is polyaffine (i.e. Θ and $-\Theta$ are polyconvex); for instance, if $m = n$ we can consider $\Theta(F) = \det F$, and, if $m = n+1$, $\Theta(F) = \mathrm{adj}_n F$, see [8]. Next, let $\psi : \mathbb{R}_+ \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be

such that $\psi(\alpha) = 0$ ($\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$), $g : \mathbb{R}^p \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a convex function and $W : \mathbb{M}^{m\times n} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$W(F) = \psi(q(F)) + g(\Theta(F)).$$

Then,

$$RW = QW = PW = g \circ \Theta. \tag{4.2}$$

To prove (4.2), it is sufficient, since $g \circ \Theta$ is polyconvex, to show that

$$RW = g \circ \Theta. \tag{4.3}$$

First, since $\psi \geq 0$, one has $W \geq g \circ \Theta$ and thus $RW \geq g \circ \Theta$. Next, let $F \in \mathbb{M}^{m\times n}$ be such that $F_1 \neq 0$ and $F_n \neq 0$; thus, if $b = (1, 0, \ldots, 0)$ and $c = (0, \ldots, 0, 1)$, then

$$q(F_n \otimes b) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad q(F_1 \otimes c) < 0. \tag{4.4}$$

• Assume that $q(F) \leq \alpha$; by (4.4) and proposition 2.2 there exist $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, $A, B \in \mathbb{M}^{m\times n}$ such that,

$$\begin{aligned}
&F = (1-\lambda)A + \lambda B\ , \quad \operatorname{rank}(A - B) \leq 1\\
&q(A) = q(B) = \alpha\\
&\Theta(A) = \Theta(B) = \Theta(F).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
RW(F) &\leq (1-\lambda)RW(A) + \lambda RW(B)\\
&\leq (1-\lambda)W(A) + \lambda W(B)\\
&= (1-\lambda)g(\Theta(A)) + \lambda g(\Theta(B))\\
&= g(\Theta(F)).
\end{aligned}$$

• Assume that $q(F) \geq \alpha$; then $-q(F) \leq -\alpha$ and, since $-q(F_1 \otimes c) > 0$, we can proceed as above to obtain

$$RW(F) \leq g(\Theta(F)).$$

So, for $F \in \mathbb{M}^{m\times n}$ such that $F_1 \neq 0$ and $F_n \neq 0$ we have $RW(F) = g(\Theta(F))$. Finally, by continuity of RW and $g \circ \Theta$, the equality (4.3) occurs.

Example 4.4. Let us consider the function W defined on $\mathbb{M}^{m\times n}$ by

$$W(F) = \varphi(|q(F)|^{\frac{1}{2}})$$

where q is a quadratic form on $\mathbb{M}^{m\times n}$ and $\varphi : \mathbb{R}_+ \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is such that

$$\inf_{t\in\mathbb{R}_+} \varphi(t) = \varphi(0).$$

Then, if q is either nonnegative or nonpositive, $PW > CW$ in general (see [8], theorem 1.3 (iii) p. 217, 218). But, if q is onto and if (3.5) holds, then by theorem 3.3, one has $RW = PW = QW = CW = \varphi(0)$.

5. The case of Ericksen-James stored energy function

In this last section, we would like to consider the function $\phi : \mathbb{M}^{2\times 2} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by (1.6).

For $F = \begin{pmatrix} f_{11} & f_{12} \\ f_{21} & f_{22} \end{pmatrix}$ one has

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(F) &= \kappa_1(f_{11}^2 + f_{21}^2 + f_{12}^2 + f_{22}^2 - 2)^2 + \kappa_2(f_{11}f_{12} + f_{21}f_{22})^2 \\ &\qquad + \kappa_3\left(\left(\frac{f_{11}^2 + f_{21}^2 - f_{12}^2 - f_{22}^2}{2}\right)^2 - \varepsilon^2\right)^2 \\ &= \phi_1(F) + \phi_2(F) + \phi_3(F).\end{aligned}$$

If we set

$$F_1 = \begin{pmatrix} f_{11} \\ f_{21} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad F_2 = \begin{pmatrix} f_{12} \\ f_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_1(F) &= \kappa_1(|F_1|^2 + |F_2|^2 - 2)^2 \\ \phi_2(F) &= \kappa_2(F_1.F_2)^2 \\ \phi_3(F) &= \kappa_3\left(\left(\frac{|F_1|^2 - |F_2|^2}{2}\right)^2 - \varepsilon^2\right)^2\end{aligned}$$

Now, let us denote by q_1, q_2 and q_3 the following quadratic forms

$$\begin{aligned}q_1(F) &= |F_1|^2 + |F_2|^2 \\ q_2(F) &= F_1.F_2 \\ q_3(F) &= |F_1|^2 - |F_2|^2.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, thanks to theorems 3.2 and 3.3 (see also examples 4.1 and 4.2), it is easy to obtain

$$\forall F \in \mathbb{M}^{2\times 2},\ \ R\phi_1(F) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if} \quad q_1(F) \le 2 \\ \phi_1(F) & \text{if} \quad q_1(F) \ge 2 \end{cases} \tag{5.1}$$

$$\forall F \in \mathbb{M}^{2\times 2},\ \ R\phi_2(F) = 0 \tag{5.2}$$

$$\forall F \in \mathbb{M}^{2\times 2},\ \ R\phi_3(F) = 0 \tag{5.3}$$

Remark 5.1. The equality (5.2) can also be obtained by using the Pipkin formula; see [10] and below.
We have the following result:

Theorem 5.2. *If $\kappa_1 = 0$, then*

$$R\phi = Q\phi = P\phi = C\phi = 0. \tag{5.4}$$

Proof. Let $F \in \mathbb{M}^{2\times 2}$.
First, assume that $q_3(F) \leq 2\varepsilon$. Let $a \in \{F_2\}^{\perp}$, $a \neq 0$ and $b = (1,0)$; then

$$q_3(a \otimes b) = a_1^2 + a_2^2 > 0.$$

So, by proposition 2.1, there exist $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\lambda \in [0,1]$ such that, if we set

$$A = F + \lambda t a \otimes b \qquad \text{and} \qquad B = F - (1-\lambda) t a \otimes b$$

then

$$F = (1-\lambda)A + \lambda B\ , \quad \operatorname{rank}(A-B) \leq 1$$
$$q_3(A) = q_3(B) = 2\varepsilon.$$

Next

$$q_2(A) = A_1.A_2 = (F_1 + \lambda t a).F_2 = F_1.F_2 = q_2(F).$$

The same computation gives $q_2(B) = q_2(F)$.
Therefore, for $F \in \mathbb{M}^{2\times 2}$ such that $q_3(F) \leq 2\varepsilon$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} R\phi(F) &\leq (1-\lambda)R\phi(A) + \lambda R\phi(B) \\ &\leq (1-\lambda)\phi(A) + \lambda\phi(B) \\ &= (1-\lambda)\phi_2(A) + \lambda\phi_2(B) \\ &= \phi_2(F). \end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

Next, assume that $q_3(F) \geq 2\varepsilon$. Let $a \in \{F_1\}^{\perp}$, $a \neq 0$ and $b = (0,1)$; then

$$q_3(a \otimes b) = -a_1^2 - a_2^2 < 0.$$

Applying proposition 2.1 for the quadratic form $-q_3$, we see there exists $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\lambda \in [0,1]$ such that, if we set

$$A = F + \lambda t a \otimes b \qquad \text{and} \qquad B = F - (1-\lambda) t a \otimes b$$

then

$$F = (1-\lambda)A + \lambda B\ , \quad \operatorname{rank}(A-B) \leq 1$$
$$-q_3(A) = -q_3(B) = -2\varepsilon.$$

Now, as before, we can prove that $q_2(A) = q_2(B) = q_2(F)$, and for $F \in \mathbb{M}^{2\times 2}$ such that $q_3(F) \geq 2\varepsilon$, one has

$$R\phi(F) \leq \phi_2(F). \tag{5.6}$$

Thus, (5.5) and (5.6) give $R\phi \le \phi_2$, which implies $R\phi \le R\phi_2$. Finally (5.2) gives $R\phi = 0$ and (5.4). □

After having obtained this first result, we were hoping to be able to prove that $R\phi = R\phi_1$; unfortunately this is not true as we will see in the next theorem. Before that, let us recall the Pipkin formula; when a function $W : \mathbb{M}^{m\times n} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (with $m \ge n$) satisfies

$$\forall F \in \mathbb{M}^{m\times n}\ , \quad W(F) = \tilde{W}(C) \quad \text{where} \quad C = F^T F$$

and, if $\tilde{W}$ is convex, then

$$\forall F \in \mathbb{M}^{m\times n}\ , \quad RW(F) = QW(F) = PW(F) = CW(F) = \inf_{S\in \S_n^+} \tilde{W}(F^T F + S) \quad (5.7)$$

where $\S_n^+$ denote the set of real $n \times n$ symmetric positive semidefinite matrices. See [10] (theorem 2 and comment (i) following this theorem). One has:

Theorem 5.3. *If $\kappa_3 = 0$, then $R\phi = Q\phi = P\phi = C\phi$ and for $F \in \mathbb{M}^{2\times 2}$ and $C = F^T F$, one has*

- $R\phi(F) = 0$ *if $tr(C) \le 2$ and $2|c_{12}| \le 2 - tr(C)$*
- $R\phi(F) = \kappa_1(tr(C) - 2)^2 + \kappa_2 c_{12}^2$ *if $tr(C) \ge 2$ and $\kappa_2|c_{12}| \le 2\kappa_1(tr(C) - 2)$*
- $R\phi(F) = \kappa_1(tr(C) - 2)^2 + \kappa_2 c_{12}^2 - \dfrac{(2\kappa_1(tr(C) - 2) - \kappa_2|c_{12}|)^2}{4\kappa_1 + \kappa_2}$

$$\text{if} \begin{cases} tr(C) \ge 2 \text{ and } \kappa_2|c_{12}| \ge 2\kappa_1(tr(C) - 2) \\ \text{or} \\ tr(C) \le 2 \text{ and } 2|c_{12}| \ge 2 - tr(C) \end{cases}$$

Proof. Since $\kappa_3 = 0$, then for $F \in \mathbb{M}^{2\times 2}$ and $C = F^T F$, one has

$$\phi(F) = \tilde{\phi}(C) = \kappa_1(\text{tr}(C) - 2)^2 + \kappa_2 c_{12}^2.$$

Clearly, the function $\tilde{\phi}$ is convex, and using (5.7) we can write $R\phi = Q\phi = P\phi = C\phi$ and

$$\forall F \in \mathbb{M}^{2\times 2}\ , \quad R\phi(F) = \inf_{S\in \S_2^+} \tilde{\phi}(F^T F + S). \quad (5.8)$$

Let us remark that, if $S = \begin{pmatrix} s_{11} & s_{12} \\ s_{21} & s_{22} \end{pmatrix}$, then

$$S \in \S_2^+ \iff s_{12} = s_{21},\ s_{11} \ge 0,\ s_{22} \ge 0 \ \text{ and } \ s_{12}^2 \le s_{11}s_{22}. \quad (5.9)$$

Now, let us consider $F \in \mathbb{M}^{2\times 2}$, $C = F^T F$ and set $p = \text{tr}(C) - 2$ and $r = c_{12}$. Thanks to (5.8) and (5.9) we have

$$R\phi(F) = \inf_{(x,y,z)\in D} h(x, y, z)$$

where

$$h(x,y,z) = \tilde{\phi}\left(C + \begin{pmatrix} x^2 & z \\ z & y^2 \end{pmatrix}\right) = \kappa_1(x^2+y^2+p)^2 + \kappa_2(z+r)^2$$

and $D = \{(x,y,z) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \ ; \ z^2 \leq x^2y^2\}$.
Since $h(x,y,z) \longrightarrow +\infty$ when $x^2+y^2+z^2 \longrightarrow +\infty$, it follows that $\inf\limits_{(x,y,z)\in D} h(x,y,z)$ is attained by a certain $(x_0,y_0,z_0) \in D$.

• *Case 1* : Let us assume that $p \leq 0$ and $|2r| \leq -p$; then there exists $(x_0,y_0,z_0) \in D$ such that

$$x_0^2 + y_0^2 = -p \quad \text{and} \quad z_0 = -r$$

and thus

$$h(x_0,y_0,z_0) = 0 = \inf_{(x,y,z)\in D} h(x,y,z).$$

• *Case 2* : Let us assume that either $p > 0$ or $|2r| > -p$; then

$$\forall (x,y,z) \in D \ , \quad (x^2+y^2+p, z+r) \neq (0,0). \tag{5.10}$$

Next,

$$\frac{\partial h}{\partial x}(x,y,z) = 2\kappa_1(x^2+y^2+p)x$$

$$\frac{\partial h}{\partial y}(x,y,z) = 2\kappa_1(x^2+y^2+p)y$$

$$\frac{\partial h}{\partial z}(x,y,z) = 2\kappa_2(z+r)$$

and therefore, thanks to (5.10), it is easy to see that

$$\forall (x,y,z) \in \overset{\circ}{D}, \quad \nabla h(x,y,z) \neq 0$$

which implies

$$\inf_{(x,y,z)\in D} h(x,y,z) = \inf_{(x,y,z)\in \partial D} h(x,y,z) = \inf_{(x,y)\in \mathbb{R}^2} g(x,y)$$

with $g(x,y) = \kappa_1(x^2+y^2+p)^2 + \kappa_2(xy+r)^2$. Now, to obtain this last infimum, let us compute $\nabla g(x,y)$:

$$\frac{\partial g}{\partial x}(x,y) = 2\kappa_1(x^2+y^2+p)x + 2\kappa_2(xy+r)y$$

$$\frac{\partial g}{\partial y}(x,y) = 2\kappa_1(x^2+y^2+p)y + 2\kappa_2(xy+r)x$$

So, if $\nabla g(x_0,y_0) = 0$ then

$$\begin{cases} (x_0^2+y_0^2+p)(x_0^2-y_0^2) = 0 \\ (x_0y_0+r)(x_0^2-y_0^2) = 0 \end{cases}$$

which gives, with (5.10), $x_0^2 = y_0^2$. Therefore

$$\inf_{(x,y)\in\mathbb{R}^2} g(x,y) = \min_{\varepsilon\in\{-1,1\}} \Big(\inf_{x\in\mathbb{R}} l_\varepsilon(x) \Big) \tag{5.11}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} l_\varepsilon(x) &= \kappa_1(2x^2+p)^2 + \kappa_2(\varepsilon x^2 + r)^2 \\ &= (4\kappa_1+\kappa_2)x^4 + 2(2\kappa_1 p + \varepsilon\kappa_2 r)x^2 + \kappa_1 p^2 + \kappa_2 r^2. \end{aligned}$$

Now, if we look for the infimum of the function $x \longmapsto \alpha x^4 + 2\beta x^2 + \gamma$, we obtain immediatly

$$\inf_{x\in\mathbb{R}} l_\varepsilon(x) = \begin{cases} \kappa_1 p^2 + \kappa_2 r^2 & \text{if} \quad 2\kappa_1 p + \varepsilon\kappa_2 r \geq 0 \\ \kappa_1 p^2 + \kappa_2 r^2 - \dfrac{(2\kappa_1 p + \varepsilon\kappa_2 r)^2}{4\kappa_1+\kappa_2} & \text{if} \quad 2\kappa_1 p + \varepsilon\kappa_2 r \leq 0 \end{cases}$$

and to conclude, it is enough to replace p and r by their values and use (5.11). □

Remark 5.4. When $\kappa_3 \neq 0$, the function $\tilde{\phi}$ is not convex and we can not apply the Pipkin formula.

Acknowledgements. We are indebted to Professor Chipot for pertinent remarks, and for his interest in our work.

References

[1] J. M. Ball: Convexity conditions and existence theorems in nonlinear elasticity, Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal. 64 (1977) 337–403.

[2] J. M. Ball, F. Murat: $W^{1,p}$-quasiconvexity and variational problems for multiple integrals, J. Funct. Anal. 58 (1984) 225–253.

[3] M. Bousselsal: Etude de Quelques Problèmes de Calcul des Variations Liés à la Mécanique, Thesis, University of Metz, 1993.

[4] M. Bousselsal and M. Chipot: Relaxation of some functionals of the calculus of variations, Arch. Math. 65 (1995) 316–326.

[5] P. G. Ciarlet: Mathematical Elasticity, Volume 1: Three-Dimensional Elasticity, North-Holland, 1988.

[6] P. G. Ciarlet: Elasticité Tridimensionnelle, Masson, Paris, 1986.

[7] C. Collins, M. Luskin: Numerical modeling of the microstructure of crystals with symmetry-related variants, Proceedings of the ARO US-Japan Workshop on Smart/Intelligent Materials and Systems, Honolulu, Hawaii, March 19-23, Technomic Publishing Company, Lancaster, PA, 1990.

[8] B. Dacorogna: Direct Methods in the Calculus of Variations, Applied Math. Sciences 78, Springer-Verlag Berlin et al., 1989.

[9] P. A. Gremaud: Numerical analysis of a nonconvex variational problem related to solid-solid phase transition, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 31 (1994) 111–127.

[10] H. Le Dret, A. Raoult: Quasiconvex envelopes of stored energy densities that are convex with respect to the strain tensor, in: Calculus of Variations, Applications and Computations, Proc. 2nd Europ. Conf. Elliptic Parabolic Problems, C. Bandle et al. (eds.), Pitman Res. Notes Math. Ser. 326 (1995) 138–146.

[11] C. B. Morrey: Quasiconvexity and the semicontinuity of multiple integrals, Pacific J. Math 2 (1952) 25–53.

[12] C. B. Morrey: Multiple Integrals in the Calculus of Variations, Springer-Verlag Berlin et al., 1966.

[13] A. C. Pipkin: Convexity conditions for strain-dependent energy functions for membranes, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. 121 (1993) 361–376.

[14] A. C. Pipkin: Relaxed energy densities for small deformations of membranes, IMA J. Appl. Math. 50 (1993) 225–237.

[15] A. C. Pipkin: Relaxed energy densities for large deformations of membranes, IMA J. Appl. Math. 52 (1994) 297–308.

[16] V. Šverák: Rank-one convexity does not imply quasiconvexity, Proc. Royal Soc.Edinburgh 120A (1992) 185–189.

HIER :

Leere Seite
320