

A constrained proof of the strong version of the Eshelby conjecture for the three-dimensional isotropic medium

T. Y. Yuan^{1,2}, K. F. Huang^{3,*} and J. X. Wang^{1,2,*}

¹State Key Laboratory for Turbulence and Complex System, College of Engineering,
Peking University, Beijing 100871, P.R. China

²CAPT-HEDPS, and IFSA Collaborative Innovation Center of MoE, College of Engineering,
Peking University, Beijing 100871, P.R. China

³Department of Mechanics and Aerospace Engineering,
Southern University of Science and Technology, Shenzhen, Guangdong 518055, P.R. China

Abstract

Eshelby's seminal work on the ellipsoidal inclusion problem leads to the conjecture that the ellipsoid is the only inclusion possessing the uniformity property that a uniform eigenstrain is transformed into a uniform elastic strain. For the three-dimensional isotropic medium, the weak version of the Eshelby conjecture has been substantiated. The previous work of Ammari et al substantiates the strong version of the Eshelby conjecture for the cases when the three eigenvalues of the eigenstress are distinct or all the same, whereas the case where two of the eigenvalues of the eigenstress are identical and the other one is distinct remains a difficult problem. In this work, we study the latter case. To this end, firstly, we present and prove a necessary condition for a convex inclusion being capable of transforming a single uniform eigenstress into a uniform elastic stress field. Since the necessary condition is not enough to determine the shape of the inclusion, secondly, we introduce a constraint that is concerned with the material parameters, and prove that there exist combinations of the elastic tensors and uniform eigenstresses such that only an ellipsoid can have the Eshelby uniformity property for these combinations simultaneously. Finally, we provide a more specifically constrained proof of the conjecture by proving that for the uniform strain fields constrained to that induced by an ellipsoid from a set of specified uniform eigenstresses, the strong version of the Eshelby conjecture is true for a set of isotropic elastic tensors which are associated with the specified uniform eigenstresses. This work makes some progress towards the complete solution of the intriguing and longstanding Eshelby conjecture for three-dimensional isotropic media.

Subject Areas: solid mechanics, applied mathematics, engineering

Key words: Eshelby conjecture, inclusion problems, isotropic medium, eigenstrain, elasticity

Author for correspondence:

J. X. Wang: jxwang@pku.edu.cn; K. F. Huang: huangkf@sustc.edu.cn

1 Introduction

Eshelby's work [1, 2] on the inclusion problem is essential to the development of the theories for the mechanical performance of heterogeneous materials. Mura introduced the concept of the eigenstrain, and conducted a series of studies via the Eshelby formalism [3]. Many researchers have investigated inclusion problems from diverse aspects. For instance, from the aspect of multi-physical fields, the generalized Eshelby formalisms for piezoelectric inclusions [4, 5] and inclusions governed by more general coupled-fields [6] have been developed; from the aspect of multi-scales, the interface effect of nano-inclusions and nano-inhomogeneities has been studied [7–12], and the inclusion problem in the context of second gradient elasticity have been investigated [13]. In addition, the classical Eshelby's inclusion theory for solids has been extended to investigations of liquid inclusions in soft materials [14, 15].

In the field of the inclusion problem, the most significant and fantastic phenomenon is the Eshelby uniformity property of the ellipsoid, which means that the uniform eigenstrain (eigenstress) prescribed in an ellipsoidal inclusion in an infinite medium induces a uniform elastic strain (stress) field inside the inclusion. In 1961, Eshelby [16] conjectured that the ellipsoid uniquely possesses such marvelous uniformity property, which has long been a difficult problem to be proved or disproved. According to previous researches [17–19], the Eshelby conjecture can be more specifically understood in two senses, i.e. the weak and strong versions. The weak version asserts that “*an ellipsoid alone transforms all uniform eigenstrains (eigenstressess) into uniform elastic strain (stress) fields in it*”, and the strong version asserts that “*no inclusion other than an ellipsoid transforms a single uniform eigenstrain (eigenstress) into a uniform elastic strain (stress) field in it*” [20]. Note that there are also other ways of statements of the versions [17–19]. It is easily seen that the validity of the strong version leads to the validity of the weak version.

For the isotropic medium in three dimensions, in 2008, the proof of the weak version was fulfilled by Liu [17] with the utilization of the obstacle function on the basis of inclusion problem, and by Kang and Milton [18] with the utilization of the single-layer potential on the basis of the inhomogeneity problem. The conjecture is also valid for the three-dimensional conductivity problem [21]. For the isotropic medium in two dimensions, the proof of the Eshelby conjecture has been fulfilled [22–24]. For anisotropic media, the weak and strong versions of the Eshelby conjecture have already been proved to be valid in two dimensions [19]. For the three-dimensional case, Yuan et al. [20] recently proved that the weak version for cubic, transversely isotropic, orthotropic, and monoclinic symmetries is valid, but there are counterexamples to the strong version.

However, the strong version of the conjecture for the three-dimensional isotropic case has not been fully resolved, though some progress has been made. It was proved by Markenscoff [25] in 1997 that the inclusion that possesses the Eshelby uniformity property can not have any planar surface. In 1998, Lubarda and Markenscoff [26] further drew the conclusion that the surface of the inclusion that possesses the Eshelby uniformity property needs to satisfy some particular conditions. Then Markenscoff [27] also proved that the only way to assure the Eshelby uniformity property is the infinitesimal perturbation of the ellipsoid into another ellipsoid.

In 2010, a further step towards the proof of the strong version was made by Ammari et al. [28]. By categorizing the induced strain field based on its eigenvalues, Ammari et al. [28] proved that when the three eigenvalues of the elastic strain field induced by the remote loading are either all the same or all distinct, the ellipsoidal inhomogeneity uniquely possesses the Eshelby uniformity property, which is stronger than the weak version and close to the strong version.

It is noted that the result given by Ammari et al. [28] for the inhomogeneity problem in the

isotropic medium can be extended to prove that the ellipsoidal inclusion uniquely possesses the Eshelby uniformity property, when the eigenvalues of the eigenstress are either all distinct or all identical, that is, the strong version of the Eshelby conjecture is true for these two special cases. In this work, we consider the remaining case where two of the eigenvalues of the eigenstress are identical, and the other one is distinct. In this case, we show and prove three theorems. The first theorem constitutes a necessary condition for a convex inclusion to possess the Eshelby uniformity property. However, the necessary condition alone can not help us to determine the shape of the inclusion. Therefore, in the second theorem, we bring in an additional constraint associated with the material parameters, and find that the inclusion can only be an ellipsoid owing to the necessary condition under the constraint that the inclusion possesses the Eshelby uniformity property for two isotropic media whose elastic tensors are linearly independent. Thus, the second theorem provides a constrained proof of the strong version. Further, we evaluate the elastic field induced by an arbitrary inclusion with the Eshelby uniformity property, and find that the uniform strain field induced by an inclusion of any non-ellipsoidal shape, if there is one, can not be equal to that induced by an ellipsoid for the same uniform eigenstress, which constitutes the third theorem. Thus the third theorem provides an alternative constrained proof of the strong version from another viewpoint when the induced strain field is constrained to be equal to that induced by an ellipsoid for the same uniform eigenstress. All together, this work makes some progress towards the complete resolution of the strong version of the Eshelby conjecture for the three-dimensional isotropic medium.

2 Basic equations

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ denote the inclusion domain, which is a one-component connected bounded domain with a Lipschitz boundary. The equilibrium equation for Eshelby's inclusion problem in the infinite elastic homogenous isotropic medium is

$$\nabla \cdot [\mathbf{C} : (\nabla \otimes \mathbf{u}) - \chi_\Omega \boldsymbol{\sigma}^*] = \mathbf{0} \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^3, \quad (1)$$

where \mathbf{u} denotes the displacement field, which is a vector; ∇ denotes the gradient operator; $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^*$ denotes a uniform eigenstress, which is a symmetric second-order tensor; χ_Ω denotes the indicator function with respect to Ω ; and

$$\mathbf{C} = [\lambda \delta_{ij} \delta_{kl} + \mu (\delta_{ik} \delta_{jl} + \delta_{il} \delta_{jk})] \mathbf{e}_i \otimes \mathbf{e}_j \otimes \mathbf{e}_k \otimes \mathbf{e}_l \quad (2)$$

denotes the fourth-order elastic tensor for the isotropic medium with δ_{ij} being the Kronecker delta, λ and μ being Lamé parameters that satisfy

$$\mu > 0, \quad 3\lambda + 2\mu > 0, \quad (3)$$

and $\{\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2, \mathbf{e}_3\}$ being the bases of a Cartesian coordinate system $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$. Unless otherwise stated, the summation convention on repeated indices will always be stipulated.

By the Fourier analysis [17, 20], the solution to (1) is

$$u_p(\mathbf{x}) = -\frac{i}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} L_{pq}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) \sigma_{qj}^* \xi_j \int_{\Omega} e^{i(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\xi}} d\mathbf{y} d\boldsymbol{\xi}, \quad (4)$$

where $i = \sqrt{-1}$ denotes the imaginary unit, and

$$L_{pq} C_{qlmn} \xi_l \xi_n = \delta_{pm}. \quad (5)$$

By substituting (2) into (5), we gain

$$L_{pq}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \frac{1}{\mu|\boldsymbol{\xi}|^2} \delta_{pq} - \frac{\mu + \lambda}{\mu(2\mu + \lambda)} \frac{\xi_p \xi_q}{|\boldsymbol{\xi}|^4}. \quad (6)$$

Owing to the isotropy of the elastic tensor \mathbf{C} , which means \mathbf{C} possesses the same expression (2) in all Cartesian coordinate systems, we see that (6) and thus (4) do not vary with the rotation of the Cartesian coordinate system. Thus to simplify the derivations in the sequel, we let the axes of the Cartesian coordinate system $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ coincide with the three mutually orthogonal unit eigenvectors of the eigenstress $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^*$. Then in such a coordinate system, the off-diagonal elements of $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^*$ are zero, and the diagonal elements $\sigma_{11}^*, \sigma_{22}^*, \sigma_{33}^*$ are the three eigenvalues of $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^*$.

In this coordinate system, the inclusion Ω that possesses the Eshelby uniformity property must yield

$$\frac{\partial u_p(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_l} = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} L_{pq}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) \sigma_{qj}^* \xi_j \xi_l \int_{\Omega} e^{i(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\xi}} d\mathbf{y} d\boldsymbol{\xi} = \text{constant}, \quad (7)$$

Note that the left-hand side of (7) corresponds to the total strain induced by Ω . Since the total strain is the sum of the elastic strain and the uniform eigenstrain, thus the uniformity of the total strain is equivalent to the uniformity of the elastic strain. Thus based on (7), the completion of the proof of the strong version of the Eshelby conjecture for the three-dimensional isotropic medium can be achieved by classifying the three eigenvalues $\sigma_{11}^*, \sigma_{22}^*, \sigma_{33}^*$ of the eigenstress into three cases: they are all identical; they are all distinct; and two of them are identical and the other one is distinct, and then proving Ω that leads to (7) must be ellipsoidal for these cases.

As is mentioned before, the strong version for the eigenstress possessing either all identical or all distinct eigenvalues can be proved by extending the result of Ammari et al. [28] to the inclusion problem via the same mathematical manipulations in Section 3 of their paper. And we also provide an alternative proof for this case by using the Fourier analysis in the Appendix. Therefore, only the case where two eigenvalues of the eigenstress are identical and the other one is distinct will be studied in detail in the following sections. Note that the classification of the eigenstress is equivalent to the classification of the eigenstrain due to the isotropy of the elastic tensor.

3 A constrained proof of the strong version for the eigenstress possessing only two identical eigenvalues

We define

$$g(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\xi}) := \int_{\Omega} e^{i(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\xi}} d\mathbf{y} \quad (8)$$

and let $\sigma_{11}^* = \sigma_{22}^* = k_1$, $\sigma_{33}^* = k_3$ with $k_1 \neq k_3$.

Since the inclusion Ω with the Eshelby uniformity property satisfies (7), then by substituting $\sigma_{11}^* = \sigma_{22}^* = k_1$, $\sigma_{33}^* = k_3$ along with (6) and (8) into (7), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\forall j = 1, 2, 3 \quad & \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \xi_1 \xi_j \left(\frac{\mu k_1}{|\xi|^2} + \frac{(\lambda + \mu)(k_1 - k_3) \xi_3^2}{|\xi|^4} \right) g(\mathbf{x}, \xi) d\xi = \text{constant}, \\
& \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \xi_2 \xi_j \left(\frac{\mu k_1}{|\xi|^2} + \frac{(\lambda + \mu)(k_1 - k_3) \xi_3^2}{|\xi|^4} \right) g(\mathbf{x}, \xi) d\xi = \text{constant}, \\
& \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \xi_3 \xi_j \left(\frac{k_3(\lambda + 2\mu) - k_1(\lambda + \mu)}{|\xi|^2} + \frac{(\lambda + \mu)(k_1 - k_3) \xi_3^2}{|\xi|^4} \right) g(\mathbf{x}, \xi) d\xi = \text{constant} \quad \mathbf{x} \in \Omega.
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

It follows from (9) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left(\frac{\mu k_1}{|\xi|^2} + \frac{(\lambda + \mu)(k_1 - k_3) \xi_3^2}{|\xi|^4} \right) g(\mathbf{x}, \xi) d\xi &= \text{Linear}, \\
\frac{\partial}{\partial x_2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left(\frac{\mu k_1}{|\xi|^2} + \frac{(\lambda + \mu)(k_1 - k_3) \xi_3^2}{|\xi|^4} \right) g(\mathbf{x}, \xi) d\xi &= \text{Linear}, \\
\frac{\partial}{\partial x_3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left(\frac{k_3(\lambda + 2\mu) - k_1(\lambda + \mu)}{|\xi|^2} + \frac{(\lambda + \mu)(k_1 - k_3) \xi_3^2}{|\xi|^4} \right) g(\mathbf{x}, \xi) d\xi &= \text{Linear} \quad \mathbf{x} \in \Omega,
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

which finally leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left(\frac{\mu k_1}{|\xi|^2} + \frac{(\lambda + \mu)(k_1 - k_3) \xi_3^2}{|\xi|^4} \right) g(\mathbf{x}, \xi) d\xi &= q_1(\mathbf{x}) + \varphi_1(x_3), \\
\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left(\frac{k_3(\lambda + 2\mu) - k_1(\lambda + \mu)}{|\xi|^2} + \frac{(\lambda + \mu)(k_1 - k_3) \xi_3^2}{|\xi|^4} \right) g(\mathbf{x}, \xi) d\xi &= q_2(\mathbf{x}) + \varphi_2(x_1, x_2) \quad \mathbf{x} \in \Omega,
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where $q_1(\mathbf{x})$ and $q_2(\mathbf{x})$ denote two quadratic functions, and $\varphi_1(x_3)$ and $\varphi_2(x_1, x_2)$ denote two unknown functions.

To continue the analysis, we introduce two potentials. The first one is the well-known Newtonian potential $N_\Omega(\mathbf{x})$ of the inclusion domain Ω , which can be expressed as

$$N_\Omega(\mathbf{x}) = -\frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{g(\mathbf{x}, \xi)}{|\xi|^2} d\xi. \tag{12}$$

Note that the Newtonian potential $N_\Omega(\mathbf{x})$ in (12) is exactly the first term of the integral on the left-hand side of (11). Besides, we know that the Newtonian potential $N_\Omega(\mathbf{x})$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \Delta N_\Omega(\mathbf{x}) = \chi_\Omega & \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3, \\ N_\Omega(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{|\mathbf{x}|}\right) & \text{as } |\mathbf{x}| \rightarrow +\infty, \end{cases} \tag{13}$$

where Δ denotes the Laplacian operator, and $\mathcal{O}(\cdot)$ denotes the order of magnitude. (13) admits a unique solution, i.e.,

$$N_\Omega(\mathbf{x}) = -\frac{1}{4\pi} \int_\Omega \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|} d\mathbf{y}, \tag{14}$$

which provides an explicit expression of $N_\Omega(\mathbf{x})$.

The second one is a bi-harmonic potential H , which is defined as

$$H(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{g(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\xi})}{|\boldsymbol{\xi}|^4} d\boldsymbol{\xi}. \quad (15)$$

By substituting (15) into (12), it is easy to verify that

$$\Delta H(\mathbf{x}) = N_\Omega(\mathbf{x}); \quad (16)$$

thus by (13)₁,

$$\Delta^2 H(\mathbf{x}) = \chi_\Omega \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3, \quad (17)$$

which indicates $H(\mathbf{x})$ is bi-harmonic in $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Omega$.

It could be derived from (15) that

$$\frac{\partial^2 H(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_3^2} = -\frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{\xi_3^2}{|\boldsymbol{\xi}|^4} g(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\xi}) d\boldsymbol{\xi}, \quad (18)$$

which is exactly the second term of the integral on the left-hand side of (11). Therefore, substitution of (12) and (18) into (11) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha N_\Omega(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{\partial^2 H(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_3^2} &= q_1(\mathbf{x}) + \varphi_1(x_3), \\ \beta N_\Omega(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{\partial^2 H(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_3^2} &= q_2(\mathbf{x}) + \varphi_2(x_1, x_2) \quad \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where α and β are two real constants defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &:= -\frac{\mu k_1}{(\lambda + \mu)(k_1 - k_3)}; \\ \beta &:= -\frac{[k_3(\lambda + 2\mu) - k_1(\lambda + \mu)]}{(\lambda + \mu)(k_1 - k_3)}. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Note that, here, the values of q_i and φ_i in (19) are equal to $\frac{1}{(2\pi)^3}$ times q_i and φ_i in (11). Since $k_1 \neq k_3$, it is easy to verify that for any combination of the Lamé parameters λ, μ that satisfy (3), (20) is always valid, and $\alpha \neq \beta$.

To determine the shape of Ω , we proceed to analyze (19). Previously, we have shown the expression (14) of the Newtonian potential $N_\Omega(\mathbf{x})$. By substituting (14) into (16), we can derive

$$H(\mathbf{x}) = -\frac{1}{8\pi} \int_{\Omega} |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}| d\mathbf{y} + H^*(\mathbf{x}), \quad (21)$$

where $H^*(\mathbf{x})$ is an unknown harmonic function that satisfies

$$\Delta H^*(\mathbf{x}) = 0 \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3. \quad (22)$$

Then we are going to determine $H^*(\mathbf{x})$.

By combining (16) with (13)₂, we see

$$H(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{x}|) \quad \text{as } |\mathbf{x}| \rightarrow +\infty. \quad (23)$$

And by (15) and (23), it is easy to verify that

$$H(\mathbf{x}) \propto |\mathbf{x}| \quad \text{as } |\mathbf{x}| \rightarrow +\infty. \quad (24)$$

Further, by substituting (21) along with (22) into (24), we see $H^*(\mathbf{x})$ at infinity must satisfy either

$$H^*(\mathbf{x}) \propto |\mathbf{x}| \quad \text{as } |\mathbf{x}| \rightarrow +\infty, \quad (25)$$

or

$$H^*(\mathbf{x}) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } |\mathbf{x}| \rightarrow +\infty. \quad (26)$$

Take a ball $B_r = \{\mathbf{x} \mid |\mathbf{x}| \leq r, r > 0\}$. Due to the mean-value property of the harmonic function, we have

$$H^*(\mathbf{0}) = \frac{1}{4\pi r^2} \int_{\partial B_r} H^*(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}. \quad (27)$$

We then consider the case when r tends to infinity in (27). If (25) holds, by substituting (25) into (27) with $r \rightarrow +\infty$, we obtain

$$H^*(\mathbf{0}) \propto r \quad \text{where } r \rightarrow +\infty. \quad (28)$$

The above result is impossible since $H(\mathbf{0})$ is a finite constant. Hence (25) can not be valid, and thus $H^*(\mathbf{x})$ at infinity should satisfy (26).

Equations (22) and (26) signify that $H^*(\mathbf{x})$ is a harmonic function in \mathbb{R}^3 , and $H^*(\mathbf{x})$ will tend to zero at infinity; thus due to the analyticity of $H^*(\mathbf{x})$ in \mathbb{R}^3 , we see $H^*(\mathbf{x})$ is bounded in \mathbb{R}^3 . Then owing to the boundary condition (26) and the Liouville theorem, which stipulates that “*any harmonic function in \mathbb{R}^3 bounded from above or below is constant*” [29], we conclude that

$$H^*(\mathbf{x}) \equiv 0. \quad (29)$$

It can be derived from (21) along with (29) that

$$\frac{\partial^2 H(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_3^2} = -\frac{1}{8\pi} \int_{\Omega} \left[\frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|} - \frac{(x_3 - y_3)^2}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|^3} \right] d\mathbf{y}. \quad (30)$$

Given this, we define

$$\tilde{N}_{\Omega}(\mathbf{x}) := -\frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{\Omega} \frac{(x_3 - y_3)^2}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|^3} d\mathbf{y}. \quad (31)$$

Then by substituting (14), (30) and (31) into (19), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma N_{\Omega}(\mathbf{x}) + \tilde{N}_{\Omega}(\mathbf{x}) &= q_1(\mathbf{x}) + \varphi_1(x_3), \\ \eta N_{\Omega}(\mathbf{x}) + \tilde{N}_{\Omega}(\mathbf{x}) &= q_2(\mathbf{x}) + \varphi_2(x_1, x_2) \quad \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where $N_\Omega(\mathbf{x})$ and $\tilde{N}_\Omega(\mathbf{x})$ both have explicit expressions, i.e., (14) and (31), respectively, and

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma &:= \frac{[k_3(\lambda + \mu) - k_1(\lambda + 3\mu)]}{(\lambda + \mu)(k_1 - k_3)}, \\ \eta &:= \frac{[k_3(\lambda + 3\mu) - k_1(\lambda + \mu)]}{(\lambda + \mu)(k_1 - k_3)}\end{aligned}\tag{33}$$

are real constants that are determined by the elastic tensors \mathbf{C} (Lamé parameters λ, μ) and the eigenvalues k_1, k_3 of the eigenstress $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^*$.

Recently, Yuan et al. [20] demonstrate that the material parameters can serve as an important factor in the study of the Eshelby conjecture. Likewise, we also consider the influence of the material parameters in this work. To prove the strong version of the Eshelby conjecture for the eigenstress possessing only two identical eigenvalues is to prove the following proposition:

Proposition 3.1 *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ be a one-component connected bounded open domain with a Lipschitz boundary. Equation (32) holds for $(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^*, \mathbf{C})$, where $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^*$ is a given uniform eigenstress that possesses two identical eigenvalues k_1 and a distinct eigenvalue k_3 , and \mathbf{C} is an isotropic elastic tensor, if and only if Ω is of ellipsoidal shape.*

To prove or disprove Proposition 3.1, we investigate (32). Firstly, we derive a necessary condition for a convex inclusion possessing the Eshelby uniformity property from (32), which is stated in the following theorem:

Theorem 3.1 *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ be a one-component connected bounded open convex domain with a Lipschitz boundary. If equation (32) holds for $(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^*, \mathbf{C})$ where $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^*$ is a given uniform eigenstress that possesses two identical eigenvalues k_1 and a distinct eigenvalue k_3 , and \mathbf{C} is an isotropic elastic tensor, then in the Cartesian coordinate system $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ defined by the eigenvectors of the eigenstress $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^*$, there must exist an ellipsoid $E \subset \Omega$ that satisfies*

$$N_\Omega(\mathbf{x}) - N_E(\mathbf{x}) = \varphi(x_1, x_2), \quad \mathbf{x} \in E,\tag{34}$$

where $\varphi(x_1, x_2)$ is an unknown function that only relies on two spatial coordinates, and $N_E(\mathbf{x})$ is the Newtonian potential of the ellipsoid E , whose expression is (14) with Ω replaced by E .

Theorem 3.1 implies that the Newtonian potential of a convex Ω that possesses the Eshelby uniformity property for the eigenstress possessing only two identical eigenvalues is necessarily correlated with the Newtonian potential of an ellipsoid E via (34). If Ω is ellipsoidal, (34) is automatically satisfied. Thus, the significance of Theorem 3.1 is that a non-ellipsoidal convex inclusion that does not satisfy (34) is excluded from the set of inclusions that possess the Eshelby uniformity property.

Secondly, we impose an extra constraint concerned with the material parameters to make (32) the sufficient and necessary condition for Ω to be the ellipsoidal shape, which is stated in the following theorem:

Theorem 3.2 *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ be a one-component connected bounded open domain with a Lipschitz boundary. There exist combinations $(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^*, \mathbf{C}^{(1)})$ and $(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^*, \mathbf{C}^{(2)})$, where $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^*$ is a given uniform eigenstress that possesses two identical eigenvalues k_1 and a distinct eigenvalue k_3 , and $\mathbf{C}^{(1)}$ and $\mathbf{C}^{(2)}$ are two linearly independent isotropic elastic tensors, such that equation (32) holds for $(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^*, \mathbf{C}^{(1)})$ and $(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^*, \mathbf{C}^{(2)})$ simultaneously, if and only if Ω is of ellipsoidal shape.*

By comparing Theorem 3.2 with Proposition 3.1, it is straightforward to see that the condition that (32) holds for $(\sigma^*, \mathbf{C}^{(1)})$ and $(\sigma^*, \mathbf{C}^{(2)})$ simultaneously is stronger than the condition that (32) holds for (σ^*, \mathbf{C}) , which reveals extra constraints here. Thus Theorem 3.2 provides a constrained proof of Proposition 3.1 and thus the strong version of the Eshelby conjecture for the eigentress possessing only two identical eigenvalues.

It is seen that the above theorems do not exclude the existence of non-ellipsoidal inclusions that can satisfy the Eshelby uniformity property (otherwise the strong version is ultimately proved). Then, if there exist non-ellipsoidal inclusions that satisfy the Eshelby uniformity property, what are the (uniform) strain fields in them like? We explore the answer to this interesting question by the following theorem:

Theorem 3.3 *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ be a one-component connected bounded open domain with a Lipschitz boundary. There exists an isotropic elastic tensor \mathbf{C} and an ellipsoid E with $E \supset \Omega$, such that the elastic strain field induced by Ω is equal to that induced by E within Ω for a given uniform eigenstress σ^* that possesses two identical eigenvalues k_1 and a distinct eigenvalue k_3 with the same sign as that of k_1 , if and only if Ω is of ellipsoidal shape.*

Theorem 3.3 implies that for the uniform strain fields constrained to be equal to that induced by an ellipsoid from the specified k_1 and k_3 , the strong version of the Eshelby conjecture is true for a set of isotropic elastic tensors \mathbf{C} , which, as we will show below, are determined by the eigenvalues k_1 and k_3 .

Theorem 3.3 can be expressed mathematically as follows. We define a mapping F that maps the Cartesian product of the set $\{\sigma^*\}$ of the uniform eigenstress, the set $\{\mathbf{C}\}$ of the isotropic elastic tensor and the set $\{\Omega\}$ of the configuration of the inclusion into the set $\{\varepsilon^e\}$ of the induced elastic strain inside Ω for the eigenstrain problem, i.e.,

$$F : \{\sigma^*\} \times \{\mathbf{C}\} \times \{\Omega\} \rightarrow \{\varepsilon^e\}, (\sigma^*, \mathbf{C}, \Omega) \mapsto F(\sigma^*, \mathbf{C}, \Omega) \subset \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}. \quad (35)$$

As is known from the previous researches [1–3],

$$\forall (\sigma^*, \mathbf{C}, E) \in \{\sigma^*\} \times \{\mathbf{C}\} \times \{E\}, F(\sigma^*, \mathbf{C}, E) = \text{constant}, \quad (36)$$

where E denotes an ellipsoid, and $\{E\}$ denotes the set of ellipsoids, which is a subset of $\{\Omega\}$. And in terms of the mapping F defined by (35), the strong version of the Eshelby conjecture can be mathematically interpreted as

$$\forall (\sigma^*, \mathbf{C}) \in \{\sigma^*\} \times \{\mathbf{C}\}, \text{ if } \exists \Omega \in \{\Omega\} \text{ such that } F(\sigma^*, \mathbf{C}, \Omega) = \text{constant}, \text{ then } \Omega \in \{E\}. \quad (37)$$

We let $\bar{\sigma}^*$ denote a special kind of the uniform eigenstress that possesses two identical eigenvalues k_1 and a distinct eigenvalue k_3 with the same sign as that of k_1 . And we let $\{\bar{\sigma}^*\}$ denote the set of $\bar{\sigma}^*$, which is a subset of $\{\sigma^*\}$. Then Theorem 3.3 can be mathematically interpreted as

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall \bar{\sigma}^* \in \{\bar{\sigma}^*\}, \exists \bar{\mathbf{C}} \in \{\mathbf{C}\}, \Omega \in \{\Omega\}, E \in \{E\} \text{ with } E \supset \Omega, \\ & \text{such that } F(\bar{\sigma}^*, \bar{\mathbf{C}}, \Omega) = F(\bar{\sigma}^*, \bar{\mathbf{C}}, E) \equiv \text{constant}, \text{ if and only if } \Omega \in \{E\}. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

We use $\{\bar{\mathbf{C}}\}$ to denote the set of $\bar{\mathbf{C}}$ that makes (38) valid. Then we can conclude from (38) that for the uniform elastic strain fields constrained to that induced by an ellipsoid, i.e., $F(\bar{\sigma}^*, \bar{\mathbf{C}}, E)$, from the specified uniform eigenstress $\bar{\sigma}^*$, the strong version of the Eshelby conjecture is true for a set $\{\bar{\mathbf{C}}\}$ of isotropic elastic tensors, which is associated with the set $\{\bar{\sigma}^*\}$ of the specified uniform eigenstresses. In this regard, we will show that the Lamé parameters λ, μ for the isotropic elastic tensor $\bar{\mathbf{C}}$ are determined by the eigenvalues k_1, k_3 of the specified uniform eigenstress $\bar{\sigma}^*$.

Then we turn to prove these three theorems.

3.1 Proof of Theorem 3.1

It can be directly derived from (32) that

$$\begin{aligned} N_{\Omega}(\mathbf{x}) &= \frac{q_2(\mathbf{x}) + \varphi_2(x_1, x_2) - q_1(\mathbf{x}) - \varphi_1(x_3)}{\eta - \gamma}, \\ \tilde{N}_{\Omega}(\mathbf{x}) &= \frac{\eta q_1(\mathbf{x}) + \eta \varphi_1(x_3) - \gamma q_2(\mathbf{x}) - \gamma \varphi_2(x_1, x_2)}{\eta - \gamma} \quad \mathbf{x} \in \Omega. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

By substituting (39)₁ into (13), we gain

$$\frac{\partial^2 \varphi_1(x_3)}{\partial x_3^2} + \frac{\partial^2 \varphi_2(x_1, x_2)}{\partial x_1^2} + \frac{\partial^2 \varphi_2(x_1, x_2)}{\partial x_2^2} = \text{constant}, \quad (40)$$

which indicates that $\varphi_1(x_3)$ is a constant, linear or quadratic function, and $\varphi_2(x_1, x_2)$ must satisfy

$$\Delta \varphi_2(x_1, x_2) = \text{constant}. \quad (41)$$

Up to now, it is straightforward to see that (39)₁ can be rewritten as

$$N_{\Omega}(\mathbf{x}) = q'(\mathbf{x}) + \varphi'(x_1, x_2) \quad \mathbf{x}' \in \Omega, \quad (42)$$

where $q'(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{q_2(\mathbf{x}) - q_1(\mathbf{x}) - \varphi_1(x_3)}{\eta - \gamma}$, and $\varphi'(x_1, x_2) := \frac{\varphi_2(x_1, x_2)}{\eta - \gamma}$.

Then we are going to derive (34) from (42). Since Ω is assumed to be convex, $\forall \mathbf{p} \in \partial\Omega$, there must be a supporting hyperplane $S^*(\mathbf{p})$ that passes through \mathbf{p} but does not intersect the interior of Ω , which means Ω is entirely on one side of $S^*(\mathbf{p})$. Hence, if we define \mathbf{n}_p as the normal vector of $S^*(\mathbf{p})$, which points outside Ω , we see that

$$\mathbf{n}_p \cdot (\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{y}) > 0, \quad \forall \mathbf{y} \in \Omega \text{ and } \mathbf{y} \neq \mathbf{p}, \quad (43)$$

and thus

$$\mathbf{n}_p \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} N_{\Omega}(\mathbf{x})|_{\mathbf{p}} = \int_{\Omega} \frac{\mathbf{n}_p \cdot (\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{y})}{4\pi|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{y}|^3} d\mathbf{y} > 0, \quad (44)$$

which indicates that $N_{\Omega}(\mathbf{x})$ always increases when \mathbf{x} moves from the interior of Ω to the exterior of Ω . Hence there must be a minimum point \mathbf{M} of $N_{\Omega}(\mathbf{x})$ inside Ω . Since $N_{\Omega}(\mathbf{x})$ is analytic inside Ω , we can expand $N_{\Omega}(\mathbf{x})$ into the Taylor series at \mathbf{M} and then take \mathbf{M} as the origin of a new Cartesian coordinate system $\mathbf{x}' = (x'_1, x'_2, x'_3)$, which yields

$$\begin{aligned} N_{\Omega}(\mathbf{x}') &= - \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{4\pi|\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{y}'|} d\mathbf{y}' \\ &= N_{\Omega}(0) + \mathbf{x}' \cdot \nabla \otimes \nabla N_{\Omega}(0) \cdot \mathbf{x}' + \varphi^0(\mathbf{x}') \quad \mathbf{x}' \in U(0), \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

where $\mathbf{y}' = (y'_1, y'_2, y'_3)$ are the coordinates of the point within Ω on the basis of the new coordinate system; $\varphi^0(\mathbf{x}')$ denotes the sum of the terms whose degree is larger than 2; and $U(0) \subset \Omega$ is the neighborhood of the origin. Note that $\nabla \otimes \nabla N_{\Omega}(0)$ is positive definite due to the origin being the minimum point of N_{Ω} .

It can be seen from (42) that in the new coordinate system $\mathbf{x}' = (x'_1, x'_2, x'_3)$,

$$N_\Omega(\mathbf{x}') = q'(\mathbf{x}') + \varphi'(x'_1, x'_2) \quad \mathbf{x}' \in \Omega. \quad (46)$$

Then we can expand the right-hand side of (46) into the Taylor series at the origin, which results in

$$N_\Omega(\mathbf{x}') = q^*(\mathbf{x}') + \varphi^*(x'_1, x'_2) \quad \mathbf{x}' \in U(0), \quad (47)$$

where $q^*(\mathbf{x}')$ is a quadratic function, and $\varphi^*(x'_1, x'_2)$ is the sum of the terms with respect to x'_1 and x'_2 whose degree is larger than 2.

Then comparison of (47) with (45) leads to

$$\varphi^*(x'_1, x'_2) = \varphi^0(\mathbf{x}') \quad (48)$$

and

$$q^*(\mathbf{x}') = N_\Omega(0) + \mathbf{x}' \cdot \nabla \otimes \nabla N_\Omega(0) \cdot \mathbf{x}'. \quad (49)$$

Let

$$q^0(x'_1, x'_2) := q'(\mathbf{x}') - q^*(\mathbf{x}'); \quad (50)$$

thus by substituting (49) and (50) into (46), we obtain

$$N_\Omega(\mathbf{x}') = N_\Omega(0) + \mathbf{x}' \cdot \nabla \otimes \nabla N_\Omega(0) \cdot \mathbf{x}' + q^0(x'_1, x'_2) + \varphi'(x'_1, x'_2) \quad \mathbf{x}' \in \Omega. \quad (51)$$

Let $\varphi''(x'_1, x'_2) := q^0(x'_1, x'_2) + \varphi'(x'_1, x'_2)$; it follows from (51) that

$$N_\Omega(\mathbf{x}') = N_\Omega(0) + \mathbf{x}' \cdot \nabla \otimes \nabla N_\Omega(0) \cdot \mathbf{x}' + \varphi''(x'_1, x'_2) \quad \mathbf{x}' \in \Omega. \quad (52)$$

Note that the term $\mathbf{x}' \cdot \nabla \otimes \nabla N_\Omega(0) \cdot \mathbf{x}'$ on the right-hand side of (52) needs to satisfy

$$\Delta(\mathbf{x}' \cdot \nabla \otimes \nabla N_\Omega(0) \cdot \mathbf{x}') = 1, \quad (53)$$

which is derived by substitution of (45) into (13)₁. Besides, we have already proved that $\mathbf{x}' \cdot \nabla \otimes \nabla N_\Omega(0) \cdot \mathbf{x}'$ is positive definite.

Then based on the above property of $\mathbf{x}' \cdot \nabla \otimes \nabla N_\Omega(0) \cdot \mathbf{x}'$, it is known from [32] that there must be an ellipsoid $E \subset \Omega$ satisfying

$$N_E(\mathbf{x}') = C^E + \mathbf{x}' \cdot \nabla \otimes \nabla N_\Omega(0) \cdot \mathbf{x}' \quad \mathbf{x}' \in E \quad (54)$$

with C^E a positive real constant.

Then substituting (54) into (52) yields

$$N_\Omega(\mathbf{x}') = N_E(\mathbf{x}') + \varphi(x'_1, x'_2) \quad \mathbf{x}' \in E, \quad (55)$$

where $\varphi(x'_1, x'_2) := \varphi''(x'_1, x'_2) + N_\Omega(0) - C^E$. Thus the proof of Theorem 3.1 is completed.

3.2 Proof of Theorem 3.2

First of all, because we are going to consider two elastic tensors, denoted by $\mathbf{C}^{(1)}$ and $\mathbf{C}^{(2)}$, all of the parameters, variables, and functions that correspond to $\mathbf{C}^{(1)}$ and $\mathbf{C}^{(2)}$ will be distinguished by the superscripts (1) and (2), respectively.

Since (32) holds for $(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^*, \mathbf{C}^{(1)})$ and $(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^*, \mathbf{C}^{(2)})$ simultaneously, it is derived from (32)₁ that for $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$,

$$\gamma^{(i)} N_\Omega(\mathbf{x}) + \tilde{N}_\Omega(\mathbf{x}) = q_1^{(i)}(\mathbf{x}) + \varphi_1^{(i)}(x_3) \quad i = 1, 2, \quad (56)$$

where

$$\gamma^{(i)} = \frac{[k_3(\lambda^{(i)} + \mu^{(i)}) - k_1(\lambda^{(i)} + 3\mu^{(i)})]}{(\lambda^{(i)} + \mu^{(i)})(k_1 - k_3)} \quad i = 1, 2; \quad (57)$$

$q_1^{(i)}(\mathbf{x})$ ($i = 1, 2$) are quadratic functions; and $\varphi_1^{(i)}(x_3)$ ($i = 1, 2$) have been proved to be constant, linear or quadratic functions in the above derivation.

According to Theorem 3.1, if Ω is convex, there exists an ellipsoid E such that (34) holds. Thus by substituting (34) into (56), we gain

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_2(x_1, x_2) &= \frac{q_1^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}) + \varphi_1^{(1)}(x_3) - [q_1^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}) + \varphi_1^{(2)}(x_3)]}{\gamma^{(1)} - \gamma^{(2)}} \\ &\quad - N_E(\mathbf{x}) \quad \mathbf{x} \in \Omega. \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

The validity of (58) calls for

$$\gamma^{(1)} \neq \gamma^{(2)}, \quad (59)$$

which requires

$$\lambda^{(1)}\mu^{(2)} - \lambda^{(2)}\mu^{(1)} \neq 0. \quad (60)$$

Note that (60) is satisfied owing to the linear independence of $\mathbf{C}^{(1)}$ and $\mathbf{C}^{(2)}$.

Since the Newtonian potential $N_E(\mathbf{x})$ of the ellipsoid E is a quadratic function of \mathbf{x} [30, 31], it is concluded from (58) that $\varphi_2(x_1, x_2)$ can only be a constant, linear or quadratic function of x_1, x_2 .

Given that $\varphi_2(x_1, x_2)$ can only be a constant, linear or quadratic function, we see that $N_\Omega(\mathbf{x})$ must be quadratic inside Ω due to (34). To further determine the shape of Ω , we resort to a powerful theorem, i.e.,

Theorem 3.4 *Let Ω be a bounded domain with a Lipschitz boundary. The relation*

$$N_\Omega(\mathbf{x}) = -\frac{1}{4\pi} \int_\Omega \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|} d\mathbf{y} = \text{quadratic} \quad \mathbf{x} \in \Omega \quad (61)$$

holds if and only if Ω is an ellipsoid [18].

Since we have proved that $N_\Omega(\mathbf{x})$ must be quadratic inside Ω , then according to Theorem 3.4, we conclude that Ω must be ellipsoidal. Thus Theorem 3.2 is proved for convex inclusions.

We note that even if the inclusion Ω is concave, we can also verify Theorem 3.2. It can be directly derived from (56) that

$$N_\Omega(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{q_1^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}) + \varphi_1^{(1)}(x_3) - [q_1^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}) + \varphi_1^{(2)}(x_3)]}{\gamma^{(1)} - \gamma^{(2)}} \quad \mathbf{x} \in \Omega. \quad (62)$$

Since (62) still indicates that $N_\Omega(\mathbf{x})$ must be quadratic inside Ω , then by Theorem 3.4, we draw the conclusion that Ω is of ellipsoid shape, which completes the proof of Theorem 3.2.

3.3 Proof of Theorem 3.3

According to the derivations from (10) to (32), Theorem 3.3 indicates that there exists an ellipsoid E satisfying $E \supset \Omega$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} [\gamma N_\Omega(\mathbf{x}) + \tilde{N}_\Omega(\mathbf{x})] &= \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} [\gamma N_E(\mathbf{x}) + \tilde{N}_E(\mathbf{x})] \quad i = 1, 2, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial x_3} [\eta N_\Omega(\mathbf{x}) + \tilde{N}_\Omega(\mathbf{x})] &= \frac{\partial}{\partial x_3} [\eta N_E(\mathbf{x}) + \tilde{N}_E(\mathbf{x})] \quad \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

where $\tilde{N}_E(\mathbf{x})$ is given by (31) with Ω replaced by E .

Let $E^* = \{t\mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{x} \in E, t > 0\}$, which is still large enough to contain Ω but intersects with Ω at $\mathbf{Q} = (Q_1, Q_2, Q_3)$. Then owing to the quadratic forms of $N_E(\mathbf{x})$ and $\tilde{N}_E(\mathbf{x})$, which can be explicitly calculated for any E , it is easy to verify that

$$N_{E^*}(\mathbf{x}) - N_E(\mathbf{x}) = \text{constant}, \quad \tilde{N}_{E^*}(\mathbf{x}) - \tilde{N}_E(\mathbf{x}) = \text{constant}, \quad (64)$$

substitution of which into (63) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} [\gamma N_{E^* \setminus \Omega}(\mathbf{x}) + \tilde{N}_{E^* \setminus \Omega}(\mathbf{x})] &= 0 \quad i = 1, 2, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial x_3} [\eta N_{E^* \setminus \Omega}(\mathbf{x}) + \tilde{N}_{E^* \setminus \Omega}(\mathbf{x})] &= 0 \quad \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} N_{E^* \setminus \Omega}(\mathbf{x}) &:= -\frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{E^* \setminus \Omega} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|} d\mathbf{y}, \\ \tilde{N}_{E^* \setminus \Omega}(\mathbf{x}) &:= -\frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{E^* \setminus \Omega} \frac{(x_3 - y_3)^2}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|^3} d\mathbf{y}. \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

Then we can choose an isotropic elastic tensor \mathbf{C} that leads to

$$\gamma = 0, \quad (67)$$

which requires

$$k_1(\lambda + 3\mu) = k_3(\lambda + \mu). \quad (68)$$

Under the condition that k_1 and k_3 have the same sign, it is easy to verify that there exist λ, μ that satisfy (3) such that (68) holds. Note that if k_1 and k_3 have opposite signs, (68) cannot be valid.

Then in terms of (67), it can be derived from (65) that

$$\begin{aligned} N_{E^* \setminus \Omega}(\mathbf{x}) &= \frac{1}{\eta} [\varphi_2(x_1, x_2) + C_2 - \varphi_1(x_3) - C_1], \\ \tilde{N}_{E^* \setminus \Omega}(\mathbf{x}) &= C_1 + \varphi_1(x_3) \quad \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

where C_1, C_2 denote two real constants, and φ_1, φ_2 still denote two unknown functions.

Let $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, n_2, n_3)$ denote the outward-pointing normal vector of ∂E^* at the point $\mathbf{Q} = (Q_1, Q_2, Q_3)$. Then it can be derived from (66)₂ that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla \tilde{N}_{E^* \setminus \Omega} \Big|_{\mathbf{Q}} &= -2n_3 \int_{E^* \setminus \Omega} \frac{(Q_3 - y_3)}{4\pi|\mathbf{Q} - \mathbf{y}|^3} d\mathbf{y} + 3 \int_{E^* \setminus \Omega} \frac{(Q_3 - y_3)^2 (\mathbf{Q} - \mathbf{y}) \cdot \mathbf{n}}{4\pi|\mathbf{Q} - \mathbf{y}|^5} d\mathbf{y} \\ &= -2n_3 \frac{\partial N_{E^* \setminus \Omega}}{\partial x_3} \Big|_{\mathbf{Q}} + 3 \int_{E^* \setminus \Omega} \frac{(Q_3 - y_3)^2 (\mathbf{Q} - \mathbf{y}) \cdot \mathbf{n}}{4\pi|\mathbf{Q} - \mathbf{y}|^5} d\mathbf{y}.\end{aligned}\quad (70)$$

We define a vector function \mathbf{F} , i.e.,

$$\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}) := 3 \int_{E^* \setminus \Omega} \frac{(x_3 - y_3)^2 (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})}{4\pi|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|^5} d\mathbf{y}, \quad (71)$$

and thus substituting (71) into (70) leads to

$$\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{F} \Big|_{\mathbf{Q}} = \left(\mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla \tilde{N}_{E^* \setminus \Omega} + 2n_3 \frac{\partial N_{E^* \setminus \Omega}}{\partial x_3} \right) \Big|_{\mathbf{Q}}. \quad (72)$$

Based on (72), we will make some arguments on the change of \mathbf{F} at \mathbf{Q} near the boundary ∂E^* , just like the arguments on a similar situation for the change of the Newtonian potential made by Kang and Milton [18].

Likewise, we consider two cases concerning the continuity of $\partial\Omega$.

3.3.1 $\partial\Omega$ possesses C^1 continuity

In this case, \mathbf{n} is also the outward-pointing normal vector of $\partial\Omega$ at \mathbf{Q} . Thus by substituting (69) into (72), we obtain

$$\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{F} \Big|_{\mathbf{Q}} = \left(\frac{2}{\eta} - 1 \right) n_3 \frac{\partial \varphi_1(x_3)}{\partial x_3} \Big|_{\mathbf{Q}}. \quad (73)$$

To analyze the change of \mathbf{F} at \mathbf{Q} via (73), we eliminate the unknown function $\varphi_1(x_3)$ on the right-hand side of (73) by letting

$$\eta = 2, \quad (74)$$

which requires

$$k_1(\lambda + \mu) = k_3(\mu - \lambda). \quad (75)$$

Note that for given eigenvalues k_1 and k_3 , (68) and (75) together determine a unique combination (λ, μ) of the Lamé parameters and thus a unique isotropic elastic tensor \mathbf{C} .

Then by substituting (74) into (73), we obtain

$$\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{F} \Big|_{\mathbf{Q}} = 0. \quad (76)$$

However, if $E^* \setminus \Omega$ is not empty, we see $(\mathbf{Q} - \mathbf{y}) \cdot \mathbf{n} \geq 0$, substitution of which into (71) yields

$$\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{F} \Big|_{\mathbf{Q}} = 3 \int_{E^* \setminus \Omega} \frac{(Q_3 - y_3)^2 (\mathbf{Q} - \mathbf{y}) \cdot \mathbf{n}}{4\pi|\mathbf{Q} - \mathbf{y}|^5} d\mathbf{y} > 0. \quad (77)$$

Since (77) contradicts (76), thus $E^* \setminus \Omega$ must be empty to avoid the contradiction, which leads to the conclusion $\Omega = E^*$.

Note that (73) is valid only when there are line segments $\{\mathbf{Q} \pm t\mathbf{n} \mid t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ belonging to Ω , which is obvious if $\partial\Omega$ is C^1 continuous.

3.3.2 $\partial\Omega$ possesses Lipschitz continuity

In this case, as is stated before, (73) may not hold since there may not be a line segment $\{\mathbf{Q} \pm t\mathbf{n} \mid t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ belonging to Ω . Hence there is an alternative way to proceed with the argument.

If $E^* \setminus \Omega$ is not empty, from (77), we know that the vector function \mathbf{F} at \mathbf{Q} must satisfy

$$\mathbf{F}|_{\mathbf{Q}} \neq \mathbf{0}. \quad (78)$$

Let L be a line passing through \mathbf{Q} and satisfying $L \cap \Omega \subset \Omega$. The direction of L is represented by \mathbf{v} . Since $\partial\Omega$ has Lipschitz continuity, there is a neighborhood \mathbf{V} in S^2 of \mathbf{v} , where S^2 denotes the unit sphere in \mathbb{R}^3 ; any line L^0 passing through \mathbf{Q} and possessing the direction of the vector in \mathbf{V} will lead to $L^0 \cap \Omega \subset \Omega$. Those lines are contained in a set denoted by $\{L^0\}$. Based on (78), we know that $\exists L^* \in \{L^0\}$, whose direction is \mathbf{v}^* , such that

$$\mathbf{v}^* \cdot \mathbf{F}|_{\mathbf{Q}} \neq 0. \quad (79)$$

However, since $L^* \in \{L^0\}$ so that $L^* \cap \Omega \subset \Omega$, there are line segments $\{\mathbf{Q} \pm t\mathbf{v}^* \mid t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ belonging to Ω , and thus (73) can still be valid with \mathbf{n} replaced by \mathbf{v}^* , which leads to

$$\mathbf{v}^* \cdot \mathbf{F}|_{\mathbf{Q}} = \left(\frac{2}{\eta} - 1\right) v_3^* \frac{\partial \phi_1(x_3)}{\partial x_3} \Big|_{\mathbf{Q}}. \quad (80)$$

Finally, by similarly letting (74) and then substituting (74) into (80), we obtain

$$\mathbf{v}^* \cdot \mathbf{F}|_{\mathbf{Q}} = 0, \quad (81)$$

which contradicts (79). Likewise, $E^* \setminus \Omega$ must be empty to avoid the contradiction so that $\Omega = E^*$. Therefore, the proof of Theorem 3.3 is fulfilled.

4 Conclusions

In this work, we have studied the strong version of the Eshelby conjecture in the context of three-dimensional isotropic elasticity, for the case where two of the eigenvalues of the eigenstress are identical and the other one is distinct. We have made progress towards the proof of the conjecture by presenting and proving three theorems. The first theorem gives a necessary condition for the Newtonian potential of convex inclusions possessing the Eshelby uniformity property, which can exclude non-ellipsoidal convex inclusions that do not satisfy the condition. In terms of the necessary condition, and by introducing the effect of the elastic constants of the isotropic medium, the second theorem indicates that there exist combinations of the elastic tensors and uniform eigenstresses such that only an ellipsoid can have the Eshelby uniformity property for these combinations simultaneously. The third theorem provides a more specifically constrained proof of the conjecture. It proves that for the uniform strain fields constrained to that induced by an ellipsoid from a set of the specified uniform eigenstress, the strong version of the Eshelby conjecture is true for a set of isotropic elastic tensors which are associated with the specified uniform eigenstress.

Acknowledgements

The authors sincerely thank Professor Liping Liu of Rutgers University for helpful discussions. The authors also acknowledge the support of the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant 11521202.

Appendix

Appendix. A proof of the strong version for the eigenstress possessing either all distinct or all identical eigenvalues by using Fourier analysis

We are going to prove the strong version for the eigenstress possessing either all distinct or all identical eigenvalues through an alternative method, i.e., the Fourier analysis, which is somehow more concise than the method proposed by Ammari et al. [28].

We then consider the two cases concerning the eigenvalues, separately.

(1) σ^* has three identical eigenvalues

Assume Ω possesses the Eshelby uniformity property; thus (7) holds. Let $\sigma_{11}^* = \sigma_{22}^* = \sigma_{33}^* = k$. Then by substituting $\sigma_{11}^* = \sigma_{22}^* = \sigma_{33}^* = k$ along with (6) and (8) into (7) and then substituting (7) into (12), we obtain

$$\nabla \otimes \mathbf{u} = \frac{k}{\lambda + 2\mu} \nabla \otimes \nabla N_{\Omega}(\mathbf{x}) = \text{constant} \quad \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

which indicates that $N_{\Omega}(\mathbf{x})$ must be quadratic inside Ω . Then by resorting to Theorem 3.4, we conclude that Ω must be ellipsoidal.

(2) σ^* has three distinct eigenvalues

Likewise, assume Ω possesses the Eshelby uniformity property; thus (7) holds. Let $\sigma_{11}^* = k_1, \sigma_{22}^* = k_2, \sigma_{33}^* = k_3$ with $k_1 \neq k_2, k_2 \neq k_3, k_3 \neq k_1$. Then by substituting $\sigma_{11}^* = k_1, \sigma_{22}^* = k_2, \sigma_{33}^* = k_3$ along with (6) and (8) into (7), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \forall j = 1, 2, 3, \quad & \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{\xi_1 \xi_j}{\mu} \left(\frac{k_1}{|\xi|^2} - \frac{\lambda + \mu}{\lambda + 2\mu} \frac{k_1 \xi_1^2 + k_2 \xi_2^2 + k_3 \xi_3^2}{|\xi|^4} \right) g(\mathbf{x}, \xi) d\xi = \text{constant}; \\ & \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{\xi_2 \xi_j}{\mu} \left(\frac{k_2}{|\xi|^2} - \frac{\lambda + \mu}{\lambda + 2\mu} \frac{k_1 \xi_1^2 + k_2 \xi_2^2 + k_3 \xi_3^2}{|\xi|^4} \right) g(\mathbf{x}, \xi) d\xi = \text{constant}; \\ & \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{\xi_3 \xi_j}{\mu} \left(\frac{k_3}{|\xi|^2} - \frac{\lambda + \mu}{\lambda + 2\mu} \frac{k_1 \xi_1^2 + k_2 \xi_2^2 + k_3 \xi_3^2}{|\xi|^4} \right) g(\mathbf{x}, \xi) d\xi = \text{constant} \quad \mathbf{x} \in \Omega. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

It can be derived from (A.2) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{\xi_1 \xi_2 (k_1 - k_2)}{|\xi|^2} g(\mathbf{x}, \xi) d\xi = \text{constant}; \\ & \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{\xi_2 \xi_3 (k_2 - k_3)}{|\xi|^2} g(\mathbf{x}, \xi) d\xi = \text{constant}; \\ & \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{\xi_3 \xi_1 (k_3 - k_1)}{|\xi|^2} g(\mathbf{x}, \xi) d\xi = \text{constant} \quad \mathbf{x} \in \Omega. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

We note that the integrals on the left-hand side of (A.3) are exactly the second derivatives of the Newtonian potential $N_\Omega(\mathbf{x})$, i.e.,

$$\frac{\partial^2 N_\Omega(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_p \partial x_l} = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{\xi_j \xi_l}{|\boldsymbol{\xi}|^2} g(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\xi}) d\boldsymbol{\xi}, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

which can be derived from (12).

Since $k_1 \neq k_2$, $k_2 \neq k_3$, $k_3 \neq k_1$, by comparing (A.3) with (A.4), we see

$$\forall i \neq j, \quad \frac{\partial^2 N_\Omega(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} = \text{constant} \quad \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

which implies

$$N_\Omega(\mathbf{x}) = q(\mathbf{x}) + \psi_1(x_1) + \psi_2(x_2) + \psi_3(x_3) \quad \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where q denotes a quadratic function, and $\psi_i (i = 1, 2, 3)$ denote unknown functions.

By substituting (A.6) into (13)₁, we gain

$$\frac{\partial^2 \psi_1(x_1)}{\partial x_1^2} + \frac{\partial^2 \psi_2(x_2)}{\partial x_2^2} + \frac{\partial^2 \psi_3(x_3)}{\partial x_3^2} = \text{constant}. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Hence $\psi_i (i = 1, 2, 3)$ must be constant, linear or quadratic functions, and thus the Newtonian potential $N_\Omega(\mathbf{x})$ in (A.6) must be quadratic. Likewise, according to Theorem 3.4, we conclude that Ω must be ellipsoidal.

References

- [1] Eshelby, J.D.: The determination of the elastic field of an ellipsoidal inclusion, and related problems. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A. Mathematical and Physical Sciences.* **241**, 376–396 (1957)
- [2] Eshelby, J.D.: The elastic field outside an ellipsoidal inclusion. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A. Mathematical and Physical Sciences.* **252**, 561–569 (1959)
- [3] Mura, T.: *Micromechanics of Defects in Solids.* Springer Netherlands, Leiden (1987)
- [4] Wang, B.: Three-dimensional analysis of an ellipsoidal inclusion in a piezoelectric material. *International Journal of Solids and Structures.* **29**, 293–308 (1992)
- [5] Jiang, B., Fang, D.N., Hwang, K.: The effective properties of piezocomposites, part I: Single inclusion problem. *Acta Mechanica Sinica.* **13**, 339–346 (1997)
- [6] Li, J.Y., Dunn, M.L.: Anisotropic coupled-field inclusion and inhomogeneity problems. *Philosophical Magazine A.* **77**, 1341–1350 (1998)
- [7] Sharma, P., Ganti, S., Bhate, N.: Effect of surfaces on the size-dependent elastic state of nano-inhomogeneities. *Applied Physics Letters.* **82**, 535–537 (2003)

- [8] Sharma, P., Ganti, S.: Size-dependent Eshelby's tensor for embedded nano-inclusions incorporating surface/interface energies. *Journal of Applied Mechanics-Transactions of the ASME*. **71**, 663–671 (2004)
- [9] Sharma, P., Wheeler, L.: Size-dependent elastic state of ellipsoidal nano-inclusions incorporating surface/interface tension. *Journal of Applied Mechanics-Transactions of the ASME*. **74**, 447–454 (2007)
- [10] Duan, H.L., Wang, J.X., Huang, Z.P., et al.: Eshelby formalism for nano-inhomogeneities. *Proceedings of the Royal Society a-Mathematical Physical and Engineering Sciences*. **461**, 3335–3353 (2005)
- [11] Lim, C., Li, Z., He, L.: Size dependent, non-uniform elastic field inside a nano-scale spherical inclusion due to interface stress. *International Journal of Solids and Structures*. **43**, 5055–5065 (2006)
- [12] Tian, L., Rajapakse, R.: Elastic field of an isotropic matrix with a nanoscale elliptical inhomogeneity. *International Journal of Solids and Structures*. **44**, 7988–8005 (2007)
- [13] Ma, H.S., Hu, G.K., Wei, Y. G., et al.: Inclusion problem in second gradient elasticity. *International Journal of Engineering Science*. **132**, 60–78 (2018)
- [14] Style, R.W., Wettlaufer, J.S., Dufresne, E.R.: Surface tension and the mechanics of liquid inclusions in compliant solids. *Soft Matter*. **11**, 672–679 (2015)
- [15] Ti, F., Chen, X., Yang, H.Q., et al.: A theory of mechanobiological sensation: strain amplification/attenuation of coated liquid inclusion with surface tension. *Acta Mechanica Sinica*. **37**, 145–155 (2021)
- [16] Eshelby, J.D.: Elastic inclusions and inhomogeneities. In: *Progress in solid mechanics II* (eds I. N. Sneddon, R. Hill), pp. 89–140. North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam (1961)
- [17] Liu, L.P.: Solutions to the Eshelby conjectures. *Proceedings of the Royal Society a-Mathematical Physical and Engineering Sciences*. **464**, 573–594 (2008)
- [18] Kang, H., Milton, G.W.: Solutions to the pólya-szegő conjecture and the weak Eshelby conjecture. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*. **188**, 93–116 (2008)
- [19] Xu, B.X., Zhao, Y.T., Gross, D., et al.: Proof of the strong Eshelby conjecture for plane and anti-plane anisotropic inclusion problems. *Journal of Elasticity*. **97**, 173–188 (2009)
- [20] Yuan, T.Y., Huang, K.F., Wang, J.X.: Solutions to the generalized Eshelby conjecture for anisotropic media: Proofs of the weak version and counter-examples to the high-order and the strong versions. *Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids*. **158**, 104648 (2022)
- [21] Wang, B., Li, H.G., Bao, J.G.: Determination of the insulated inclusion in conductivity problem and related Eshelby conjecture. *Journal of Differential Equations*. **257**, 4503–4524 (2014)
- [22] Sendeckyj, G.P.: Elastic inclusion problems in plane elastostatics. *International Journal of Solids and Structures*. **6**, 1535–1543 (1970)

- [23] Ru, C.Q., Schiavone, P.: On the elliptic inclusion in anti-plane shear. *Mathematics and Mechanics of Solids*. **1**, 327–333 (1996)
- [24] Vigdergauz, S.: Constant-stress inclusions in an elastic plate. *Mathematics and Mechanics of Solids*. **5**, 265–279 (2000)
- [25] Markenscoff, X.: On the shape of the Eshelby inclusions. *Journal of Elasticity*. **49**, 163–166 (1997)
- [26] Lubarda, V.A., Markenscoff, X.: On the absence of Eshelby property for non-ellipsoidal inclusions. *International Journal of Solids and Structures*. **35**, 3405–3411 (1998)
- [27] Markenscoff, X.: Inclusions with constant eigenstress. *Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids*. **46**, 2297–2301 (1998)
- [28] Ammari, H., Capdeboscq, Y., Kang, H., et al.: Progress on the strong Eshelby’s conjecture and extremal structures for the elastic moment tensor. *Journal De Mathematiques Pures Et Appliquees*. **94**, 93–106 (2010)
- [29] Han, Q.: *A Basic Course in Partial Differential Equations*. American Mathematical Society, Providence (2012)
- [30] Ferrers, N.M.: On the potentials of ellipsoids, ellipsoidal shells, elliptic laminae and elliptic rings of variable densities. *The Quarterly Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics*. **14**, 1–22 (1877)
- [31] Dyson, F.: The potentials of ellipsoids of variable densities. *The Quarterly Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics*. **25**, 259–288 (1891)
- [32] Benedetto, E.D., Friedman, A.: Bubble growth in porous media. *Indiana University Mathematics Journal*. **35**, 573–606 (1986)