

# VORTEX DENSITY MODELS FOR SUPERCONDUCTIVITY AND SUPERFLUIDITY

S. BALDO, R.L. JERRARD, G. ORLANDI, AND H.M. SONER

ABSTRACT. We study some functionals that describe the density of vortex lines in superconductors subject to an applied magnetic field, and in Bose-Einstein condensates subject to rotational forcing, in quite general domains in 3 dimensions. These functionals are derived from more basic models via Gamma-convergence, here and in the companion paper [4]. In our main results, we use these functionals to obtain descriptions of the critical applied magnetic field (for superconductors) and forcing (for Bose-Einstein), above which ground states exhibit nontrivial vorticity, as well as a characterization of the vortex density in terms of a non local vector-valued generalization of the classical obstacle problem.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we study certain limits of the Ginzburg-Landau model, which describes a superconducting object in an external magnetic field, and the Gross-Pitaevsky functional, which describes a Bose-Einstein condensate confined in a trap and subject to rotational forcing.

Most prior mathematical work on these sorts of problems has been limited to 2-dimensional models that are good descriptions, in various regimes, either of very flat, thin objects (superconductors or condensates), or of objects that are translation-invariant, or very nearly so, in one direction. Important results about the 2-dimensional Ginzburg-Landau model, obtained by Sandier and Serfaty in [24], [25] (see also the book [26]) include the characterization of the applied critical magnetic field, below which the ground state of a superconductor expels the magnetic field, and above which the superconductor in the ground state is penetrated by magnetic vortices; and a description, in terms of an obstacle problem solved by the magnetic field, of the limiting density of magnetic vortices above the critical applied field. Similar descriptions of 2d Bose-Einstein condensates hold, though they are somewhat less well-documented in the literature.

In this paper we prove analogous results for the full physical problems of 3-dimensional superconductors and condensates. In particular, we find a critical applied field for superconductors, characterized by the same dichotomy as in the 2d case; and we obtain a description, in the supercritical case, of the limiting vortex density in terms of a constrained minimization problem solved by the magnetic field. This problem is *not* a classical obstacle problem, but it is a kind of nonlocal, vector-valued obstacle problem with an interesting structure. We also establish corresponding results about vortices in Bose-Einstein condensate wave functions, that is, ground states of the Gross-Pitaevsky functional with rotational forcing. These

results include the determination of a critical rotational velocity, and a characterization, in terms of a nonlocal generalization of an obstacle problem, of the limiting vortex density for rotations above this critical value.

We obtain these results from the study of certain functionals whose ground states characterize vortex density, and other associated quantities, in limits of sequence of minimizers of (suitably scaled) Ginzburg-Landau or Gross-Pitaevsky functionals. In the case of Ginzburg-Landau, this limiting functional was derived in a companion paper, see [4], as a corollary of a general result proved there about the asymptotic behavior of a relatively simple model functional. In the case of Gross-Pitaevsky, the derivation of the limiting functional, using results of [4], is given in Section 4.1.

Although we mostly emphasize the analogy between the problems we study here and obstacle problems, there are also close connections between our vortex density models and total variation models in image processing as introduced by Rudin, Osher, and Fatemi [23]. (See [7] for a survey of related mathematical results.) In particular, the functional  $\mathcal{G}$  derived in Proposition 4, see (1.22), can be viewed as a generalization of the Rudin-Osher-Fatemi model, and in situations with rotational symmetry, it reduces to exactly a (weighted) Rudin-Osher-Fatemi functional. The paper concludes in Section 5 with a discussion of this and some related issues.

**1.1. the Ginzburg-Landau functional.** Let  $\Omega$  be a bounded open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . A superconducting sample occupying the region  $\Omega$  may be described by a pair  $(u, A)$ , where  $u$  is a complex-valued function on  $\Omega$  and  $A$  is a 1-form on  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , that encode various physical attributes of the superconductor. For example,  $|u|^2$  corresponds to the density of Cooper pairs of superconducting electrons;  $dA$  can be identified with the magnetic field; and the superconducting current is given by

$$(1.1) \quad j_A u := \frac{i}{2}(u \overline{d_A u} - \bar{u} d_A u), \quad \text{where } d_A u := du - iAu.$$

Stable states of a superconductor in an external magnetic field  $H_{\epsilon, ex} = dA_{\epsilon, ex}$ , with  $A_{\epsilon, ex} \in H_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}^3; \Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3)$ , correspond to minimizers (or local minimizers) of the Ginzburg-Landau functional:

$$(1.2) \quad \mathcal{F}_\epsilon(u, A) = \int_\Omega \frac{|d_A u|^2}{2} + \frac{(|u|^2 - 1)^2}{4\epsilon^2} dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{|dA - H_{\epsilon, ex}|^2}{2} dx.$$

Here the parameter  $\epsilon$  is related to physical properties of the superconducting sample. We will study the limit  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ , with  $A_{\epsilon, ex}$  scaling so that it will turn out to be comparable to the critical value mentioned above. For a discussion of the physical relevance of this scaling, see for example [26].

The model case is a constant external magnetic field, for which we may take  $A_{\epsilon, ex} = \frac{1}{2}c_\epsilon(x_1 dx^2 - x_2 dx^1)$  for some real-valued scaling factor  $c_\epsilon$ , corresponding to a spatially constant external field  $H_{\epsilon, ex} = c_\epsilon dx^1 \wedge dx^2$ , which in this example points in the  $e_3$  direction.

The functional  $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon$  makes sense for  $u \in H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{C})$  and  $A$  such that  $A - A_{\epsilon, ex} \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3; \Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3)$ . As is well known, the functional is gauge-invariant in the sense that for any such  $(u, A)$  and for any function  $\phi$  such that  $d\phi \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ , the identity  $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(u, A) = \mathcal{F}_\epsilon(e^{i\phi}u, A + d\phi)$  holds. Moreover,  $(u, A)$  and  $(e^{i\phi}u, A + d\phi)$  correspond to *exactly* the same physical state, in the sense that all physically observable quantities are pointwise equal for the two pairs.

Our starting point is the following, which is an immediate consequence of [4], Theorem 4. We use the notation

$$\dot{H}_*^1(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3) := \{1\text{-forms } A \text{ in } \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3) : d^*A = 0\}$$

which is a Hilbert space with the inner product  $(A, B)_{\dot{H}_*^1} := \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} dA \cdot dB$ . We will often write  $H_*^1$  for short. We also write  $H^k(\Lambda^p U)$  to denote the space of  $p$ -forms on  $U$  with coefficients in the Sobolev space  $H^k$ .

**Proposition 1.** *Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$  be a bounded open set with  $C^1$  boundary. Assume that  $A_{\epsilon, ex} \in H_{loc}^1(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3)$  and that there exists  $A_{ex} \in H_{loc}^1(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3)$  such that*

$$(1.3) \quad \frac{A_{\epsilon, ex}}{|\log \epsilon|} - A_{ex} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } \dot{H}_*^1(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3) := \{A \in \dot{H}^1(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3) : d^*A = 0\}.$$

*Let  $(u_\epsilon, A_\epsilon)$  minimize  $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon$  in  $H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{C}) \times [A_{\epsilon, ex} + \dot{H}_*^1(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3)]$ . Then there exists some  $A_0 \in [A_{ex} + \dot{H}_*^1]$  and  $v_0 \in L^2(\Omega; \Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3)$  such that  $dv_0$  is a measure, and such that*

$$(1.4) \quad \frac{A_\epsilon}{|\log \epsilon|} - A_0 \rightharpoonup 0 \quad \text{weakly in } \dot{H}_*^1(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3),$$

$$(1.5) \quad \frac{j_{A_\epsilon} u_\epsilon}{|\log \epsilon|} \rightharpoonup v_0 - A_0 \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(\Lambda^1 \Omega),$$

and

$$(1.6) \quad \frac{1}{|\log \epsilon|} J_{A_\epsilon} u_\epsilon := \frac{1}{2|\log \epsilon|} d(j_{A_\epsilon} u + A_\epsilon) \rightarrow \frac{1}{2} dv_0 \quad \text{in } W^{-1,p}(\Lambda^2 \Omega) \quad \forall p \leq 3/2.$$

Moreover,  $(v_0, A_0)$  minimizes the functional

$$(1.7) \quad \mathcal{F}(v, A) = \frac{1}{2} |dv|(\Omega) + \frac{1}{2} \|v - A\|_{L^2(\Lambda^1 \Omega)}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|dA - H_{ex}\|_{L^2(\Lambda^2 \mathbb{R}^3)}^2$$

in  $L^2(\Omega; \Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3) \times [A_{ex} + \dot{H}_*^1]$ . Here  $|dv|$  denotes the total variation measure associated with  $dv$ . (We understand  $\mathcal{F}(v, A)$  to equal  $+\infty$  if  $dv$  is not a measure.)

Our new results about superconductivity in this paper are derived entirely by studying properties of the limiting functional  $\mathcal{F}$ ; the connection to the more basic Ginzburg-Landau model is provided by the above Proposition 1.

Note that  $\mathcal{F}$  is gauge-invariant in the sense that if  $\gamma \in \dot{H}^2(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3)$ , then

$$(1.8) \quad \mathcal{F}(v - d\gamma|_\Omega, A + d\gamma) = \mathcal{F}(v, A).$$

Our first main result reformulates the problem of minimizing  $\mathcal{F}$  through convex duality, the relevance of which in these settings was first pointed out in [6].

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$  be a bounded open set with  $C^1$  boundary, and assume that  $A_{ex} \in H_{loc}^1(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3)$ . A pair  $(v_0, A_0)$  minimizes  $\mathcal{F}$  in  $L^2(\Lambda^1 \Omega) \times [A_{ex} + \dot{H}_*^1(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3)]$  if and only if the following two conditions are satisfied:*

1. *The 2-form  $B_0 = d(A_0 - A_{ex})$  belongs to the constraint set*

$$(1.9) \quad \mathcal{C} := \left\{ B \in H^1(\Lambda^2 \mathbb{R}^3) \cap \dot{H}^1(\Lambda^2 \mathbb{R}^3), \text{ supp}(d^*B) \subset \bar{\Omega}, \quad \|B\|_* \leq \frac{1}{2} \right\},$$

where

$$(1.10) \quad \|B\|_* := \sup \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} B \cdot d\alpha : \alpha \in H^1(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3), \int_{\Omega} |d\alpha| \leq 1 \right\}.$$

In addition,

$$(1.11) \quad d^* B_0 + \mathbf{1}_\Omega (A_0 - v_0) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3,$$

and if  $\bar{v}_0 \in L^2(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3)$  is any 1-form such that  $\bar{v}_0|_\Omega = v_0$ , then

$$(1.12) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} B_0 \cdot d\bar{v}_0 = -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} |d\bar{v}_0|.$$

2.  $B_0$  is the unique minimizer in  $\mathcal{C}$  of the functional

$$(1.13) \quad B \mapsto \mathcal{E}_0(B) := \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |B|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} |d^* B + A_{ex}|^2.$$

It is clear that if  $\|B\|_* < \infty$  then

$$(1.14) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} B \cdot dv = 0 \quad \text{for all } v \in H^1(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3) \text{ such that } dv = 0 \text{ in } \Omega.$$

Remark also that (1.12) implies that  $\|B_0\|_* = \frac{1}{2}$  if the vorticity  $dv_0 \neq 0$ . This is related to the following necessary and sufficient condition for the vorticity to vanish.

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$  be a bounded open set with  $C^1$  boundary, and assume that  $A_{ex} \in H_{loc}^1(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3)$ . Let  $(v_0, A_0)$  minimize  $\mathcal{F}$  in  $L^2(\Lambda^1 \Omega) \times [A_{ex} + \dot{H}^1(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3)]$ , and let  $B_*$  denote the unique minimizer of  $\mathcal{E}_0(\cdot)$  in the set*

$$(1.15) \quad \mathcal{C}' := \{B \in H^1(\Lambda^2 \mathbb{R}^3) \cap d\dot{H}^1(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3) : B \text{ satisfies (1.14)}\}$$

where  $\mathcal{E}_0$  is defined in (1.13).

Then  $dv_0 = 0$  if and only if  $\|B_*\|_* \leq \frac{1}{2}$ .

As a result, if  $(u_\epsilon, A_\epsilon)$  minimizes  $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon$  in  $H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{C}) \times [A_{\epsilon, ex} + \dot{H}_*^1(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3)]$ , then  $|\log \epsilon|^{-1} J_{A_\epsilon} u_\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  in  $W^{-1,p}$ ,  $p < 3/2$ , if and only if  $\|B_*\|_* \leq \frac{1}{2}$ .

The subtle point in Theorem 3 is the identification of the correct space  $\mathcal{C}'$  in which the magnetic field for the vortex-free minimizer is energetically optimal.

*Remark 1.* We give a different (but necessarily equivalent) characterization of when  $v_0$  is vortex-free, and a different dual problem, see Theorem 9 and Lemma 10 in Section 3.3.

*Remark 2.* Observe that for  $B \in \mathcal{C}'$  we have, by virtue of Hahn-Banach theorem,

$$\|B\|_* = \inf\{\|\beta\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}, \quad \beta \in H^1(\Lambda^2 \mathbb{R}^3), \quad d^* \beta = d^* B\},$$

so that  $\|B\|_*$  can be interpreted as a nonlocal  $L^\infty$  norm of  $B \in \mathcal{C}'$  for  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$  with  $N \geq 3$ , while for  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  we have  $\|B\|_* = \|B\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ , since in that case in (1.10) one can test with forms  $\alpha_j \in H^1(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^2)$  with  $d\alpha_j = f_j(x)dx_1 \wedge dx_2$  such that the scalar functions  $f_j(x)$  converge to a Dirac mass  $\delta_{x_0}$  for arbitrarily fixed  $x_0 \in \Omega$ .

Hence in the 2-dimensional case  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  the constrained variational problem (1.9), (1.13) of Theorem 2 corresponds to a classical obstacle problem (as is well-known), while in three (or higher) dimensions one may interpret it as a generalized, nonlocal, vectorial obstacle problem. Remark also that norms related to  $\|\cdot\|_*$  have been studied in the context of critical Sobolev spaces (see [5, 28]).

*Remark 3.* Condition (1.14) is easily seen to imply that  $\text{supp}(d^* B) \subset \bar{\Omega}$ . The converse holds if and only if  $\Omega$  is simply connected. We do not know whether the minimizer of  $\mathcal{E}_0$  in the space  $\mathcal{C}'' := \{B \in H^1(\Lambda^2 \mathbb{R}^3) \cap d\dot{H}^1(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3) : \text{supp}(d^* B) \subset \bar{\Omega}\}$  coincides with  $B_*$  when  $\Omega$  fails to be simply connected.

*Remark 4.* It may appear unsettling that the functional  $\mathcal{E}_0$  contains the non-gauge-invariant quantity  $A_{ex}$ . This can be effectively eliminated, however, by decomposing  $A_{ex}|_\Omega = A_{ex}^1 + A_{ex}^2$ , where  $A_{ex}^1 \in (\ker d)^\perp$  and  $A_{ex}^2 \in \ker d$  (see (2.5), (2.6)). Then  $A_{ex}^1$  is gauge-invariant, and  $\int_\Omega |d^*B + A_{ex}|^2 = \int_\Omega |d^*B + A_{ex}^1|^2 + |A_{ex}^2|^2$ .

As mentioned before, a rather complete analysis of the asymptotic behavior of the Ginzburg-Landau functional for superconductivity in 2d can be found in [26]. In the 3d case, some results in agreement with Proposition 1 have been obtained by formal arguments, as in [8], and, rigorously in [3] for the case of the ball, using some arguments of [18]. In particular, [3] identifies a candidate for the first critical field for the ball in a uniform applied field. Our results show that this candidate first critical field is in fact correct. (In fact, it agrees exactly with the alternate expression for the critical field alluded to in Remark 1, see Theorem 9.) Critical fields on thin superconducting shells, among other results, have been derived in [9, 10] via a reduction to a limiting problem on a 2d manifold.

**1.2. the Gross-Pitaevsky functional.** The second main object of study in this paper is a variational problem that describes a Bose-Einstein condensate with mass  $m$ , confined by a smooth potential  $a : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  such that

$$(1.16) \quad a \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3), \quad a(x) \rightarrow +\infty \text{ as } |x| \rightarrow +\infty,$$

and subjected to forcing  $\Phi_\epsilon$  that in general depends on a scaling parameter  $\epsilon$ . In the model case corresponding to rotation about the  $z$ -axis,  $\Phi_\epsilon := \frac{1}{2}c_\epsilon(x_1dx^2 - x_2dx^1)$ , and  $a(x)$  grows quadratically or faster. In this situation, a stable condensate may be described by wave function  $u_0$  that is a minimizer, local or global, in a function space to be specified shortly, of a functional that may be written in the form

$$(1.17) \quad \mathcal{G}_\epsilon(u) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{1}{2} |\nabla u|^2 - \Phi_\epsilon \cdot ju + \frac{1}{4\epsilon^2} (\rho - |u|^2)^2 + \frac{w}{2\epsilon^2} |u|^2,$$

where  $j(u) = \frac{i}{2}(ud\bar{u} - \bar{u}du)$ . The functions  $\rho, w$  appearing in the functional  $\mathcal{G}_\epsilon$  are determined by the trapping potential  $a$  and the mass  $m$  as follows:

$$(1.18) \quad \rho(x) := (\lambda - a(x))^+, \quad w(x) := (\lambda - a(x))^- , \quad \text{for } \lambda \text{ such that } \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \rho \, dx = m.$$

The last condition clearly determines  $\lambda$  uniquely.

We study  $\mathcal{G}_\epsilon$  in the function space

$$(1.19) \quad H_a^1(\mathbb{R}^3; \mathbb{C}) := H_a^1 := \text{completion of } C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3; \mathbb{C}) \text{ with respect to } \|\cdot\|_a,$$

where the norm  $\|\cdot\|_a$  is defined by  $\|u\|_a^2 := \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |du|^2 + (1+a)|u|^2$ . We also define

$$H_{a,m}^1(\mathbb{R}^3; \mathbb{C}) := H_{a,m}^1 := \{u \in H_a^1 : \int |u|^2 = m\}.$$

We will study the behavior of minimizers of  $\mathcal{G}_\epsilon$  in  $H_{a,m}^1$ .

Throughout our discussion of the Gross-Pitaevsky functional we will use the notation

$$(1.20) \quad \Omega = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : \rho(x) > 0\}.$$

We will always assume that  $\lambda$  is a regular value of  $a$ , so that  $|Da| \geq c > 0$  on  $\partial\Omega$ , and hence  $w > 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \bar{\Omega}$ , and

$$(1.21) \quad |\nabla \rho(x)|^2 + \rho(x) \geq c > 0, \quad \rho(x) \geq c \, \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega), \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega.$$

1.2.1. *results: Bose-Einstein condensates.* Our results for the Gross-Pitaevsky functional parallel those we obtain for the Ginzburg-Landau functional: we identify a limiting variational problem, see (1.22), (1.23) below, characterize when minimizers of the limiting problem are vortex-free, and obtain a description of minimizers of the limiting problem as solutions of a sort of nonlocal vector-valued obstacle problem.

We start by proving a theorem that characterizes  $\Gamma$ -limits of the Gross-Pitaevsky functional, see Theorem 12 in Section 4. This is parallel to Theorem 4 from [4] for the Ginzburg-Landau functional, and the proof relies on results from [4] on the reduced GL functional. An immediate consequence of Theorem 12 is the following.

**Proposition 4.** *Assume that  $\Phi_\epsilon = |\log \epsilon| \Phi$ , with  $\Phi \in L^4_{loc}(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3)$  and that  $|\Phi(x)|^2 \leq Ca(x)$  outside some compact set  $K$ .*

*Assume that  $u_\epsilon$  minimizes  $\mathcal{G}_\epsilon$  in  $H^1_{a,m}$ . Then*

$$|u_\epsilon| \rightarrow \rho \quad \text{in } L^4(\mathbb{R}^3)$$

*for  $\rho$  defined in (1.18), and there exists  $j_0 \in L^{4/3}(\Lambda^1 \Omega)$  such that*

$$|\log \epsilon|^{-1} j u_\epsilon \rightharpoonup j_0 \quad \text{weakly in } L^{4/3}(\mathbb{R}^3)$$

*Moreover,  $j_0 = \rho v_0$ , where  $v_0$  is the unique minimizer of*

$$(1.22) \quad \mathcal{G}(v) := \int_{\Omega} \rho \left( \frac{|v|^2}{2} - v \cdot \Phi + \frac{1}{2} |dv| \right).$$

*in the space*

$$(1.23) \quad L^2_{\rho}(\Lambda^1 \Omega) := \left\{ v \in L^1_{loc}(\Lambda^1 \Omega) : \int_{\Omega} \rho |v|^2 dx < \infty \right\}.$$

*(We set  $\mathcal{G}(v) = +\infty$  if  $dv$  is not a Radon measure or if  $\rho$  is not  $|dv|$ -integrable.)*

*Remark 5.* We also establish parallel results in the case when  $\Phi_\epsilon = \sqrt{g_\epsilon} \Phi$  with  $|\log \epsilon| \ll g_\epsilon \ll \epsilon^{-2}$ . In particular, in this case the limiting energy corresponding to (1.22) is given by  $\tilde{G}(v) = \int_{\Omega} \rho (|v - \Phi|^2 - |\Phi|^2)$ . See Remark 7 for details.

It is clear that  $v_0 = \Phi|_{\Omega}$  is the unique minimizer of  $\tilde{G}$ . In particular, this implies that for a supercritical rotation around the (vertical)  $x_3$  axis, corresponding to  $\Phi_\epsilon = \sqrt{g_\epsilon} \frac{c_0}{2} (x_1 dx_2 - x_2 dx_1)$  with  $g_\epsilon$  as above, the limiting ground-state vorticity is given by  $dv_0 = c_0 dx_1 \wedge dx_2$ , corresponding to an asymptotically uniform distribution of vortex lines throughout the condensate, regardless of its geometry or topology. This generalizes to 3 dimensions results obtained in [12] in the 2d case.

We next identify a necessary and sufficient condition on  $\Phi$  and  $\rho$  for minimizers of the limiting functional  $\mathcal{G}$  to be vortex-free, by which we mean that  $dv_0 = 0$  in  $\Omega$ . For this result, it is useful to note that the space  $L^2_{\rho}(\Lambda^1 \Omega)$  defined above is a Hilbert space with an inner product and norm that we will write as

$$(v, w)_{\rho} := \int_{\Omega} \rho v \cdot w dx, \quad \|v\|_{\rho} := (v, v)_{\rho}^{1/2}.$$

We will sometimes use the same notation to denote the  $\rho$ -weighted  $L^2$  inner product or norm for  $k$ -forms with values of  $k$  other than 1; the meaning should always be clear from the context. We let  $P_{\rho}$  denote the orthogonal projection with respect to the  $L^2_{\rho}$  inner product, onto  $(\ker d)_{\rho}$ , where

$$(\ker d)_{\rho} := L^2_{\rho}\text{-closure of } \{\phi \in C^{\infty}(\Lambda^1 \Omega) : d\phi = 0, \|\phi\|_{\rho} < \infty\}.$$

We will also write  $P_\rho^\perp$  for the complementary orthogonal projection. Note that if  $w \in \text{Image}(P_\rho^\perp) = (\ker d)_\rho^\perp$ , then  $\int (\rho w) \cdot \phi = 0$  for all  $\phi \in (\ker d)_\rho \supset \ker d$ . Thus  $\rho w \in (\ker d)^\perp$ , and so it follows from the standard unweighted Hodge decomposition (see section 2.2, and in particular (2.7)) that

$$(1.24) \quad \forall w \in (\ker d)_\rho^\perp, \exists \beta \in H_N^1(\Lambda^2 \Omega) \text{ such that } w = \frac{d^* \beta}{\rho} \text{ and } \int_\Omega \frac{|d^* \beta|^2}{\rho} = \|w\|_\rho^2.$$

Thus if  $\Phi \in L_\rho^2$ , there exists  $\beta_\Phi \in H_N^1$  such that  $d^* \beta_\Phi \in L_\rho^2$  and  $\Phi = P_\rho \Phi + \frac{d^* \beta_\Phi}{\rho}$ .

We now state

**Theorem 5.** *Suppose that  $\Omega$  is a bounded, open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^3$  and that  $\rho \in C^1(\Omega)$  and  $\Phi \in L_{loc}^4(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3) \cap L_\rho^2(\Lambda^1 \Omega)$  are given, with  $\rho$  satisfying (1.21).*

*Let  $\beta_\Phi \in H_N^1(\Lambda^2 \Omega)$  be such that  $P_\rho^\perp \Phi = \frac{d^* \beta_\Phi}{\rho}$ , and let  $\beta_0$  minimize the functional*

$$(1.25) \quad \beta \mapsto \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega \frac{|d^* \beta|^2}{\rho}$$

*in the space*

$$(1.26) \quad \left\{ \beta \in H_N^1(\Lambda^2 \Omega) : \frac{d^* \beta}{\rho} \in L_\rho^2(\Lambda^1 \Omega), \quad \|\beta - \beta_\Phi\|_{\rho*} \leq \frac{1}{2} \right\},$$

*where*

$$(1.27) \quad \|\beta\|_{\rho*} := \sup \left\{ \int_\Omega \beta \cdot dw : w \in C^\infty(\Lambda^1 \bar{\Omega}), \int_\Omega \rho |dw| \leq 1 \right\}.$$

*Then  $v_0 = P_\rho \Phi + \frac{d^* \beta_0}{\rho}$  is the unique minimizer of  $\mathcal{G}(\cdot)$  in  $L_\rho^2(\Lambda^1 \Omega)$ .*

*Moreover,*

$$(1.28) \quad \int_\Omega (\beta_\Phi - \beta_0) \cdot dv_0 = \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega \rho |dv_0|.$$

*Finally,  $dv_0 = 0$  if and only if  $\|\beta_\Phi\|_{\rho*} \leq \frac{1}{2}$ .*

Note that (1.28) states that the action of the vorticity distribution  $dv_0$  on the potential  $\beta_0 - \beta_\Phi$  is the largest possible given the constraint (1.26). Similar considerations apply to (1.12) and (1.9) in the case of superconductivity.

We finally remark that in general there can exist  $\beta \in H_N^1(\Lambda^2 \Omega)$  satisfying  $\frac{d^* \beta}{\rho} \in L_\rho^2(\Lambda^1 \Omega)$  and  $\|\beta\|_{\rho*} < \infty$ , but such that  $\beta$  is not  $|dw|$ -integrable for some  $w \in L_\rho^2(\Lambda^1 \Omega)$  such that  $\int \rho |dw| < 1$ . Hence the restriction to smooth 1-forms  $w$  in the supremum that appears in the definition of the  $\|\cdot\|_{\rho*}$  norm.

**1.2.2. related results about 2d BEC.** We do not know of any source in the literature that establishes 2d results analogous to Proposition 4 and Theorem 5. Such results are however in some sense known, at least as folklore, and can be established by arguing *exactly* as in the proofs we supply here in the 3d case, but taking as a starting-point results from [19] about  $\Gamma$ -limits of the reduced Ginzburg-Landau functional in 2d, rather than the analogous results about the same problem in 3d from [4], which (together with very general convex duality arguments) are the chief input in the relevant proofs.

In particular, limits of sequences of minimizers in 2d are described, in the same sense as in Proposition 4, by a functional  $\mathcal{G}$  on  $L_\rho^2(\Omega')$  of *exactly* the same form as in (1.22), for a suitable  $\Omega' \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ . More generally, this functional can be obtained as



a  $\Gamma$ -limit of the scaled 2d Gross-Pitaevsky energy, completely parallel to Theorem 12. Moreover, this limiting functional admits a dual formulation as functional with constraints, parallel to that in Theorem 5, and from this one can easily determine a necessary and sufficient condition for the limiting vorticity to vanish.

On the other hand, for more extreme rotation regimes in anharmonic trapping potentials in 2d, a quite detailed analysis has been carried out recently in [12, 11, 22].

In a different direction, the critical rotation has been derived in certain highly symmetric domains in for example [14, 15, 1]. These references also examine the behavior of minimizers for *slightly* supercritical rotations.

The main difference between 2 and 3 dimensions is the form of the constraint in the limiting variational problem. In particular, in 2d, as in 3d, it is the case that if  $v_0$  minimizes  $\mathcal{G}$ , then  $dv_0 = d(\frac{d^* \beta_0}{\rho})$ , where the potential  $\beta_0$  minimizes the functional (1.25), subject to the constraint (1.26), where the norm in the constraint is defined as in (1.27). The difference is that in 2d, the potentials  $\beta$  are 2-forms on  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , and so can be identified with functions. And since it is not hard to check that  $\{d\omega : \int_{\Omega} \rho |d\omega| \leq 1\}$  is weakly dense in the set of signed measures  $\mu$  such that  $\int_{\Omega} \rho d|\mu| \leq 1$ , the 2d constrained problem reduces to minimizing (1.25) in the set

$$(1.29) \quad \left\{ \beta \in H^1(\Lambda^2 \Omega) : \left\| \frac{1}{\rho}(\beta - \beta_{\Phi}) \right\|_{L^\infty} \leq \frac{1}{2} \right\}.$$

This is a classical (weighted) 2-sided obstacle problem; for many  $\Phi$ , using the maximum principle it in fact reduces to a one-sided obstacle problem.

Thus we view the problem in Theorem 5 as a nonlocal, vector-valued analog of the classical obstacle problem.

**1.2.3. previous work in 3d.** For trapping potentials of the form  $a(x) = \sum_{i=1}^3 \omega_i x_i^2$  with  $\omega_i > 0$ , and for  $\Phi_\epsilon = |\log \epsilon| \Phi = \lambda |\log \epsilon| (x_1 dx_2 - x_2 dx_1)$ , the description of the critical rotation given in Theorem 5 was obtained in [17], building on earlier work of [2]. Indeed, these results show that if  $\|\beta_\Phi\|_* < \frac{1}{2}$ , then vorticity vanishes in the sense that  $Jv_\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ . This is stronger than the estimate  $|\log \epsilon|^{-1} Jv_\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  that follows from Proposition 4 and Theorem 5. The same paper [17] characterized the  $\Gamma$ -limit of the Gross-Pitaevsky functionals for the particular choice of  $a$  and  $\Phi_\epsilon$  described above, in cases where one has an a priori bound on the part of the energy associated with the vorticity of the condensate. A similar  $\Gamma$ -limit result was shown by Montero [21] to hold for very general trapping potentials  $a$  and forcing terms  $\Phi_\epsilon$ . Although it was not done in [21], this result could in principle be used to prove that  $Jv_\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  for subcritical rotations in these situations. The a priori bound on part of the energy required for these results means that they cannot give any information about minimizers for supercritical rotations.

**Acknowledgments.** S.B., R.L.J. and G.O. wish to thank FIM at ETH Zürich, where part of this work was completed, for the warm hospitality.

## 2. BACKGROUND AND NOTATION

**2.1. differential forms.** If  $U$  is an open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , we will use the notation  $W^{1,p}(\Lambda^k U)$  to denote the space of maps  $U \rightarrow \Lambda^k \mathbb{R}^n$  (that is,  $k$ -forms on  $U$ ) that belong to the Sobolev space  $W^{1,p}$ . A generic element  $\omega \in W^{1,p}(\Lambda^k U)$  thus has the



form

$$(2.1) \quad \sum_{\{\alpha: 1 \leq \alpha_1 < \dots < \alpha_k \leq n\}} \omega_\alpha dx^{\alpha_1} \wedge \dots \wedge dx^{\alpha_k}$$

with  $\omega_\alpha \in W^{1,p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$  for every multiindex  $\alpha$ . We use the notation  $L^p(\Lambda^k U)$ ,  $C^\infty(\Lambda^k U)$ , and so on in a parallel way.

For an open set  $\Omega$  with nonempty boundary and  $\omega \in C^0(\Lambda^k \bar{\Omega})$ , we define  $\omega_\top$  and  $\omega_N$  in  $C^0(\Lambda^k \partial\Omega)$  by

$$\omega_\top = i^* \omega, \text{ where } i : \partial\Omega \rightarrow \bar{\Omega} \text{ is the inclusion; } \quad \omega_N = \omega|_{\partial\Omega} - \omega_\top.$$

One refers to  $\omega_\top$  and  $\omega_N$  as the tangential and normal parts of  $\omega$  on  $\partial\Omega$ . We will use the same notation  $\omega_\top, \omega_N$  to refer to the tangential and normal parts of (the trace of) a form  $\omega \in W^{1,p}(\Lambda^k \Omega)$ , which one can define by noting that for example the map  $\omega \mapsto \omega_\top$ , well-defined on a dense subset of  $W^{1,p}(\Lambda^k \Omega)$ , extends to a bounded linear map  $W^{1,p}(\Lambda^k \Omega) \rightarrow L^p(\Lambda^k \partial\Omega)$ , or equivalently by applying the pointwise definition of  $\omega_\top$ , say, to the trace of  $\omega$  at a.e. point of  $\partial\Omega$ .

If  $\omega, \phi$  are elements of  $L^2(\Omega; \Lambda^k \mathbb{R}^n)$ , written as in (2.1), we will write  $\omega \cdot \phi$  to denote the integrable function defined by

$$\omega \cdot \phi = \sum_{\{\alpha: 1 \leq \alpha_1 < \dots < \alpha_k \leq n\}} \omega_\alpha \phi_\alpha.$$

This allows us to define an  $L^2$  inner product on spaces of differential forms in the obvious way. We write  $d^*$  to denote the formal adjoint of  $d$ , so that  $\int d\omega \cdot \phi = \int \omega \cdot d^* \phi$  when  $\omega$  is a smooth  $k-1$ -form and  $\phi$  a smooth  $k$ -form for some  $k$ , and at least one of them has compact support. Then

$$d^* \phi = (-1)^k \star d \star \phi \quad \text{if } \phi \text{ is a } k\text{-form,}$$

where in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , the  $\star$  operator, mapping  $k$ -forms to  $(3-k)$ -forms, is characterized by

$$\omega \wedge \star \phi = \star \omega \wedge \phi = \omega \cdot \phi \, dx^1 \wedge dx^2 \wedge dx^3.$$

(In even dimensions one must be more careful about signs.)

We will use the notation

$$W_\top^{1,p}(\Lambda^k \Omega) := \{\omega \in W^{1,p}(\Lambda^k \Omega) : \omega_\top = 0\},$$

$$W_N^{1,p}(\Lambda^k \Omega) := \{\omega \in W^{1,p}(\Lambda^k \Omega) : \omega_N = 0\}.$$

and

$$\mathcal{H}_\top(\Lambda^k \Omega) := \{\omega \in W^{1,p}(\Lambda^k \Omega) : \omega_\top = 0, d\omega = d^* \omega = 0\},$$

$$\mathcal{H}_N(\Lambda^k \Omega) := \{\omega \in W^{1,p}(\Lambda^k \Omega) : \omega_N = 0, d\omega = d^* \omega = 0\}.$$

In fact forms in  $\mathcal{H}_\top^k$  and  $\mathcal{H}_N^k$  are known to be smooth.

Gauge-invariance implies that the set of minimizers of  $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon$  is noncompact in  $H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{C}) \times [A_{ex} + H^1(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3)]$ . In order to remedy this, we will often restrict  $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon$  to a smaller space. Thus we introduce

$$(2.2) \quad \dot{H}_*^1(\mathbb{R}^3; \Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3) = \dot{H}_*^1 := \{A \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3; \Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3) : d^* A = 0\}$$

with the inner product  $(A, B)_{\dot{H}_*^1(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3)} = (A, B)_* := (dA, dB)_{L^2(\Lambda^2 \mathbb{R}^3)}$ . This makes  $\dot{H}_*^1(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3)$  into a Hilbert space, satisfying in addition the Sobolev inequality

$$\|A\|_{L^6(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C \|A\|_{\dot{H}_*^1(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3)}.$$

In view of standard results about the Hodge decomposition, given any 1-form  $\tilde{A}$  such that  $\tilde{A} \in A_{\epsilon, ex} + \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3; \Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3)$ , we can write  $\tilde{B} := \tilde{A} - A_{\epsilon, ex} \in \dot{H}^1$  in the form

$$\tilde{B} = B + d\phi, \quad \text{where } B \in H_*^1 \text{ and } d\phi \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3; \Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3).$$

Thus given any pair  $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{A}) \in H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{C}) \times [A_{ex} + H^1(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3)]$ , there exists an equivalent pair  $(u, A) = (\tilde{u}e^{-i\phi}, \tilde{A} - d\phi)$  in  $H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{C}) \times [A_{\epsilon, ex} + \dot{H}_*^1]$ , so that in restricting  $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon$  to  $H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{C}) \times [A_{\epsilon, ex} + \dot{H}_*^1]$ , we do not sacrifice any generality.

**2.2. Hodge decompositions.** We will need several Hodge decompositions. First, on a bounded open domain  $\Omega$  with  $C^1$  boundary, we have, for every integer  $k \in \{0, \dots, n\}$  the decompositions

$$(2.3) \quad L^2(\Lambda^k \Omega) = dH^1(\Lambda^{k-1} \Omega) \oplus d^*H_N^1(\Lambda^{k+1} \Omega) \oplus \mathcal{H}_N(\Lambda^k \Omega)$$

and

$$(2.4) \quad L^2(\Lambda^k \Omega) = dH_\top^1(\Lambda^{k-1} \Omega) \oplus d^*H^1(\Lambda^{k+1} \Omega) \oplus \mathcal{H}_\top(\Lambda^k \Omega).$$

These are known from work of Morrey (see also [16], Theorem 5.7). The first of these, for example, means that every  $\omega \in L^2(\Lambda^k \Omega)$  can be written in the form  $\omega = d\alpha + d^*\beta + \gamma$ , where  $\alpha \in H^1(\Lambda^{k-1} \Omega)$ ,  $\beta \in d^*H_N^1(\Lambda^{k+1} \Omega)$ , and  $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}_N^k$ , and moreover  $d\alpha$ ,  $d^*\beta$ , and  $\gamma$  are mutually orthogonal in  $L^2$ .

We will sometimes use the notation

$$(2.5) \quad \ker d = H^1(\Omega) \oplus \mathcal{H}_N(\Lambda^1 \Omega), \quad (\ker d)^\perp = d^*H_N^1(\Lambda^2 \Omega).$$

This is justified by the following considerations. First, we claim that for  $v \in L^2(\Lambda^1 \Omega)$ ,

$$(2.6) \quad dv = 0 \text{ as a distribution on } \Omega \iff v \in dH^1(\Omega) \oplus \mathcal{H}_N(\Lambda^1 \Omega).$$

Indeed, to prove that  $v \in dH^1(\Omega) \oplus \mathcal{H}_N(\Lambda^1 \Omega)$ , it suffices by (2.3) to verify that  $v \perp d^*H_N^1(\Lambda^2 \Omega)$ . Fix any  $\beta \in H_N^1(\Lambda^2 \Omega)$ , and let  $\chi_\epsilon \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$  be a sequence of functions such that  $\chi_\epsilon = 1$  in  $\{x \in \Omega : \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) > \epsilon\}$ ,  $\|\nabla \chi_\epsilon\|_\infty \leq C\epsilon$ . Then the assumption that  $dv = 0$  in  $\Omega$  implies that

$$0 = \int_\Omega v \cdot d^*(\chi_\epsilon \beta) = \int_\Omega \chi_\epsilon v \cdot d^*\beta + \int_\Omega v \cdot \star \cdot (d\chi_\epsilon \wedge \star \beta)$$

for every  $\epsilon$ . Thus

$$\int_\Omega v \cdot d^*\beta = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_\Omega \chi_\epsilon v \cdot d^*\beta = - \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_\Omega v \cdot \star (d\chi_\epsilon \wedge \star \beta) = 0$$

where the last equality follows from the fact that  $\beta_N = 0$ . This proves one implication in (2.6), and the other is obvious.

Similarly, the Hodge decomposition implies that if  $\omega \in L^2(\Lambda^k \Omega)$ , then

$$(2.7) \quad \omega \in d^*H_N^1(\Lambda^{k+1} \Omega) \iff \int_\Omega \omega \cdot \phi = 0 \quad \forall \phi \in H^1(\Lambda^k \Omega) \text{ with } d\phi = 0,$$

We also define

$$(2.8) \quad P := L^2(\Lambda^1 \Omega) \text{ orthogonal projection onto } d^*W_N^{1,2}(\Lambda^2 \Omega) = (\ker d)^\perp.$$

Given  $A \in \dot{H}^1(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3)$  for example, we will generally abuse notation and write  $PA_1$  instead of  $P(A_1|_\Omega)$ . We remark that

$$(2.9) \quad \|PB\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 = \inf\{\|B + \gamma\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 : \gamma \in H^1(\Omega), d\gamma = 0\}.$$

For applications to Bose-Einstein condensates we will need a Hodge decomposition in the weighted Hilbert space  $L^2_\rho(\Lambda^k\Omega)$ . In particular, in the notation from the introduction (compare (1.23), (1.24)), we may decompose<sup>1</sup>  $\phi \in L^2_\rho(\Lambda^1\Omega)$  as

$$\phi = \omega + \frac{d^*\beta}{\rho}, \quad \omega = P_\rho\phi \in (\ker d)_\rho, \quad \frac{d^*\beta}{\rho} \in L^2_\rho(\Lambda^1\Omega).$$

For refined results assuming  $\rho$  and  $\phi$  sufficiently smooth, see [21].

**2.3. duality.** We will frequently use the following basic result, whose proof can be found for example in [13].

**Lemma 6.** *Assume that  $H$  is a Hilbert space, and that  $I : H \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$  is a convex function and that  $I(x) < \infty$  for some  $x \in H$ .*

*Let  $G(x) := I(x) + \frac{1}{2}\|x\|_H^2$ .*

*Let  $I^*$  denote the Legendre-Fenchel transform of  $I$ , so that*

$$I^*(\xi) := \sup_{x \in H} ((\xi, x)_H - I(x)).$$

*Then if we define  $G^\dagger(x) := I^*(-x) + \frac{1}{2}\|x\|_H^2$ , the following hold:*

- (1) *There exists a unique  $x_0 \in H$  such that  $G(x_0) = \min_H G(\cdot)$ .*
- (2) *The same  $x_0 \in H$  is the unique minimizer of  $G^\dagger$  in  $H$ .*
- (3)  *$G(x) + G^\dagger(y) \geq 0$ , and  $G(x) + G(y) = 0$  if and only if  $(x, y) = (x_0, x_0)$ .*

### 3. VORTEX DENSITY IN 3D SUPERCONDUCTORS

**3.1. A dual variational problem.** We start with the proof of Theorem 2, in which we identify a variational problem dual to that of minimizing  $\mathcal{F}$ , which describes the limiting density of vortex lines in a superconducting material subjected to an applied magnetic field. We then use this dual problem to prove Theorem 3, giving a necessary and sufficient condition for the limiting vorticity to vanish.

In the next section we present several different and, actually, simpler derivations of (an equivalent but different-looking expression for) the critical field. The approach presented here, although a little more complicated, has the advantage of yielding the dual problem of the statement of Theorem 2, which clearly generalizes, in an interesting way, the obstacle problem identified in the 2d literature, see [26].

*Proof of Theorem 2. Step 0.* Let us write  $\xi = A|_\Omega - v$  and  $\zeta = A - A_{ex}$ , so that in terms of the  $\xi, \zeta$  variables,

$$\mathcal{F}(v, A) = \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega |\xi|^2 + |d(\zeta - \xi + A_{ex})| + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |d\zeta|^2 =: F(\xi, \zeta).$$

Also, let  $H := L^2(\Lambda^1\Omega) \times \dot{H}^1_*$ . Note that  $H$  is a Hilbert space with the norm

$$\|(\xi, \zeta)\|_H^2 := \|\xi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|d\zeta\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2$$

and the corresponding inner product. We next define

$$I(\xi, \zeta) := \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega |d(\zeta - \xi + A_{ex})|$$

---

<sup>1</sup>Notice that our notation is inconsistent, with  $P_\rho$  = projection onto  $(\ker d)_\rho$  for Bose-Einstein, and  $P :=$  projection onto  $(\ker d)^\perp$  for superconductivity. These conventions are convenient however, and we do not think they can lead to any confusion.

so that

$$F(\xi, \zeta) = \frac{1}{2} \|(\xi, \zeta)\|_H^2 + I(\xi, \zeta).$$

As usual,  $I$  is understood to equal  $+\infty$  if  $d(\zeta - \xi + A_{ex})$  is not a Radon measure. Let  $I^*$  denote the Legendre-Fenchel transform of  $I$ , so that

$$I^*(\xi, \zeta) = \sup_{(\xi^*, \zeta^*) \in H} \{((\xi, \zeta), (\xi^*, \zeta^*))_H - I(\xi^*, \zeta^*)\}$$

Let us further write

$$F^\dagger(\xi, \zeta) = \frac{1}{2} \|(\xi, \zeta)\|_H^2 + I^*(\xi, \zeta).$$

**Step 1.** As remarked in Lemma 6 above,  $(\xi_0, \zeta_0)$  minimizes  $F$  if and only if  $(-\xi_0, -\zeta_0)$  minimizes  $F^\dagger$ . To compute  $I^*$ , note that for  $(\xi, \zeta) \in H$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} I^*(\xi, \zeta) &= \sup_{(\xi^*, \zeta^*) \in H} \left\{ ((\xi, \zeta), ((\xi^* - A_{ex}) + A_{ex}, \zeta^*))_H - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} |d(\zeta^* - (\xi^* - A_{ex}))| \right\} \\ (3.1) \quad &= (\xi, A_{ex})_{L^2(\Omega)} + \sup_{(\xi^*, \zeta^*) \in H} \left\{ ((\xi, \zeta), (\xi^*, \zeta^*))_H - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} |d(\zeta^* - \xi^*)| \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

It is clear the supremum on the right-hand side equals zero if  $(\xi, \zeta)$  satisfies

$$(3.2) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \mathbf{1}_{\Omega} \xi \cdot \xi^* + d\zeta \cdot d\zeta^* \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} |d(\zeta^* - \xi^*)| \quad \text{for all } (\xi^*, \zeta^*) \in H.$$

and if this condition fails to hold, then (by homogeneity) the sup in (3.1) is infinite. Thus

$$I^*(\xi, \zeta) = \begin{cases} (\xi, A_{ex})_{L^2(\Omega)} & \text{if (3.2) holds} \\ +\infty & \text{if not.} \end{cases}$$

It follows that

$$F^\dagger(\xi, \zeta) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \|(\xi + A_{ex}, \zeta)\|_H^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|A_{ex}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 & \text{if (3.2) holds} \\ +\infty & \text{if not.} \end{cases}$$

**Step 2.** We want to rewrite  $F^\dagger$  in a more useful form. To this end, we first claim that  $(\xi, \zeta) \in H$  satisfies (3.2) if and only if

$$(3.3) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} d\zeta \cdot d\zeta^* \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} |d\zeta^*| \quad \text{for all } \zeta^* \in \dot{H}^1(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3)$$

and

$$(3.4) \quad \zeta \in H_{loc}^2 \cap H_*^1, \quad \text{and } d^* d\zeta + \mathbf{1}_{\Omega} \xi = 0.$$

**Step 2a.** First assume that (3.2) holds. Note that since  $(\xi, \zeta) \in H$

$$((\xi, \zeta), (\xi^*, \zeta^*))_H \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} |d(\zeta^* - \xi^*)| \quad \text{for all } (\xi, \zeta) \in L^2(\Lambda^1 \Omega) \times \dot{H}^1(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3).$$

This follows from (3.2), since we can write  $(\xi^*, \zeta^*) \in L^2(\Omega) \times \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$  as  $(\xi^*, \zeta') + (0, \zeta'')$  with  $(\xi^*, \zeta') \in H$  and  $\zeta'' \perp \dot{H}_*^1$ , so that  $d\zeta'' \equiv 0$ .

Now we immediately obtain (3.3) by taking  $(\xi^*, \zeta^*)$  of the form  $(0, \zeta^*)$  in the above inequality. Similarly, by choosing  $(\xi^*, \zeta^*)$  of the form  $\pm(\zeta^*|_{\Omega}, \zeta^*)$  we find that

$$(3.5) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (d\zeta \cdot d\zeta^* + \mathbf{1}_{\Omega} \xi \cdot \zeta^*) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \zeta^* \in \dot{H}^1(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3).$$

Since  $d^*\zeta = 0$  for all  $\zeta \in \dot{H}^1$ , we see from (3.5) that  $-\Delta\zeta + \mathbf{1}_\Omega\xi = 0$  as distributions, and hence from elliptic regularity that  $\zeta \in H_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$  and that  $d^*d\zeta + \mathbf{1}_\Omega\xi = 0$  a.e. in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , so that (3.4) holds.

**Step 2b.** Conversely, suppose that (3.3), (3.4) hold. Clearly (3.4) implies (3.5), so for  $(X^*, \zeta^*) \in \dot{H}^1(\Lambda^1\mathbb{R}^3) \times \dot{H}^1(\Lambda^1\mathbb{R}^3)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \xi \cdot X^* + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} d\zeta \cdot d\zeta^* &\stackrel{(3.5)}{=} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} d\zeta \cdot d(\zeta^* - X^*) \\ &\stackrel{(3.3)}{\leq} \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} |d(\zeta^* - X^*)|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus (3.2) follows whenever  $\xi^*$  is the restriction to  $\Omega$  of some  $X^* \in \dot{H}^1(\Lambda^1\mathbb{R}^3)$ .

We next deduce from this that (3.2) holds whenever  $\xi^* \in L^2(\Lambda^1\Omega)$ . We may assume that  $d\zeta^*$  is a measure, as otherwise the right-hand side of (3.2) is infinite and there is nothing to prove. Then, given  $(\xi^*, \zeta^*)$ , it suffices to find  $(X_\epsilon^*, \zeta_\epsilon^*) \in \dot{H}^1(\Lambda^1\mathbb{R}^3) \times \dot{H}^1(\Lambda^1\mathbb{R}^3)$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} (3.6) \quad &X_\epsilon^*|_{\Omega} \rightharpoonup \xi^* \text{ weakly in } L^2(\Lambda^1\Omega), \\ &d\zeta_\epsilon^* \rightharpoonup d\zeta^* \text{ weakly in } L^2(\Lambda^1\mathbb{R}^3), \text{ and} \\ &\int_{\Omega} |d(\zeta_\epsilon^* - X_\epsilon^*)| \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} |d(\zeta^* - \xi^*)|. \end{aligned}$$

To do this, we start by fixing, for all  $\epsilon$  sufficiently small, a  $C^1$  diffeomorphism  $\Psi_\epsilon : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  such that

$$(3.7) \quad \Psi_\epsilon(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : \text{dist}(x, \Omega) < \epsilon\}) \subset \Omega, \quad \Psi_\epsilon(x) = x \text{ if } \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) > \sqrt{\epsilon}$$

and

$$(3.8) \quad \|D\Psi_\epsilon - I\|_\infty \leq C\sqrt{\epsilon}, \quad \|D\Psi_\epsilon^{-1} - I\|_\infty \leq C\sqrt{\epsilon}.$$

For example we may take  $\Psi_\epsilon$  in  $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) \leq \sqrt{\epsilon}\}$  to have the form  $\Psi_\epsilon(s) = x - f_\epsilon(d(x))\bar{\nu}(x)$ , where  $\bar{\nu}(x)$  is the outer unit normal to  $\partial\Omega$  at the point of  $\partial\Omega$  closest to  $x$ , and  $d(x)$  is the signed distance (positive outside  $\Omega$ , negative in  $\Omega$ ) to  $\partial\Omega$ , and  $f_\epsilon$  is a nonnegative function with compact support in  $(-\sqrt{\epsilon}, \sqrt{\epsilon})$  such that  $|f'_\epsilon| \leq C\sqrt{\epsilon}$  and  $f_\epsilon(\epsilon) > \epsilon$ .

Next, let  $\bar{\xi}^*$  denote some extension of  $\xi$  to an element of  $L^2(\Lambda^1\mathbb{R}^3)$ , and let  $\psi_\epsilon$  be a smooth nonnegative radially symmetric mollifier with support in  $B(0, \epsilon/2)$  and such that  $\int \phi_\epsilon = 1$ .

Then we define

$$X_\epsilon^* := \psi_\epsilon * (\Psi_\epsilon^\# \bar{\xi}^*), \quad \text{and} \quad \zeta_\epsilon^* := \psi_\epsilon * (\Psi_\epsilon^\# \zeta^*).$$

Then the verification of (3.6) follows by a reasonably straightforward, classical argument. (See for example the proof of Lemma 13, at the end of Section 4.1, where similar computations are carried out in detail in a somewhat more complicated setting.)

**Step 3.** In view of (3.4), we can eliminate  $\xi$  from the expression for  $F^\dagger$  to find that

$$F^\dagger(\xi, \zeta) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \|(-d^*d\zeta + A_{ex}, \zeta)\|_H^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|A_{ex}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 & \text{if (3.3), (3.4) hold} \\ +\infty & \text{if not.} \end{cases}$$

We now rewrite everything in terms of  $A = \zeta + A_{ex}$ ,  $v = A|_{\Omega} - \xi = (\zeta + A_{ex})|_{\Omega} - \xi$ , and  $B = d(A - A_{ex}) = d\zeta$ .

First, the constraints (3.3), (3.4) are equivalent to the conditions appearing under part **1** of the statement of the theorem, that is,

$$(3.9) \quad B \in \mathcal{C}, \text{ and } d^*B + \mathbf{1}_\Omega(A - v) = 0,$$

where the constraint set  $\mathcal{C}$  is defined in (1.9).

Second, it follows from Lemma 6 that

$$\begin{aligned} (v_0, A_0) \text{ minimizes } \mathcal{F} \text{ in } L^2(\Omega) \times [A_{ex} + \mathcal{H}_0] \\ \iff (A_0 - v_0, A_0 - A_{ex}) \text{ minimizes } F \text{ in } H \\ \iff (v_0 - A_0, A_{ex} - A_0) \text{ minimizes } F^\dagger \text{ in } H, \\ \iff (v_0, A_0) \text{ minimizes } \mathcal{F}^\dagger \text{ in } L^2(\Omega) \times [A_{ex} + \mathcal{H}_0], \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathcal{F}^\dagger(v, A) := F^\dagger(v - A, A_{ex} - A) + \frac{1}{2}\|A_{ex}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2$ .

Thus

$$(3.10) \quad \mathcal{F}^\dagger(v, A) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}\|(v - A + A_{ex}, A_{ex} - A)\|_H^2 & \text{if (3.9) holds, and} \\ +\infty & \text{if not.} \end{cases}$$

Rewriting  $\mathcal{F}^\dagger$  in terms of  $B := d(A - A_{ex})$ , it follows that  $(v_0, A_0)$  minimizes  $\mathcal{F}^\dagger$  if and only if conditions **1** and **2** from the statement of the theorem hold. Remark finally that (1.12) follows from (1.11) and the relation

$$(3.11) \quad \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega |dv_0| + \int_\Omega (v_0 - A_0) \cdot v_0 = 0$$

which in turn follows by stationarity of  $\mathcal{F}(v_0, A_0)$  with respect to variations  $v_t = e^t \cdot v_0$  around  $t = 0$ .  $\square$

**3.2. first characterization of the critical applied magnetic field.** We next want to prove Theorem 3, which gives a necessary and sufficient condition for the vorticity of a minimizer of  $\mathcal{F}$  to be nonzero. Recall that this criterion involves the minimizer of an energy  $\mathcal{E}_0$  in a space  $\mathcal{C}'$ , defined in (1.15). We first establish some facts about  $\mathcal{C}'$ . Given a function  $v$  defined on  $\Omega$ , we use the notation  $\mathbf{1}_\Omega v$  to denote its extension to the function, defined on  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , that vanishes away from  $\Omega$ .

**Lemma 7.** *Assume that  $B \in H^1(\Lambda^2 \mathbb{R}^3) \cap d\dot{H}^1(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3)$ .*

*If  $B \in \mathcal{C}'$ , then  $\text{supp}(d^*B) \subset \bar{\Omega}$ , and  $(d^*B)|_\Omega \in d^*H_N^1(\Lambda^2 \Omega) = (\ker d)^\perp$ .*

*Conversely, given any  $\phi \in d^*H_N^1(\Lambda^2 \Omega)$ , there exists  $B_\phi \in \mathcal{C}'$  such that  $d^*B_\phi = \mathbf{1}_\Omega \phi$*

*Finally,*

$$(3.12) \quad \mathcal{C}' \subset \bigcap_{1 < p \leq 2} \dot{W}^{1,p} \subset \bigcap_{\frac{3}{2} < q \leq 6} \dot{L}^q.$$

*Remark 6.* The proof will show that  $B_\phi = d(-\Delta)^{-1}(\mathbf{1}_\Omega \phi)$ , where  $(-\Delta)^{-1}$  denotes convolution with the fundamental solution for the Laplacian on  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , with  $(-\Delta)^{-1}(\mathbf{1}_\Omega \phi) \in \cap_{1 < p \leq 2} \dot{W}^{2,p} \subset \cap_{r > 3} L^r$ .

*Proof. Step 1.* We first claim that if  $B \in \mathcal{C}'$ , then

$$(3.13) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} d^*B \cdot v = 0 \quad \text{for all } v \in L^2(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3) \text{ such that } dv = 0 \text{ in } \Omega.$$

(Recall that by definition of  $\mathcal{C}'$ , this identity holds for  $v \in H^1(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3)$  such that  $dv = 0$  in  $\Omega$ .) To see this, define a diffeomorphism  $\Psi_\epsilon : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  as in (3.7), (3.8),

and let  $\psi_\epsilon$  denote a symmetric approximate identity supported in  $B(0, \epsilon/2)$ . Given  $v \in L^2(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3)$  such that  $dv = 0$  in  $\Omega$ , define  $v_\epsilon := \psi_\epsilon * (\Psi_\epsilon^\# v) \in H^1(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3)$ . Clearly  $v_\epsilon \rightarrow v$  in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ , as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ , and we also claim that  $dv_\epsilon = 0$  in  $\Omega$ . To see this, note that for any  $\phi \in C_c^1(\Lambda^2 \Omega)$ ,

$$\int_\Omega dv_\epsilon \cdot \phi = \int_\Omega v_\epsilon \cdot d^* \phi = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Psi_\epsilon^\# v \cdot (\psi_\epsilon * d^* \phi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Psi_\epsilon^\# v \wedge d \star (\psi_\epsilon * \phi).$$

Since  $\Psi_\epsilon^\# v \wedge d \star (\psi_\epsilon * \phi) = \Psi_\epsilon^\# [v \wedge (\Psi_\epsilon^{-1})^\# (d \star (\psi_\epsilon * \phi))]$ , it follows that

$$(3.14) \quad \int_\Omega dv_\epsilon \cdot \phi = \int_{\Psi_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}^3)} v \wedge d(\Psi_\epsilon^{-1})^\# (\star(\psi_\epsilon * \phi)) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} v \cdot d^* \star \phi_\epsilon$$

for  $\phi_\epsilon := (\Psi_\epsilon^{-1})^\# (\star(\psi_\epsilon * \phi))$ . The definitions of  $\Psi_\epsilon$  and  $\psi_\epsilon$  imply that  $\phi_\epsilon$  has compact support in  $\Omega$ . Thus  $\int_\Omega dv_\epsilon \cdot \phi = \int_\Omega dv \cdot \phi_\epsilon = 0$  for every  $\psi \in C_c^1(\Lambda^2 \Omega)$ , and it follows that  $dv_\epsilon = 0$  in  $\Omega$ . Then if  $B \in \mathcal{C}'$ ,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} d^* B \cdot v = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} B \cdot dv_\epsilon = 0.$$

**Step 2.** Now for  $B \in \mathcal{C}'$ , if  $\chi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Omega)$ , then  $\chi d^* B \in L^2(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3)$  and  $d(\chi d^* B) = 0$  in  $\Omega$ , so  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \chi |d^* B|^2 = 0$  by (3.13). Hence  $\text{supp}(d^* B) \subset \bar{\Omega}$ . Then (3.13) implies that for any  $v \in L^2(\Lambda^1 \Omega)$  such that  $dv = 0$ ,

$$0 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} d^* B \cdot (\mathbf{1}_\Omega v) = \int_\Omega d^* B \cdot v$$

Thus  $(d^* B)|_\Omega \in (\ker d)^\perp = d^* H_N^1(\Lambda^2 \Omega)$ .

**Step 3.** Now, given  $\phi \in d^* H_N^1(\Lambda^2 \omega)$ , let  $\psi = (-\Delta)^{-1}(\mathbf{1}_\Omega \phi)$ , and let  $B_\phi := d\psi$ .

Then the fact that  $\phi \in d^* H_N^1$  implies that  $d^*(\mathbf{1}_\Omega \phi) = 0$  on  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . It follows that  $d^* \psi = 0$ , and hence that  $d^* B_\phi = d^* d\psi = (d^* d + dd^*)\psi = -\Delta \psi = \mathbf{1}_\Omega \phi$ . In particular  $\text{supp}(d^* \psi) \subset \bar{\Omega}$ .

Finally, to see that  $B_\phi \in \mathcal{C}'$ , observe that  $\mathbf{1}_\Omega \phi \in \cap_{1 \leq p \leq 2} L^p(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3)$ , so elliptic regularity and embedding theorems imply  $B_\psi \in \cap_{1 < p \leq 2} \dot{W}^{1,p} \subset \cap_{3/2 < q < 6} L^q$ ,  $B_\phi \in H^1(\Lambda^2 \mathbb{R}^3) \cap d\dot{H}^1(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3)$ , and in addition (3.12) holds. It is clear that  $\text{supp}(d^* B_\phi) = \text{supp}(\mathbf{1}_\Omega \phi) \subset \bar{\Omega}$ , so  $B_\phi \in \mathcal{C}'$ .  $\square$

We need one more easy fact about  $\mathcal{C}'$ .

**Lemma 8.** *If  $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{C}'$ , then there exists  $\psi_1 \in \cap_{1 < p \leq 2} \dot{W}^{2,p}(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3)$  such that  $d\psi_1 = B_1$  and*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} B_1 \cdot B_2 = \int_\Omega \psi_1 \cdot d^* B_2.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\psi_1 = (-\Delta)^{-1} d^* B$ , so that in view of Remark 6,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} B_1 \cdot B_2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} d\psi_1 \cdot B_2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \psi_1 \cdot d^* B_2 = \int_\Omega \psi_1 \cdot d^* B_2$$

where the integration by parts is easily justified in view of the decay properties recorded in (3.12) and Remark 6.  $\square$

Now we give the



*proof of Theorem 3. Step 1.* We first assume that  $\|B_*\|_* \leq \frac{1}{2}$ . Then, recalling (1.11), and recalling that  $dB_0 = 0$ , we must show that

$$0 = dv_0 = dd^*B_0 + dA_0 = dd^*B_0 + B_0 + H_{ex} \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Since  $B_0$  and  $B_*$  minimize  $\mathcal{E}_0$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{C}'$  respectively, and since  $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{C}'$ , it is clear that  $B_* = B_0$  if and only if  $B_* \in \mathcal{C}$ , which holds if and only if  $\|B_*\|_* \leq \frac{1}{2}$ . So it suffices to check that

$$(3.15) \quad dd^*B_* + B_* + H_{ex} = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

To do this, we take first variations of  $\mathcal{E}_0$  in  $\mathcal{C}'$  to find that  $B_*$  satisfies

$$(3.16) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} B_* \cdot B + \int_{\Omega} (d^*B_* + A_{ex}) \cdot d^*B = 0 \quad \text{for all } B \in \mathcal{C}'.$$

By Lemma 8, we may rewrite this as

$$\int_{\Omega} (\psi + d^*B_* + A_{ex}) \cdot d^*B = 0 \quad \text{for all } B \in \mathcal{C}'.$$

where  $\psi = (-\Delta)^{-1}d^*B_*$ , so that  $d\psi = B_*$ . Then we conclude from Lemma 7 that  $(\psi + d^*B_* + A_{ex})|_{\Omega} \in ((\ker d)^{\perp})^{\perp} = \ker d$ , and hence that  $d(\psi + d^*B_* + A_{ex}) = 0$  in  $\Omega$ , which is (3.15).

**Step 2.** Now we assume that  $dv_0 = 0$  in  $\Omega$ . We will show that in this case,  $\mathcal{E}_0(B_0) = \mathcal{E}_0(B_*)$ . Since  $B_*$  is the unique minimizer of  $\mathcal{E}_0$  in  $\mathcal{C}'$  and  $B_0 \in \mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{C}'$ , this implies that  $B_0 = B_*$ , and hence that  $B_* \in \mathcal{C}$ .

First note that

$$(3.17) \quad \int_{\Omega} v_0 \cdot d^*B = 0 \quad \text{for any } B \in \mathcal{C}',$$

since  $d^*B \in d^*H_N^1(\Lambda^2\Omega) = (\ker d)^{\perp}$  by Lemma 7. Applying this to  $B = B_0$  and recalling that  $v_0 = d^*B_0 + A_0 = d^*B_0 + (A_0 - A_{ex}) + A_{ex}$  in  $\Omega$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_{\Omega} (d^*B_0 + (A_0 - A_{ex}) + A_{ex}) \cdot d^*B_0 \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (d^*B_0 + (A_0 - A_{ex}) + A_{ex}) \cdot d^*B_0 \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |d^*B_0|^2 + |B_0|^2 + A_{ex} \cdot d^*B_0. \end{aligned}$$

(The integration by parts is easily justified using (3.12).) Using this to rewrite the definition of  $\mathcal{E}_0$  yields

$$(3.18) \quad \mathcal{E}_0(B_0) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} A_{ex} \cdot d^*B_0 + |A_{ex}|^2$$

**Step 3.** Next, taking  $B_*$  as a test function in (3.16), we obtain

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |B_*|^2 + \mathbf{1}_{\Omega}(|d^*B_*|^2 + A_{ex} \cdot d^*B) = 0.$$

It follows that

$$(3.19) \quad \mathcal{E}_0(B_*) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} (d^*B_* \cdot A_{ex} + |A_{ex}|^2)$$

3. From (3.16) we also have

$$(3.20) \quad 0 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} B_* \cdot B_0 + \mathbf{1}_\Omega(d^*B_* + A_{ex}) \cdot d^*B_0 = 0$$

On the other hand, again using (3.17), we compute

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_{\Omega} v_0 \cdot d^*B_* = \int_{\Omega} (d^*B_0 + (A_0 - A_{ex}) + A_{ex}) \cdot d^*B_* \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (d^*B_0 + (A_0 - A_{ex}) + \mathbf{1}_\Omega A_{ex}) \cdot d^*B_* \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} d^*B_0 \cdot d^*B_* + B_0 \cdot B_* + \mathbf{1}_\Omega A_{ex} \cdot d^*B_* \end{aligned}$$

recalling that  $d(A_0 - A_{ex}) = B_0$ . And by comparing this and (3.20), we find that

$$\int_{\Omega} A_{ex} \cdot d^*B_* = \int_{\Omega} A_{ex} \cdot d^*B_0.$$

This, together with (3.18) and (3.19), shows that  $\mathcal{E}_o(B_*) = \mathcal{E}_0(B_0)$ , completing the proof.  $\square$

**3.3. an alternate characterization of the critical applied field.** Our next result gives a different characterization of the critical field.

**Theorem 9.** *Let  $(v_0, A_0)$  minimize  $\mathcal{F}$  in  $L^2(\Omega; \Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3) \times [A_{ex} + \dot{H}_*^1]$ .*

*Further, let*

$$(3.21) \quad \mathcal{E}_1(A) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \mathbf{1}_\Omega |PA|^2 + |dA - H_{ex}|^2 dx,$$

*where  $P$  is defined in (2.8), and let  $A_1$  minimize  $\mathcal{E}_1$  in  $A_{ex} + H^1(\mathbb{R}^3; \Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3)$ . Let  $\alpha_1 \in H^1(\Omega; \Lambda^2 \mathbb{R}^3)$  be such that*

$$(3.22) \quad d^*\alpha_1 = PA_1, \quad d\alpha_1 = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad \alpha_{1,N} = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega.$$

*(Such an  $\alpha_1$  exists by definition of  $P$ .) Note that  $A_1$  and hence  $\alpha_1$  depend on  $A_{ex}$ .*

*Then  $dv_0 = 0$  if and only if*

$$(3.23) \quad \|\alpha_1\|_{**} := \sup_{|dv|(\Omega) \leq 1} \int_{\Omega} dv \cdot \alpha_1 \leq 1/2.$$

*Moreover, if  $dv_0 = 0$  then  $A_0 = A_1$ .*

**3.3.1. Theorem 9 via a splitting of  $\mathcal{F}$ .** We will give three proofs of this theorem. We first present the most direct proof, which does not use convex duality at all.

*First proof of Theorem 9.* Recall from (2.6) that for  $v \in L^2(\Lambda^1 \Omega)$ ,  $dv = 0$  in  $\Omega$  if and only if  $v \in dH^1(\Omega) \oplus \mathcal{H}_N(\Lambda^1 \Omega) = \ker d$ , see (2.6). Define

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(v, A) &:= \inf \{ \mathcal{F}(v + \gamma, A) : \gamma \in \ker d \} \\ &\stackrel{(2.9)}{=} \frac{1}{2} \left[ \int_{\Omega} |dv| + |P(v - A)|^2 dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |dA - H_{ex}|^2 dx \right]. \end{aligned}$$

(Note that the definition (3.21) of  $\mathcal{E}_1$  can be rewritten  $\mathcal{E}_1(A) = \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(0, A)$ .) It is clear that

$$(v_0, A_0) \text{ minimizes } \tilde{\mathcal{F}} \iff (v_0 + \gamma, A_0) \text{ minimizes } \mathcal{F} \text{ for some } \gamma \in \ker d.$$

Since we are interested here in  $dv_0$ , we may consider  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$  instead of  $\mathcal{F}$ . We rewrite

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(v, A) = \mathcal{E}_1(A) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} |dv| + |Pv|^2 - 2Pv \cdot PA \, dx.$$

Since  $A_1$  minimizes  $\mathcal{E}_1$ ,

$$(3.24) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \mathbf{1}_{\Omega} PA_1 \cdot PB + (dA_1 - H_{ex}) \cdot dB \, dx = 0$$

for all  $B \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3; \Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3)$ , so that

$$\mathcal{E}_1(A_1 + B) = \mathcal{E}_1(A_1) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \mathbf{1}_{\Omega} |PB|^2 + |dB|^2 \, dx$$

for  $B$  as above. Given any  $A$ , let us write  $A = A_1 + B$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(v, A_1 + B) &= \mathcal{E}_1(A_1) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} |PB|^2 \, dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |dB|^2 \, dx \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} |dv| + |Pv|^2 - 2Pv \cdot (PA_1 + PB) \, dx \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} |P(B - v)|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |dB|^2 + \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{2} |dv| - Pv \cdot PA_1. \end{aligned}$$

For  $\alpha_1$  as in the statement of the theorem,

$$(3.25) \quad \int_{\Omega} Pv \cdot PA_1 = \int_{\Omega} Pv \cdot d^* \alpha_1 \, dx = \int_{\Omega} dv \cdot \alpha_1 \, dx$$

where the boundary terms arising from integration by parts have vanished due to the fact that  $\alpha_{1,N} = 0$ . Thus

$$(3.26) \quad \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(v, A) = \mathcal{E}_1(A_1) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |dB|^2 + \mathbf{1}_{\Omega} |P(v - B)|^2 + \int_{\Omega} \left( \frac{1}{2} |dv| - dv \cdot \alpha_1 \right).$$

If condition (3.23) holds, then  $\int_{\Omega} (\frac{1}{2} |dv| - dv \cdot \alpha_1) \geq 0$  for all  $v \in L^2(\Omega)$ , and thus  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(v, A) \geq \mathcal{E}_1(A_1)$  for all  $(v, A)$ . Moreover, if  $(v_0, A_0) = (v_0, A_1 + B_0)$  attains this minimum, then  $\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |dB_0|^2 + \mathbf{1}_{\Omega} |P(v_0 - B_0)|^2 = 0$ , and this implies that  $dv_0 = 0$ .

And if (3.23) fails, then there exists some  $v_1$  such that  $\int_{\Omega} -dv_1 \cdot \alpha_1 + \frac{1}{2} |dv_1| < 0$ , and then it is clear that  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\lambda v_1, A_1) < \mathcal{E}_1(A_1) = \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(0, A_1)$  for all sufficiently small  $\lambda > 0$ . Thus  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(v_0, A_0) < \mathcal{E}_1(A_1)$  for any minimizing  $(v_0, A_0)$ , and then (3.26) implies that  $dv_0 \neq 0$ .

Finally, if  $dv_0 = 0$  then it is clear from (3.26) that  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(0, A_1) = \mathcal{E}_1(A_1) = \min \mathcal{F}$ , and hence that  $A_0 = A_1$ .  $\square$

**3.3.2. Theorem 9 via partial convex duality.** We next prove Theorem 9 by a duality computation that differs slightly from the one used in the proof of Theorem 2. The result of this computation is summarized in the following

**Lemma 10.** *Let*

$$(3.27) \quad N := \left\{ \zeta \in L^2(\Omega) : (\zeta, \xi)_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \frac{1}{2} \int |d\xi| \quad \text{for all } \xi \in L^2(\Omega) \right\}.$$

*and define*

$$(3.28) \quad \mathcal{F}^{\dagger}(A) := \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (|d(A - A_{ex})|^2 + \mathbf{1}_{\Omega} |A|^2) \, dx - \frac{1}{2} \text{dist}_{L^2(\Omega)}^2(A, N)$$

*Then  $(v_0, A_0)$  minimizes  $\mathcal{F}$  in  $L^2(\Omega; \Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3) \times [A_{ex} + \dot{H}_*^1]$  if and only if*

1.  $A_0$  minimizes  $\mathcal{F}^\dagger$  in  $[A_{ex} + \dot{H}_*^1]$ , and
2.  $A_0|_\Omega - v_0 \in N$ , and  $\|A_0 - v_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = \text{dist}_{L^2(\Omega)}(A_0, N)$ .

It is clear from the definition that  $N \subset (\ker d)^\perp = \text{Image}(P)$ , and it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}^\dagger(A) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (|d(A - A_{ex})|^2 + \mathbf{1}_\Omega |PA|^2) dx - \frac{1}{2} \text{dist}_{L^2(\Omega)}^2(PA, N) \\ (3.29) \quad &= \mathcal{E}_1(A) - \frac{1}{2} \text{dist}_{L^2(\Omega)}^2(PA, N). \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* We will compute the convex dual of  $\mathcal{F}$  with respect to the “ $v$ ” variable only, treating  $A$  as a parameter. Thus, let  $\xi = A|_\Omega - v$ , and write  $\tilde{F}(\xi; A) = \mathcal{F}(v, A)$ , so that

$$\tilde{F}(\xi; A) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} |\xi|^2 + |d(A - \xi)| + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |d(A - A_{ex})|^2.$$

Let

$$\tilde{I}(\xi; A) := \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} |d(A - \xi)| + c_A, \quad c_A := \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |d(A - A_{ex})|^2.$$

Then  $\tilde{F}(\xi; A) = \tilde{I}(\xi; A) + \frac{1}{2} \|\xi\|_2^2$ .

Next, let

$$\tilde{I}^*(\xi^*; A) := \sup_{\xi \in L^2} \left\{ (\xi^*, \xi)_{L^2(\Omega)} - \tilde{I}(\xi; A) \right\}.$$

A short computation like that in the proof of Theorem 2 shows that

$$(3.30) \quad \tilde{I}^*(\xi^*; A) = \begin{cases} (\xi^*, A) - c_A & \text{if } \xi^* \in N \\ +\infty & \text{if not} \end{cases}$$

for  $N$  as defined in (3.27). Now let

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{F}^\dagger(\xi^*, A) &:= \tilde{I}^*(-\xi^*; A) + \frac{1}{2} \|\xi\|^2 \\ &= \begin{cases} (-\xi^*, A) + \frac{1}{2} \|\xi\|^2 - c_A & \text{if } \xi^* \in N \\ +\infty & \text{if not} \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \|\xi^* - A\|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (|d(A - A_{ex})|^2 + \mathbf{1}_\Omega |A|^2) dx & \text{if } \xi^* \in N \\ +\infty & \text{if not.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Then it is clear that

$$-\inf_{\xi^*} \tilde{F}^\dagger(\xi^*; A) = \mathcal{F}^\dagger(A)$$

as defined above, and that the infimum is attained by a unique  $\xi$ , the closest point to  $A$  in the (closed convex) set  $N$ . Recall from Lemma 6 that  $\xi$  minimizes  $\tilde{F}(\cdot; A)$  if and only if it minimizes  $\tilde{F}^\dagger(\cdot; A)$ , and moreover that  $\min_\xi \tilde{F}(\cdot; A) = -\min_\xi \tilde{F}^\dagger(\cdot; A)$ . Thus

$$\min_{A, v} \mathcal{F}(v; A) = \min_A \min_v \mathcal{F}(v; A) = \min_A (-\min_\xi \tilde{F}(\xi, A)) = \min_A \mathcal{F}^\dagger(A),$$

and  $(v_0, A_0)$  minimizes  $\mathcal{F}$  if and only if  $A_0$  minimizes  $\mathcal{F}^\dagger$  and  $v_0 = A_0|_\Omega - \xi_0$ , where  $\xi_0$  is the closest point in  $N$  to  $A$ . □

Now we use Lemma 10 to give a

*second proof of Theorem 9.* Fix  $(v_0, A_0)$  minimizing  $\mathcal{F}$ , and  $A_1$  minimizing  $\mathcal{E}_0$ . By Lemma 10,  $A_0$  minimizes  $\mathcal{F}^\dagger$ .

We write  $\xi_0 = A_0|_\Omega - v_0$  as above, so that  $\xi_0$  is the closest point to  $A_0$  in  $N$ . From the definition (2.8) of  $P$  we know that  $dPA_0 = dA_0$ , so that

$$dv_0 = 0 \iff d(PA_0 - \xi_0) = 0 \text{ in } \mathcal{D}'(\Omega).$$

Also,  $PA_0 - \xi_0 \in (\ker d)^\perp = d^*W_N^{1,2}(\Lambda^2\Omega)$ , since the definitions of  $N$  and  $P$  imply that  $N \subset (\ker d)^\perp$  and  $\text{Image}(P) = (\ker d)^\perp$ . Then (2.6) implies that  $d(PA_0 - \xi_0) = 0$  in  $\mathcal{D}'$  if and only if  $PA_0 - \xi_0 \in d^*W_N^{1,2}(\Lambda^2\Omega) \cap (dH^1(\Omega) \oplus \mathcal{H}(\Lambda^1\Omega)) = \{0\}$ . In other words,  $dv_0 = 0$  if and only if  $PA_0 = \xi_0$ . But since  $\xi_0$  is the closest point in  $N$  to  $A_0$ , and hence to  $PA_0$ , we conclude that

$$(3.31) \quad dv_0 = 0 \iff PA_0 \in N.$$

Next, note that  $A \mapsto \mathcal{F}^\dagger(A_{ex} + A)$  is strictly convex in  $H_*^1$ , so that the minimizers  $A_0$  of  $\mathcal{F}^\dagger$  and  $A_1$  of  $\mathcal{E}_1$  are unique. Also, (3.29) implies that if  $PA \in N$  and  $A' \in H_*^1$ , then

$$\mathcal{F}^\dagger(A + A') \leq \mathcal{E}_1(A + A') \leq \mathcal{F}^\dagger(A) + C\|A'\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq \mathcal{F}^\dagger(A) + C\|A'\|_{H_*^1}^2.$$

Thus any critical point  $A$  of  $\mathcal{E}_1$  such that  $PA \in N$  must also be a critical point of  $\mathcal{F}^\dagger$ , and conversely.

$$(3.32) \quad PA_0 \in N \text{ if and only if } PA_1 \in N.$$

It follows along the same lines that if  $dv_0 = 0$  then  $A_0 = A_1$ . Finally, recalling the definitions (3.22) of  $\alpha_1$  and (3.27) of  $N$ , and integrating by parts as in (3.25), we conclude that

$$PA_1 \in N \iff \|\alpha_1\|_* \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

By combining this with (3.31) and (3.32), we conclude this proof of Theorem 9.  $\square$

**3.3.3. Equivalence of Theorem 9 and Theorem 3.** In Theorem 3 and Theorem 9, we have derived two necessarily equivalent but rather different-looking necessary and sufficient conditions for the vorticity  $dv_0$  of a minimizing pair  $(v_0, A_0)$  to vanish. In this section we elucidate the connection between the auxiliary functions  $B_*$ , defined in Theorem 3, and  $\alpha_1$ , defined in (3.23).

**Proposition 11.** *If  $dv_0 = 0$  in  $\Omega$ , then  $PA_1 = d^*\alpha_1 = (d^*B_*)|_\Omega$ , and  $\|\alpha_1\|_{**} = \|B_*\|_*$ .*

This can be seen as a third proof of Theorem 9.

*Proof.* If  $dv_0 = 0$ , then  $Pv_0 = 0$ , and we have seen that  $A_0 = A_1$  and  $B_0 = B_*$ . As a result,

$$(d^*B_*)|_\Omega = (d^*B_0)|_\Omega = P(d^*B_0) = P(A_0 - v_0) = PA_0 = PA_1 = d^*\alpha_1$$

by Theorem 3, Lemma 7, and (1.11). Thus for every  $v \in H^1(\Lambda^2\mathbb{R}^3)$ ,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} dv \cdot B_* = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} v \cdot d^*B = \int_\Omega v \cdot d^*B = \int_\Omega v \cdot d^*\alpha_1 = \int_\Omega dv \cdot \alpha_1.$$

Now the conclusion follows from the definitions of the norms  $\|\cdot\|_*$  and  $\|\cdot\|_{**}$ , see (1.10) and (3.23).  $\square$

## 4. VORTEX DENSITY IN 3D BOSE-EINSTEIN CONDENSATES

In this section we use the results of [4] to prove convergence as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  of Gross-Pitaevsky functional  $\mathcal{G}_\epsilon$ , defined in (1.17) to the limiting  $\mathcal{G}$ , defined in (1.22). We also establish some results describing minimizers of  $\mathcal{G}$ .

**4.1.  $\Gamma$ -convergence.** Our first theorem makes precise the sense in which  $\mathcal{G}$  is a limiting functional associated to the sequence of functionals  $(\mathcal{G}_\epsilon)_{\epsilon \in (0,1]}$ . The statement of the result uses some notation that is introduced in Section 1.2.

**Theorem 12.** *Assume that  $\Phi_\epsilon = |\log \epsilon| \Phi$  for  $\Phi \in L^4_{loc}(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3)$  and that  $|\Phi(x)|^2 \leq C(a(x) + 1)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$ .*

(i) compactness: *Assume that  $(u_\epsilon)_{\epsilon \in (0,1]} \subset H^1_{a,m}$  and that there exists some  $C > 0$  such that*

$$(4.1) \quad \mathcal{G}_\epsilon(u_\epsilon) \leq C |\log \epsilon|^2 \quad \text{for all } \epsilon \in (0, 1/2]$$

*Then there exists  $j \in L^{4/3}(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3)$ , supported in  $\bar{\Omega}$ , such that if we define  $v = \frac{1}{\rho} j|_\Omega$  and pass to a subsequence if necessary, we have*

$$(4.2) \quad \frac{j u_\epsilon}{|\log \epsilon|} \rightharpoonup j = \rho v \text{ weakly in } L^{4/3}(\mathbb{R}^3), \quad \text{and } v \in L^2_\rho(\Lambda^1 \Omega) \text{ with } \int_\Omega \rho |dv| < \infty.$$

(ii): lower bound inequality: *There exists a sequence of numbers  $(\kappa_\epsilon)$  such that if we assume above hypotheses and (4.2), then*

$$(4.3) \quad \liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} |\log \epsilon|^{-2} (\mathcal{G}_\epsilon(u_\epsilon) - \kappa_\epsilon) \geq \mathcal{G}(v).$$

(iii) upper bound inequality *Given any  $v \in L^2_\rho(\Lambda^1 \Omega)$  such that  $dv$  is a measure on  $\Omega$  with  $\int_\Omega \rho |dv| < \infty$ , there exists a sequence  $u_\epsilon \in H^1_{a,m}$  such that (4.2) holds and  $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} |\log \epsilon|^{-2} (\mathcal{G}_\epsilon(u_\epsilon) - \kappa_\epsilon) = \mathcal{G}(v)$ .*

The theorem states that the functionals  $|\log \epsilon|^{-2} (\mathcal{G}_\epsilon(\cdot) - \kappa_\epsilon)$  converge to  $\mathcal{G}$  in the sense of  $\Gamma$ -convergence, with respect to the convergence (4.2). As remarked in the introduction, Proposition 4 is a direct corollary of Theorem 12 and basic properties of  $\Gamma$ -convergence.

*Remark 7.* In fact we prove a more general result than Theorem 12, since we also allow higher rotations  $\Phi_\epsilon = \sqrt{g_\epsilon} \Phi$ , with  $|\log \epsilon|^2 \ll g_\epsilon \ll \epsilon^{-2}$ . In fact we show that for such  $\Phi_\epsilon$ , if  $\mathcal{G}_\epsilon(u_\epsilon) \leq C g_\epsilon$ , then after passing to a subsequence,  $\frac{j u_\epsilon}{\sqrt{g_\epsilon}} \rightharpoonup j$  weakly in  $L^{4/3}(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3)$ , with  $j = \mathbf{1}_\Omega \rho v$  for some  $v \in L^2_\rho(\Lambda^1 \Omega)$ , and

$$(4.4) \quad g_\epsilon^{-1} (\mathcal{G}_\epsilon(\cdot) - \kappa_\epsilon) \xrightarrow{\Gamma} \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(\cdot), \quad \text{where } \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(v) = \int_\Omega \rho \left( \frac{v^2}{2} - \Phi \cdot v \right).$$

As noted in Remark 5 in the Introduction, it easily follows that for rotations around the  $z$  axis of order  $|\log \epsilon| \ll \sqrt{g_\epsilon} \ll \epsilon^{-1}$ , ground states exhibit an asymptotically uniform distribution of vertical vortex lines, generalizing 2d results of [12].

The proofs rely at certain points on Theorem 2 in [4].

*Proof of Theorem 12 and Remark 7.* Let  $\mathcal{G}_\epsilon(u_\epsilon) \leq C g_\epsilon$ , for  $|\log \epsilon|^2 \leq g_\epsilon \ll \epsilon^{-2}$ , and let  $\Phi_\epsilon = \sqrt{g_\epsilon} \Phi$ .

**Step 1.** First we control the potentially negative term in  $\mathcal{G}_\epsilon(u_\epsilon)$ . To do this, recall our assumption that  $|\Phi|^2 \leq C(a+1)$ . Since  $|ju| \leq |u| |du|$ , it follows that

$$|\Phi_\epsilon \cdot ju_\epsilon| \leq \frac{1}{2}g_\epsilon|\Phi|^2|u|^2 + \frac{1}{2}|du|^2 \leq Cg_\epsilon(a+1)|u|^2 + \frac{1}{2}|du|^2.$$

But (1.18) implies that  $a(x) = w(x) - \rho(x) + \lambda \leq w(x) + \lambda$ , so it follows that

$$|\Phi_\epsilon \cdot ju_\epsilon| \leq Cg_\epsilon(w + \lambda + 1)|u_\epsilon|^2 + \frac{1}{2}|du_\epsilon|^2.$$

Integrating this over  $\mathbb{R}^3$  and recalling that  $\|u_\epsilon\|_2^2 = m$ , we obtain

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\Phi_\epsilon \cdot ju_\epsilon| \leq C\mathcal{G}_\epsilon(u_\epsilon) + Cg_\epsilon(\lambda + 1) \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |u_\epsilon|^2 \leq Cg_\epsilon.$$

It follows from this that

$$(4.5) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{1}{2}|du_\epsilon|^2 + \frac{1}{4\epsilon^2}(\rho - |u_\epsilon|^2)^2 + \frac{w}{2\epsilon^2}|u_\epsilon|^2 = \mathcal{G}_\epsilon(u_\epsilon) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Phi_\epsilon \cdot ju_\epsilon \leq Cg_\epsilon.$$

In particular  $|u_\epsilon|^2 \rightarrow \rho$  in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ .

**Step 2.** Next,

$$\|u_\epsilon\|_{L^4(\mathbb{R}^3)}^4 = \| |u_\epsilon|^2 \|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(\| |u_\epsilon|^2 - \rho \|_{L^2}^2 + \|\rho\|_{L^2}^2) \leq C + \epsilon^2\mathcal{G}_\epsilon(u_\epsilon) \leq C,$$

and Step 1 implies that  $\|du_\epsilon\|_{L^2} \leq C\sqrt{g_\epsilon}$ . Since  $\|ju_\epsilon\|_{L^{4/3}} \leq \|u_\epsilon\|_{L^4}\|du_\epsilon\|_{L^2}$ , we conclude that  $\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{g_\epsilon}}ju_\epsilon\}$  is uniformly bounded in  $L^{4/3}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ , and it follows that there exists some  $j \in L^{4/3}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  such that

$$(4.6) \quad \frac{ju_\epsilon}{\sqrt{g_\epsilon}} \rightharpoonup j \text{ weakly in } L^{4/3} \text{ along some subsequence.}$$

**Step 3.** Now let  $f_\epsilon$  denote the minimizer in  $H_a^1(\mathbb{R}^3; \mathbb{R})$  of  $\mathcal{G}_\epsilon(\cdot)$ , where  $H_a^1(\mathbb{R}^3; \mathbb{R})$  is defined by analogy with  $H_a^1(\mathbb{R}^3; \mathbb{C})$ , see (1.19).

Note that when  $f$  is real-valued,  $jf = 0$ , so the forcing term  $\Phi \cdot jf$  vanishes on  $H_a^1(\mathbb{R}^3; \mathbb{R})$ . It is standard that  $f_\epsilon$  does not vanish, and we will assume that  $f_\epsilon > 0$ . Then for any  $u \in H_{a,m}^1$  we may define  $U := u/f_\epsilon$ , and it is known that

$$(4.7) \quad \mathcal{G}_\epsilon(u) = \mathcal{G}_\epsilon(f_\epsilon U) = \mathcal{G}_\epsilon(f_\epsilon) + H_\epsilon(U) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f_\epsilon^2 \Phi_\epsilon \cdot jU,$$

where  $H_\epsilon(U) = H_\epsilon(U; \mathbb{R}^3)$ , and for a measurable subset  $A \subset \mathbb{R}^3$  we write

$$(4.8) \quad H_\epsilon(U; A) := \int_A \frac{f_\epsilon^2}{2}|dU|^2 + \frac{f_\epsilon^4}{4\epsilon^2}(|U|^2 - 1)^2 dx.$$

See [21] for a proof in exactly<sup>2</sup> the situation we consider here, following ideas that originated in [20] and have been used extensively in the literature on Bose-Einstein condensates. It is also known that  $f_\epsilon^2 \rightarrow \rho$  uniformly in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , see again [21].

**Step 4.** Now let  $\Omega'$  denote an subset of  $\Omega$  such that  $\Omega' \subset\subset \Omega$ , so that  $\rho \geq 2c'$  in  $\Omega'$  for some  $c'$ , and hence  $f_\epsilon^2 \geq c'$  for all sufficiently small  $\epsilon$ . Let  $U_\epsilon = u_\epsilon/f_\epsilon$ , and note that Step 1 implies that  $H_\epsilon(U_\epsilon) \leq Cg_\epsilon$ . Thus the functional

$$\tilde{H}_\epsilon(U_\epsilon) = \int_{\Omega'} \frac{1}{2}|dU_\epsilon|^2 + \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}W(u) \leq C'g_\epsilon, \quad \text{where } W(U) = \frac{c'}{4}(|U|^2 - 1)^2,$$

verifies in  $\Omega'$  hypothesis  $(H_q)$  of Theorem 2 in [4], for  $q = 4$ . Hence Theorem 2 of [4] (or arguments such as those in Steps 1 and 2 above) imply that there

<sup>2</sup>The Gross-Pitaevsky integrand is written in a slightly different way in in [21], but this is purely a cosmetic difference.



exists some  $v'$  in  $L^2(\Lambda^1\Omega')$  such that, after passing to a further subsequence if necessary,  $\frac{jU_\epsilon}{\sqrt{g_\epsilon}} \rightharpoonup v'$  weakly in  $L^{4/3}(\Lambda^1\Omega')$ . Since  $u_\epsilon = f_\epsilon U_\epsilon$ , one easily checks that  $ju_\epsilon = f_\epsilon^2 jU_\epsilon$ , and then it follows from (4.6) and the uniform convergence  $f_\epsilon^2 \rightarrow \rho$  that  $j = \rho v'$  in  $\Omega'$ , and hence that  $v' = j/\rho =: v$  in  $\Omega'$ , independent of  $\Omega'$ . It also follows that the chosen subsequence is independent of  $\Omega'$ . Let moreover

$$\mu_\epsilon := \frac{1}{g_\epsilon} \left( \frac{1}{2} |dU_\epsilon|^2 + \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} W(u) \right) dx,$$

be the energy density of  $\tilde{H}_\epsilon$ , and notice also that  $\int_{\Omega'} \mu_\epsilon$  is uniformly bounded, so that after passing to a subsequence, we may assume that there exist a measure  $\mu_0$  on  $\Omega'$  such that  $\mu_\epsilon \rightharpoonup \mu_0$  weakly as measures in  $\Omega'$ . It then follows from Theorem 2 and Remark 4 in [4], that, in the case  $g_\epsilon \leq C|\log \epsilon|^2$ ,  $\mu_0 \geq \frac{1}{2}(|v|^2 dx + |dv|)$ , in the sense that  $|dv|$  is a Radon measure, and

$$\mu_0(U) \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_U (|v|^2 dx + |dv|)$$

for every open  $U \subset \Omega'$ , while for  $|\log \epsilon|^2 \ll g_\epsilon \ll \epsilon^{-2}$  we have  $\mu_0 \geq \frac{1}{2}|v|^2 dx$ . In either case we deduce (using basic facts about weak convergence of measures) that

$$(4.9) \quad \liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{g_\epsilon} H_\epsilon(U_\epsilon; \Omega') = \liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega'} f_\epsilon^2 \mu_\epsilon \geq \int_{\Omega'} \rho \mu_0,$$

which yields

$$(4.10) \quad \liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{g_\epsilon} H_\epsilon(U_\epsilon; \Omega') \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega'} \rho(|v|^2 dx + |dv|) \quad \text{if } g_\epsilon \leq C|\log \epsilon|^2,$$

and

$$(4.11) \quad \liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{g_\epsilon} H_\epsilon(U_\epsilon; \Omega') \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega'} \rho |v|^2 dx \quad \text{if } |\log \epsilon|^2 \ll g_\epsilon \ll \epsilon^{-2}.$$

Since this holds for all  $\Omega' \subset \Omega$ , it follows in particular that  $v \in L^2_\rho(\Lambda^1\Omega)$  and (in case  $g_\epsilon \leq C|\log \epsilon|^2$ ) that  $dv$  is a measure on all of  $\Omega$  with  $\int_\Omega \rho |dv| < \infty$ , nearly completing the proof of (4.2). (We still need however to prove that  $j$  is supported in  $\bar{\Omega}$ .)

**Step 5.** We next claim that

$$(4.12) \quad \frac{1}{g_\epsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f_\epsilon^2 \Phi_\epsilon \cdot jU_\epsilon \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \rho \Phi \cdot v.$$

To prove (4.12), since  $\Phi_\epsilon = \sqrt{g_\epsilon} \Phi$  and  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{g_\epsilon}} ju_\epsilon = \frac{1}{\sqrt{g_\epsilon}} f_\epsilon^2 jU_\epsilon \rightharpoonup j = \rho v$  weakly in  $L^{4/3}(\Omega)$ , it is clear that

$$\frac{1}{g_\epsilon} \int_\Omega f_\epsilon^2 \Phi_\epsilon \cdot jU_\epsilon \rightarrow \int_\Omega \rho \Phi \cdot v,$$

and we only need to show that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Omega} \Phi \cdot \frac{ju_\epsilon}{\sqrt{g_\epsilon}} \rightarrow 0.$$

Since  $\rho = 0$  outside  $\Omega$ , in this set we have

$$|j(u_\epsilon)| \leq |u_\epsilon| \quad |du_\epsilon| \leq \frac{1}{4\epsilon} |u_\epsilon|^4 + \frac{3\epsilon^{1/3}}{4} |du_\epsilon|^{4/3} = \frac{1}{4\epsilon} (|u_\epsilon|^2 - \rho)^2 + \frac{3\epsilon^{1/3}}{4} |du_\epsilon|^{4/3},$$

whence, for any compact  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ , we see from (4.5) that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{g_\epsilon}} \int_{K \setminus \Omega} |ju_\epsilon| \leq C \left( \epsilon \sqrt{g_\epsilon} + (\epsilon \sqrt{g_\epsilon})^{1/3} \right).$$

Thus  $\frac{ju_\epsilon}{\sqrt{g_\epsilon}} \rightarrow 0$  in  $L^1(\Lambda^1(K \setminus \Omega))$  for any compact  $K$ . This implies that  $j = 0$  outside  $\Omega$ , so that the identity  $j = \rho v$  holds in all of  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , finally completing the proof of (4.2), and it also implies that

$$\frac{1}{g_\epsilon} \int_{K \setminus \Omega} \Phi_\epsilon \cdot ju_\epsilon = \int_{K \setminus \Omega} \Phi \cdot \frac{ju_\epsilon}{\sqrt{g_\epsilon}} \rightarrow 0$$

for  $K$  compact. Next, due to (1.16), (1.18) and the assumption that  $|\Phi|^2 \leq C(a+1)$ , we can find a compact  $K$  such that  $|\Phi|^2 \leq Cw$  outside of  $K$ , so that (arguing as in Step 1)

$$|\Phi \cdot ju_\epsilon| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} |du|^2 + \frac{w}{2\epsilon} |u|^2 \quad \text{outside of } K.$$

It follows from this and Step 1 that

$$\frac{1}{g_\epsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus K} |\Phi_\epsilon \cdot ju_\epsilon| \leq C\epsilon.$$

By combining these inequalities, we obtain the claim (4.12).

**Step 6.** We now complete the proof of the lower bound inequality. Note that, by combining (4.12) with (4.10) and recalling (4.7), we find that, in case  $g_\epsilon \leq C|\log \epsilon|^2$ ,

$$\liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{|\log \epsilon|^2} (\mathcal{G}_\epsilon(u_\epsilon) - \mathcal{G}_\epsilon(f_\epsilon)) \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega'} \rho(|v|^2 + |dv|) - \int_{\Omega} \rho \Phi \cdot v.$$

for any open  $\Omega'$  compactly contained in  $\Omega$ . Taking the supremum over all such  $\Omega'$ , we obtain (4.3) with  $\kappa_\epsilon = \mathcal{G}_\epsilon(f_\epsilon)$ . Analogously, in case  $|\log \epsilon|^2 \ll g_\epsilon \ll \epsilon^{-2}$ , using (4.11) in place of (4.10) we obtain the lower bound part in (4.4)

$$\liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{g_\epsilon} (\mathcal{G}_\epsilon(u_\epsilon) - \mathcal{G}_\epsilon(f_\epsilon)) \geq \int_{\Omega} \rho \left( \frac{|v|^2}{2} - \Phi \cdot v \right).$$

**Step 7.** Let us prove the upper bound inequality in case  $g_\epsilon \leq C|\log \epsilon|^2$ . The proof in the case  $|\log \epsilon|^2 \ll g_\epsilon \ll \epsilon^{-2}$  follows the same lines and hence is omitted. We will use the following lemma.

**Lemma 13.** *Suppose that  $v \in L^2_\rho(\Lambda^1 \Omega)$  and that  $dv$  is a locally finite measure with  $\int_{\Omega} \rho |dv| < \infty$ . Then for every  $\delta > 0$ , there exists  $v_\delta \in C_c^\infty(\Lambda^1 \mathbb{R}^3)$  such that*

$$(4.13) \quad \int_{\Omega} \rho |v_\delta - v|^2 < \delta, \quad \int_{\Omega} \rho |dv_\delta| \leq \int_{\Omega} \rho |dv| + \delta$$

The proof is given at the end of this section. Now we use the lemma to complete the proof of the theorem.

Fix  $v$  and  $v_\delta$  as in the statement of the Lemma.

It is proved in [21], Lemma B.1, that the (positive) function  $f_\epsilon$  appearing in the decomposition (4.7) satisfies  $\|f_\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq c_0$ , for  $c_0$  independent of  $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$ , and moreover there exists  $R > 0$  such that  $\Omega \subset \subset B_R$ , and  $0 < f_\epsilon(x) \leq Ce^{-R/\epsilon^{2/3}}$  whenever  $|x| \geq R$ .

Now for every  $\delta > 0$ , it follows from Theorem 2 and Remark 4 in [4] that there exists a sequence  $U_\epsilon^\delta \in H^1(B_{R+1}; \mathbb{C})$  such that  $\frac{1}{|\log \epsilon|} jU_\epsilon^\delta \rightharpoonup v_\delta$  weakly in  $L^{4/3}(B_{R+1})$ , and

$$(4.14) \quad \frac{1}{|\log \epsilon|} \left( \frac{1}{2} |dU_\epsilon^\delta|^2 + \frac{1}{4\epsilon^2} (|U_\epsilon^\delta|^2 - 1)^2 \right) \rightharpoonup \frac{1}{2} (|v_\delta|^2 + |dv_\delta|)$$

weakly as measures in  $B_{R+1}$ . Let  $\epsilon' := c_0 \epsilon$ , and let  $u_\epsilon^\delta := f_\epsilon \chi U_{\epsilon'}^\delta$ , where  $\chi \in C_c^\infty(B_{R+1})$  is a function such that  $\chi \equiv 1$  on  $B_R$  and  $|d\chi| \leq C$ . Also, set  $u_\epsilon^\delta := 0$  on  $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_{R+1}$ . Then as in (4.7), and recalling that  $\Phi_\epsilon = |\log \epsilon| \Phi$ , we have

$$\frac{1}{|\log \epsilon|^2} (\mathcal{G}_\epsilon(u_\epsilon^\delta) - \mathcal{G}_\epsilon(f_\epsilon)) = \frac{1}{|\log \epsilon|^2} H_\epsilon(\chi U_{\epsilon'}^\delta) + \frac{1}{|\log \epsilon|^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \chi f_\epsilon^2 \Phi_\epsilon \cdot jU_{\epsilon'}^\delta.$$

The second term on the right-hand side converges to  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \chi \rho \Phi \cdot v_\delta = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \rho \Phi \cdot v_\delta$  as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ . The proof of this statement is like that of (4.12), but easier. We break the other term into two pieces. The first is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{|\log \epsilon|^2} H_\epsilon(\chi U_{\epsilon'}^\delta; B_R) &= \frac{1}{|\log \epsilon|^2} \int_{B_R} f_\epsilon^2 \left( \frac{1}{2} |dU_{\epsilon'}^\delta|^2 + \frac{f_\epsilon^2}{4\epsilon^2} (|U_{\epsilon'}^\delta|^2 - 1)^2 \right) \\ &\leq \frac{(1 + o(1))}{|\log \epsilon'|^2} \int_{B_R} f_\epsilon^2 \left( \frac{1}{2} |dU_{\epsilon'}^\delta|^2 + \frac{1}{4\epsilon'^2} (|U_{\epsilon'}^\delta|^2 - 1)^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then, since  $\text{supp}(\rho) \subset \bar{\Omega} \subset\subset B_R$ , it follows from (4.14) and the uniform convergence  $f_\epsilon^2 \rightarrow \rho$  that

$$\limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{|\log \epsilon|^2} H_\epsilon(\chi U_{\epsilon'}^\delta; B_R) \leq \int \rho (|v_\delta|^2 + |dv_\delta|).$$

And from properties of  $\chi$  and exponential smallness of  $f_\epsilon$  outside of  $B_R$ , it easily follows that  $H_\epsilon(\chi U_{\epsilon'}^\delta; \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_R) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ . By combining the above inequalities, we find that

$$\limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{|\log \epsilon|^2} (\mathcal{G}_\epsilon(u_\epsilon^\delta) - \mathcal{G}_\epsilon(f_\epsilon)) \leq \mathcal{G}(v_\delta) \leq \mathcal{G}(v) + C\delta.$$

Note also that

$$\frac{j u_\epsilon^\delta}{|\log \epsilon|} = (1 + o(1)) (f_\epsilon \chi)^2 \frac{j U_{\epsilon'}^\delta}{|\log \epsilon'|} \rightarrow \rho v_\delta \text{ weakly in } L^{4/3}(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

Conclusion (iii) now follows by setting  $u_\epsilon := u_\epsilon^{\delta(\epsilon)}$  for  $\delta(\epsilon)$  converging to 0 sufficiently slowly.  $\square$

We conclude this section with the proof of the approximation lemma used above.

*Proof of Lemma 13.* We introduce some auxiliary functions. First, for  $r \in (0, 1]$ , let

$$\Omega_r := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : \text{dist}(x, \Omega) < r\}, \quad \Omega_{-r} := \{x \in \Omega : \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) > r\}.$$

Next, for sufficiently small  $\sigma > 0$ , let  $\Psi_\sigma : \Omega_\sigma \rightarrow \Omega$  be the  $W^{1,\infty}$  diffeomorphism given by

$$\Psi_\sigma(x) := \begin{cases} x - \sqrt{\sigma}(d(x) + \sqrt{\sigma} - \sigma)\bar{\nu}(x) & \text{if } x \in \Omega_\sigma \setminus \Omega_{\sigma-\sqrt{\sigma}} \\ x & \text{if } x \in \Omega_{\sigma-\sqrt{\sigma}} \end{cases}$$

where  $\bar{\nu}(x)$  is the outer unit normal to  $\partial\Omega$  at the point of  $\partial\Omega$  closest to  $x$ , and  $d(x)$  is the signed distance (positive outside  $\Omega$ , negative in  $\Omega$ ) to  $\partial\Omega$ . Note that

$$(4.15) \quad \|D\Psi_\sigma - I\|_\infty \leq C\sqrt{\sigma}, \quad \|D\Psi_\sigma^{-1} - I\|_\infty \leq C\sqrt{\sigma}$$

where  $I$  denotes the identity matrix. In addition,  $\rho(\Psi_\sigma(x)) \geq \rho(x)$  for all  $x$ , whenever  $\sigma$  is sufficiently small, since  $D\rho(y) = -c(y)\nu(y)$  for  $y \in \partial\Omega$ , with  $c(y) \geq c > 0$  for all  $y$ , by (1.21).

Next, let  $\chi_\sigma \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$  be a nonnegative function such that  $\chi_\sigma = 1$  in  $\Omega_{\sigma/4}$  and  $\chi_\sigma$  has compact support in  $\Omega_{3\sigma/4}$ . Finally, for  $\tau \in (0, 1]$  let  $\eta_\tau$  be a smooth nonnegative even mollifier with supported in  $B(0, \tau)$  with  $\int \eta_\tau = 1$ .

We define  $v_\delta := \eta_\tau * (\chi_\sigma \cdot \Psi_\sigma^\# v)$ , where  $\tau, \sigma$  will be fixed below. Here  $\Psi_\sigma^\# v$  denotes the pullback of  $v$  by  $\Psi_\sigma$ , which is a one-form on  $\Omega_\sigma$ , and the product  $\chi_\sigma \cdot \Psi_\sigma^\# v$  is understood to equal zero on  $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Omega_\sigma$ .

Note that  $\chi_\sigma \cdot \Psi_\sigma^\# v$  is integrable on  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , so that the convolution in the definition of  $v_\delta$  makes sense. Indeed, (4.15) implies that  $|\Psi_\sigma^\# v(x)| \leq (1 + C\sqrt{\sigma})|v(\Psi_\sigma(x))|$  for all  $x$ , so that by a change of variables,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\chi_\sigma \cdot \Psi_\sigma^\# v| \leq \int_{\Omega_{3\sigma/4}} |\Psi_\sigma^\# v| \leq C \int_{\Psi_\sigma(\Omega_{3\sigma/4})} |v| < \infty.$$

The final estimate follows from the  $v \in L_\rho^2$ , as well as the fact that  $\rho$  is bounded away from 0 in  $\Psi_\sigma(\Omega_{3\sigma/4})$ , since this set is compactly contained in  $\Omega$ .

We will take  $\tau < \sigma/4$ , so that  $v_\delta = \eta_\tau * \Psi_\sigma^\# v$  in  $\Omega$ . Then

$$\int_\Omega \rho |v_\delta - v|^2 \leq 2 \int_\Omega \rho |\eta_\tau * \Psi_\sigma^\# v - \Psi_\sigma^\# v|^2 + 2 \int_\Omega \rho |\Psi_\sigma^\# v - v|^2.$$

The definition of  $\Psi_\sigma$  implies that  $\Psi_\sigma^\# v - v = 0$  if  $\text{dist}(x, \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Omega) > \sigma$ , and  $|\Psi_\sigma^\# v - v| \leq C|v|$ , so that the second term on the right-hand side tends to 0 as  $\sigma \rightarrow 0$ , by the dominated convergence theorem, and can be made less than  $\delta/2$  by choosing  $\sigma$  appropriately. Then we can clearly make the first term on the right-hand side less than  $\delta/2$  by taking  $\tau$  smaller if necessary.

To estimate  $\int \rho |dv_\delta|$ , we consider the action of  $dv_\delta$  on some  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\Lambda^2\Omega)$ . Exactly as in (3.14), we can rewrite

$$\int_\Omega \rho \phi \cdot dv_\delta = \int_{\Psi_\sigma(\Omega)} v \cdot d^* \star (\Psi_\sigma^{-1})^\# (\eta_\tau * (\rho \star \phi)).$$

Since  $d^* \star (\Psi_\sigma^{-1})^\# (\eta_\tau * (\rho \star \phi))$  is smooth, and thus continuous,

$$\int_\Omega \rho \phi \cdot dv_\delta = \int_{\Psi_\sigma(\Omega)} dv \cdot \star (\Psi_\sigma^{-1})^\# (\eta_\tau * (\rho \star \phi))$$

where the right-hand side indicates the integral of the continuous function  $\star (\Psi_\sigma^{-1})^\# (\dots)$  with respect to the measure  $dv$ . It follows that

$$\int_\Omega \rho \phi \cdot dv_\delta \leq \sup_{x \in \Psi_\sigma(\Omega)} \left| \frac{1}{\rho} (\Psi_\sigma^{-1})^\# (\eta_\tau * (\rho \star \phi))(x) \right| \int_\Omega \rho |dv|.$$

And for  $x \in \Psi_\sigma(\Omega)$ , since  $|\star \phi(x)| = |\phi(x)|$  for all  $x$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \left| \frac{1}{\rho} (\Psi_\sigma^{-1})^\# (\eta_\tau * (\rho \star \phi))(x) \right| &\stackrel{(4.15)}{\leq} \frac{(1 + C\sqrt{\sigma})}{\rho(x)} (\eta_\tau * |\rho \star \phi|)(\Psi_\sigma^{-1}(x)) \\
 &\leq \|\phi\|_\infty \frac{(1 + C\sqrt{\sigma})}{\rho(x)} (\eta_\tau * \rho)(\Psi_\sigma^{-1}(x)) \\
 (4.16) \qquad &\leq \|\phi\|_\infty \frac{(1 + C\sqrt{\sigma})}{\rho(x)} \left( \sup_{B_\tau(\Psi_\sigma^{-1}(x))} \rho \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

And writing  $y := \Psi_\sigma^{-1}(x)$ , if  $\sigma$  is small enough then  $D\rho \cdot \nu \leq -c < 0$  in the set where  $\Psi_\sigma$  is not the identity, so it follows from the mean value theorem and the definition of  $\Psi_\sigma$  that  $\rho(\Psi_\sigma(y)) \geq \rho(y) + c\sqrt{\sigma}(d(y) + \sqrt{\sigma} - \sigma)^+$ , where  $(\dots)^+$  denotes the positive part. Thus

$$\frac{1}{\rho(\Psi_\sigma(y))} \left( \sup_{B_\tau(y)} \rho \right) \leq \frac{\rho(y) + C\tau}{\rho(y) + c\sqrt{\sigma}(d(y) + \sqrt{\sigma} - \sigma)^+}.$$

We insist that  $\sigma < 1/16$  (in addition to other smallness conditions), so that in  $\Omega \setminus \Omega_{-\sigma}$ , we have the inequality  $d(y) + \sqrt{\sigma} - \sigma \geq \sqrt{\sigma} - 2\sigma \geq \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\sigma}$ . In this set, then,

$$\frac{\rho(y) + C\tau}{\rho(y) + c\sqrt{\sigma}(d(y) + \sqrt{\sigma} - \sigma)^+} \leq \frac{\rho(y) + C\tau}{\rho(y) + (c/2)\sigma} \leq 1 \quad \text{for } \tau \text{ sufficiently small.}$$

By taking  $\tau$  small enough, we can make  $C\tau/\rho(y)$  as small as we like in the set  $\Omega_{-\sigma}$ , where  $\rho \geq c\sigma$ . Thus by taking  $\tau$  still smaller, if necessary, we can guarantee that the right-hand side of (4.16) is bounded by  $(1 + \delta)\|\phi\|_\infty$ . Inserting this into the above estimates, we conclude that

$$\int_\Omega \rho \phi \cdot dv_\delta \leq \|\phi\|_\infty (1 + \delta) \int_\Omega \rho |dv|$$

for all  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\Lambda^2\Omega)$ , and hence that  $v_\delta$  satisfies (4.13).  $\square$

**4.2. a dual problem and critical forcing.** In this section we give the proof of Theorem 5. We will use notation introduced in Section 1.2.

*Proof of Theorem 5. 1.* We first formulate a dual problem. Let

$$I_0(w) := - \int_\Omega \rho w \cdot \Phi + \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega \rho |dw| = -(w, \Phi)_\rho + \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega \rho |dw|$$

so that  $\mathcal{G}(v) = I_0(v) + \frac{1}{2}\|v\|_\rho^2$ . Then

$$I_0^*(v) := \sup_{w \in L_\rho^2} ((v, w)_\rho - I_0(w)) = \sup_{w \in L_\rho^2} \left( (v + \Phi, w)_\rho - \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega \rho |dw| \right).$$

It is clear that if  $(v + \Phi, w)_\rho - \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega \rho |dw| > 0$  for any  $w$ , then the supremum on the right-hand side above is unbounded, so we conclude that

$$I_0^*(v) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } v + \Phi \in N \quad (\text{defined below}) \\ +\infty & \text{if not,} \end{cases}$$

for

$$(4.17) \quad N := \left\{ \xi \in L_\rho^2(\Lambda^1\Omega) : (\xi, w)_\rho \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega \rho |dw| \text{ for all } w \in L_\rho^2(\Lambda^1\Omega) \right\}.$$

Then it follows from basic facts about duality, see Lemma 6, that the unique minimizer  $v_0$  of  $\mathcal{G}$  in  $L^2_\rho$  is also the unique minimizer of

$$(4.18) \quad \mathcal{G}^\dagger(v) := I_0^*(-v) + \frac{1}{2}\|v\|_\rho^2 = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}\|v\|_\rho^2 & \text{if } \Phi - v \in N \\ +\infty & \text{if not.} \end{cases}$$

**2.** We next rewrite the dual problem. It is immediate from the definition (4.17) of  $N$  that  $N \subset (\ker d)_\rho^\perp$ . Hence, writing  $P_\rho$  for  $L^2_\rho$ -orthogonal projection onto  $(\ker d)_\rho$ , it follows that

$$\Phi - v \in N \quad \text{if and only if} \quad P_\rho \Phi = P_\rho v \quad \text{and} \quad P_\rho^\perp \Phi - P_\rho^\perp v \in N$$

In particular,

$$\frac{1}{2}\|v\|_\rho^2 = \frac{1}{2}\|P_\rho \Phi\|_\rho^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|P_\rho^\perp v\|^2 \quad \text{if } \Phi - v \in N$$

so that minimizing the  $L^2_\rho$  norm of  $v$ , subject to the constraint  $\Phi - v \in N$ , is equivalent to minimizing the  $L^2_\rho$  norm of  $P_\rho^\perp v$ , subject to the constraint  $P_\rho^\perp \Phi - P_\rho^\perp v \in N$ .

Now recall from the description (1.24) of  $(\ker d)_\rho^\perp = \text{Image}(P_\rho^\perp)$  that every element of  $(\ker d)_\rho^\perp$  can be written in the form  $\frac{d^* \beta}{\rho}$  for some  $d^* \beta \in H_N^1(\Lambda^2 \Omega)$ . In particular, if we write  $P_\rho^\perp \Phi = \frac{d^* \beta_\Phi}{\rho}$  and  $P_\rho^\perp v_0 = \frac{d^* \beta_0}{\rho}$ , then

$$(4.19) \quad v_0 = P_\rho \Phi + \frac{d^* \beta_0}{\rho} \quad \text{where } \beta_0 \text{ minimizes} \\ \beta \mapsto \frac{1}{2} \left\| \frac{d^* \beta}{\rho} \right\|_\rho^2 \text{ in } \left\{ \beta \in H_N^1(\Lambda^2 \Omega) : \frac{d^*(\beta_\Phi - \beta)}{\rho} \in N \right\}.$$

As usual, we understand  $\left\| \frac{d^* \beta}{\rho} \right\|_\rho$  to equal  $+\infty$  if  $\frac{d^* \beta}{\rho}$  does not belong to  $L^2_\rho(\Lambda^1 \Omega)$ .

We now rewrite the constraint by noting that for any smooth  $w \in C^\infty(\Lambda^1 \bar{\Omega})$  and for  $\beta \in H_N^1(\Lambda^2 \Omega)$  such that  $\frac{d^* \beta}{\rho} \in L^2_\rho(\Lambda^1 \Omega)$ ,

$$\left( \frac{d^*(\beta_\Phi - \beta)}{\rho}, w \right)_\rho = \int_\Omega d^*(\beta_\Phi - \beta) \cdot w = \int_\Omega (\beta_\Phi - \beta) \cdot dw.$$

Here the boundary terms vanish due to the fact that  $(\beta_\Phi)_N = \beta_N = 0$ . Then the definition (4.17) of  $N$  and facts about density of smooth functions established in Lemma 13 imply that

$$(4.20) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{d^*(\beta_\Phi - \beta)}{\rho} \in N &\iff \left( \frac{d^*(\beta_\Phi - \beta)}{\rho}, w \right) \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega \rho |dw| \quad \text{for all } w \in C^\infty(\Lambda^1 \bar{\Omega}) \\ &\iff \int_\Omega (\beta_\Phi - \beta) \cdot dw \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega \rho |dw| \quad \text{for all } w \in C^\infty(\Lambda^1 \bar{\Omega}) \\ &\iff \|\beta_\Phi - \beta\|_{\rho*} \leq \frac{1}{2} \end{aligned}$$

where we recall the definition

$$\|\gamma\|_{\rho*} := \sup \left\{ \int_\Omega \gamma \cdot dw : w \in C^\infty(\Lambda^1 \bar{\Omega}), \int_\Omega \rho |dw| \leq 1 \right\}.$$

Now by combining (4.19) and (4.20), we obtain the characterization of  $v_0$  appearing in Theorem 3, see (1.25), (1.26), (1.27).

Observe further that, by stationarity of (1.22) with respect to variations  $t \mapsto e^t v_0$  around  $t = 0$  we obtain

$$(4.21) \quad \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \rho |dv_0| + \int_{\Omega} \rho v_0 \cdot (v_0 - \Phi) = 0.$$

Recalling that  $\Phi = P_{\rho} \Phi + \frac{d^* \beta_{\Phi}}{\rho}$ , we have  $\rho(v_0 - \Phi) = d^* \beta_0 - d^* \beta_{\Phi}$ . Inserting in (4.21) yields (1.28) after integration by parts.

**3.** It remains to check that  $dv_0 = 0$  if and only if  $\|\beta_{\Phi}\|_{\rho^*} \leq \frac{1}{2}$ .

The global minimizer of the functional  $\beta \mapsto \frac{1}{2} \|\frac{d^* \beta}{\rho}\|_{\rho}^2$  in  $H_N^1(\Lambda^2 \Omega)$  is attained by  $\beta = 0$ , and this satisfies the constraint (4.20) if and only if  $\|\beta_{\Phi}\|_{\rho^*} \leq \frac{1}{2}$ .

Thus if  $\|\beta_{\Phi}\|_{\rho^*} \leq \frac{1}{2}$ , then  $v_0 = P_{\rho} \Phi \in (\ker d)_{\rho}$ , and in this case clearly  $dv_0 = 0$ .

On the other hand, if  $\|\beta_{\Phi}\|_{\rho^*} > \frac{1}{2}$ , then  $v_0 - P_{\rho} \Phi = \frac{d^* \beta_0}{\rho}$  is a (nonzero) element of  $(\ker d)_{\rho}^{\perp}$ , and hence in this case  $0 \neq d(v_0 - P_{\rho} \Phi) = dv_0$ .  $\square$

## 5. FURTHER REMARKS

**5.1. symmetry reduction.** In the presence of rotational symmetry, the functionals we study in this paper reduce to simpler 2-dimensional models. We discuss this first for the functional  $\mathcal{G}$ , defined in (1.22), arising in case of Bose-Einstein condensates.

**Lemma 14.** *Consider the functional  $\mathcal{G}(v) = \int_{\Omega} \rho \left( \frac{|v|^2}{2} - v \cdot \Phi + \frac{1}{2} |dv| \right)$ , and assume that there exist some  $\tilde{\Omega} \subset [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}$  and some  $\tilde{\rho} : \tilde{\Omega} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega &= \{(r \cos \alpha, r \sin \alpha, z) : (r, z) \in \tilde{\Omega}, \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\}, \\ \rho(r \cos \alpha, r \sin \alpha, z) &= \tilde{\rho}(r, z) \quad \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{R}. \end{aligned}$$

*Assume moreover that there exists some  $\phi : \tilde{\Omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that*

$$\Phi(r \cos \alpha, r \sin \alpha, z) = \phi(r, z) d\theta \quad \text{for all } \alpha.$$

*Then the unique minimizer  $v_0$  of  $\mathcal{G}$  is given in cylindrical coordinates by  $v_0 = w_0(r, z) d\theta$ , where  $w_0$  minimizes the functional*

$$(5.1) \quad \mathcal{G}^{red}(w) := \frac{1}{2} \int_{\tilde{\Omega}} \tilde{\rho} \left( |\nabla w|^2 + \frac{(w - \phi)^2}{r} \right) dr dz$$

*in the space of functions  $w : \tilde{\Omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\int_{\tilde{\Omega}} \frac{\tilde{\rho}}{r} w^2 dr dz < \infty$ .*

We set  $\mathcal{G}^{red}(w) = +\infty$  if  $dw$  is not a Radon measure in  $\tilde{\Omega}$  or if  $r\tilde{\rho}$  is not  $|dw|$ -integrable.

As noted in the introduction,  $\mathcal{G}^{red}$  is exactly a (weighted) version of a functional that has been studied in the context of image denoising, see for example [23, 7].

*Proof.* **1.** Let  $R_{\alpha} : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  denote rotation by an angle  $\alpha$  around the  $x_3$  axis. Equivalently, in cylindrical coordinates,  $R_{\alpha}$  is the map  $(r, \theta, z) \mapsto (r, \theta + \alpha, z)$ . Then our assumptions imply that

$$R_{\alpha}(\Omega) = \Omega, \quad \rho \circ R_{\alpha} = \rho, \quad R_{\alpha}^{\#} \Phi = \Phi$$

for all  $\alpha$ . It easily follows that  $\mathcal{G}(R_{\alpha}^{\#} v) = \mathcal{G}(v)$  for all  $v$  and  $\alpha$ . By uniqueness of the minimizer  $v_0$  of  $\mathcal{G}$ , which follows from strict convexity, we conclude that

$$v_0 \in \tilde{L}_{\rho}^2(\Lambda^1 \Omega) := \{v \in L_{\rho}^2(\Lambda^1 \Omega) : R_{\alpha}^{\#} v = v \text{ for all } \alpha\}.$$



It is then immediate that  $v_0$  minimizes  $\mathcal{G}$  in  $\tilde{L}_\rho^2(\Lambda^1\Omega)$ .

2. Any  $v \in \tilde{L}_\rho^2(\Lambda^1\Omega)$  can be written in polar coordinates as

$$(5.2) \quad v = v^\theta(r, z)d\theta + v^r(r, z)dr + v^z(r, z)dz.$$

We claim that for any such  $v$ ,

$$(5.3) \quad \mathcal{G}(v) \geq \mathcal{G}(v^\theta d\theta) = 2\pi \mathcal{G}^{red}(v^\theta) - C(\Phi).$$

Clearly, this together with Step 1 implies the conclusion of the lemma. To prove (5.3), note that if  $v$  is smooth and has the form (5.2), then

$$|dv| = |\partial_r v^\theta dr \wedge d\theta + \partial_z v^\theta dz \wedge d\theta + (\partial_r v^z - \partial_z v^r)dr \wedge dz| \geq |d(v^\theta d\theta)|.$$

In the general case, the same conclusion follows from the density of smooth functions in  $v \in \tilde{L}_\rho^2(\Lambda^1\Omega)$  in the sense of Lemma 13. It is also clear that if  $v \in \tilde{L}_\rho^2(\Lambda^1\Omega)$  and  $\Phi = \phi(r, z)d\theta$ , then

$$|v - \Phi|^2 = \frac{(v^\theta - \phi)^2}{r^2} + (v^r)^2 + (v^z)^2 \geq \frac{(v^\theta - \phi)^2}{r^2} = |v^\theta d\theta - \Phi|^2$$

pointwise, so that

$$\int_\Omega \rho \left( \frac{|v|^2}{2} - v \cdot \Phi \right) = \int_\Omega \frac{\rho}{2} (|v - \Phi|^2 - |\Phi|^2) \geq \int_\Omega \rho \left( \frac{|v^\theta d\theta|^2}{2} - (v^\theta d\theta) \cdot \Phi \right).$$

Combining these estimates, we conclude that  $\mathcal{G}(v) \geq \mathcal{G}(v^\theta d\theta)$  for all  $v \in \tilde{L}_\rho^2(\Lambda^1\Omega)$ .

Finally, the identity

$$\mathcal{G}(v^\theta d\theta) = 2\pi \mathcal{G}^{red}(v^\theta) - C(\Phi), \quad C(\Phi) := \int_\Omega \frac{\rho}{2} |\Phi|^2$$

is clear if  $v^\theta$  is smooth, and in the general case can be verified either by a density argument similar to the one given above, or by directly relating the definitions of the total variation measures associated with  $d(v^\theta d\theta)$  in  $\Omega$  and  $\nabla v^\theta$  in  $\tilde{\Omega}$ , respectively.  $\square$

*Remark 8.* As in Theorem 5, one can use duality to rewrite the problem of minimizing  $\mathcal{G}^{red}$  as a constrained variational problem. For example, one can verify that  $v_0$  minimizes  $\mathcal{G}^{red}$  if and only if it minimizes the functional

$$(5.4) \quad w \mapsto \int_{\tilde{\Omega}} \frac{\tilde{\rho}}{r} w^2 \, dr \, dz$$

subject to the constraint

$$(5.5) \quad \int_{\tilde{\Omega}} \frac{\tilde{\rho}}{r} (\phi - w) \zeta \, dr \, dz \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\tilde{\Omega}} \tilde{\rho} |\nabla \zeta| \quad \text{for all } \zeta \in C^\infty(\tilde{\Omega}),$$

analogous to (4.18). One could also reformulate this as a problem of minimizing a weighted Dirichlet energy of a 1-form on  $\tilde{\Omega}$  with a nonlocal constraint like that of (1.26), but in this setting this seems to us less natural, since the formulation in terms of functions rather than 1-forms seems simpler.

*Remark 9.* For velocity field represented by the 1-form  $v = w(r, z)d\theta$ , the associated vorticity 2-form is  $dv = \partial_r w \, dr \wedge d\theta + \partial_z w \, dz \wedge d\theta$ . The vorticity vector field, that is, the vector field dual to  $dv$ , is then  $\frac{1}{r}(\partial_r w \, \hat{e}_z - \partial_z w \, \hat{e}_r)$ , where  $\hat{e}_z$  and  $\hat{e}_r$  denote unit vectors in the (upward) vertical and (outward) radial directions respectively. It is natural to interpret integral curves of this vector field as “vortex curves”. Since the vorticity vector field has no  $\hat{e}_\theta$  component and is always tangent to level surfaces

of  $w$ , we conclude that, formally, vortex curves have the form “ $\theta = \text{constant}$ ,  $w = \text{constant}$ ” (at least for regular values of  $w$ ).

Thus in the reduced 2d model, we interpret level sets of a minimizer  $w_0$ , or more precisely sets of the form  $\partial\{(r, z) : w_0(r, z) > t\}$ , as representing vortex curves.

For similar reasons, one should think of the “vorticity measure” as being given by  $\nabla^\perp w_0$ , rather than  $\nabla w_0$ .

Similarly, we have

**Lemma 15.** *Consider the functional*

$$\mathcal{F}(v, A) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} |dv| + |v - A|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |d(A - A_{ex})|^2$$

and assume that there exist some  $\tilde{\Omega} \subset [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}$  and  $\phi : \tilde{\Omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\Omega = \{(r \cos \alpha, r \sin \alpha, z) : (r, z) \in \tilde{\Omega}, \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\},$$

$$A_{ex}(r \cos \alpha, r \sin \alpha, z) = \phi(r, z) d\theta \quad \text{for all } \alpha.$$

Then the unique minimizer  $(v_0, A_0)$  of  $\mathcal{F}$  is given in cylindrical coordinates by  $(v_0, A_0) = (w_0(r, z) d\theta, b_0(r, z) d\theta)$ , where  $(w_0, b_0)$  minimizes the functional

$$(5.6) \quad \mathcal{F}^{red}(w, b) := \frac{1}{2} \int_{\tilde{\Omega}} |\nabla w| + \frac{(w - b)^2}{r} dr dz + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\tilde{\mathbb{R}}^2} \frac{|\nabla(b - \phi)|^2}{r} dr dz$$

in the space of  $(w, b) : \tilde{\mathbb{R}}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  for which  $\mathcal{F}^{red}(w, b)$  is well-defined and finite, where  $\tilde{\mathbb{R}}^2 := \{(r, z) : r > 0\}$ .

We omit the proof, which is extremely similar to that of Lemma 14.

**5.2. contact curves and vortex curves.** It is interesting to ask whether one can define a useful analog of the “contact set” (as normally defined for classical obstacle problems) for the variational problems with nonlocal constraints formulated in Theorems 2 and 5. We address this question first for Bose-Einstein condensates in the presence of rotational symmetry, as discussed immediately above. Thus, we assume that  $w_0 : \tilde{\Omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  minimizes the functional (5.4) subject to the constraint (5.5). An approximation argument starting from (5.5) shows that if  $E$  is a set of locally finite perimeter in  $\tilde{\Omega}$ , then

$$(5.7) \quad \int \frac{\tilde{\rho}}{r} (\phi - w_0) \mathbf{1}_E dr dz \leq \frac{1}{2} \int \tilde{\rho} |\nabla \mathbf{1}_E|.$$

We say that  $\partial E$  is a *contact curve* if equality holds in the above (where  $\partial E$  should be understood as the 1-dimensional set that carries  $|\nabla \mathbf{1}_E|$ ).

**Lemma 16.** *For a.e.  $t$ ,  $\partial\{w_0 > t\}$  is a contact curve.*

As argued in Remark 9, it is natural to interpret  $\partial\{w_0 > t\}$  as a “vortex curve”, so the Lemma states, heuristically, that every vortex curve for  $w_0$  is also a contact curve.

*Proof.* By using rotational symmetry to reduce (1.28) to the  $(r, z)$  variables, or by using the fact that  $0 = \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{G}^{red}(e^t w_0)|_{t=0}$ , we find that

$$\frac{1}{2} \int \tilde{\rho} |\nabla w_0| + \int \frac{\tilde{\rho}}{r} (w_0 - \phi) w_0 dr dz = 0.$$

Using the coarea formula, we rewrite this as

$$(5.8) \quad \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left( \frac{1}{2} \int \tilde{\rho} |\nabla \mathbf{1}_{\{w_0 > t\}}| + \int \frac{\tilde{\rho}}{r} (w_0 - \phi) \mathbf{1}_{\{w_0 > t\}} dr dz \right) dt = 0.$$

It follows from (5.7) that

$$\frac{1}{2} \int \tilde{\rho} |\nabla \mathbf{1}_{\{w_0 > t\}}| + \int \frac{\tilde{\rho}}{r} (w_0 - \phi) \mathbf{1}_{\{w_0 > t\}} dr dz \geq 0$$

for every  $t$ , and then (5.8) implies that in fact equality holds for a.e.  $t$ .  $\square$

It is almost certainly not true that every contact curve for the minimizer  $w_0$  is also a vortex curve, in the generality that we consider here, due to the possibility of degenerate (nonlocal) obstacles, as in the classical obstacle problem. One might hope, however, that the vortex curves and contact curves coincide under reasonable physical assumptions (for example,  $\Phi = r^2 d\theta$ , corresponding to rotation of a condensate around the  $z$  axis, probably also with some conditions on  $\rho$ .)

The situation is more complicated for Bose-Einstein condensates in a general domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$  without rotational symmetry, since in this case the analogs of vortex curves and contact curves may not in fact be curves and do not in general admit a very easy concrete characterization. Abstractly, they may be described as follows: if we write  $\mathcal{Z}$  to denote the closure (in the sense of distributions) of

$$\{d\alpha : \alpha \in L^2(\Lambda^1 \Omega), \int_{\Omega} \rho |d\alpha| \leq 1\},$$

then one can think of the set  $\text{extr } \mathcal{Z}$  of extreme points of (the convex set)  $\mathcal{Z}$  as analogous to the objects — distributional boundaries of sets of finite weighted perimeter — used above to describe vortex and contact curves. Indeed, by arguments exactly like those of Remark 3 of [27], general convexity considerations and a bit of functional analysis imply that  $\text{extr } \mathcal{Z}$  is a nonempty Borel subset of a metric space, and for any  $T$  in the vector space generated by  $\mathcal{Z}$  (that is, the space  $\cup_{\lambda > 0} \lambda \mathcal{Z}$ ), there is a measure  $\mu_T$  on  $\text{extr } \mathcal{Z}$  such that

$$(5.9) \quad T = \int_{\text{extr } \mathcal{Z}} \omega \, d\mu_T(\omega)$$

and in addition

$$(5.10) \quad \int_{\Omega} \rho d|T| = \int_{\text{extr } \mathcal{Z}} \left( \int_{\Omega} \rho d|\omega| \right) d\mu_T(\omega).$$

We remark that in the closely related situation of divergence-free vector fields on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , a concrete characterization of elements of the analog of  $\text{extr } \mathcal{Z}$  as “elementary solenoids” is established in [27].

With this notation, an analog of Lemma 16 is

**Lemma 17.** *Let  $\beta_0$  be the minimizer of the constrained variational problem (1.25), (1.26), so that  $v_0 = P_{\rho} \Phi + \frac{d^* \beta_0}{\rho}$  is the minimizer of  $\mathcal{G}(\cdot)$ . Then*

$$(5.11) \quad \int_{\Omega} (\beta_{\Phi} - \beta_0) \cdot d\omega \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \rho d|\omega|.$$

for every  $\omega \in \mathcal{Z}$ . We say that  $\omega \in \text{extr } \mathcal{Z}$  is a “generalized contact curve” if the above holds with equality.

Furthermore, let  $\mu_{dv_0}$  denote a measure on  $\text{extr } \mathcal{Z}$  satisfying (5.9), (5.10) (with  $T$  replaced by  $dv_0$ ). Then  $\mu_{dv_0}$  a.e.  $\omega$  is a generalized contact curve.

The proof is exactly like that of Lemma 16, except that (5.9), (5.10) are substituted for the coarea formula. Then (5.11) follows immediately from the fact that  $\beta_0$  satisfies (1.26), and the last assertion as a consequence of (1.28).

A version of Lemma 17 could be formulated for the functional  $\mathcal{F}$  arising in the description of superconductivity and the associated contained variational problem described in Theorem 2, using a measurable decomposition (5.9), (5.10) of the vorticity  $dv_0$  to deduce from (1.12) a precise form of the assertion that every (generalized) vortex curve is a (generalized) contact curve.

It would presumably be rather easy to adapt results of [27] to the closely related situations considered here, to obtain concrete descriptions of extr  $\mathcal{Z}$ , or the corresponding objects relevant for superconductivity, although we are not sure that this would add much insight. It would also be interesting to know whether, if we consider the model case of uniform rotation about the  $z$  axis (for Bose-Einstein) or a constant applied magnetic field (for Ginzburg-Landau), the complexities sketched above do not in fact occur, and the vortex curves and contact curves for minimizers can in fact be identified with curves of finite length; this seems likely to us to be the case.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Amandine Aftalion, Stan Alama, and Lia Bronsard. Giant vortex and the breakdown of strong pinning in a rotating Bose-Einstein condensate. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 178(2):247–286, 2005.
- [2] Amandine Aftalion and Tristan Rivière. Vortex energy and vortex bending for a rotating Bose-Einstein condensate. *Phys. Rev. A*, 64(4):043611, 2001.
- [3] Stan Alama, Lia Bronsard, and J. Alberto Montero. On the Ginzburg-Landau model of a superconducting ball in a uniform field. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 23(2):237–267, 2006.
- [4] S. Baldo, R.L. Jerrard, G. Orlandi, and H.M. Soner. Convergence of Ginzburg-Landau functionals in 3-d superconductivity. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1102.4650>, 2011.
- [5] Jean Bourgain, Haim Brezis, and Petru Mironescu.  $H^{1/2}$  maps with values into the circle: minimal connections, lifting, and the Ginzburg-Landau equation. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.*, (99):1–115, 2004.
- [6] Haim Brezis and Sylvia Serfaty. A variational formulation for the two-sided obstacle problem with measure data. *Commun. Contemp. Math.*, 4(2):357–374, 2002.
- [7] Vicent Caselles, Antonin Chambolle, and Matteo Novaga. Total variation in imaging. In *Handbook of Mathematical Methods in Imaging*, pages 1016–1057. Springer, 2011.
- [8] S. J. Chapman. A hierarchy of models for type-II superconductors. *SIAM Rev.*, 42(4):555–598 (electronic), 2000.
- [9] Andres Contreras. On the first critical field in Ginzburg-Landau theory for thin shells and manifolds. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 200(2):563–611, 2011.
- [10] Andres Contreras and Peter Sternberg. Gamma-convergence and the emergence of vortices for Ginzburg-Landau on thin shells and manifolds. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 38(1-2):243–274, 2010.
- [11] M. Correggi, N. Rougerie, and J. Yngvason. The transition to a giant vortex phase in a fast rotating Bose-Einstein condensate. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 303(2):451–508, 2011.
- [12] Michele Correggi and Jakob Yngvason. Energy and vorticity in fast rotating Bose-Einstein condensates. *J. Phys. A*, 41(44):445002, 19, 2008.
- [13] Ivar Ekeland and Roger Témam. *Convex analysis and variational problems*, volume 28 of *Classics in Applied Mathematics*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, english edition, 1999. Translated from the French.
- [14] Radu Ignat and Vincent Millot. The critical velocity for vortex existence in a two-dimensional rotating Bose-Einstein condensate. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 233(1):260–306, 2006.
- [15] Radu Ignat and Vincent Millot. Energy expansion and vortex location for a two-dimensional rotating Bose-Einstein condensate. *Rev. Math. Phys.*, 18(2):119–162, 2006.

- [16] T. Iwaniec, C. Scott, and B. Stroffolini. Nonlinear Hodge theory on manifolds with boundary. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4)*, 177:37–115, 1999.
- [17] Robert L. Jerrard. Local minimizers with vortex filaments for a Gross-Pitaevsky functional. *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, 13(1):35–71 (electronic), 2007.
- [18] Robert L. Jerrard, Alberto Montero, and Peter Sternberg. Local minimizers of the Ginzburg-Landau energy with magnetic field in three dimensions. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 249(3):549–577, 2004.
- [19] Robert L. Jerrard and Halil Mete Soner. Limiting behavior of the Ginzburg-Landau functional. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 192(2):524–561, 2002.
- [20] Lotfi Lassoued and Petru Mironescu. Ginzburg-Landau type energy with discontinuous constraint. *J. Anal. Math.*, 77:1–26, 1999.
- [21] José Alberto Montero. Hodge decomposition with degenerate weights and the Gross-Pitaevskii energy. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 254(7):1926–1973, 2008.
- [22] Nicolas Rougerie. The giant vortex state for a Bose-Einstein condensate in a rotating anharmonic trap: extreme rotation regimes. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 95(3):296–347, 2011.
- [23] L. Rudin, S. Osher, and E. Fatemi. Nonlinear total variation based noise removal algorithms. *Physica D*, 60:259–268, 1992.
- [24] Etienne Sandier and Sylvia Serfaty. Global minimizers for the Ginzburg-Landau functional below the first critical magnetic field. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 17(1):119–145, 2000.
- [25] Étienne Sandier and Sylvia Serfaty. A rigorous derivation of a free-boundary problem arising in superconductivity. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)*, 33(4):561–592, 2000.
- [26] Etienne Sandier and Sylvia Serfaty. *Vortices in the magnetic Ginzburg-Landau model*. Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications, 70. Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 2007.
- [27] S. K. Smirnov. Decomposition of solenoidal vector charges into elementary solenoids, and the structure of normal one-dimensional flows. *Algebra i Analiz*, 5(4):206–238, 1993.
- [28] Jean Van Schaftingen. A simple proof of an inequality of Bourgain, Brezis and Mironescu. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 338(1):23–26, 2004.

DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF VERONA, VERONA, ITALY  
*E-mail address*: `sisto.baldo@univr.it`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO, TORONTO, ONTARIO, CANADA  
*E-mail address*: `rjerrard@math.toronto.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF VERONA, VERONA, ITALY  
*E-mail address*: `giandomenico.orlandi@univr.it`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, ETH ZÜRICH, ZÜRICH, SWITZERLAND  
*E-mail address*: `mete.soner@math.ethz.ch`