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ABSTRACT
In this paper, we consider the inverse problem of recovering an isotropic elastic tensor from the Neumann-to-Dirichlet map. To this end, we prove a Lipschitz stability estimate. The proof relies on a monotonicity result combined with the techniques of localized potentials. To numerically solve the inverse problem, we propose a Kohn-Vogelius-type cost functional over a class of admissible parameters subject to two boundary value problems. The reformulation of the minimization problem as a suitable saddle point problem allows us to obtain the optimality conditions by using differentiability properties of the min-sup formulation. The reconstruction is then performed by means of an iterative algorithm based on a quasi-Newton method. Finally, we give and discuss several numerical examples.
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1. Introduction

In this paper, we consider the inverse problem of recovering the elastic tensor \( C \) of a linear isotropic elastic body from the Neumann-to-Dirichlet operator \( \Lambda(C) \). The main motivations of this problem are non-destructive testing of elastic structures for material impurities, exploration geophysics, and medical diagnosis, in particular detection of potential tumors via a medical imaging modality called elastography. Elastography is concerned with the reconstruction of the elastic properties in biological tissues and the present article aims at giving access to these features.

From the theoretical point of view, the inverse problem of recovering \( C \) (or the Lamé moduli \( \lambda, \mu \); cf. [2]) has been studied by several authors. In the two dimensional case Ikehata [1] proves that the deflection \( h \) between \((\lambda+h, \mu+h)\) and \((\lambda, \mu)\) can be uniquely determined by the first-order approximation of the Dirichlet-to-Neumann operator. Akamatsu, Nakamura and Steinberg [2], give an inversion formula for the normal derivatives at the boundary of the Lamé coefficients \( \lambda, \mu \in C^\infty \) from the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map. At the same time they present stability estimates for the boundary...
values of $\lambda, \mu$. Nakamura and Uhlmann [3] established that the Lamé coefficients are uniquely determined from the Dirichlet-to-Neumann operator, assuming that they are sufficiently close to a pair of positive constants. Imanuvilov and Yamamoto [4] proved that the Lamé coefficient $\lambda$ can be recovered from partial Cauchy data if the coefficient $\mu$ is some positive constant. A global uniqueness result for recovering $\mathbb{C}$ on the boundary can be found in [5].

For the three dimensional case, Nakamura and Uhlmann [6,7] and Eskin and Ralston [8] proved uniqueness results for both Lamé coefficients when $\mu$ is assumed to be close to a positive constant. The proofs in the above papers rely on the construction of complex geometric optics solutions. For a partial data version, uniqueness for recovering piecewise constant Lamé parameters was proved in [9,10], and some boundary determination results were shown in [5,6,11]. For fully anisotropic $\mathbb{C}$, uniqueness was proved in [12] for a piecewise homogeneous medium. Isakov, Wang and Yamamoto [13], proved Hölder and Lipschitz stability estimates of determining all coefficients of a dynamical Lamé system with residual stress, including the density Lamé parameters, and the residual stress, by three pairs of observations from the whole boundary or from a part of it.

In this paper, we prove a Lipschitz stability result when the Lamé coefficient $\lambda$ is piecewise continuous, $\mu$ is Lipschitz and a definiteness assumption holds. Our approach relies on the monotonicity of the Neumann-to-Dirichlet operator with respect to the elastic tensor and the techniques of localized potentials [14–30]. For the numerical solution, we reformulate the inverse problem into a minimization problem using a Kohn-Vogelius type cost functional, and use a quasi-Newton method which employs the analytic gradient of the cost function and the approximation of the inverse Hessian is updated by a BFGS (Broyden, Fletcher, Goldfarb, Shanno) scheme [31].

Let us give some more remarks on the relation of this work to previous results. Stability for inverse coefficient problems are derived in general from technically challenging approaches involving Carleman estimates or complex geometrical optics solutions [6,17,32,33]. Our approach on proving a Lipschitz stability result is relatively simple and easy to extend to other settings, and has already led to new results on uniqueness and Lipschitz stability in EIT with finitely many electrodes [34] as well as for the inverse Robin transmission problem [35] and on the stability in machine learning reconstruction algorithms [36] under a definiteness assumption.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we introduce the forward as well as the Neumann-to-Dirichlet operator. Section 3 and 4 contain the main theoretical tools for this work. In section 3, we show a monotonicity result between the Lamé parameters and the Neumann-to-Dirichlet operator and deduce the existence of localized potentials. Then, we prove the Lipschitz stability estimate. In section 4, we introduce the minimization problem and compute the first order optimality condition using the framework of the min-sup differentiability. In the last section, satisfactory numerical results for two-dimensional problems are presented to illustrate the efficiency of the approach.

2. Problem formulation

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ($d \geq 2$), be a bounded and connected open set, occupied by an isotropic material with linear stress-strain relation. The boundary $\partial \Omega$, is assumed to be $C^{1,1}$ and consists of two disjoints parts, the fixed "Dirichlet-boundary" (zero displacements) $\Gamma_D$
and the "Neumann-boundary" (application of surface load) $\Gamma_N$:

$$\partial \Omega = \Gamma_N \cup \Gamma_D, \quad \Gamma_N \cap \Gamma_D = \emptyset.$$ 

We denote the surface loads by $g \in L^2(\Gamma_N)^d$. Then the displacement vector $u : \overline{\Omega} \to \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfies the following boundary value problem:

$$
\begin{cases}
-\text{div}(C \hat{\nabla} u) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\
(C \hat{\nabla} u)\nu = g & \text{on } \Gamma_N, \\
u = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_D,
\end{cases}
$$

(1)

where $\nu$ is the outer unit normal vector to $\partial \Omega$. The linearized strain tensor $\hat{\nabla} u$ and the stress tensor $C \hat{\nabla} u$ are given by

$$
\hat{\nabla} u = \frac{1}{2} \left( \nabla u + (\nabla u)^T \right), \quad C \hat{\nabla} u = \left( \sum_{k,l=1}^{d} C_{ijkl} \frac{\partial u_k}{\partial x_l} \right)_{1 \leq i,j \leq d}.
$$

The isotropic elastic tensor is defined as

$$
C_{ijkl} := \lambda \delta_{ij} \delta_{kl} + \mu (\delta_{ik} \delta_{jl} + \delta_{il} \delta_{jk}),
$$

(2)

where $\lambda, \mu$ are the Lamé coefficients and can be written as

$$
C := \lambda I \otimes I + 2\mu \mathbb{I}
$$

with $I := \delta_{ij} e_i \otimes e_j$ and $\mathbb{I} := \frac{1}{2} (\delta_{ik} \delta_{jl} + \delta_{il} \delta_{jk}) e_i \otimes e_j \otimes e_k \otimes e_l$. The vector $(e_1, \ldots, e_d)$ being the canonical basis of $\mathbb{R}^d$ and $\otimes$ denoting the tensor product between vectors in $\mathbb{R}^d$.

Next, we take a look at the unique continuation principle and state it in accordance with [37]:

**Theorem 2.1.** Let $\Omega'$ be a connected open set containing 0 in $\mathbb{R}^d$ for $d \geq 2$. (Especially we apply the case $\Omega' = \Omega$ in this paper.) Let $\mu(x) \in C^{0,1}(\Omega')$ and $\lambda(x) \in L^\infty(\Omega')$ satisfy:

$$
\mu(x) \geq \delta_0, \quad \lambda(x) + 2\mu(x) \geq \delta_0 \quad \text{a.e. } x \in \Omega',
$$

$$
\|\mu\|_{C^{0,1}(\Omega')} + \|\lambda\|_{L^\infty(\Omega')} \leq M_0,
$$

with positive constants $\delta_0, M_0$, where we define $\|f\|_{C^{0,1}(\Omega')} = \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega')} + \|\nabla f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega')}$. Then any nontrivial solution $u$ of

$$
-\text{div}(C \hat{\nabla} u) = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega',
$$

satisfies the (strong) unique continuation property (UCP) that is $u$ can only vanish at finite order at any point of $\Omega'$.

For given constants $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_1$ satisfying $0 < \alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2$, $0 < \beta_1 \leq \beta_2$, we define the set of admissible elastic tensor by

$$
\mathcal{A} = \{ C = C(\lambda, \mu) : (\lambda, \mu) \in L^\infty(\Omega) \times C^{0,1}(\Omega), \quad \alpha_1 \leq \lambda \leq \alpha_2, \quad \beta_1 \leq \mu \leq \beta_2 \}.
$$
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Hence, the Lamé parameters of every $C(\lambda, \mu) \in A$ satisfy the conditions of Theorem 2.1.

In what follows, we denote $A : B = \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} a_{ij} b_{ij}$, for matrices $A = (a_{ij})$ and $B = (b_{ij})$.

The weak formulation of problem (1) reads as follows

$$\int_{\Omega} C \hat{\nabla} u : \hat{\nabla} v dx = \int_{\Gamma_N} g \cdot v ds \quad \text{for all } v \in \mathcal{V},$$

where

$$\mathcal{V} := \left\{ v \in H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) : v|_{\Gamma_D} = 0 \right\}.$$

It is easy to see that for each $C \in A$, problem (3) has a unique solution $u \in \mathcal{V}$, which follows by the Lax-Milgram theorem and is shown, e.g., in [38] for the time-dependent elastic wave equation.

We introduce the Neumann-to-Dirichlet operator $\Lambda(C)$:

$$\Lambda(C) : L^2(\Gamma_N; \mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow L^2(\Gamma_N; \mathbb{R}^d) : g \mapsto u_{|\Gamma_N}.$$

It is well known that $\Lambda(C)$ is a self-adjoint compact linear operator. The associated bilinear form is given by:

$$\langle g, \Lambda(C)h \rangle = \int_{\Omega} C \hat{\nabla} u^g_C : \hat{\nabla} u^h_C dx,$$

where $u^g_C$ solves the elastic wave equation (1) and $u^h_C$ the corresponding problem with boundary load $h$.

The inverse problem we consider here is the following:

$$\text{Find } C \text{ or } (\lambda, \mu) \text{ knowing } \langle g, \Lambda(C)g \rangle.$$

(4)

3. Monotonicity, localized potentials and Lipschitz stability

In this section, we show a monotonicity estimate between the elastic tensor and the Neumann-to-Dirichlet operator and the existence of localized potentials. Then we deduce a Lipschitz stability estimate.

Lemma 3.1 (Monotonicity estimate). Let $C_1 := C(\lambda_1, \mu_1), C_2 := C(\lambda_2, \mu_2) \in A, g \in L^2(\Gamma_N; \mathbb{R}^d)$ be an applied boundary load, and let $u_1 := u^g_{C_1}, u_2 := u^g_{C_2} \in \mathcal{V}$. Then

$$\int_{\Omega} (C_1 - C_2) \hat{\nabla} u_2 : \hat{\nabla} u_2 dx \geq \langle g, \Lambda(C_2)g \rangle - \langle g, \Lambda(C_1)g \rangle \geq \int_{\Omega} (C_1 - C_2) \hat{\nabla} u_1 : \hat{\nabla} u_1 dx.$$

(5)
Proof. From the variational equation, we get

\[ \int_{\Omega} C_1 \nabla u_1 : \nabla u_2 \, dx = \langle g, \Lambda(C_2)g \rangle = \int_{\Omega} C_2 \nabla u_2 : \nabla u_2 \, dx. \]

Thus

\[ \int_{\Omega} C_1 (u_1 - u_2) : \nabla (u_1 - u_2) \, dx = \int_{\Omega} C_1 \nabla u_1 : \nabla u_1 \, dx + \int_{\Omega} C_1 \nabla u_2 : \nabla u_2 \, dx \]

\[ - 2 \int_{\Omega} C_1 \nabla u_1 : \nabla u_2 \, dx \]

\[ = \langle g, \Lambda(C_1)g \rangle - \langle g, \Lambda(C_2)g \rangle + \int_{\Omega} (C_1 - C_2) \nabla u_2 : \nabla u_2 \, dx. \]

Since the left-hand side is nonnegative, the first asserted inequality follows. Interchanging \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \), we obtain

\[ \langle g, \Lambda(C_2)g \rangle - \langle g, \Lambda(C_1)g \rangle = \int_{\Omega} C_2 \nabla (u_2 - u_1) : \nabla (u_2 - u_1) \, dx \]

\[ + \int_{\Omega} (C_1 - C_2) \nabla u_1 : \nabla u_1 \, dx. \]

Since the first integral on the right-hand side is nonnegative, the second asserted inequality follows. \( \square \)

Corollary 3.2 (Monotonicity). For \( C_1 := C(\lambda_1, \mu_1), C_2 := C(\lambda_2, \mu_2) \in \mathcal{A} \)

\[ \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \text{ and } \mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \quad \text{implies} \quad \Lambda(C_1) \geq \Lambda(C_2). \quad (6) \]

Theorem 3.3 (Localized potentials). Let \( C \in \mathcal{A} \) and \( D_1, D_2 \subseteq \overline{\Omega} \) be two open sets with \( D_1 \cap D_2 = \emptyset \) and \( \Omega \setminus (D_1 \cup D_2) \) is connected. Then there exists a sequence \((g_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset L^2(\Gamma_N, \mathbb{R}^d)\), such that the corresponding solutions \((u^{(g_n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\) of (1) fulfill

\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} \int_{D_1} \left( \text{div} \, u^{(g_n)} \right)^2 \, dx = \infty, \quad (7) \]

\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} \int_{D_2} \left( \text{div} \, u^{(g_n)} \right)^2 \, dx = 0, \quad (8) \]

\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} \int_{D_1} \nabla u^{(g_n)} : \nabla u^{(g_n)} \, dx = \infty, \quad (9) \]

\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} \int_{D_2} \nabla u^{(g_n)} : \nabla u^{(g_n)} \, dx = 0. \quad (10) \]

Proof. We first repeat the following unique continuation property (Theorem 2.1). For every open connected subset \( U \subseteq \Omega \) only the trivial solution of

\[ \text{div}(C \nabla u) = 0 \quad \text{in} \ U, \]

vanishes on an open subset of \( U \) or possesses zero Cauchy data on a smooth, open part \( \partial U \). For essentially bounded \( \lambda \) and Lipschitz \( \mu \), this property is proven in [37]. We define the virtual measurement operators
(a) $A_j$ ($j = 1, 2$) by

$$A_j : L^2(D_j, \mathbb{R}^d) \to L^2(\Gamma_N)^d, \quad F \mapsto v|_{\Gamma_N},$$

where $v \in \mathcal{V}$ solves

$$\int_{\Omega} \mathcal{C} \nabla v : \nabla w \, dx = \int_{D_j} F \cdot \text{div} \, w \, dx \quad \text{for all } w \in \mathcal{V}, \quad (11)$$

(b) $B_j$ ($j = 1, 2$) by

$$B_j : L^2(D_j, \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}) \to L^2(\Gamma_N)^d, \quad G \mapsto v|_{\Gamma_N},$$

where $v \in \mathcal{V}$ solves

$$\int_{\Omega} \mathcal{C} \nabla v : \nabla w \, dx = \int_{D_j} G : \nabla w \, dx \quad \text{for all } w \in \mathcal{V}. \quad (12)$$

First, we show that the dual operators

$$A'_{j} : L^2(\Gamma_N)^d \to L^2(D_j, \mathbb{R}^d), \quad j = 1, 2,$$

$$B'_{j} : L^2(\Gamma_N)^d \to L^2(D_j, \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}), \quad j = 1, 2,$$

are given by $A'_{j} g = \text{div}(u)|_{D_j}$ and $B'_{j} g = \mathcal{N}(u)|_{D_j}$, where $u$ solves problem (1).

To (a): Let $F \in H^1(\Omega)'$, $g \in L^2(\Gamma_N)^d$, $u, v \in H^1(\Omega)^d$ solve (1) and (11), respectively. Then,

$$(F, A'_{j} g) = (g, A_j F) = \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{C} \nabla v : \nabla u \, dx = (F, \text{div}(v)|_{D_j}).$$

To (b): Let $G \in (H^1(\Omega)')^{d \times d}$, $g \in L^2(\Gamma_N)^d$, $u, v \in H^1(\Omega)^d$ solve (1) and (12), respectively. Then,

$$(G, B'_{j} g) = (g, B_j G) = \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{C} \nabla v : \nabla u \, dx = (G, \mathcal{N}(v)|_{D_j}).$$

Now the assertion is equivalent to show the following range (non)inclusion

$$\mathcal{R}(A_1) \not\subseteq \mathcal{R}(B_2) \quad (13)$$

(see, e.g., [26], Corollary 2.6) to show that (7) and (10) hold simultaneously.

Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{R}(A_1) \cap \mathcal{R}(B_2)$. Then there exist $v_1, v_2 \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $v_1|_{\Gamma_N} = v_2|_{\Gamma_N} = \varphi$, and

$$\int_{\Omega} \mathcal{C} \nabla v_j : \nabla w \, dx = \int_{\Omega} \lambda \nabla \cdot v_j \nabla \cdot w + \int_{\Omega} 2\mu \nabla v_j : \nabla w \, dx = 0$$

for all $w \in \mathcal{V}$ with supp($w$) $\subset \overline{\Omega} \setminus D_j$, $j = 1, 2$. 
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In particular
\[
\begin{cases}
\text{div}(C \nabla v_1) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega \setminus D_1, \\
\text{div}(C \nabla v_2) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega \setminus D_2,
\end{cases}
\]
and \((C \nabla v_1)\nu|_{\Gamma_N} = (C \nabla v_2)\nu|_{\Gamma_N} = 0\). The unique continuation principle (Theorem 2.1) yields that \(v_1 = v_2\) in \(\Omega \setminus (D_1 \cup D_2)\). Hence \(v := v_1\chi_{\Omega \setminus D_1} + v_2\chi_{\Omega \setminus D_2} \in \mathcal{V}\) and satisfies
\[
\begin{cases}
\text{div}(C \nabla v) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\
(C \nabla v)\nu = 0 & \text{in } \Gamma_N.
\end{cases}
\]

It follows that \(v = 0\) and thus \(\varphi = v|_{\Gamma_N} = 0\), and consequently \(\mathcal{R}(A_1) \cap \mathcal{R}(B_2) = \{0\}\). Finally, using unique continuation (Theorem 2.1) again, we obtain that \(A_1'\) is injective, so that \(\mathcal{R}(A_1)\) is dense in \(L^2(\Gamma_N)^d\). A fortiori, \(\mathcal{R}(A_1) \neq \{0\}\), which, together with \(\mathcal{R}(A_1) \cap \mathcal{R}(B_2) = \{0\}\), proves \([13]\) and hence, \([7]\) as well as \([10]\) are proved so that there exists a sequence \((g_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\) such that
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \int_{D_1} \left( \text{div} u^{(g_n)} \right)^2 dx = \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \to \infty} \int_{D_2} \nabla u^{(g_n)} : \nabla u^{(g_n)} dx = 0.
\]

Further, we immediately obtain that \([7]\) implicates \([9]\). In addition, since we can rewrite \([8]\) as
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \int_{D_2} \left( \text{tr} \left( \nabla u^{(g_n)} \right) \right)^2 dx,
\]
we get the limit relation \([8]\) directly from \([10]\).

All in all, this leads to the desired result
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \int_{D_1} \left( \text{div} u^{(g_n)} \right)^2 dx = \infty \quad \lim_{n \to \infty} \int_{D_2} \left( \text{div} u^{(g_n)} \right)^2 dx = 0
\]
\[
\downarrow \quad \text{and} \quad \uparrow
\]
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \int_{D_1} \nabla u^{(g_n)} : \nabla u^{(g_n)} dx = \infty \quad \lim_{n \to \infty} \int_{D_2} \nabla u^{(g_n)} : \nabla u^{(g_n)} dx = 0
\]

Next, we go over to the background of the Lipschitz stability and introduce the definition of piecewise continuous functions.

**Definition 3.4.** A function \(f \in L^\infty(\Omega)\) is called piecewise continuous, if there exists a finite decomposition \(\overline{\Omega} = \overline{\Omega}_1 \cup \ldots \cup \overline{\Omega}_n\), \(\Omega_i \cap \Omega_j = \emptyset\ (i \neq j)\), so that \(f\) is defined throughout \(\Omega\) and is continuous on each open subset \(\Omega_i\) for \(i = 1, \ldots, n\).
Given a finite dimensional subset $\mathcal{F}$ of $\hat{C}(\Omega) \times C^{0,1}(\Omega)$, where $\hat{C}(\Omega)$ is the space of piecewise continuous functions. We consider four constants $0 < a \leq b$ and $0 < c \leq d$ and define the sets

$$\mathcal{F}_{[a,b] \times [c,d]} = \{(\lambda, \mu) \in \mathcal{F} : a \leq \lambda(x) \leq b, \ c \leq \mu(x) \leq d \text{ for all } x \in \Omega\},$$

$$\mathcal{E} = \{C(\lambda, \mu) : (\lambda, \mu) \in \mathcal{F}_{[a,b] \times [c,d]}\}.$$

In the following main result of this paper, the domain $\Omega$, the finite-dimensional subset $\mathcal{F}$ and the bounds $0 < a \leq b$ and $0 < c \leq d$ are fixed, and the constant in the Lipschitz stability result will depend on them.

**Theorem 3.5** (Lipschitz stability). There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $C_1 := C(\lambda_1, \mu_1), C_2 := C(\lambda_2, \mu_2) \in \mathcal{E}$ we have

$$d_{\Omega}(C_1, C_2) := \max \left( \|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}, \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \right) \leq C \|\Lambda(C_1) - \Lambda(C_2)\|_*, \quad (14)$$

provided that $\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 \leq 0$ and $\mu_1 - \mu_2 \leq 0$ or $\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 \geq 0$ and $\mu_1 - \mu_2 \geq 0$. Here $\|\cdot\|_*$ is the natural norm of $\|\cdot\|_{L^2(\Gamma_N; \mathbb{R}^d)}$.

**Remark 1.** Denote

$$\mathcal{S}_+ = \{(\lambda_1, \mu_1), (\lambda_2, \mu_2) : (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2) \geq 0 \text{ and } (\mu_1 - \mu_2) \geq 0\},$$

$$\mathcal{S}_- = \{(\lambda_1, \mu_1), (\lambda_2, \mu_2) : (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2) \leq 0 \text{ and } (\mu_1 - \mu_2) \leq 0\}.$$

By setting $\mathcal{F} = \text{span}(\mathcal{S}_+)$ or $\mathcal{F} = \text{span}(\mathcal{S}_-)$, the estimate $[14]$ implies that for all $C_1 := C(\lambda_1, \mu_1), C_2 := C(\lambda_2, \mu_2) \in \mathcal{E}$,

$$\Lambda(C_1) = \Lambda(C_2) \text{ if and only if } C_1 = C_2.$$

**Proof.** For the sake of brevity, we write $\|\cdot\|$ for $\|\cdot\|_{L^2(\Gamma_N; \mathbb{R}^d)}$ and $\|\cdot\|_*$. Since $\Lambda(C_1)$ and $\Lambda(C_2)$ are self-adjoint, we have that

$$\|\Lambda(C_2) - \Lambda(C_1)\|$$

$$= \sup_{\|g\|=1} \left| \int_{\Gamma_N} g (\Lambda(C_2) - \Lambda(C_1)) g \, ds \right|$$

$$= \sup_{\|g\|=1} \max \left\{ \int_{\Gamma_N} g (\Lambda(C_2) - \Lambda(C_1)) g \, ds, \int_{\Gamma_N} g (\Lambda(C_1) - \Lambda(C_2)) g \, ds \right\}.$$

Introducing the equivalent representation $u^g_{\lambda, \mu} = u^g_{(\lambda, \mu)}$, we use the first inequality in the monotonicity relation $[5]$ in Lemma 3.1 and with $C_1$ and $C_2$ interchanged, we obtain for all $g \in L^2(\Gamma_N; \mathbb{R}^d)$
\[ \int_{\Gamma_N} g (\Lambda(\mathcal{C}_2) - \Lambda(\mathcal{C}_1)) \, g \, ds \geq \int_{\Omega} (\mathcal{C}_1 - \mathcal{C}_2) \nabla u_{\mathcal{C}_1}^g : \nabla u_{\mathcal{C}_2}^g \, dx, \]
\[ = \int_{\Omega} (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2) \left( \text{div} u_{(\lambda_1, \mu_1)}^g \right)^2 \, dx \]
\[ + 2 \int_{\Omega} (\mu_1 - \mu_2) \nabla u_{(\lambda_1, \mu_1)}^g : \nabla u_{(\lambda_1, \mu_1)}^g \, dx \]
\[ \int_{\Gamma_N} g (\Lambda(\mathcal{C}_1) - \Lambda(\mathcal{C}_2)) \, g \, dx \geq \int_{\Omega} (\mathcal{C}_2 - \mathcal{C}_1) \nabla u_{\mathcal{C}_2}^g : \nabla u_{\mathcal{C}_1}^g \, dx \]
\[ = \int_{\Omega} (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) \left( \text{div} u_{(\lambda_2, \mu_2)}^g \right)^2 \, dx \]
\[ + 2 (\mu_2 - \mu_1) \nabla u_{(\lambda_2, \mu_2)}^g : \nabla u_{(\lambda_2, \mu_2)}^g \, dx, \]

where \( u_{\mathcal{C}_1}^g, u_{\mathcal{C}_2}^g \in \mathcal{V} \) denote the solutions of (1) with Neumann data \( g \) and elastic tensor \( \mathcal{C}_1 \) and \( \mathcal{C}_2 \), respectively. Hence, for \( \mathcal{C}_1 \neq \mathcal{C}_2 \), we have

\[ \frac{\|\Lambda(\mathcal{C}_2) - \Lambda(\mathcal{C}_1)\|}{d_\Omega(\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2)} \geq \sup_{\|g\|=1} \Psi \left( g, \frac{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2}{d_\Omega(\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2)}, \frac{\mu_1 - \mu_2}{d_\Omega(\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2)}, (\lambda_1, (\lambda_2, \mu_1, (\lambda_2, \mu_2)) \right), \]

where (for \( g \in L^2(\Gamma_N)^d \), \( (\zeta_1, \zeta_2) \in \mathcal{F} \), and \( (\kappa_1, \tau_1), (\kappa_2, \tau_2) \in \mathcal{F}_{[a,b] \times [c,d]} \))

\[ \Psi (g, (\zeta_1, \zeta_2), (\kappa_1, \tau_1), (\kappa_2, \tau_2)) := \max \left( \Psi_1 (g, (\zeta_1, \zeta_2), (\kappa_1, \tau_1)), \Psi_2 (g, (\zeta_1, \zeta_2), (\kappa_2, \tau_2)) \right), \]

with

\[ \Psi_1 (g, (\zeta_1, \zeta_2), (\kappa_1, \tau_1)) := \int_{\Omega} \zeta_1 \left( \text{div} u_{(\kappa_1, \tau_1)}^g \right)^2 \, dx + 2 \int_{\Omega} \zeta_2 \nabla u_{(\kappa_1, \tau_1)}^g : \nabla u_{(\kappa_1, \tau_1)}^g \, dx, \]

and

\[ \Psi_2 (g, (\zeta_1, \zeta_2), (\kappa_2, \tau_2)) := \int_{\Omega} (-\zeta_1) \left( \text{div} u_{(\kappa_2, \tau_2)}^g \right)^2 \, dx + 2 \int_{\Omega} (-\zeta_2) \nabla u_{(\kappa_2, \tau_2)}^g : \nabla u_{(\kappa_2, \tau_2)}^g \, dx. \]

We introduce the compact sets

\[ \mathcal{C}_+ = \{(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) \in \mathcal{F} : \zeta_1, \zeta_2 \geq 0 \text{ and } \max \left( \|\zeta_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}, \|\zeta_2\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \right) = 1 \}, \]

\[ \mathcal{C}_- = \{(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) \in \mathcal{F} : \zeta_1, \zeta_2 \leq 0 \text{ and } \max \left( \|\zeta_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}, \|\zeta_2\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \right) = 1 \}, \]

and denote \( \mathcal{C} := \mathcal{C}_+ \cup \mathcal{C}_- \). Then, we have

\[ \frac{\|\Lambda(\mathcal{C}_2) - \Lambda(\mathcal{C}_1)\|}{d_\Omega(\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2)} \geq \inf_{(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) \in \mathcal{C}} \sup_{g \in \mathcal{F}_{[a,b] \times [c,d]}} \Psi (g, (\zeta_1, \zeta_2), (\kappa_1, \tau_1), (\kappa_2, \tau_2)). \quad (15) \]

The assertion of Theorem 3.5 follows if we can show that the right-hand side of (15) is positive. Since \( \Psi \) is continuous, the function

\[ ((\zeta_1, \zeta_2), (\kappa_1, \tau_1), (\kappa_2, \tau_2)) \mapsto \sup_{\|g\|=1} \Psi (g, (\zeta_1, \zeta_2), (\kappa_1, \tau_1), (\kappa_2, \tau_2)) \]

is continuous and positive on \( \mathcal{C} \).
is semi-lower continuous, so that it attains its minimum on the compact set \( \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{F}_{[a,b] \times [c,d]} \times \mathcal{F}_{[a,b] \times [c,d]} \). Hence, to prove Theorem 3.5, it suffices to show that
\[
\sup_{\|g\|=1} \Psi(g, (\zeta_1, \zeta_2), (\kappa_1, \tau_1), (\kappa_2, \tau_2)) > 0,
\]
for all \(( (\zeta_1, \zeta_2), (\kappa_1, \tau_1), (\kappa_2, \tau_2) ) \in \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{F}_{[a,b] \times [c,d]} \times \mathcal{F}_{[a,b] \times [c,d]} \). To show this, let \(( (\zeta_1, \zeta_2), (\kappa_1, \tau_1), (\kappa_2, \tau_2) ) \in \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{F}_{[a,b] \times [c,d]} \times \mathcal{F}_{[a,b] \times [c,d]} \). Assume that \(( \zeta_1, \zeta_2 ) \in \mathcal{C}_- \).
Then there exist an open subset \( D_1 \subset \Omega \) and a constant \( 0 < \delta < 1 \), such that
\[
(a) \ |\zeta_1|_{D_1} \geq \delta, \text{ and } \zeta_2 \geq 0, \text{ or } \\
(b) \ |\zeta_2|_{D_1} \geq \delta, \text{ and } \zeta_1 \geq 0.
\]
We use the localized potentials sequence in Lemma 3.3 to obtain an open subset \( D_2 \subset \Omega \) with \( D_1 \cap D_2 = \emptyset \), and a boundary load \( \hat{g} \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \) with
\[
\int_{D_1} (\text{div} \hat{u}^\ast_{(\kappa_1, \tau_1)})^2 \, dx \geq \frac{1}{\delta} \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{D_1} \hat{\nabla} \hat{u}^\ast_{(\kappa_1, \tau_1)} : \hat{\nabla} \hat{u}^\ast_{(\kappa_1, \tau_1)} \, dx \geq \frac{1}{2\delta}.
\]
In case (a), we have
\[
\Psi(\hat{g}, (\zeta_1, \zeta_2), (\kappa_1, \tau_1), (\kappa_2, \tau_2)) \geq \int_{\Omega} \zeta_1 (\text{div} \hat{u}^\ast_{(\kappa_1, \tau_1)})^2 \, dx + 2 \int_{\Omega} \zeta_2 \hat{\nabla} \hat{u}^\ast_{(\kappa_1, \tau_1)} : \hat{\nabla} \hat{u}^\ast_{(\kappa_1, \tau_1)} \, dx \\
\geq \int_{D_1} \zeta_1 (\text{div} \hat{u}^\ast_{(\kappa_1, \tau_1)})^2 \, dx \geq \delta \int_{D_1} (\text{div} \hat{u}^\ast_{(\kappa_1, \tau_1)})^2 \, dx \geq 1.
\]
In case (b), we have
\[
\Psi(\hat{g}, (\zeta_1, \zeta_2), (\kappa_1, \tau_1), (\kappa_2, \tau_2)) \geq \int_{\Omega} \zeta_2 \hat{\nabla} \hat{u}^\ast_{(\kappa_1, \tau_1)} : \hat{\nabla} \hat{u}^\ast_{(\kappa_1, \tau_1)} \, dx + 2 \int_{\Omega} \zeta_1 (\text{div} \hat{u}^\ast_{(\kappa_1, \tau_1)})^2 \, dx \\
\geq 2 \int_{D_1} \zeta_2 \hat{\nabla} \hat{u}^\ast_{(\kappa_1, \tau_1)} : \hat{\nabla} \hat{u}^\ast_{(\kappa_1, \tau_1)} \, dx \geq 2\delta \int_{D_1} \hat{\nabla} \hat{u}^\ast_{(\kappa_1, \tau_1)} : \hat{\nabla} \hat{u}^\ast_{(\kappa_1, \tau_1)} \, dx \geq 1.
\]
Hence, in both cases,
\[
\sup_{\|g\|=1} \Psi(g, (\zeta_1, \zeta_2), (\kappa_1, \tau_1), (\kappa_2, \tau_2)) \geq \Psi\left(\frac{\hat{g}}{\|\hat{g}\|}, (\zeta_1, \zeta_2), (\kappa_1, \tau_1), (\kappa_2, \tau_2)\right) \\
= \frac{1}{\|\hat{g}\|^2} \Psi(\hat{g}, (\zeta_1, \zeta_2), (\kappa_1, \tau_1), (\kappa_2, \tau_2)) > 0.
\]
For \((\zeta_1, \zeta_2) \in \mathcal{C}_- \), we can analogously use a localized potentials sequence for \((\kappa_2, \tau_2) \), and prove that
\[
\sup_{\|g\|=1} \Psi(g, (\zeta_1, \zeta_2), (\kappa_1, \tau_1), (\kappa_2, \tau_2)) > 0,
\]
so that Theorem 3.5 is proven. \(\square\)
4. Numerical approach to solve the inverse problem

In order to solve the inverse problem numerically, we consider only Lamé parameters in the admissible set

$$\mathcal{P} = \{ (\lambda, \mu) \in C(\Omega) \times C(\Omega), \ 0 < \alpha_1 \leq \lambda \leq \alpha_2, \ 0 < \beta_1 \leq \mu \leq \beta_2 \},$$

where $0 < \alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2$ and $0 < \beta_1 \leq \beta_2$ are positive constants, and study the following minimization problem:

$$\min_{(\lambda, \mu) \in \mathcal{P}} J(\lambda, \mu) = \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{C}(\lambda, \mu) \nabla (u_N - u_D) : \nabla (u_N - u_D) \, dx. \quad (16)$$

Here $u_N$ and $u_D$ solve the following problems:

$$\begin{cases}
- \text{div}(\mathcal{C} \nabla u_N) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\
(\mathcal{C} \nabla u_N) \nu = g & \text{on } \Gamma_N, \\
u_N = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_D,
\end{cases} \quad (17)$$

$$\begin{cases}
- \text{div}(\mathcal{C} \nabla u_D) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\
u_D = f & \text{on } \Gamma_N, \\
u_D = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_D,
\end{cases} \quad (18)$$

where $f \in L^2(\Gamma_N; \mathbb{R}^d)$ is a measurement of the potential corresponding to the input surface loads $g$.

The weak formulation of problem (17) reads:

$$\int_{\Omega} \mathcal{C} \nabla u_N : \nabla v \, dx = \int_{\partial \Omega} g \cdot v \, ds \quad \text{for all } v \in V. \quad (19)$$

For the Dirichlet problem (18) the constraint $u_D = f$ makes the Sobolev space dependent on $f$. To get around this difficulty, we introduce a Lagrange multiplier and we get the weak formulation (see [39, Sec 6.2, p. 433])

$$\int_{\Omega} \mathcal{C} \nabla u_D : \nabla v \, dx + \int_{\Gamma_N} (f - u_D) \cdot \xi \, ds = 0$$

for all $v \in H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d), \xi \in H^{-1/2}(\Gamma_N, \mathbb{R}^d)$.

Writing the saddle point equation for the Lagrangian, one obtains $\xi = (\mathcal{C} \nabla v) \nu$, and the weak formulation of the Dirichlet problem is then defined by:

$$\int_{\Omega} \mathcal{C} \nabla u_D : \nabla v \, dx + \int_{\Gamma_N} (f - u_D) \cdot (\mathcal{C} \nabla v) \nu \, ds = 0 \quad \text{for all } v \in V. \quad (20)$$

We have the following theoretical result which justifies the use of the functional $J$. 
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Proposition 4.1. If the inverse problem has a solution \((\lambda^*, \mu^*)\), then \((\lambda^*, \mu^*)\) is the unique solution of the optimization problem.

Proof. If \((\lambda^*, \mu^*)\) is a solution of the inverse problem then \(u_N = u_D\) and \((\lambda^*, \mu^*)\) is a minimum of \(J(\lambda, \mu) = 0\).

Let \((\lambda^\dagger, \mu^\dagger)\) be another minimum of \(J\). Then \(J(\lambda^\dagger, \mu^\dagger) = 0\) and \(u_N = u_D\). From the uniqueness result (see, Theorem 3.5), we deduce that \((\lambda^\dagger, \mu^\dagger) = (\lambda^*, \mu^*)\).

4.1. Min-sup formulation

In what follows we focus on the computation of the derivative of the functional \(J\).

From the definition of the functional \(J\), and applying Green’s formula once, we have

\[ J(\lambda, \mu) := J(C, u_N, u_D) = J_0(C, u_N) + J_0(C, u_D) + J_1, \]

where

\[ J_0(C, u) = \int_\Omega C\tilde{\nabla} v : \tilde{\nabla} u \, dx, \quad J_1 = -2 \int_{\Gamma_N} f \cdot g \, ds. \]

Since \(J_1\) is a constant, its derivative with respect to \((\lambda, \mu)\) vanishes. Thus, the derivative of \(J\) with respect to \((\lambda, \mu)\) in the direction \((\tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{\mu})\) reads

\[ dJ(C, u_N(C), u_D(C); (\tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{\mu})) = dJ_0(C, u_N(C); (\tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{\mu})) + dJ_0(C, u_D(C); (\tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{\mu})). \]

We introduce the Lagrangian functionals

\[ G_N(C, \varphi, \psi) = J_0(C, \varphi) + \int_\Omega C\tilde{\nabla} \varphi : \tilde{\nabla} \psi \, dx - \int_{\Gamma_N} g \cdot \psi \, ds \quad \text{for all } \varphi, \psi \in V, \]

\[ G_D(C, \varphi, \psi) = J_0(C, \varphi) + \int_\Omega C\tilde{\nabla} \varphi : \tilde{\nabla} \psi \, dx + \int_{\Gamma_N} (f - u_D) \cdot (C\tilde{\nabla} \psi) \nu \, ds, \]

for all \(\varphi \in V, \psi \in H^1_0(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)\). Then, it is easy to check that

\[ J_0(C, u_N(C)) = \min_{\varphi \in V} \sup_{\psi \in V} G_N(C, \varphi, \psi), \]

\[ J_0(C, u_D(C)) = \min_{\varphi \in V} \sup_{\psi \in H^1_0(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)} G_D(C, \varphi, \psi), \]

since

\[ \sup_{\psi \in V} G_N(C, \varphi, \psi) = \begin{cases} J_0(C, u_N(C)) & \text{if } \varphi = u_N(C), \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases} \]

\[ \sup_{\psi \in H^1_0(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)} G_D(C, \varphi, \psi) = \begin{cases} J_0(C, u_D(C)) & \text{if } \varphi = u_D(C), \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases} \]
It is easily shown that the functional $G_N$ (respectively $G_D$) is convex continuous with respect to $\varphi$ and concave continuous with respect to $\psi$. Therefore, according to Ekeland and Temam [40], the functional $G_N$ has a saddle point $(u_N, v_N)$ if and only if $(u_N, v_N)$ solves the following system:

\[
\begin{align*}
\partial_{\psi} G_N(C, u_N, v_N; \hat{\psi}) &= 0, \\
\partial_{\varphi} G_N(C, u_N, v_N; \hat{\varphi}) &= 0,
\end{align*}
\]

for all $\hat{\psi} \in \mathcal{V}$ and $\hat{\varphi} \in \mathcal{V}$. This yields that $G_N$ has a saddle point $(u_N, v_N)$, where the state $u_N$ is the unique solution of (19) and the adjoint state $v_N = v_N(C)$ is the solution of the following adjoint problem:

\[
\begin{cases}
-\text{div}(C\hat{\nabla}v_N) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\
\sigma(v_N) \cdot \nu = -2g & \text{on } \Gamma_N, \\
v_N = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_D.
\end{cases}
\]

Similarly, the Lagrangian $G_D$ has a unique saddle point $(u_D, v_D)$ where the direct state $u_D$ is the solution of the problem (20) and the adjoint state $v_D = v_D(C)$ is the unique solution of the following adjoint problem

\[
\begin{cases}
-\text{div}(C\hat{\nabla}v_D) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\
v_D = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_N, \\
v_D = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_D.
\end{cases}
\]

Summarizing the above, we have obtained

**Theorem 4.2.** The functionals $J_0(C, u_N(C))$ and $J_0(C, u_D(C))$ are given as

\[
J_0(C, u_N(C)) = \min_{\varphi \in \mathcal{V}} \sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{V}} G_N(C, \varphi, \psi),
\]

\[
J_0(C, u_D(C)) = \min_{\varphi \in \mathcal{V}} \sup_{\psi \in H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)} G_D(C, \varphi, \psi).
\]

The unique saddle points for $G_N$ and $G_D$ are respectively given by $(u_N, v_N)$ and $(u_D, v_D)$, where $v_N = -2u_N$ and $v_D = 0$.

**Theorem 4.3.** The functional $J$ is Gateaux differentiable, and its Gateaux derivative at $(\lambda, \mu) \in L^\infty(\Omega) \times L^\infty(\Omega)$ in the direction $(\bar{\lambda}, \bar{\mu})$ is given by

\[
DJ\left(C(\lambda, \mu), u_N, u_D; (\bar{\lambda}, \bar{\mu})\right) = \int_\Omega C(\bar{\lambda}, \bar{\mu}) \hat{\nabla} u_D : \hat{\nabla} u_D \, dx \\
- \int_\Omega C(\bar{\lambda}, \bar{\mu}) \hat{\nabla} u_N : \hat{\nabla} u_N \, dx.
\]

**Proof.** Let $C_t = C + t\hat{C}$, where $C = C(\lambda, \mu)$, $\hat{C} = C(\bar{\lambda}, \bar{\mu})$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$ is sufficiently
small parameter. Under hypotheses of Theorem 6.1 we have
\[
DJ(C, u_N, u_D); (\bar{\lambda}, \bar{\mu}) = \frac{\partial_t \tilde{G}_N(t, u_N, v_N)}{t=0} + \frac{\partial_t \tilde{G}_D(t, u_D, v_D)}{t=0},
\]

where
\[
\tilde{G}_N(t, \varphi, \psi) := G_N(C_t, \varphi, \psi) = J_0(C_t, \varphi) + \int_{\Omega} C_t \tilde{\nabla} \varphi : \tilde{\nabla} \psi dx - \int_{\Gamma_N} g \cdot \psi ds,
\]
\[
\tilde{G}_D(t, \varphi, \psi) := G_D(C_t, \varphi, \psi) = J_0(C_t, \varphi) + \int_{\Omega} C_t \tilde{\nabla} \varphi : \tilde{\nabla} \psi dx + \int_{\Gamma_N} (f - u_D) \cdot (C_t \tilde{\nabla} \psi) \nu ds,
\]

and
\[
\frac{\partial_t \tilde{G}_N(t, u_N, v_N)}{t=0} = -\int_{\Omega} \tilde{C}_t \tilde{\nabla} u_N : \tilde{\nabla} u_N dx,
\]
\[
\frac{\partial_t \tilde{G}_D(t, u_D, v_D)}{t=0} = \int_{\Omega} \tilde{C}_t \tilde{\nabla} u_D : \tilde{\nabla} u_D dx.
\]

The above equations yield (25). To end the proof, we should verify the four assumptions (H1) – (H4) of Theorem 6.1 given in the appendix. As in Theorem 6.1, we introduce the sets

\[
X_N(t) := \left\{ x^t \in V : \sup_{y \in V} \tilde{G}_N(t, x^t, y) = \inf_{x \in V} \sup_{y \in V} \tilde{G}_N(t, x, y) \right\},
\]
\[
Y_N(t) := \left\{ y^t \in V : \inf_{x \in V} \tilde{G}_N(t, x, y^t) = \sup_{y \in V} \inf_{x \in V} \tilde{G}_N(t, x, y) \right\},
\]
\[
X_D(t) := \left\{ x^t \in V : \sup_{y \in H^1_0(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)} \tilde{G}_D(t, x^t, y) = \inf_{x \in V} \sup_{y \in H^1_0(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)} \tilde{G}_D(t, x, y) \right\},
\]
\[
Y_D(t) := \left\{ y^t \in H^1_0(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) : \inf_{x \in V} \tilde{G}_D(t, x, y^t) = \sup_{y \in H^1_0(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)} \inf_{x \in V} \tilde{G}_D(t, x, y) \right\},
\]

and obtain

for all \( t \in [0, \varepsilon] \) \( S_N(t) = X_N(t) \times Y_N(t) = \{ u_N(C_t), v_N(C_t) \} \neq \emptyset, \)

for all \( t \in [0, \varepsilon] \) \( S_D(t) = X_D(t) \times Y_D(t) = \{ u_D(C_t), v_D(C_t) \} \neq \emptyset, \)

and assumption (H1) is satisfied.
We apply the same technique to the variational equation which yields \( \Omega \) such that

From Korn’s inequality and the trace theorem, there exists \( c > 0 \), depending only on \( \Omega \) such that

\[
\|u_N(\mathcal{C}_t)\|_{H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)} \leq c\|g\|_{L^2(\Gamma_N; \mathbb{R}^d)},
\]

which yields

\[
\sup_{t \in [0, \varepsilon]} \|u(\mathcal{C}_t)\|_{H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)} \leq c\|g\|_{L^2(\Gamma_N; \mathbb{R}^d)}.
\]

We apply the same technique to the variational equation

\[
\int_{\Omega} \mathcal{C}_t \nabla u_D(\mathcal{C}_t) : \nabla v \, dx + \int_{\Gamma_N} (f - u_D(\mathcal{C}_t)) \cdot (\mathcal{C} \nabla v) \nu \, ds,
\]

for all \( v \in \mathcal{V} \), and we are able to show that the function \( u_D(\mathcal{C}_t) \) is bounded. The next step is to show the continuity with respect to \( t \) of \( (u_N(\mathcal{C}_t), u_D(\mathcal{C}_t)) \). Subtracting (26) at \( t > 0 \) and \( t = 0 \) and choosing \( v = u_N(\mathcal{C}) - u_N(\mathcal{C}_t) \) yields

\[
\int_{\Omega} \mathcal{C} \nabla (u_N(\mathcal{C}) - u_N(\mathcal{C}_t)) : \nabla (u_N(\mathcal{C}) - u_N(\mathcal{C}_t)) \, dx
\]

\[
= \int_{\Omega} (\mathcal{C} - \mathcal{C}_t) \nabla u_N(\mathcal{C}_t) : \nabla (u_N(\mathcal{C}) - u_N(\mathcal{C}_t)) \, dx.
\]

Furthermore due to the boundedness of \( u_N(\mathcal{C}_t) \), we obtain

\[
\|u_N(\mathcal{C}_t) - u_N(\mathcal{C})\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C d_\Omega(\mathcal{C}_t, \mathcal{C}).
\]

Due to the strong continuity of \( \mathcal{C}_t \) as a function of \( t \), one deduces that \( u_N(\mathcal{C}_t) \to u_N(\mathcal{C}) \) in \( H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \) as \( t \to 0 \). Concerning the continuity of \( u_D(\mathcal{C}_t) \), one may show from (27) that \( u_D(\mathcal{C}_t) \to u_D(\mathcal{C}) \) in \( H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \). Finally in view of the strong continuity of

\[
(t, \varphi) \to \partial_t \tilde{G}_N(t, \varphi, \psi), \quad (t, \psi) \to \partial_t \tilde{G}_N(t, \varphi, \psi),
\]

\[
(t, \varphi) \to \partial_t \tilde{G}_D(t, \varphi, \psi), \quad (t, \psi) \to \partial_t \tilde{G}_D(t, \varphi, \psi),
\]

assumptions \( (H_3) \) and \( (H_4) \) are verified. \( \square \)
5. Implementation details and numerical examples

In the following numerical examples, the domain Ω under consideration is the unit disk centered at the origin. We use a Delaunay triangular mesh and a standard finite element method with piecewise finite elements to numerically compute the states for our problem. The exact data $f$ are computed synthetically by solving the direct problem (1). In the real-world, the data $f$ are experimentally acquired and thus always contaminated by errors. In our numerical examples the simulated noise data are generated using the following formula:

$$\tilde{f}(x_1, x_2) = f(x_1, x_2) (1 + \varepsilon \delta) \quad \text{on } \Gamma_N,$$

where $\delta$ is a uniform distributed random variable and $\varepsilon$ indicates the level of noise. For our examples, the random variable $\delta$ is realized using the Matlab function `rand()`. We use the BFGS algorithm to minimize the cost function defined in (16). This quasi-Newton method is well adapted to such problem.

5.1. Numerical examples

For the following numerical examples, we use four measurements corresponding to the following surface loads:

$$g_1 = (0.1, 0.1), \quad g_2 = (0.1, 0.2), \quad g_3 = (0.2, 0.1), \quad \text{and} \quad g_4 = (0.3, 0.5) \text{ on } \Gamma_N.$$ 

In this case the cost function $J$ takes the form:

$$J(C, u_N, u_D) = \sum_{k=1}^{4} \int_{\Omega} C \nabla (u^{g_k}_N - u^{g_k}_D) : \nabla (u^{g_k}_N - u^{g_k}_D) \, dx,$$

where $u^{g_k}_N$ and $u^{g_k}_D$ are the solutions to problem (17) and (18) respectively with respect to the boundary load $g_k$ and the corresponding measurement data.

5.1.1. Example 1

In this example, we consider the case of constant Lamé parameters. Let $(\lambda_i, \mu_i)$ denote the initialization, $(\lambda_e, \mu_e)$ the exact parameters to be recovered and $(\lambda_c, \mu_c)$ the computed parameters. Table 1 summarizes the computational results of the algorithm. Figures [13] show the decrease of cost function $J$ and the $L^\infty$-norm of $DJ$ in the course of the optimization process. The numerical solution represents a good approximation and it is stable with respect to small amount of noise.

| noise | $(\lambda_i, \mu_i)$ | $(\lambda_e, \mu_e)$ | $(\lambda_c, \mu_c)$ | $|\lambda_c - \lambda_e|/|\lambda_e|$ | $|\mu_c - \mu_e|/|\mu_e|$ |
|-------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| $\varepsilon = 0.0$ | (1,1) | (2.999999, 6.999999) | (3,7) | 3.33e-07 | 1.42e-07 |
| $\varepsilon = 0.3$ | (1,1) | (2.638955, 6.839400) | (3,7) | 0.120 | 0.022 |
| $\varepsilon = 0.5$ | (1,1) | (2.550545,6.536486) | (3,7) | 0.149 | 0.066 |

Table 1. Lamé parameters.
Figure 1. Simulation results for Example 1: History of the cost function $J$ and the $L^\infty$-norm of $DJ$ in the case of level noise $\varepsilon = 0.0$.

Figure 2. Simulation results for Example 1: History of the cost function $J$ and the $L^\infty$-norm of $DJ$ in the case of level noise $\varepsilon = 0.3$.

Figure 3. Simulation results for Example 1: History of the cost function $J$ and the $L^\infty$-norm of $DJ$ in the case of level noise $\varepsilon = 0.5$. 
5.1.2. Example 2

In this example, the exact Lamé parameter to be recovered is given by

$$\mu(x_1, x_2) = \frac{2(1 + \exp \left(-5(x_1^2 + x_2^2)\right))}{5}$$

as depicted in Figure 4. For ease of computations we assume that $\lambda = \mu$. This corresponds to the case when the Poisson’s ratio $\nu = 1/4$.

Figure 4. Simulation results for Example 2: The initial and the exact Lamé parameter $\mu$.

Figure 5 and 7 show the computed Lamé parameter $\mu$ and the corresponding relative error.

Figure 5. Simulation results for Example 2: The computed Lamé parameter $\mu$ and the corresponding relative error in the case of level noise $\epsilon = 0.0$. 
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Figure 6. Simulation results for Example 2: History of the cost function $J$ and the $L^\infty$-norm of $DJ$ in the case of level noise $\varepsilon = 0.0$.

Figure 6 and 8 depict the decrease of cost function $J$ and the $L^\infty$-norm of $DJ$ in the course of the optimization process. In this case the numerical solution represents a reasonable approximation and it is stable with respect to a small amount of noise.

Figure 7. Simulation results for Example 2: The computed Lamé parameter $\mu$ and the corresponding relative error in the case of level noise $\varepsilon = 0.01$.

Figure 8. Simulation results for Example 2: History of the cost function $J$ and the $L^\infty$-norm of $DJ$ in the case of level noise $\varepsilon = 0.01$. 
6. Conclusion

In this paper, we dealt with the identification of Lamé parameters in linear elasticity. We introduced the inverse problem and the corresponding Neumann-to-Dirichlet operator. Based on this, we analyzed the connection between the Lamé parameters and the Neumann-to-Dirichlet operator which led to a monotonicity result. In order to prove a Lipschitz stability estimate, we applied the monotonicity result combined with the localized potentials. The numerical solution of the inverse problem itself, was obtained via the minimization of a Kohn-Vogelius-type cost functional. In more detail, the reconstruction was performed via an iterative algorithm based on a quasi-Newton method. Finally, we presented our numerical examples and discussed them.

Appendix

An abstract differentiability result

We first introduce some notations. Consider the functional
\[
G : [0, \varepsilon] \times X \times Y \to \mathbb{R}
\] (28)
for some \( \varepsilon > 0 \) and the Banach spaces \( X \) and \( Y \). For each \( t \in [0, \varepsilon] \), define
\[
g(t) = \inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} G(t, x, y), \quad h(t) = \sup_{y \in Y} \inf_{x \in X} G(t, x, y), \quad (29)
\]
and the associated sets
\[
X(t) = \left\{ x^t \in X : \sup_{y \in Y} G(t, x^t, y) = g(t) \right\}, \quad (30)
\]
\[
Y(t) = \left\{ y^t \in Y : \inf_{x \in X} G(t, x, y^t) = h(t) \right\}. \quad (31)
\]
Note that inequality \( h(t) \leq g(t) \) holds. If \( h(t) = g(t) \), the set of saddle points is given by
\[
S(t) := X(t) \times Y(t). \quad (32)
\]
We now state a simplified version of a result from [39] which gives realistic conditions that allows to differentiate \( g(t) \) at \( t = 0 \). The main difficulty is to obtain conditions which allow to exchange the derivative with respect to \( t \) and the inf-sup in [29].

**Theorem 6.1** (Correa and Seeger [39,41]). Let \( X, Y, G \) and \( \varepsilon \) be given as above. Assume that the following assumptions hold:

(H1) \( S(t) \neq \emptyset \) for \( 0 \leq t \leq \varepsilon \).

(H2) The partial derivative \( \partial_t G(t, x, y) \) exists for all \( (t, x, y) \in [0, \varepsilon] \times X \times Y \).

(H3) For any sequence \( \{t_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, \) with \( t_n \to 0 \), there exist a subsequence \( \{t_{n_k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \) and \( x^0 \in X(0), x_{n_k} \in X(t_{n_k}) \) such that for all \( y \in Y(0) \),
\[
\lim_{t \to 0, k \to \infty} \partial_t G(t, x_{n_k}, y) = \partial_t G(0, x^0, y).
\]
(H4) For any sequence \(\{t_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\) with \(t_n \to 0\), there exist a subsequence \(\{t_{n_k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}\) and \(y^0 \in Y(0)\), \(y_{n_k} \in Y(t_{n_k})\) such that for all \(x \in X(0)\),

\[
\lim_{t \searrow 0, k \to \infty} \partial_t G(t, x, y_{n_k}) = \partial_t G(0, x, y^0).
\]

Then there exists \((x^0, y^0) \in X(0) \times Y(0)\) such that

\[
\frac{dg}{dt}(0) = \partial_t G(0, x^0, y^0).
\]
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