

UPSCALING AND SPATIAL LOCALIZATION OF NON-LOCAL ENERGIES WITH PERSISTENT NONLINEARITIES

JOSÉ MATIAS, MARCO MORANDOTTI, DAVID R. OWEN, AND ELVIRA ZAPPALE

ABSTRACT. A description of the energetic response of a continuous body to changes in geometry is crucial for the formulation of continuum field theories and their associated variational problems. Whenever possible one attempts to enrich such field theories by means of energetic responses that account for changes in geometry at submacroscopic levels. We here describe such submacroscopic geometrical changes via the multiscale geometry of structured deformations, and we introduce energy responses to changes at the microlevel near a given point x in the body by means of a response function Ψ that depends on weighted averages of the jump-discontinuities of deformation u_n throughout a neighborhood of x of a given size r . The deformation u_n describes geometrical changes as viewed through a microscope with magnification power proportional to $\frac{1}{n}$, and the multiscale geometry provides that u_n can be chosen so as to approach a given macroscopic deformation field g and so that its gradient ∇u_n (away from sites of discontinuities) approaches a preassigned field G as n tends to infinity. We prove here that for a broad class of nonlinear response functions Ψ the process of upscaling “ $n \rightarrow \infty$ ” results in a macroscale energy response that depends through the given non-linear response function Ψ upon (1) the jumps $[g]$ of the macroscopic deformation g and upon the *disarrangement* field $\nabla g - G$, upon (2) the preassigned size r of the neighborhood over which the jumps in u_n were averaged, and upon (3) the weighting functions α_r employed in the microscale averaging. The term “non-local” is used here to convey the dependence of the energy upon the size parameter r and upon the averaging functions α_r both before and after upscaling. By contrast, continuum field theories that do not account for submacroscopic changes generally are “local”, in the sense that no such size parameter and weighting functions appear in the energy response functions. Consequently, we study here not only the process of upscaling to the macrolevel “ $n \rightarrow \infty$ ” but also the process of spatial localization “ $r \rightarrow 0$ ”. We prove that the energetic response after the successive processes of upscaling and of spatial localization depends through the original function Ψ (and in some cases also through the recession function of Ψ) upon the jumps of the macroscopic deformation g and upon the disarrangement field $\nabla g - G$, but the upscaled and localized response no longer depends upon r or upon the nature of the non-local averaging process. The resulting non-linear dependence of the energy upon the disarrangement field $\nabla g - G$ has previously been shown to be significant for the description of yielding and hysteresis in special settings, and our results show that this significance can be studied in a far broader context than before. As an illustration we apply our results in the context of the plasticity of single crystals. We also show that the nonlinearities of Ψ persist after both upscaling and localization when a purely local term is added to the non-local energy response at the microlevel.

Keywords: structured deformations, upscaling, non-local energies, crystal plasticity.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries	7
2.1. Notation	7
2.2. Measure Theory	7
2.3. BV and SBV functions	10
2.4. Structured deformations	11
3. Upscaling of the non-local energy E^{α_r}	12
4. Spatial localization of the upscaled non-local energy	13
5. Coupling local and non-local energies	16
5.1. Relaxation of the local energy E_L	16
5.2. Relaxation of the total energy $E_L + E^{\alpha_r}$	18
5.3. On the reverse order of the limits	19

Date: February 20, 2020.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 49J45 (74G65, 74A60, 74C99, 74N05).

5.4. Bulk relaxed densities of the form $F_1(x, G(x)) + F_2(x, \nabla g(x) - G(x))$	20
6. Example from crystal plasticity	21
6.1. Invertible structured deformations	21
6.2. Slip systems for single crystals; crystallographic structured deformations	22
6.3. Slip-neutral two-level shears	24
6.4. Frame-indifferent energetic responses	25
6.5. Periodic properties of the energetic response Ψ_i to crystallographic slip	26
6.6. Form of the initial non-local energy appropriate for crystalline plasticity	27
References	28

1. INTRODUCTION

In continuum mechanics, structured deformations [14] provide a rich tool for including the multiscale geometry of deformations. In light of the modern developments of analytical tools for the energetic formulation of mechanical phenomena, structured deformations have been cast in a variational framework in the pioneering work of Choksi and Fonseca [11]. In their setting, a (first-order) structured deformation is a pair (g, G) , where g represents the macroscopic deformation and G represents the contribution at the macrolevel of smooth submacroscopic geometrical changes; in order to allow the macroscopic deformation g to include non-smooth behavior, such as slips and separations, Choksi and Fonseca required that $g \in SBV(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$, the space of special functions of bounded variations (see [2]). The matrix-valued field $G \in L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})$ captures the contribution of the smooth submacroscopic geometrical changes to the deformation gradient ∇g , so that a relevant object in the theory of structured deformation is the disarrangement tensor $M := \nabla g - G$.

The connection between structured deformations and the actual submacroscopic geometrical changes occurring during a deformation is captured in the Approximation Theorem [11, Theorem 2.12] (which is a counterpart of [14, Theorem 5.8]), stating that for each $(g, G) \in SD(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times N}) := SBV(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \times L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})$ there exists a sequence $u_n \in SBV(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$u_n \rightarrow g \quad \text{in } L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla u_n \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} G \quad \text{in } \mathcal{M}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{d \times N}). \quad (1.1)$$

In the formula above, the geometrical process of upscaling from the submacroscopic to the macroscopic level is made precise via the notions of convergence used there. In (1.1), $\mathcal{M}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})$ is the space of matrix-valued Radon measures and the symbol $\overset{*}{\rightharpoonup}$ denotes the weak-* convergence in $\mathcal{M}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})$. (In the context of SBV functions, the symbol ∇ is used to denote the part of the distributional derivative which is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure.) The approximating functions u_n in (1.1) are interpreted as a description of both smooth and non-smooth submacroscopic geometrical changes, and we may write

$$M = \nabla \left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u_n \right) - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nabla u_n.$$

Thus, the disarrangement tensor emerges as a measure of the non-commutativity of the limit operation and taking the absolutely continuous part of the distributional derivative; because of this, it captures the contribution in the limit of the jump discontinuities of the u_n 's. Notice that the approximating sequence u_n in (1.1) need not be unique.

The main issues that Choksi and Fonseca addressed were the assignment of an energy to a structured deformation and the establishment of an integral representation for that energy. They took an initial energy $E_L: SBV(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ featuring a bulk energy density $W: \mathbb{R}^{d \times N} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ and an interfacial energy density $\psi: \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{S}^{N-1} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ in the form

$$E_L(u) := \int_{\Omega} W(\nabla u(x)) \, dx + \int_{\Omega \cap S_u} \psi([u](x), \nu_u(x)) \, d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(x), \quad (1.2)$$

where dx and $d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(x)$ denote integration with respect to the N -dimensional Lebesgue measure and the $(N-1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measures, respectively, S_u is the jump set of u , $[u](x)$ is the jump of u at $x \in S_u$, and $\nu_u(x)$ is the outer unit normal at $x \in S_u$.

Because of the non-uniqueness of the approximating sequence u_n , the energy $I_L(g, G)$ for a given structured deformation is defined as the most economical way, in terms of energies $E_L(u_n)$ in (1.2), to reach (g, G) .

From the mathematical point of view, this corresponds to a relaxation procedure, namely

$$I_L(g, G) := \inf_{\{u_n\} \subset SBV(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)} \left\{ \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_L(u_n) : u_n \text{ converges to } (g, G) \text{ as in (1.1)} \right. \\ \left. \text{and } \sup_n \|\nabla u_n\|_{L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})} < \infty \right\} \quad (1.3)$$

where $p \geq 1$. The representation theorems [11, Theorems 2.16 and 2.17] state that, under suitable hypotheses on W , ψ , and G depending upon p , there exist a certain relaxed bulk energy density $H: \mathbb{R}^{d \times N} \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times N} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ and a certain relaxed interfacial energy density $h: \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{S}^{N-1} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ such that

$$I_L(g, G) = \int_{\Omega} H(\nabla g(x), G(x)) dx + \int_{\Omega \cap S_g} h([g](x), \nu_g(x)) d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(x). \quad (1.4)$$

We refer the reader to Section 5.1 for the integral representation theorem providing (1.4); the particular hypotheses on W , ψ , and G that depend upon p will not play a role until then. As a matter of fact, we will present a more general version where we allow the initial bulk and surface energy densities W and ψ to depend on the space variable x .

In [16] a one-dimensional procedure inspired by that in [11] was carried out for the notion of structured deformations introduced in [14]; there the initial energy (1.2) had the form

$$E_L(u) = \int_0^1 W(\nabla u(x)) dx + \sum_{z \in S_u} \psi([u](z)) \quad (1.5)$$

and the resulting integral representation (1.4) was shown to be

$$I_L(g, G) = \int_0^1 (W(G(x)) + \lambda(\nabla g(x) - G(x))) dx + \sum_{z \in S_g} \psi([g](z)),$$

where $\lambda := \liminf_{\zeta \rightarrow 0^+} \psi(\zeta)/\zeta$. In this example, the contribution to the relaxed bulk energy density H of the initial interfacial energy density ψ has a special character: as the definition of λ shows, only arbitrarily small jumps influence the relaxed bulk response, which, in turn, is linear in the disarrangement tensor M . In [10] and subsequently in [17, 18] a periodic dependence upon M was shown to account for yielding, hysteresis, and hardening in single crystals undergoing two-level shears. Therefore, to include such significant non-linear effects, the choice (1.5) of initial energy must be modified.

A proposal in [16] toward capturing a non-linear dependence on M was as follows: for each $r \in (0, 1)$ let

$$F^r(u) := \int_0^1 W(\nabla u(x)) dx + \sum_{z \in S_u} \psi([u](z)) + \int_0^1 \Psi \left(\sum_{z \in S_u \cap (x-r, x+r)} \frac{[u](z)}{2r} \right) dx, \quad (1.6)$$

where the added, non-local term includes the bounded and uniformly continuous bulk energy density $\Psi: [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ which accounts for the average of the jumps within each interval of radius r .

Passing to structured deformations in (1.6) and then taking the limit as $r \rightarrow 0^+$ yields (see [16, Proposition 2.3 and (2.21)])

$$J(g, G) = \int_0^1 (W(G(x)) + \lambda(\nabla g(x) - G(x))) dx + \sum_{z \in S_g} \psi([g](z)) + \int_0^1 \Psi(\nabla g(x) - G(x)) dx, \quad (1.7)$$

where a second, possibly non-linear, dependence on the disarrangements appears through the density Ψ in the last integral above.

The goal of this paper is to show that an analogous procedure that achieves in one dimension the energy in (1.7) can be carried out in higher dimensions in the *SBV* framework of [11], by adding to the energy E_L in (1.2) a term analogous to the last term on the right-hand side of (1.6). Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a bounded connected open set with Lipschitz boundary $\partial\Omega$; for a continuous function $\Psi: \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times N} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ and for $u \in SBV(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$, define

$$E^{\alpha_r}(u) := \int_{\Omega_r} \Psi(x, (D^s u * \alpha_r)(x)) dx, \quad (1.8)$$

where $D^s u$ is the jump part of the distributional derivative $Du = \nabla u \mathcal{L}^N + D^s u$; for $r > 0$, $\Omega_r := \{x \in \Omega : \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) > r\}$, B_r is the ball of radius r centered at the origin, and

$$\alpha_r(x) := \frac{1}{r^N} \alpha\left(\frac{x}{r}\right), \quad (1.9a)$$

where

$$\alpha \in C_b(B_1) = \{\alpha : B_1 \rightarrow [0, +\infty) : \alpha \text{ is continuous and bounded}\} \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{B_1} \alpha(x) dx = 1; \quad (1.9b)$$

The symbol $*$ denotes the convolution operation (whose output is a function) of a measure with the continuous function α_r (see [2, Definition 2.1]); in particular, for $x \in \Omega_r$ and the measure $D^s u$,

$$(D^s u * \alpha_r)(x) = \int_{B_r(x) \cap S_u} \alpha_r(x-y)[u](y) \otimes \nu_u(y) d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(y), \quad (1.10)$$

where $B_r(x) = x + B_r$ (the ball of radius r centered at x) and where we used the structure theorem for the derivative of SBV functions (see formula (2.11) below).

Notice that we have introduced an explicit dependence on x in the non-local energy density Ψ in (1.8). The need for such a dependence is motivated by some explicit applications to yielding, hysteresis, and crystal plasticity that we have in mind, and that we will discuss in Sections 5.4 and 6.

Putting (1.8) and (1.10) together yields the following form for the averaged interfacial energy E^{α_r}

$$E^{\alpha_r}(u) = \int_{\Omega_r} \Psi\left(x, \int_{B_r(x) \cap S_u} \alpha_r(x-y)[u](y) \otimes \nu_u(y) d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(y)\right) dx. \quad (1.11)$$

We note that in the expression above the non-local character of the averaged interfacial energy emerges through the appearance of two iterated integrations, the inner surface integral with respect to \mathcal{H}^{N-1} and the outer volume integral with respect to \mathcal{L}^N .

Our main aim in this paper is to study the behavior of energy (1.11) under upscaling, i.e., as the field u approaches a target structured deformation (g, G) , followed by spatial localization, i.e., as r approaches 0. The first contribution we obtain is the following strengthened version of the Approximation Theorem [11, Theorem 2.12] that is similar in spirit to the Approximation Theorem [38, Theorem 1.2]. Here and in the sequel $\mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)$ denotes the set of positive Radon measures on Ω .

Theorem 1.1 (Approximation Theorem). *Given $(g, G) \in SD(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})$ there exists a sequence $u_n \in SBV(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ converging to (g, G) according to (1.1) and such that*

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{there exist scalar fields } \gamma^a, \gamma^s \text{ such that } \Gamma := \gamma^a \mathcal{L}^N + \gamma^s \mathcal{H}^{N-1} \llcorner S_g \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega) \\ & \text{and } |D^s u_n| \xrightarrow{*} \Gamma \quad \text{in } \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega). \end{aligned} \quad (1.12)$$

In particular, there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$|Du_n|(\Omega) \leq C(1 + \|g\|_{BV} + \|G\|_{L^1}). \quad (1.13)$$

Whenever a sequence $u_n \in SBV(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ converges to (g, G) according to (1.1) in such a way that (1.12) holds, we write

$$u_n \xrightarrow{SD} (g, G). \quad (1.14)$$

Notice that convergence (1.1) and the uniform bound (1.13) alone imply that up to a subsequence

$$D^s u_n \xrightarrow{*} (\nabla g - G) \mathcal{L}^N + D^s g \quad \text{in } \mathcal{M}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{d \times N}). \quad (1.15)$$

We state now our first result concerning the behavior of the initial energy $E^{\alpha_r}(u_n)$ with respect to the convergence (1.14) that here embodies the process of upscaling from submacroscopic to macroscopic levels.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a bounded Lipschitz domain, $\Psi : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times N} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ be a continuous function, for $r > 0$, let α_r be as in (1.9), and let E^{α_r} be as in (1.11). Then for every $(g, G) \in SD(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d \times$*

$\mathbb{R}^{d \times N}$) and for every sequence $u_n \in SBV(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $u_n \xrightarrow{SD} (g, G)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E^{\alpha_r}(u_n) &= \int_{\Omega_r} \Psi \left(x, \int_{B_r(x)} \alpha_r(y-x)(\nabla g - G)(y) dy \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{B_r(x) \cap S_g} \alpha_r(y-x)[g](y) \otimes \nu_g(y) d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(y) \right) dx \\ &=: I^{\alpha_r}(g, G; \Omega_r). \end{aligned} \quad (1.16)$$

After proving Theorem 1.2 in Section 3, we devote Section 4 to deducing an explicit formula for

$$I(g, G) := \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E^{\alpha_r}(u_n) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} I^{\alpha_r}(g, G; \Omega_r), \quad (1.17)$$

where $I(g, G)$ represents the spatial localization of the upscaled energy $I^{\alpha_r}(g, G; \Omega_r)$. In our main result, we obtain an explicit formula for $I(g, G)$ via an extension of $(g, G) \in SD(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})$ to $(\bar{g}, \bar{G}) \in BV(\mathbb{R}^N; \mathbb{R}^d) \times L^1(\mathbb{R}^N; \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})$ such that $|D^s \bar{g}|(\partial\Omega) = 0$ (see [26, 27]). This extension permits us to add a term to $I^{\alpha_r}(g, G; \Omega_r)$ such that the resulting sum $\bar{I}^{\alpha_r}(\bar{g}, \bar{G}; \Omega)$ is an integral over the fixed domain Ω whose limit can be studied via Reshetnyak continuity-type theorems, and the resulting explicit formula turns out not to depend on the particular choice of the extension. Accordingly, we restrict our attention to functions Ψ with at most linear growth at infinity.

We focus on two different classes of continuous functions $\Psi: \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times N} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$, namely

(E) Ψ can be extended to a function (still denoted by Ψ) belonging to $C(\bar{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})$ with the property that $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \Psi(x, t\xi)/t$ exists uniformly in $x \in \bar{\Omega}$ and ξ with $|\xi| = 1$. (Such functions Ψ form the class $\mathbf{E}(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})$ defined in [29, Section 2.4].) In particular, this entails that

(i) Ψ has at most linear growth at infinity with respect to the second variable, namely there exists $C_\Psi > 0$ such that

$$|\Psi(x, \xi)| \leq C_\Psi(1 + |\xi|) \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega \text{ and } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times N}; \quad (1.18)$$

(ii) for all $x \in \bar{\Omega}$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times N}$ there exists the limit

$$\lim_{\substack{x' \rightarrow x \\ \xi' \rightarrow \xi \\ t \rightarrow +\infty}} \frac{\Psi(x', t\xi')}{t}. \quad (1.19)$$

(L) (i) Ψ is Lipschitz with respect to the second variable, *i.e.*, there exists $L_\Psi > 0$ such that

$$|\Psi(x, \xi) - \Psi(x, \xi')| \leq L_\Psi |\xi - \xi'|, \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega \text{ and } \xi, \xi' \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times N}; \quad (1.20)$$

(ii) there exists a continuous function $\omega: [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$, with $\omega(s) \rightarrow 0^+$ as $s \rightarrow 0^+$, such that

$$|\Psi(x, \xi) - \Psi(x', \xi)| \leq \omega(|x - x'|)(1 + |\xi|), \quad \text{for all } x, x' \in \Omega, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times N}. \quad (1.21)$$

Notice that, by fixing $\xi' \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times N}$, (1.20) implies that there exists $C_\Psi > 0$ such that (1.18) holds.

Remark 2.4 offers a comment on the relationship between the classes (E) and (L).

We are now in a position to state our result concerning the limit (1.17), the spatial localization of the upscaled energy $I^{\alpha_r}(g, G; \Omega_r)$.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a bounded Lipschitz domain, let $\Psi: \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times N} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ be a continuous function belonging to (E) or (L), and let α_r be as in (1.9). Then for any $(g, G) \in SD(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})$ we have that the limiting energy $I(g, G)$ in (1.17) is given by*

$$I(g, G) = \int_{\Omega} \Psi(x, \nabla g(x) - G(x)) dx + \int_{\Omega \cap S_g} \Psi^\infty \left(x, \frac{dD^s g}{d|D^s g|}(x) \right) d|D^s g|(x), \quad (1.22)$$

with

$$\Psi^\infty(x, \xi) = \limsup_{\substack{x' \rightarrow x \\ \xi' \rightarrow \xi \\ t \rightarrow +\infty}} \frac{\Psi(x', t\xi')}{t} \quad (1.23)$$

for every $x \in \Omega$, $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^{d \times N - 1}$, and extended to $\mathbb{R}^{d \times N}$ by positive 1-homogeneity.

Remark 1.4. We observe the following:

- The function Ψ^∞ defined in (1.23) is finite whenever Ψ is in (E) or (L). Notice that it is a limit if Ψ is in (E), see (1.19).
- In Theorem 1.3, the resulting bulk energy density retains the character of the function Ψ that defines the initial non-local energy (1.8). Moreover, we observe that since Ψ^∞ vanishes in the case of sublinear growth at infinity formula (1.22) reduces to

$$I(g, G) = \int_{\Omega} \Psi(x, \nabla g(x) - G(x)) \, dx \quad (1.24)$$

when Ψ has sublinear growth.

It is now natural to consider an initial energy that combines both a local contribution, described by the functional E_L in (1.2), and a non-local one, described by E^{α_r} in (1.8). We now focus our attention on the upscaling, in the context of [11], of the energy functional

$$F^{\alpha_r}(u) := E_L(u) + E^{\alpha_r}(u), \quad (1.25)$$

namely, we consider

$$J^{\alpha_r}(g, G) := \inf_{\{u_n\} \subset SBV(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)} \left\{ \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} F^{\alpha_r}(u_n) : u_n \text{ converges to } (g, G) \text{ according to (1.1)} \right. \\ \left. \text{and } \sup_n \|\nabla u_n\|_{L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})} < \infty \right\} \quad (1.26)$$

where, as in (1.3), $p \geq 1$. We will prove in Theorem 5.4 that the upscaling of the sum F^{α_r} in (1.25) is the sum of the upscaling I^{α_r} in (1.16) of E^{α_r} and the relaxation I_L in (1.3) of E_L :

$$J^{\alpha_r}(g, G) = I_L(g, G) + I^{\alpha_r}(g, G; \Omega_r), \quad (1.27)$$

so that, defining

$$J(g, G) := \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} J^{\alpha_r}(g, G) \quad (1.28)$$

and keeping (1.17) into account, we obtain

$$J(g, G) = I_L(g, G) + I(g, G). \quad (1.29)$$

Eventually, from (1.4) and (1.22) the energy $J(g, G)$ has the explicit expression (see (5.9) in Corollary 5.5)

$$J(g, G) = \int_{\Omega} H(\nabla g(x), G(x)) \, dx + \int_{\Omega \cap S_g} h([g](x), \nu_g(x)) \, d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(x) \\ + \int_{\Omega} \Psi(x, \nabla g(x) - G(x)) \, dx + \int_{\Omega \cap S_g} \Psi^\infty\left(x, \frac{dD^s g}{|D^s g|}(x)\right) \, d|D^s g|(x). \quad (1.30)$$

The formula above couples together the contributions to the total energy $J(g, G)$ coming from the local part $I_L(g, G)$ and from the limit $I(g, G)$ of the non-local energy. The contribution of the singularities of g enters the expression of $J(g, G)$ both through the surface term of $I_L(g, G)$ and through the surface term of $I(g, G)$, via the function Ψ^∞ , thus retaining the linear character at infinity of Ψ . The effect of Ψ on the disarrangements is encoded in the bulk term of $I(g, G)$.

Thus, our approach to the study of non-local energies rests on two limiting processes:

- 1 – upscaling:** Starting from a submacroscopic level at which a weighted average of disarrangements within each neighborhood of a fixed size $r > 0$ determines the initial energy density, one passes to the macrolevel, permitting disarrangements to diffuse throughout each such neighborhood. This upscaling process determines a structured deformation as well as the non-local dependence of the energy density on that structured deformation.
- 2 – spatial localization:** Starting at the macrolevel from neighborhoods of the given size r above, one passes to neighborhoods of smaller and smaller sizes to obtain in the limit $r \rightarrow 0$ purely local bulk and interfacial energy densities for the structured deformation identified above.

Our final result, Corollary 5.5, provides the explicit representation (1.30) and shows that the nonlinearities introduced in the microlevel energy E^{α_r} through Ψ persist under the two operations of upscaling and spatial localization.

Previous research on relaxation of energies for continuous bodies has rested on one or the other, but not on both, of these two limiting processes. In [7, 11, 12, 16, 36, 39] the first process is carried out for purely

local energy densities, so that the parameter r does not appear, and the second process is irrelevant. The important results in [39] (that are exemplified in [7, 12, 16, 36]) show that the relaxed bulk energies obtained via the limiting process (1), when the initial energy is both purely local and purely interfacial, form a class that excludes the periodic functions used in [10] to predict yielding and hysteresis.

Peridynamics provides a context in which only the second limiting process is employed: for example, classical, local theories of elasticity and fracture are recovered in [37] and [32] from peridynamic theories under the limiting process $r \rightarrow 0$. In the case of peridynamics, the principal focus with respect to storage of energy and with respect to associated field theories is the non-local case in which the “horizon” r remains fixed, while the present approach via the two limiting processes achieves a purely local relaxed energy that, unlike the relaxations based on process (1) alone, admits periodic relaxed energy responses in the context of the field theories [20, 21, 34] for bodies undergoing structured deformations.

We note that there are particular classes of local initial energy densities W and ψ for which explicit formulas are available [7, 36, 39] for the relaxed energy $I_L(g, G)$ in (1.4). Notice that formula (1.22) does provide an explicit formula for the non-local energy $I(g, G)$, so that an explicit formula for $J(g, G)$ could then be obtained via (1.29) and (1.30). Moreover, in the one-dimensional case, explicit formulas for I_L are available in [12] and [16, Part II, Sections 2.1–2.5]. The distinction between the types of dependence of the relaxed bulk energy on the disarrangement tensor $M = \nabla g - G$ that we pointed out earlier in this introduction (see (1.7)) for the one-dimensional results in [16] remains apparent in the multi-dimensional cases where explicit formulas are available for both. Specifically, Remark 5.6 provides sufficient conditions in the multi-dimensional case in order that the relaxed bulk energy density be given by the sum $W(x, G(x)) + \Psi(x, M(x))$, with W the initial bulk energy response function and Ψ the initial non-local bulk energy response function.

The overall plan of this work is the following: in Section 2 we fix the notation and recall some basic results used throughout this article. In Section 3 and Section 4, we prove Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3, respectively, that are the main novel contribution of this work. In Section 5, we consider an initial energy featuring both a local and a non-local term and discuss its relaxation and the limit for a vanishing measure of non-locality. The brief Subsection 5.3 contains some comments on the inversion of the two limiting procedures and discusses why, at least in the present context, we cannot expect a commutability result to hold. In Subsection 5.4 we show how our results provide a firm foundation for the predictions of yielding and hysteresis in earlier studies based on structured deformations; in Section 6, we turn to crystal plasticity to present an example of bulk energies of the type recovered by our upscaling and spatial localization of non-local energies.

2. PRELIMINARIES

We start this section by fixing the notation used throughout this work; then we recall some results on measure theory and give a contained presentation of special functions of bounded variation, and finally we conclude by introducing structured deformations in the framework of [11].

2.1. Notation. We will use the following notations

- $U \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is a bounded connected open set with $\mathcal{L}^N(\partial U) = 0$;
- $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is a bounded connected open Lipschitz set with $\mathcal{L}^N(\partial\Omega) = 0$;
- $\mathcal{A}(\Omega)$ is the family of all open subsets of Ω ; $\mathcal{B}(\Omega)$ is the family of all Borel subsets of Ω ;
- $\mathcal{M}(U)$ and $\mathcal{M}(U; \mathbb{R}^\ell)$ are the sets of (signed) finite real-valued or vector-valued Radon measures on U , respectively; $\mathcal{M}^+(U)$ is the set of non-negative finite Radon measures on U ;
- given $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(U)$ or $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(U; \mathbb{R}^\ell)$, the measure $|\mu| \in \mathcal{M}^+(U)$ denotes the total variation of μ ;
- \mathcal{L}^N and \mathcal{H}^{N-1} denote the N -dimensional Lebesgue measure and the $(N-1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure in \mathbb{R}^N , respectively; the symbol dx will also be used to denote integration with respect to \mathcal{L}^N , while $d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}$ will be used to denote surface integration with respect to \mathcal{H}^{N-1} ;
- given $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(U; \mathbb{R}^d)$, we denote by $\mu = m^a \mathcal{L}^N + \mu^s$ its decomposition into absolutely continuous part with respect to the Lebesgue measure and singular part; for every $A \in \mathcal{B}(U)$, we define $\langle \mu \rangle(A) := \int_A \sqrt{1 + |m^a(x)|^2} dx + |\mu^s|(A)$;
- \mathbb{S}^{N-1} denotes the unit sphere in \mathbb{R}^N ;
- for any $r > 0$, B_r denotes the open ball of \mathbb{R}^N centred at the origin of radius r ; for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $B_r(x) := x + rB$ denotes the open ball centred at x of radius r ; $Q := (-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})^N$ denotes the open unit cube of \mathbb{R}^N centred at the origin; for any $\eta \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$, Q_η denotes the open unit cube in \mathbb{R}^N with

- two faces orthogonal to η ; for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\delta > 0$, $Q(x, \delta) := x + \delta Q$ denoted the open cube in \mathbb{R}^N centered at x with side δ ;
- for any $r > 0$ and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, $\Omega_r := \{x \in \Omega : \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) > r\}$ and $\Omega^r := \Omega + B_r$;
- C represents a generic positive constant that may change from line to line;
- $C_b(B_1) := \{\alpha : B_1 \rightarrow [0, +\infty) : \alpha \text{ is continuous and bounded}\}$;
- $C_c(B_1) := \{\alpha : B_1 \rightarrow [0, +\infty) : \alpha \text{ is continuous and has compact support in } B_1\}$;
- $C_0(B_1)$ denotes the closure of $C_c(B_1)$ in the sup norm;
- for any $p \in [1, +\infty)$, $L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^\ell)$ denotes the space of vector-valued functions whose p -th power is integrable;
- $BV(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^\ell)$ denotes the space of vector-valued functions of bounded variation;
- $SBV(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^\ell)$ denotes the space of vector-valued special functions of bounded variation;
- the set of structured deformations is defined as $SD(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times N}) := SBV(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \times L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})$.

2.2. Measure Theory. We collect here some basic definitions and results from measure theory that will be used throughout the paper. In particular, we introduce the notions of weak-* and $\langle \cdot \rangle$ -strict convergences and conclude by stating the Reshetnyak Continuity Theorem.

Given $U \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ a measurable set, we denote by $\mathcal{M}(U; \mathbb{R}^\ell)$ the set of \mathbb{R}^ℓ -valued Radon measures defined on U . The Radon-Nikodým Theorem [2, Theorem 1.28] ensures that, for any $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(U; \mathbb{R}^\ell)$ there exists a unique pair of Radon measures μ^a and μ^s such that μ^a is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure \mathcal{L}^N , μ^s is singular with respect to \mathcal{L}^N , and $\mu = \mu^a + \mu^s$. Moreover, there exists a unique function $m^a \in L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^\ell)$ such that $\mu^a = m^a \mathcal{L}^N$, so that $\mu = m^a \mathcal{L}^N + \mu^s$. The singular part μ^s of μ is supported on a set of Lebesgue measure zero.

Definition 2.1. Let $\mu_n = m_n^a \mathcal{L}^N + \mu_n^s \in \mathcal{M}(U; \mathbb{R}^\ell)$ be a sequence of measures and let $\mu = m^a \mathcal{L}^N + \mu^s \in \mathcal{M}(U; \mathbb{R}^\ell)$.

- (i) We say that μ_n converges weakly-* to μ (in symbols $\mu_n \xrightarrow{*} \mu$) if

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_U \varphi(x) d\mu_n(x) = \int_U \varphi(x) d\mu(x) \quad \text{for every } \varphi \in C_0(U).$$

- (ii) We say that μ_n converges locally weakly-* to μ if

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_U \varphi(x) d\mu_n(x) = \int_U \varphi(x) d\mu(x) \quad \text{for every } \varphi \in C_c(U).$$

- (iii) If, furthermore, $\mu_n, \mu \in \mathcal{M}(\bar{U}; \mathbb{R}^\ell)$, we say that μ_n converges $\langle \cdot \rangle$ -strictly to μ if $\mu_n \xrightarrow{*} \mu$ and $\langle \mu_n \rangle(\bar{U}) \rightarrow \langle \mu \rangle(\bar{U})$, where, for every $A \in \mathcal{B}(\bar{U})$,

$$\langle \mu \rangle(A) := \int_A \sqrt{1 + |m^a(x)|^2} dx + |\mu^s|(A).$$

Proposition 2.2 ([2, Proposition 1.62(b)]). Let $\mu_n \in \mathcal{M}(U; \mathbb{R}^\ell)$ be a sequence of bounded Radon measures locally weakly-* converging to μ . Then, if $|\mu_n|$ locally weakly-* converges to Λ , then $\Lambda \geq |\mu|$. Moreover, if V is a relatively compact μ -measurable set such that $\Lambda(\partial V) = 0$, then $\mu_n(V) \rightarrow \mu(V)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. More generally,

$$\int_U u(x) d\mu(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_U u(x) d\mu_n(x),$$

for every bounded Borel function $u : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with compact support, such that the set of discontinuity points is Λ -negligible.

Theorem 2.3. Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\bar{U}; \mathbb{R}^\ell)$ and, for $r > 0$, let α_r be as in (1.9). Then $\mu * \alpha_r \in L^1(U_r; \mathbb{R}^\ell)$ and

- (i) the measures $\mu_r := (\mu * \alpha_r) \mathcal{L}^N$ locally weakly-* converge to μ as $r \rightarrow 0^+$ and, for every $V \subset U_r$ a Borel set,

$$\int_V |\mu * \alpha_r|(x) dx \leq |\mu|(V^r) \tag{2.1}$$

and the measures $|\mu_r|$ locally weakly-* converge in U to $|\mu|$;

- (ii) if $|\mu|(\partial U) = 0$, it follows that $\langle \mu_r \rangle(\bar{U}) \rightarrow \langle \mu \rangle(\bar{U})$, that is μ_r converges $\langle \cdot \rangle$ -strictly to μ according to Definition 2.1(iii).

Proof. Fix $r \in (0, 1)$. We start by proving that $\mu * \alpha_r$ is continuous \mathcal{L}^N -a.e. in U_r . Let $N(r) := \{x \in U_r : |\mu|(\partial B_r(x)) > 0\}$ and notice that $\mathcal{L}^N(N(r)) = 0$. For $x, x' \in U_r \setminus N(r)$, we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} |(\mu * \alpha_r)(x) - (\mu * \alpha_r)(x')| &\leq \left| \int_{U \cap B_r(x)} \alpha_r(y-x) \, d\mu(y) - \int_{U \cap B_r(x')} \alpha_r(y'-x') \, d\mu(y') \right| \\ &\leq \int_{U \cap (B_r(x) \cap B_r(x'))} |\alpha_r(y-x) - \alpha_r(y-x')| \, d|\mu|(y) \\ &\quad + \int_{U \cap (B_r(x) \setminus B_r(x'))} |\alpha_r(y-x)| \, d|\mu|(y) \\ &\quad + \int_{U \cap (B_r(x') \setminus B_r(x))} |\alpha_r(y-x')| \, d|\mu|(y) \\ &=: I_1(x') + I_2(x') + I_3(x'). \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

By the uniform continuity of α_r there exists a function $\omega_r: [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ such that $\omega_r(s) \rightarrow 0^+$ as $s \rightarrow 0^+$ such that

$$I_1(x') \leq C\omega_r(|x-x'|)|\mu|(U). \tag{2.3}$$

Assuming that $\delta := |x-x'| < r$, and denoting by $A_{r-\delta}^{r+\delta}(x) = B_{r+\delta}(x) \setminus \overline{B_{r-\delta}(x)}$ the annulus centered at x and setting $C_{\alpha_r} = \sup_{B_r} |\alpha_r|$, we can estimate

$$I_2(x') + I_3(x') \leq C_{\alpha_r} |\mu|(U \cap A_{r-\delta}^{r+\delta}(x)). \tag{2.4}$$

Noting that $\delta \mapsto A_{r-\delta}^{r+\delta}(x)$ is a monotone family of sets and that $\bigcap_{\delta>0} A_{r-\delta}^{r+\delta}(x) = \partial B_r(x)$,

$$\lim_{x' \rightarrow x} |(\mu * \alpha_r)(x) - (\mu * \alpha_r)(x')| \leq \lim_{x' \rightarrow x} (I_1(x') + I_2(x') + I_3(x')) = 0$$

by (2.3) and (2.4), recalling that $|\mu|(\partial B_r(x)) = 0$. This proves the continuity of $\mu * \alpha_r$ for \mathcal{L}^N -a.e. $x \in U_r$.

Estimate (2.1) follows from an application of Fubini's Theorem:

$$\int_V |\mu * \alpha_r|(x) \, dx \leq \int_V \left(\int_{B_r(x)} \alpha_r(y-x) \, d|\mu|(y) \right) dx \leq \int_{V^r} \left(\int_{B_r(y)} \alpha_r(y-x) \, dx \right) d|\mu|(y) \leq |\mu|(V^r). \tag{2.5}$$

Recalling that the right-hand side of (2.5) is bounded above by $|\mu|(\overline{U})$, we obtain that both μ_r and $|\mu_r|$ are uniformly bounded, hence converging weakly-* in the sense of measures, up to subsequences, to certain measures $\mu^* \in \mathcal{M}(\overline{U}; \mathbb{R}^\ell)$ and $\lambda^* \in \mathcal{M}_+(\overline{U})$, respectively.

Observe that we can extend μ as a measure in $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^N; \mathbb{R}^\ell)$ in such a way that $\text{spt } \mu \subset K$, where K is a compact set containing $\overline{U} + B_1$, and recall that, upon extension outside of B_r as the zero function, the convolution kernels α_r in (1.9) converge in the sense of distributions in \mathbb{R}^N to the Dirac delta δ_0 centred at the origin as $r \rightarrow 0^+$. Thus, μ_r converges to μ in the sense of distributions as $r \rightarrow 0^+$ by [25, Theorem 5.1.3] and $\mu^* = \mu$ by the uniqueness of the distributional limit. The same reasoning holds for $|\mu_r|$, so that $\lambda^* = |\mu|$. This proves (i).

The proof (ii) follows by combining the proof of [4, Proposition 2.22(iii)] with the convergence granted by [25, Theorem 5.1.3] to replace the standard convolution kernels considered in [4, Proposition 2.22(iii)] by our α_r of (1.9). Notice that it is necessary to extend μ outside of \overline{U} , but the fact that $|\mu|(\partial U) = 0$ avoids concentration effects at the boundary. \square

Given $\mu = m^a \mathcal{L}^N + \mu^s \in \mathcal{M}(U; \mathbb{R}^\ell)$ and $\Phi: U \times \mathbb{R}^\ell \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ continuous, let

$$\mathcal{J}(\mu) := \int_U \Phi(x, m^a(x)) \, dx + \int_U \Phi^\infty \left(x, \frac{d\mu^s}{d|\mu^s|}(x) \right) d|\mu^s|(x), \tag{2.6}$$

where Φ^∞ is the *recession function* of Φ at infinity, defined by

$$\Phi^\infty(x, \xi) := \limsup_{\substack{x' \rightarrow x \\ \xi' \rightarrow \xi \\ t \rightarrow +\infty}} \frac{\Phi(x', t\xi')}{t} \tag{2.7}$$

for every $x \in \overline{U}$, $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^{\ell-1}$ and extended to \mathbb{R}^ℓ by positive 1-homogeneity (compare with (1.23)). We say that $\Phi \in \mathbf{E}(U \times \mathbb{R}^\ell)$ if Φ belongs to the class (E) defined in the introduction. Notice that if $\Phi \in \mathbf{E}(U \times \mathbb{R}^\ell)$, then Φ^∞ is a limit, namely

$$\Phi^\infty(x, \xi) = \lim_{\substack{x' \rightarrow x \\ \xi' \rightarrow \xi \\ t \rightarrow +\infty}} \frac{\Phi(x', t\xi')}{t} \quad (2.8)$$

for every $x \in \overline{U}$, $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^{\ell-1}$ and extended to \mathbb{R}^ℓ by positive 1-homogeneity. We point out that (i) continuous and positively 1-homogeneous functions and (ii) convex functions with linear growth are two classes of functions belonging to $\mathbf{E}(U \times \mathbb{R}^\ell)$ (see [30]). We refer the reader to [29, Section 2.4] for a detailed description of the class $\mathbf{E}(U \times \mathbb{R}^\ell)$. Motivated by the fact that Lipschitz functions do not necessarily belong to $\mathbf{E}(U \times \mathbb{R}^\ell)$ (see Remark 2.4 below), we considered further here the classes of functions (E) and (L) described in the Introduction.

Remark 2.4. The two classes (E) and (L) have a non-empty intersection, but also a non-trivial symmetric difference.

An example of a function which belongs to (E) but not to (L), with $N = d = 1$, is the function $\Psi: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by $\Psi(\xi) = \sqrt{1 - \xi^2}$ for $\xi \in [-1, 1]$ and extended by periodicity. The limit in (1.19) exists and equals 0, but Ψ is not Lipschitz.

An example of a function which belongs to (L) but not to (E), again with $N = d = 1$, is given by $\Psi: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined in terms of the sequence $\{\xi_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$, defined recursively by $\xi_1 = 1$ and $\xi_{n+1} = 2n\xi_n$, for $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$, and such that

$$\Psi(\xi) = \begin{cases} 0, & 0 \leq \xi \leq 1, \\ \xi - \xi_n, & \xi_n \leq \xi \leq \frac{\xi_n + \xi_{n+1}}{2}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}, \\ \xi_{n+1} - \xi, & \frac{\xi_n + \xi_{n+1}}{2} \leq \xi \leq \xi_{n+1}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}. \end{cases}$$

Then $\Psi(\xi_n)/\xi_n = 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ and

$$\frac{\Psi\left(\frac{\xi_n + \xi_{n+1}}{2}\right)}{\frac{\xi_n + \xi_{n+1}}{2}} = \frac{\xi_{n+1} - \xi_n}{\xi_{n+1} + \xi_n} = \frac{2n - 1}{2n + 1}, \quad \text{for } n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}.$$

Consequently,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Psi(\xi_n)}{\xi_n} = 0 < 1 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Psi\left(\frac{\xi_n + \xi_{n+1}}{2}\right)}{\frac{\xi_n + \xi_{n+1}}{2}},$$

so that (1.19) does not hold.

The following two results will be useful in Section 4.

Theorem 2.5 (Reshetnyak upper-semicontinuity theorem, [4, Corollary 2.11]). *Let $\mu_n = m_n^a \mathcal{L}^N + \mu_n^s \in \mathcal{M}(U; \mathbb{R}^\ell)$ be a sequence of measures and let $\mu = m^a \mathcal{L}^N + \mu^s \in \mathcal{M}(U; \mathbb{R}^\ell)$ be such that $\mu_n \langle \cdot \rangle$ -strictly converges to μ . Let $\Phi: U \times \mathbb{R}^\ell \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ be a continuous function with linear growth at infinity (see (1.18)). Then the functional \mathcal{I} defined in (2.6) is upper semicontinuous, namely*

$$\mathcal{I}(\mu) \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{I}(\mu_n).$$

Theorem 2.6 (Reshetnyak continuity theorem, [29, Theorem 4]). *Let $\mu_n = m_n^a \mathcal{L}^N + \mu_n^s \in \mathcal{M}(\overline{U}; \mathbb{R}^\ell)$ be a sequence of measures and let $\mu = m^a \mathcal{L}^N + \mu^s \in \mathcal{M}(\overline{U}; \mathbb{R}^\ell)$ be such that $\mu_n \langle \cdot \rangle$ -strictly converges to μ . Let $\Phi \in \mathbf{E}(U \times \mathbb{R}^\ell)$. Then Φ^∞ is given by (2.8) and*

$$\overline{\mathcal{I}}(\mu_n) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{I}}(\mu), \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

where

$$\overline{\mathcal{I}}(\mu) := \int_U \Phi(x, m^a(x)) \, dx + \int_{\overline{U}} \Phi^\infty\left(x, \frac{d\mu^s}{d|\mu^s|}(x)\right) \, d|\mu^s|(x),$$

and analogously for $\overline{\mathcal{I}}(\mu_n)$.

We conclude this subsection by proving the following property for functions Φ belonging to the class (L).

Lemma 2.7. *Let $\Phi: U \times \mathbb{R}^\ell \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ belong to the class (L). Then the recession function Φ^∞ defined in (2.7) can be computed as*

$$\Phi^\infty(x, \xi) = \limsup_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\Phi(x, t\xi)}{t}, \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^\ell. \quad (2.9)$$

Proof. Fix $x \in U$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^\ell$. The inequality $\Phi^\infty(x, \xi) \geq \limsup_{t \rightarrow +\infty} t^{-1}\Phi(x, t\xi)$ is obvious from the definition of lim sup. The proof of the converse inequality is a matter of a computation, using the subadditivity of the lim sup and keeping (1.20) and (1.21) in mind. \square

2.3. BV and SBV functions. We start by recalling some facts on functions of bounded variation. We refer to [2] for a detailed treatment of this subject.

A function $u \in L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ is said to be of *bounded variation*, and we write $u \in BV(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$, if the distributional derivative $Du \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})$, that is, it is a (signed) finite Radon measure. The space $BV(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ is a Banach space when endowed with the norm $\|u\|_{BV(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)} := \|u\|_{L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)} + |Du|(\Omega)$. Since this norm is too strong for practical applications, it is customary to consider the weak* convergence in BV , which is the appropriate notion for compactness properties (see [2]). We say that a sequence $u_n \in BV(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ converges weakly-* to a function $u \in BV(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$, in symbols $u_n \xrightarrow{*} u$, if

$$u_n \rightarrow u \quad \text{in } L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \quad \text{and} \quad Du_n \xrightarrow{*} Du \quad \text{in } \mathcal{M}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{d \times N}).$$

Since $Du \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})$, it can be split into the sum of two mutually singular measures $D^a u$ and $D^s u$. By ∇u we denote the density of $D^a u$ with respect to \mathcal{L}^N , so that we can write

$$Du = \nabla u \mathcal{L}^N + D^s u.$$

The measure $D^s u$ can be further split into the sum of two contributions, $D^j u$ measuring the discontinuities of u and $D^c u$ measuring the Cantor-like behavior of the distributional derivative. In particular, denoting by S_u the set of points $x \in \Omega$ for which there exist two vectors $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and a unit vector $\nu \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$, normal to S_u at x , such that $a \neq b$ and

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{\varepsilon^N} \int_{\{y \in x + \varepsilon Q_\nu : (y-x) \cdot \nu > 0\}} |u(y) - a| dy = 0, \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{\varepsilon^N} \int_{\{y \in x + \varepsilon Q_\nu : (y-x) \cdot \nu < 0\}} |u(y) - b| dy = 0, \quad (2.10)$$

the triple (a, b, ν) is uniquely determined by (2.10) up to permutation of a and b and a change of sign of ν and is denoted by $(u^+(x), u^-(x), \nu_u(x))$. The set S_u is called the *jump set* of u and it is $(N-1)$ -rectifiable. In conclusion, the distributional derivative Du can be written as the sum of three mutually singular measures as

$$Du = \nabla u \mathcal{L}^N + [u] \otimes \nu_u \mathcal{H}^{N-1} \llcorner S_u + D^c u,$$

where $[u] := u^+ - u^-$.

The space of *special functions of bounded variation*, $SBV(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ is the space of functions $u \in BV(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $D^c u = 0$; therefore, for each $u \in SBV(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$

$$Du = \nabla u \mathcal{L}^N + [u] \otimes \nu_u \mathcal{H}^{N-1} \llcorner S_u. \quad (2.11)$$

2.4. Structured deformations. Following [11], we define the set of structured deformations as

$$SD(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times N}) := SBV(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \times L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{d \times N}).$$

We introduce the shorthand notation $\|(g, G)\|_{SD(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})} := \|g\|_{BV(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)} + \|G\|_{L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})}$, which we are going to denote simply by $\|(g, G)\|_{SD}$ when no domain specification is needed.

A fundamental result in the theory of structured deformations is the Approximation Theorem [14, Theorem 5.8], a counterpart of which was recovered in [11, Theorem 2.12] in the SBV framework and in [38] in a broader framework. Its proof is a consequence of the following two results.

Theorem 2.8 ([1, Theorem 3]). *Let $f \in L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})$. Then there exist $u \in SBV(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$, a Borel function $\beta: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times N}$, and a constant $C > 0$ depending only on N such that*

$$Du = f \mathcal{L}^N + \beta \mathcal{H}^{N-1} \llcorner S_u, \quad \int_{S_u \cap \Omega} |\beta(x)| d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(x) \leq C \|f\|_{L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})}. \quad (2.12)$$

Lemma 2.9 ([11, Lemma 2.9]). *Let $u \in BV(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$. Then there exist piecewise constant functions $\bar{u}_n \in SBV(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\bar{u}_n \rightarrow u$ in $L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ and*

$$|Du|(\Omega) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |D\bar{u}_n|(\Omega) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{S_{\bar{u}_n}} |[\bar{u}_n](x)| \, d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(x). \quad (2.13)$$

In the Introduction we stated our version of the Approximation Theorem, which we now prove.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let $(g, G) \in SD(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})$ and, by Theorem 2.8, choose $h \in SBV(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\nabla h = \nabla g - G$. Furthermore, let $\bar{h}_n \in SBV(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ be a sequence of piecewise constant functions approximating h as per Lemma 2.9. Then, the sequence of functions

$$u_n := g + \bar{h}_n - h \quad (2.14)$$

is easily seen to approximate (g, G) in the sense of (1.1). Invoking the triangle inequality, the inequality in (2.12), and (2.13), we obtain

$$|Du_n|(\Omega) \leq C(\mathcal{L}^N(\Omega) + \|(g, G)\|_{SD(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})}), \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (2.15)$$

which is (1.13). The uniform bound (2.15) ensures the existence of a subsequence (not relabeled) such that $|D^s u_n|$ converges weakly- $*$ to a certain measure $\Gamma = \Gamma^a + \Gamma^s \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)$. Upon noting that Theorem 2.8 and Lemma 2.9 hold in any open set $U \in \mathcal{A}(\Omega)$, estimate (2.15) holds true in U as well

$$|Du_n|(U) \leq C(\mathcal{L}^N(U) + \|(g, G)\|_{SD(U; \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})}), \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (2.16)$$

so that, by lower-semicontinuity (see, e.g., [2, Proposition 1.62(a)]),

$$\Gamma(U) \leq C(\mathcal{L}^N(U) + \|(g, G)\|_{SD(U; \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})}). \quad (2.17)$$

Since Γ is a Radon measure, it is outer regular on all Borel sets, so by (2.17), we have for every $B \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega)$

$$\Gamma(B) = \inf_{U \supset B} \Gamma(U) \leq \inf_{U \supset B} C(\mathcal{L}^N(U) + \|(g, G)\|_{SD(U; \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})}) = C(\mathcal{L}^N(B) + \|(g, G)\|_{SD(B; \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})}),$$

since the latter measure in the right hand side is also a Radon measure. The inequality above shows that Γ is absolutely continuous with respect to the measure $\mathcal{B}(\Omega) \ni B \mapsto \mathcal{L}^N(B) + \|(g, G)\|_{SD(B; \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})}$, which proves that $\text{spt}(\Gamma^s) \subseteq S_g$. Therefore, there must exist scalar fields γ^a, γ^s such that $\Gamma = \gamma^a \mathcal{L}^N + \gamma^s \mathcal{H}^{N-1} \llcorner S_g$. This proves (1.12) and concludes the proof. \square

Remark 2.10. To justify (1.15) in the Introduction, observe the following. Let $u_n \in SBV(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ be a sequence that converges to a structured deformation $(g, G) \in SD(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})$ in the sense of (1.1). The convergence of $u_n \rightarrow g$ in L^1 implies that $Du_n \rightarrow Dg$ in the sense of distributions, which, together with (2.15) and the convergence $\nabla u_n \xrightarrow{*} G$ in $\mathcal{M}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})$, entails that (up to the extraction of a further subsequence) (1.15) holds, namely $D^s u_n \xrightarrow{*} (\nabla g - G)\mathcal{L}^N + D^s g$ in $\mathcal{M}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})$.

3. UPSCALING OF THE NON-LOCAL ENERGY E^{α_r}

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let α_r be as in (1.9), let $(g, G) \in SD(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})$, and let us define $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})$ by the right-hand side of (1.15) and $\mu_r \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})$ its convolution with α_r , namely

$$\mu := (\nabla g - G)\mathcal{L}^N + D^s g \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_r := (\mu * \alpha_r)\mathcal{L}^N, \quad (3.1)$$

For any sequence $u_n \in SBV(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$, let $\mu_n := D^s u_n$. If u_n converges to (g, G) in the sense of (1.14), then formula (1.15) can be written as

$$\mu_n \xrightarrow{*} \mu. \quad (3.2)$$

Let us recall that S_g is a $(N-1)$ -rectifiable set, so that for every fixed $r \in (0, 1)$, the set

$$\mathcal{N}_r := \{x \in \Omega_r : \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(\partial B_r(x) \cap S_g) > 0\}$$

has Lebesgue measure zero. Therefore, by Proposition 2.2, for every $x \in \Omega_r \setminus \mathcal{N}_r$, (3.2) reads

$$D^s u_n(\Omega \cap B_r(x)) \rightarrow \int_{\Omega \cap B_r(x)} (\nabla g(y) - G(y)) \, dy + \int_{\Omega \cap B_r(x) \cap S_g} [g](y) \otimes \nu_g(y) \, d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(y). \quad (3.3)$$

For every $x \in \Omega_r \setminus \mathcal{N}_r$ (that is, for \mathcal{L}^N -a.e. $x \in \Omega_r$) we define

$$\begin{aligned} f_{r,n}(x) &:= \int_{\Omega \cap B_r(x) \cap S_{u_n}} \alpha_r(y-x)[u_n](y) \otimes \nu_{u_n}(y) \, d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(y), \\ f_r(x) &:= \int_{\Omega \cap B_r(x)} \alpha_r(y-x)(\nabla g(y) - G(y)) \, dy + \int_{\Omega \cap B_r(x) \cap S_g} \alpha_r(y-x)[g](y) \otimes \nu_g(y) \, d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(y). \end{aligned}$$

By classical results (see, e.g., [3]), $f_{r,n}$ and f_r are \mathcal{L}^N -measurable in Ω_r if we prove that they are continuous \mathcal{L}^N -a.e. in Ω_r . Indeed, fix $x, x' \in \Omega_r \setminus \mathcal{N}_r$ such that $|D^s u_n|(\partial B_r(x)) = 0$ (this happens for \mathcal{L}^N -a.e. x); analogously to the proof of Theorem 2.3(i), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |f_{r,n}(x) - f_{r,n}(x')| &= \left| \int_{\Omega \cap B_r(x) \cap S_{u_n}} \alpha_r(y-x)[u_n](y) \otimes \nu_{u_n}(y) \, d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(y) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \int_{\Omega \cap B_r(x') \cap S_{u_n}} \alpha_r(y'-x')[u_n](y') \otimes \nu_{u_n}(y') \, d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(y') \right| \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega \cap (B_r(x) \cap B_r(x')) \cap S_{u_n}} |\alpha_r(y-x) - \alpha_r(y-x')| \cdot |[u_n](y) \otimes \nu_{u_n}(y)| \, d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(y) \\ &\quad + \int_{\Omega \cap (B_r(x) \setminus B_r(x')) \cap S_{u_n}} |\alpha_r(y-x)| \cdot |[u_n](y) \otimes \nu_{u_n}(y)| \, d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(y) \\ &\quad + \int_{\Omega \cap (B_r(x') \setminus B_r(x)) \cap S_{u_n}} |\alpha_r(y-x')| \cdot |[u_n](y) \otimes \nu_{u_n}(y)| \, d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(y) \\ &=: I_1(x') + I_2(x') + I_3(x'). \end{aligned}$$

By the uniform continuity of α_r there exists a function $\omega_r: [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ such that $\omega_r(s) \rightarrow 0^+$ as $s \rightarrow 0^+$ such that

$$I_1(x') \leq C\omega_r(|x-x'|)(1 + \|(g, G)\|_{SD}), \quad (3.4)$$

where we have used (2.15). Assuming that $\delta := |x-x'| < r$, and denoting by $A_{r-\delta}^{r+\delta}(x) = B_{r+\delta}(x) \setminus \overline{B_{r-\delta}(x)}$ the annulus centered at x with inner and outer radii $r-\delta$ and $r+\delta$, respectively, and setting $C_{\alpha_r} = \sup_{B_r} |\alpha_r|$, we can estimate

$$I_2(x') + I_3(x') \leq C_{\alpha_r} |D^s u_n|(\Omega \cap A_{r-\delta}^{r+\delta}(x) \cap S_{u_n}). \quad (3.5)$$

Noting that $\delta \mapsto A_{r-\delta}^{r+\delta}(x)$ is a monotone family of sets and that $\bigcap_{\delta>0} A_{r-\delta}^{r+\delta}(x) = \partial B_r(x)$,

$$\lim_{x' \rightarrow x} |f_{r,n}(x) - f_{r,n}(x')| \leq \lim_{x' \rightarrow x} (I_1(x') + I_2(x') + I_3(x')) = 0$$

by (3.4) and (3.5), recalling that $|D^s u_n|(\partial B_r(x)) = 0$. This proves the continuity of $f_{r,n}$ for \mathcal{L}^N -a.e. $x \in \Omega_r$. The continuity of f_r can be proved in a similar way. Moreover, recalling (2.15), we have the pointwise uniform bound

$$|f_{r,n}(x)| \leq C_{\alpha_r} |D^s u_n|(\Omega) \leq C_{\alpha_r} C(1 + \|(g, G)\|_{SD}) < +\infty, \quad (3.6)$$

which proves that $f_{r,n} \in L^1(\Omega_r; \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})$; similarly we can conclude that also $f_r \in L^1(\Omega_r; \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})$. Finally, by (3.3), since $\alpha_r \in C_b(B_r)$ and hence in $\mathcal{E}'(\mathbb{R}^N)$ (the space of continuous linear forms on $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$), and by [25, Theorem 5.1.3] we conclude that $f_{r,n} \rightarrow f_r$ in the sense of distributions. It is easily seen that the bound in (3.6) also entails that up to a subsequence the limit is also in the sense of measures.

Defining, for $x \in \Omega_r \setminus \mathcal{N}_r$,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{f}_{r,n}(x) &:= \int_{\Omega \cap B_r(x) \cap S_{u_n}} \alpha_r(y-x)[u_n](y) \otimes \nu_{u_n}(y) \, d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(y), \\ \bar{f}_r(x) &:= \int_{\Omega \cap B_r(x)} \alpha_r(y-x)\Lambda_{(g,G)}^a(y) \, dy + \int_{\Omega \cap B_r(x) \cap S_g} \alpha_r(y-x)\Lambda_{(g,G)}^s(y) \, d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(y), \end{aligned}$$

and recalling (1.12) we obtain that $\bar{f}_{r,n} \xrightarrow{*} \bar{f}_r$, by applying [25, Theorem 5.1.3] once again. Again by Proposition 2.2 we get that, up to subsequences, $f_{r,n} \rightarrow f_r$ \mathcal{L}^N -a.e. in Ω_r .

Let us consider a subsequence $k \mapsto f_{r,n_k}$ such that $f_{r,n_k} \rightarrow f_r$ \mathcal{L}^N -a.e. in Ω_r . Then

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega_r} \Psi(x, f_{r,n_k}(x)) \, dx = \int_{\Omega_r} \Psi(x, f_r(x)) \, dx. \quad (3.7)$$

Indeed, for each such subsequence f_{r,n_k} (3.6) gives $|f_{r,n_k}(x)| \leq C_{\alpha_r} C(1 + \|(g, G)\|_{SD})$ which, using the continuity of Ψ provides the uniform upper bound

$$|\Psi(x, f_{r,n_k}(x))| \leq \max \left\{ \Psi(x, A) : x \in \bar{\Omega}_r, |A| \leq C_{\alpha_r} C(1 + \|(g, G)\|_{SD}) \right\}, \quad (3.8)$$

for \mathcal{L}^N -a.e. $x \in \Omega_r$ and for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\Psi(\cdot, f_{r,n_k}(\cdot)) \rightarrow \Psi(\cdot, f_r(\cdot))$ \mathcal{L}^N -a.e. in Ω_r , again by the continuity of Ψ , (3.7) follows by dominated convergence. Since every u_n converging to (g, G) according to (1.14) has a subsequence u_{n_k} for which the corresponding f_{r,n_k} is such that (3.7) holds, and since the right-hand side of (3.7) is the same for every subsequence, then (1.16) holds. This concludes the proof. \square

4. SPATIAL LOCALIZATION OF THE UPSCALED NON-LOCAL ENERGY

In this section we deal with the limit (1.17), that is, we find an explicit formula for the energy $I^{\alpha_r}(g, G; \bar{\Omega}_r)$ in the limit as the measure of non-locality r tends to zero. As mentioned in the Introduction, we restrict our attention to continuous functions $\Psi: \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times N} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ belonging to the classes (E) or (L). As a first step, given $(g, G) \in SD(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})$, we provide a pair $(\bar{g}, \bar{G}) \in BV(\Omega + B_1; \mathbb{R}^d) \times L^1(\Omega + B_1; \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})$ satisfying

- (e1) $(\bar{g}, \bar{G})|_{\Omega} = (g, G)$;
- (e2) $|D\bar{g}|(\Omega + B_1) \leq C\|g\|_{BV(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)}$, for some constant $C > 0$;
- (e3) $|D^s \bar{g}|(\partial\Omega) = 0$.

Because $\partial\Omega$ is Lipschitz and, in particular, $g \in BV(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$, a function $\hat{g} \in BV(\mathbb{R}^N; \mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying $\hat{g}|_{\Omega} = g$, (e2), and (e3) is provided by [27, Theorem 1.4]. Then we can take $\bar{g} := \hat{g}|_{\Omega + B_1}$. Any function $\bar{G} \in L^1(\Omega + B_1; \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})$ satisfying $\bar{G}|_{\Omega} = G$ provides the second element of the pair (\bar{g}, \bar{G}) satisfying (e1-3). For any (\bar{g}, \bar{G}) satisfying (e1-3) and for α_r as in (1.9), in analogy to (3.1), we define the measures $\bar{\mu}, \bar{\mu}_r \in \mathcal{M}(\bar{\Omega}; \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})$ by

$$\bar{\mu} := (\nabla \bar{g} - \bar{G})\mathcal{L}^N + D^s \bar{g} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\mu}_r := (\bar{\mu} * \alpha_r)\mathcal{L}^N, \quad (4.1)$$

and we define the functional $\bar{I}^{\alpha_r}(\bar{g}, \bar{G}; \Omega)$ by

$$\bar{I}^{\alpha_r}(\bar{g}, \bar{G}; \Omega) := \int_{\Omega} \Psi(x, (\bar{\mu} * \alpha_r)(x)) dx. \quad (4.2)$$

Noting that, by (e1), $\bar{\mu} \llcorner \Omega = \mu$ (see (3.1) and (4.1)), and recalling (1.16), (4.2) can be written as

$$\bar{I}^{\alpha_r}(\bar{g}, \bar{G}; \Omega) = I^{\alpha_r}(g, G; \Omega_r) + \int_{\Omega \setminus \Omega_r} \Psi(x, (\bar{\mu} * \alpha_r)(x)) dx. \quad (4.3)$$

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.3

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Let us fix $(g, G) \in SD(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})$ and let $(\bar{g}, \bar{G}) \in BV(\Omega + B_1; \mathbb{R}^d) \times L^1(\Omega + B_1; \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})$ satisfy (e1-3). In view of (4.2) and (4.3), it suffices to show that $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \bar{I}^{\alpha_r}(\bar{g}, \bar{G}; \Omega)$ exists and is equal to the expression for $I(g, G)$ in (1.22), and to show that the integral in the right-hand side of (4.3) tends to zero as $r \rightarrow 0^+$, namely

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\Omega \setminus \Omega_r} \Psi(x, (\bar{\mu} * \alpha_r)(x)) dx = 0. \quad (4.4)$$

Because $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} |\Omega \setminus \Omega_r| = 0$, (4.4) follows by using Fubini's Theorem, (1.9), and (1.18) to obtain the following chain of inequalities (recall the proof of (2.1))

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\Omega \setminus \Omega_r} \Psi(x, (\bar{\mu} * \alpha_r)(x)) dx \right| &\leq C_{\Psi} \int_{\Omega \setminus \Omega_r} (1 + |(\bar{\mu} * \alpha_r)(x)|) dx \leq C_{\Psi} \left(|\Omega \setminus \Omega_r| + \int_{\Omega \setminus \Omega_r} |(\bar{\mu} * \alpha_r)(x)| dx \right) \\ &\leq C_{\Psi} \left(|\Omega \setminus \Omega_r| + \int_{\Omega \setminus \Omega_r} \int_{B_r(x)} \alpha_r(y-x) d|\bar{\mu}|(y) dx \right) \\ &\leq C_{\Psi} \left(|\Omega \setminus \Omega_r| + \int_{(\Omega \setminus \Omega_r)^r} \left(\int_{B_r(y)} \alpha_r(y-x) dx \right) d|\bar{\mu}|(y) \right) \\ &\leq C_{\Psi} \left(|\Omega \setminus \Omega_r| + |\bar{\mu}|((\Omega \setminus \Omega_r)^r) \right) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow 0^+, \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

where we used the fact that $(\Omega \setminus \Omega_r)^r \rightarrow \partial\Omega$ as $r \rightarrow 0^+$ and (e3).

We now prove that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \bar{I}^{\alpha_r}(\bar{g}, \bar{G}; \Omega) = \int_{\Omega} \Psi(x, \nabla g(x) - G(x)) dx + \int_{\Omega \cap S_g} \Psi^{\infty}\left(x, \frac{dD^s g}{d|D^s g|}(x)\right) d|D^s g|(x). \quad (4.6)$$

To do so, let us define the functional $\bar{\mathcal{F}}: \mathcal{M}(\Omega + B_1; \mathbb{R}^{d \times N}) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ by

$$\bar{\mathcal{F}}(\lambda) := \int_{\Omega} \Psi\left(x, \frac{d\lambda}{d\mathcal{L}^N}(x)\right) dx + \int_{\Omega \cap \text{spt}(|\lambda^s|)} \Psi^{\infty}\left(x, \frac{d\lambda}{d|\lambda^s|}(x)\right) d|\lambda^s|(x), \quad (4.7)$$

for $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega + B_1; \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})$, where λ^s is the part of λ which is singular with respect to \mathcal{L}^N , $|\lambda^s|$ is its total variation, and Ψ^{∞} denotes the recession function at infinity of Ψ (see (2.7)). Keeping (4.7) in mind, we can write $\bar{I}^{\alpha_r}(\bar{g}, \bar{G}; \Omega) = \bar{\mathcal{F}}(\bar{\mu}_r)$; similarly, invoking (e1), the right-hand side of (4.6) can be written as $\bar{\mathcal{F}}(\bar{\mu})$, so that (4.6) is proved if we show that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \bar{\mathcal{F}}(\bar{\mu}_r) = \bar{\mathcal{F}}(\bar{\mu}). \quad (4.8)$$

Recalling the definitions of $\bar{\mu}, \bar{\mu}_r$ in (4.1), we argue as in (4.5) and use (e2) to obtain the estimate

$$|\bar{\mu}_r|(\bar{\Omega}) \leq C(\|g\|_{BV(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)} + \|\bar{G}\|_{L^1(\Omega + B_1; \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})}).$$

In turn, arguing as in the proof of Theorem 2.3(i), this entails that

$$\bar{\mu}_r \xrightarrow{*} \bar{\mu} \quad \text{in } \mathcal{M}(\bar{\Omega}; \mathbb{R}^{d \times N}), \quad \text{and} \quad |\bar{\mu}_r| \xrightarrow{*} |\bar{\mu}| \quad \text{in } \mathcal{M}^+(\bar{\Omega}).$$

In particular, we have

$$|\bar{\mu}_r| \xrightarrow{*} |\nabla \bar{g} - \bar{G}| \mathcal{L}^N + |D^s \bar{g}| \quad \text{in } \mathcal{M}^+(\bar{\Omega}). \quad (4.9)$$

Finally, since $|\bar{\mu}|(\partial\Omega) = 0$, by Theorem 2.3(ii) we obtain that $\langle \bar{\mu}_r \rangle(\bar{\Omega}) \rightarrow \langle \bar{\mu} \rangle(\bar{\Omega})$, yielding that $\bar{\mu}_r \langle \cdot \rangle$ -strictly converges to $\bar{\mu}$ (see Definition 2.1(iii)).

If Ψ belongs to the class (E), since the limsup in the definition of Ψ^{∞} is indeed a limit (see Remark 1.4) we can apply Theorem 2.6, to obtain (4.8). In turn (4.6) is proved and therefore (1.22), which concludes the proof.

If Ψ belongs to the class (L), Theorem 2.5 provides the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\Omega} \Psi(x, (\bar{\mu} * \alpha_r)(x)) dx &\leq \int_{\Omega} \Psi(x, (\nabla \bar{g} - \bar{G})(x)) dx + \int_{\Omega \cap S_{\bar{g}}} \Psi^{\infty}\left(x, \frac{dD^s \bar{g}}{d|D^s \bar{g}|}(x)\right) d|D^s \bar{g}|(x) \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \Psi(x, (\nabla g - G)(x)) dx + \int_{\Omega \cap S_g} \Psi^{\infty}\left(x, \frac{dD^s g}{d|D^s g|}(x)\right) d|D^s g|(x), \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

where the equality holds by (e1). We now prove that

$$\int_{\Omega} \Psi(x, \nabla g(x) - G(x)) dx + \int_{\Omega \cap S_g} \Psi^{\infty}\left(x, \frac{dD^s g}{d|D^s g|}(x)\right) d|D^s g|(x) \leq \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\Omega} \Psi(x, (\bar{\mu} * \alpha_r)(x)) dx \quad (4.11)$$

To this end, set $\{\bar{\theta}_r\} \subset \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)$ by $\bar{\theta}_r := \Psi(\cdot, (\bar{\mu} * \alpha_r)(\cdot)) \mathcal{L}^N$. Since this is a bounded sequence of Radon measures, it converges weakly-* to some positive measure $\bar{\theta}$. We obtain (4.11) if we show that

$$\frac{d\bar{\theta}}{d\mathcal{L}^N}(x) \geq \Psi(x, (\nabla g - G)(x)) \quad \text{for } \mathcal{L}^N\text{-a.e. } x \in \Omega, \quad (4.12a)$$

$$\frac{d\bar{\theta}}{d|D^s g|}(x) \geq \Psi^{\infty}\left(x, \frac{dD^s g}{d|D^s g|}(x)\right) \quad \text{for } \mathcal{H}^{N-1}\text{-a.e. } x \in S_g. \quad (4.12b)$$

We start with (4.12a). By the linearity of the convolution operator and the definition of $\bar{\mu}_r$, we know that, as $r \rightarrow 0^+$,

$$((\nabla \bar{g} - \bar{G}) \mathcal{L}^N * \alpha_r) \mathcal{L}^N \xrightarrow{*} (\nabla g - G) \mathcal{L}^N \quad \text{and} \quad (D^s \bar{g} * \alpha_r) \mathcal{L}^N \xrightarrow{*} D^s g, \quad (4.13)$$

in $\mathcal{M}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})$ and, by [28, Corollary 2.1.17], we have

$$((\nabla \bar{g} - \bar{G}) \mathcal{L}^N * \alpha_r) \rightarrow (\nabla g - G)(x) \quad \text{for } \mathcal{L}^N\text{-a.e. } x \in \Omega. \quad (4.14)$$

Let us fix $x_0 \in \Omega \setminus S_g$ which is a Lebesgue point for $\nabla g - G$ and let us compute

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\bar{\theta}}{d\mathcal{L}^N}(x_0) &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\bar{\theta}(Q(x_0; \delta_k))}{\mathcal{L}^N(Q(x_0; \delta_k))} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\bar{\theta}_r(Q(x_0; \delta_k))}{\delta_k^N} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{\delta_k^N} \int_{Q(x_0; \delta_k)} \Psi(x, (\bar{\mu} * \alpha_r)(x)) dx \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{\delta_k^N} \int_{Q(x_0; \delta_k)} \Psi(x, ((\nabla \bar{g} - \bar{G})\mathcal{L}^N * \alpha_r)(x) + (D^s \bar{g} * \alpha_r)(x)) dx \\ &\geq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{\delta_k^N} \int_{Q(x_0; \delta_k)} \Psi(x, ((\nabla \bar{g} - \bar{G})\mathcal{L}^N * \alpha_r)(x)) dx - \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{L_\Psi}{\delta_k^N} \int_{Q(x_0; \delta_k)} |(D^s \bar{g} * \alpha_r)(x)| dx, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (1.20). Since, by the second convergence in (4.13), the last integral is the Radon-Nikodým of $|D^s \bar{g}|$ with respect to \mathcal{L}^N , it vanishes, so that we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\bar{\theta}}{d\mathcal{L}^N}(x_0) &\geq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{\delta_k^N} \int_{Q(x_0; \delta_k)} \Psi(x, ((\nabla \bar{g} - \bar{G})\mathcal{L}^N * \alpha_r)(x)) dx \\ &\geq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\delta_k^N} \int_{Q(x_0; \delta_k)} \Psi(x, (\nabla g - G)(x)) dx \\ &\geq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_Q \Psi(x_0 + \delta_k y, (\nabla g - G)(x_0 + \delta_k y)) dy \geq \Psi(x_0, (\nabla g - G)(x_0)), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the continuity of Ψ , (4.14), and Fatou's Lemma in the second inequality, a change of variables and (1.20) and (1.21) in the subsequent estimates. This proves (4.12a).

To prove (4.12b), let us fix $x_0 \in S_g$ and let $\tau(x_0) := \frac{dD^s g}{d|D^s g|}(x_0)$. By Lemma 2.7, the recession function $\Psi^\infty(x_0, \tau(x_0))$ can be computed using formula (2.9). Let now $\{t_k\}$ be a sequence diverging to $+\infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ along which the lim sup in (2.9) is indeed a limit, that is,

$$\Psi^\infty(x_0, \tau(x_0)) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Psi(x_0, t_k \tau(x_0))}{t_k}.$$

Since Ψ is Lipschitz continuous, a reasoning analogous to that of [4, Lemma 4.2] grants that the sequence $\{t_k\}$ can be chosen as

$$t_k := \frac{|D^s \bar{g}|(Q(x_0; \delta_k))}{\delta_k^N}, \quad (4.15)$$

with $\{\delta_k\}$ a vanishing sequence such that $\bar{\theta}(\partial Q(x_0; \delta_k)) = 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\bar{\theta}}{d|D^s g|}(x_0) &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\bar{\theta}(Q(x_0; \delta_k))}{|D^s g|(Q(x_0; \delta_k))} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\bar{\theta}_r(Q(x_0; \delta_k))}{|D^s g|(Q(x_0; \delta_k))} \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\int_{Q(x_0; \delta_k)} \Psi(x, (\bar{\mu} * \alpha_r)(x)) dx}{|D^s g|(Q(x_0; \delta_k))} \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{t_k} \int_Q \Psi(x_0 + \delta_k y, (\bar{\mu} * \alpha_r)(x_0 + \delta_k y)) dy \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows by a change of variables, taking (4.15) into account. Defining

$$\bar{w}_{k,r}(y) := \frac{(\bar{\mu} * \alpha_r)(x_0 + \delta_k y)}{t_k},$$

we can continue the chain of equalities above as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d\bar{\theta}}{d|D^s g|}(x_0) &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{t_k} \int_Q \Psi(x_0 + \delta_k y, (\bar{\mu} * \alpha_r)(x_0 + \delta_k y)) \, dy \\
&= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{t_k} \int_Q \Psi(x_0 + \delta_k y, t_k \bar{w}_{k,r}(y)) \, dy \\
&\geq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \left[\frac{1}{t_k} \int_Q \Psi(x_0, t_k \tau(x_0)) \, dy - L_\Psi \int_Q |\bar{w}_{k,r}(y) - \tau(x_0)| \, dy \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{1}{t_k} \int_Q \omega(\delta_k |y|)(1 + t_k |\tau(x_0)|) \, dy \right] = \Psi^\infty(x_0, \tau(x_0)),
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used (1.20) and (1.21) and where the last two terms in the square bracket vanish since $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \int_Q w_{k,r}(y) \, dy = \tau(x_0)$ by (4.15) and by the properties of the modulus of continuity ω . This concludes the proof of (4.12b) and, consequently, of (4.11). Combining (4.10) and (4.11) yields a chain of equalities, which is precisely (1.22). The theorem is proved. \square

Recalling (2.11), the limiting energy $I(g, G)$ in (1.22) can be written as

$$I(g, G) = \int_\Omega \Psi(x, \nabla g(x) - G(x)) \, dx + \int_{\Omega \cap S_g} \Psi^\infty(x, [g](x) \otimes \nu_g(x)) \, d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(x) \quad (4.16)$$

Moreover, as a particular case of Ψ with sublinear growth, one can consider a bounded Ψ . In this case, the formula above reduces clearly to (1.24) (since $\Psi^\infty = 0$).

5. COUPLING LOCAL AND NON-LOCAL ENERGIES

In this section we extend the results first proved in the pioneering paper [11] to the case of x -dependent energy densities. The integral representation results [11, Theorems 2.16 and 2.17] are expected to hold with the obvious modifications, namely with the relaxed energy densities depending on x as well. This generalization is somewhat natural and can be obtained with minor modifications to the original proofs, but since it is not presented elsewhere, we highlight here the adaptation of the proofs from [11] for sake of completeness.

5.1. Relaxation of the local energy E_L . In this subsection we present the relaxation results for local energies, like E_L defined in (1.2), contained in the pioneering paper [11]. We start by introducing the assumptions on the bulk and interfacial energy densities W and ψ . Let $p \geq 1$ and let $W : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times N} \rightarrow [0, +\infty[$ and $\psi : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{S}^{N-1} \rightarrow [0, +\infty[$ be continuous functions satisfying the following conditions

(W1)_p there exists $C > 0$ such that, for all $x \in \Omega$ and $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times N}$,

$$|W(x, A) - W(x, B)| \leq C|A - B|(1 + |A|^{p-1} + |B|^{p-1})$$

(W2) there exists a continuous function $\omega_W : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ with $\omega_W(s) \rightarrow 0$ as $s \rightarrow 0^+$ such that, for every $x_0 \in \Omega$ and $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times N}$,

$$|W(x, A) - W(x_0, A)| \leq \omega_W(|x - x_0|)(1 + |A|^p);$$

(W3) there exist $C, T > 0$ and $0 < \alpha < 1$ such that, for all $x \in \Omega$ and $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times N}$ with $|A| = 1$,

$$\left| W^\infty(x, A) - \frac{W(x, tA)}{t} \right| \leq \frac{C}{t^\alpha}, \quad \text{for all } t > T,$$

where W^∞ denotes the *recession function* at infinity of W (with respect to A), see (2.9);

(ψ 1) there exist $c, C > 0$ such that, for all $x \in \Omega$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $\nu \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$,

$$c|\lambda| \leq \psi(x, \lambda, \nu) \leq C|\lambda|;$$

(ψ 2) (positive 1-homogeneity) for all $x \in \Omega$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\nu \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$, and $t > 0$

$$\psi(x, t\lambda, \nu) = t\psi(x, \lambda, \nu),$$

(ψ 3) (sub-additivity) for all $x \in \Omega$, $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $\nu \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$,

$$\psi(x, \lambda_1 + \lambda_2, \nu) \leq \psi(x, \lambda_1, \nu) + \psi(x, \lambda_2, \nu).$$

($\psi 4$) there exists a continuous function $\omega_\psi: [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ with $\omega_\psi(s) \rightarrow 0$ as $s \rightarrow 0^+$ such that, for every $x_0 \in \Omega$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $\nu \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$,

$$|\psi(x, \lambda, \nu) - \psi(x_0, \lambda, \nu)| \leq \omega_\psi(|x - x_0|)|\lambda|.$$

Given W and ψ as above, and $u \in SBV(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$, we defined the initial energy $E_L(u)$ as

$$E_L(u) := \int_{\Omega} W(x, \nabla u(x)) \, dx + \int_{\Omega \cap S_u} \psi(x, [u](x), \nu_u(x)) \, d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(x) \quad (5.1)$$

and, given $(g, G) \in SD(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})$, we defined the relaxed energies $I_p(g, G)$ as

$$I_p(g, G) := \inf_{\{u_n\} \subset SBV(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)} \left\{ \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_L(u_n) : u_n \rightarrow (g, G) \text{ in the sense of (1.14)}, \right. \\ \left. (1 - \delta_1(p)) \sup_n \|\nabla u_n\|_{L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})} < \infty \right\}. \quad (5.2)$$

In the formula above, and in what follows, we use the symbol $\delta_1(p)$ as the Kronecker delta computed at p , namely $\delta_1(p) = 1$ if $p = 1$ and zero otherwise, and use it as a selector between the cases $p = 1$ and $p > 1$. In particular, in (5.2), the control on the L^p norm of $|\nabla u_n|$ does not appear in the formula if $p = 1$, since in that case $1 - \delta_1(p) = 0$.

We introduce now the classes of competitors for the cell formulae for the relaxed bulk and surface energy densities. For $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times N}$ let

$$\mathcal{C}_p^{\text{bulk}}(A, B) := \left\{ u \in SBV(Q; \mathbb{R}^d) : u|_{\partial Q}(x) = Ax, \int_Q \nabla u \, dx = B, |\nabla u| \in L^p(Q) \right\} \quad (5.3)$$

and for $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\nu \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$ let

$$\mathcal{C}_p^{\text{surface}}(\lambda, \nu) := \left\{ u \in SBV(Q_\nu; \mathbb{R}^d) : u|_{\partial Q_\nu}(x) = u_{\lambda, \nu}(x), \delta_1(p)\mathfrak{C}_1(u) + (1 - \delta_1(p))\mathfrak{C}(u) \right\},$$

where the function $u_{\lambda, \nu}$ is defined by

$$u_{\lambda, \nu}(x) := \begin{cases} \lambda & \text{if } x \cdot \nu \geq 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } x \cdot \nu < 0, \end{cases}$$

and the conditions $\mathfrak{C}_1(u)$ and $\mathfrak{C}(u)$ are

$$\mathfrak{C}_1(u) \iff \int_Q \nabla u \, dx = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{C}(u) \iff \nabla u(x) = 0 \text{ for } \mathcal{L}^N\text{-a.e. } x \in Q_\nu \quad (5.4)$$

We state now the integral representation theorem for the relaxed energies I_p defined in (5.2). It generalizes the results contained in [11, Theorems 2.16 and 2.17] to the inhomogeneous case considered here. For the sake of being concise, we give a unified statement through the use of the selector $\delta_1(p)$, which takes into account the different nuances between the case $p = 1$ and the case $p > 1$. Note that the formulae for the relaxed energy densities H_p and h_p are obtained via the blow-up method [6, 23, 24] and involve the contributions of both W and ψ for H_p , and of ψ and possibly W^∞ for h_p .

Theorem 5.1. *Let $p \geq 1$ and let $W: \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times N} \rightarrow [0, +\infty[$ and $\psi: \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{S}^{N-1} \rightarrow [0, +\infty[$ be continuous functions satisfying hypotheses $(W1)_p$, $(W2)$, $\delta_1(p)(W3)$, $(\psi 1)$, $(\psi 2)$, $(\psi 3)$, and $(\psi 4)$; let $(g, G) \in SD(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})$ and let $I_p(g, G)$ be given by (5.2). Then there exist $H_p: \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times N} \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times N} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ and $h_p: \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{S}^{N-1} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ such that*

$$I_p(g, G) = \int_{\Omega} H_p(x, \nabla g(x), G(x)) \, dx + \int_{\Omega \cap S_g} h_p(x, [g](x), \nu_g(x)) \, d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(x). \quad (5.5)$$

For all $x_0 \in \Omega$ and $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times N}$,

$$H_p(x_0, A, B) := \inf \left\{ \int_Q W(x_0, \nabla u(x)) \, dx + \int_{Q \cap S_u} \psi(x_0, [u](x), \nu_u(x)) \, d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(x) : u \in \mathcal{C}_p^{\text{bulk}}(A, B) \right\}; \quad (5.6)$$

for all $x_0 \in \Omega$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $\nu \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$,

$$h_p(x_0, \lambda, \nu) := \inf \left\{ \delta_1(p) \int_{Q_\nu} W^\infty(x_0, \nabla u(x)) \, dx + \int_{Q_\nu \cap S_u} \psi(x_0, [u](x), \nu_u(x)) \, d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(x) : u \in \mathcal{C}_p^{\text{surface}}(\lambda, \nu) \right\}, \quad (5.7)$$

with W^∞ defined in (2.9).

Remark 5.2. Theorem 5.1 collects the content of Theorems 2.16 and 2.17 in [11] in a compact form. In particular, the form of the integral representation of the relaxed energies (5.2) provided by formula (5.5) is structurally the same both for $p = 1$ and for $p > 1$: it features a bulk energy and an interfacial energy.

We make the following observations.

- The condition $|\nabla u| \in L^p(Q)$ in (5.3) is redundant if $p = 1$ (see [11, Remark 2.15]);
- If $p = 1$, hypothesis (W3) is required and we notice that in formula (5.7) the recession function at infinity W^∞ defined in (2.9) appears, to account for concentration phenomena arising when taking the limit of functions in L^1 .
- In (5.4), condition \mathcal{C}_1 contains condition \mathcal{C} , so that, for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\nu \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$, we have the inclusion $\mathcal{C}_{p>1}^{\text{surface}}(\lambda, \nu) \subset \mathcal{C}_1^{\text{surface}}(\lambda, \nu)$.
- The cell formula (5.7) for $p > 1$ corrects formula (2.17) in [11], where the dependence on the normal ν was mistakenly omitted, as already noted in [36, Theorem 3] and [39, formula (4)].

We point out the following final remarks.

- Hypothesis $(W1)_p$ could be strengthened to include coercivity (p -growth from below). Although this would be a strong restriction from the mechanical point of view, it would make the proofs easier. We refer the reader to [11, Step 1 in the proof of Proposition 2.22] for a discussion on this.
- If $p > 1$, hypotheses $(\psi1)$ and $(\psi2)$ can be relaxed. We refer the reader to [11, Remark 3.3] for a discussion on this.
- If $p > 1$, Theorem 5.1 provides a representation of the relaxed energy density $I_p(g, G)$ only in the case $G \in L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})$ (see again [11, Remark 2.15]).

These final remarks pave the way for a statement of Theorem 5.1 under the minimal set of hypotheses.

Sketch of the proof of Theorem 5.1. Formula (5.5) is obtained by using the blow-up method [6, 23, 24] to prove that the energy densities (5.6) and (5.7) provide upper and lower bound for the Radon-Nikodým derivatives of suitable measures associated with $I_p(g, G)$ with respect to \mathcal{L}^N and $||[g]|\mathcal{H}^{N-1} \llcorner S_g$. The dependence on x is not involved in this process, and the existence of the moduli of continuity ω_W and ω_ψ is a strong enough assumption to estimate the error when passing from the evaluation of the energy densities at generic $x \in Q(x_0, \delta)$ to the evaluation at x_0 . A similar strategy was undertaken in [8], in the spirit of [6]. \square

We remark that Theorem 5.1 does not address effects such as the bending due to jumps in ∇u_n , that are captured by second-order structured deformations [8, 22, 35].

5.2. Relaxation of the total energy $E_L + E^{\alpha r}$. We now address the relaxation of the total energy including both the local initial energy E_L and the non-local initial energy $E^{\alpha r}$. Lemma 5.3 below allows us to perform the relaxation of E_L and the upscaling of $E^{\alpha r}$ as two separate processes.

Lemma 5.3. *Given $(g, G) \in SD(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})$, there exists a sequence of functions $u_n \in SBV(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ admissible for the relaxation process of Theorem 5.1 and satisfying (1.14).*

Proof. Let us fix a structured deformation $(g, G) \in SD(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})$ and let us consider a recovery sequence u_n for the energy (5.2) underlying Theorem 5.1; then u_n converges to (g, G) in the sense (1.1). By property $(\psi1)$, i.e., the coercivity of the surface energy density ψ , $|D^s u_n|$ is bounded uniformly with respect to n and therefore (up to a subsequence) it converges weakly- $*$ to a measure $\Gamma = \Gamma^a + \Gamma^s \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)$, as in the second line of (1.12). Arguing as in Remark 2.10, we obtain (1.15), while the very definitions of H_p and h_p (see (5.6) and (5.6)) yield an estimate like (2.16), and we obtain (2.17) invoking [2, Proposition 1.62(a)] again. Then the same argument as in the final part of the proof of Theorem 1.1 proves (1.12) from which we conclude that u_n converges to (g, G) as in (1.14). \square

Theorem 5.4. *Under the conditions of Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 5.1, the relaxation (1.26) of the initial energy (1.25) admits the integral representation (1.27), where, for any $(g, G) \in SD(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})$, the relaxed energy $I_L(g, G)$ of the local initial energy E_L in (1.2) is given by (5.5) and the upscaled energy*

$I^{\alpha_r}(g, G; \Omega_r)$ of the non-local initial energy E^{α_r} is provided by Theorem 1.2. In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} J^{\alpha_r}(g, G) &= \int_{\Omega} H_p(x, \nabla g(x), G(x)) \, dx + \int_{\Omega \cap S_g} h_p(x, [g](x), \nu_g(x)) \, d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(x) \\ &\quad + \int_{\Omega_r} \Psi(x, ((\nabla g - G) * \alpha_r)(x) + (D^s g * \alpha_r)(x)) \, dx. \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

Proof. The representation formula (5.8) is an immediate consequence of Theorem 1.2, Theorem 5.1, Lemma 5.3, and the superadditivity properties of the \liminf . \square

Corollary 5.5. *Under the conditions of Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 5.4, for any $(g, G) \in SD(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})$, the functional $J(g, G)$ defined in (1.28) admits the integral representation in (1.29), namely,*

$$\begin{aligned} J(g, G) &= \int_{\Omega} H_p(x, \nabla g(x), G(x)) \, dx + \int_{\Omega \cap S_g} h_p(x, [g](x), \nu_g(x)) \, d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(x) \\ &\quad + \int_{\Omega} \Psi(x, \nabla g(x) - G(x)) \, dx + \int_{\Omega \cap S_g} \Psi^{\infty}(x, [g](x) \otimes \nu_g(x)) \, d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(x). \end{aligned} \quad (5.9)$$

Proof. The result follows immediately by Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 5.4. \square

As noticed in the last bullet of Remark 5.2, if $p > 1$ Theorem 5.4 and Corollary 5.5 provide integral representation results only for fields $G \in L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})$.

5.3. On the reverse order of the limits. After the presentation of the iterated limiting procedure carried out in Sections 3 and 4, a legitimate question is whether the two operations commute, namely, whether we obtain the same result if we reverse the order in which the two limits are taken: first letting $r \rightarrow 0$ and then letting $n \rightarrow \infty$. The problem is a relevant one in the scientific community and a similar question was studied in [9] for a problem of dimension reduction in the context of structured deformations. In the following few lines, we will give a brief explanation of why in the present case a commutability result does not hold.

Under the hypotheses of the previous sections on W , ψ , and Ψ , let us consider the reversed iterated limiting procedure for an initial energy of the type $E_L + E^{\alpha_r}$, with E_L as in (5.1) and E^{α_r} as in (1.8). We first let the measure of non-locality tend to zero and then relax to structured deformations, namely we consider, for $u \in SBV(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$

$$I_L(u) := \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} (E_L(u) + E^{\alpha_r}(u)) \quad (5.10)$$

and then we relax this energy as in (5.2), for $(g, G) \in SD(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})$:

$$\begin{aligned} I_p^{(R)}(g, G) &:= \inf_{\{u_n\} \subset SBV(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)} \left\{ \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} I_L(u_n) : u_n \rightarrow (g, G) \text{ in the sense of (1.14),} \right. \\ &\quad \left. (1 - \delta_1(p)) \sup_n \|\nabla u_n\|_{L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{d \times N})} < \infty \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

Given that E_L is independent of r , it is easy to deal with (5.10). Since Ψ belongs to the class (E) or (L), an application of the Reshetnyak Continuity Theorem 2.6 with $\Phi = \Psi$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} E^{\alpha_r}(u) &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} \Psi(x, (\alpha_r * D^s u)(x)) \, dx = \int_{\Omega} \Psi(x, 0) \, dx + \int_{\Omega \cap S_u} \Psi^{\infty}\left(x, \frac{dD^s u}{d|D^s u|}(x)\right) \, d|D^s u|(x) \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \Psi(x, 0) \, dx + \int_{\Omega \cap S_u} \Psi^{\infty}(x, [u](x) \otimes \nu_u(x)) \, d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(x). \end{aligned}$$

The chain of equalities above is justified upon extending the function u outside of Ω , as it was done in Section 4 for the function g (through the application of [27, Theorem 1.4]), and recalling that the energy does not depend on the chosen extension in the limit as $r \rightarrow 0$ (see also (4.5)). Therefore, in (5.10) we obtain

$$I_L(u) = E_L(u) + \int_{\Omega} \Psi(x, 0) \, dx + \int_{\Omega \cap S_u} \Psi^{\infty}(x, [u](x) \otimes \nu_u(x)) \, d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(x).$$

Now, it is easy to prove that if Ψ is in the class (L), then also Ψ^{∞} is in the class (L). Therefore, for either (i) Ψ belonging to (L) or (ii) Ψ belonging to (E) with Ψ^{∞} Lipschitz in the second variable uniformly with respect to the first one, it is immediate to see that Ψ^{∞} is a surface energy density that satisfies hypotheses $(\psi 1)$, $(\psi 2)$, and $(\psi 3)$ (see [11, Remark 3.3] and [33, Remark 3.1]). Thus, the relaxation process (5.11) is the same

as that of Theorem 5.1 for a local energy of the type (5.1) whose densities are $\widetilde{W}(x, A) := W(x, A) + \Psi(x, 0)$ and $\widetilde{\psi}(x, \lambda, \nu) := \psi(x, \lambda, \nu) + \Psi^\infty(x, \lambda \otimes \nu)$. The cell formulas (5.6) and (5.7) imply that only the behavior of $\Psi(x, A)$ at $A = 0$ or as $|A| \rightarrow \infty$ can influence the relaxed energy in (5.11), whereas the presence of the third integral in (5.9) shows that all of the values of $\Psi(x, A)$ can influence the relaxed energy $J(g, G)$ in (5.9).

5.4. Bulk relaxed densities of the form $F_1(x, G(x)) + F_2(x, \nabla g(x) - G(x))$. The representation (5.9) of the relaxed energy $J(g, G)$ established in Corollary 5.5 contains the bulk part

$$\int_{\Omega} (H_p(x, \nabla g(x), G(x)) + \Psi(x, \nabla g(x) - G(x))) dx,$$

in which the bulk relaxed density is a sum of the contribution $H_p(x, \nabla g(x), G(x))$ from the initial local energy $E_L(u)$ in (5.1) and the contribution $\Psi(x, \nabla g(x) - G(x))$ from the initial non-local energy $E^{\alpha r}$ in (1.11). The second term $\Psi(x, \nabla g(x) - G(x))$ has the distinction of capturing a bulk energy density due to disarrangements alone through its sole dependence on the deformation due to disarrangements $M(x) = \nabla g(x) - G(x)$, while the first term $H(x, \nabla g(x), G(x))$ can be written as $H(x, G(x) + M(x), G(x))$ and so depends in general on both the deformation due to disarrangements $M(x)$ and the deformation without disarrangements $G(x)$. This situation leads naturally to the question of finding conditions on the initial local energy $E_L(u)$ that imply that the term $H_p(x, G(x) + M(x), G(x))$ depends on $G(x)$ alone or, more generally, that

$$H_p(x, G(x) + M(x), G(x)) = H_{\setminus}(x, G(x)) + H_d(x, M(x)), \quad (5.12)$$

in which case the bulk relaxed density becomes

$$H_p(x, G(x) + M(x), G(x)) + \Psi(x, M(x)) = H_{\setminus}(x, G(x)) + (H_d(x, M(x)) + \Psi(x, M(x))), \quad (5.13)$$

a function H_{\setminus} of deformation without disarrangements plus a function $H_d + \Psi$ of deformation due to disarrangements.

The existence of a decomposition of the form (5.12) was raised in [11] and [10] and was shown not to be available, in general, in the study [31]. A modified form of (5.12) was established in [5]: there the x -dependence was absent, and the term $H_{\setminus}(x, G(x))$ in (5.13) was replaced by $H_{\setminus}(G(x), \nabla G(x))$. In the context of plasticity addressed in the articles [10, 13, 17], the availability of (5.12) was shown to provide a variational basis for describing and predicting the phenomena of yielding, hysteresis, and hardening observed in both single crystals and in polycrystalline materials.

In this subsection we verify that conditions on the initial local energy $E_L(u)$ in (5.1) that were identified in [11, pages 100-101] guarantee the validity of the special additive decomposition (5.12) for the bulk relaxed energy density H_1 and provide explicit formulas for the functions H_{\setminus} and H_d in that decomposition. Because no proof of the special additive decomposition (5.12) is given in [11], we provide a proof in the context of the following remark that employs the recent results in [39].

Remark 5.6. For the initial local energy $E_L(u)$ in (5.1), assume that $W: \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{N \times N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous, convex function that satisfies (W1)₁ and (W2) and that $\psi: \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{S}^{N-1} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ is continuous, satisfies $(\psi 1)$ – $(\psi 4)$, and is such that $\psi(-\lambda, -\nu) = \psi(\lambda, \nu)$. It follows that the cell formula (5.6) for $p = 1$ becomes

$$H_1(x_0, A, B) = W(x_0, B) + \inf \left\{ \int_{Q \cap S_u} \psi(x_0, [u](x), \nu_u(x)) d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(x) : u \in \mathcal{C}_1^{\text{bulk}}(A, B) \right\} \quad (5.14)$$

for every $x_0 \in \Omega$ and $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$. Moreover, the infimum on the right-hand side is given by the expressions

$$H_1(x_0, A, B) - W(x_0, B) = \sup \left\{ \Theta(x_0, A - B) : \Theta(x_0, \cdot): \mathbb{R}^{N \times N} \rightarrow [0, +\infty) \text{ is subadditive and} \right. \\ \left. \Theta(x_0, \lambda \otimes \nu) \leq \psi(x_0, \lambda, \nu) \text{ for all } \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^N \text{ and } \nu \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1} \right\}. \quad (5.15)$$

Proof. It is convenient to omit the explicit appearance of the point $x_0 \in \Omega$ on both sides of the desired decomposition and that remains fixed throughout the proof. Let $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ and $u \in \mathcal{C}_1^{\text{bulk}}(A, B)$ be given. The cell formula (5.6) along with the convexity and continuity of W yield the inequalities

$$\int_Q W(\nabla u(x)) dx + \int_{Q \cap S_u} \psi([u](x), \nu_u(x)) d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(x) \geq W \left(\int_Q \nabla u(x) dx \right) + \int_{Q \cap S_u} \psi([u](x), \nu_u(x)) d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(x) \\ \geq W(B) + \inf \left\{ \int_{Q \cap S_u} \psi([u](x), \nu_u(x)) d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(x) : u \in \mathcal{C}_1^{\text{bulk}}(A, B) \right\},$$

and, therefore, also yield the lower bound

$$H_1(A, B) \geq W(B) + \inf \left\{ \int_{Q \cap S_u} \psi([u](x), \nu_u(x)) d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(x) : u \in \mathcal{C}_1^{\text{bulk}}(A, B) \right\}. \quad (5.16)$$

To obtain an upper bound for $H_1(A, B)$ we note that $\mathcal{C}_1^{\text{bulk}}(A, B) \supset \{u \in SBV(Q, \mathbb{R}^N) : u|_{\partial Q} = Ax, \nabla u = B \mathcal{L}^N\text{-a.e. on } Q\} =: \mathcal{C}(A, B)$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} H_1(A, B) &= \inf \left\{ \int_Q W(\nabla u(x)) dx + \int_{Q \cap S_u} \psi([u](x), \nu_u(x)) d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(x) : u \in \mathcal{C}_1^{\text{bulk}}(A, B) \right\} \\ &\leq \inf \left\{ \int_Q W(\nabla u(x)) dx + \int_{Q \cap S_u} \psi([u](x), \nu_u(x)) d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(x) : u \in \mathcal{C}(A, B) \right\} \\ &= W(B) + \inf \left\{ \int_{Q \cap S_u} \psi([u](x), \nu_u(x)) d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(x) : u \in \mathcal{C}(A, B) \right\} \\ &= W(B) + \inf \left\{ \int_{Q \cap S_u} \psi([u](x), \nu_u(x)) d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(x) : u \in SBV(Q, \mathbb{R}^N), u|_{\partial Q} = (A - B)x, \nabla u = 0 \text{ a.e.} \right\} \\ &= W(B) + \inf \left\{ \int_{Q \cap S_u} \psi([u](x), \nu_u(x)) d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(x) : u \in SBV(Q, \mathbb{R}^N), u|_{\partial Q} = (A - B)x, \int_Q \nabla u = 0 \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is established in [39, Theorem 2.3(iii) and (iv)]. It is now easy to see that the upper bound (5.17) and lower bound (5.16) just obtained for $H_1(A, B)$ are the same. The relation (5.15) follows from (5.14) and from [39, Theorem 2.3(i)]. \square

6. EXAMPLE FROM CRYSTAL PLASTICITY

We turn to the subject of the mechanics of single crystals to identify an example of bulk energies of the type recovered in the volume integral in (1.22) through our relaxation of non-local energies. The example emerges within the special class of *invertible structured deformations* (g, G) in which the tensors G and $K_{(g, G)}$ in (6.2) below play the role of F^e and $(F^p)^{-1}$ in the standard treatments of crystal plasticity.

6.1. Invertible structured deformations. The main mechanisms of deformation in single crystals are the distortion without disarrangements of the crystalline lattice and the shearing due to disarrangements. The articles [14, 19] show that the class of invertible structured deformations is appropriate for capturing such multiscale geometrical changes. In the present setting, we can identify (g, G) as an *invertible structured deformation* when (see [14] for a broader setting for this notion)

- (I1) g is a diffeomorphism of class C^1 for which ∇g and $(\nabla g)^{-1}$ are Lipschitzian,
- (I2) G is continuous on $\bar{\Omega}$ with invertible values,
- (I3) the macroscopic volume change multiplier $\det \nabla g$ and the multiplier for volume change without disarrangements $\det G$ are equal: $\det \nabla g = \det G$.

For an open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, we define

$$ISD(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}) := \{(g, G) \in SD(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}) : (I1), (I2), \text{ and } (I3) \text{ hold}\}.$$

Invertible structured deformations turn out to be a useful setting for understanding some kinematical ingredients in continuum models of single crystals undergoing plastic deformations, partly because the relation $\det \nabla g = \det G$ reflects the fact that the disarrangements occurring in single crystals typically do not involve changes in volume, *i.e.*, arise without the formation of submacroscopic voids.

One useful mathematical property of invertible structured deformations rests on the notion of composition of invertible structured deformations: if $(g, G) \in ISD(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3})$ and $(h, H) \in ISD(g(\Omega))$, then the composition $(h, H) \diamond (g, G)$ is defined by

$$(h, H) \diamond (g, G) := (h \circ g, (H \circ g)G). \quad (6.1)$$

It is easy to show that $(h, H) \diamond (g, G) \in ISD(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3})$ and each $(g, G) \in ISD(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3})$ has the factorization

$$(g, G) = (g, \nabla g) \diamond (i, K_{(g, G)}) \quad (6.2)$$

where $i := x \mapsto x$ is the identity mapping on Ω and $K_{(g,G)} := (\nabla g)^{-1}G$. The factor $(g, \nabla g) \in ISD(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3})$ carries all of the macroscopic deformation and is a classical deformation, *i.e.*, it causes no disarrangements because $M_{(g, \nabla g)} := \nabla g - \nabla g = 0$. The factor $(i, K_{(g,G)}) \in ISD(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3})$ is purely submacroscopic, *i.e.*, it causes no macroscopic deformation, and carries the disarrangements

$$M_{(i, K_{(g,G)})} := \nabla i - K_{(g,G)} = I - (\nabla g)^{-1}G = (\nabla g)^{-1}(\nabla g - G) = (\nabla g)^{-1}M_{(g,G)}. \quad (6.3)$$

Moreover, both factors in (6.2) are invertible structured deformations, because $\det K_{(g,G)} = \det G / \det \nabla g = 1 = \det \nabla i$ and, trivially, $\det \nabla g = \det \nabla g$.

6.2. Slip systems for single crystals; crystallographic structured deformations. For a single crystal in the reference configuration Ω the crystallographic data required for the analysis of crystallographic slip consists of pairs of orthogonal unit vectors (s^a, m^a) for $a = 1, \dots, A$, with A the number of potentially active slip systems. For crystallographic slip, the discontinuity in deformation arises only across a limited family of slip planes identified via the slip systems. The unit vector s^a provides the direction of slip, while the unit vector m^a is a normal to the slip plane for the a^{th} slip-system (s^a, m^a) . For the case of face-centered cubic crystals, the vectors m^a are chosen from the normals to the faces of a preassigned regular octahedron and the slip vectors s^a are chosen to be one of the directed edges of the face associated with m^a .

We wish next to identify a collection of invertible structured deformations for which the disarrangements arise only through the action of the slip systems of a give crystal. To this end, we recall [15] that for each structured deformation (g, G) in the sense of [14] and, hence, for each invertible structured deformation there exists a sequence of injective, piecewise smooth deformations f_n such that

$$f_n \rightarrow g \quad \text{in } L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3), \quad \nabla f_n \rightarrow G \quad \text{in } L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}),$$

and, for every such sequence and for every $x \in \Omega$, the disarrangement tensor $M_{(g,G)}$ is given by the identification relation

$$M_{(g,G)}(x) := \nabla g(x) - G(x) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{V_3(r)} \int_{B_r(x) \cap S_{f_n}} [f_n](y) \otimes \nu_{f_n}(y) \, d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(y), \quad (6.4)$$

and the deformation without disarrangements G by the identification relation

$$G(x) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{V_3(r)} \int_{B_r(x)} \nabla f_n(y) \, dy. \quad (6.5)$$

In both (6.4) and (6.5), $V_3(r)$ denotes the volume of the three-dimensional ball of radius r . Suppose now that the approximating deformations f_n are such that the dyadic fields $[f_n] \otimes \nu_{f_n}$ are compatible with the A slip-systems of the crystal in the sense that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and for every $r > 0$ there exist continuous fields $\gamma_n^a(\cdot, r): \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for $a = 1, \dots, A$ such that

$$\int_{B_r(x) \cap S_{f_n}} [f_n](y) \otimes \nu_{f_n}(y) \, d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(y) = \sum_{a=1}^A V_3(r) \gamma_n^a(x, r) \nabla g(x) s^a \otimes m^a, \quad (6.6)$$

and such that $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_n^a(x, r) =: \gamma^a(x)$ exists for every $x \in \Omega$ and for $a = 1, \dots, A$. Under these assumptions, the identification relation (6.4) becomes

$$M_{(g,G)}(x) = \sum_{a=1}^A \gamma^a(x) \nabla g(x) s^a \otimes m^a,$$

so that the first relation in (6.3) becomes

$$M_{(i, K_{(g,G)})}(x) = I - K_{(g,G)}(x) = \sum_{a=1}^A \gamma^a(x) s^a \otimes m^a \quad (6.7)$$

and

$$K_{(g,G)}(x) = I - \sum_{a=1}^A \gamma^a(x) s^a \otimes m^a \quad (6.8)$$

We have provided through (6.6) sufficient conditions that the disarrangement tensor field $M_{(i, K_{(g,G)})}$ for the purely submacroscopic part $(i, (\nabla g)^{-1}G)$ of (g, G) is a linear combination of the (spatially constant) crystallographic slip dyads $s^a \otimes m^a$ for $a = 1, \dots, A$ associated with the given crystal. In this context we

may say that the invertible structured deformation (g, G) generates disarrangements only in the form of crystallographic slips or, more briefly, that (g, G) is *crystallographic*. We note in passing that the article [19] provided a precise sense in which one may consider approximations by crystallographic slips of the disarrangement matrix $M_{(g,G)} = \nabla g - G$ of any invertible structured deformations. Since we here restrict our attention to those invertible structured deformations for which (6.7) holds, the approximations in [19] become exact in the present context.

For a crystallographic structured deformation (g, G) and a point $x \in \Omega$ we say that a slip-system a is active at x if $\gamma^a(x) \neq 0$, and we say that single slip occurs at x if there is only one slip-system that is active at x . If more than one slip system is active at x we say that multiple slip occurs at x . If (g, G) is crystallographic, so that (6.6), (6.7), and (6.8) hold, we may use the relations $\text{tr}(s^a \otimes m^a) = s^a \cdot m^a = 0$ for all a and $\det K_{(g,G)} = \det G / \det \nabla g$ to conclude from (6.8) and the definition of invertible structured deformations that

$$\text{tr} K_{(g,G)} = 3 \quad \text{and} \quad \det K_{(g,G)} = 1. \quad (6.9)$$

Consequently, the crystallographic structured deformations are among those for which $K_{(g,G)} = (\nabla g)^{-1}G$ satisfies (6.9). We note that a slip system a is active at x for (g, G) if and only if a is active at x for the purely submacroscopic part $(i, K_{(g,G)})$ of (g, G) .

Examples of crystallographic structured deformations that undergo single slip at every point are the two-level shears $(g_{\mu, x_o}^a, G_\nu^a)$ for $a = 1, \dots, A$, for $\mu, \nu \in \mathbb{R}$ and for $x_o \in \Omega$:

$$\begin{aligned} g_{\mu, x_o}^a(x) &:= x_o + (I + \mu s^a \otimes m^a)(x - x_o) \\ G_\nu^a(x) &:= I + \nu s^a \otimes m^a, \end{aligned} \quad (6.10)$$

for which it can be verified [14] via the ‘‘deck of cards’’ family of approximations f_n that (6.6) is satisfied, and for which

$$\nabla g_\mu^a(x) = I + \mu s^a \otimes m^a, \quad (6.11a)$$

$$M_{(g_{\mu, x_o}^a, G_\nu^a)}(x) = (\mu - \nu)s^a \otimes m^a, \quad (6.11b)$$

and

$$K_{(g_{\mu, x_o}^a, G_\nu^a)}(x) = I + (\nu - \mu)s^a \otimes m^a = I - M_{(g_{\mu, x_o}^a, G_\nu^a)}(x). \quad (6.12)$$

The ‘‘deck of cards’’ approximations f_n show that each two-level shear $(g_{\mu, x_o}^a, G_\nu^a)$ is approximated for each n by smooth shears of amount ν of the crystal lattice between $n - 1$ slip planes, along with slip-discontinuities in the direction s^a across the $n - 1$ planes, each slip-discontinuity of amount $\frac{\mu - \nu}{n}$ times a reference dimension in the direction m^a . By virtue of the ‘‘deck of cards’’ approximations f_n and, in view of (6.11a), (6.10)₂, (6.11b), and the trivial relation

$$\mu = \nu + (\mu - \nu),$$

we may then call μ the macroscopic shear, ν the shear without slip, and $\mu - \nu$ the shear due to slip for the two-level shear $(g_{\mu, x_o}^a, G_\nu^a)$. Of particular interest is the case $\nu = 0$, *i.e.*, the two-level shear (g_{μ, x_o}^a, I) , in which the region between slip planes undergoes no shear and the macroshear μ arises entirely from slips on slip-system a .

6.3. Slip-neutral two-level shears. We now summarize arguments provided in [10] in a more limited setting that are based on the observation that crystallographic slip is physically activated within very thin bands, the so-called slip-bands, whose thickness is typically of the order 10^2 atomic units, while the separation of active slip-bands is typically of order 10^4 atomic units. The arguments in [10] indicate the following: for each $a = 1, \dots, A$, there is a number $p^a > 0$ such that a two-level shear $(g_{\mu, x_o}^a, G_\nu^a)$ for which the shear due to slip $\mu - \nu$ is an integral multiple of p^a gives rise to submacroscopic slips equal to an integral number of atomic units in the direction of slip s^a . The dimensionless number p^a equals a shift of one atomic unit in the direction of slip s^a divided by the separation 10^4 in the direction m^a of consecutive active slip-bands associated with system a (measured in the same atomic units). Consequently, p^a is of the order of 10^{-4} , and a two-level shear $(g_{\mu, x_o}^a, G_\nu^a)$ with

$$\mu - \nu = np^a, \quad \text{with } n \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (6.13)$$

produces a shift of n atomic units and so does not produce a misfit of the crystalline lattice across the active slip bands, no matter what the amount of shear without slip ν . Thus, when (6.13) holds, the disarrangements due to slip are not revealed by the deformed positions under the two-level shear attained by the lattice points

away from the slip bands. We refer to a two-level shear (g_{μ,x_o}^a, G_ν^a) satisfying (6.13) as slip-neutral for the slip-system a . In particular, when $\nu = 0$ we have $G_\nu^a = I$, and the two-level shear (g_μ^a, I) is slip-neutral if the macroshear $\mu = \mu - \nu$ is an integral multiple of p^a . Although a slip-neutral shear of the form $(g_{np^a}^a, I)$ causes a macroscopic shearing of the body, not only does it cause no misfit of the lattice across slip bands, it also causes no distortion of the lattice. Consequently, we call the two-level shear $(g_{np^a}^a, I)$ completely neutral for the slip-system a .

We suppose now that the given body undergoes a completely neutral two-level shear (g_{μ,x_o}^a, I) with $\mu = np^a$, starting from the region Ω , and suppose further that (g_{μ,x_o}^a, I) is then followed by a crystallographic deformation (g, G) , so that we have the composition and factorization as in (6.1) and (6.2):

$$(g, G) \diamond (g_{\mu,x_o}^a, I) = (g \circ g_{\mu,x_o}^a, G \circ g_{\mu,x_o}^a) = (g \circ g_{\mu,x_o}^a, \nabla(g \circ g_{\mu,x_o}^a)) \diamond (i, K_{(g \circ g_{\mu,x_o}^a, G \circ g_{\mu,x_o}^a)}),$$

with $K_{(g \circ g_{\mu,x_o}^a, G \circ g_{\mu,x_o}^a)}$ given by

$$\begin{aligned} K_{(g \circ g_{\mu,x_o}^a, G \circ g_{\mu,x_o}^a)} &= (\nabla(g \circ g_{\mu,x_o}^a))^{-1} (G \circ g_{\mu,x_o}^a) = ((\nabla g \circ g_{\mu,x_o}^a) \nabla g_{\mu,x_o}^a)^{-1} (G \circ g_{\mu,x_o}^a) \\ &= (\nabla g_{\mu,x_o}^a)^{-1} (\nabla g \circ g_{\mu,x_o}^a)^{-1} (G \circ g_{\mu,x_o}^a) = ((\nabla g_{\mu,x_o}^a)^{-1} (\nabla g)^{-1} G) \circ g_{\mu,x_o}^a \\ &= (\nabla g_{\mu,x_o}^a)^{-1} K_{(g,G)} \circ g_{\mu,x_o}^a \end{aligned}$$

and with $K_{(g_{\mu,x_o}^a, I)}$ given by (6.12):

$$K_{(g_{\mu,x_o}^a, I)} = I - \mu s^a \otimes m^a = (\nabla g_{\mu,x_o}^a)^{-1}.$$

Therefore, we have the relation

$$K_{(g,G) \diamond (g_{mp^a}^a, I)} = K_{(g_{\mu,x_o}^a, I)} (K_{(g,G)} \circ g_{\mu,x_o}^a),$$

and the relations $M_{(i, K_{(g,G)})} = I - K_{(g,G)}$, (6.8), (6.11b), and (6.12) then yield

$$\begin{aligned} I - M_{(i, K_{(g,G) \diamond (g_{mp^a}^a, I)})} &= K_{(g,G) \diamond (g_{mp^a}^a, I)} = K_{(g_{\mu,x_o}^a, I)} (K_{(g,G)} \circ g_{\mu,x_o}^a) \\ &= (I - M_{(g_{\mu,x_o}^a, I)}) (I - M_{(i, K_{(g,G)})} \circ g_{\mu,x_o}^a) \\ &= I - M_{(i, K_{(g,G)})} \circ g_{\mu,x_o}^a - M_{(g_{\mu,x_o}^a, I)} + M_{(g_{\mu,x_o}^a, I)} M_{(i, K_{(g,G)})} \circ g_{\mu,x_o}^a \\ &= I - M_{(i, K_{(g,G)})} \circ g_{\mu,x_o}^a - M_{(g_{\mu,x_o}^a, I)} + \mu (s^a \otimes m^a) M_{(i, K_{(g,G)})} \circ g_{\mu,x_o}^a \\ &= I - M_{(i, K_{(g,G)})} \circ g_{\mu,x_o}^a - M_{(g_{\mu,x_o}^a, I)} + \mu s^a \otimes (M_{(i, K_{(g,G)})}^T \circ g_{\mu,x_o}^a) m^a. \end{aligned} \quad (6.14)$$

When $\mu \neq 0$ the last term in (6.14) vanishes at a point x if and only if $M_{(i, K_{(g,G)})}^T (g_{\mu,x_o}^a(x)) m^a = 0$, and, because $g_{\mu,x_o}^a(x_o) = x_o$, we conclude from (6.7) the following remark.

Remark 6.1. The disarrangement tensor $M_{(i, K_{(g,G) \diamond (g_{\mu,x_o}^a, I)})}(x_o)$ at $x_o \in \Omega$ for the submacroscopic part of the composition $(g, G) \diamond (g_{\mu,x_o}^a, I)$ of a crystallographic deformation (g, G) with the completely neutral two-level shear (g_{μ,x_o}^a, I) , where $\mu = np^a$, is given by

$$M_{(i, K_{(g,G) \diamond (g_{\mu,x_o}^a, I)})}(x_o) = M_{(i, K_{(g,G)})}(x_o) + M_{(g_{\mu,x_o}^a, I)}(x_o) \quad (6.15)$$

if and only if

$$\sum_{b=1}^A \gamma^b(x) (s^b \cdot m^a) m^b = M_{(i, K_{(g,G)})}^T(x_o) m^a = 0. \quad (6.16)$$

The identification relation (6.4) for M shows that the vanishing of $M_{(i, K_{(g,G)})}^T(x_o) m^a$ in (6.16) is the statement that, on average, as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $r \rightarrow 0$, the jumps in approximating deformations f_n must be parallel to the slip plane for the a^{th} slip system. A sufficient condition on the crystallographic deformation (g, G) in order that the sum in (6.16) vanish is the following: every slip system b that is active at x_o for (g, G) satisfies $s^b \cdot m^a = 0$, *i.e.*, the slip plane for the completely neutral two-level shear $(g_{np^a}^a, I)$ contains every slip direction s^b of every slip system b , active at x_o for (g, G) . In particular, if (g, G) is a double slip at x_o with active slip systems (s^1, m^1) and (s^2, m^2) , then (6.15) holds for every a such that $s^1 \cdot m^a = s^2 \cdot m^a = 0$. Such double slips (g, G) include the case of ‘‘cross slip’’ in which $(s^1, m^1) = (s^a, m^1)$ and $(s^2, m^2) = (s^a, m^2)$ with $m^a = m^1 \neq m^2$ in which slips in one and the same direction s^a occur in two different slip systems at x_o .

Our discussion above of the relationship between the disarrangement tensor $M_{(i, K_{(g,G)} \diamond (g_{\mu, x_o}^a, I))}$ for the purely submacroscopic part of the composition $(g, G) \diamond (g_{\mu, x_o}^a, I)$ and the disarrangement tensor $M_{(i, K_{(g,G)})}$ for the purely submacroscopic part of (g, G) is of particular interest for energetics, because (g_{μ, x_o}^a, I) was assumed to be completely neutral for the slip-system a , *i.e.*, $\mu = np^a$ with n an integer. In that case, the lattice on which (g, G) acts when following (g_{μ, x_o}^a, I) differs from that on which (g, G) acts when *not* following (g_{μ, x_o}^a, I) only by undetectable translations of the lattice between active slip-planes for system a . Consequently, the submacroscopic kinematical states of the crystal attained by means of the two purely submacroscopic structured deformations $(i, K_{(g,G) \diamond (g_{\mu, x_o}^a, I)})$ and $(i, K_{(g,G)})$ are indistinguishable. Therefore, the energetic responses to the corresponding disarrangement fields $M_{(i, K_{(g,G) \diamond (g_{\mu, x_o}^a, I)})}$ and $M_{(i, K_{(g,G)})}$ would be indistinguishable, so that the validity of (6.15) would have significant implications with respect to properties of the energetic response of the crystal. We now provide specific circumstances under which the relaxed energies recovered in Corollary 5.5 would be subject to those implications, and we set the stage by highlighting the role of $M_{(i, K_{(g,G)})}$, the disarrangement tensor for the purely submacroscopic deformation $(i, K_{(g,G)})$, in providing constitutive relations for the energetic response to crystallographic deformation that are frame-indifferent (independent of observer).

6.4. Frame-indifferent energetic responses. We noted in the text above the relation (6.3) that contains the formulas

$$M_{(i, K_{(g,G)})} = I - K_{(g,G)} = (\nabla g)^{-1} M_{(g,G)},$$

relating $M_{(g,G)}$, the disarrangement tensor for an invertible structured deformation (g, G) , and $M_{(i, K_{(g,G)})}$, the disarrangement tensor for the purely submacroscopic deformation $(i, K_{(g,G)})$ in (6.2). Because ∇g and M both are premultiplied by a rotation Q under a change of observer associated with the rotation Q , the tensor field $K_{(g,G)}$ as well as the disarrangement tensor $M_{(i, K_{(g,G)})}$ are unchanged under such a change of observer. Therefore, for a function $\Psi_i : \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the mapping

$$x \mapsto \Psi_i(M_{(i, K_{(g,G)})}(x)) = \Psi_i((\nabla g(x))^{-1} M_{(g,G)}(x))$$

has the property that its dependence on the structured deformation (g, G) is independent of observer. The function Ψ_i specifies the energetic response of a body from the reference configuration Ω to the disarrangements arising in purely submacroscopic deformations.

If we define for the given macroscopic deformation g the mapping $\Psi_g : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by,

$$\Psi_g(x, L) := \Psi_i((\nabla g(x))^{-1} L), \quad \text{for all } L \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}, \quad (6.17)$$

then the mapping $x \mapsto \Psi_g(x, M_{(g,G)}(x)) = \Psi_i((\nabla g(x))^{-1} M_{(g,G)}(x))$ also has the property that its dependence on (g, G) is independent of observer. The following constitutive assumption for the dependence on invertible structured deformations (g, G) of $\psi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the free energy density due to disarrangements, namely,

$$\psi(x) = \Psi_i(M_{(i, K_{(g,G)})}(x)) = \Psi_i((\nabla g(x))^{-1} M_{(g,G)}(x)) = \Psi_g(x, M_{(g,G)}(x)), \quad x \in \Omega, \quad (6.18)$$

then is independent of observer and carries the assumption that the free energy density due to disarrangements depends only on the disarrangements associated with the submacroscopic factor $(i, K_{(g,G)})$ in (6.2). When (g, G) is a crystallographic deformation, then the response functions Ψ_i and Ψ_g determine the free energy density due to crystallographic slip as a function of the disarrangement tensors $M_{(i, K_{(g,G)})}$ and $M_{(g,G)}$, respectively.

6.5. Periodic properties of the energetic response Ψ_i to crystallographic slip. Let $x_o \in \Omega$, $a \in \{1, \dots, A\}$, $\mu = np^a$ with $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, and a crystallographic structured deformation (g, G) be given. We argued above that the lattice on which (g, G) acts, when following the completely neutral two-level shear (g_{μ, x_o}^a, I) , differs from that on which (g, G) acts, when *not* following (g_{μ, x_o}^a, I) , only by the undetectable translations of the lattice between active slip bands for system a . Consequently, the submacroscopic kinematical states of the crystal lattice attained by means of the two purely submacroscopic structured deformations $(i, K_{(g,G) \diamond (g_{\mu, x_o}^a, I)})$ and $(i, K_{(g,G)})$ are indistinguishable. We invoke this indistinguishability to assert that the free energy density $\psi(x_o)$ due to crystallographic slip should be the same for $(i, K_{(g,G) \diamond (g_{\mu, x_o}^a, I)})$ and for

$(i, K_{(g,G)})$ at the fixed point x_o of g_{μ, x_o}^a . Under the constitutive assumption (6.18) applied to the point x_o this assertion means that, for every $\mu = np^a$ with $n \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\Psi_i(M_{(i, K_{(g,G)} \circ (g_{\mu, x_o}^a, I))}(x_o)) = \Psi_i(M_{(i, K_{(g,G)})}(x_o)). \quad (6.19)$$

We wish to translate (6.19) into a property of the response function $\Psi_i: \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by invoking the additivity property (6.15) in Remark 6.1. This property requires that we restrict attention to matrices $M \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ of the form

$$M = \sum_{b=1}^A \beta^b s^b \otimes m^b \quad (6.20)$$

with $\beta^1, \dots, \beta^A \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$M^\top m^a = 0, \quad (6.21)$$

and such that

$$\det(I - M) = 1. \quad (6.22)$$

If we define

$$\mathbb{M}^a := \{M \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} : (6.20), (6.21), (6.22) \text{ hold}\},$$

then it is easy to show that if there exists $b \in \{1, \dots, A\}$, $s \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$, such that $s \cdot m^a = 0$ and

$$M = s \otimes m^a + \xi(m^a \times m^b) \otimes m^b \quad (6.23)$$

then $M \in \mathbb{M}^a$. When $m^b = \pm m^a$ then the matrix M in (6.23) reduces to $s \otimes m^a$ and represents disarrangements arising from slips in the crystallographic plane with normal m^a , but not necessarily in one of the slip directions in the list of slip systems for the crystal. When $m^b \neq \pm m^a$, $s^a = m^a \times m^b = s$, and $\xi \neq 0$, M represents disarrangements of the previous type along with slips in the direction $m^a \times m^b$ in the crystallographic plane with normal m^b and so corresponds to the cross-slip described in Remark 5.6.

Suppose now that (g, G) , a , and x_o are such that $M_{(i, K_{(g,G)})}(x_o) \in \mathbb{M}^a$. By Remark 6.1, (6.15) holds for every completely neutral two-level shear (g_{np^a, x_o}^a, I) , *i.e.*,

$$M_{(i, K_{(g,G)} \circ (g_{np^a, x_o}^a, I))}(x_o) = M_{(i, K_{(g,G)})}(x_o) + M_{(g_{np^a, x_o}^a, I)}(x_o)$$

which by (6.11b) we may write in the following form

$$M_{(i, K_{(g,G)} \circ (g_{np^a, x_o}^a, I))}(x_o) = M_{(i, K_{(g,G)})}(x_o) + np^a s^a \otimes m^a.$$

Consequently, when $M_{(i, K_{(g,G)})}(x_o) \in \mathbb{M}^a$, this formula and the constitutive restriction (6.19) on the response function Ψ_i yield the relation

$$\Psi_i(M_{(i, K_{(g,G)})}(x_o) + np^a s^a \otimes m^a) = \Psi_i(M_{(i, K_{(g,G)})}(x_o)), \quad \text{for every } n \in \mathbb{Z}. \quad (6.24)$$

For matrices $M \in \mathbb{M}^a$ satisfying (6.23) this restriction takes the form

$$\Psi_i((s + np^a s^a) \otimes m^a + \xi(m^a \times m^b) \otimes m^b) = \Psi_i(s \otimes m^a + \xi(m^a \times m^b) \otimes m^b) \quad (6.25)$$

for every $s \in \{m^a\}^\perp$, $b \in \{1, \dots, A\}$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$, and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. In other terms, (6.25) is the assertion that for each $b \in \{1, \dots, A\}$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ the mapping

$$s \mapsto \Psi_i(s \otimes m^a + \xi(m^a \times m^b) \otimes m^b) \quad (6.26)$$

is periodic on $\{m^a\}^\perp$ with (vector) period $p^a s^a$. Thus, the presence of completely neutral two-level shears $(g_{p^a, I}^a)$ has led via (6.24) to the identification of a family of affine subspaces

$$\mathbb{M}_{b, \xi}^a := \{s \otimes m^a + \xi(m^a \times m^b) \otimes m^b : s \in \{m^a\}^\perp\}$$

of $\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$, each two-dimensional and on each of which the restriction of Ψ_i is periodic with corresponding period $p^a s^a$.

6.6. Form of the initial non-local energy appropriate for crystalline plasticity. In this subsection we take the basic constitutive assumption (6.18) and the property (6.24) of Ψ_i that reflects the complete neutrality of certain two-level shears, and we identify additional properties of Ψ_i that permit the application of our principal relaxation result Theorem 1.3 when Ψ_g appears in place of Ψ in the formula (1.11) for the averaged interfacial energy. The following theorem provides conditions on Ψ_i and (g, G) sufficient for the application of Theorem 1.3 in the context of crystal plasticity. We note in advance that the fact that the macroscopic deformation g for a crystallographic structured deformation (g, G) is smooth (as is the case, more generally, for $(g, G) \in ISD(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3})$) means that the singular part $D^s g$ of the distributional derivative Dg is zero and, consequently, that the term in (1.22) involving the recession function Ψ_g^∞ is zero. (This would not be the case were one to use the original definition of invertible structured deformation in [14] in which g is allowed to be discontinuous.)

Theorem 6.2. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ be a bounded Lipschitz domain, and let $\Psi_i: \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a sublinear Lipschitz continuous mapping satisfying, for each $a, b \in \{1, \dots, A\}$ and for each $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$, the periodicity condition (6.26). Moreover, for each crystallographic structured deformation (g, G) , let $\Psi_g: \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be given in terms of Ψ_i by (6.17), and for each $u \in SBV(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$ define as in (1.8) the averaged interfacial energy*

$$E_g^{\alpha_r}(u) := \int_{\Omega_r} \Psi_g(x, (D^s u * \alpha_r)(x)) dx.$$

Then for each mollifier $\alpha \in C_0(B_1)$, for each $r > 0$, and for the convergence in (1.14), the upscales energy $I^{\alpha_r}(g, G; \Omega_r)$ in (1.16) is given by

$$I^{\alpha_r}(g, G; \Omega_r) = \int_{\Omega_r} \Psi_g(x, ((\nabla g - G) * \alpha_r)(x)) dx, \quad (6.27)$$

and the spatially localized, upscaled energy $I(g, G)$ in (1.17) takes the form given in (1.24)

$$\begin{aligned} I(g, G) &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} I^{\alpha_r}(g, G; \Omega_r) = \int_{\Omega} \Psi_g(x, \nabla g(x) - G(x)) dx = \int_{\Omega} \Psi_i(I - \nabla g(x)^{-1} G(x)) dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \Psi_i(I - K_{(g, G)}(x)) dx = \int_{\Omega} \Psi_i(M_{(i, K_{(g, G)})}(x)) dx. \end{aligned} \quad (6.28)$$

In particular, the spatially localized, upscaled bulk energy density retains the periodicity property (6.26).

Proof. We note that for each $(g, G) \in ISD(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3})$ there also holds $(g, G) \in SD(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3})$. Moreover, the Lipschitz continuity of $(\nabla g)^{-1}$ and the assumed Lipschitz continuity of Ψ_i imply that Ψ_g satisfies (L), so that we may invoke not only Theorem 1.2 to obtain (6.27) but also Theorem 1.3 to obtain (6.28). \square

Acknowledgments: The authors thank the Center for Nonlinear Analysis at Carnegie Mellon University, Instituto Superior Técnico at Universidade de Lisboa, the Zentrum Mathematik of the Technische Universität München, the Dipartimento di Ingegneria Industriale of the Università di Salerno, and the Dipartimento di Scienze Matematiche “G. L. Lagrange” of Politecnico di Torino for their support and hospitality. Finally, the authors would like to thank the Isaac Newton Institute for Mathematical Sciences for support and hospitality during the programme *The mathematical design of new materials* when work on this paper was undertaken. This work was partially supported by EPSRC Grant Number EP/R014604/1.

MM and EZ are members of the Gruppo Nazionale per l’Analisi Matematica, la Probabilità e le loro Applicazioni (GNAMPA) of the Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica (INdAM).

JM acknowledges partial support from the Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia through the grant UID/MAT/04459/2013 and gratefully acknowledges support from GNAMPA-INdAM through *Programma professori visitatori 2018*. MM acknowledges partial support from the ERC Starting grant *High-Dimensional Sparse Optimal Control* (Grant agreement no. 306274) and the DFG Project *Identifikation von Energien durch Beobachtung der zeitlichen Entwicklung von Systemen* (FO 767/7). EZ acknowledges partial support from the INdAM-GNAMPA Project 2019 *Analysis and optimisation of thin structures*. Funding from the *Starting grant per giovani ricercatori* of Politecnico di Torino is also gratefully acknowledged.

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Alberti: *A Lusin type Theorem for gradients*. J. Funct. Anal. **100** (1991), 110-118.
- [2] L. Ambrosio, N. Fusco, and D. Pallara: *Functions of Bounded Variation and Free Discontinuity Problems*. Oxford University Press, 2000.
- [3] T. Apostol: *Mathematical Analysis*. Addison-Wesley, 1974.
- [4] M. Baía, M. Chermisi, J. Matias, and P. M. Santos: *Lower semicontinuity and relaxation of signed functionals with linear growth in the context of A -quasiconvexity*. Calc. Var. **47** (2013), 465-498.
- [5] M. Baía, J. Matias, and P. M. Santos: *A relaxation result in the framework of structured deformations*. Proc. Royal Soc. Edinburgh: Section A. **142** (2012), 239-271.
- [6] A. C. Barroso, G. Bouchitté, G. Buttazzo, and I. Fonseca: *Relaxation of bulk and interfacial energies*. Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **135** (1996), 107-173.
- [7] A. C. Barroso, J. Matias, M. Morandotti, and D. R. Owen: *Explicit Formulas for Relaxed Energy Densities Arising from Structured Deformations*. Math. Mech. Complex Syst. **5**(2) (2017), 163-189.
- [8] A. C. Barroso, J. Matias, M. Morandotti, and D. R. Owen: *Second-order structured deformations: relaxation, integral representation and applications*. Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **225**(3) (2017), 1025-1072.
- [9] G. Carita, J. Matias, M. Morandotti, and D. R. Owen: *Dimension reduction in the context of structured deformations*. J. Elast. **133** (2018), 1-35.
- [10] R. Choksi, G. Del Piero, I. Fonseca, and D. R. Owen: *Structured deformations as energy minimizers in models of fracture and hysteresis*. Math. Mech. Solids **4** (1999)(3), 321-356.
- [11] R. Choksi and I. Fonseca: *Bulk and interfacial energy densities for structured deformations of continua*. Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **138** (1997), 37-103.
- [12] G. Del Piero: *The Energy of a One-Dimensional Structured Deformation*. Math. Mech. Solids **6**(4) (2001), 387-408.
- [13] G. Del Piero: *The variational structure of classical plasticity*. Math. Mech. Complex Syst. **6** (2018), 137-180.
- [14] G. Del Piero and D. R. Owen: *Structured deformations of continua*. Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **124** (1993), 99-155.
- [15] G. Del Piero and D. R. Owen: *Integral-gradient formulae for structured deformations*. Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **131** (1995), 121-138.
- [16] G. Del Piero and D. R. Owen: *Structured Deformations: Part Two*. Quaderni dell'Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica, Gruppo Nazionale di Fisica Matematica, no. **58** (2000), 1-62.
- [17] L. Deseri and D. R. Owen: *Active slip-band separation and the energetics of slip in single crystals*. Int. J. Plast. **16** (2000), 1411-1418.
- [18] L. Deseri and D. R. Owen: *Energetics of two-level shears and hardening of single crystals*. Math. Mech. Solids **7** (2002), 113-147.
- [19] L. Deseri and D. R. Owen: *Invertible structured deformations and the geometry of multiple slip in single crystals*. Int. J. Plast. **18** (2002), 833-849.
- [20] L. Deseri and D. R. Owen: *Toward a field theory for elastic bodies undergoing disarrangements*. J. Elast. **70** (2003), 197-236.
- [21] L. Deseri and D. R. Owen: *Elasticity with hierarchical disarrangements: a field theory that admits slips and separations at multiple submacroscopic levels*. J. Elast. **135** (2019), 149-182.
- [22] I. Fonseca, A. Hagerty, and R. Paroni: *Second-Order Structured Deformations in the Space of Functions of Bounded Hessian*. J. Nonlinear Sci. **29**(6) (2019), 2699-2734.
- [23] I. Fonseca and S. Müller: *Quasiconvex integrands and lower semicontinuity in L^1* . SIAM J. Math. Anal. **23** (1992), 1081-1098.
- [24] I. Fonseca and S. Müller: *Relaxation of quasiconvex functionals in $BV(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^p)$ for integrands $f(x, u, \nabla u)$* . Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **123** (1993), 1-49.
- [25] G. Friedlander and M. Joshi: *Introduction to the theory of distributions*. Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- [26] E. Gagliardo: *Caratterizzazioni delle tracce sulla frontiera relative ad alcune classi di funzioni in n variabili*. (Italian) Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Padova **27** (1957), 284-305.
- [27] C. Gerhardt: *Trace and extensions of BV functions*. Lecture notes, Institut für Angewandte Mathematik.
- [28] L. Grafakos: *Classical Fourier Analysis*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics **249**, Springer, 2008.
- [29] J. Kristensen and F. Rindler: *Characterization of Generalized Gradient Young Measures Generated by Sequences in $W^{1,1}$ and BV* , Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **197**(2) (2010), 539-598.
- [30] J. Kristensen and F. Rindler: *Relaxation of signed integral functionals in BV* , Calc. Var. **37** (2010), 29-62.
- [31] C. J. Larsen: *On the representation of effective energy densities*. ESAIM Control, Optimisation, and Calculus of Variations **5** (2000), 529-538.
- [32] R. Lipton: *Cohesive dynamics and brittle fracture*. J. Elast. **124** (2016), 143-191.
- [33] J. Matias, M. Morandotti, and E. Zappale: *Optimal design of fractured media with prescribed macroscopic strain*. J. Math. Anal. Appl. **449**(2) (2017), 1094-1132.
- [34] D. R. Owen: *Elasticity with gradient disarrangements: a multiscale perspective for strain-gradient theories of elasticity and of plasticity*. J. Elast. **127** (2017), 115-150.
- [35] D. R. Owen and R. Paroni: *Second-order structured deformations*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **155** (2000), 215-235.
- [36] D. R. Owen and R. Paroni: *Optimal flux densities for linear mappings and the multiscale geometry of structured deformations*. Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **218** (2015), 1633-1652.
- [37] S. A. Silling and R. B. Lehoucq: *Convergence of peridynamics to classical elasticity theory*. J. Elast. **93** (2008), 13-37.

- [38] M. Šilhavý: *On the approximation theorem for structured deformations from $BV(\Omega)$* . *Math. Mech. Complex Syst.***3**(1) (2015), 83–100.
- [39] M. Šilhavý: *The general form of the relaxation of a purely interfacial energy for structured deformations*. *Math. Mech. Complex Syst.* **5**(2) (2017), 191-215.

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA, INSTITUTO SUPERIOR TÉCNICO, Av. ROVISCO PAIS, 1, 1049-001 LISBOA, PORTUGAL
Email address, J. Matias: jose.c.matias@tecnico.ulisboa.pt

DIPARTIMENTO DI SCIENZE MATEMATICHE “G. L. LAGRANGE”, POLITECNICO DI TORINO, CORSO DUCA DEGLI ABRUZZI,
24, 10129 TORINO, ITALY
Email address, M. Morandotti (✉): marco.morandotti@polito.it

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY, 5000 FORBES AVE., PITTSBURGH, 15213
USA
Email address, D. R. Owen: do04@andrew.cmu.edu

DIPARTIMENTO DI INGEGNERIA INDUSTRIALE, UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI SALERNO, VIA GIOVANNI PAOLO II, 132, 84084
FISCIANO (SA), ITALY
Email address, E. Zappalé: ezappale@unisa.it