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1 Introduction. Statement of the problem

Along with bulk and surface waves (a fair example of the latter is the Rayleigh wave [32] in half-space), wedge waves comprise a fundamental type of oscillations of solids and are intensively studied in geophysics, machine building, civil engineering etc.

First theoretical results on waves propagating along the edge of a wedge were obtained by numerical simulations (see, e.g., [15], [16], [21], [35]). Then these waves were studied analytically at the physical level of rigor by many authors, mostly for small openings (slender wedge, see, e.g., [20], [22], [12], [13], [14], [29]) and openings slightly less than $\pi$ ([23], [29], [33], see also a survey in [5, Ch. 10, Sec. 2]).

The first rigor proof of existence of the wedge wave was obtained in the pioneering paper [9] by variational method for openings less then $\frac{\pi}{2}$. Then the idea of [9] was developed in [39] and [30] where the range of aperture angles was enlarged. Further applications of this idea can be found in [3] and [31].

In this paper, we prove the existence of a symmetric wedge mode in an elastic deformable wedge for all admissible values of the Poisson ratio $\sigma \in (-1, \frac{1}{2})$ and openings close to $\pi$ and derive an asymptotic formula for corresponding eigenvalue. We note that neither explicit coefficient in the asymptotic formula for the velocity of the wave propagating along elastic wedges with openings close to $\pi$, nor a validation of the formal computations were provided in above-mentioned papers, and our approach is novel and differs from applied previously.

Let

$$\Omega^\varepsilon = \{(x_1, x_2) : r > 0, \ \phi \in (\alpha, \pi - \alpha)\}$$

be an angle on the plane $\mathbb{R}^2$. Here $(r, \phi)$ stand for polar coordinates of a point $(x_1, x_2)$, and $\varepsilon = \tan(\alpha)$ is a small positive parameter. We consider $\Omega^\varepsilon$ as the cross section of an isotropic homogeneous elastic wedge $K^\varepsilon = \Omega^\varepsilon \times \mathbb{R} \ni (x_1, x_2, x_3)$; see Fig.…
We seek for a solution $U^\varepsilon = (U_1^\varepsilon, U_2^\varepsilon, U_3^\varepsilon)$ of the elasticity system in $K^\varepsilon$ subject to the traction-free boundary conditions on $\partial K^\varepsilon$ (see [17, Ch. 3]) in the form

$$U^\varepsilon(x_1, x_2, x_3, t) = U^\varepsilon(x_1, x_2, x_3)e^{-i\omega t},$$

where $\omega = \omega(\varepsilon) > 0$ is a given oscillation frequency. Then for the vector function of displacements $U^\varepsilon = (U_1^\varepsilon, U_2^\varepsilon, U_3^\varepsilon)$, we obtain the boundary value problem

$$L(\partial_1, \partial_2, \partial_3)U^\varepsilon = \rho \omega^2 U^\varepsilon \text{ in } K^\varepsilon, \quad N(\partial_1, \partial_2, \partial_3)U^\varepsilon = 0 \text{ on } \partial K^\varepsilon, \quad (1)$$

where $\rho > 0$ is the constant density of the material (without loss of generality, we set $\rho = 1$), and $\partial_m = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_m}$.

Differential expressions in (1) are defined component-wise by the following relations with $n = 1, 2, 3$:

$$\left(L(\partial_1, \partial_2, \partial_3)U^\varepsilon\right)_n = -\partial_m \sigma_{nm}[U^\varepsilon], \quad \left(N(\partial_1, \partial_2, \partial_3)U^\varepsilon\right)_n = \sigma_{nm}[U^\varepsilon]\nu_m, \quad (2)$$

where $\nu = (\nu_1, \nu_2, \nu_3)$ is the outward normal unit vector on $\partial K^\varepsilon$ (evidently $\nu_3 = 0$). Here and throughout the paper we use the convention of summation from 1 to 3 with respect to repeated indices.

In (2) $\sigma_{nm}[U^\varepsilon]$ stand for the stress tensor components

$$\sigma_{nm}[U^\varepsilon] = \lambda \partial_1 U_1^\varepsilon \delta_{n,m} + \mu (\partial_m U_1^\varepsilon + \partial_n U_m^\varepsilon),$$

where $\delta_{n,m}$ is the Kronecker symbol and the Lamé constants $\lambda$ and $\mu$ satisfy the inequalities $\lambda + \frac{2}{3}\mu > 0$ and $\mu > 0$.

We search for a solution to the problem (1) in the form

$$U^\varepsilon(x_1, x_2, x_3) = u^\varepsilon(x_1, x_2)e^{ikx_3},$$

corresponding to an elastic wave propagating along the edge of the wedge $K^\varepsilon$ while $k > 0$ is the wave number. Then the problem reduces to

$$L(\partial_1, \partial_2, ik)u^\varepsilon = \omega^2 u^\varepsilon \text{ in } \Omega^\varepsilon, \quad N(\partial_1, \partial_2, ik)u^\varepsilon = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega^\varepsilon. \quad (3)$$
From now on we regard that in all formulae \( \partial_3 \) should be replaced by \( ik \).

Since the wedge waves are localized in the vicinity of the edge, the vector function

\[
\mathbf{u}^w = (u_1^w, u_2^w, u_3^w)
\]

should decay at infinity.

Due to material symmetry with respect to the plane \( x_1 = 0 \), the operator of the problem \( \mathcal{K} \) is reduced by the decomposition of the Sobolev space \( (H^2(\Omega^e))^3 \) into the subspaces of antisymmetric and symmetric displacements, which makes it possible to consider the antisymmetric (flexural) modes

\[
u_1^w(-x_1,x_2) = u_1^w(x_1,x_2), \quad u_2^w(-x_1,x_2) = -u_2^w(x_1,x_2), \quad u_3^w(-x_1,x_2) = -u_3^w(x_1,x_2),
\]

and the symmetric modes

\[
u_1^w(-x_1,x_2) = -u_1^w(x_1,x_2), \quad u_2^w(-x_1,x_2) = u_2^w(x_1,x_2), \quad u_3^w(-x_1,x_2) = u_3^w(x_1,x_2).
\]

Numerical simulations in \([21, 35]\) predict the existence of symmetric modes \( \mathcal{O} \) for obtuse wedges. The existence of such modes was proved rigorously in \([39, 30]\) for certain values of the Poisson ratio \( \sigma = \frac{1}{2(\lambda + \mu)} \) and some range of wedge openings that are far from \( \pi \).

Now we formulate our main result.

**Theorem 1** For any \( \sigma \in (-1, \frac{1}{2}) \), one finds \( \varepsilon^0 \) such that for any \( 0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon^0 \) there exists a symmetric mode \( \mathbf{u}^w \in (H^2(\Omega^e))^3 \) decaying exponentially as \( |x| \to \infty \) and solving the problem \( \mathcal{K} \) with \( \omega^2 = \tilde{\omega}^2(\varepsilon) < c_k^2k^2 \). Corresponding wedge wave propagates along the edge with the velocity \( c_w \) which has the following asymptotics as \( \varepsilon \to 0 \):

\[
c_w^2 = c_R^2(1 - \varepsilon^2 \vartheta + O(\varepsilon^3)),
\]

where \( \vartheta > 0 \) is an explicit coefficient depending on \( \sigma \) only.

Recall that rigor results obtained in previous papers were established by variational method. However, it is not applicable for openings close to \( \pi \), see \([25]\). In this way, we use an asymptotic method, namely, a variant of the method of matched asymptotic expansions (see \([37, 8, 18, \text{Ch. 2}]\) and other monographs) adapted earlier only for scalar diffraction problems in \([25, 26]\) and other papers.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we transform the problem to a convenient form and give its operator formulation. In Section 3 we construct the “inner” asymptotic expansion. We emphasize that for this we need to modify advisedly the use of the Kondrat’ev theory, see Subsections 3.1 and 3.2. Section 4 provides the “outer” expansions and the matching procedure. In Section 5 we construct the approximate eigenvector of the problem \( \mathcal{K} \) gluing the asymptotic expansions obtained in Sections 3 and 4. Thus we justify the asymptotic formula \( \mathcal{O} \) and prove Theorem 1.

We recall the following standard notation:

- \( c_l = \sqrt{\mu} \) and \( c_t = \sqrt{\lambda + 2\mu} \) are the velocities of the transverse and longitudinal bulk waves, respectively;

- \( c_R < c_t \) is the velocity of the Rayleigh wave;

- \( \varkappa^2 = 1 - c_R^2/c_t^2 > 0 \), \( \varkappa^2 = 1 - c_R^2/c_t^2 > 0 \). Notice that \( \varkappa \) and \( \varkappa \) depend on \( \sigma \) only.

The following inequality is a consequence of the Rayleigh equation (see \([32, 17, \text{Ch. 3}]\)) and will be used in the sequel:

\[
16 - 24B + 8B^2 - B^3 = 16 \frac{c_T^2 - c_R^2}{c_t^2} > 0, \quad \text{where} \quad B := 1 - \varkappa^2.
\]
2 Transformation of the problem (3)

Using the idea of [26] we cut the angle \( \Omega^\varepsilon \) along the line \( x_1 = 0 \) and transform it into a half-plane with a wedge-like notch of aperture \( 2\alpha \) (cf. Fig. 1 and Fig. 2)

\[
\Pi^\varepsilon = \{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x_2 > 0, \ |x_1| > \varepsilon x_2 \}.
\]

![Figure 2: Half-plane with a wedge-like notch](image)

The equations and the boundary conditions (3) are rewritten as follows:

\[
L(\partial_1, \partial_2, ik)u^\varepsilon = \omega^2 u^\varepsilon \text{ in } \Pi^\varepsilon,
\]

\[
N(\partial_1, \partial_2, ik)u^\varepsilon \equiv (\sigma_{12}[u^\varepsilon], \sigma_{22}[u^\varepsilon], \sigma_{32}[u^\varepsilon])(x_1, 0) = 0,
\]

and should be supplemented with the transmission conditions on the surfaces of the removed infinite sector

\[
\begin{align*}
\nu_n^\varepsilon(\varepsilon x_2, x_2)\nu_n^{\varepsilon+} + u_n^\varepsilon(-\varepsilon x_2, x_2)\nu_n^{\varepsilon-} &= 0, \\
u_n^\varepsilon(\varepsilon x_2, x_2)\tau_n^{\varepsilon+} + u_n^\varepsilon(-\varepsilon x_2, x_2)\tau_n^{\varepsilon-} &= 0, \\
u_3^\varepsilon(\varepsilon x_2, x_2) &= u_3^\varepsilon(-\varepsilon x_2, x_2);
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\sigma_{nm}[u^\varepsilon](\varepsilon x_2, x_2)\nu_m^{\varepsilon+} + \sigma_{nm}[u^\varepsilon](-\varepsilon x_2, x_2)\nu_m^{\varepsilon-} = 0, \quad n = 1, 2, 3,
\]

where \( x_2 > 0 \) and

\[
\nu^{\varepsilon\pm} = \left(\mp \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \varepsilon^2}}, \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{1 + \varepsilon^2}}, 0\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \tau^{\varepsilon\pm} = \left(-\frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{1 + \varepsilon^2}}, \mp \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \varepsilon^2}}, 0\right)
\]

are the outward normal and tangential unit vectors, respectively. Relations (8) and (9) ensure the smoothness of displacements after returning to the original domain \( \Omega^\varepsilon \).

The variational (weak) formulation of the problem (7)–(9) refers to the integral identity

\[
a_{\Pi^\varepsilon}(ik; u^\varepsilon, v) := \int_{\Pi^\varepsilon} \sigma_{nm}[u^\varepsilon] \overline{\partial_m v_n} \, dx_1 dx_2 = \omega^2(u^\varepsilon, v)_{\Pi^\varepsilon}, \quad v \in \left( H_1^1(\Pi^\varepsilon) \right)^3,
\]
where bar stands for complex conjugation and $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\Pi^*}$ for the natural inner product in $(L^2(\Pi^*))^3$, while $(H^1(\Pi^*))^3$ is a subspace of vector functions in $(H^1(\Pi^*))^3$ satisfying the condition \( \mathbb{S} \). The quadratic form $a_{\Pi^*}(ik; u, u)$ in $(L^2(\Pi^*))^3$ with domain $(H^1(\Pi^*))^3$ is symmetric, positive and closed. Therefore, the boundary value problem (7)–(9) is associated with an unbounded positive definite self-adjoint operator $A^*(ik)$ in the space $(L^2(\Pi^*))^3$ (see, e.g., [4, Ch. 10]).

It is shown in [9] that the essential spectrum of this operator coincides with the ray $[c_R^2 k^2, +\infty)$. Consequently, only the discrete spectrum may occur below the cutoff point $\omega_R^2 = c_R^2 k^2$. If this spectrum is non-empty, the corresponding eigenvector generates a localized wedge mode propagating along the edge with a velocity less than $c_R$.

3 The inner expansion

According to [15, Ch. 10], formation of a notch (Fig. 2) in the half-plane $\Omega^0 = \mathbb{R}_+^2$ should be looked upon as a regular perturbation due to special transmission conditions \( \mathbb{S} \) and \( \mathbb{S} \). Hence, it seems natural to assume that an eigenvalue $\omega^2$ lies near the cutoff point $\omega_R^2$ and to choose the following ansatz for the “inner” asymptotic expansion of the corresponding vector eigenvector in the bounded vicinity of the cut:

$$u^\varepsilon = w^0 + \varepsilon w^1 + \varepsilon^2 w^2 + \ldots,$$

where dots substitute for higher-order terms inessential in our formal analysis.

As the main asymptotic term $w^0$ we take the solution decaying as $x_2 \to +\infty$ of the wave propagation problem along the traction-free boundary of an elastic isotropic half space $\mathbb{R}_+^3$, namely the Rayleigh wave [32], see also [17, Ch. 3],

$$u^R(x_2) = (0, u^R_2(x_2), u^R_3(x_2)),$$

$$u^R_2(x_2) = i A x_1 \left( e^{-k_0 x_2} - \frac{2}{1 + \kappa_1^2} e^{-k_0 x_2} \right),$$

$$u^R_3(x_2) = A \left( e^{-k_0 x_2} - \frac{2 \kappa_1 x_1}{1 + \kappa_1^2} e^{-k_0 x_2} \right).$$

Without loss of generality we set $A = 1$.

We insert formula (12) with $w^0 = u^R$ into the transmission conditions \( \mathbb{S} \), \( \mathbb{S} \) and collect terms of order $\varepsilon$. As a result, the first correction term $w^1$ should satisfy the problem (here $n = 1, 2, 3$)

$$L(\partial_1, \partial_2, ik)w^1 = \omega^2_R w^1 \quad \text{in} \quad \Pi^0, \quad \mathcal{N}(\partial_1, \partial_2, ik)w^1(x_1, 0) = 0;$$

$$-w^1_n(+0, x_2) + w^1_n(-0, x_2) = -2u^R_2(x_2)\delta_{n,1},$$

$$-\sigma_{n1}[w^1](+0, x_2) + \sigma_{n1}[w^1](-0, x_2) = -2\sigma_{n2}[u^R](0, x_2), \quad x_2 > 0.$$

3.1 Operator pencil generated by the problem (15), (16)

First, we notice that the homogeneous problem (15), (16) appears to be a problem in the half-plane $\mathbb{R}_+^2$. Applying the Laplace transform with respect to $x_1$ we obtain a boundary value problem for a system of ordinary differential equations

$$L(\xi, \partial_2, ik)\hat{w}(x_2) - \omega^2_R \hat{w}(x_2) = 0, \quad x_2 > 0; \quad \mathcal{N}(\xi, \partial_2, ik)\hat{w}(0) = 0.$$
Here \( \mathcal{L}(\xi, \partial_2, ik) \) is the matrix differential operator

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\mu(k^2 - \partial_2^2) - (\lambda + 2\mu)\xi^2 & -(\lambda + \mu)\xi \partial_2 & -(\lambda + \mu)i\xi k \\
-(\lambda + \mu)\xi \partial_2 & -(\lambda + 2\mu)\partial_2^2 + \mu(k^2 - \xi^2) & -(\lambda + \mu)i\partial_2 \\
-(\lambda + \mu)i\xi k & -(\lambda + \mu)i\partial_2 & -\mu(\xi^2 + \partial_2^2) + (\lambda + 2\mu)k^2
\end{bmatrix},
\]

and analogously

\[
\mathcal{N}(\xi, \partial_2, ik) = \begin{bmatrix}
-\mu \partial_2 & -\mu \xi & 0 \\
-\lambda \xi & -(\lambda + 2\mu)\partial_2 & -\lambda ik \\
0 & -\mu ik & -\mu \partial_2
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

**Theorem 2** There is a \( \beta > 0 \) depending only on \( \lambda, \mu \) and \( k \) such that a unique eigenvalue of the (quadratic) operator pencil

\[
\mathfrak{A}(\xi) := (\mathcal{L}(\xi, \partial_2, ik) - \omega_R^2; \mathcal{N}(\xi, \partial_2, ik))
\]

in the strip \( \{ \xi \in \mathbb{C} : |\Re \xi| \leq \beta \} \) is zero eigenvalue of algebraic multiplicity two. Corresponding Jordan block consists of eigenvector \( \hat{w}^0(x_2) = u^R(x_2) \) and associated vector

\[
\hat{w}^1(x_2) = ( -ik^{-1}u_3^R(x_2), 0, 0 ).
\]

**Proof. 1.** Let \( \xi = i\eta, \eta \in \mathbb{R} \). Then

\[
\mathcal{L}(i\eta, \partial_2, ik) \equiv M^{-1}\mathcal{L}(0, \partial_2, i\sqrt{k^2 + \eta^2})M,
\]

\[
\mathcal{N}(i\eta, \partial_2, ik) \equiv M^{-1}\mathcal{N}(0, \partial_2, i\sqrt{k^2 + \eta^2})M,
\]

where \( M \) is the matrix of rotation in the plane \( x_1Ox_3 \) by the angle \( \arctan(\eta/k) \).

Thus, any eigenvector of the pencil

\[
(\mathcal{L}(i\eta, \partial_2, ik) - \omega^2; \mathcal{N}(i\eta, \partial_2, ik))
\]

generates a surface wave in the half-space propagating with the velocity \( \omega/\sqrt{k^2 + \eta^2} \). Since this velocity cannot be smaller then \( c_R \), we obtain

\[
\int_0^\infty \mathcal{L}(i\eta, \partial_2, ik)u(x_2) \cdot u(x_2) \, dx_2 \geq c_R^2(k^2 + \eta^2)\|u; (L^2(\mathbb{R}_+))^3\|^2
\]

for all smooth and rapidly decaying vector functions \( u \) satisfying \( \mathcal{N}(i\eta, \partial_2, ik)u(0) = 0 \). Here and further central dot stands for the scalar product in \( \mathbb{R}^3 \).

2. In particular, \([21]\) implies that the eigenvector \( \hat{w}^0(x_2) \) of the pencil \([20]\) with \( \omega = \omega_R \) can exist only for \( \eta = 0 \). We have

\[
\mathcal{L}(0, \partial_2, ik)\hat{w}^0(x_2) = \omega_R^2\hat{w}^0(x_2), \quad x_2 > 0; \quad \mathcal{N}(0, \partial_2, ik)\hat{w}^0(0) = 0,
\]

and thus \( \hat{w}^0(x_2) = u^R(x_2) \) (up to a multiplicative constant).

For the associated vector of rank 1, we obtain the problem

\[
\mathcal{L}(0, \partial_2, ik)\hat{w}^1(x_2) - \omega_R^2\hat{w}^1(x_2) = -\partial_2 \mathcal{L}(0, \partial_2, ik)\hat{w}^0(x_2), \quad x_2 > 0;
\]

\[
\mathcal{N}(0, \partial_2, ik)\hat{w}^1(0) = -\partial_2 \mathcal{N}(0, \partial_2, ik)\hat{w}^0(0).
\]
A direct calculation gives (18).

Finally, the associated vector of rank 2 should be a solution of the problem
\[ \mathcal{L}(0, \partial_2, ik) \hat{w}^2(x_2) - \omega_2^2 \hat{w}^2(x_2) = - \partial_2 \mathcal{L}(0, \partial_2, ik) \hat{w}^1(x_2) - \frac{1}{2} \partial_2^2 \mathcal{L}(0, \partial_2, ik) \hat{w}^0(x_2), \quad x_2 > 0; \]  
\[ \mathcal{N}(0, \partial_2, ik) \hat{w}^2(0) = - \partial_2 \mathcal{N}(0, \partial_2, ik) \hat{w}^1(0) - \frac{1}{2} \partial_2^2 \mathcal{N}(0, \partial_2, ik) \hat{w}^0(0). \]  
(24)

Assume that such solution exists. We multiply this equation by the eigenvector \( \hat{w}^0 \) and integrate over \( \mathbb{R}_+ \). Then integrating by parts and using (22) yield
\[ 0 = b := - \frac{\lambda}{ik} u_3^R(0) u_2^R(0) + \int_0^\infty \left[ i(\lambda + \mu) u_3^B(x_2) \overline{u_2^B(x_2)} - (\lambda + 2\mu)|u_3^R(x_2)|^2 - \mu |u_2^R(x_2)|^2 \right] dx_2. \]  
(25)

A direct calculation based on the explicit formulae (14) gives
\[ b = -(\lambda + 2\mu) \frac{B^3(16 - 24B + 8B^2 - B^3)(1 - B)^2(7 - 2B + 1)}{128 k(1 - B) \frac{1}{2}(2 - B)^2}, \]  
(26)
we recall that \( B = 1 - \varepsilon_0^2 \in (0, 1) \). Since \( b < 0 \) according to (3), the relation (25) is impossible. Thus, the algebraic multiplicity of the zero eigenvalue is just 2.

3. Since solutions of the equation \( \mathcal{L}(\xi, \partial_2, ik) u = \omega_2^2 u \) depend on \( \xi \) analytically, the eigenvalues of the pencil (17) are the roots of an analytic function and thus cannot have finite accumulation points. Therefore, it remains to show that they cannot approach imaginary axis at infinity.

Integration by parts gives
\[ \int_0^\infty \mathcal{L}(\xi, \partial_2, ik) u(x_2) \cdot u(x_2) \, dx_2 = \int_0^\infty \left[ \mu |u'_1|^2 + (\mu k^2 - (\lambda + 2\mu) \xi^2)|u_1|^2 
+ (\lambda + 2\mu)|u'_2|^2 + \mu(k^2 - \xi^2)|u_2|^2 + \mu |u'_3|^2 + ((\lambda + 2\mu)k^2 - \mu \xi^2)|u_3|^2 
+ 2\lambda \xi(u_1 \overline{u_2} - u_2 \overline{u_1}) + \mu \xi(u_2 \overline{u_3} - u_3 \overline{u_2}) + \lambda k(u_3 \overline{u_2} - u_2 \overline{u_3}) + \mu k(u_2 \overline{u_3} - u_3 \overline{u_2}) 
- (\lambda + \mu) i k \xi(u_1 \overline{u_3} + u_3 \overline{u_1}) \right] \, dx_2 =: a(\xi, ik; u, u) \]  
for all smooth and rapidly decaying vector functions \( u \) satisfying \( \mathcal{N}(\xi, \partial_2, ik) u(0) = 0 \).

Let \( \xi = \zeta + i \eta \). Then for arbitrary vector function \( u \in (H^1(\mathbb{R}_+))^3 \) we estimate
\[ |a(\xi, ik; u, u) - a(i \eta, ik; u, u)| \leq C|\zeta||u| (L^2(\mathbb{R}_+))^3 || \times \left( |u'; (L^2(\mathbb{R}_+))^3 || + (k + |\zeta| + |\eta|)||u; (L^2(\mathbb{R}_+))^3 || \right), \]  
(28)
where \( C \) depends on \( \lambda \) and \( \mu \) only. Furthermore,
\[ a(i \eta, ik; u, u) = \int_0^\infty \left[ \mu(|v'_1|^2 + (k^2 + \eta^2)|v_1|^2) 
+ (\lambda + 2\mu)(|v'_2|^2 + (k^2 + \eta^2)|v_2|^2) + 2\lambda \sqrt{k^2 + \eta^2} \Im(v'_2 \overline{v}_3) 
+ \mu(|v'_3|^2 + (k^2 + \eta^2)|v_3|^2 + 2\sqrt{k^2 + \eta^2} \Im(v'_3 \overline{v}_2)) \right] \, dx_2. \]
Here, $v = Mu$ and the matrix $M$ was introduced in (19). Using the inequality $\lambda + \frac{2}{3}\mu > 0$, we estimate

$$a(i\eta, ik; u, u) \geq \mu \int_0^\infty \left[ (|v_1'|^2 + (k^2 + \eta^2)|v_1|^2) + \frac{2}{3}(|v_2'|^2 + (k^2 + \eta^2)|v_2|^2) + \gamma(|v_3'|^2 - 2(k^2 + \eta^2)|v_3|^2) \right] dx_2$$

(29)

with arbitrary $\gamma < \frac{1}{2}$.

From (21) and (27) we derive

$$a(i\eta, ik; u, u) \geq c_R^2(k^2 + \eta^2)\|u'; (L^2(\mathbb{R}_+))^3\|^2$$

(30)

for all smooth and rapidly decaying vector functions $u$ satisfying $\mathcal{N}(\xi, \partial_2, ik)u(0) = 0$. By approximation, this inequality holds for all $u \in (H^1(\mathbb{R}_+))^3$. We combine (29) and (30), choose $\gamma = c_R^2/(3\mu)$ and conclude that

$$a(i\eta, ik; u, u) \geq \frac{c^2_R}{6}\left(\|u'; (L^2(\mathbb{R}_+))^3\|^2 + (k^2 + \eta^2)\|u; (L^2(\mathbb{R}_+))^3\|^2\right).$$

(31)

The relations (27), (28) and (31) ensure that for any eigenvector of the pencil (17)

$$0 = a(\xi, ik; u, u) - \omega_R^2\|u; (L^2(\mathbb{R}_+))^3\|^2 \geq \left(\frac{c^2_R}{6} - C\epsilon\right)\|u'; (L^2(\mathbb{R}_+))^3\|^2$$

$$+ \frac{c^2_R}{6}k^2 - \frac{C_2^2}{6} - C\left( (k + |\xi| + |\eta|) \right)\|u; (L^2(\mathbb{R}_+))^3\|^2,$$

which is impossible for any given $k$ and $\xi$ if $\epsilon > 0$ is small and $|\eta|$ is large. The proof is completed.

In particular, Theorem 2 implies that a general solution of the homogeneous problem (15), (16) with polynomial growth in $x_1$ is a linear combination $C_u u^R(x_2) + C_v v^R(x_1, x_2)$, where $u^R$ is the Rayleigh wave (13) while

$$v^R(x) = x_1 \tilde{w}^0(x_2) + \tilde{w}^1(x_2) = (-ik^{-1}u^R_2(x_2), x_1 u^R_2(x_2), x_1 u^R_3(x_2)),$$

see also (10).

### 3.2 Application of the Kondrat’ev theory

Let us comment on certain peculiarities in application of the Kondrat’ev theory (see also the pioneering paper [1], the monograph [28 Ch. 3 and 5] and the survey paper [24, §3]) to assure that any solution of the non-homogeneous problem (15), (16) with the polynomial growth as $x_1 \to \pm\infty$ gets the form

$$w^1(x) = \sum_{\pm} \chi(\pm x_1)(c_u^+ u^R(x_2) + c_v^+ v^R(x)) + \tilde{w}^1(x).$$

(32)

Here, $\chi$ is a smooth cutoff function

$$0 \leq \chi \leq 1, \quad \chi(t) = 1 \text{ for } t > 2, \quad \chi(t) = 0 \text{ for } t < 1,$$

(33)

and the remainder $\tilde{w}^1(x)$ decays exponentially as $|x| \to \infty$. 
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3.2.1 An auxiliary problem in the half-plane

First of all, we study the problem in the half-plane

\[ \mathcal{L}(\partial_1, \partial_2, ik)v - \omega_R^2 v = f \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^2_+, \quad \mathcal{N}(\partial_1, \partial_2, ik)v = g \quad \text{on} \quad \partial\mathbb{R}^2_+. \tag{34} \]

To deploy the corresponding technique, we ought to regard the half-plane as the cylinder \( \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \). A non-standard detail is that the cross-section \( \mathbb{R}_+ \ni x_2 \) is an unbounded domain in contrast to the traditional formulation of elliptic boundary value problems in cylinders with bounded cross-sections. However, this distortion is compensated by Theorem 2 which provides the pencil (17) with all the required properties\(^1\). Below we outline the customary steps to conclude on the existence of a solution to (34) and its decomposition (32) (the detailed description can be found, e.g., in [28, Ch. 3, §§1-2]).

We introduce the weighted Lebesgue (for \( \ell = 0 \)) and Sobolev (for \( \ell \in \mathbb{N} \)) spaces \( W^{\ell}_2(\mathbb{R}^2_+) \) with the norms

\[ \|w; W^\ell_2(\mathbb{R}^2_+)\| = \|e^{\beta x_1}w; H^\ell(\mathbb{R}^2_+)\|. \]

Here the weight index \( \beta > 0 \) is defined in Theorem 2. Note that a function \( w \in W^\ell_2(\mathbb{R}^2_+) \) decays exponentially as \( x_1 \to +\infty \) but may grow as \( x_1 \to -\infty \). By \( W^{\ell+\frac{1}{2}}_2(\partial\mathbb{R}^2_+) \) we denote the weighted Sobolev–Slobodetskii space supplied with the natural trace norm

\[ \|g; W^{\ell+\frac{1}{2}}_2(\partial\mathbb{R}^2_+)\| = \inf \{ \|G; W^\ell_2(\mathbb{R}^2_+)\| : G|_{\partial\mathbb{R}^2_+} = g \}. \]

We consider the problem (34) with the right-hand sides

\[ f \in (W^{\ell}_2(\mathbb{R}^2_+))^3 \cap (W^{\ell}_-\beta(\mathbb{R}^2_+))^3, \quad g \in (W^{\ell+\frac{1}{2}}_2(\partial\mathbb{R}^2_+))^3 \cap (W^{\ell+\frac{1}{2}}_-\beta(\partial\mathbb{R}^2_+))^3, \tag{35} \]

which decay as \( x_1 \to \pm\infty \). In this way, the problem (34) is associated with two operators

\[ A_{\pm} : (W^{\ell+2}_\pm\beta(\mathbb{R}^2_+))^3 \to (W^{\ell}_\pm\beta(\mathbb{R}^2_+))^3 \times (W^{\ell+\frac{1}{2}}_\pm\beta(\partial\mathbb{R}^2_+))^3. \tag{36} \]

By Theorem 2 the lines \( I_{\pm} = \{ \xi \in \mathbb{C} : \Re \xi = \pm\beta \} \) are free of the spectrum of the pencil (17). Therefore, both the operators (36) are isomorphisms. This conclusion is made by the standard scheme [11]: the direct Fourier transform, the resolvent \( \mathcal{R}(\xi) = (\mathfrak{A}(\xi))^{-1} \) with \( \xi \in I_{\pm} \) and the inverse Fourier transform\(^2\). Therefore, in view of (35) we obtain two solutions \( w^\pm \in (W^{\ell+2}_\pm\beta(\mathbb{R}^2_+))^3 \) of the problem (34). These solutions are given by integrals along the lines \( I_{\pm} \). By Theorem 2 \( \xi \mapsto \mathcal{R}(\xi) \) is a holomorphic operator function in the strip between the lines \( I_- \) and \( I_+ \) with the only pole of rank 2 at the point \( \xi = 0 \). Therefore, the Cauchy residual theorem gives the relation

\[ w^+(x_1, x_2) - w^-(x_1, x_2) = a_n u^R(x_2) + a_v v^R(x), \tag{37} \]

---

\(^1\)Cf. [24] Proposition 3.2(2)] for the Neumann problem for a formally self-adjoint elliptic system in cylinders with bounded cross-sections.

\(^2\)In the cited literature the pencil always possesses the important property: for any \( \xi_1, \xi_2 \in \mathbb{C} \) the difference \( \mathfrak{A}(\xi_1) - \mathfrak{A}(\xi_2) \) is a compact operator. In our case this property is absent and this was the very reason to prove Theorem 2 individually.
Therefore, the remainder term \( \tilde{w}^1 \) in (32) decays exponentially as \(|x_1| \to \infty \) but in general not as \( x_2 \to +\infty \). However, it is easy to see that if \( \tilde{f} \) decays exponentially as \( x_2 \to +\infty \) then \( \tilde{w}^1 \) does the same.

### 3.2.2 Reduction of the problem (15), (16) to the form (34)

We proceed in two steps. According to (14), the right-hand sides in (16) are smooth and decay exponentially as \( x \to +\infty \) the first quadrant which also decays exponentially as \( x \to +\infty \). Therefore, there is a smooth vector function \( w^\pm \) in the first quadrant which also decays exponentially as \( x_2 \to +\infty \) and meets the boundary conditions

\[
\begin{align*}
  w^+_{n1}(0, x_2) &= u^R_1(x_2)\delta_{n1}, & n = 1, 2, 3.
\end{align*}
\]

We define \( w^\pm \) in the second quadrant as

\[
\begin{align*}
  w^-_1(-x_1, x_2) &= -w^+_1(x_1, x_2), \\
  w^-_2(-x_1, x_2) &= w^+_2(x_1, x_2), \\
  w^-_3(-x_1, x_2) &= w^+_3(x_1, x_2).
\end{align*}
\]

Then the composite function

\[
  w^b(x) = \begin{cases} 
    w^+(x) - (1 - \chi(x_1))w^-(x), & x_1 > 0, \\
    w^+(x) - (1 - \chi(-x_1))w^-(x), & x_1 < 0
  \end{cases}
\]

(recall that the cutoff function \( \chi \) is introduced in (33)) meets the homogeneous jump conditions (16) and therefore satisfies the problem in the half-plane

\[
\mathcal{L}(\partial_1, \partial_2, ik)w^b - \omega_R^b w^b = f^b \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}_+^2, \quad \mathcal{N}(\partial_1, \partial_2, ik)w^b = g^b \quad \text{on} \quad \partial \mathbb{R}_+^2.
\]

Moreover, the function \( f^b \) is supported in the semi-infinite strip and decays exponentially as \( x_2 \to +\infty \), while \( g^b \) is supported in the segment \([0, 2] \). Thus, \( f^b \in \left( W^{0, 0}_{x, \beta}(\mathbb{R}_+^2) \right)^3 \) and \( g^b \in \left( W^{1, 0}_{x, \beta}(\partial \mathbb{R}_+^2) \right)^3 \).

Unfortunately, \( g^b \) has the jump at the origin, \( \mathbb{R}^3 \ni g^b := g^b(0) - g^b(-0) \neq 0 \). Therefore, \( g^b \notin \left( W^{1, 0}_{x, \beta}(\partial \mathbb{R}_+^2) \right)^3 \), and the previous argument at \( \ell = 0 \) is not applicable. To come over this obstacle we need the second step.

To compensate for the above-mentioned discontinuity, we again employ the Kondrat’ev theory, now in a domain with a corner point at the boundary. Recall that \((r, \phi)\) are the polar coordinates of the point \((x_1, x_2)\), define

\[
\mathcal{L}(\partial_r, \partial_\phi) := \mathcal{L}(\partial_1, \partial_2, 0), \quad \mathcal{R}(\partial_r, \partial_\phi) := \mathcal{N}(\partial_1, \partial_2, 0)
\]
and consider the problem

\[ \mathcal{L}(\partial_r, \partial_\phi)\Psi = 0, \quad (r, \phi) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times (0, \pi); \]
\[ \mathcal{N}(\partial_r, \partial_\phi)\Psi(r, 0) = \frac{1}{2}g^*, \quad \mathcal{N}(\partial_r, \partial_\phi)\Psi(r, \pi) = -\frac{1}{2}g^*. \]  

(38)

Using the Kondrat’ev technicality (see, e.g., [28, Lemma 3.5.11]) we find out a particular solution of (38) in the form

\[ \Psi(r, \phi) = r(\psi^0(\phi) \log(r) + \psi^1(\phi)), \]

(39)

where \( \psi^0, \psi^1 \in (C^\infty[0, \pi])^3 \).

**Remark 2** According to the classical works [38] and [11], the displacement field \( u^\varepsilon \) solving the problem (3) in the angle \( \Omega^\varepsilon \) gets the singular component \( r^\varepsilon(\Phi^\varepsilon((1 - 2\alpha/\pi)\phi + \alpha) \) near the origin. Here \( t(\varepsilon) \) and \( \Phi^\varepsilon \in (C^\infty[0, \pi])^3 \) depend smoothly on \( \varepsilon \geq 0 \), and the following relations hold as \( \varepsilon \to +0 \):

\[ t(\varepsilon) = 1 + \varepsilon t^1 + O(\varepsilon^2), \quad \Phi^\varepsilon((1 - 2\alpha/\pi)\phi + \alpha) = \Phi^0(\phi) + \varepsilon\Phi^1(\phi) + O(\varepsilon^2). \]

Moreover, \( r\Phi^0(\phi) \) is a vector function linear in \( x \). We then have

\[ r^\varepsilon(\Phi^\varepsilon((1 - 2\alpha/\pi)\phi + \alpha) = r\Phi^0(\phi) + \varepsilon r(t^1\Phi^0(\phi) \log(r) + \Phi^1(\phi)) + O(\varepsilon^2) \]

that explains the appearance of the logarithmic-dependent term (39) in the asymptotic ansatz.

Finally, we set

\[ w(x) = w^\flat(x) - (1 - \chi(r))\Psi(r, \phi) \]

and claim that \( w \) meets the problem (34) with right-hand sides satisfying (35) for \( \ell = 0 \).

Indeed, by (38), the function \( f - f^\flat \) is compactly supported and contains only the first derivatives of \( \Psi \). Furthermore,

\[ g(x_1) = g^\flat(x_1) - (1 - \chi(x_1)) \frac{\text{sign}(x_1)}{2} g^* + h(x_1)\Psi|_{x_2=0}, \]

where \( h \) is a compactly supported smooth function. Thus the claim follows.

**Remark 3** Notice that the function \( \Psi \) does not belong to \( H^2_\text{loc}(\mathbb{R}_+^2) \) because of singularity at the origin. However, \( \Psi \in H^1_\text{loc}(\mathbb{R}_+^2) \) that is sufficient for our purposes.

### 3.3 The completion of the construction

Summing up, we have established the solvability of the problem (15), (16) and a general form (32) of the solution, while the exponential decay of the remainder follows from Remark 1. To complete the construction of the first correction term in (12) we need to compute the constants \( c^\pm_u \) and \( c^\pm_v \). Since \( w^\pm \) is defined up to a summand \( C_u u^R + C_v v^R \), we can assume without loss of generality that \( c^+_u + c^-_u = 0 \) and \( c^+_v + c^-_v = 0 \).
We apply the method [19], see also [28, Ch. 3, §3]. Namely, we insert \( w^1 \) and \( u^R \) into the Green formula in the rectangles \( Q^\pm(T) = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 0 < \pm x_1 < T, \; 0 < x_2 < T \} \):

\[
\int_{\partial Q^\pm} \left( N(\partial_1, \partial_2, ik)w^1 \cdot u^R - w^1 \cdot N(\partial_1, \partial_2, ik)u^R \right) = \int_{Q^\pm} \left( \mathcal{L}(\partial_1, \partial_2, ik)w^1 \cdot u^R - w^1 \cdot \mathcal{L}(\partial_1, \partial_2, ik)u^R \right) = 0
\]

and then send \( T \) to \(+\infty\). Using (10) we arrive at the relation

\[
c^+_v = \frac{c^+_v - c^-_v}{2} = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty \left( \sigma_{22} |u^R|^2 u^R_2 + \sigma_{32} [u^R] u^R_2 - u^R_2 \sigma_{11} [u^R] \right) \, dx_2 \bigg|_{x_2 = 0}^{x_2 = T}.
\] (40)

Due to the explicit formulae (14) a direct calculation of (10) gives

\[
c^+_v = -\frac{k(1 - B)^2 (4 - B)(2 - B)^2 (8(1 - B)^2 + B^2(2 - B))}{2B(8(1 - B) + B^2)(8(1 - B)^2 + B^2(3 - 2B))}.
\] (41)

Since \( B \in (0, 1) \), we evidently have \( c^+_v < 0 \), this inequality will be used below. Similarly, applying the Green formula to \( w^1 \) and \( u^R \) we obtain \( c^+_u = 0 \).

The next terms of the expansion (12) can also be found; however, we do not need their explicit expressions.

4 The outer expansions

4.1 Construction of expansions

To construct the “outer” asymptotic expansion of \( u^\varepsilon \) which is valid for large \( |x_1| \), we need to find special solutions of the problem (3) in the half-plane \( \Omega^0 \)

\[
W^\varepsilon(x_1, x_2) = e^{\xi^\pm x_1} U^\varepsilon^\pm(x_2), \quad \xi^\pm = \xi^\pm(\varepsilon),
\] (42)

-describing waves with the exponential decay as \( x_1 \to \pm \infty \), that is, \( \pm \xi^\pm < 0 \), with the spectral parameter

\[
\omega^2 = \omega_R^2 - \varepsilon^2 \Lambda^1 + \tilde{\Lambda}^\varepsilon, \quad \Lambda^1 > 0, \quad \tilde{\Lambda}^\varepsilon = O(\varepsilon^3).
\] (43)

Substitution of (12) into (3) shows that \( (-\xi^\pm, U^\varepsilon^\pm) \) is a nontrivial solution of the problem

\[
\mathcal{L}(\xi^\pm, \partial_2, ik)U^\varepsilon^\pm(x_2) = \omega^2 U^\varepsilon^\pm(x_2), \quad x_2 \in \mathbb{R}_+;
\]

\[
\mathcal{N}(\xi^\pm, \partial_2, ik)U^\varepsilon^\pm(0) = 0.
\] (44)

Following [36, Ch. 9], we accept the standard asymptotic ansatz

\[
\xi^\pm = \mp \varepsilon \xi^1 + \tilde{\xi}^\pm, \quad \xi^1 > 0, \quad |\tilde{\xi}^\pm| \leq C \varepsilon^2;
\] (45)

\footnote{This book deals with linear but non-self-adjoint pencils and reduction of a quadratic pencil to a linear one is obvious.}
$$U^{\varepsilon\pm}(x_2) = U^0(x_2) + \xi^{\pm}U^1(x_2) + \tilde{U}^{\varepsilon\pm}(x_2), \quad ||\tilde{U}^{\varepsilon\pm}(x_2); (H^2(\mathbb{R}_+))^3|| \leq C\varepsilon^2,$$

with small remainders \(\tilde{\xi}^{\pm}\) and \(\tilde{U}^{\varepsilon\pm}\); their estimates are provided by general results in [36, Ch. 9] after performing the necessary calculation as below.

We insert (43), (45), and (46) into (44) and collect coefficients at powers of the small parameter \(\varepsilon\). At the first step we obtain the problem (22) that gives \(U^0(x_2) = u^R(x_2)\) (up to a multiplicative constant).

At the second step, cancelling the common factor \(\xi^{\pm}\) we obtain the problem (23) and conclude that \(U^1(x_2) = (-ik^{-1}u^R_3(x_2), 0, 0)\).

At the third step, we have (compare with (24))

$$\mathcal{L}(0, \partial_2, ik)U^2(x_2) - \omega^2_0U^2(x_2) = -\Lambda^1U^0(x_2) - (\xi^{\pm})^2(\partial_2\mathcal{L}(0, \partial_2, ik)U^1(x_2) + \frac{i}{2}\partial^2_2\mathcal{L}(0, \partial_2, ik)U^0(x_2)), \quad x_2 > 0;$$

$$\mathcal{N}(0, \partial_2, ik)U^2(0) = - (\xi^{\pm})^2(\partial_2\mathcal{N}(0, \partial_2, ik)U^1(0) + \frac{i}{2}\partial^2_2\mathcal{N}(0, \partial_2, ik)U^0(0)).$$

To derive the only compatibility condition, we multiply the equation in (47) by \(U^0\), integrate over \(\mathbb{R}_+\) and integrate by parts. These give

$$b(\xi^{\pm})^2 + \Lambda^1||U^0; (L^2(\mathbb{R}_+))^3||^2 = 0,$$

where \(b\) is defined in (25).

Since \(b < 0\) according to (26) and (6), the equation (48) has two roots, positive and negative, as we needed in formulae (42). We have concluded with the asymptotics (45) and (46) together with estimates of the remainders according to [36, Ch. 9].

### 4.2 The matching procedure

We use a variant of matched asymptotic expansions method, see [25, 26]. Since a trapped elastic mode is defined up to a multiplicative constant we regard (12) as its inner expansion (in a finite part of \(\Pi^c\)) and take two outer expansions (for \(\pm x_1 \to +\infty\)) in the form

$$C^{\pm}(\varepsilon)W^{\varepsilon\pm}(x) + \ldots,$$

where \(W^{\varepsilon\pm}\) are the waves (12).

Since the main terms in the expansions (12) and (46) are equal \(w^0 = U^0 = u^R\), we can write \(C^{\pm}(\varepsilon) = 1 + \varepsilon C^{\pm}_1 + \ldots\). Using (45) and (46) we derive

$$C^{\pm}(\varepsilon)W^{\varepsilon\pm}(x) = U^0(x_2) + \varepsilon(\mp \xi^{\pm}(x_1U^0(x_2) + U^1(x_2)) + C^{\pm}_1U^0(x_2)) + \ldots$$

Comparing the terms of order \(\varepsilon\) in (49) and (12) and taking into account (32) we obtain

$$\xi^{\pm} = -c^{\pm}_v, \quad C^{\pm}_1 = c^{\pm}_u = 0.$$

Notice that the first relation in (50) is justified by the above-verified inequality \(c^{\pm}_v < 0\). From (48) and (50) we derive the final formula for the first correction term in the eigenvalue expansion (43):

$$\Lambda^1 = \frac{|b|(c^{\pm}_v)^2}{||U^0; (L^2(\mathbb{R}_+))^3||^2} > 0.$$
5 Justification of asymptotic formulae

5.1 Reduction to an abstract equation

Asymptotic structures found out in previous sections allow to construct a vector function \( U^\varepsilon \in (H^1_\varepsilon(\Pi^\varepsilon))^3 \) such that
\[
a^\Pi(ik; U^\varepsilon, U^\varepsilon) < \omega^2_R(U^\varepsilon, U^\varepsilon)_\Pi^\varepsilon,
\]
where the form \( a^\Pi(ik; \cdot, \cdot) \) is defined in (11). By the variational principle (see, e.g., [1, Sec. 10.2]) this implies that the (discrete) spectrum of the operator \( A^\varepsilon(ik) \) below \( \omega^2_R \) is not empty and thus proves the existence of a wedge mode.

To localize the eigenvalue of \( A^\varepsilon(ik) \) and to justify its asymptotics as \( \varepsilon \to 0 \), we employ a well-known trick based on elementary technique of spectral measure, cf. [25, 26].

Recall that \( (H^1_\varepsilon(\Pi^\varepsilon))^3 \) is the subspace of vector functions in \( (H^1(\Pi^\varepsilon))^3 \) satisfying condition (53). Denote by \( H^\varepsilon \) the space \( (H^1_\varepsilon(\Pi^\varepsilon))^3 \) equipped with the new scalar product
\[
(\varepsilon, v)_{\Pi^\varepsilon} := a^\Pi(ik; u, v) + (\varepsilon, v)_{\Pi^\varepsilon},
\]
and notice that the corresponding norm is equivalent to the standard norm in \( (H^1_\varepsilon(\Pi^\varepsilon))^3 \), see [3, Ch. III, Sec. 3] and [2].

The quadratic form \( (\varepsilon, u)^{\Pi^\varepsilon} \) generates a bounded positive self-adjoint operator \( \mathcal{K}^\varepsilon \) in \( H^\varepsilon \), and the problem (11) is equivalent to the abstract equation
\[
\mathcal{K}^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon = \kappa u^\varepsilon
\]
with the new spectral parameter \( \kappa = (1 + \omega^2)^{-1} \). Since the essential spectrum of \( A^\varepsilon(ik) \) coincides with the ray \([\omega^2_R, +\infty)\), the essential spectrum of \( \mathcal{K}^\varepsilon \) is the closed segment \([0, \kappa_t]\) with \( \kappa_t = (1 + \omega^2_R)^{-1} \).

The spectral measure \( dE(t) \) associated with \( \mathcal{K}^\varepsilon \) (see [3, Ch. 5]) gives rise to the family of scalar measures
\[
de_u(t) := \langle dE(t)u, u \rangle_{\varepsilon}, \quad u \in H^\varepsilon.
\]
Moreover, the following obvious formulae hold for arbitrary \( u \in H^\varepsilon \):
\[
\|u; H^\varepsilon\|^2 \equiv \langle u, u \rangle_{\varepsilon} = \int \de_u(t), \quad \|\mathcal{K}^\varepsilon u - \kappa u; H^\varepsilon\|^2 = \int (t - \kappa)^2 \de_u(t).
\]

Now we assume that an interval \( \Delta = (\kappa - \delta, \kappa + \delta) \) is free of the spectrum of \( \mathcal{K}^\varepsilon \). Then we have for any \( u \in H^\varepsilon \)
\[
\|\mathcal{K}^\varepsilon u - \kappa u; H^\varepsilon\|^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus \Delta} (t - \kappa)^2 \de_u(t) \geq \delta^2 \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus \Delta} \de_u(t) = \delta^2 \|u; H^\varepsilon\|^2.
\]

Thus, if we find some \( \delta = \delta(\varepsilon) > 0, \kappa = \kappa(\varepsilon) > \kappa_t + \delta \) and \( U^\varepsilon \in H^\varepsilon \) such that
\[
\|\mathcal{K}^\varepsilon U^\varepsilon - \kappa U^\varepsilon; H^\varepsilon\| < \delta \|U^\varepsilon; H^\varepsilon\|,
\]
then the observed contradiction between (54) and (55) shows that the interval \( \Delta \) contains a spectrum point. This point is definitely an isolated eigenvalue because \( \Delta \) does not intersect the essential spectrum of \( \mathcal{K}^\varepsilon \) by the choice of \( \kappa \) and \( \delta \).
5.2 Construction of the trial function

According to (43) and (53), we take
\[ \kappa = \kappa(\varepsilon) = (1 + \omega_R^2 - \varepsilon^2 \Lambda_1)^{-1} > \kappa_1 + \varepsilon^2 \Lambda_1 \kappa_1^2 \]  
(56)
as an approximate eigenvalue of the operator \( \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon \), i.e. as a candidate to fulfill the inequality (55). The construction of corresponding approximate eigenvector \( U_\varepsilon \) is based on our previous asymptotic analysis and glues the inner and outer expansions (12) as follows:

\[ U_\varepsilon(x) = X_\varepsilon(x)W_\varepsilon(x) + \sum_{\pm} X_{\pm}(x)W_{\pm}(x) - \sum_{\pm} X_{\pm}(x)X_\varepsilon(x)(u^R(x_2) + \varepsilon c_0^\pm v^R(x)). \]  
(57)

Here \( X_\varepsilon \) and \( X_{\pm} \) are cutoff functions with overlapping supports:

\[ X_\varepsilon(x) = \chi(x_2 - |x_1| + \varepsilon^{-1}), \quad X_{\pm}(x) = \chi(\pm x_1 - x_2), \]  
(58)
where the cutoff function \( \chi \) is introduced in (33), see Fig. 3 and Fig. 4.

Next, the vector function \( W_\varepsilon \) has the form

\[ W_\varepsilon(x) = w^0(x) + \varepsilon w^1(x) + \varepsilon^2 w_\varepsilon(x), \]
where \( w^0 = u^R \) and \( w^1 \) are two terms of the inner expansion (12) constructed in Section 3 and \( w_\varepsilon \) is a smooth vector function supported in the union of two skewed semi-infinite strips

\[ \Upsilon_{\pm} = \{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x_2 \geq 0, 0 \leq \pm x_1 - \varepsilon x_2 \leq 2 \} \]
and such that \( W_\varepsilon \) verifies the transmission condition (8). Furthermore, \( W_{\pm} \) are the waves (12) with slow exponential decay as \( x_1 \to \pm \infty \), see (15). Finally, we notice that the terms matched in Section 4.2 are duplicated in the first and second terms in (57), and we eliminate this duplication by the subtrahend involving both cutoff functions (58).

We emphasize that the supports of the cutoff functions drawn in Fig. 3 and Fig. 4 are angular. This becomes the key trick in the forthcoming estimates because the exponential decay of the ingredients of (57) in the supports of \( \nabla X_\varepsilon \) and \( \nabla X_{\pm} \) is based on the exponential decay as either \( x_2 \to +\infty \) or \( x_1 \to \pm \infty \).

To estimate the norm on the left-hand side of (55), we use obvious relation

\[ \|u; \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon\| = \sup_{\|v; \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon\| \leq 1} |\langle u, v \rangle_\varepsilon|. \]  
(59)
The equivalence of (11) and (53), definition (56) and integrating by parts yield

\[
\langle \nu U^\varepsilon - \mathcal{K} U^\varepsilon, v \rangle_x = \nu \left( a_{\Pi} (ik; U^\varepsilon, v) - \left( \omega_R^2 - \varepsilon^2 \Lambda^1 \right) (U^\varepsilon, v)_{\Pi^e} \right) \\
= \kappa \left( (\mathcal{L}(\partial_1, \partial_2, ik) - \omega_R^2 + \varepsilon^2 \Lambda^1) U^\varepsilon, v \right)_{\Pi^e} + \kappa \int_{\partial \Pi^e} \mathcal{N}(\partial_1, \partial_2, ik) U^\varepsilon \cdot \nu d\Gamma. \tag{60}
\]

We use for brevity the notation \( \mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(\partial_1, \partial_2, ik) \) and write

\[
(\mathcal{L} - \omega_R^2 + \varepsilon^2 \Lambda^1) U^\varepsilon = \mathcal{X}^\varepsilon (\mathcal{L} - \omega_R^2) (w^0 + \varepsilon w^1) + \varepsilon^2 \mathcal{X}^\varepsilon (\mathcal{L} - \omega_R^2 + \varepsilon^2 \Lambda^1) w_*^\varepsilon \\
+ \varepsilon^2 \mathcal{X}^\varepsilon \Lambda^1 \left( w^0 + \varepsilon w^1 - \sum \pm \mathcal{X}_\pm (u^R + \varepsilon c^\pm_v v^R) \right) \\
+ [\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{X}^\varepsilon] \left( w^0 + \varepsilon w^1 - \sum \pm \mathcal{X}_\pm (u^R + \varepsilon c^\pm_v v^R) \right) \\
+ \sum \pm \mathcal{X}_\pm (\mathcal{L} - \omega_R^2 + \varepsilon^2 \Lambda^1) W^{\varepsilon \pm} \\
+ \sum \pm [\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{X}_\pm] (W^{\varepsilon \pm} - \mathcal{X}^\varepsilon (u^R + \varepsilon c^\pm_v v^R)) \tag{61}
=: J_1 + J_2 + J_3 + J_4 + \sum \pm J_5^\pm + \sum \pm J_6^\pm,
\]

where \([\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{X}]\) stand for the commutators of the Lame operator with cutoff functions.

We estimate the contribution of all terms to (60) separately.

1. By definition of \( w^0, w^1 \) and \( W^{\varepsilon \pm} \) we have \( J_1 \equiv 0 \) and \( J_5^\pm \equiv 0 \).

2. Notice that the discrepancy of \( w^0 + \varepsilon w^1 \) in the transmission conditions (8), (9) are functions of order \( \varepsilon^2 \) exponentially decaying in \( x_2 \), see (10), (14) and (16). Therefore we can fulfil the estimate

\[
\| w_*^\varepsilon; (H^2(\Pi_\pm^e))^3 \| = \| w_*^\varepsilon; (H^2(\Upsilon_+^e \cap \Upsilon_-^e))^3 \| \leq c \tag{62}
\]

(here and in the sequel we denote by \( c \) constants independent of \( \varepsilon \)). This yields

\[
\sup_{\| v; \mathcal{H}_x \| \leq 1} \| (J_2, v)_{\Pi^e} \| \leq \varepsilon^2 \sup_{\| v; \mathcal{H}_x \| \leq 1} \| w_*^\varepsilon; (H^2(\Pi_\pm^e))^3 \| \| v; (L^2(\Pi^e))^3 \| \leq c \varepsilon^2.
\]

3. Taking into account the supports of cutoff functions (58) we have

\[
J_3 = \varepsilon^2 \Lambda^1 (1 - \mathcal{X}_+ - \mathcal{X}_-) u^R + \varepsilon^3 \mathcal{X}^\varepsilon \left( w^1 - \sum \pm \mathcal{X}_\pm c^\pm_v v^R \right).
\]

Using again the position of supports of cutoff functions and (52) we see that the both terms are of the exponential decay as \( |x| \to \infty \). Thus,

\[
\sup_{\| v; \mathcal{H}_x \| \leq 1} \| (J_3, v)_{\Pi^e} \| \leq c \varepsilon^2.
\]

4. Since the coefficients of the operator \([\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{X}^\varepsilon]\) are supported in the set \( \text{supp}(\nabla \mathcal{X}^\varepsilon) \) where \( \mathcal{X}_\pm \equiv 1 \), we have

\[
J_4 = \varepsilon [\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{X}^\varepsilon] \tilde{w}^1,
\]
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where \( \tilde{w}^1 \) is the remainder term in (32) decaying exponentially as \( |x| \to \infty \). Therefore,

\[
\sup_{\| v; H^\epsilon \| \leq 1} |(J_4, v)_{H^\epsilon}| \leq e^{-c\epsilon^{-1}}.
\]

5. From relations (45) and (46), we derive that the functions \( W^{\pm} \) decay exponentially as \( |x| \to \infty \) on the supports of \( [\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{X}_\pm] \), respectively. Furthermore, they are of order \( \epsilon^2 \), and we derive

\[
\sup_{\| v; H^\epsilon \| \leq 1} |(J_{5, v})_{H^\epsilon}| \leq c\epsilon^2.
\]

Next, we set \( \mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}(\partial_1, \partial_2, ik) \) and rewrite the last term in (60) as follows:

\[
\mathcal{N} U^\epsilon = \mathcal{X}^\epsilon \mathcal{N}(w^0 + \epsilon w^1) + \epsilon^2 \mathcal{X}^\epsilon \mathcal{N} w_0^\epsilon
\]

\[
+ [\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{X}^\epsilon] \left( w^0 + \epsilon w^1 - \sum_{\pm} \mathcal{X}_\pm (u^R + \epsilon c_\nu^\pm v^R) \right)
\]

\[
+ \sum_{\pm} \mathcal{X}_\pm \mathcal{N} W^\pm + \sum_{\pm} [\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{X}_\pm] (W^\pm - \mathcal{X}^\epsilon (u^R + \epsilon c_\nu^\pm v^R))
\]

\[
=: J_7 + J_8 + J_9 + \sum_{\pm} J_{10}^\pm + \sum_{\pm} J_{11}^\pm. \tag{63}
\]

We estimate the contribution of all terms separately taking into account the supports of cutoff functions (58).

6. By definition of \( w^0, w^1 \) and \( W^\pm \) we have \( J_{10}^\pm \equiv 0 \) and

\[
\int_{\partial H^\epsilon} J_7 \cdot \nabla d\Gamma = \int_{\{x_1 = \epsilon x_2 > 0\}} \mathcal{N}(w^0 + \epsilon w^1) \cdot \nabla d\Gamma.
\]

We employ the standard trace inequalities

\[
\| u; (H^1(\partial H^\epsilon))^3 \| \leq c\| u; (H^2(\Pi^\epsilon))^3 \|, \quad \| v; (L^2(\partial H^\epsilon))^3 \| \leq c\| v; H^\epsilon \| \tag{64}
\]

and recall that the discrepancy of \( w^0 + \epsilon w^1 \) in the transmission conditions (8), (9) are functions of order \( \epsilon^2 \) exponentially decaying in \( x_2 \). This gives the estimate

\[
\sup_{\| v; H^\epsilon \| \leq 1} \left| \int_{\partial H^\epsilon} J_7 \cdot \nabla d\Gamma \right| \leq c\epsilon^2.
\]

7. Similarly, from (62) and (64) we readily have

\[
\sup_{\| v; H^\epsilon \| \leq 1} \left| \int_{\partial H^\epsilon} J_8 \cdot \nabla d\Gamma \right| \leq c\epsilon^2.
\]

8. The terms \( J_9 \) and \( J_{11}^\pm \) are processed in the same way as \( J_4 \) and \( J_6^\pm \), respectively, so that

\[
\sup_{\| v; H^\epsilon \| \leq 1} \left| \int_{\partial H^\epsilon} J_9 \cdot \nabla d\Gamma \right| \leq e^{-c\epsilon^{-1}}; \quad \sup_{\| v; H^\epsilon \| \leq 1} \left| \int_{\partial H^\epsilon} J_{11}^\pm \cdot \nabla d\Gamma \right| \leq c\epsilon^2.
\]
Summing up the estimates obtained, we conclude from (59) and (60)
\[ \| \kappa U^\varepsilon - K^\varepsilon U^\varepsilon; H^\varepsilon \| \leq c \varepsilon^2. \] (65)

To estimate the right-hand side in (55) from below, we write
\[ \| U^\varepsilon; H^\varepsilon \|^2 \geq \| U^\varepsilon; L^2(\Pi^\varepsilon) \|^2 \geq \int_{3+\varepsilon^{-1}}^{\infty} \int_{0}^{1} |W^\varepsilon(x)|^2 dx_2 dx_1 \geq c \int_{3+\varepsilon^{-1}}^{\infty} e^{2x_1} dx_1 \geq c \varepsilon^{-1}. \] (66)

Inequalities (65) and (66) provide (55) with \( \delta \leq c \varepsilon^5 \). According to (56) we conclude that, for all sufficiently small \( \varepsilon > 0 \), the interval

\[ \Delta(\varepsilon) = (\kappa - c \varepsilon^2, \kappa + c \varepsilon^2) \]

contains an eigenvalue \( \hat{\kappa} = \hat{\kappa}(\varepsilon) \) of the operator \( K^\varepsilon \). Recalling the relation between \( \kappa \) and \( \omega \) we see that the problem (11) has an eigenvalue \( \hat{\omega}^2 = \hat{\omega}^2(\varepsilon) = 1 - \hat{\kappa}^{-1} \) satisfying the asymptotic formula
\[ \hat{\omega}^2 = \omega^2_R - \varepsilon^2 \Lambda^1 + O(\varepsilon^5), \quad \varepsilon \to 0. \] (67)

5.3 Proof of Theorem 1

The existence of the solution \( u^\varepsilon \) to the eigenproblem (3) is proved in the previous subsection. Since the Rayleigh wave, the first approximation in the asymptotic expansions (12) and (49), satisfies the symmetry condition (11), it is easy to observe that all other terms of expansions are also symmetric, whence \( u^\varepsilon \) is symmetric. Its exponential decay follows from the relation \( \hat{\omega}^2 < \omega^2_R \), see [34] and [7, §53] for scalar equations. Furthermore, by standard elliptic theory \( u^\varepsilon \) is infinitely smooth outside the origin. By Remark 2 the asymptotic behavior of \( u^\varepsilon \) near origin falls into \((H^2(\Omega^\varepsilon))^3\).

Formula (53) with \( \vartheta = \Lambda^1 \omega_R^{-2} \) follows from (67). Finally, we recall that \( \Lambda^1 \) is given by (51). A direct calculation using explicit formulae (14) gives
\[ \| U^0; (L^2(\mathbb{R}^+))^3 \|^2 = \frac{B^2((1-B)^2(7-2B)+1)}{8k(1-B)^{5/2}(2-B)^2}, \]
and due to (11) and (26) \( \vartheta \) depends on \( \sigma \) only. \( \square \)

Remark 4 Notice that despite the fact that \( u^\varepsilon \in (H^2(\Omega^\varepsilon))^3 \), the constructed approximate eigenvector \( \mathbf{U}^\varepsilon \) lives in \((H^1(\Omega^\varepsilon))^3\) only, see Remark 3. It could be smoothened out near the corner point with the help of an approach in [27] but going over to the abstract equation (62) obviates this complication.
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