



SCUOLA INTERNAZIONALE SUPERIORE DI STUDI AVANZATI

SISSA Digital Library

Quasistatic crack growth in elasto-plastic materials with hardening: The antiplane case

Original

Quasistatic crack growth in elasto-plastic materials with hardening: The antiplane case / Dal Maso, Gianni; Toader, Rodica. - In: ADVANCES IN CALCULUS OF VARIATIONS. - ISSN 1864-8258. - 17:2(2024), pp. 487-502. [10.1515/acv-2022-0025]

Availability:

This version is available at: 20.500.11767/138150 since: 2024-04-04T17:05:43Z

Publisher:

Published

DOI:10.1515/acv-2022-0025

Terms of use:

Testo definito dall'ateneo relativo alle clausole di concessione d'uso

Publisher copyright

note finali coverpage

(Article begins on next page)

11 May 2024

QUASISTATIC CRACK GROWTH IN ELASTO-PLASTIC MATERIALS WITH HARDENING: THE ANTIPLANE CASE

GIANNI DAL MASO AND RODICA TOADER

ABSTRACT. We study a variational model for crack growth in elasto-plastic materials with hardening in the antiplane case. The main result is the existence of a solution to the initial value problem with prescribed time-dependent boundary conditions.

Keywords: fracture mechanics, small strain associative elasto-plasticity with hardening, free-discontinuity problems, quasistatic evolution problems, rate independent processes, variational models.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 35R35, 74R10, 74C05.

1. INTRODUCTION

There are several models for elasto-plastic materials with hardening for which a complete mathematical theory is available. For this subject we refer to the classical books [19], [20], [22], [23], and papers [10], [11], [21], [25], [26], while for more recent results and for a review of the literature we refer to [6], [15], [16], and [27]. In this paper we study a model for the quasistatic crack growth in elasto-plastic materials with hardening, where an energetic formulation for elasto-plasticity is combined with the variational approach to irreversible crack growth. More precisely, we adopt the model of plasticity with hardening in the small strain regime presented in [24, Section 4.3.1.1]. As for crack growth, we follow the variational formulation introduced in [14] (see also [4]) and use some tools developed in [7]. In order to avoid a lot of technical difficulties, we prefer to consider here only the case of antiplane shear.

The reference configuration is a bounded open set Ω in \mathbb{R}^d , $d \geq 2$, with Lipschitz boundary, and the crack is described by a subset Γ of $\bar{\Omega}$ of dimension $d - 1$. The displacement is a function $u: \Omega \setminus \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and the corresponding strain is determined by its gradient ∇u , which is additively decomposed into an elastic and a plastic part: $\nabla u = e + p$. As in [24, Section 4.3.1.1], we consider also the scalar isotropic-hardening parameter $\eta: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

The energetic formulation of our problem is based on the energy used in linearised elasto-plasticity with hardening and on a dissipation distance depending also on the cracks. The energy is given by

$$\mathcal{E}(e, p, \eta) := \frac{\alpha}{2} \|e\|^2 + \frac{\beta}{2} \|p\|^2 + (\eta h | p) + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|\eta\|^2. \quad (1.1)$$

Here and in the rest of the paper the symbols $(\cdot | \cdot)$ and $\|\cdot\|$ denote the scalar product and the norm in $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ or $L^2(\Omega)$, according to the context. In the previous formula $\alpha > 0$ is the Hooke constant, $\beta > 0$ determines the kinematic hardening, $\gamma > 0$ determines the isotropic hardening, while $h \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a vector reflecting possible coupling between kinematic and isotropic hardening. We assume that $|h|^2 < \beta\gamma$, so that the energy satisfies a suitable coerciveness condition.

If $\Gamma_1 \subset \Gamma_2$ the dissipation distance is given by

$$\mathcal{D}(p_2, \eta_2, \Gamma_2; p_1, \eta_1, \Gamma_1) := \int_{\Omega} R(p_2 - p_1, \eta_2 - \eta_1) dx + \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\Gamma_2 \setminus \Gamma_1), \quad (1.2)$$

where R is a positively one-homogeneous dissipation potential satisfying the usual coerciveness and growth conditions (see (2.3) below), and \mathcal{H}^{d-1} is the $(d-1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure. To force the irreversibility of crack growth we set $\mathcal{D}(p_2, \eta_2, \Gamma_2; p_1, \eta_1, \Gamma_1) := +\infty$ if $\Gamma_1 \not\subset \Gamma_2$.

The evolution $t \mapsto (u(t), e(t), p(t), \eta(t), \Gamma(t))$ of our system in the time interval $[0, T]$ is driven by a time-dependent Dirichlet boundary condition of the form $u(t) = w(t)$ on $\partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma(t)$, where $w: [0, T] \rightarrow H^1(\Omega)$ is a prescribed absolutely continuous function. More precisely, a quasistatic evolution $t \mapsto (u(t), e(t), p(t), \eta(t), \Gamma(t))$ with boundary condition w is a function that satisfies the following conditions:

(GS) (global stability) for every $t \in [0, T]$ we have $\nabla u(t) = e(t) + p(t)$ in $\Omega \setminus \Gamma(t)$, $u(t) = w(t)$ on $\partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma(t)$, and

$$\mathcal{E}(e(t), p(t), \eta(t)) \leq \mathcal{E}(\hat{e}, \hat{p}, \hat{\eta}) + \mathcal{D}(\hat{p}, \hat{\eta}, \hat{\Gamma}; p(t), \eta(t), \Gamma(t))$$

for every crack $\hat{\Gamma}$, every hardening parameter $\hat{\eta}$, and every $(\hat{u}, \hat{e}, \hat{p})$ such that $\nabla \hat{u} = \hat{e} + \hat{p}$ in $\Omega \setminus \hat{\Gamma}$ and $\hat{u} = w(t)$ on $\partial\Omega \setminus \hat{\Gamma}$;

(EDB) (energy-dissipation balance) for every $t \in [0, T]$ we have

$$\mathcal{E}(e(t), p(t), \eta(t)) + \text{Diss}(p(\cdot), \eta(\cdot), \Gamma(\cdot); 0, t) = \mathcal{E}(e(0), p(0), \eta(0)) + \alpha \int_0^t (e(s) | \nabla \dot{w}(s)) ds,$$

where $\text{Diss}(p(\cdot), \eta(\cdot), \Gamma(\cdot); 0, t)$ denotes the dissipation in the interval $[0, t]$ corresponding to the distance \mathcal{D} introduced in (1.2) (see (2.5) below).

The main result of the paper is that, given $(u_0, e_0, p_0, \eta_0, \Gamma_0)$ satisfying condition (GS) at $t = 0$, there exists a quasistatic evolution with $u(0) = u_0$, $e(0) = e_0$, $p(0) = p_0$, $\eta(0) = \eta_0$, $\Gamma(0) = \Gamma_0$ (see Theorem 2.2). To obtain this result we use the standard variational approach based on the construction of discrete-time approximate solutions obtained by solving incremental minimum problems. Then we prove the convergence of these approximate solutions to a continuous-time quasistatic evolution satisfying (GS) and (EDB).

In Section 2 we present a detailed description of our model and introduce the function spaces used for a precise formulation of the problem. In particular, the estimates available for the displacement u lead us to choose a subspace of the space $GSBV(\Omega)$ of generalized special functions of bounded variation, for which we refer to [2, Section 4.5]. Unfortunately, we cannot choose the space $H^1(\Omega \setminus \Gamma)$ for the displacement, because there is no way to guarantee that the set Γ constructed in the proofs is closed, unless we impose additional unnatural topological assumptions.

As a consequence of the choice of $GSBV(\Omega)$ for the displacement, the crack Γ belongs to the set $\mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\bar{\Omega})$ of $(\mathcal{H}^{d-1}, d-1)$ -rectifiable subsets $\bar{\Omega}$ (see [12, 3.2.14(4)]).

In Section 3 we study the incremental minimum problems in detail. A nontrivial issue is the existence of a solution. This is due to the fact that, while an estimate of the L^2 -norm of ∇u is easily available, there are no estimates on the L^2 -norm of the displacement u (nor on any L^p -norm), due to the presence of the cracks. For this reason the compactness theorem in $GSBV(\Omega)$ by Ambrosio [1] (see also [2, Theorem 4.36]) cannot be applied. To overcome this difficulty we rely on a recent result proved in [17], which provides the convergence of a suitable modification of a minimising sequence. In this way we obtain the existence of a solution to the incremental minimum problems. We conclude this section by showing that a solution $(u_1, e_1, p_1, \eta_1, \Gamma_1)$ of an incremental minimum problem satisfies also

$$\mathcal{E}(e_1, p_1, \eta_1) \leq \mathcal{E}(\hat{e}, \hat{p}, \hat{\eta}) + \mathcal{D}(\hat{p}, \hat{\eta}, \hat{\Gamma}; p_1, \eta_1, \Gamma_1) \tag{1.3}$$

for every crack $\hat{\Gamma}$, every hardening parameter $\hat{\eta}$, and every $(\hat{u}, \hat{e}, \hat{p})$ such that $\nabla \hat{u} = \hat{e} + \hat{p}$ in $\Omega \setminus \hat{\Gamma}$ and $\hat{u} = u_1$ on $\partial\Omega \setminus \hat{\Gamma}$;

In Section 4 we recall a notion of convergence in $\mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\bar{\Omega})$, called σ -convergence, introduced in [18, Definition 6.1] and use its properties to prove the stability of the minimality

condition (1.3) with respect to the natural convergences of e_1 , p_1 , η_1 , and to the σ -convergence of Γ_1 . The proof relies on the jump transfer lemma of Francfort and Larsen [13, Theorem 2.1], adapted to σ -convergence in [18, Theorem 7.4].

In Section 5 we use the results of the previous sections to prove the existence of a solution to the initial value problem for the quasistatic evolution described by conditions (GS) and (EDB). As usual, we first construct approximate solutions by solving incremental minimum problems and then prove the convergence of a suitable subsequence. To this aim we use two variants of Helly's Theorem, one for functions with bounded variation with values in separable Hilbert spaces, and one for increasing functions with values in $\mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\overline{\Omega})$ endowed with the σ -convergence.

Condition (GS) for the limit functions is obtained thanks to the results of Section 4. The upper energy-dissipation inequality can be easily obtained by semicontinuity, while the lower energy-dissipation inequality, which in other papers (starting from the proof of [7, Theorem 3.15]) is obtained by approximating a Lebesgue integral with suitable Riemann sums, is proved here through an easier argument (see Lemma 5.4).

The corresponding problem in linearly elastic-perfectly plastic materials (without hardening) is much more difficult. The only result (see [9]), concerns the planar case and is obtained under a constraint: the number of connected components of the cracks is bounded by a prescribed constant. No result has been proved so far in dimension $d > 2$, not even in the antiplane case. In our opinion the main technical obstruction is related to possible interactions between cracks and concentrated plastic shears.

2. THE MODEL AND THE MAIN RESULT

In this section we present a variational model of a quasistatic crack growth in an elastoplastic material with hardening and state the main result of this paper. The model is based on the energetic formulation for rate-independent processes described in [24]. As explained in the introduction, we consider only the case of antiplane shear.

We assume that the elastic and plastic strains satisfy $e, p \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$, while the scalar isotropic-hardening parameter satisfies $\eta \in L^2(\Omega)$. The energy $\mathcal{E}(e, p, \eta)$ is defined by (1.1). We remark that the assumption $|h|^2 < \beta\gamma$ implies that there exists $\nu_0 > 0$ such that

$$\frac{\beta}{2}|\pi|^2 + \zeta h \cdot \pi + \frac{\gamma}{2}|\zeta|^2 \geq \nu_0(|\pi|^2 + |\zeta|^2) \quad (2.1)$$

for every $\pi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}$. We observe that by (2.1) the functional

$$\mathcal{E}: L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \times L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \times L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow [0, +\infty) \quad \text{is convex.} \quad (2.2)$$

To introduce the dissipation distance we consider a bounded closed convex set $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$ containing $(0, 0)$ in its interior. The dissipation potential $R: \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is its support function:

$$R(\pi, \zeta) := \sup_{(\pi^*, \zeta^*) \in \Sigma} (\pi^* \cdot \pi + \zeta^* \zeta).$$

It is well-known that R is convex and positively homogeneous of degree one. Moreover, it satisfies the inequalities

$$c_R(|\pi|^2 + |\zeta|)^{1/2} \leq R(\pi, \zeta) \leq C_R(|\pi|^2 + |\zeta|)^{1/2} \quad \text{for every } (\pi, \zeta) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}, \quad (2.3)$$

for suitable constants $0 < c_R \leq C_R$. The corresponding functional $\mathcal{R}: L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \times L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ is

$$\mathcal{R}(p, \eta) := \int_{\Omega} R(p, \eta) dx.$$

To describe the contribution of the crack to the dissipation distance we introduce the set $\mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\overline{\Omega})$ of $(\mathcal{H}^{d-1}, d-1)$ -rectifiable subsets $\overline{\Omega}$ (see [12, 3.2.14(4)]) and consider the

pseudo-distance \mathcal{H} on $\mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\overline{\Omega})$ defined by

$$\mathcal{H}(\Gamma_2, \Gamma_1) := \begin{cases} \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\Gamma_2 \setminus \Gamma_1) & \text{if } \Gamma_1 \subset \Gamma_2 \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where \mathcal{H}^{d-1} is the $(d-1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure. The complete dissipation distance in $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \times L^2(\Omega) \times \mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\overline{\Omega})$ is then given by

$$\mathcal{D}(p_2, \eta_2, \Gamma_2; p_1, \eta_1, \Gamma_1) := \mathcal{R}(p_2 - p_1, \eta_2 - \eta_1) + \mathcal{H}(\Gamma_2, \Gamma_1). \quad (2.4)$$

Given a time interval $[s, t]$ and three functions $p: [s, t] \rightarrow L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$, $\eta: [s, t] \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)$, and $\Gamma: [s, t] \rightarrow \mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\overline{\Omega})$, the corresponding dissipation is defined by

$$\text{Diss}(p(\cdot), \eta(\cdot), \Gamma(\cdot); s, t) := \sup \sum_{i=1}^k \mathcal{D}(p(t_i), \eta(t_i), \Gamma(t_i); p(t_{i-1}), \eta(t_{i-1}), \Gamma(t_{i-1})), \quad (2.5)$$

where the supremum is taken over all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and over all subdivisions $s = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_k = t$. In the same way we define

$$\text{Diss}_R(p(\cdot), \eta(\cdot), \Gamma(\cdot); s, t) := \sup \sum_{i=1}^k \mathcal{R}(p(t_i) - p(t_{i-1}), \eta(t_i) - \eta(t_{i-1})). \quad (2.6)$$

If $\Gamma(\cdot)$ is increasing on $[s, t]$, i.e., $\Gamma(\tau_1) \subset \Gamma(\tau_2)$ for every $s \leq \tau_1 < \tau_2 \leq t$, it is clear from (2.4) that

$$\text{Diss}(p(\cdot), \eta(\cdot), \Gamma(\cdot); s, t) = \text{Diss}_R(p(\cdot), \eta(\cdot), \Gamma(\cdot); s, t) + \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\Gamma(t) \setminus \Gamma(s)), \quad (2.7)$$

while

$$\text{Diss}(p(\cdot), \eta(\cdot), \Gamma(\cdot); s, t) = +\infty$$

if $\Gamma(\cdot)$ is not increasing on $[s, t]$.

To describe the energetic formulation of our evolution problem it is convenient to consider the displacement u as a function defined \mathcal{L}^d -a.e. in Ω , where \mathcal{L}^d denotes the d -dimensional Lebesgue measure. Since u might have essential discontinuity points on Γ , it is natural to assume that it belongs to a suitable function space which allows for discontinuities along $(d-1)$ -dimensional sets.

The estimates available for u lead us to choose a subspace of the space $GSBV(\Omega)$ of generalized special functions of bounded variation, for which we refer to [2, Section 4.5]. We recall that for every $v \in GSBV(\Omega)$ the approximate gradient ∇v is well-defined \mathcal{L}^d -a.e. in Ω , the jump set J_v of v is a countably $(\mathcal{H}^{d-1}, d-1)$ -rectifiable subset of Ω (according to [12, 3.2.14(3)]), and the trace of v on $\partial\Omega$ is well-defined \mathcal{H}^{d-1} -a.e. on $\partial\Omega$ (see [2, Theorem 4.34]).

To be precise, we consider the subspace $GSBV^2(\Omega)$ defined by

$$GSBV^2(\Omega) := \{v \in GSBV(\Omega) : \nabla v \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d), \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(J_v) < +\infty\}$$

and recall that $GSBV^2(\Omega)$ is a vector space (see, e.g., [7, Proposition 2.3]). In our model we assume that $u \in GSBV^2(\Omega)$, that the equality $\nabla u = e + p$ takes place \mathcal{L}^d -a.e. in Ω , and that $J_u \tilde{\subset} \Gamma$, where $A \tilde{\subset} B$ means $\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(A \setminus B) = 0$.

The Dirichlet boundary condition is prescribed through a function $w \in H^1(\Omega)$, imposing that the traces of u and w satisfy $u = w$ \mathcal{H}^{d-1} -a.e. on $\partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma$.

To simplify the exposition, given $\Gamma \in \mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\overline{\Omega})$ and $w \in H^1(\Omega)$, it is convenient to introduce the set $\mathcal{A}(\Gamma, w)$ of admissible pairs defined as the set of $(e, p) \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \times L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that there exists $u \in GSBV^2(\Omega)$ with the following properties:

$$\nabla u = e + p \quad \mathcal{L}^d\text{-a.e. in } \Omega, \quad (2.8)$$

$$J_u \tilde{\subset} \Gamma, \quad (2.9)$$

$$u = w \quad \mathcal{H}^{d-1}\text{-a.e. on } \partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma, \quad (2.10)$$

where the last equality is intended in the sense of traces.

We study the evolution problem on the time interval $[0, T]$ with $T > 0$. The time-dependent boundary condition is given by means of a function $t \mapsto w(t)$. We assume that $w \in AC([0, T]; H^1(\Omega))$, the space of absolutely continuous functions from $[0, T]$ with values in $H^1(\Omega)$. We recall that $\nabla \dot{w}(t)$ is well-defined for \mathcal{L}^1 -a.e. $t \in [0, T]$ and that $\nabla \dot{w} \in L^1((0, T); L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d))$ (see [5, Appendix]).

We are now in a position to give the precise definition of a quasistatic evolution for our model in the framework of the notion of energetic solutions for rate-independent systems.

Definition 2.1. Given $w \in AC([0, T]; H^1(\Omega))$, a quasistatic evolution with boundary condition w is a function $t \mapsto (e(t), p(t), \eta(t), \Gamma(t))$ from $[0, T]$ into $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \times L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \times L^2(\Omega) \times \mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\bar{\Omega})$ that satisfies the following conditions:

(GS) (global stability) for every $t \in [0, T]$ we have $(e(t), p(t)) \in \mathcal{A}(\Gamma(t), w(t))$ and

$$\mathcal{E}(e(t), p(t), \eta(t)) \leq \mathcal{E}(\hat{e}, \hat{p}, \hat{\eta}) + \mathcal{D}(\hat{p}, \hat{\eta}, \hat{\Gamma}; p(t), \eta(t), \Gamma(t))$$

for every $\hat{\Gamma} \in \mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\bar{\Omega})$, $(\hat{e}, \hat{p}) \in \mathcal{A}(\hat{\Gamma}, w(t))$, and $\hat{\eta} \in L^2(\Omega)$;

(EDB) (energy-dissipation balance) the function $t \mapsto e(t)$ belongs to $L^\infty((0, T); L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d))$ and for every $t \in [0, T]$ we have

$$\mathcal{E}(e(t), p(t), \eta(t)) + \text{Diss}(p(\cdot), \eta(\cdot), \Gamma(\cdot); 0, t) = \mathcal{E}(e(0), p(0), \eta(0)) + \alpha \int_0^t (e(s) | \nabla \dot{w}(s)) ds.$$

We are interested in the study of the existence of a quasistatic evolution with a prescribed initial condition $(e_0, p_0, \eta_0, \Gamma_0) \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \times L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \times L^2(\Omega) \times \mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\bar{\Omega})$. From the global stability condition it follows that the initial data must satisfy:

$$(e_0, p_0) \in \mathcal{A}(\Gamma_0, w(0)), \quad (2.11)$$

$$\mathcal{E}(e_0, p_0, \eta_0) \leq \mathcal{E}(\hat{e}, \hat{p}, \hat{\eta}) + \mathcal{D}(\hat{p}, \hat{\eta}, \hat{\Gamma}; p_0, \eta_0, \Gamma_0), \quad (2.12)$$

for every $\hat{\Gamma} \in \mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\bar{\Omega})$, $(\hat{e}, \hat{p}) \in \mathcal{A}(\hat{\Gamma}, w(0))$, and $\hat{\eta} \in L^2(\Omega)$.

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

Theorem 2.2. *Let $w \in AC([0, T]; H^1(\Omega))$ and let $(e_0, p_0, \eta_0, \Gamma_0) \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \times L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \times L^2(\Omega) \times \mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\bar{\Omega})$ be such that (2.11) and (2.12) hold. Then there exists a quasistatic evolution with boundary condition w such that $(e(0), p(0), \eta(0), \Gamma(0)) = (e_0, p_0, \eta_0, \Gamma_0)$.*

Theorem 2.2 will be proved through the usual variational approach. We first construct a discrete-time approximation by solving incremental minimum problems, then we prove the convergence of these approximate solutions to a solution according to Definition 2.1.

3. THE INCREMENTAL MINIMUM PROBLEM

In this section we study the incremental minimum problems, which have the following general form. Given $p_0 \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$, $\eta_0 \in L^2(\Omega)$, $\Gamma_0 \in \mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\bar{\Omega})$, and $w_1 \in H^1(\Omega)$, the problem is to find $(e_1, p_1, \eta_1, \Gamma_1) \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \times L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \times L^2(\Omega) \times \mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\bar{\Omega})$ such that

$$\begin{cases} (e_1, p_1) \in \mathcal{A}(\Gamma_1, w_1), \\ \mathcal{E}(e_1, p_1, \eta_1) + \mathcal{D}(p_1, \eta_1, \Gamma_1; p_0, \eta_0, \Gamma_0) \leq \mathcal{E}(\hat{e}, \hat{p}, \hat{\eta}) + \mathcal{D}(\hat{p}, \hat{\eta}, \hat{\Gamma}; p_0, \eta_0, \Gamma_0) \\ \text{for every } \hat{\Gamma} \in \mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\bar{\Omega}), (\hat{e}, \hat{p}) \in \mathcal{A}(\hat{\Gamma}, w_1), \text{ and } \hat{\eta} \in L^2(\Omega). \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

To solve this problem it is convenient to express it in terms of the displacement u . In order to deal with the boundary condition we introduce a bounded open set $\Omega' \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with Lipschitz boundary such that $\bar{\Omega} \subset \Omega'$ and we extend p_0 , η_0 , and w_1 to functions (denoted by the same symbols) belonging to the spaces $L^2(\Omega'; \mathbb{R}^d)$, $L^2(\Omega')$, and $H^1(\Omega')$, respectively.

To express (3.1) in terms of ∇u and J_u we introduce the function $f: \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ defined by

$$f(\xi, \pi, \zeta) := \min_{\hat{\pi} \in \mathbb{R}^d, \hat{\zeta} \in \mathbb{R}} g(\xi, \pi, \zeta, \hat{\pi}, \hat{\zeta}), \quad (3.2)$$

where $g(\xi, \pi, \zeta, \hat{\pi}, \hat{\zeta}) := \frac{\alpha}{2}|\xi - \hat{\pi}|^2 + \frac{\beta}{2}|\hat{\pi}|^2 + \hat{\zeta} h \cdot \hat{\pi} + \frac{\gamma}{2}|\hat{\zeta}|^2 + R(\hat{\pi} - \pi, \hat{\zeta} - \zeta)$. By (2.1) we have

$$g(\xi, \pi, \zeta, \hat{\pi}, \hat{\zeta}) \geq \frac{\alpha}{2}|\xi - \hat{\pi}|^2 + \nu_0|\hat{\pi}|^2 + \nu_0|\hat{\zeta}|^2. \quad (3.3)$$

Since $g(\xi, \pi, \zeta, \hat{\pi}, \hat{\zeta})$ tends to $+\infty$ as $|(\hat{\pi}, \hat{\zeta})| \rightarrow \infty$, the minimum in (3.2) is attained. Moreover, since g is strictly convex in $(\hat{\pi}, \hat{\zeta})$, the minimum point is unique. We introduce two functions $\tilde{\pi} : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\tilde{\zeta} : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$(\hat{\pi}, \hat{\zeta}) \text{ is a minimiser of } g(\xi, \pi, \zeta, \cdot, \cdot) \iff \begin{cases} \hat{\pi} = \tilde{\pi}(\xi, \pi, \zeta), \\ \hat{\zeta} = \tilde{\zeta}(\xi, \pi, \zeta). \end{cases}$$

By the uniqueness of the minimiser, the functions $\tilde{\pi}$ and $\tilde{\zeta}$ depend continuously on (ξ, π, ζ) . This implies that the function f is continuous.

Taking $\hat{\pi} = 0$ and $\hat{\zeta} = 0$ in (3.2), we obtain from (2.3) that

$$f(\xi, \pi, \zeta) \leq \frac{\alpha}{2}|\xi|^2 + R(-\pi, -\zeta) \leq \frac{\alpha}{2}|\xi|^2 + C_R(|\pi|^2 + |\zeta|^2)^{1/2}, \quad (3.4)$$

while by (3.3) we deduce that there exists $\mu_0 > 0$ such that

$$f(\xi, \pi, \zeta) \geq \mu_0|\xi|^2. \quad (3.5)$$

From (3.3) and (3.4) we infer that there exists a constant $\Lambda_0 > 0$ such that

$$|\tilde{\pi}(\xi, \pi, \zeta)| + |\tilde{\zeta}(\xi, \pi, \zeta)| \leq \Lambda_0|\xi| + \Lambda_0(|\pi| + |\zeta|)^{1/2}. \quad (3.6)$$

By (2.1) the function $(\hat{\pi}, \hat{\zeta}) \mapsto \frac{\beta}{2}|\hat{\pi}|^2 + \hat{\zeta} h \cdot \hat{\pi} + \frac{\gamma}{2}|\hat{\zeta}|^2 + R(\hat{\pi} - \pi, \hat{\zeta} - \zeta)$ is convex. Hence we can conclude that

$$\xi \mapsto f(\xi, \pi, \zeta) \quad \text{is convex in } \mathbb{R}^d \text{ for every } (\pi, \zeta) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}. \quad (3.7)$$

We consider the following auxiliary problem

$$\min_{\substack{u \in GSBV^2(\Omega') \\ u = w_1 \quad \mathcal{L}^d\text{-a.e. in } \Omega' \setminus \bar{\Omega}}} \int_{\Omega'} f(\nabla u, p_0, \eta_0) dx + \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(J_u \setminus \Gamma_0), \quad (3.8)$$

and study the existence of a solution.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $p_0 \in L^2(\Omega'; \mathbb{R}^d)$, $\eta_0 \in L^2(\Omega')$, $\Gamma_0 \in \mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\bar{\Omega})$, and $w_1 \in H^1(\Omega')$. Then there exists a solution to (3.8).*

Proof. Let $(u_k)_k$ be a minimising sequence for (3.8). By (3.5) we can apply [17, Theorem 3.1] with

$$E_k(v) := \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^2 dx + \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(J_v) \quad \text{and} \quad h_k = w_1$$

for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. We obtain a subsequence (not relabelled), modifications $(y_k)_k$ of $(u_k)_k$, and a function u such that the following conditions hold:

$$y_k, u \in GSBV^2(\Omega') \quad \text{and} \quad y_k = u = w_1 \quad \mathcal{L}^d\text{-a.e. in } \Omega' \setminus \Omega, \quad (3.9)$$

$$y_k \rightarrow u \quad \mathcal{L}^d\text{-a.e. in } \Omega', \quad (3.10)$$

$$\nabla y_k \rightharpoonup \nabla u \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla u_k \rightharpoonup \nabla u \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(\Omega'; \mathbb{R}^d), \quad (3.11)$$

$$\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(J_u \cap A) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(J_{y_k} \cap A) \quad \text{for every open set } A \subset \Omega', \quad (3.12)$$

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(J_{y_k} \setminus J_{u_k}) = 0. \quad (3.13)$$

In [17, Theorem 3.1] inequality (3.12) is proved only for $A = \Omega'$. The result for an arbitrary A in (3.12) follows from Ambrosio's compactness theorem ([2, Theorem 4.36]) applied to $GSBV^2(A)$. Inequality (3.13) can be obtained by a slight modification of the arguments used in [17]. Indeed, a careful inspection of the proof of (7)(i)-(ii) in [17, Theorem 3.2] allows us to replace (9)(ii) with the estimate $\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(J_v \setminus J_u) < C_M \theta$ for the functions u

and v and the constants C_M and θ in [17, Corollary 3.3]. This leads to the inequality $\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(J_{y_k} \setminus J_{u_k}) \leq \frac{1}{k}$ instead of (34)(i) in [17, Theorem 3.8].

By the convexity of $\xi \mapsto f(\xi, p_0(x), \eta_0(x))$ for \mathcal{L}^d -a.e. x in Ω' (see (3.7)) and by (3.11) we have

$$\int_{\Omega'} f(\nabla u, p_0, \eta_0) dx \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega'} f(\nabla u_k, p_0, \eta_0) dx. \quad (3.14)$$

Since $\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\Gamma_0) < +\infty$, for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a compact set $K \subset \Gamma_0$ such that $\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\Gamma_0 \setminus K) < \varepsilon$. By (3.12) and (3.13) we have

$$\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(J_u \setminus \Gamma_0) \leq \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(J_u \setminus K) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(J_{u_k} \setminus K) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(J_{u_k} \setminus \Gamma_0) + \varepsilon.$$

Passing to the limit as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ we obtain

$$\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(J_u \setminus \Gamma_0) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(J_{u_k} \setminus \Gamma_0).$$

Recalling that $(u_k)_k$ is a minimising sequence, this inequality together with (3.9) and (3.14) shows that u is a minimiser of (3.8). \square

Given a solution u_1 of (3.8) we set

$$p_1 := \tilde{\pi}(\nabla u_1, p_0, \eta_0), \quad e_1 := \nabla u_1 - p_1, \quad \eta_1 := \tilde{\zeta}(\nabla u_1, p_0, \eta_0), \quad \Gamma_1 := J_{u_1} \cup \Gamma_0. \quad (3.15)$$

Then $p_1, e_1 \in L^2(\Omega'; \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\eta_1 \in L^2(\Omega')$ by (3.6), while $\Gamma_1 \in \mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\overline{\Omega})$.

We now prove that $(e_1, p_1, \eta_1, \Gamma_1)$ solves the minimum problem (3.1).

Theorem 3.2. *Let u_1 be a solution of (3.8) and $e_1, p_1, \eta_1, \Gamma_1$ be defined by (3.15). Then $(e_1, p_1, \eta_1, \Gamma_1)$ is a solution to the minimum problem (3.1).*

Proof. Condition $(p_1, \eta_1) \in \mathcal{A}(\Gamma_1, w_1)$ is satisfied by definition. To prove the minimality we fix $\hat{\Gamma} \in \mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\overline{\Omega})$ with $\hat{\Gamma} \supseteq \Gamma_0$, $(\hat{e}, \hat{p}) \in \mathcal{A}(\hat{\Gamma}, w_1)$, and $\hat{\eta} \in L^2(\Omega)$. Let $\hat{u} \in GSBV^2(\Omega)$ be such that $\nabla \hat{u} = \hat{e} + \hat{p}$ \mathcal{L}^d -a.e. in Ω , $J_{\hat{u}} \subseteq \hat{\Gamma}$, and $\hat{u} = w_1$ \mathcal{H}^{d-1} -a.e. on $\partial\Omega \setminus \hat{\Gamma}$. We now extend $\hat{u}, \hat{e}, \hat{p}, \hat{\eta}$ to Ω' by setting $\hat{u} := w_1$, $\hat{e} := \nabla w_1 - p_0$, $\hat{p} := p_0$, $\hat{\eta} := \eta_0$ in $\Omega' \setminus \Omega$. Then $\hat{u} \in GSBV^2(\Omega')$, hence by (3.8) we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega'} f(\nabla u_1, p_0, \eta_0) dx + \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(J_{u_1} \setminus \Gamma_0) \leq \int_{\Omega'} f(\nabla \hat{u}, p_0, \eta_0) dx + \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(J_{\hat{u}} \setminus \Gamma_0),$$

which gives

$$\int_{\Omega} f(\nabla u_1, p_0, \eta_0) dx + \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(J_{u_1} \setminus \Gamma_0) \leq \int_{\Omega} f(\nabla \hat{u}, p_0, \eta_0) dx + \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(J_{\hat{u}} \setminus \Gamma_0).$$

By the definition (3.2) of f and (3.15) the previous inequality gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\alpha}{2} \int_{\Omega} |e_1|^2 dx + \frac{\beta}{2} \int_{\Omega} |p_1|^2 dx + \int_{\Omega} \eta_1 h \cdot p_1 dx + \frac{\gamma}{2} \int_{\Omega} |\eta_1|^2 dx \\ & \quad + \int_{\Omega} R(p_1 - p_0, \eta_1 - \eta_0) dx + \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(J_{u_1} \setminus \Gamma_0) \\ & \leq \frac{\alpha}{2} \int_{\Omega} |\hat{e}|^2 dx + \frac{\beta}{2} \int_{\Omega} |\hat{p}|^2 dx + \int_{\Omega} \hat{\eta} h \cdot \hat{p} dx + \frac{\gamma}{2} \int_{\Omega} |\hat{\eta}|^2 dx \\ & \quad + \int_{\Omega} R(\hat{p} - p_0, \hat{\eta} - \eta_0) dx + \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(J_{\hat{u}} \setminus \Gamma_0). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(J_{u_1} \setminus \Gamma_0) = \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\Gamma_1 \setminus \Gamma_0)$ and $\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(J_{\hat{u}} \setminus \Gamma_0) \leq \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\hat{\Gamma} \setminus \Gamma_0)$, the previous inequality gives $\mathcal{E}(e_1, p_1, \eta_1) + \mathcal{D}(p_1, \eta_1, \Gamma_1; p_0, \eta_0, \Gamma_0) \leq \mathcal{E}(\hat{e}, \hat{p}, \hat{\eta}) + \mathcal{D}(\hat{p}, \hat{\eta}, \hat{\Gamma}; p_0, \eta_0, \Gamma_0)$, thus proving that $(e_1, p_1, \eta_1, \Gamma_1)$ is a solution to the minimum problem (3.1). \square

In the proof of Theorem 2.2 we shall use also the property of the solution of (3.1) provided by the following proposition.

Proposition 3.3. *Let $(e_1, p_1, \eta_1, \Gamma_1)$ be a solution to the minimum problem (3.1). Then*

$$\mathcal{E}(e_1, p_1, \eta_1) \leq \mathcal{E}(\hat{e}, \hat{p}, \hat{\eta}) + \mathcal{D}(\hat{p}, \hat{\eta}, \hat{\Gamma}; p_1, \eta_1, \Gamma_1) \quad (3.16)$$

for every $\hat{\Gamma} \in \mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\overline{\Omega})$, $(\hat{e}, \hat{p}) \in \mathcal{A}(\hat{\Gamma}, w_1)$, and $\hat{\eta} \in L^2(\Omega)$.

Proof. It is enough to observe that

$$\mathcal{D}(\hat{p}, \hat{\eta}, \hat{\Gamma}; p_0, \eta_0, \Gamma_0) - \mathcal{D}(p_1, \eta_1, \Gamma_1; p_0, \eta_0, \Gamma_0) \leq \mathcal{D}(\hat{p}, \hat{\eta}, \hat{\Gamma}; p_1, \eta_1, \Gamma_1)$$

by the triangular inequality. \square

4. A NOTION OF CONVERGENCE FOR CRACKS AND STABILITY OF MINIMISERS

In this section we recall a notion of convergence for cracks introduced in [18] and use its properties to prove the stability of condition (3.16) (see Theorem 4.4).

Let $\mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\Omega')$ be the set of $(\mathcal{H}^{d-1}, d-1)$ -rectifiable subsets of Ω' , see [12, 3.2.14(4)]. For the definition of σ -convergence we refer to [18, Definition 6.1]. The following proposition summarises the basic properties of σ -convergence.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $(\Gamma_k)_k$ be a sequence in $\mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\Omega')$. Then*

- (a) *(compactness) if $(\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\Gamma_k))_k$ is bounded, then there exist a subsequence, not relabelled, and a set $\Gamma \in \mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\Omega')$ such that*

$$\Gamma_k \text{ } \sigma\text{-converges in } \Omega' \text{ to } \Gamma;$$

- (b) *(semicontinuity) if Γ_k σ -converges in Ω' to Γ then*

$$\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\Gamma \cap A) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\Gamma_k \cap A) \quad (4.1)$$

for every open subset A of Ω' ;

- (c) *(stability) if Γ_k σ -converges in Ω' to Γ and $(\tilde{\Gamma}_k)_k$ is a sequence in $\mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\Omega')$ such that $\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\tilde{\Gamma}_k \Delta \Gamma_k) \rightarrow 0$ then $\tilde{\Gamma}_k$ σ -converges in Ω' to Γ .*

Proof. Property (a) is proved in [18, Proposition 6.3]. Under the assumption of (b) we observe that $\Gamma_k \cap A$ σ -converges in A to $\Gamma \cap A$ for every open set $A \subset \Omega'$. Therefore (4.1) follows from [18, Proposition 6.3] if $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\Gamma_k \cap A) < +\infty$ and is trivial otherwise. Property (c) is proved in [18, Remark 6.2]. \square

The following proposition presents the main property of σ -convergence. According to [7, Definition 2.6], we say that a sequence $(u_k)_k$ converges to u weakly in $GSBV^2(\Omega')$ if $u_k, u \in GSBV^2(\Omega')$, $u_k \rightarrow u$ \mathcal{L}^d -a.e. in Ω' , $\nabla u_k \rightharpoonup \nabla u$ weakly in $L^2(\Omega'; \mathbb{R}^d)$, and $(\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(J_{u_k}))_k$ is bounded in \mathbb{R} .

Proposition 4.2. *Let $(\Gamma_k)_k$ be a sequence in $\mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\Omega')$ that σ -converges in Ω' to $\Gamma \in \mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\Omega')$. Let $(u_k)_k$ be a sequence in $GSBV^2(\Omega')$ with $u_k \rightharpoonup u$ weakly in $GSBV^2(\Omega')$ and $\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(J_{u_k} \setminus \Gamma_k) \rightarrow 0$. Then $J_u \tilde{\subset} \Gamma$.*

Proof. If, in addition, $u_k \in BV(\Omega') \cap L^\infty(\Omega')$ and $(u_k)_k$ is bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega')$, then the result follows from [18, Proposition 6.8]. The general case can be obtained by truncation, arguing as in [7, Proposition 4.6]. \square

In the proof of the stability result for (3.16) a crucial role is played by the following theorem which extends the jump transfer argument introduced in [13, Theorem 2.1].

Theorem 4.3 (Jump transfer in $GSBV^2$). *Let $(\Gamma_k)_k$ be a sequence in $\mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\overline{\Omega})$ σ -converging in Ω' to $\Gamma \in \mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\overline{\Omega})$ and let $v \in GSBV^2(\Omega')$. Then there exists a sequence*

$(v_k)_k$ in $GSBV^2(\Omega')$ such that

$$v_k = v \quad \mathcal{L}^d\text{-a.e. in } \Omega' \setminus \Omega, \quad (4.2)$$

$$v_k \rightarrow v \quad \mathcal{L}^d\text{-a.e. in } \Omega', \quad (4.3)$$

$$\nabla v_k \rightarrow \nabla v \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(\Omega'; \mathbb{R}^d), \quad (4.4)$$

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(J_{v_k} \setminus \Gamma_k) \leq \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(J_v \setminus \Gamma). \quad (4.5)$$

Proof. If, in addition, $v \in BV(\Omega')$, then the result follows from [18, Theorem 7.4]. In the general case we conclude arguing as in [7, Theorem 5.3]. \square

We are now ready to prove the stability result for (3.16).

Theorem 4.4 (Stability of minimisers). *Let $(e_k)_k, (p_k)_k, (\eta_k)_k, (\Gamma_k)_k, (w_k)_k$ be sequences in $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d), L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d), L^2(\Omega), \mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\overline{\Omega})$, and $H^1(\Omega)$, respectively. For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we suppose that $(e_k, p_k) \in \mathcal{A}(\Gamma_k, w_k)$ and*

$$\mathcal{E}(e_k, p_k, \eta_k) \leq \mathcal{E}(\hat{e}, \hat{p}, \hat{\eta}) + \mathcal{D}(\hat{p}, \hat{\eta}, \hat{\Gamma}; p_k, \eta_k, \Gamma_k) \quad (4.6)$$

for every $\hat{\Gamma} \in \mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\overline{\Omega})$, $(\hat{e}, \hat{p}) \in \mathcal{A}(\hat{\Gamma}, w_k)$, and $\hat{\eta} \in L^2(\Omega)$. Assume that

$$e_k \rightharpoonup e \text{ weakly in } L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d), \quad (4.7)$$

$$p_k \rightharpoonup p \text{ weakly in } L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d), \quad (4.8)$$

$$\eta_k \rightharpoonup \eta \text{ weakly in } L^2(\Omega), \quad (4.9)$$

$$\Gamma_k \sigma\text{-converges in } \Omega' \text{ to } \Gamma, \quad (4.10)$$

$$w_k \rightarrow w \text{ strongly in } H^1(\Omega). \quad (4.11)$$

Then $(e, p) \in \mathcal{A}(\Gamma, w)$ and

$$\mathcal{E}(e, p, \eta) \leq \mathcal{E}(\hat{e}, \hat{p}, \hat{\eta}) + \mathcal{D}(\hat{p}, \hat{\eta}, \hat{\Gamma}; p, \eta, \Gamma) \quad (4.12)$$

for every $\hat{\Gamma} \in \mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\overline{\Omega})$, $(\hat{e}, \hat{p}) \in \mathcal{A}(\hat{\Gamma}, w)$, and $\hat{\eta} \in L^2(\Omega)$.

To prove the theorem we use the following lemma.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $e \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$, $p \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$, $\eta \in L^2(\Omega)$, $\Gamma \in \mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\overline{\Omega})$, and $w \in H^1(\Omega)$. The following conditions are equivalent:*

(a) $(e, p) \in \mathcal{A}(\Gamma, w)$ and

$$\mathcal{E}(e, p, \eta) \leq \mathcal{E}(\hat{e}, \hat{p}, \hat{\eta}) + \mathcal{D}(\hat{p}, \hat{\eta}, \hat{\Gamma}; p, \eta, \Gamma) \quad (4.13)$$

for every $\hat{\Gamma} \in \mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\overline{\Omega})$, $(\hat{e}, \hat{p}) \in \mathcal{A}(\hat{\Gamma}, w)$, and $\hat{\eta} \in L^2(\Omega)$;

(b) $(e, p) \in \mathcal{A}(\Gamma, w)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq & \alpha(e|\tilde{e}) + \frac{\alpha}{2}\|\tilde{e}\| + \beta(p|\tilde{p}) + \frac{\beta}{2}\|\tilde{p}\|^2 + (\eta h|\tilde{p}) + (\tilde{\eta} h|p) + (\tilde{\eta} h|\tilde{p}) \\ & + \gamma(\eta|\tilde{\eta}) + \frac{\gamma}{2}\|\tilde{\eta}\|^2 + \mathcal{R}(\tilde{p}, \tilde{\eta}) + \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\tilde{\Gamma} \setminus \Gamma) \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

for every $\tilde{\Gamma} \in \mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\overline{\Omega})$, with $\tilde{\Gamma} \supset \Gamma$, $(\tilde{e}, \tilde{p}) \in \mathcal{A}(\tilde{\Gamma}, 0)$, and $\tilde{\eta} \in L^2(\Omega)$.

Proof. (a) \Rightarrow (b) Let $\tilde{\Gamma} \in \mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\overline{\Omega})$, with $\tilde{\Gamma} \supset \Gamma$, $(\tilde{e}, \tilde{p}) \in \mathcal{A}(\tilde{\Gamma}, 0)$, and $\tilde{\eta} \in L^2(\Omega)$. Define $\hat{\Gamma} = \tilde{\Gamma}$, $\hat{e} = e + \tilde{e}$, $\hat{p} = p + \tilde{p}$, $\hat{\eta} = \eta + \tilde{\eta}$, and observe that $(\hat{e}, \hat{p}) \in \mathcal{A}(\hat{\Gamma}, w)$. Substituting in (4.13) and using the definition of \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{D} we obtain (4.14). The proof of the other implication is similar. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.4. Since $(e_k, p_k) \in \mathcal{A}(\Gamma_k, w_k)$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $u_k \in GSBV^2(\Omega)$ such that

$$\nabla u_k = e_k + p_k \quad \mathcal{L}^d\text{-a.e. in } \Omega, \quad (4.15)$$

$$J_{u_k} \tilde{\subset} \Gamma_k, \quad (4.16)$$

$$u_k = w_k \quad \mathcal{H}^{d-1}\text{-a.e. on } \partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma_k. \quad (4.17)$$

We extend u_k to $\Omega' \setminus \Omega$ by setting $u_k := w_k$ in $\Omega' \setminus \Omega$ and observe that $u_k \in GSBV^2(\Omega')$ and that by (4.16) and (4.17) the jump of the extension in Ω' satisfies $J_{u_k} \tilde{\subset} \Gamma_k$.

By (4.7) and (4.15) we deduce that $(\nabla u_k)_k$ is bounded in $L^2(\Omega'; \mathbb{R}^d)$. Since also $\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(J_{u_k})$ is bounded we can apply [17, Theorem 3.1] and obtain a subsequence (not re-labelled), modifications $(y_k)_k$ of $(u_k)_k$, and a function u satisfying (3.9)-(3.13), with w_1 replaced by w . Applying Proposition 4.2 we conclude that $J_u \tilde{\subset} \Gamma$, hence $J_u \cap \Omega \tilde{\subset} \Gamma$ and $u = w$ on $\partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma$ in the sense of traces. By (3.11), (4.7), and (4.8) we obtain that $\nabla u = e + p$ \mathcal{L}^d -a.e. in Ω , which together with the previous remarks gives $(e, p) \in \mathcal{A}(\Gamma, w)$.

Let us fix $\tilde{\Gamma} \in \mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\overline{\Omega})$ with $\tilde{\Gamma} \tilde{\supset} \Gamma$, $(\tilde{e}, \tilde{p}) \in \mathcal{A}(\tilde{\Gamma}, 0)$, and $\tilde{\eta} \in L^2(\Omega)$. Then there exists a function $\tilde{v} \in GSBV^2(\Omega)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla \tilde{v} &= \tilde{e} + \tilde{p} \quad \mathcal{L}^d\text{-a.e. in } \Omega, \\ J_{\tilde{v}} &\tilde{\subset} \tilde{\Gamma}, \\ \tilde{v} &= 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega \setminus \tilde{\Gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

We extend \tilde{v} to $\Omega' \setminus \Omega$ by setting $\tilde{v} := 0$ on $\Omega' \setminus \Omega$ and observe that $\tilde{v} \in GSBV^2(\Omega')$. By the Jump Transfer Theorem 4.3 there exists a sequence $(\tilde{v}_k)_k$ in $GSBV^2(\Omega')$ which satisfies (4.2)-(4.5). We define $\tilde{e}_k := \nabla \tilde{v}_k - \tilde{p}$ and $\tilde{\Gamma}_k := \Gamma_k \cup J_{\tilde{v}_k}$. Then $\tilde{e}_k \rightarrow \tilde{e}$ strongly in $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ by (4.4), and $(\tilde{e}_k, \tilde{p}) \in \mathcal{A}(\tilde{\Gamma}_k, 0)$ for every k .

Using the implication (a) \Rightarrow (b) in Lemma 4.5, from (4.6) we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq & \alpha(e_k | \tilde{e}_k) + \frac{\alpha}{2} \|\tilde{e}_k\|^2 + \beta(p_k | \tilde{p}) + \frac{\beta}{2} \|\tilde{p}\|^2 + (\eta_k h | \tilde{p}) + (\tilde{\eta} h | p_k) + (\tilde{\eta} h | \tilde{p}) \\ & + \gamma(\eta_k | \tilde{\eta}) + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|\tilde{\eta}\|^2 + \mathcal{R}(\tilde{p}, \tilde{\eta}) + \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(J_{\tilde{v}_k} \setminus \Gamma_k) \end{aligned}$$

for every k . Passing to the limit as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and using (4.5) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq & \alpha(e | \tilde{e}) + \frac{\alpha}{2} \|\tilde{e}\|^2 + \beta(p | \tilde{p}) + \frac{\beta}{2} \|\tilde{p}\|^2 + (\eta h | \tilde{p}) + (\tilde{\eta} h | p) + (\tilde{\eta} h | \tilde{p}) \\ & + \gamma(\eta | \tilde{\eta}) + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|\tilde{\eta}\|^2 + \mathcal{R}(\tilde{p}, \tilde{\eta}) + \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(J_{\tilde{v}} \setminus \Gamma). \end{aligned}$$

Since $J_{\tilde{v}} \tilde{\subset} \tilde{\Gamma}$, from this inequality we obtain (4.14). The conclusion follows from the implication (b) \Rightarrow (a) in Lemma 4.5. \square

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.2

In this section we prove Theorem 2.2. We use the standard procedure based on the construction of discrete-time approximate solutions obtained by solving incremental minimum problems. To this aim for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we consider a subdivision $0 = t_k^0 < t_k^1 < \dots < t_k^k = T$ of $[0, T]$ such that

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq k} (t_k^i - t_k^{i-1}) \rightarrow 0 \quad (5.1)$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

Given $w \in AC([0, T]; H^1(\Omega))$ and $(e_0, p_0, \eta_0, \Gamma_0) \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \times L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \times L^2(\Omega) \times \mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\overline{\Omega})$ satisfying (2.11) and (2.12), the values of the approximate solutions at times t_k^i are defined in the following way. For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we set $e_k^0 := e_0$, $p_k^0 := p_0$, $\eta_k^0 := \eta_0$, and $\Gamma_k^0 := \Gamma_0$. Then, for $i = 1, \dots, k$ we define e_k^i , p_k^i , η_k^i , and Γ_k^i inductively as a solution to (3.1) with e_0 , p_0 , η_0 , Γ_0 , and w_1 replaced by e_k^{i-1} , p_k^{i-1} , η_k^{i-1} , Γ_k^{i-1} , and $w(t_k^i)$, respectively.

A crucial role in the proof of Theorem 2.2 is played by the following energy estimate for the discrete-time approximate solutions.

Lemma 5.1 (Discrete energy estimate). *There exists a sequence $a_k \rightarrow 0+$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{E}(e_k^i, p_k^i, \eta_k^i) + \sum_{j=1}^i \mathcal{D}(p_k^j, \eta_k^j, \Gamma_k^j; p_k^{j-1}, \eta_k^{j-1}, \Gamma_k^{j-1}) \\ & \leq \mathcal{E}(e_0, p_0, \eta_0) + \alpha \sum_{j=1}^i (e_k^j |\nabla w(t_k^j) - \nabla w(t_k^{j-1})|) + a_k \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and every $1 \leq i \leq k$.

Proof. Let us fix k and i . For every $1 \leq j \leq i$ we take $\hat{\Gamma} := \Gamma_k^{j-1}$, $\hat{e} := e_k^{j-1} + \nabla w(t_k^j) - \nabla w(t_k^{j-1})$, $\hat{p} := p_k^{j-1}$, and $\hat{\eta} := \eta_k^{j-1}$ as competitor in the minimum problem satisfied by $(e_k^j, p_k^j, \eta_k^j, \Gamma_k^j)$ and we obtain the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{E}(e_k^j, p_k^j, \eta_k^j) + \mathcal{D}(p_k^j, \eta_k^j, \Gamma_k^j; p_k^{j-1}, \eta_k^{j-1}, \Gamma_k^{j-1}) \\ & \leq \mathcal{E}(\eta_k^{j-1}, p_k^{j-1}, \eta_k^{j-1}) + \alpha (e_k^j |\nabla w(t_k^j) - \nabla w(t_k^{j-1})|) + \frac{\alpha}{2} \|\nabla w(t_k^j) - \nabla w(t_k^{j-1})\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Summing this inequalities for $1 \leq j \leq i$ we obtain (5.2) with

$$a_k := \frac{\alpha}{2} \sum_{j=1}^k \|\nabla w(t_k^j) - \nabla w(t_k^{j-1})\|^2 \leq M_k \sup_{1 \leq j \leq k} \|\nabla w(t_k^j) - \nabla w(t_k^{j-1})\|,$$

where $M_k := \frac{\alpha}{2} \sum_{j=1}^k \|\nabla w(t_k^j) - \nabla w(t_k^{j-1})\|$. Since $w \in AC([0, T]; H^1(\Omega))$, by (5.1) we conclude that $a_k \rightarrow 0+$. \square

The discrete energy estimate proved in the previous lemma leads to the following a priori estimate for the discrete-time approximate solutions.

Lemma 5.2 (A priori estimate). *There exists $C > 0$ such that*

$$\|e_k^i\|^2 + \|p_k^i\|^2 + \|\eta_k^i\|^2 + \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\Gamma_k^i) \leq C \quad (5.3)$$

for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $1 \leq i \leq k$.

Proof. Let $M_k := \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} (\|e_k^i\|^2 + \|p_k^i\|^2 + \|\eta_k^i\|^2)$. From (5.2) and the coerciveness (2.1) we obtain that there exists a constant $C_0 > 0$ such that

$$\|e_k^i\|^2 + \|p_k^i\|^2 + \|\eta_k^i\|^2 + \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\Gamma_k^i \setminus \Gamma_0) \leq C_0 \sum_{j=1}^k \|e_k^j\| \|\nabla w(t_k^j) - \nabla w(t_k^{j-1})\|. \quad (5.4)$$

Since $w \in AC([0, T]; H^1(\Omega))$ there exists a constant $C_1 > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^k \|\nabla w(t_k^j) - \nabla w(t_k^{j-1})\|_{L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C_1$$

for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, hence

$$\|e_k^i\|^2 + \|p_k^i\|^2 + \|\eta_k^i\|^2 \leq C_0 C_1 M_k^{1/2}$$

for every $1 \leq i \leq k$. Taking the supremum with respect to i we obtain that $M_k \leq C_0^2 C_1^2$. Taking into account (5.4) we now deduce that $\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\Gamma_k^i) \leq C_0^2 C_1^2 + \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\Gamma_0)$, which concludes the proof. \square

To prove the global stability condition (GS) in Definition 2.1 we observe that the approximate solutions satisfy a discrete-time version of the same property.

Remark 5.3. By Proposition 3.3 the quadruple $(e_k^i, p_k^i, \eta_k^i, \Gamma_k^i)$ satisfies

$$\mathcal{E}(e_k^i, p_k^i, \eta_k^i) \leq \mathcal{E}(\hat{e}, \hat{p}, \hat{\eta}) + \mathcal{D}(\hat{p}, \hat{\eta}, \hat{\Gamma}; p_k^i, \eta_k^i, \Gamma_k^i) \quad (5.5)$$

for every $\hat{\Gamma} \in \mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\bar{\Omega})$, $(\hat{e}, \hat{p}) \in \mathcal{A}(\hat{\Gamma}, w(t_k^i))$, and $\hat{\eta} \in L^2(\Omega)$.

Proof of Theorem 2.2. Let e_k^i , p_k^i , η_k^i , and Γ_k^i be defined as at the beginning of this section. For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and every $t \in [0, T]$ we consider their piecewise constant interpolations defined by:

$$e_k(t) := e_k^{i-1}, p_k(t) := p_k^{i-1}, \eta_k(t) := \eta_k^{i-1}, \Gamma_k(t) := \Gamma_k^{i-1}, w_k(t) := w(t_k^{i-1}) \quad (5.6)$$

for every $t \in [t_k^{i-1}, t_k^i]$ for $1 \leq i < k$, and $t \in [t_k^{i-1}, t_k^i]$ for $i = k$.

Note that $t \mapsto \Gamma_k(t)$ is increasing, $(e_k(t), p_k(t)) \in \mathcal{A}(\Gamma_k(t), w_k(t))$, and by Remark 5.3 we have

$$\mathcal{E}(e_k(t), p_k(t), \eta_k(t)) \leq \mathcal{E}(\hat{e}, \hat{p}, \hat{\eta}) + \mathcal{D}(\hat{p}, \hat{\eta}, \hat{\Gamma}; p_k(t), \eta_k(t), \Gamma_k(t)) \quad (5.7)$$

for every $\hat{\Gamma} \in \mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\bar{\Omega})$, $(\hat{e}, \hat{p}) \in \mathcal{A}(\hat{\Gamma}, w_k(t))$, and $\hat{\eta} \in L^2(\Omega)$.

By (5.3) we obtain that there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\|e_k(t)\|^2 + \|p_k(t)\|^2 + \|\eta_k(t)\|^2 + \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\Gamma_k(t)) \leq C \quad (5.8)$$

for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and every $t \in [0, T]$.

Recalling (2.5)-(2.7), by (5.2) it follows that there exists a sequence $b_k \rightarrow 0+$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{E}(e_k(t), p_k(t), \eta_k(t)) + \text{Diss}_R(p_k, \eta_k; 0, t) + \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\Gamma_k(t) \setminus \Gamma_0) \\ & \leq \mathcal{E}(e_0, p_0, \eta_0) + \alpha \int_0^t (e_k(\tau) |\nabla \dot{w}(\tau)|) d\tau + b_k \end{aligned} \quad (5.9)$$

for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and every $t \in [0, T]$.

Since $\nabla \dot{w} \in L^1(0, T; L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d))$, by (5.8) and (5.9), we obtain that there exists a constant $M_R > 0$ such that $\text{Diss}_R(p_k, \eta_k; 0, T) \leq M_R$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. By (2.3) this implies that the functions $t \mapsto p_k(t)$ and $t \mapsto \eta_k(t)$ have equibounded variation. By Helly's Theorem for functions of bounded variation with values in a separable Hilbert space (see, for instance, [3, Theorem 1.126]) there exist a subsequence, not relabelled, and two functions $p: [0, T] \rightarrow L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\eta: [0, T] \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)$ with $\text{Diss}_R(p, \eta; 0, T) \leq M_R$, such that for every $t \in [0, T]$

$$p_k(t) \rightharpoonup p(t) \text{ weakly in } L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d), \quad (5.10)$$

$$\eta_k(t) \rightharpoonup \eta(t) \text{ weakly in } L^2(\Omega). \quad (5.11)$$

The arguments used in [8, Theorem 6.3] and [7, Theorem 4.8] lead to a variant of Helly's theorem for increasing functions with values in $\mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\bar{\Omega})$ endowed with σ -convergence. More precisely, the bound on $\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\Gamma_k(t))$ in (5.8) implies that there exist a subsequence, not relabelled, and an increasing function $\Gamma: [0, T] \rightarrow \mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\bar{\Omega})$ such that

$$\Gamma_k(t) \text{ } \sigma\text{-converges to } \Gamma(t) \text{ for every } t \in [0, T]. \quad (5.12)$$

Let us fix $t \in [0, T]$. By (5.8) there exist a subsequence $(e_{k_j}(t))_j$, depending on t , and a function $e^* \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that

$$e_{k_j}(t) \rightharpoonup e^* \text{ weakly in } L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d). \quad (5.13)$$

By Theorem 4.4 we obtain that $(e^*, p(t)) \in \mathcal{A}(\Gamma(t), w(t))$ and

$$\mathcal{E}(e^*, p(t), \eta(t)) \leq \mathcal{E}(\hat{e}, \hat{p}, \hat{\eta}) + \mathcal{D}(\hat{p}, \hat{\eta}, \hat{\Gamma}; p(t), \eta(t), \Gamma(t)) \quad (5.14)$$

for every $\hat{\Gamma} \in \mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\bar{\Omega})$, $(\hat{e}, \hat{p}) \in \mathcal{A}(\hat{\Gamma}, w(t))$, and $\hat{\eta} \in L^2(\Omega)$.

By taking $\hat{p} = p(t)$, $\hat{\eta} = \eta(t)$, and $\hat{\Gamma} = \Gamma(t)$ in (5.14) we obtain

$$\|e^*\|^2 \leq \|\hat{e}\|^2 \quad (5.15)$$

for every $\hat{e} \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$, such that $(\hat{e}, p(t)) \in \mathcal{A}(\Gamma(t), w(t))$.

We claim that there exists a unique function $e^* \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $(e^*, p(t)) \in \mathcal{A}(\Gamma(t), w(t))$ and (5.15) holds. Indeed, if e_* satisfies the same properties then $\|e^*\| = \|e_*\|$, and if e^* and e_* do not coincide \mathcal{L}^d -a.e. in Ω , then the function $\tilde{e} := \frac{1}{2}e^* + \frac{1}{2}e_*$ satisfies $(\tilde{e}, p(t)) \in \mathcal{A}(\Gamma(t), w(t))$ and, by strict convexity, $\|\tilde{e}\|^2 < \|e^*\|^2$, which contradicts the minimality of e^* and proves the claim.

This uniqueness property implies that for every $t \in [0, T]$ there exists $e(t) \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that the whole sequence satisfies

$$e_k(t) \rightharpoonup e(t) \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d). \quad (5.16)$$

This shows that the function $t \mapsto e(t)$ from $[0, T]$ into $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ is weakly measurable, hence it is strongly measurable. Recalling (5.8) this proves that $e \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d))$.

Moreover, by (5.14) we have $(e(t), p(t)) \in \mathcal{A}(\Gamma(t), w(t))$ and

$$\mathcal{E}(e(t), p(t), \eta(t)) \leq \mathcal{E}(\hat{e}, \hat{p}, \hat{\eta}) + \mathcal{D}(\hat{p}, \hat{\eta}, \hat{\Gamma}; p(t), \eta(t), \Gamma(t)) \quad (5.17)$$

for every $\hat{\Gamma} \in \mathcal{R}_{d-1}(\bar{\Omega})$, $(\hat{e}, \hat{p}) \in \mathcal{A}(\hat{\Gamma}, w(t))$, and $\hat{\eta} \in L^2(\Omega)$. This proves condition (GS) in Definition 2.1.

We now prove condition (EDB). By the convexity of \mathcal{E} (see (2.2)) and the weak convergence of the functions (see (5.10), (5.11), and (5.16)) for every $t \in [0, T]$ we have

$$\mathcal{E}(e(t), p(t), \eta(t)) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}(e_k(t), p_k(t), \eta_k(t)). \quad (5.18)$$

For every subdivision $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_m = t$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathcal{R}(p(t_i) - p(t_{i-1}), \eta(t_i) - \eta(t_{i-1})) &\leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathcal{R}(p_k(t_i) - p_k(t_{i-1}), \eta_k(t_i) - \eta_k(t_{i-1})) \\ &\leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{Diss}_R(p_k(\cdot), \eta_k(\cdot); 0, t). \end{aligned}$$

Passing to the supremum over all subdivisions we obtain

$$\text{Diss}_R(p(\cdot), \eta(\cdot); 0, t) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{Diss}_R(p_k(\cdot), \eta_k(\cdot); 0, t) \quad \text{for every } t \in [0, T]. \quad (5.19)$$

By Proposition 4.1 we have

$$\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\Gamma(t) \setminus \Gamma_0) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\Gamma_k(t) \setminus \Gamma_0). \quad (5.20)$$

By (5.16) for every $\tau \in [0, T]$ we have

$$(e_k(\tau)|\nabla \dot{w}(\tau)) \rightarrow (e(\tau)|\nabla \dot{w}(\tau)).$$

By (5.8) we can apply the Dominated Convergence Theorem and we obtain

$$\int_0^t (e_k(\tau)|\nabla \dot{w}(\tau)) d\tau \rightarrow \int_0^t (e(\tau)|\nabla \dot{w}(\tau)) d\tau. \quad (5.21)$$

Passing to the limit in (5.9) by (5.18)-(5.21) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(e(t), p(t), \eta(t)) + \text{Diss}_R(p(\cdot), \eta(\cdot); 0, t) + \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\Gamma(t) \setminus \Gamma_0) \\ \leq \mathcal{E}(e_0, p_0, \eta_0) + \alpha \int_0^t (e(\tau)|\nabla \dot{w}(\tau)) d\tau \end{aligned} \quad (5.22)$$

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

To prove the opposite inequality we use the following lemma. Given $t > 0$, let

$$s_k^i := \frac{i}{k}t \quad \text{for every } k \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } i = 0, 1, \dots, k. \quad (5.23)$$

For every $s \in (0, s_k^1)$ we subdivide $[0, t]$ by means of the points

$$\tau_{k,s}^0 := 0, \quad \tau_{k,s}^i := s_k^i - s \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, k, \quad \tau_{k,s}^{k+1} = t. \quad (5.24)$$

Lemma 5.4. *Let X be a Banach space, let $t > 0$, let s_k^i and $\tau_{k,s}^i$ be defined by (5.23) and (5.24), let $f: [0, t] \rightarrow X$ be a Bochner integrable function, let $f_s^k: (0, t] \rightarrow X$ be the piecewise constant function defined by*

$$f_s^k(\tau) := f(\tau_{k,s}^i) \quad \text{for } \tau \in (\tau_{k,s}^{i-1}, \tau_{k,s}^i], \quad i = 1, \dots, k+1$$

and let $f^k: [0, t] \rightarrow X$ be the Bochner integrable function defined by

$$f^k(\tau) := \frac{1}{s_k^1} \int_0^{s_k^1} f_s^k(\tau) ds \quad \text{for every } \tau \in [0, t].$$

Then

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t \|f^k(\tau) - f(\tau)\|_X d\tau = 0. \quad (5.25)$$

Proof. If $s_k^{i-1} < \tau \leq s_k^i$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$ an elementary change of variables gives

$$s_k^1 f^k(\tau) = \int_{s_k^{i-1}}^\tau f(\sigma + s_k^1) d\sigma + \int_\tau^{s_k^i} f(\sigma) d\sigma = \int_{s_k^{i-1}}^\tau (f(\sigma + s_k^1) - f(\sigma)) d\sigma + \int_{s_k^{i-1}}^{s_k^i} f(\sigma) d\sigma \quad (5.26)$$

If $s_k^{k-1} < \tau \leq s_k^k = t$ the same argument gives

$$s_k^1 f^k(\tau) = \int_{s_k^{k-1}}^\tau f(t) d\sigma + \int_\tau^{s_k^k} f(\sigma) d\sigma = \int_{s_k^{k-1}}^\tau (f(t) - f(\sigma)) d\sigma + \int_{s_k^{k-1}}^{s_k^k} f(\sigma) d\sigma. \quad (5.27)$$

Let $\bar{f}^k: [0, t] \rightarrow X$ be the piecewise constant function defined by

$$\bar{f}^k(\tau) := \frac{1}{s_k^1} \int_{s_k^{i-1}}^{s_k^i} f(\sigma) d\sigma$$

for $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ and $s_k^{i-1} < \tau \leq s_k^i$. It is known (see, for instance, [5, Appendix]) that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t \|\bar{f}^k(\tau) - f(\tau)\|_X d\tau = 0. \quad (5.28)$$

From (5.26) and (5.27) we deduce that

$$\|f^k(\tau) - \bar{f}^k(\tau)\|_X \leq \frac{1}{s_k^1} \int_{s_k^{i-1}}^{s_k^i} \|f(\sigma + s_k^1) - f(\sigma)\|_X d\sigma$$

if $s_k^{i-1} < \tau \leq s_k^i$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$, while

$$\|f^k(\tau) - \bar{f}^k(\tau)\|_X \leq \frac{1}{s_k^1} \int_{s_k^{k-1}}^{s_k^k} \|f(t) - f(\sigma)\|_X d\sigma$$

if $s_k^{k-1} < \tau \leq s_k^k = t$. Integrating these inequalities with respect to τ and adding with respect to i we obtain

$$\int_0^t \|f^k(\tau) - \bar{f}^k(\tau)\|_X d\tau \leq \int_0^{s_k^{k-1}} \|f(\sigma + s_k^1) - f(\sigma)\|_X d\sigma + \int_{s_k^{k-1}}^{s_k^k} \|f(t) - f(\sigma)\|_X d\sigma.$$

By the continuity in L^1 of translations and by the absolute continuity of the integral, from this inequality we obtain

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t \|f^k(\tau) - \bar{f}^k(\tau)\|_X d\tau = 0,$$

which, together with (5.28), gives (5.25). \square

Proof of Theorem 2.2 (continuation). We fix $t \in (0, T]$. For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ let s_k^i and $\tau_{k,s}^i$ be defined by (5.23) and (5.24). For every $s \in (0, s_k^1)$ let $e_s^k: [0, t] \rightarrow L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ be the piecewise constant function defined by

$$e_s^k(\tau) := e(\tau_{k,s}^i) \quad \text{for } \tau \in (\tau_{k,s}^{i-1}, \tau_{k,s}^i], \quad i = 1, \dots, k+1$$

and let $e^k : [0, t] \rightarrow L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ be the Bochner integrable function defined by

$$e^k(\tau) := \frac{1}{s_k^1} \int_0^{\tau} e_s^k(\tau) ds \quad \text{for every } \tau \in [0, t].$$

By Lemma 5.4 we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t \|e^k(\tau) - e(\tau)\| d\tau = 0. \quad (5.29)$$

Given $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $s \in (0, s_k^1)$, and $i \in \{1, \dots, k+1\}$, we use the inequality (5.17), with $t = \tau_{k,s}^{i-1}$, $\hat{e} = e(\tau_{k,s}^i) - \nabla w(\tau_{k,s}^i) + \nabla w(\tau_{k,s}^{i-1})$, $\hat{p} = p(\tau_{k,s}^i)$, $\hat{\eta} = \eta(\tau_{k,s}^i)$, and $\hat{\Gamma} = \Gamma(\tau_{k,s}^i)$, obtaining

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{E}(e(\tau_{k,s}^{i-1}), p(\tau_{k,s}^{i-1}), \eta(\tau_{k,s}^{i-1})) \leq \mathcal{E}(e(\tau_{k,s}^i), p(\tau_{k,s}^i), \eta(\tau_{k,s}^i)) \\ & + \mathcal{R}(p(\tau_{k,s}^i) - p(\tau_{k,s}^{i-1}), \eta(\tau_{k,s}^i) - \eta(\tau_{k,s}^{i-1})) + \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\Gamma(\tau_{k,s}^i) \setminus \Gamma(\tau_{k,s}^{i-1})) \\ & - \alpha(e(\tau_{k,s}^i) | \nabla w(\tau_{k,s}^i) - \nabla w(\tau_{k,s}^{i-1})) + \frac{\alpha}{2} \|\nabla w(\tau_{k,s}^i) - \nabla w(\tau_{k,s}^{i-1})\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Summing for $i = 1, \dots, k+1$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(e(0), p(0), \eta(0)) & \leq \mathcal{E}(e(t), p(t), \eta(t)) + \text{Diss}_R(p(\cdot), \eta(\cdot); 0, t) \\ & + \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\Gamma(t) \setminus \Gamma_0) - \alpha \int_0^t (e_s^k(\tau) | \nabla \dot{w}(\tau)) d\tau + \varepsilon_k(w, t), \end{aligned} \quad (5.30)$$

where

$$\varepsilon_k(w, t) := \frac{\alpha}{2} \sup_{s \in (0, s_k^1)} \|\nabla w(\tau_{k,s}^i) - \nabla w(\tau_{k,s}^{i-1})\| \int_0^t \|\nabla \dot{w}(\tau)\| d\tau.$$

Since $w \in AC([0, T]; H^1(\Omega))$ we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_k(w, t) = 0. \quad (5.31)$$

Taking the mean value for $s \in (0, s_k^1)$, from (5.30) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(e(0), p(0), \eta(0)) & \leq \mathcal{E}(e(t), p(t), \eta(t)) + \text{Diss}_R(p(\cdot), \eta(\cdot); 0, t) \\ & + \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\Gamma(t) \setminus \Gamma_0) - \alpha \int_0^t (e^k(\tau) | \nabla \dot{w}(\tau)) d\tau + \varepsilon_k(w, t). \end{aligned}$$

Passing to the limit as $k \rightarrow \infty$, from Lemma 5.4 and from (5.31) we obtain the inequality opposite to (5.22), thus concluding the proof of condition (EDB) in Definition 2.1. \square

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS. This paper is based on work supported by the National Research Project (PRIN 2017) "Variational Methods for Stationary and Evolution Problems with Singularities and Interfaces", funded by the Italian Ministry of University and Research. The authors are members of the Gruppo Nazionale per l'Analisi Matematica, la Probabilità e le loro Applicazioni (GNAMPA) of the Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica (INdAM).

REFERENCES

- [1] Ambrosio L.: A compactness theorem for a new class of functions of bounded variation. *Boll. Un. Mat. Ital. B (7)* **3** (1989), 857-881.
- [2] Ambrosio L., Fusco N., Pallara D.: Functions of bounded variation and free discontinuity problems. Oxford Mathematical Monographs. *The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York*, 2000.
- [3] Barbu V., Precupanu T.: Convexity and optimization in Banach spaces. Fourth edition. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. *Springer, Dordrecht*, 2012.
- [4] Bourdin B., Francfort G.A., Marigo J.-J.: The variational approach to fracture. Reprinted from *J. Elasticity* 91 (2008). *Springer, New York*, 2008.
- [5] Brézis H.: Opérateurs maximaux monotones et semi-groupes de contractions dans les espaces de Hilbert. (French) North-Holland Mathematics Studies, No. 5. Notas de Matemática, No. 50. *North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam-London; American Elsevier Publishing Co., Inc., New York*, 1973.
- [6] Brokate M., Krejčí P.: Wellposedness of kinematic hardening models in elastoplasticity. *RAIRO Modél. Math. Anal. Numér.* **32** (1998), 177-209.

- [7] Dal Maso G., Francfort G.A., Toader R.: Quasistatic crack growth in nonlinear elasticity. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **176** (2005), 165-225.
- [8] Dal Maso G., Toader R.: A model for the quasi-static growth of brittle fractures: existence and approximation results. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **162** (2002), 101-135.
- [9] Dal Maso G., Toader R.: Quasistatic crack growth in elasto-plastic materials: the two-dimensional case. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **196** (2010), 867-906.
- [10] Drucker D. C.: Some implications of work hardening and ideal plasticity. *Quart. Appl. Math.* **7** (1950), 411-418.
- [11] Drucker, D. C. Stress-strain relations for strain hardening materials: Discussion and proposed experiments. Proc. Symposia Appl. Math., Vol. I, pp. 181-187. *American Mathematical Society, New York, N. Y.*, 1949.
- [12] Federer H.: Geometric measure theory. Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 153 *Springer-Verlag New York Inc., New York*, 1969.
- [13] Francfort G.A., Larsen, C.J.: Existence and convergence for quasi-static evolution in brittle fracture. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **56** (2003), 1465-1500.
- [14] Francfort G.A., Marigo J.-J.: Revisiting brittle fracture as an energy minimization problem. *J. Mech. Phys. Solids* **46** (1998), 1319-1342.
- [15] Francfort G.A., Stefanelli U.: Quasi-static evolution for the Armstrong-Frederick hardening-plasticity model. *Appl. Math. Res. Express. AMRX* **2** (2013), 297-344.
- [16] Frehse J., Löbch D.: Regularity results for three-dimensional isotropic and kinematic hardening including boundary differentiability. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* **19** (2009), 2231-2262.
- [17] Friedrich M.: A compactness result in $GSBV^p$ and applications to Γ -convergence for free discontinuity problems. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* **58** (2019), Paper No. 86.
- [18] Giacomini A., Ponsiglione M.: A Γ -convergence approach to stability of unilateral minimality properties in fracture mechanics and applications. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **180** (2006) 399-447.
- [19] Gurtin M.E., Fried E., Anand L.: The mechanics and thermodynamics of continua. *Cambridge University Press, Cambridge*, 2010.
- [20] Han W., Reddy B. D.: Plasticity. Mathematical theory and numerical analysis. Interdisciplinary Applied Mathematics, 9. *Springer-Verlag, New York*, 1999.
- [21] Johnson C.: On plasticity with hardening. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **62** (1978), 325-336.
- [22] Lemaitre J., Chaboche J.-L.: Mechanics of Solid Materials, *Cambridge University Press, Cambridge*, 1990.
- [23] Maugin G.A.: The thermomechanics of plasticity and fracture. Cambridge Texts in Applied Mathematics. *Cambridge University Press, Cambridge*, 1992.
- [24] Mielke A., Roubíček T.: Rate-independent systems. Theory and application. Applied Mathematical Sciences, 193. *Springer, New York*, 2015.
- [25] Prager W.: Strain hardening under combined stresses. *J. Appl. Phys.* **16** (1945), 837-840.
- [26] Prager W.: Recent developments in the mathematical theory of plasticity. *J. Appl. Phys.* **20** 235-241 (1949)
- [27] Stefanelli U.: A variational principle for hardening elastoplasticity. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **40** (2008), 623-652.

(Gianni Dal Maso) SISSA, VIA BEIRUT 2-4, 34014 TRIESTE, ITALY
Email address, Gianni Dal Maso: dalmaso@sisssa.it

(Rodica Toader) UNIVERSITÀ DI UDINE, D.M.I.F., VIA DELLE SCIENZE 208, 33100 UDINE, ITALY
Email address, Rodica Toader: toader@uniud.it