

# RECONSTRUCTION OF SINGULAR AND DEGENERATE INCLUSIONS IN CALDERÓN'S PROBLEM

HENRIK GARDE AND NUUTTI HYVÖNEN

**ABSTRACT.** We consider the reconstruction of the support of an unknown perturbation to a known conductivity coefficient in Calderón's problem. In a previous result by the authors on monotonicity-based reconstruction, the perturbed coefficient is allowed to simultaneously take the values 0 and  $\infty$  in some parts of the domain and values bounded away from 0 and  $\infty$  elsewhere. We generalise this result by allowing the unknown coefficient to be the restriction of an  $A_2$ -Muckenhoupt weight in parts of the domain, thereby including singular and degenerate behaviour in the governing equation. In particular, the coefficient may tend to 0 and  $\infty$  in a controlled manner, which goes beyond the standard setting of Calderón's problem. Our main result constructively characterises the outer shape of the support of such a general perturbation, based on a local Neumann-to-Dirichlet map defined on an open subset of the domain boundary.

**Keywords:** Calderón's problem, electrical impedance tomography, monotonicity method, inclusion detection, degenerate elliptic problem, singular elliptic problem.

**2020 Mathematics Subject Classification:** 35R30, 35R05, 47H05.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $\Omega$  be a bounded Lipschitz domain in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $d \geq 2$ , with connected complement and let  $\Gamma \subseteq \partial\Omega$  be relatively open. For an appropriate nonnegative scalar-valued function  $\gamma$ , we consider the conductivity equation

$$-\nabla \cdot (\gamma \nabla u) = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega. \quad (1.1)$$

The task of determining  $\gamma$  from Cauchy data of the solutions to (1.1) is called Calderón's inverse conductivity problem, which corresponds to the real-world imaging modality *electrical impedance tomography* (EIT); see [2, 3, 6, 25]. Instead of the general Calderón problem, this work concentrates on the simpler task of inclusion detection: Our aim is to reconstruct the outer shape of  $\text{supp}(\gamma - \gamma_0)$  based on the local *Neumann-to-Dirichlet* (ND) map  $\Lambda(\gamma)$  on  $\Gamma$  for (1.1), with  $\gamma_0$  being a known background conductivity coefficient that belongs to

$$L_+^\infty(\Omega) = \{\zeta \in L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}) \mid \text{ess inf } \zeta > 0\}$$

and satisfies a weak *unique continuation principle* (UCP) in connection to the conductivity equation; cf., e.g., [4, Definition 3.3]. The outer shape  $D$  of  $\text{supp}(\gamma - \gamma_0)$  refers to the smallest closed set in  $\Omega$  having connected complement and satisfying  $\text{supp}(\gamma - \gamma_0) \subseteq D$ .

In our analysis, the coefficient  $\gamma$  may formally take values 0 (perfectly insulating) and  $\infty$  (perfectly conducting) in certain parts of  $\Omega$ ; we refer to such regions as *extreme inclusions*. If  $\gamma$  is characterised by such extreme inclusions as well as finite positive and negative perturbations to  $\gamma_0$ , the monotonicity method has been proven to produce an exact reconstruction of the outer shape of  $\text{supp}(\gamma - \gamma_0)$  under only mild geometric assumptions [4, Theorem 3.7]. However, this previous result requires that the restriction of  $\gamma$  to the complement of the extreme inclusions belongs to  $L_+^\infty$ , thus only allowing (infinite) jump discontinuities at the boundaries of the extreme inclusions and no singular or degenerate behaviour elsewhere in  $\Omega$ .

The purpose of this paper is to provide a simple extension to the proof of [4, Theorem 3.7] so that it applies to a much larger class of unknown conductivity coefficients  $\gamma$ . To be more precise, we permit singular and degenerate behaviour by letting  $\gamma$  be the restriction of an  $A_2$ -Muckenhoupt

weight in parts of  $\Omega$ , which corresponds to a standard way of relaxing the assumptions on a coefficient in an elliptic partial differential equation [11, 20]. Unlike in [4, Theorem 3.7], we also allow  $\gamma$  to tend to  $\gamma_0$  in a controlled manner rather than insisting on jump discontinuities at the boundary of  $\text{supp}(\gamma - \gamma_0)$ ; see [18, Theorem 4.7] for allowing such behaviour without extreme inclusions. Although there exist a few recent results on the unique solvability of the general Calderón problem with certain classes of singular and degenerate coefficients in two dimensions [1, 5, 23], we are not aware of any previous extensions of inclusion detection methods to such frameworks. Moreover, we pose no restrictions on the spatial dimension  $d \geq 2$  and only require local measurements.

As a motivation for the use of  $A_2$ -coefficients, let us mention a couple of examples that are outside the standard setting for Calderón's problem but can still be tackled within our setting. An  $A_2$ -weight is allowed to locally behave as  $\text{dist}(\cdot, \Sigma)^s$  for any  $s \in (-1, 1)$  and Lipschitz hypersurface  $\Sigma$ ; see, e.g., [9, Lemma 3.3]. In particular, such a hypersurface can be a subset of the boundary of an extreme inclusion, allowing a continuous decay to 0 or a continuous growth to  $\infty$  when approaching the inclusion boundary. Since even stronger singular or degenerate behaviour is possible for  $A_2$ -weights near a point, the coefficient  $\gamma$  can also behave as  $\text{dist}(\cdot, x_0)^s$  close to an arbitrary  $x_0 \in \Omega$  for any  $s \in (-d, d)$ .

The main theoretical developments and related properties of monotonicity-based reconstruction in connection to Calderón's problem and EIT can be found in [4, 10, 12, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 24] for the continuum model and in [13, 14, 16, 19] for related practical electrode models. For an extensive list of references to papers employing similar monotonicity-based arguments in other inverse coefficient problems, we refer to [16]. More general information on the theoretical aspects of Calderón's problem is available in the review article [25] and the references therein.

The rest of this article is organised as follows. Section 2 introduces the main result on reconstruction of inclusions as Theorem 2.2; the required assumptions are summarised in Assumption 2.1. Section 3 further elaborates on Assumption 2.1. Section 4 rigorously defines the Neumann problem for (1.1) and the associated local ND map in the context of a Muckenhoupt coefficient and extreme inclusions. Finally, Section 5 concludes the paper by proving Theorem 2.2.

## 2. MAIN RESULT

The family of admissible inclusions is defined as

$$\mathcal{A} = \{C \subset \Omega \mid C \text{ is the closure of an open set,} \\ \text{has connected complement,} \\ \text{and has Lipschitz boundary } \partial C\}.$$

Let  $D \in \mathcal{A}$  be the set representing the inclusions in  $\Omega$ , that is,  $D$  is (the outer shape of) the closure of the set where the investigated conductivity  $\gamma$  differs from the known background conductivity  $\gamma_0 \in L_+^\infty(\Omega)$ . More precisely,  $D$  is assumed to be composed of 'negative' and 'positive' parts as  $D = D^- \cup D^+$ ,

$$D^- = D_{\text{deg}} \cup D_0 \cup D_{\text{F}}^- \quad \text{and} \quad D^+ = D_{\text{sing}} \cup D_\infty \cup D_{\text{F}}^+,$$

where  $D_{\text{deg}}, D_{\text{sing}}, D_0, D_\infty, D_{\text{F}}^-, D_{\text{F}}^+$  are mutually disjoint measurable sets, each of which may be empty or have multiple components with the exact conditions on their geometry given in Assumption 2.1 below.

We define  $\gamma$  as

$$\gamma = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{in } D_0, \\ \infty & \text{in } D_\infty, \\ \gamma_{\text{deg}} & \text{in } D_{\text{deg}}, \\ \gamma_{\text{sing}} & \text{in } D_{\text{sing}}, \\ \gamma_{\text{F}}^- & \text{in } D_{\text{F}}^-, \\ \gamma_{\text{F}}^+ & \text{in } D_{\text{F}}^+, \\ \gamma_0 & \text{in } \Omega \setminus D. \end{cases}$$

Before introducing the exact assumptions on the different types of inclusions and the associated conductivities, we summarise that  $D_0$  and  $D_\infty$  correspond to the subsets of  $\Omega$  where  $\gamma$  is characterised by extreme inclusions and  $D_{\text{deg}}$  and  $D_{\text{sing}}$  to the subsets where  $\gamma$  is allowed to be an  $A_2$ -Muckenhoupt weight. In the subsets  $D_{\mathbb{F}}^\pm$  the coefficient  $\gamma$  is bounded away from 0 and  $\infty$ . However, it should be noted that in the nonextreme parts,  $\gamma$  is only assumed to deviate from  $\gamma_0$  near  $\partial D$ .

Some implications and interpretations of the following assumptions are presented in Section 3.

**Assumption 2.1.** We assume the following about  $D$  and  $\gamma$ .

- (i)  $\gamma \leq \gamma_0$  in  $D^-$  and  $\gamma \geq \gamma_0$  in  $D^+$ .
- (ii)  $\gamma_{\mathbb{F}}^- \in L_+^\infty(D_{\mathbb{F}}^-)$  and  $\gamma_{\mathbb{F}}^+ \in L_+^\infty(D_{\mathbb{F}}^+)$ .
- (iii) The sets  $D_{\text{deg}}$  and  $D_{\text{sing}}$  are compactly contained in the interior of  $D$ , and  $\gamma_{\text{deg}}$  and  $\gamma_{\text{sing}}$  are restrictions of an  $A_2$ -Muckenhoupt weight.
- (iv) The sets  $D_0, D_\infty, D_0 \cup D_{\text{deg}} \cup D_{\text{sing}}$ , and  $D_\infty \cup D_{\text{deg}} \cup D_{\text{sing}}$  are closures of open sets with finitely many components and Lipschitz boundaries. Moreover,  $D_0$  and  $D_0 \cup D_{\text{deg}} \cup D_{\text{sing}}$  have connected complements.
- (v) For every open neighbourhood  $W$  of  $x \in \partial D$ , there exists a relatively open set  $V \subset D$  that intersects  $\partial D$ , and  $V \subset \tilde{D} \cap W$  for one set  $\tilde{D} \in \{D_0, D_\infty, D_{\mathbb{F}}^-, D_{\mathbb{F}}^+\}$ .
  - (a) If  $\tilde{D} = D_{\mathbb{F}}^-$ , there exists an open ball  $B \subset V$  such that  $\text{ess sup}_B(\gamma_{\mathbb{F}}^- - \gamma_0) < 0$ .
  - (b) If  $\tilde{D} = D_{\mathbb{F}}^+$ , there exists an open ball  $B \subset V$  such that  $\text{ess inf}_B(\gamma_{\mathbb{F}}^+ - \gamma_0) > 0$ .

Let  $\Lambda(\gamma)$  be the local ND map on  $\Gamma$  corresponding to the coefficient  $\gamma$ ; see Section 4 for its precise definition, including an explanation on how extreme, singular, and degenerate inclusions are included in the associated elliptic Neumann boundary value problem. For  $C \in \mathcal{A}$ , we define  $\Lambda_0(C)$  as the ND map with coefficient 0 in  $C$  and  $\gamma_0$  outside  $C$ . In the same manner, we define  $\Lambda_\infty(C)$  to be the ND map with coefficient  $\infty$  in  $C$  and  $\gamma_0$  outside  $C$ .

This prelude finally leads to the following general result on reconstructing inclusions from a local ND map.

**Theorem 2.2.** *Let  $\gamma$  and  $D$  satisfy Assumption 2.1 and  $\gamma_0$  satisfy the UCP. For  $C \in \mathcal{A}$ , it holds*

$$D \subseteq C \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \Lambda_0(C) \geq \Lambda(\gamma) \geq \Lambda_\infty(C).$$

*In particular,  $D = \cap\{C \in \mathcal{A} \mid \Lambda_0(C) \geq \Lambda(\gamma) \geq \Lambda_\infty(C)\}$ .*

It follows immediately from the proof of Theorem 2.2 that if  $D^+$  is empty, then only the inequality  $\Lambda_0(C) \geq \Lambda(\gamma)$  needs to be considered, and if  $D^-$  is empty, then only  $\Lambda(\gamma) \geq \Lambda_\infty(C)$  needs to be considered.

### 3. SOME REMARKS ON ASSUMPTION 2.1

Let us present a few remarks on Assumption 2.1:

- The condition (iii) ensures that at  $\partial D$  the coefficient  $\gamma$  has a jump to 0 or  $\infty$ , or a well-behaving finite transition characterised by  $\gamma_{\mathbb{F}}^-$  or  $\gamma_{\mathbb{F}}^+$ . In particular, singular and degenerate behaviour of an  $A_2$ -weight is not permitted exactly at the boundary of  $D$  but only in its interior.
- However, (iii) still allows  $\gamma$  to exhibit singular and degenerate behaviour in the interior of  $D$ , e.g., by approaching 0 or  $\infty$  with a limited rate near the extreme inclusions, certain hypersurfaces, curves, or points.
- The condition (iv) is related to technical assumptions for a convergence result in [4] for potentials and ND maps in connection with extreme inclusions.
- The condition (v) excludes certain pathological cases such as  $\gamma - \gamma_0$  changing its sign arbitrarily often everywhere near an open part of  $\partial D$ . This type of oscillating behaviour is, however, allowed near points on  $\partial D$  if these points are separated by at least a fixed positive distance. Indeed, the condition (v) ensures that one can access  $D$  everywhere along  $\partial D$  through an open set that only intersects with one of the inclusion types.

- However, (v) still allows  $\gamma$  to approach  $\gamma_0$  in a controlled manner near some parts of the inclusion boundary, while also allowing finite jump discontinuities as has previously been considered in connection to extreme inclusions in [4]. The former could, e.g., correspond to  $\gamma$  equalling  $\gamma_0$  on an open subset  $\Sigma \subset \partial D$  but exhibiting a local strict increase or decrease inside  $D$  with respect to the distance from  $\Sigma$ .

#### 4. FORWARD PROBLEM WITH A MUCKENHOUP COEFFICIENT

In this section we consider the Neumann problem for (1.1) when the coefficient is a restriction of an  $A_2$ -Muckenhoupt weight that is well-behaved near  $\partial\Omega$  and allows perfectly insulating and perfectly conducting parts in  $\Omega$ . We denote the coefficient in the Neumann problem by  $\sigma$  to distinguish it from the fixed coefficient  $\gamma$  in (1.1). This provides the means to introduce the corresponding local ND map  $\Lambda(\sigma)$ , which in turn defines the forward map  $\sigma \mapsto \Lambda(\sigma)$  associated to the considered inverse problem.

We refer to [11, 20] for an introduction to Muckenhoupt weights and weighted Sobolev spaces, although for weighted Poincaré inequalities we refer to results in [8] since those are shown for more general domains. A nonnegative function  $w$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  is called an  $A_2$ -Muckenhoupt weight provided that  $w$  and  $1/w$  are locally integrable and satisfy

$$\exists C > 0, \forall B \text{ open ball in } \mathbb{R}^d : \left( \int_B w \, dx \right) \left( \int_B \frac{1}{w} \, dx \right) \leq C.$$

A common equivalent definition integrates over cubes rather than balls.

Let  $C_0 \Subset \Omega$  be such that  $\tilde{\Omega} = \Omega \setminus C_0$  is a Lipschitz domain;  $C_0$  will play the role of perfectly insulating inclusions in the following. For an  $A_2$ -weight  $w$ , define the norms

$$\|v\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}, w)}^2 = \int_{\tilde{\Omega}} w |v|^2 \, dx, \quad (4.1)$$

$$\|v\|_{H^1(\tilde{\Omega}, w)}^2 = \|v\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}, w)}^2 + \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}, w)}^2, \quad (4.2)$$

where  $\|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}, w)}$  refers to the  $L^2(\tilde{\Omega}, w)$ -norm of  $|\nabla v|$ . The weighted spaces  $L^2(\tilde{\Omega}, w)$  and  $H^1(\tilde{\Omega}, w)$  are then defined as the completions of the spaces of  $C^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})$ -functions with finite norms with respect to (4.1) and (4.2). In particular, both  $L^2(\tilde{\Omega}, w)$  and  $H^1(\tilde{\Omega}, w)$  are Hilbert spaces.

By density and using [8, Theorem 3.3] with  $\alpha = 1$ ,  $p = q = 2$ , and the weight function  $\sqrt{w}$ , we arrive at the weighted Poincaré inequality

$$\inf_{c \in \mathbb{C}} \|v - c\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}, w)} \leq C \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}, w)}, \quad v \in H^1(\tilde{\Omega}, w). \quad (4.3)$$

In particular, the quotient space  $H^1(\tilde{\Omega}, w)/\mathbb{C}$  can be equipped with the norm

$$\|v\|_{H^1(\tilde{\Omega}, w)/\mathbb{C}} = \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}, w)}, \quad v \in H^1(\tilde{\Omega}, w)/\mathbb{C},$$

which is equivalent to the standard quotient norm of  $H^1(\tilde{\Omega}, w)/\mathbb{C}$  due to (4.3).

In order to define a local ND map, we need to ensure that the elements of the considered space  $H^1(\tilde{\Omega}, w)$  have well-defined Dirichlet traces. To this end, suppose there exist  $K \Subset \Omega$  and  $c \in (0, 1)$  such that  $\tilde{\Omega} \setminus K$  is a Lipschitz domain and  $c \leq w \leq c^{-1}$  almost everywhere in  $\tilde{\Omega} \setminus K$ . This is sufficient for guaranteeing the existence of a bounded Dirichlet trace map from  $H^1(\tilde{\Omega}, w)$  to  $H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)$ , and thus also to  $L^2(\Gamma)$ : First, notice that if  $v \in H^1(\tilde{\Omega}, w)$ , then there is a sequence  $(\phi_i)$  in  $C^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})$  such that  $\phi_i \rightarrow v$  in  $H^1(\tilde{\Omega}, w)$ . Consequently, it also holds that  $\phi_i|_{\tilde{\Omega} \setminus K} \rightarrow v|_{\tilde{\Omega} \setminus K}$  in  $H^1(\tilde{\Omega} \setminus K, w) = H^1(\tilde{\Omega} \setminus K)$ . Hence, we may apply the standard trace theorem for  $H^1(\tilde{\Omega} \setminus K)$  to deduce

$$\|v|_\Gamma\|_{L^2(\Gamma)} \leq \|v|_{\partial\Omega}\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)} \leq C \|v\|_{H^1(\tilde{\Omega} \setminus K)} \leq C \|v\|_{H^1(\tilde{\Omega}, w)}.$$

Moreover,

$$\|v|_\Gamma\|_{L^2(\Gamma)/\mathbb{C}} \leq C \|v\|_{H^1(\tilde{\Omega}, w)/\mathbb{C}}, \quad v \in H^1(\tilde{\Omega}, w)/\mathbb{C},$$

due to an obvious generalisation.

Finally, let  $C_\infty \Subset \Omega \setminus C_0$  be the closure of an open set with Lipschitz boundary; in our analysis,  $C_\infty$  corresponds to perfectly conducting inclusions. We define the considered conductivity coefficient as

$$\sigma = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{in } C_0, \\ \infty & \text{in } C_\infty, \\ w & \text{in } \Omega \setminus (C_0 \cup C_\infty) \end{cases}$$

and the corresponding closed subspace of  $H^1(\tilde{\Omega}, w)/\mathbb{C}$  via

$$\mathcal{H}(\sigma) = \{v \in H^1(\Omega \setminus C_0, w)/\mathbb{C} \mid \nabla v = 0 \text{ in } C_\infty^\circ\},$$

where  $C_\infty^\circ$  denotes the interior of  $C_\infty$ . We abbreviate this Hilbert space as  $\mathcal{H}$  if there is no room for misinterpretation. The induced norm on  $\mathcal{H}$  is

$$\|v\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 = \int_{\Omega \setminus (C_0 \cup C_\infty)} \sigma |\nabla v|^2 dx, \quad v \in \mathcal{H}.$$

For a current density  $f$  belonging to the  $\Gamma$ -mean free space

$$L_\diamond^2(\Gamma) = \{g \in L^2(\Gamma) \mid \langle g, 1 \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} = 0\},$$

we define the electric potential  $u$ , corresponding to the conductivity coefficient  $\sigma$ , as the unique solution in  $\mathcal{H}$  to the variational problem

$$\int_{\Omega \setminus (C_0 \cup C_\infty)} \sigma \nabla u \cdot \overline{\nabla v} dx = \langle f, v|_\Gamma \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)}, \quad \forall v \in \mathcal{H}, \quad (4.4)$$

where there is no ambiguity in the right hand-side because of the mean free condition for  $f$ . The unique solvability of (4.4) is a straightforward consequence of the Lax–Milgram lemma. We will occasionally write  $u = u_f^\sigma$  if the connection of  $u$  to the specific Neumann boundary value  $f$  and conductivity coefficient  $\sigma$  needs to be emphasised.

Since the left hand-side of (4.4) defines a symmetric sesquilinear form on  $\mathcal{H}$ ,  $u$  is also the unique minimiser of the following functional (cf., e.g., [15, Remark 12.23] and [7, Theorem 1.1.2]):

$$J_\sigma(v) = \int_{\Omega \setminus (C_0 \cup C_\infty)} \sigma |\nabla v|^2 dx - 2 \operatorname{Re} \langle f, v|_\Gamma \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)}, \quad v \in \mathcal{H}. \quad (4.5)$$

The dependence on  $\sigma$  in the notation  $J_\sigma$  also encodes the extreme inclusions  $C_0$  and  $C_\infty$ , as well as the domain  $\mathcal{H}$  for the functional.

The corresponding local ND map  $\Lambda(\sigma) \in \mathcal{L}(L_\diamond^2(\Gamma))$ , in the space of bounded linear operators on  $L_\diamond^2(\Gamma)$ , is defined as  $\Lambda(\sigma)f = u_f^\sigma|_\Gamma$ . Here the notation is slightly abused by denoting with  $u_f^\sigma$  the unique  $\Gamma$ -mean free element in the corresponding equivalence class of the quotient space  $\mathcal{H}$ , which makes the definition of  $\Lambda(\sigma)$  concordant with the material in [4]. In particular,  $\Lambda(\sigma)$  is compact, self-adjoint, and satisfies

$$\langle \Lambda(\sigma)f, f \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} = \int_{\Omega \setminus (C_0 \cup C_\infty)} \sigma |\nabla u_f^\sigma|^2 dx, \quad f \in L_\diamond^2(\Gamma), \quad (4.6)$$

which are also standard properties of ND maps for conductivity coefficients in  $L_+^\infty(\Omega)$ .

*Remark 4.1.* We have decided to use (4.4) as the definition of the Neumann problem for the conductivity equation with  $A_2$ -Muckenhoupt weights and extreme inclusions. For the connection of (4.4) to the underlying partial differential equation and associated Neumann and Dirichlet boundary conditions on  $\partial C_0$  and  $\partial C_\infty$ , respectively, we refer to [4], where the situation is analysed for standard  $L_+^\infty$ -coefficients. In particular, we consider the direct employment of the variational problem (4.4) as the natural generalisation to the case of  $A_2$ -weights.

## 5. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.2

As we will see, the proof can essentially be reduced to showing that  $\Lambda(\gamma_L) \geq \Lambda(\gamma) \geq \Lambda(\gamma_U)$  for certain modified variants of  $\gamma$  satisfying  $\gamma_L \leq \gamma \leq \gamma_U$ . Specifically, for  $D_{A_2} = D_{\text{deg}} \cup D_{\text{sing}}$  we define

$$\gamma_L = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{in } D_{A_2}, \\ \gamma & \text{in } \Omega \setminus D_{A_2}, \end{cases} \quad \gamma_U = \begin{cases} \infty & \text{in } D_{A_2}, \\ \gamma & \text{in } \Omega \setminus D_{A_2}. \end{cases}$$

Notice that  $\gamma_L$  and  $\gamma_U$  satisfy the conditions required by [4, Theorem 3.7] if one modifies its statement and proof to also allow  $\gamma$  to approach  $\gamma_0$  in a controlled manner (cf. Assumption 2.1(v)). This slight generalisation of [4, Theorem 3.7] is given below.

**Proposition 5.1.** *Let  $\gamma$  and  $D$  satisfy Assumption 2.1, but with  $D_{\text{deg}} = D_{\text{sing}} = \emptyset$ , and let  $\gamma_0$  satisfy the UCP. For  $C \in \mathcal{A}$ , it holds*

$$D \subseteq C \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \Lambda_0(C) \geq \Lambda(\gamma) \geq \Lambda_\infty(C).$$

*Proof.* The first part of the proof for [4, Theorem 3.7] remains identical in such a setting, whereas its second part must be slightly modified: when choosing the ball  $B$  where potentials are localised in parts (a) and (b) of the proof, Assumption 2.1(v) guarantees that  $B$  can be chosen such that  $\gamma$  is bounded away from  $\gamma_0$  in  $B$ , without requiring a jump discontinuity at the inclusion boundary as in the original assumptions for [4, Theorem 3.7].  $\square$

In what follows we denote  $D_{\text{ext}} = D_0 \cup D_\infty$ . As the coefficients  $\gamma_L$  and  $\gamma_U$  purposefully do not have singular or degenerate parts, the corresponding potentials  $u_f^{\gamma_L}$  and  $u_f^{\gamma_U}$  are minimisers of the appropriate energy functionals defined by (4.5), over the unweighted spaces  $\mathcal{H}(\gamma_L)$  and  $\mathcal{H}(\gamma_U)$ , respectively. Moreover,  $u_f^\gamma \in \mathcal{H}(\gamma)$  obviously satisfies  $u_f^\gamma|_{\Omega \setminus (D_0 \cup D_{A_2})} \in \mathcal{H}(\gamma_L)$  and, on the other hand,  $u_f^{\gamma_U} \in \mathcal{H}(\gamma)$  since it has vanishing gradient in the region where  $\gamma$  may exhibit  $A_2$  behaviour. These observations are employed below when manipulating the energy functionals associated to different conductivity coefficients.

We start by proving  $\Lambda(\gamma_L) \geq \Lambda(\gamma)$ . Using (4.4) and (4.6), we get

$$\begin{aligned} -\langle \Lambda(\gamma)f, f \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} &= \int_{\Omega \setminus D_{\text{ext}}} \gamma |\nabla u_f^\gamma|^2 dx - 2\langle f, u_f^\gamma|_\Gamma \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} \\ &\geq \int_{\Omega \setminus (D_{\text{ext}} \cup D_{A_2})} \gamma_L |\nabla u_f^\gamma|^2 dx - 2\langle f, u_f^\gamma|_\Gamma \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} \\ &\geq \int_{\Omega \setminus (D_{\text{ext}} \cup D_{A_2})} \gamma_L |\nabla u_f^{\gamma_L}|^2 dx - 2\langle f, u_f^{\gamma_L}|_\Gamma \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} \\ &= -\langle \Lambda(\gamma_L)f, f \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

where the  $L^2(\Gamma)$  inner products have real values by (4.4) and (4.6). The first inequality follows from the nonnegativity of the integrand and the fact that  $\gamma$  equals  $\gamma_L$  outside  $D_{A_2}$ , whereas the second one is a consequence of  $u_f^{\gamma_L}$  being the minimiser of  $J_{\gamma_L}$  in  $\mathcal{H}(\gamma_L)$ .

Next we prove  $\Lambda(\gamma) \geq \Lambda(\gamma_U)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} -\langle \Lambda(\gamma_U)f, f \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} &= \int_{\Omega \setminus (D_{\text{ext}} \cup D_{A_2})} \gamma_U |\nabla u_f^{\gamma_U}|^2 dx - 2\langle f, u_f^{\gamma_U}|_\Gamma \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} \\ &= \int_{\Omega \setminus D_{\text{ext}}} \gamma |\nabla u_f^{\gamma_U}|^2 dx - 2\langle f, u_f^{\gamma_U}|_\Gamma \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} \\ &\geq \int_{\Omega \setminus D_{\text{ext}}} \gamma |\nabla u_f^\gamma|^2 dx - 2\langle f, u_f^\gamma|_\Gamma \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} \\ &= -\langle \Lambda(\gamma)f, f \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

where the second equality follows from  $|\nabla u_f^{\gamma_U}|$  vanishing in  $D_{A_2}$ , while the inequality is a consequence of  $u_f^\gamma$  being the minimiser of  $J_\gamma$  in  $\mathcal{H}(\gamma)$ .

To prove the actual theorem, assume first  $D \subseteq C$ . Due to (5.1), (5.2), and Proposition 5.1 applied to  $\gamma_L$  and  $\gamma_U$ ,

$$\Lambda_0(C) \geq \Lambda(\gamma_L) \geq \Lambda(\gamma) \geq \Lambda(\gamma_U) \geq \Lambda_\infty(C), \quad (5.3)$$

which proves the direction “ $\Rightarrow$ ” of the assertion.

To prove the opposite direction “ $\Leftarrow$ ”, assume that  $D \not\subseteq C$ , i.e., there is a part of  $D \setminus C$  that can be connected to  $\Gamma$  via a relatively open connected set  $U \subset \Omega \setminus C$ . By virtue of Assumption 2.1(v), we may assume that  $U$  only intersects one of the inclusion types  $D_0, D_\infty, D_F^-,$  or  $D_F^+$ . Proposition 5.1 does not directly reveal which one of its two operator inequalities that fails when applied to  $\gamma_L$  or  $\gamma_U$  in case  $D \not\subseteq C$  (cf. (5.3)). However, according to [4, Proof of Theorem 3.7], this depends on the inclusion type that  $U$  intersects, and we choose our approach to dealing with  $\gamma$  accordingly: If (Case A) the intersected inclusion type belongs to  $D^-$ , we will investigate  $\Lambda_0(C) - \Lambda(\gamma)$ , and, on the other hand, if (Case B) the inclusion type belongs to  $D^+$ , we will investigate  $\Lambda(\gamma) - \Lambda_\infty(C)$ .

We start by considering Case A, meaning that the only part of  $D$  that  $U$  is chosen to intersect is either  $D_0$  or  $D_F^-$ . According to (5.2),

$$\Lambda_0(C) - \Lambda(\gamma_U) \geq \Lambda_0(C) - \Lambda(\gamma).$$

However, by repeating either part (b) (if  $U$  intersects  $D_F^-$ ) or part (d) (if  $U$  intersects  $D_0$ ) in [4, Proof of Theorem 3.7], we deduce  $\Lambda_0(C) \not\geq \Lambda(\gamma_U)$ , and therefore also  $\Lambda_0(C) \not\geq \Lambda(\gamma)$ .

In Case B, the only part of  $D$  that  $U$  is chosen to intersect is either  $D_\infty$  or  $D_F^+$ . According to (5.1),

$$\Lambda(\gamma_L) - \Lambda_\infty(C) \geq \Lambda(\gamma) - \Lambda_\infty(C).$$

However, by repeating either part (a) (if  $U$  intersects  $D_F^+$ ) or part (c) (if  $U$  intersects  $D_\infty$ ) in [4, Proof of Theorem 3.7], we deduce  $\Lambda(\gamma_L) \not\geq \Lambda_\infty(C)$ , and therefore also  $\Lambda(\gamma) \not\geq \Lambda_\infty(C)$ .  $\square$

**Acknowledgments.** This work is supported by the Academy of Finland (decision 336789) and the Aalto Science Institute (AScI). In addition, HG is supported by The Research Foundation of DPhil Ragna Rask-Nielsen and is associated with the Aarhus University DIGIT Centre, and NH is supported by Jane and Aatos Erkkö Foundation via the project Electrical impedance tomography — a novel method for improved diagnostics of stroke.

## REFERENCES

- [1] K. Astala, M. Lassas, and L. Päiväranta. The borderlines of invisibility and visibility in Calderón’s inverse problem. *Anal. PDE*, 9(1):43–98, 2016.
- [2] L. Borcea. Electrical impedance tomography. *Inverse Problems*, 18(6):R99–R136, 2002.
- [3] L. Borcea. Addendum to “Electrical impedance tomography”. *Inverse Problems*, 19(4):997–998, 2003.
- [4] V. Candiani, J. Dardé, H. Garde, and N. Hyvönen. Monotonicity-based reconstruction of extreme inclusions in electrical impedance tomography. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 52(6):6234–6259, 2020.
- [5] C. Cârstea and J. N. Wang. Uniqueness for the two dimensional Calderón’s problem with unbounded conductivities. *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5)*, 18(4):1459–1482, 2018.
- [6] M. Cheney, D. Isaacson, and J. C. Newell. Electrical impedance tomography. *SIAM Review*, 41(1):85–101, 1999.
- [7] P. Ciarlet. *The Finite Element Method for Elliptic Problems*. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1978.
- [8] I. Drelichman and R. G. Durán. Improved Poincaré inequalities with weights. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 347(1):286–293, 2008.
- [9] R. G. Durán and F. L. García. Solutions of the divergence and analysis of the Stokes equations in planar Hölder- $\alpha$  domains. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 20(1):95–120, 2010.
- [10] A. C. Esposito, L. Faella, G. Piscitelli, R. Prakash, and A. Tamburrino. Monotonicity Principle in tomography of nonlinear conducting materials. *Inverse Problems*, 37(4), 2021. Article ID 045012.
- [11] E. B. Fabes, C. E. Kenig, and R. P. Serapioni. The local regularity of solutions of degenerate elliptic equations. *Comm. PDE*, 7(1):77–116, 1982.
- [12] H. Garde. Reconstruction of piecewise constant layered conductivities in electrical impedance tomography. *Comm. PDE*, 45(9):1118–1133, 2020.
- [13] H. Garde and S. Staboulis. Convergence and regularization for monotonicity-based shape reconstruction in electrical impedance tomography. *Numer. Math.*, 135(4):1221–1251, 2017.
- [14] H. Garde and S. Staboulis. The regularized monotonicity method: detecting irregular indefinite inclusions. *Inverse Probl. Imag.*, 13(1):93–116, 2019.
- [15] G. Grubb. *Distributions and Operators*. Springer, New York, 2009.

- [16] B. Harrach. Uniqueness and Lipschitz stability in electrical impedance tomography with finitely many electrodes. *Inverse Problems*, 35(2), 2019. Article ID 024005.
- [17] B. Harrach and J. K. Seo. Exact shape-reconstruction by one-step linearization in electrical impedance tomography. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 42(4):1505–1518, 2010.
- [18] B. Harrach and M. Ullrich. Monotonicity-based shape reconstruction in electrical impedance tomography. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 45(6):3382–3403, 2013.
- [19] B. Harrach and M. Ullrich. Resolution guarantees in electrical impedance tomography. *IEEE T. Med. Imaging*, 34(7):1513–1521, 2015.
- [20] J. Heinonen, T. Kilpeläinen, and O. Martio. *Nonlinear potential theory of degenerate elliptic equations*. Dover Publications, Inc., Mineola, NY, 2006.
- [21] M. Ikehata. Size estimation of inclusion. *J. Inverse Ill-Posed Probl.*, 6(2):127–140, 1998.
- [22] H. Kang, J. K. Seo, and D. Sheen. The inverse conductivity problem with one measurement: stability and estimation of size. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 28(6):1389–1405, 1997.
- [23] A. Nachman, I. Regev, and D. Tataru. A nonlinear Plancherel theorem with applications to global well-posedness for the defocusing Davey–Stewartson equation and to the inverse boundary value problem of Calderón. *Invent. Math.*, 220(2):395–451, 2020.
- [24] A. Tamburrino and G. Rubinacci. A new non-iterative inversion method for electrical resistance tomography. *Inverse Problems*, 18(6):1809–1829, 2002.
- [25] G. Uhlmann. Electrical impedance tomography and Calderón’s problem. *Inverse Problems*, 25(12), 2009. Article ID 123011.

(H. Garde) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, AARHUS UNIVERSITY, NY MUNKEGADE 118, 8000 AARHUS C, DENMARK.

*Email address:* `garde@math.au.dk`

(N. Hyvönen) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND SYSTEMS ANALYSIS, AALTO UNIVERSITY, P.O. BOX 11100, 00076 HELSINKI, FINLAND.

*Email address:* `nuutti.hyvonen@aalto.fi`