

MONOTONICITY PRINCIPLE FOR NONLINEAR ELECTRICAL CONDUCTIVITY TOMOGRAPHY

ANTONIO CORBO ESPOSITO¹, LUISA FAELLA¹, GIANPAOLO PISCITELLI¹, RAVI PRAKASH², ANTONELLO TAMBURRINO^{1,3}

Abstract. We consider a nonlinear inverse electrical conductivity problem consisting in reconstructing the (nonlinear) electrical conductivity starting from boundary measurements in steady currents operations. In this framework, a key role is played by the Monotonicity Principle, consisting in a monotone relation connecting the unknown material property to the (measured) Dirichlet-to-Neumann operator (DtN). Monotonicity Principles are the foundations for non-iterative and real-time imaging methods and algorithms.

In this article, we prove that under very general assumptions a Monotonicity Principle for the Dirichlet Energy in nonlinear problems holds. Then, we show that apart from linear and p-Laplacian cases, it is impossible to transfer this monotonicity result from the Dirichlet Energy to the DtN operator. Therefore, we introduce a new boundary operator, somehow corresponding to an average DtN, to get the Monotonicity Principle.

Keywords: Inverse electrical conductivity problem, Nonlinearity, Monotonicity Principle, Average Dirichlet-to-Neumann operator.

MSC 2010: 35R30, 35J60.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we derive the Monotonicity Principle for an inverse conductivity problem modeled by a fully nonlinear variant of the Calderón problem. Specifically we treat the problem of retrieving the nonlinear electrical conductivity σ starting from boundary measurements in stationary conditions (steady currents). More precisely, we consider a fully nonlinear problem where the constitutive relationship is local, isotropic and non-hysteretic:

$$\mathbf{J}(x) = \sigma(x, |\mathbf{E}|)\mathbf{E} \quad \forall x \in \Omega, \quad (1.1)$$

¹Dipartimento di Ingegneria Elettrica e dell'Informazione "M. Scarano", Università degli Studi di Cassino e del Lazio Meridionale, Via G. Di Biasio n. 43, 03043 Cassino (FR), Italy.

²Departamento de Matemática, Facultad de Ciencias Físicas y Matemáticas, Universidad de Concepción, Avenida Esteban Iturra s/n, Bairro Universitario, Casilla 160 C, Concepción, Chile.

³Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI-48824, USA.

Email: antonio.corboesposito@unicas.it, luisa.faella@unicas.it, gianpaolo.piscitelli@unicas.it, rpakash@udec.cl, antonello.tamburrino@unicas.it (*corresponding author*).

being σ the nonlinear electrical conductivity, \mathbf{J} the electric current density, \mathbf{E} the electric field and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 2$, an open bounded domain with Lipschitz boundary. Ω represents the region occupied by the conducting material.

In steady currents operations the electric field can be expressed through the electrical scalar potential $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ as $\mathbf{E}(x) = -\nabla u(x)$, where $p > 1$ depends on σ . The electric scalar potential u solves the steady current problem:

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div} \left(\sigma(x, |\nabla u(x)|) \nabla u(x) \right) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega \\ u(x) = f(x) & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

where $f \in X_\diamond$ is the applied boundary potential, with X_\diamond a proper abstract trace space (see Section 2). The existence of a solution is guaranteed under suitable assumptions on σ (see Section 2).

In this framework, a key role is played by the (nonlinear) Dirichlet-to-Neumann (DtN) operator, mapping the boundary voltage f to the current flux at the boundary

$$\Lambda_\sigma : f \in X_\diamond \rightarrow -\mathbf{J} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}|_{\partial\Omega} = \sigma \partial_n u|_{\partial\Omega} \in X'_\diamond$$

where X'_\diamond is the dual of X_\diamond and $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$ denotes the outer unit normal on $\partial\Omega$.

The goal of this paper is to provide a “tool”, the Monotonicity Principle, to reconstruct the nonlinear electrical conductivity σ starting from the knowledge of the boundary data Λ_σ .

The Monotonicity Principle Method (MPM) is an imaging method which relies on a monotone relation connecting the unknown material property to the measured DtN or its inverse. In the linear case, MPM states that

$$\sigma \leq \tau \implies \Lambda_\sigma \leq \Lambda_\tau. \quad (1.3)$$

where σ and τ are two electrical conductivities defined in Ω , Λ_σ and Λ_τ are the corresponding DtN operators. In equation (1.3), $\sigma \leq \tau$ is understood in the almost everywhere sense in Ω , and $\Lambda_\sigma \leq \Lambda_\tau$ means that $\Lambda_\sigma - \Lambda_\tau$ is negative semidefinite. Monotonicity relation (1.3) shows that a pointwise increase of the electrical conductivity leads to “greater” boundary data.

Monotonicity (1.3) is the basis to develop non-iterative and real-time reconstruction methods and algorithms [1, 2, 3]. MPM has been mainly applied to shape reconstruction problems for detecting the shape of anomalies in a given background. In this specialization, the method determines if a test inclusion is part of the anomaly or not by a simple test. Indeed, if T is a “test” anomaly and V is the unknown anomaly, corresponding to the electrical conductivities given by σ_T and σ_V , respectively, (1.3) implies

$$T \subseteq V \implies \Lambda_{\sigma_T} \geq \Lambda_{\sigma_V}, \quad (1.4)$$

where we have assumed that both anomalies have electrical conductivity smaller than that of the background. Equation (1.4) corresponds to

$$\Lambda_{\sigma_T} \not\geq \Lambda_{\sigma_V} \implies T \not\subseteq V. \quad (1.5)$$

Therefore, from the knowledge of the boundary DtN operators, we can infer if the prescribed test anomaly T is contained or not in the unknown anomaly V . By repeating the test in (1.5) for different sets T , we can reconstruct the shape of the unknown anomaly V .

According to our awareness, the first evidence of a monotone property (1.3) for the linear case appeared in [4]. Then its relevance to the field of Inverse Problems was first recognized in [1], where Tamburrino and Rubinacci proposed (1.5) to establish a new imaging method. Specifically, they (i) proved the equivalent of (1.3) but for a real-world system made by a finite number of electrodes, (ii) proposed and numerically tested the imaging method based onto (1.5) and (iii) extended (1.3) to perfectly conducting or insulating anomalies.

Surprisingly, Monotonicity Principles, appear to be a general feature which can be found in many problems governed by PDEs of different nature. Indeed, despite originally found for elliptic PDEs arising from static problems (as, for instance, Electrical Resistance, Capacitance or Inductance Tomography) [1, 3, 5, 6, 7], it was also found for elliptic PDEs but arising from quasi-static problems (as, for instance, Eddy Current Tomography) [2, 3, 8].

Parabolic PDEs (for instance pulsed Eddy Current Tomography) have been treated in [9, 10, 11, 12, 13]. Specifically, it was proved a Monotonicity Principle for the time constants of the natural modes.

Monotonicity of the transmission eigenvalues for the Helmholtz equation was exploited in [14]. Other Monotonicity principles for problems governed by the Helmholtz equation were developed in [15, 16] for bounded domains and in [17, 18] for unbounded domains. Monotonicity was also applied to crack detection for the Helmholtz equation in [19].

Monotonicity for linear elasticity was introduced in [20].

A special feature of MPM is that it provides rigorous upper and lower bounds to the unknown, even in the presence of noise, under proper hypothesis [21].

The limiting case of perfectly insulating anomalies has been treated in [1, 22] and the case of perfectly conducting anomalies in [1].

The concept of regularization for MPM was introduced in [23, 24]. This is non trivial because MPM is not based upon the minimization of an objective function, where regularization can be easily introduced by means of penalty terms. Vice versa Monotonicity has been used as regularizer in [25].

A first experimental validation of MPM for Eddy Current Tomography can be found in [26].

Additional numerical aspects have been studied in [27, 28, 29, 24, 30].

Theoretical applications of the Monotonicity can be found in the prove of uniqueness results [31, 32, 33].

Other than soft-field Tomography and Nondestructive Testing, MPM has been applied to homogenization of materials [34] and concrete rebars inspection [35, 36].

Monotonicity was combined with frequency-difference and ultrasound modulated Electrical Impedance Tomography measurements, to reduce the impact of modelling errors such those arising from electrode positions and the shape of the imaging domain [37].

The converse of monotonicity (1.4), under the assumption that the unknown anomaly consists of union of non-contractible sets, was proved by Harrach and Ullrich in [7]. This result is relevant because it states that MPM gives exact reconstruction for (union of) contractible anomalies, at least in the ideal setting when the measured boundary data is the DtN operator. Unfortunately, this is not the case for practical systems made of a finite number of electrodes where implication (1.4) holds [1] but not its converse.

Eventually, it is worth noting that imaging methods based on Monotonicity Principle fall in the class of non-iterative imaging methods. Colton and Kirsch introduced the first non-iterative approach named Linear Sampling Method (LSM) [38] followed by the Factorization Method (FM) proposed by Kirsch [39]. Ikeata proposed the Enclosure Method [40, 41] and Devaney applied MUSIC (MUltiple Signal Classification), a well known algorithm in signal processing, as imaging method [42].

A special case for equation (1.1) is when $\sigma(x, |\mathbf{E}|) = \theta(x)|\mathbf{E}|^{p-2}$. Then the relationship between the electrical current density \mathbf{J} and the electric field \mathbf{E} can be written as

$$\mathbf{J}(x) = \theta(x)|\mathbf{E}(x)|^{p-2}\mathbf{E}(x), \quad (1.6)$$

where $\theta \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and $\theta(x) \geq c_0$ a.e. in Ω for some positive constant c_0 . This leads to the study of a steady current problem involving the p -Laplacian. Here, briefly, we give an overview of the main and most recent results concerning the nonlinear p -Laplace type model. The inverse problem of Calderón was initially posed in the setting of the p -conductivity equation by Salo and Zhong [43] and, then, studied in [44, 45] also. In [43], the authors proved boundary determination results under proper regularity assumptions on the conductivity and boundary of the domain. Moreover, they showed that to investigate Calderón-type problems for equations with weak non-linearities (see [46, 47]), one can use the Gâteaux derivative of the DtN operator at constant boundary values. The method does not work for p -Laplace equation as proved in the Appendix of [43]. For these Calderón-type problems, the monotonicity inequality was proved in [44] (see Lemma 2.1). Here the authors study the enclosure method for non linear equation. The enclosure method introduced by Ikehata uses complex geometrical optics (CGO) solution in place of point sources (see [40, 41]). In [45], the author gave a boundary uniqueness result for the first order normal derivative of the conductivity. In [48], the authors

extended the weak DtN operator to conductivities that include regions of zero or infinite conductivity.

The extension from the isotropic case of [44] to the anisotropic one has been proposed in [49]. The authors used the monotonicity inequality to prove injectivity for the DtN operator under a monotonicity assumption (see Theorem 2.1 and Lemma 2.2). Their results show injectivity in two dimensions for Lipschitz conductivities. In higher dimension cases, one of the conductivities is required to be close to a constant.

In [50], a Calderón problem for nonlinear p -Laplacian type equations is studied. In this paper, the authors show that monotonicity based shape reconstruction methods ([1, 3]) work in the p -Laplacian case which allow them to find the complex hull of the inclusion without any regularity or interface jump assumption. As a matter of fact, any regularity on jump properties for the inclusion is not required and they obtain this subset using both the monotonicity and enclosure method. For properties of DtN operator with $\theta = 1$ in (1.6), we refer to Hauer [51].

The original contribution of this paper consists in deriving a Monotonicity Principle in the fully nonlinear case. This result is not at all a trivial development of the previous ones. Indeed, we prove that, in general, the Dirichlet Energy $\mathbb{F}_\sigma(u^f)$ is the quantity being monotone with respect to the electrical conductivity (Theorem 4.1), that is:

$$\sigma_1 \leq \sigma_2 \implies \mathbb{F}_{\sigma_1}(u_1^f) \leq \mathbb{F}_{\sigma_2}(u_2^f), \quad (1.7)$$

where u_1^f and u_2^f are the solution of (1.2) corresponding to σ_1 and σ_2 , respectively, and f is the prescribed boundary voltage. In (1.7) $\sigma_1 \leq \sigma_2$, means that

$$\sigma_1(x, E) \leq \sigma_2(x, E) \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \overline{\Omega} \text{ and } \forall E > 0.$$

Then, we found that monotonicity can be easily transferred to the boundary DtN operator, but only for linear and p -Laplacian problems. Indeed, we found that in those cases the DtN power product $\langle \Lambda_\sigma(f), f \rangle$ is proportional to the Dirichlet Energy, hence the Monotonicity for the boundary DtN operator follows.

When the nonlinearity is of general type, for instance it is of polynomial type, the Dirichlet Energy is monotone with respect to the constitutive relationship but it is not proportional to the power product $\langle \Lambda_\sigma(f), f \rangle$ (see Subsection 4.2). Therefore, monotonicity cannot be transferred from an “internal” quantity such as the Dirichlet Energy to a boundary data such as Λ_σ . This is a major issue since in solving inverse problem, we do not have any access to internal quantities like the Dirichlet Energy but, rather, we have access only to data which we can measure from the boundary. Therefore, for the general nonlinear case, we need to “transfer” the Monotonicity Principle from the Dirichlet Energy (internal quantity) to another proper boundary operator rather than Λ_σ .

Specifically, we introduce a new nonlinear boundary operator $\overline{\Lambda}_\sigma$ which is monotonic with respect to the nonlinear material property. Operator $\overline{\Lambda}_\sigma$, that we term

as *Average DtN Operator*, is defined as:

$$\bar{\Lambda}_\sigma : f \in X_\diamond \mapsto \bar{\Lambda}_\sigma(f) = \int_0^1 \Lambda_\sigma(\alpha f) \, d\alpha \in X'_\diamond. \quad (1.8)$$

Our main result is to show Monotonicity Principle for the operator (1.8):

$$\sigma_1 \leq \sigma_2 \implies \bar{\Lambda}_{\sigma_1} \leq \bar{\Lambda}_{\sigma_2},$$

where $\bar{\Lambda}_{\sigma_1} \leq \bar{\Lambda}_{\sigma_2}$ means $\langle \bar{\Lambda}_{\sigma_1}(f), f \rangle \leq \langle \bar{\Lambda}_{\sigma_2}(f), f \rangle$ for any $f \in X_\diamond$.

The key factor is achieving this result is Theorem 4.2 where we prove that the Dirichlet Energy is transferred to the power product for the Average DtN operator $\bar{\Lambda}_\sigma$ as:

$$(\mathbb{F}_\sigma \circ \mathbb{U}_\sigma)(f) = \langle \bar{\Lambda}_\sigma(f), f \rangle \quad \forall f \in X_\diamond, \quad (1.9)$$

where operator \mathbb{U}_σ maps the boundary data f to the solution u^f :

$$\mathbb{U}_\sigma : f \in X_\diamond \rightarrow u^f \in W^{1,p}(\Omega).$$

The proof of (1.9) is based on a fundamental result proved in Proposition 3.4. Specifically, we prove that the Gâteaux derivative operator of $\mathbb{F}_\sigma \circ \mathbb{U}_\sigma$, with respect to the boundary data f , is equal to the DtN operator Λ_σ , i.e.:

$$d(\mathbb{F}_\sigma \circ \mathbb{U}_\sigma) = \Lambda_\sigma. \quad (1.10)$$

To highlights the differences with the p -Laplacian and the linear ($p = 2$) cases, it is worth noting that (1.9) is replaced by

$$(\mathbb{F}_\sigma \circ \mathbb{U}_\sigma)(f) = p^{-1} \langle \Lambda_\sigma(f), f \rangle \quad \forall f \in X_\diamond,$$

whereas (1.10) remains unchanged.

The paper is organized as follows: in Section 2, we describe the problem together with the preliminaries required for its analysis; in Section 3 we study the behaviour of the solution of Problem (1.2) and of the Dirichlet Energy with respect a variation of the boundary data; in Section 4, we prove the main result and, eventually, in Section 5, we provide some conclusions.

2. FOUNDATIONS OF THE PROBLEM

Throughout this paper, Ω is the region occupied by the conducting material. We assume $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 2$, to be an open bounded domain with Lipschitz boundary. We denote by $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$ the outer unit normal defined on $\partial\Omega$, by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ the integral scalar product on $\partial\Omega$ and by V and S the n -dimensional and the $(n - 1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure, respectively. Moreover, we denote

$$L_+^\infty(\Omega) := \{\theta \in L^\infty(\Omega) \mid \theta \geq c_0 \text{ a.e. in } \Omega, \text{ for some positive constant } c_0\}.$$

Then, $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ is the closure set of $C_0^1(\Omega)$ in the $W^{1,p}$ -norm, $1 < p < +\infty$. Furthermore, the applied boundary voltage f belongs to the abstract trace space

$$X = W^{1,p}(\Omega)/W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \approx B_p^{1-\frac{1}{p},p}(\partial\Omega),$$

that is also a Besov space (refer to [52], [53, Chap. 17], [43, App.]). In the sequel, by a little abuse of notation, we write $f \in X$ meaning that f is a representative of an X -equivalence class, i.e. $f \in [a]_X$ where $[a]_X \in X$. We indicate that X_\diamond is the set of elements in X with zero average on $\partial\Omega$ with respect to the measure S .

2.1. The physical problem. Let σ be a function representing the nonlinear electrical conductivity, i.e. $\mathbf{J}(x) = \sigma(x, E(x))\mathbf{E}(x)$ where \mathbf{E} and \mathbf{J} are the electric field and the electrical current density, respectively. In addition, let E and J be the magnitude of \mathbf{E} and \mathbf{J} , respectively.

Stationary currents are governed by:

$$\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{E}(x) = 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \quad \int_{\bar{x}}^{\bar{y}} \mathbf{E} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{t}} \, dl = f(\bar{x}) - f(\bar{y}) \quad \forall \bar{x}, \bar{y} \in \partial\Omega; \quad (2.1)$$

$$\operatorname{div} \mathbf{J}(x) = 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \quad (2.2)$$

$$\mathbf{J}(x) = \sigma(x, E(x)) \mathbf{E}(x) \text{ in } \Omega, \quad (2.3)$$

where $f \in X_\diamond$ is the prescribed boundary voltage. Equations (2.1) and (2.2) come from Maxwell equations for stationary phenomenon. We stress that equations (2.1) and (2.2) have to be meant in weak sense and

$$\mathbf{E} \in H_{\operatorname{curl}}(\Omega) = \{\mathbf{w} \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n) \mid \operatorname{curl}(\mathbf{w}) \in L^2(\Omega)\},$$

$$\mathbf{J} \in H_{\operatorname{div}}(\Omega) = \{\mathbf{w} \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n) \mid \operatorname{div}(\mathbf{w}) \in L^2(\Omega)\}.$$

The curvilinear integral appearing in (2.1) is well defined for \mathbf{E} in $H_{\operatorname{curl}}(\Omega)$ and holds for any curve in Ω with extrema \bar{x} and $\bar{y} \in \partial\Omega$ (see [54]).

2.2. Existence of solutions. The existence of a solution is guaranteed by the following assumptions on $\sigma : \bar{\Omega} \times [0, +\infty[\rightarrow \mathbb{R}$:

(H1) $x \in \bar{\Omega} \mapsto \sigma(x, E)$ measurable $\forall E \geq 0$;

(H2) $x \in \bar{\Omega} \mapsto \sigma(x, E)$ is in $L^{\infty}_+(\Omega)$, $\forall E > 0$;

(H3) $E \in]0, +\infty[\mapsto \sigma(x, E)E$ is increasing for a.e. $x \in \bar{\Omega}$;

(H4) $E \in [0, +\infty[\mapsto \sigma(x, E)$ is in $C([0, +\infty[)$ for a.e. $x \in \bar{\Omega}$;

(H5) there exist four real constants $p \geq 2$, $\bar{\sigma}_2 \geq \underline{\sigma}_1 > 0$ and $E_0 > 0$ such that:

$$\underline{\sigma}_1 \left(\frac{E}{E_0} \right)^{p-2} \leq \sigma(x, E) \leq \bar{\sigma}_2 \max \left\{ 1, \left(\frac{E}{E_0} \right)^{p-2} \right\} \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \bar{\Omega} \text{ and } \forall E > 0;$$

(H6) there exists $c > 0$ such that:

$$(\sigma(x, E_2)\mathbf{E}_2 - \sigma(x, E_1)\mathbf{E}_1) \cdot (\mathbf{E}_2 - \mathbf{E}_1) \geq c |\mathbf{E}_2 - \mathbf{E}_1|^p \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \bar{\Omega} \text{ and } \forall \mathbf{E}_1, \mathbf{E}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

We stress that assumptions (H1)-(H6) are very general (see the geometric interpretation in Figure 1) and are satisfied in many practical situations of interest. In particular, the assumption (H4) can be replaced by piecewise continuity with discontinuities, at most of first kind, in a finite number of points. Parameter p

appearing in (H5) is related to $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$, the functional space to which the scalar potential belongs.

Our objective is to generalize the linear and p -Laplacian cases (see (2.12) and (2.13) below) to more general cases. Indeed, assumptions (H1)-(H6) include polynomial electrical conductivities:

$$\sigma(x, E) = \sum_{k=0}^N \theta_k(x) E^k \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \overline{\Omega} \text{ and } \forall E > 0. \quad (2.4)$$

Assumptions (H1)-(H4) can be easily satisfied. Moreover, polynomial (2.4) satisfies (H5) with $p = N + 2$ and $\underline{\sigma}_1 = c_0$ as in the definition of $L_+^\infty(\Omega)$ and $\bar{\sigma}_2$ the maximum among the essential supremums of θ_k , $k = 0, \dots, N$. Eventually, we stress that (H6) is a generalization of the standard inequality:

$$(E_2^k \mathbf{E}_2 - E_1^k \mathbf{E}_1) \cdot (\mathbf{E}_2 - \mathbf{E}_1) \geq \frac{1}{2^{k+1}} |\mathbf{E}_2 - \mathbf{E}_1|^{k+2} \quad \forall k \geq 0. \quad (2.5)$$

Each term of the sum in (2.4) satisfies (2.5) for any $k = 0, \dots, N$. By summing up these inequalities, the fact that the second term is greater than the term with the bigger exponent, implies that (2.4) satisfies (H6).




FIGURE 1. The electrical conductivity satisfies (H5) for a given spatial point in the region Ω .

2.3. Scalar potential. In terms of the electrical scalar potential, that is $\mathbf{E}(x) = -\nabla u(x)$ with $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$, the Ohm's law (2.3) is

$$\mathbf{J}(x) = -\sigma(x, |\nabla u(x)|) \nabla u(x). \quad (2.6)$$

Therefore, by (2.1), (2.2) and (2.6), the electrical potential u solves the steady current problem:

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div} \left(\sigma(x, |\nabla u(x)|) \nabla u(x) \right) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega \\ u(x) = f(x) & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (2.7)$$

Here u satisfies the boundary condition in the sense that $u - f \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and we write $u|_{\partial\Omega} = f$. Specifically, problem (2.7) is meant in weak form, that is

$$\int_{\Omega} \sigma(x, |\nabla u(x)|) \nabla u(x) \cdot \nabla \varphi(x) \, dx = 0 \quad \forall \varphi \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega).$$

2.4. The Dirichlet Energy functional. The solution u of (2.7) is variationally characterized as

$$\arg \min \{ \mathbb{F}_{\sigma}(u) : u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega), u|_{\partial\Omega} = f \}. \quad (2.8)$$

In (2.8) functional $\mathbb{F}_{\sigma}(u)$ is the Dirichlet Energy:

$$\mathbb{F}_{\sigma}(u) = \int_{\Omega} Q_{\sigma}(x, |\nabla u(x)|) \, dx, \quad (2.9)$$

and Q_{σ} is the Dirichlet Energy density

$$Q_{\sigma}(x, E) = \int_0^E \sigma(x, \xi) \xi \, d\xi \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \bar{\Omega} \text{ and } \forall E \geq 0. \quad (2.10)$$

The existence of solutions to the minimum problem (2.8) are assured by the convexity and coercivity on Q_{σ} , following (H4) and (H5). We stress that problems as in (2.8) have been deeply studied in various fields of mathematics (see e.g. [55] and reference therein).

Furthermore if Q_{σ} is strictly convex in E :

(H3+) $E \in]0, +\infty[\mapsto \sigma(x, E)E$ is strictly increasing for a.e. $x \in \bar{\Omega}$,

then problem (2.8) admits a unique minimizer. The proof follows by using standard direct methods of calculus of variations (see e.g. [56, Sec.s 4,5], [57] and reference therein for further results).

2.5. The relation among the electrical conductivity σ , the electrical current density J_{σ} and the Dirichlet Energy density Q_{σ} . The Ohm's law (2.3) is isotropic and local, i.e. \mathbf{J} is parallel to \mathbf{E} and J_{σ} depends on the position x and the magnitude of the electric field E at the same location x .

By (2.6), the Dirichlet Energy density can be also written as

$$Q_{\sigma}(x, E) = \int_0^E J_{\sigma}(x, \xi) \, d\xi \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \bar{\Omega} \text{ and } \forall E > 0. \quad (2.11)$$

Relation (2.3) gives the electrical current density as

$$J_{\sigma}(x, E) = \sigma(x, E)E \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \bar{\Omega} \text{ and } \forall E > 0.$$




FIGURE 2. The nonlinear case. For any given spatial point in the region Ω , (a) the electrical conductivity $\sigma(\cdot, E)$ is the secant line to the graph of the function $J_\sigma(\cdot, E)$; (b) $Q_\sigma(\cdot, E)$ is the area of the sub-graph of $J_\sigma(\cdot, E)$.

Moreover, relation (2.10) gives the electrical conductivity as

$$\sigma(x, E) = E^{-1} J_\sigma(x, E) = E^{-1} \partial_E Q_\sigma(x, E) \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \bar{\Omega} \text{ and } \forall E > 0.$$

The electrical conductivity $\sigma(x, E)$ is the secant line to the graph of the function $J_\sigma(x, E(x))$, and $Q_\sigma(x, E(x))$ is the area of the sub-graph of $J_\sigma(x, E(x))$. The geometric interpretation is in Figure 2.

A special case is when $\sigma(x, E(x)) = \theta(x)E(x)^{p-2}$, $1 < p < +\infty$. In this case the electrical current density is given by

$$\mathbf{J}(x) = -\theta(x)|\nabla u(x)|^{p-2}\nabla u(x), \quad (2.12)$$

that leads to the study of a steady current problem involving the p -Laplacian. When the dependence by E does not occur, we have the standard linear model where $\sigma(x, E(x)) = \sigma(x)$:

$$\mathbf{J}(x) = -\sigma(x)\nabla u(x). \quad (2.13)$$

In the linear case, we do not need hypothesis (H3) and, since $dE^2 = \frac{1}{2}E dE$, the integral (2.11) is a half of the ohmic power absorbed by the system (refer to Figure 3), related to the Joule effect:

$$Q_\sigma(x, E(x)) = \frac{1}{2} J_\sigma(x, E(x))E(x) = \frac{1}{2} \sigma(x)E(x)^2 \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \bar{\Omega} \text{ and } \forall E(x) > 0.$$




FIGURE 3. The linear case. For any given spatial point of the region Ω , (a) the electrical conductivity is both the secant and the tangent line to the graph of the function $J_\sigma(\cdot, E)$; (b) the area of the subgraph, that is $Q_\sigma(\cdot, E)$, and the area of the super-graph are both equal to a half of the ohmic power density JE absorbed by the system.

2.6. The DtN operator. One of the quite general way to represent boundary measurements is considering the Dirichlet-to-Neumann (DtN) operator:

$$\Lambda_\sigma : f \in X_\diamond \mapsto -\mathbf{J}^f \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}|_{\partial\Omega} = \sigma \partial_n u^f|_{\partial\Omega} \in X'_\diamond, \quad (2.14)$$

being X'_\diamond the dual space of X , \mathbf{J}^f the current density produced by the boundary data f and u^f the minimizer of (2.8). We stress that $-\mathbf{J}^f \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}|_{\partial\Omega}$ represents the following linear functional:

$$\varphi \in X_\diamond \mapsto - \int_{\partial\Omega} \varphi(x) \mathbf{J}^f(x) \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}(x) \, dS. \quad (2.15)$$

Summing up, the DtN operator evaluated at f is equal to:

$$\langle \Lambda_\sigma(f), \varphi \rangle = - \int_{\partial\Omega} \varphi(x) \mathbf{J}^f(x) \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}(x) \, dS \quad \forall \varphi \in X_\diamond. \quad (2.16)$$

The minus sign in the definition is because we consider passive conducting material. Specifically, $-\mathbf{J}^f \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}$ corresponds to the current density entering the conductor through $\partial\Omega$. It is worth noting that the injectivity of the DtN operator is guaranteed by the assumption of zero average for f . Indeed, \mathbf{J}^f is invariant up to an additive constant summed to f .

Furthermore, by testing the DtN operator (2.16) with the minimizer u^f of (2.8) and using a divergence Theorem, we obtain the ohmic power dissipated by the conducting material:

$$\langle \Lambda_\sigma(f), f \rangle = \int_\Omega J_\sigma^f(x, E(x))E(x) \, dx. \quad (2.17)$$

If $\varphi \neq f$ in (2.16), we have the so-called *virtual power* product, that plays an important role since it is equal to the Gâteaux derivative of the Dirichlet Energy \mathbb{F}_σ when evaluated on the solution u^f (see Section 3).

When the nonlinear constitutive relation (2.6) holds, the DtN operator is

$$\Lambda_\sigma : f \in X_\diamond \mapsto \sigma(x, |\nabla u^f|) \partial_n u^f \in X'_\diamond$$

In weak form, the DtN operator is

$$\langle \Lambda_\sigma(f), \varphi \rangle = \int_{\partial\Omega} \varphi(x) \sigma(x, |\nabla u^f(x)|) \partial_n u^f(x) \, dS \quad \forall \varphi \in X_\diamond.$$

In the p -Laplacian (2.12) and in the linear (2.13) case, the DtN operator particularizes as

$$\langle \Lambda_\sigma(f), \varphi \rangle = \int_{\partial\Omega} \varphi(x) \theta(x) |\nabla u^f(x)|^{p-2} \partial_n u^f(x) \, dS \quad \forall \varphi \in X_\diamond,$$

and

$$\langle \Lambda_\sigma(f), \varphi \rangle = \int_{\partial\Omega} \varphi(x) \sigma(x) \partial_n u^f(x) \, dS \quad \forall \varphi \in X_\diamond,$$

respectively.

Moreover, the power product (2.17) is proportional to the absorbed ohmic power, represented by the area of the dashed rectangle in figure 3.

3. THE GÂTEAUX DERIVATIVE OF THE DIRICHLET ENERGY

A key role in the problem, we are dealing with, is played by the Gâteaux derivative of the Dirichlet Energy \mathbb{F}_σ and by the Gâteaux derivative of the composite function $\mathbb{F}_\sigma \circ \mathbb{U}_\sigma$, where

$$\mathbb{U}_\sigma : f \in X_\diamond \rightarrow u^f \in W^{1,p}(\Omega). \quad (3.1)$$

Operator \mathbb{U}_σ maps the boundary data f to the solution u^f of problem (2.8).

It is worth noting that the results of this Section are the foundations for the proof of the Monotonicity Principle in Section 4. Firstly, we prove a convergence result (Lemma 3.1), regarding ∇u , i.e. the Electric field \mathbf{E} , with respect to the boundary data. Then, in Proposition 3.2, we study the Gâteaux derivative of the Dirichlet Energy. As corollary, we prove that when evaluated onto a physical solution, this Gâteaux derivative is equal to the virtual power product (Corollary 3.3). Eventually, in Proposition 3.4, we prove that the Gâteaux derivative of the composite operator $\mathbb{F}_\sigma \circ \mathbb{U}_\sigma$ is equal to the DtN operator Λ_σ . This is the key result for proving the Monotonicity Principle in Section 4.

For notations and properties of Gâteaux-derivative, we refer to [58, Chap. 4]). We stress that, since the definition of X_\diamond , many terms appearing in this Section depends only on the restriction of f on the boundary of Ω .

3.1. A convergence result. Firstly, we show the following useful convergence result.

Lemma 3.1. *Let Ω be an open bounded domain with Lipschitz boundary, $f, \varphi \in X_\diamond$. Then*

$$\nabla u^{f+\varepsilon\varphi} \rightarrow \nabla u^f \text{ in } L^p(\Omega) \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0,$$

where $u^{f+\varepsilon\varphi} \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ is the minimizer of (2.8) corresponding to the boundary data $f + \varepsilon\varphi$.

Proof. By a divergence Theorem, we have¹

$$\begin{aligned} I &:= \int_{\Omega} \sigma(x, |\nabla u^{f+\varepsilon\varphi}(x)|) \nabla u^{f+\varepsilon\varphi}(x) \cdot (\nabla u^{f+\varepsilon\varphi}(x) - \nabla u^f(x)) dx = \\ &= \varepsilon \int_{\partial\Omega} \varphi(x) \sigma(x, |\nabla u^{f+\varepsilon\varphi}(x)|) \partial_n u^{f+\varepsilon\varphi}(x) dS, \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} II &:= \int_{\Omega} \sigma(x, |\nabla u^f(x)|) \nabla u^f(x) \cdot (\nabla u^{f+\varepsilon\varphi}(x) - \nabla u^f(x)) dx = \\ &= \varepsilon \int_{\partial\Omega} \varphi(x) \sigma(x, |\nabla u^f(x)|) \partial_n u^f(x) dS. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

By subtracting (3.3) to (3.2), by the assumption (H6), we have that for some $c > 0$:

$$I - II \geq c \|\nabla u^{f+\varepsilon\varphi} - \nabla u^f\|_p^p. \quad (3.4)$$

On the other hand, from (H5) we know that $\sigma(x, E) \leq \bar{\sigma}_2 \max \left\{ 1, \left(\frac{E}{E_0} \right)^{p-2} \right\}$ and, therefore, by Hölder inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I - II &= \varepsilon \int_{\partial\Omega} \varphi(x) [\sigma(x, |\nabla u^{f+\varepsilon\varphi}(x)|) \partial_n u^{f+\varepsilon\varphi}(x) - \sigma(x, |\nabla u^f(x)|) \partial_n u^f(x)] dS \\ &= \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \nabla \varphi(x) \cdot [\sigma(x, |\nabla u^{f+\varepsilon\varphi}(x)|) \nabla u^{f+\varepsilon\varphi}(x) - \sigma(x, |\nabla u^f(x)|) \nabla u^f(x)] dx \\ &\leq \varepsilon \bar{\sigma}_2 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \varphi(x)| \left[\max \left\{ |\nabla u^{f+\varepsilon\varphi}(x)|, \frac{|\nabla u^{f+\varepsilon\varphi}(x)|^{p-1}}{E_0^{p-2}} \right\} + \right. \\ &\quad \left. \max \left\{ |\nabla u^f(x)|, \frac{|\nabla u^f(x)|^{p-1}}{E_0^{p-2}} \right\} \right] dx. \end{aligned}$$

¹We remind that f and φ are representatives of their equivalence classes in X_\diamond .

Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I - II &\leq \varepsilon C \left[\max\{\|\nabla\varphi\|_2 \|\nabla u^{f+\varepsilon\varphi}\|_2, \|\nabla\varphi\|_p \|\nabla u^{f+\varepsilon\varphi}\|_p^{p-1}\} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \max\{\|\nabla\varphi\|_2 \|\nabla u^f\|_2, \|\nabla\varphi\|_p \|\nabla u^f\|_p^{p-1}\} \right] \\
&\leq \varepsilon C \left[\max\{\|\nabla\varphi\|_2 \|\nabla f + \varepsilon\nabla\varphi\|_2, \|\nabla\varphi\|_p \|\nabla f + \varepsilon\nabla\varphi\|_p^{p-1}\} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \max\{\|\nabla\varphi\|_2 \|\nabla f\|_2, \|\nabla\varphi\|_p \|\nabla f\|_p^{p-1}\} \right] \\
&\leq \varepsilon C \left[\max\left\{ \|\nabla\varphi\|_2 (\|\nabla f\|_2 + \|\nabla\varphi\|_2), \|\nabla\varphi\|_p (\|\nabla f\|_p^{p-1} + \|\nabla\varphi\|_p^{p-1}) \right\} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \max\{\|\nabla\varphi\|_2 \|\nabla f\|_2, \|\nabla\varphi\|_p \|\nabla f\|_p^{p-1}\} \right]. \tag{3.5}
\end{aligned}$$

The quantity in the squared bracket is finite and hence, by (3.4) and (3.5), we have

$$\|\nabla u^{f+\varepsilon\varphi} - \nabla u^f\|_p^p \leq C\varepsilon,$$

where we renamed C . Therefore, the conclusion follows by sending $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. \square

3.2. The perturbation of the Dirichlet Energy with respect to the minimizer. Before proving the main result, we observe that (H3) gives the convexity of $Q_\sigma(x, E)$ with respect to E and, since $Q_\sigma(x, 0) = 0$, then $\partial_E Q_\sigma(x, E)$ is increasing with respect to $E > 0$ for a.e. $x \in \bar{\Omega}$. This monotony leads to the following inequalities chain for a.e. $x \in \bar{\Omega}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\leq \partial_E Q_\sigma(x, E_1)(E_2 - E_1) \leq Q_\sigma(x, E_2) - Q_\sigma(x, E_1) \\
&\leq \partial_E Q_\sigma(x, E_2)(E_2 - E_1) \quad \text{for any } 0 < E_1 \leq E_2. \tag{3.6}
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we stress that, from now on, we also consider the assumption (H6) which we never used so far. Here, we study the Gâteaux-derivative of (2.9).

Proposition 3.2. *Let Ω be a bounded connected domain with Lipschitz boundary and $u, \varphi \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$. Then*

$$d\mathbb{F}_\sigma(u; \varphi) = \mathbb{F}'_\sigma(u)\varphi = \int_\Omega \sigma(x, |\nabla u(x)|) \nabla u(x) \cdot \nabla \varphi(x) \, dx. \tag{3.7}$$

Proof. For any $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{F}_\sigma(u) &= \int_\Omega Q_\sigma(x, |\nabla u(x)|) dx, \\
\mathbb{F}_\sigma(u + \varepsilon\varphi) &= \int_\Omega Q_\sigma(x, |\nabla u(x) + \varepsilon\nabla\varphi(x)|) dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Let us study the incremental ratio:

$$\frac{\mathbb{F}_\sigma(u + \varepsilon\varphi) - \mathbb{F}_\sigma(u)}{\varepsilon} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega} Q_\sigma(x, |\nabla u(x) + \varepsilon\nabla\varphi(x)|) - Q_\sigma(x, |\nabla u(x)|) dx. \quad (3.8)$$

The magnitude of the integrand function can be easily upper bounded. Indeed, by (3.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{Q_\sigma(x, |\nabla u(x) + \varepsilon\nabla\varphi(x)|) - Q_\sigma(x, |\nabla u(x)|)}{\varepsilon} \right| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{|\varepsilon|} \sigma(x, |\nabla u(x)| + |\varepsilon\nabla\varphi(x)|) (|\nabla u(x)| + |\varepsilon\nabla\varphi(x)|) |\varepsilon\nabla\varphi(x)| \\ & \leq \sigma(x, |\nabla u(x)| + |\nabla\varphi(x)|) (|\nabla u(x)| + |\nabla\varphi(x)|) |\nabla\varphi(x)|, \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

for any $|\varepsilon| < 1$. By assumption (H5), the last term in (3.9) is a L^1 function and hence, by Lebesgue Dominate Convergence Theorem, we can pass to the limit in (3.8), as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Then, by assumption (H3), we have that $Q_\sigma(x, \cdot)$ is in $C^1([0, +\infty[)$ for a.e $x \in \overline{\Omega}$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{Q_\sigma(x, |\nabla u(x) + \varepsilon\nabla\varphi(x)|) - Q_\sigma(x, |\nabla u(x)|)}{\varepsilon} \\ & = \sigma(x, \xi_\varepsilon) \xi_\varepsilon \frac{|\nabla u(x) + \varepsilon\nabla\varphi(x)| - |\nabla u(x)|}{\varepsilon} \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

with

$$\xi_\varepsilon \in [\min\{|\nabla u(x)|, |\nabla u + \varepsilon\nabla\varphi(x)|\}, \max\{|\nabla u(x)|, |\nabla u + \varepsilon\nabla\varphi(x)|\}], \quad (3.11)$$

where the dependence of ξ_ε upon x is understood.

The last term in (3.10) is equal to

$$\begin{cases} \sigma(x, \xi_\varepsilon) \xi_\varepsilon \frac{2\nabla u(x) \cdot \nabla\varphi(x) + \varepsilon |\nabla\varphi(x)|^2}{|\nabla u(x)| + |\nabla u(x) + \varepsilon\nabla\varphi(x)|}, & \text{if } |\nabla u(x)| \neq 0, \\ \sigma(x, \xi_\varepsilon) \xi_\varepsilon \text{sign}(\varepsilon) |\nabla\varphi(x)|, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (3.12)$$

Hence, since (3.11) holds, then $\xi_\varepsilon \rightarrow |\nabla f(x)|$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ for a. e $x \in \overline{\Omega}$. We pass to the limit as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ in (3.12), (3.10) and hence in (3.8), that is (3.7). \square

Proposition 3.2 implies the following corollary by replacing u with u^f , the minimizer of (2.8).

Corollary 3.3. *Let Ω be a bounded connected domain with Lipschitz boundary, $f \in X_\diamond$ and $\varphi \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$. Then*

$$d\mathbb{F}_\sigma(u^f; \varphi) = \mathbb{F}'_\sigma(u^f)\varphi = \langle \Lambda_\sigma(f), \varphi \rangle, \quad (3.13)$$

where u^f is the minimizer of (2.8) with boundary value f .

It is worth noting that also the Gâteaux derivative $d\mathbb{F}_\sigma(u^f; \varphi)$ appearing in (3.13) depends only on the restriction of φ on the boundary of Ω .

3.3. The perturbation of \mathbb{F}_σ with respect to the boundary values. We study the Gâteaux derivative operator for the composition of the Dirichlet Energy functional F_σ and the operator U_σ defined in (3.1).

Proposition 3.4. *Let Ω be a bounded connected domain with Lipschitz boundary and $f \in X_\circ$. Then $d(\mathbb{F}_\sigma \circ \mathbb{U}_\sigma) = (\mathbb{F}_\sigma \circ \mathbb{U}_\sigma)' = \Lambda_\sigma$, i.e.*

$$d(\mathbb{F}_\sigma \circ \mathbb{U}_\sigma)(f; \varphi) = (\mathbb{F}_\sigma \circ \mathbb{U}_\sigma)'(f)\varphi = \langle \Lambda_\sigma(f), \varphi \rangle \quad \forall \varphi \in X_\circ. \quad (3.14)$$

Proof. For sake of simplicity, we set

$$\mathbb{G}_\sigma(f) := (\mathbb{F}_\sigma \circ \mathbb{U}_\sigma)(f) = \mathbb{F}_\sigma(u^f).$$

For any $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$, we consider

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{G}_\sigma(f) &= \int_{\Omega} Q_\sigma(x, |\nabla u^f(x)|) dx, \\ \mathbb{G}_\sigma(f + \varepsilon\varphi) &= \int_{\Omega} Q_\sigma(x, |\nabla u^{f+\varepsilon\varphi}(x)|) dx \leq \int_{\Omega} Q_\sigma(x, |\nabla u^f(x) + \varepsilon \nabla \varphi(x)|) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Let us consider the incremental ratio $[\mathbb{G}_\sigma(f + \varepsilon\varphi) - \mathbb{G}_\sigma(f)]/\varepsilon$. On one hand, we have

$$\frac{\mathbb{G}_\sigma(f + \varepsilon\varphi) - \mathbb{G}_\sigma(f)}{\varepsilon} \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega} Q_\sigma(x, |\nabla u^f + \varepsilon \nabla \varphi(x)|) - Q_\sigma(x, |\nabla u^f(x)|) dx. \quad (3.15)$$

The second term in (3.15) is equal to the second term in (3.8), therefore we can pass to the limit and we have:

$$\begin{aligned} &\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathbb{G}_\sigma(f + \varepsilon\varphi) - \mathbb{G}_\sigma(f)}{\varepsilon} \\ &\leq \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega} Q_\sigma(x, |\nabla u^f(x) + \varepsilon \nabla \varphi(x)|) - Q_\sigma(x, |\nabla u^f(x)|) dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \sigma(x, |\nabla u^f(x)|) \nabla u^f(x) \cdot \nabla \varphi(x) dx. \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\frac{\mathbb{G}_\sigma(f + \varepsilon\varphi) - \mathbb{G}_\sigma(f)}{\varepsilon} \geq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega} Q_\sigma(x, |\nabla u^{f+\varepsilon\varphi}(x)|) - Q_\sigma(x, |\nabla u^{f+\varepsilon\varphi}(x) - \varepsilon \nabla \varphi(x)|) dx. \quad (3.17)$$

In Lemma 3.1, we showed that $\nabla u^{f+\varepsilon\varphi} \rightarrow \nabla u^f$ in $L^p(\Omega)$. Now, let us consider a sequence $\{\varepsilon_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$, such that $\varepsilon_j \rightarrow 0$ and

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\mathbb{G}_\sigma(f + \varepsilon\varphi) - \mathbb{G}_\sigma(f)}{\varepsilon} = \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\mathbb{G}_\sigma(f + \varepsilon_j\varphi) - \mathbb{G}_\sigma(f)}{\varepsilon_j}. \quad (3.18)$$

By standard arguments, we can say that there exists a subsequence $\{\varepsilon_{j_h}\}_{h \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\nabla u^{f+\varepsilon_{j_h}\varphi} \rightarrow \nabla u^f$ a. e. in Ω and is dominated, i.e there exist a measurable real function ψ , defined in Ω , such that

$$|\nabla u^{f+\varepsilon_{j_h}\varphi}|^p \leq \psi, \quad \int_{\Omega} \psi(x) dx < +\infty.$$

Now, we focus on the integrand function in (3.17). By (3.6) and (H5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{Q_{\sigma}(x, |\nabla u^f(x) + \varepsilon_{j_h} \nabla \varphi(x)|) - Q_{\sigma}(x, |\nabla u^f(x)|)}{\varepsilon_{j_h}} \right| \\ & \leq \sigma(x, |\nabla u^{f+\varepsilon_{j_h}\varphi}(x)| + |\varepsilon_{j_h} \nabla \varphi(x)|) (|\nabla u^{f+\varepsilon_{j_h}\varphi}(x)| + |\varepsilon_{j_h} \nabla \varphi(x)|) |\nabla \varphi(x)| \\ & \leq C \max\{\tilde{C}, (|\nabla u^{f+\varepsilon_{j_h}\varphi}(x)| + |\varepsilon_{j_h} \nabla \varphi(x)|)^{p-2}\} (|\nabla u^{f+\varepsilon_{j_h}\varphi}(x)| + |\varepsilon_{j_h} \nabla \varphi(x)|) |\nabla \varphi(x)| \\ & \leq C \max\{\tilde{C}, (\psi(x) + |\nabla \varphi(x)|)^{p-2}\} (\psi(x) + |\nabla \varphi(x)|)^2 \\ & \leq C \max\{\tilde{C}((\psi(x) + |\nabla \varphi(x)|)^2), (\psi(x) + |\nabla \varphi(x)|)^p\}, \end{aligned}$$

for a. e. $x \in \Omega$, for any $|\varepsilon| < 1$ and $C, \tilde{C} > 0$ proper constants.

Now, again since $Q_{\sigma}(x, \cdot)$ is in $C^1([0, +\infty[)$ for a.e $x \in \Omega$, the integrand function in (3.17) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{Q_{\sigma}(x, |\nabla u^{f+\varepsilon\varphi}(x)|) - Q_{\sigma}(x, |\nabla u^{f+\varepsilon\varphi}(x) - \varepsilon \nabla \varphi(x)|)}{\varepsilon} \\ & = \sigma(x, \xi'_{\varepsilon}) \xi'_{\varepsilon} \frac{|\nabla u^{f+\varepsilon\varphi}(x)| - |\nabla u^{f+\varepsilon\varphi}(x) - \varepsilon \nabla \varphi(x)|}{\varepsilon} \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \xi'_{\varepsilon} \in & [\min\{|\nabla u^{f+\varepsilon\varphi}(x)|, |\nabla u^{f+\varepsilon\varphi}(x) - \varepsilon \nabla \varphi(x)|\}, \\ & \max\{|\nabla u^{f+\varepsilon\varphi}(x)|, |\nabla u^{f+\varepsilon\varphi}(x) - \varepsilon \nabla \varphi(x)|\}], \end{aligned}$$

where the dependence of ξ'_{ε} upon x is understood.

The last term in (3.19) is equal to

$$\begin{cases} \sigma(x, \xi'_{\varepsilon}) \xi'_{\varepsilon} \frac{2\nabla u^{f+\varepsilon\varphi}(x) \cdot \nabla \varphi(x) - \varepsilon |\nabla \varphi(x)|^2}{|\nabla u^{f+\varepsilon\varphi}(x)| + |\nabla u^{f+\varepsilon\varphi}(x) - \varepsilon \nabla \varphi(x)|}, & \text{if } |\nabla u^f(x)| \neq 0, \\ \sigma(x, \xi'_{\varepsilon}) \xi'_{\varepsilon} \text{sign}(-\varepsilon) |\nabla \varphi(x)|, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (3.20)$$

In the first case $\xi'_{\varepsilon} \rightarrow |\nabla u^f(x)|$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ for a. e $x \in \Omega$; in second the case $|\nabla u^f(x)| = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \xi'_{\varepsilon} = 0$. We notice that, in both cases, the terms in (3.20) tend to $\sigma(x, |\nabla u^f(x)|) \nabla u^f(x) \cdot \nabla \varphi(x)$, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

By applying Dominate Convergence Theorem, we can consider the limit as $\varepsilon_{j_h} \rightarrow 0$ in (3.20), (3.19) and hence in the second term of (3.17). Hence, by (3.17), (3.18),

(3.19) and (3.20), we conclude:

$$\begin{aligned}
\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathbb{G}_\sigma(f + \varepsilon\varphi) - \mathbb{G}_\sigma(f)}{\varepsilon} &= \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\mathbb{G}_\sigma(f + \varepsilon_j\varphi) - \mathbb{G}_\sigma(f)}{\varepsilon_j} \\
&= \lim_{h \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\mathbb{G}_\sigma(f + \varepsilon_{j_h}\varphi) - \mathbb{G}_\sigma(f)}{\varepsilon_{j_h}} \\
&= \lim_{h \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{\varepsilon_{j_h}} \int_{\Omega} Q_\sigma(x, |\nabla u^{f+\varepsilon_{j_h}\varphi}(x)|) - Q_\sigma(x, |\nabla u^{f+\varepsilon_{j_h}\varphi}(x) - \varepsilon_{j_h} \nabla \varphi(x)|) dx \\
&= \int_{\Omega} \sigma(x, |\nabla u^f(x)|) \nabla u^f(x) \cdot \nabla \varphi(x) dx.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

The conclusion follows by observing that (3.16) and (3.21) give (3.14). \square

4. MONOTONICITY PRINCIPLE

In this Section, we show a Monotonicity Principle for the Dirichlet Energy (Theorem 4.1):

$$\sigma_1 \leq \sigma_2 \implies \mathbb{F}_{\sigma_1}(u_1^f) \leq \mathbb{F}_{\sigma_2}(u_2^f) \quad \forall f \in X_\diamond, \tag{4.1}$$

where u_i^f is the minimizer of (2.8) with $\sigma = \sigma_i$, for $i = 1, 2$ and f is the prescribed boundary voltage. We recall that, both in the p -Laplacian and in the linear cases, the Dirichlet Energy is proportional to the power product $\langle \Lambda_\sigma(f), f \rangle$ and, therefore, a Monotonicity Principle for the DtN operator easily follows from (4.1).

In our nonlinear case (2.6), the Dirichlet Energy is not proportional to the power product $\langle \Lambda_\sigma(f), f \rangle$. Rather, the power product $\langle \Lambda_\sigma(f), f \rangle$ is equal to the Gâteaux derivative $d(\mathbb{F}_\sigma \circ \mathbb{U}_\sigma)(f; f)$ of the composite mapping $f \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_\sigma(u^f)$ (see Proposition 3.4), marking a huge difference between this work and previous ones. Then, starting from this latter equality, we relate the Dirichlet Energy to boundary data through the fundamental relation (see Theorem 4.2):

$$\mathbb{F}_\sigma(u^f) = \langle \bar{\Lambda}_\sigma(f), f \rangle \quad \forall f \in X_\diamond.$$

The new operator $\bar{\Lambda}_\sigma$, we call Average DtN, is defined as:

$$\bar{\Lambda}_\sigma : f \in X_\diamond \mapsto \int_0^1 \Lambda_\sigma(\alpha f) d\alpha \in X'_\diamond, \tag{4.2}$$

where

$$\langle \bar{\Lambda}_\sigma(f), \varphi \rangle = \int_0^1 \langle \Lambda_\sigma(\alpha f), \varphi \rangle d\alpha \quad \forall \varphi \in X_\diamond.$$

Operator $\bar{\Lambda}_\sigma$ gives the average flown of the electrical current density through $\partial\Omega$ for an applied boundary potential of the type αf , for $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. This is the key operator for transferring the monotonicity of the Dirichlet Energy to the boundary data and it replaces Λ_σ for nonlinear problems.

Eventually, in Theorem 4.3, we prove the Monotonicity Principle for operator $\overline{\Lambda}_\sigma$, i.e.:

$$\sigma_1 \leq \sigma_2 \implies \langle \overline{\Lambda}_{\sigma_1}(f), f \rangle \leq \langle \overline{\Lambda}_{\sigma_2}(f), f \rangle \quad \forall f \in X_\diamond,$$

where we recall that $\sigma_1 \leq \sigma_2$ means:

$$\sigma_1(x, E) \leq \sigma_2(x, E) \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \overline{\Omega} \text{ and } \forall E > 0. \quad (4.3)$$

4.1. Monotonicity Principle for the Dirichlet Energy. Firstly, we state a Monotonicity Principle for the Dirichlet Energy in the nonlinear case. This includes the the p -Laplacian (2.12) and linear (2.13) cases, where the proof is apparently simpler.

Theorem 4.1. *Let Ω be an open bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^n with Lipschitz boundary and σ_1, σ_2 satisfying (H1), (H2), (H3+), (H4), (H5), (H6). Then,*

$$\sigma_1 \leq \sigma_2 \implies \mathbb{F}_{\sigma_1}(u_1^f) \leq \mathbb{F}_{\sigma_2}(u_2^f) \quad \forall f \in X_\diamond,$$

where $\sigma_1 \leq \sigma_2$ is meant in the sense (4.3) and u_i^f is the minimizer of (2.8) with $\sigma = \sigma_i$, for $i = 1, 2$.

Proof. Since u_2^f is an admissible function for problem (2.8) with $\sigma = \sigma_1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{F}_{\sigma_1}(u_1^f) &\leq \mathbb{F}_{\sigma_1}(u_2^f) = \int_{\Omega} Q_{\sigma_1}(x, |\nabla u_2^f(x)|) \, dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \int_0^{|\nabla u_2^f(x)|} \sigma_1(x, \xi) \, \xi \, d\xi \, dx \leq \int_{\Omega} \int_0^{|\nabla u_2^f(x)|} \sigma_2(x, \xi) \, \xi \, d\xi \, dx = \mathbb{F}_{\sigma_2}(u_2^f), \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from the assumption $\sigma_1 \leq \sigma_2$. \square

4.2. Connection between Dirichlet Energy and DtN operator. The motivation for our research is in generalizing the Monotonicity Principle from linear and p -Laplacian to more general cases. The first step to generalize Monotonicity Principle is in studying a polynomial type nonlinear constitutive relationship. Let us consider

$$\sigma(x, E) = \sum_{k=0}^N \theta_k(x) E^k \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \overline{\Omega} \text{ and } \forall E > 0,$$

where either $\theta_k \in L_+^\infty(\Omega)$ or $\theta_k \equiv 0$ in $\overline{\Omega}$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$. This polynomial type nonlinearity leads to minimization problem (2.8) where $p = N + 2$, $u \in W^{1, N+2}(\Omega)$, $u|_{\partial\Omega} = f \in X_\diamond$ and

$$\mathbb{F}_\sigma(u) = \sum_{k=0}^N \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{\theta_k(x)}{k+2} |\nabla u(x)|^{k+2} \right) \, dx.$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\langle \Lambda_\sigma(f), f \rangle = \sum_{k=0}^N \int_{\Omega} \theta_k(x) |\nabla u(x)|^{k+2} dx \quad \forall f \in X_\diamond, \quad (4.4)$$

and, consequently,

$$\mathbb{F}_\sigma(u^f) \neq \langle \Lambda_\sigma(f), f \rangle \text{ in } X_\diamond.$$

This is a major issue because it prevents to transfer the monotone connection to electrical conductivity and the boundary data.

Here we investigate when the proportionality between Dirichlet Energy and the power product (4.4) holds. This proportionality holds only for some special case of nonlinearity. For a general nonlinear constitutive relationship satisfying (H1)-(H5), the Dirichlet Energy (2.9) and the ohmic power (2.17) are proportional if and only if there exists $c > 0$ such that

$$\langle \Lambda_\sigma(f), f \rangle = c \mathbb{F}_\sigma(u^f) \quad \forall f \in X_\diamond, \quad (4.5)$$

that is

$$\int_{\Omega} \left[J_\sigma(x, E(x)) E(x) - c \int_0^{E(x)} J_\sigma(x, \xi) d\xi \right] dx = 0, \quad \forall f \in X_\diamond. \quad (4.6)$$

A sufficient condition for (4.6) is

$$J_\sigma(\cdot, E) E = c \int_0^E J_\sigma(\cdot, \xi) d\xi,$$

that is

$$J'_\sigma(\cdot, E) E = (c - 1) J_\sigma(\cdot, E).$$

This latter ODE gives $J_\sigma(\cdot, E) = aE^{c-1}$, with $a \in \mathbb{R}$ i.e. $\sigma(\cdot, E) = aE^{c-2}$. Hence the proportionality (4.5) is not expected for general nonlinear constitutive relationships, but for monomial type nonlinearities.

4.3. The power product for the average DtN operator. We prove that the the Dirichlet Energy (2.9) is “transferred” to a boundary measurement involving $\overline{\Lambda}_\sigma$, i.e. to the power product $\langle \overline{\Lambda}_\sigma(f), f \rangle$.

Theorem 4.2. *Let Ω be an open bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^n with Lipschitz boundary and σ satisfying (H1), (H2), (H3+), (H4), (H5), (H6). Then*

$$\mathbb{F}_\sigma(u^f) = \langle \overline{\Lambda}_\sigma(f), f \rangle \quad \forall f \in X_\diamond,$$

where u^f is the minimizer of (2.8).

Proof. Let $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, we set

$$g(\alpha) := (\mathbb{F}_\sigma \circ \mathbb{U}_\sigma)(\alpha f).$$

By Proposition 3.4, since $\mathbb{F}_\sigma \circ \mathbb{U}_\sigma$ is Gâteaux-differentiable, then g is differentiable. By replacing f and φ with αf and f , we have

$$g'(\alpha) = d(\mathbb{F}_\sigma \circ \mathbb{U}_\sigma)(\alpha f; f) = \langle \Lambda_\sigma(\alpha f), f \rangle.$$

Eventually, by integrating over the interval $[0, 1]$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{F}_\sigma(u^f) = (\mathbb{F}_\sigma \circ \mathbb{U}_\sigma)(f) = g(1) = \int_0^1 g'(\alpha) d\alpha = \int_0^1 \langle \Lambda_\sigma(\alpha f), f \rangle d\alpha = \langle \bar{\Lambda}_\sigma(f), f \rangle.$$

□

4.4. Monotonicity Principle for $\bar{\Lambda}_\sigma$. The main result of this Section consists in proving the Monotonicity Principle for the operator (4.2).

Theorem 4.3. *Let Ω be an open bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^n with Lipschitz boundary and σ_1, σ_2 satisfying (H1), (H2), (H3+), (H4), (H5), (H6). Then*

$$\sigma_1 \leq \sigma_2 \implies \langle \bar{\Lambda}_{\sigma_1}(f), f \rangle \leq \langle \bar{\Lambda}_{\sigma_2}(f), f \rangle \quad \forall f \in X_\diamond, \quad (4.7)$$

where $\sigma_1 \leq \sigma_2$ is meant in the sense (4.3).

Proof. Let u_i^f be the unique solution of problem (2.8) with $\sigma = \sigma_i$, $i = 1, 2$, and boundary value f . By Theorems 4.1 and 4.2, we have

$$\langle \bar{\Lambda}_{\sigma_1}(f), f \rangle = \mathbb{F}_{\sigma_1}(u_1^f) \leq \mathbb{F}_{\sigma_2}(u_2^f) = \langle \bar{\Lambda}_{\sigma_2}(f), f \rangle$$

that proves (4.7). □

If the constitutive relationship $J_\sigma = J_\sigma(x, E)$ is decreasing with respect to E , then the monotonicity is reversed, i.e.

$$\sigma_1 \leq \sigma_2 \implies \langle \bar{\Lambda}_{\sigma_1}(f), f \rangle \geq \langle \bar{\Lambda}_{\sigma_2}(f), f \rangle \quad \forall f \in X_\diamond.$$

We stress that Theorem 4.3 generalizes both the p -Laplacian and the linear cases. Indeed, in such cases we have

$$\langle \Lambda_{\sigma_1}(f), f \rangle = p \langle \bar{\Lambda}_{\sigma_1}(f), f \rangle \leq p \langle \bar{\Lambda}_{\sigma_2}(f), f \rangle = \langle \Lambda_{\sigma_2}(f), f \rangle \quad \forall f \in X_\diamond.$$

5. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we proved a Monotonicity Principle for nonlinear inverse electrical conductivity problems. Namely, we proved a Monotonicity Principle where the “standard” DtN operator Λ_σ , required for p -Laplacian and linear cases, is replaced by the Average DtN operator $\bar{\Lambda}_\sigma$. Specifically, we unveiled the “mechanics” of Monotonicity by first recognizing that $\mathbb{F}_\sigma \circ \mathbb{U}_\sigma$ is monotonic w.r.t. the material property σ , even in the nonlinear case and, then, by transferring this monotonicity to the new boundary operator $\bar{\Lambda}_\sigma$. This is a non trivial result because, apart from linear and p -Laplacian cases, it is impossible to transfer the monotonicity from $\mathbb{F}_\sigma \circ \mathbb{U}_\sigma$ to the DtN operator Λ_σ . This result is based on the fundamental relation $d(\mathbb{F}_\sigma \circ \mathbb{U}_\sigma) = \Lambda_\sigma$ proved in Proposition 3.4. In doing this, we proved two

general results: (i) the virtual power product $\langle \Lambda_\sigma(f), \varphi \rangle$ is equal to $d\mathbb{F}_\sigma(u^f; \varphi)$, that is the Gâteaux derivative of the Dirichlet Energy \mathbb{F}_σ , when evaluated at the solution u^f and along direction f , and (ii) the power product $\langle \Lambda_\sigma(f), f \rangle$ is equal to $d(\mathbb{F}_\sigma \circ \mathbb{U}_\sigma)(f; f)$ that is the Gâteaux derivative of the composed function $\mathbb{F}_\sigma \circ \mathbb{U}_\sigma$, when evaluated at f along direction f .

Future work will be translating the Monotonicity Principle proved in this work in a fully nonlinear imaging method.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work has been partially supported by Progetto di eccellenza “Sistemi distribuiti intelligenti” of Dipartimento di Ingegneria Elettrica e dell’Informazione “M. Scarano” and by GNAMPA of INdAM.

REFERENCES

- [1] Tamburrino A and Rubinacci G 2002 *Inverse Problems* **18** 1809–1829
- [2] Tamburrino A and Rubinacci G 2006 *IEEE Transactions on Magnetics* **42** 2017–2028
- [3] Tamburrino A 2006 *Journal of Inverse and Ill-posed Problems* **14** 633 – 642
- [4] Gisser D, Isaacson D and Newell J 1990 *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics* **50** 1623–1634
- [5] Calvano F, Rubinacci G and Tamburrino A 2012 *NDT and E International* **46** 32–40
- [6] Tamburrino A, Rubinacci G, Soleimani M and Lionheart W 2003 Non iterative inversion method for electrical resistance, capacitance and inductance tomography for two phase materials *3rd World Congress on Industrial Process Tomography* pp 233–238
- [7] Harrach B and Ullrich M 2013 *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis* **45** 3382–3403
- [8] Tamburrino A, Ventre S and Rubinacci G 2010 *Inverse Problems* **26** 074016
- [9] Su Z, Ventre S, Udpa L and Tamburrino A 2017 *Inverse Problems* **33** 125007
- [10] Tamburrino A, Su Z, Ventre S, Udpa L and Udpa S 2016 *Studies in Applied Electromagnetics and Mechanics* **41** 1–8
- [11] Tamburrino A, Su Z, Lei N, Udpa L and Udpa S 2015 *Studies in Applied Electromagnetics and Mechanics* **40** 159–166
- [12] Su Z, Udpa L, Giovinco G, Ventre S and Tamburrino A 2017 Monotonicity principle in pulsed eddy current testing and its application to defect sizing *2017 International Applied Computational Electromagnetics Society Symposium - Italy, ACES 2017*
- [13] Tamburrino A, Su Z, Ventre S, Udpa L and Udpa S 2016 Monotonicity based imaging method in time domain eddy current testing *Electromagnetic Nondestructive Evaluation (XIX)* vol 41 pp 1–8
- [14] Tamburrino A, Barbato D C and Monk P 2015 Imaging of dielectric objects via monotonicity of the transmission eigenvalues *abstracts book of the 12th International Conference on Mathematical and Numerical Aspects of Wave Propagation (Germany)* pp 99–100
- [15] Harrach B, Pohjola V and Salo M 2019 *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis* **51** 2995–3019
- [16] Harrach B, Pohjola V and Salo M 2019 *Analysis & PDE* **12** 1741–1771
- [17] Griesmaier R and Harrach B 2018 *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics* **78** 2533–2557
- [18] Albicker A and Griesmaier R 2020 *Inverse Problems*
- [19] Daimon T, Furuya T and Saiin R 2020 *Inverse Problems in Science and Engineering* 1–12
- [20] Eberle S and Harrach B 2020 *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.02598*

- [21] Tamburrino A, Vento A, Ventre S and Maffucci A 2016 *Studies in Applied Electromagnetics and Mechanics* **41** 284–292
- [22] Candiani V, Dardé J, Garde H and Hyvönen N 2019 *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.12110*
- [23] Rubinacci G, Tamburrino A and Ventre S 2006 *IEEE Transactions on Magnetics* **42** 1179–1182
- [24] Garde H and Staboulis S 2017 *Numerische Mathematik* **135** 1221–1251
- [25] Harrach B and Minh M N 2016 *Inverse Problems* **32** 125002
- [26] Tamburrino A, Calvano F, Ventre S and Rubinacci G 2012 *NDT and E International* **47** 26–34
- [27] Harrach B and Ullrich M 2015 *IEEE transactions on medical imaging* **34** 1513–1521
- [28] Harrach B and Minh M N 2018 Monotonicity-based regularization for phantom experiment data in electrical impedance tomography *New trends in parameter identification for mathematical models* (Springer) pp 107–120
- [29] Garde H 2018 *Inverse Problems in Science and Engineering* **26** 33–50
- [30] Garde H and Staboulis S 2019 *Inverse Problems & Imaging* **13** 93
- [31] Harrach B 2009 *Inverse problems* **25** 055010
- [32] Harrach B 2012 *Inverse Problems & Imaging* **6** 663
- [33] Harrach B and Ullrich M 2017 *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* **145** 1087–1095
- [34] Maffucci A, Vento A, Ventre S and Tamburrino A 2016 *IEEE Transactions on Components, Packaging and Manufacturing Technology* **6** 1417–1427 ISSN 2156-3985
- [35] De Magistris M, Morozov M, Rubinacci G, Tamburrino A and Ventre S 2007 *COMPEL - The International Journal for Computation and Mathematics in Electrical and Electronic Engineering* **26** 389–398
- [36] Rubinacci G, Tamburrino A and Ventre S 2007 *International Journal of Applied Electromagnetics and Mechanics* **25** 333–339
- [37] Harrach B, Lee E and Ullrich M 2015 *Inverse Problems* **31** 095003
- [38] Colton D and Kirsch A 1996 *Inverse Problems* **12** 383–393
- [39] Kirsch A 1998 *Inverse Problems* **14** 1489–1512
- [40] Ikeata M 1999 *Journal of Inverse and Ill-Posed Problems* **7** 255–272
- [41] Ikehata M 2000 *Inverse Problems* **16** 785–793
- [42] Devaney A J Super-resolution processing of multi-static data using time reversal and music northeastern University preprint
- [43] Salo M and Zhong X 2012 *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis* **44** 2474–2495
- [44] Brander T, Kar M and Salo M 2015 *Inverse Problems* **31** 045001
- [45] Brander T 2016 *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* **144** 177–189
- [46] Sun Z 2004 *Advances in Applied Mathematics* **32** 791 – 800 ISSN 0196-8858
- [47] Sun Z 2005 *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* **12** 156–164
- [48] Brander T, Ilmavirta J and Kar M 2018 *Inverse Problems and Imaging* **12**
- [49] Guo C, Kar M and Salo M 2016 *Rendiconti dell'Istituto di Matematica dell'Universita di Trieste* **48**
- [50] Brander T, Harrach B, Kar M and Salo M 2018 *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics* **78** 742–758
- [51] Hauer D 2015 *Journal of Differential Equations* **259** 3615–3655
- [52] Jerison D and Kenig C 1995 *Journal of Functional Analysis* **130** 161 – 219 ISSN 0022-1236
- [53] Leoni G 2017 A first course in sobolev spaces
- [54] Mayergoyz I D and Bossavit A 2017 Computational electromagnetism: variational formulations, complementarity, edge elements

- [55] Della Pietra F, Gavitone N and Piscitelli G 2019 *Bulletin des Sciences Mathématiques* **155** 10–32
- [56] Giusti E 2003 *Direct methods in the calculus of variations* (World Scientific)
- [57] Dacorogna B 2014 *Introduction to the Calculus of Variations* (World Scientific Publishing Company)
- [58] Zeidler E 1988 *Nonlinear Functional Analysis and Its Applications* (Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag) ISBN 0387964991