

Rank-($n - 1$) convexity and quasiconvexity for divergence free fields

Article (Published Version)

Palombaro, Mariapia (2010) Rank-($n - 1$) convexity and quasiconvexity for divergence free fields. *Advances in Calculus of Variations*, 3 (3). pp. 279-285. ISSN 1864-8258

This version is available from Sussex Research Online: <http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/id/eprint/49470/>

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies and may differ from the published version or from the version of record. If you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the URL above for details on accessing the published version.

Copyright and reuse:

Sussex Research Online is a digital repository of the research output of the University.

Copyright and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable, the material made available in SRO has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Rank- $(n - 1)$ convexity and quasiconvexity for divergence free fields

Mariapia Palombaro

Communicated by G. Dal Maso

Abstract. We prove that rank- $(n - 1)$ convexity does not imply quasiconvexity with respect to divergence free fields (so-called \mathcal{S} -quasiconvexity) in $\mathbb{M}^{m \times n}$ for $m > n$, by adapting the well-known Šverák's counterexample to the solenoidal setting. On the other hand, we also remark that rank- $(n - 1)$ convexity and \mathcal{S} -quasiconvexity turn out to be equivalent in the space of $n \times n$ diagonal matrices.

Keywords. \mathcal{A} -quasiconvexity, lower semicontinuity, solenoidal fields.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. 49J45.

1 Introduction

The purpose of this note is to generalize some known results about the relationship between rank-one convexity and quasiconvexity to the context of divergence free fields. Let us recall the relevant definitions. A function $f : \mathbb{M}^{m \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ on the $m \times n$ matrices is called rank-one convex if it is convex on each rank-one line, i.e., for every $A, Y \in \mathbb{M}^{m \times n}$ with $\text{rank}(Y) = 1$, the function $t \rightarrow f(A + tY)$ is convex. It is quasiconvex if

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^n} f(A + \nabla \varphi) dx \geq f(A),$$

for all $A \in \mathbb{M}^{m \times n}$ and for all \mathbb{T}^n -periodic functions $\varphi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^m)$, where $\mathbb{T}^n := (0, 1)^n$. Quasiconvexity implies rank-one convexity. Whether the converse is true for $m = 2$ and $n \geq 2$ is an outstanding open problem. In the higher dimensional case $m \geq 3$, Šverák's counterexample [9] shows that rank-one convexity is not the same as quasiconvexity. On the other hand, Müller [6] proved that the two notions are equivalent for 2×2 diagonal matrices. See also [2, 5] for further generalizations.

In the spirit of \mathcal{A} -quasiconvexity and in relation to the lower semicontinuity results provided by Fonseca and Müller ([3], Theorems 3.6–3.7), we provide in this note the counterpart of the above mentioned results in the context of divergence free fields. This is motivated by the connection with the problem of bounding effective properties of composites (cf., for example, [4]), as well as with relaxation problems in elasticity

(see [8]). Further applications are to be found in the study of the Born-Infeld equations (see, e.g., [1, 7]).

The corresponding notion of quasiconvexity for solenoidal fields, that we call \mathcal{S} -quasiconvexity, is defined as follows.

Definition 1.1. A function $f : \mathbb{M}^{m \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be \mathcal{S} -quasiconvex if for each smooth \mathbb{T}^n -periodic matrix field $B : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{M}^{m \times n}$ such that $\text{Div} B = 0$, the following inequality holds:

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^n} f(B) dx \geq f \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^n} B dx \right). \tag{1.1}$$

The symbol Div in the Definition 1.1 denotes the operator which acts as the divergence on each row of the matrix field B . While quasiconvexity implies convexity along rank-one lines, it is easily checked that \mathcal{S} -quasiconvexity implies convexity along rank- $(n - 1)$ lines. Indeed if a function f is \mathcal{S} -quasiconvex, then $t \rightarrow f(A + tV)$ is convex for every $A, V \in \mathbb{M}^{m \times n}$ with $\text{rank}(V) \leq n - 1$. Our aim in this note is to show that rank- $(n - 1)$ convexity does not imply \mathcal{S} -quasiconvexity in $\mathbb{M}^{m \times n}$, for $m \geq n + 1 \geq 4$. More precisely we prove the following result.

Theorem 1.2. *For all $n \geq 3$ and $m \geq n + 1$, there exists $F : \mathbb{M}^{m \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that F is rank- $(n - 1)$ convex but not \mathcal{S} -quasiconvex.*

The proof of Theorem 1.2 is essentially based on the Šverák’s counterexample adapted to the solenoidal setting and is reminiscent of an example given by Tartar in connection with a theorem in compensated compactness (see [10, pp. 185–186]).

We do not know whether \mathcal{S} -quasiconvexity and rank- $(n - 1)$ convexity are equivalent in the case when $m = n$. An interesting open question is whether the solution to this problem, for any $n > 2$, would give a solution to the corresponding problem for gradients in the case $n > m = 2$, or viceversa. Nevertheless, Müller’s result on quasiconvexity on diagonal matrices extends as well to the divergence free fields. If we identify the space $D(n)$ of diagonal $n \times n$ matrices with \mathbb{R}^n via $y \rightarrow \text{diag}(y_1, \dots, y_n)$, then a rank- $(n - 1)$ convex function on $D(n)$ may be regarded as a function on \mathbb{R}^n which is convex on each hyperplane $\{y_i = \text{const}\}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then, a straightforward generalization of Theorem 1 in [6] (see also Theorem 1.5 in [5]) asserting that rank-one convexity implies quasiconvexity on diagonal matrices, leads to the following statement assuring that rank- $(n - 1)$ convexity implies \mathcal{S} -quasiconvexity on diagonal matrices.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $1 < p < \infty$. Assume that $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is convex on each hyperplane $\{y_i = \text{const}\}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, and satisfy $0 \leq f(y) \leq C(1 + |y|^p)$. Suppose*

that

$$\begin{aligned} u_h^i &\rightarrow u_\infty^i, & \text{in } L_{\text{loc}}^p(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ as } h \rightarrow \infty, & \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \\ \partial_i u_h^i &\rightarrow \partial_i u_\infty^i, & \text{in } W_{\text{loc}}^{-1,p}(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ as } h \rightarrow \infty, & \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \end{aligned}$$

Then for every open set $V \subset \mathbb{R}^n$

$$\int_V f(u_\infty^1, \dots, u_\infty^n) dx \leq \liminf_{h \rightarrow \infty} \int_V f(u_h^1, \dots, u_h^n) dx.$$

We remark that, for $n = 2$, Theorem 1.3 reduces itself to Theorem 1 (In [6] the case $n = p = 2$ is considered; see Theorem 1.5 in [5] for generalization to any $n \geq 2$ and $1 < p < \infty$). Indeed, in dimension two, the notion of \mathcal{S} -quasiconvexity coincides with that of quasiconvexity since any divergence free field defines a gradient field upon left multiplication by the rotation $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Therefore Šverák's example [9] shows that the conclusion of Theorem 1.2 already holds for $n = 2$.

Finally we recall that another result in the direction of Theorem 1.3 is that if f is a quadratic form and is rank-($n - 1$) convex, then f is also \mathcal{S} -quasiconvex (see [11]).

2 Proof of Theorem 1.2

Theorem 1.2 is a consequence of Lemma 2.2 and Corollary 2.3 below. We will basically follow Šverák's strategy. The key idea is to find three rank-($n - 1$) directions such that these directions are the only rank-($n - 1$) directions in the vector space spanned by them, which we call L . Then one defines a rank-($n - 1$) convex function on L and seeks a divergence free field that takes values only in L and for which the inequality (1.1) is violated. The desired function F is then obtained by suitably extending the rank-($n - 1$) convex function defined on L to the whole space. We first construct an example in $\mathbb{M}^{4 \times 3}$ and then we will extend it to $\mathbb{M}^{m \times n}$. Let $V_1, V_2, V_3 \in \mathbb{M}^{4 \times 3}$ be given by

$$V_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad V_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad V_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.1)$$

We consider the three-dimensional subspace of $\mathbb{M}^{4 \times 3}$ generated by V_1, V_2, V_3 :

$$L := \text{span}\{V_1, V_2, V_3\} = \{\eta_1 V_1 + \eta_2 V_2 + \eta_3 V_3, \eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3 \in \mathbb{R}\}, \quad (2.2)$$

and we define the function $f : L \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ in the following way

$$\forall \eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3 \in \mathbb{R} \quad f(\eta_1 V_1 + \eta_2 V_2 + \eta_3 V_3) = -\eta_1 \eta_2 \eta_3. \quad (2.3)$$

It can be checked that the only rank-two directions in L are given by V_1, V_2, V_3 and therefore the function f is convex (in fact linear) on each rank-two line contained in L .

Lemma 2.1. *Let L and f be defined by (2.2) and (2.3) respectively and let $P : \mathbb{M}^{4 \times 3} \rightarrow L$ be the orthogonal projection onto L . Then for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $k = k(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that the function $F : \mathbb{M}^{4 \times 3} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by*

$$F(X) = f(PX) + \varepsilon|X|^2 + \varepsilon|X|^4 + k|X - PX|^2 \tag{2.4}$$

is rank-two convex on $\mathbb{M}^{4 \times 3}$.

Lemma 2.1 is an obvious extension of Lemma 2 in [9] and therefore we refer the reader to [9] for its proof. We remark that an extension of the form (2.4) is always possible if V_1, V_2, V_3 are any three rank- $(n - 1)$ directions in $\mathbb{M}^{m \times n}$ such that they are the only rank- $(n - 1)$ directions in the subspace spanned by them and f is defined as in (2.3).

Lemma 2.2. *There exist $\varepsilon > 0$ and $k > 0$ such that the function F given by (2.4) is rank-two convex but not \mathcal{S} -quasiconvex.*

Proof. Let $B : \mathbb{T}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{M}^{4 \times 3}$ be defined by

$$B(x) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos 2\pi x_3 & \cos 2\pi x_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \cos 2\pi x_3 & 0 \\ 0 & \cos 2\pi(x_1 - x_3) & \cos 2\pi x_1 \\ \cos 2\pi(x_1 - x_3) & \cos 2\pi(x_1 - x_3) & \cos 2\pi(x_1 - x_3) \end{pmatrix}.$$

It is readily seen that the matrix field B defined above is divergence-free and it satisfies

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} B(x) \in L \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^3, \\ \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} B \, dx = 0, \\ \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} f(B) \, dx = - \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} (\cos 2\pi x_1)^2 (\cos 2\pi x_3)^2 \, dx < 0. \end{array} \right.$$

Since B is bounded, we can choose $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} (f(B) + \varepsilon|B|^2 + \varepsilon|B|^4) \, dx < 0. \tag{2.5}$$

By Lemma 2.1 there exists $k = k(\varepsilon)$ such that the function

$$F(X) = f(PX) + \varepsilon|X|^2 + \varepsilon|X|^4 + k|X - PX|^2$$

is rank-two convex. Since $|B(x) - PB(x)| = 0$ for all x in \mathbb{R}^3 , we have from (2.5)

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} F(B(x)) \, dx < 0,$$

which concludes the proof. □

Corollary 2.3. *For all $n > 3$ and $m \geq n + 1$, there exists $F^{(n)} : \mathbb{M}^{m \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that F is rank-(n - 1) convex but not \mathcal{S} -quasiconvex.*

Proof. We show how to adapt the counterexample constructed in Lemma 2.2 to an arbitrary dimension n . Since one can always increase the number of rows by adding some zeros while preserving the rank of the matrices, it is enough to consider the case when $m = n + 1$. In this situation we will exhibit three matrices $V_1^{(n)}, V_2^{(n)}, V_3^{(n)}$ which satisfy the following properties

$$\text{rank}(V_i^{(n)}) \leq n - 1 \quad \forall i = 1, 2, 3, \quad (2.6)$$

$$\text{rank}(\alpha_1 V_1^{(n)} + \alpha_2 V_2^{(n)} + \alpha_3 V_3^{(n)}) = n \quad \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{S}^2 \setminus \{(\pm 1, 0, 0), (0, \pm 1, 0), (0, 0, \pm 1)\}. \quad (2.7)$$

For each α in \mathbb{S}^2 we set

$$M^{(n)}(\alpha) := \alpha_1 V_1^{(n)} + \alpha_2 V_2^{(n)} + \alpha_3 V_3^{(n)}.$$

We first consider the case when $n = 4$. We define $V_1^{(4)}, V_2^{(4)}, V_3^{(4)}$ as follows

$$V_1^{(4)} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad V_2^{(4)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad V_3^{(4)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.8)$$

We have that $\text{rank}(V_1^{(4)}) = \text{rank}(V_3^{(4)}) = 3$ and $\text{rank}(V_2^{(4)}) = 2$. In order to see that the condition (2.7) is satisfied it is convenient to write the explicit formula for $M^{(4)}(\alpha)$:

$$M^{(4)}(\alpha) = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1 & \alpha_2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha_3 & \alpha_2 & 0 \\ \alpha_3 & \alpha_3 & \alpha_3 & \alpha_1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \alpha_3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Observe that the 4×3 minor of $M^{(4)}(\alpha)$ which is obtained by eliminating the fifth row and the fourth column is a linear combination of the matrices V_1, V_2, V_3 defined by (2.1). Then using the fact that V_1, V_2, V_3 satisfy (2.7) for $n = 3$, one easily checks that $\text{rank}(M^{(4)}(\alpha)) = 4$. Remark that replacing the entry $M_{4,4}^{(4)}(\alpha) = \alpha_1$ by $M_{4,4}^{(4)}(\alpha) = \alpha_2$ would give another possible choice of $V_1^{(4)}, V_2^{(4)}, V_3^{(4)}$.

For $n = 5$ we choose $V_1^{(5)}, V_2^{(5)}, V_3^{(5)}$ such that $M^{(5)}(\alpha)$ is given by

$$M^{(5)}(\alpha) = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1 & \alpha_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha_3 & \alpha_2 & 0 & 0 \\ \alpha_3 & \alpha_3 & \alpha_3 & a_{44} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \alpha_3 & a_{55} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \alpha_3 \end{pmatrix}$$

where a_{ii} can be chosen in the set $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$. Proceeding in a similar way, for every $n \geq 4$ we define the matrix $M^{(n)}(\alpha)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} M^{(n)}(\alpha) &\in \mathbb{M}^{(n+1) \times n}, \\ M_{i,j}^{(n)}(\alpha) &= M_{i,j}^{(n-1)}(\alpha) \quad \text{for } i \leq n, j \leq n-1, \\ M_{n,n}^{(n)}(\alpha) &= a_{nn} \quad \text{where } a_{nn} \in \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\}, \\ M_{n+1,n}^{(n)}(\alpha) &= \alpha_3, \\ M_{i,j}^{(n)}(\alpha) &= 0 \quad \text{otherwise.} \end{aligned}$$

By construction we have that

$$\text{rank}(M^{(n)}(\alpha)) = n \quad \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{S}^2 \setminus \{(\pm 1, 0, 0), (0, \pm 1, 0), (0, 0, \pm 1)\}.$$

For each n we set $L^{(n)} := \text{span}\{V_1^{(n)}, V_2^{(n)}, V_3^{(n)}\}$ and we define the function $f^{(n)} : L^{(n)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as in (2.3), i.e., $f^{(n)}(\eta_1 V_1^{(n)} + \eta_2 V_2^{(n)} + \eta_3 V_3^{(n)}) := -\eta_1 \eta_2 \eta_3$. The sought function $F^{(n)}$ is then defined as in (2.4) with $f^{(n)}$ in the place of f and with P the orthogonal projection onto $L^{(n)}$. Considering the divergence free field $B^{(n)}(x) := \cos(2\pi x_3) V_1^{(n)} + \cos(2\pi x_1) V_2^{(n)} + \cos 2\pi(x_1 - x_3) V_3^{(n)}$, we see that $F^{(n)}$ is not \mathcal{S} -quasiconvex. □

Remark 2.4. In proving Corollary 2.3 one needs to use different matrices for each dimension n . In fact, one cannot extend the function F in (2.4), to the space $\mathbb{M}^{(n+1) \times n}$ by projection. Indeed, the operator $T : \mathbb{M}^{(n+1) \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{M}^{4 \times 3}$ defined by

$$T(X) := \begin{pmatrix} x_{11} & x_{12} & x_{13} \\ x_{21} & x_{22} & x_{23} \\ x_{31} & x_{32} & x_{33} \\ x_{41} & x_{42} & x_{43} \end{pmatrix}$$

does not map rank- $(n - 1)$ lines to rank-2 lines and therefore the function $F \circ T$ is not rank- $(n - 1)$ convex.

Acknowledgments. I am grateful to Enzo Nesi for drawing my attention to this problem and for fruitful discussions. This work was done during my post-doc at the Max Planck Institute for Mathematics in the Sciences in Leipzig.

Bibliography

- [1] Y. Brenier, Hydrodynamic structure of the augmented Born-Infeld equations, *Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal.* **172**:1 (2004), 65–91.
- [2] N. Chaudhuri and S. Müller, Rank-one convexity implies quasi-convexity on certain hypersurfaces, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A* **133**:6 (2003), 1263–1272.
- [3] I. Fonseca and S. Müller, \mathcal{A} -quasiconvexity, lower semicontinuity, and Young measures, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **30**:6 (1999), 1355–1390.
- [4] A. Garroni and V. Nesi, Rigidity and lack of rigidity for solenoidal matrix fields, *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.* **460**:2046 (2004), 1789–1806.
- [5] J. Lee, P. F. X. Müller and S. Müller, Compensated compactness, separately convex functions and interpolatory estimates between Riesz transforms and Haar projections, *Comm. PDE*, accepted (2008). Preprint 7/2008, Max Planck Institute for Mathematics in the Sciences, Leipzig.
- [6] S. Müller, Rank-one convexity implies quasiconvexity on diagonal matrices, *Int. Math. Research Not.* 20 (1999), 1087–1095.
- [7] S. Müller and M. Palombaro, in preparation.
- [8] M. Palombaro and V. P. Smyshlyaev, Relaxation of three solenoidal wells and characterization of extremal three-phase H -measures, *Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal.* **194**:3 (2009), 775–822.
- [9] V. Šverák, Rank-one convexity does not imply quasiconvexity, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A* **120**:1-2 (1992), 185–189.
- [10] L. Tartar, Compensated compactness and applications to partial differential equations, in: *Nonlinear analysis and mechanics: Heriot-Watt Symposium IV*, Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics 39, 136–212, Pitman, London, 1979.
- [11] L. Tartar, Estimations fines des coefficients homogénéisés, in: *Ennio De Giorgi's Colloquium (Paris 1983)*, ed. P. Kree, 168–187, Pitman, Boston, 1985.

Received June 22, 2009; revised February 4, 2010; accepted February 1, 2010.

Author information

Mariapia Palombaro, SISSA, Via Beirut 2-4, 34014 Trieste, Italy.
E-mail: palombar@sissa.it