INTEGRAL REPRESENTATION OF LOCAL FUNCTIONALS DEPENDING ON VECTOR FIELDS

FARES ESSEBEI, ANDREA PINAMONTI, AND SIMONE VERZELLESI

ABSTRACT. Given an open and bounded set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and a family $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_m)$ of Lipschitz vector fields on Ω, with $m \le n$, we characterize three classes of local functionals defined on first-order X-Sobolev spaces, which admit an integral representation in terms of X, i.e.

$$F(u, A) = \int_A f(x, u(x), Xu(x))dx,$$

being f a Carathéodory integrand.

INTRODUCTION

The representation of local functionals as integral functionals of the form

$$F(u) = \int_\Omega f(x, u(x), Du(x))\, dx$$

has a very long history and exhibits a natural application when dealing with relaxed functionals and related Γ-limits in a suitable topology. In the Euclidean setting this problem is now very well understood, and we refer the interested reader to the papers [Alb, B, BD1, BD2, BD3] for a complete overview of the subject.

Recently, in [FSSC], the authors started the study of variational functionals driven by a family of Lipschitz vector fields. By a family of Lipschitz vector fields we mean an $m-$tuple $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_m)$, with $m \le n$, where each X_j is a first-order differential operator with Lipschitz coefficients $c_{j,i}$ defined on a bounded open set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, i.e.

$$X_j(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n c_{j,i}(x)\partial_i \quad j = 1, \dots, m.$$

Moreover, according to [MPSC], we assume that the family $\mathbf{X}$ satisfies the structure assumption *(LIC)*, which roughly means that $X_1(x), \dots, X_m(x)$ are linearly independent for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ as vectors of $\mathbb{R}^n$ (cf. Definition 1.1). We stress that this point of view is pretty general and encompasses, among other things, the Euclidean setting and many interesting sub-Riemannian manifolds.

Since [FSSC], the possibility to extend the classical results of the calculus of variations to the setting of variational functionals driven by vector fields has been the object of study of many papers. For example, the homogenization theory has been intensively studied so far in the setting of special sub-Riemannnian manifolds, i.e., Carnot groups (see for instance [BMT, FT, MV]). More recently, in [MPSC, MPSC2] the authors started the investigation of the $\Gamma-$convergence of translations-invariant local functionals $F : L^p(\Omega) \times \mathcal{A} \to [0, \infty]$, being $\mathcal{A}$ the class of all open subsets of Ω. In [MPSC, Theorem 3.12], they found conditions under which F can be represented as

$$F(u, A) = \int_A f(x, Xu(x))\, dx \tag{0.1}$$

for any $A \subseteq \Omega$ open and $u \in L^p(\Omega)$ s.t. $u|_A \in W^{1,p}_{X,loc}(A)$ (cf. Definition 1.2 and [FS]), and for a suitable $f : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^m \to [0, \infty)$. Finally, they applied this characterization to prove a Γ-compactness theorem for integral functionals of the form (0.1), when $1 < p < \infty$. Similar results have been proved in [MV], under stronger conditions on the family $\mathbf{X}$. To conclude, we also point out that functional (0.1) was studied in [FSSC] as far as its relaxation and in connection with the so-called Meyers-Serrin theorem for $W^{1,p}_X(\Omega)$.

Inspired by the results proved in [BD1, BD2], the aim of the present paper is to extend the results achieved in [MPSC] when we drop the assumption of translations-invariance. We find some sufficient and necessary conditions under which a local functional

$$F : W^{1,p}_{X,loc}(\Omega) \times \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow [0, +\infty]$$

admits an integral representation of the form

$$F(u, A) = \int_A f(x, u(x), Xu(x))\, dx \quad \forall\, u \in W^{1,p}_{X,loc}(\Omega),\, \forall\, A \in \mathcal{A}, \tag{0.2}$$

for a suitable Carathéodory function $f : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m \to [0, \infty)$. We point out that in this new framework, due to the lack of translations-invariance, a dependence of the integrand with respect to the function is expected. Let us observe that if F is defined on $L^p_{loc}(\Omega) \times \mathcal{A}$ instead of $W^{1,p}_{X,loc}(\Omega) \times \mathcal{A}$, under reasonable improvements of some assumptions it is easy to extend the integral representation to get

$$F(u, A) = \int_A f(x, u(x), Xu(x))\, dx \quad \forall\, A \in \mathcal{A},\, \forall u \in L^p_{loc}(\Omega) \text{ s.t. } u|_A \in W^{1,p}_{X,loc}(A).$$

The main goal of this paper is to obtain a representation formula as in (0.2) for the following three different classes of functionals:

(i) convex functionals (Section 2, Theorem 2.3);
(ii) $W^{1,\infty}$ weakly*- seq. l.s.c. functionals (Section 3, Theorem 3.3);
(iii) none of the above (Section 4, Theorem 4.4).

Unlike in Sobolev spaces, in this context no analogue of approximation results by a reasonable notion of piecewise X-affine function holds in general (cf. [MPSC, Section 2.3]). To overcome this difficulty we rely on the method employed in [MPSC], consisting of three steps.

1. Apply one of the classical results for Sobolev spaces ([BD1, BD2]) to the functional, obtaining an integral representation w.r.t. a "Euclidean" Lagrangian f_e of the form
$$F(u, A) = \int_A f_e(x, u(x), Du(x))dx \quad \forall u \in W^{1,p}_{loc}(\Omega),\, \forall A \in \mathcal{A}.$$
2. Find sufficient conditions on f_e that guarantee the existence of a "non Euclidean" Lagrangian f such that
$$\int_A f_e(x, u(x), Du(x))dx = \int_A f(x, u(x), Xu(x))dx \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{A},\, \forall u \in C^\infty(A). \tag{0.3}$$
3. Extend the previous equality to the whole space $W^{1,p}_{X,loc}(\Omega)$.

The second step crucially exploits third-argument convexity of the Euclidean Lagrangian f_e. Indeed, convexity of $f_e(x, u, \cdot)$ is sufficient to guarantee (0.3) (cf. Proposition 2.2). This is shown in [MPSC], and the same ideas can be adapted to the cases (i) and (ii) of convex and weakly*- seq. l.s.c. funtionals, for which the convexity of $f_e(x, u, \cdot)$ is granted. On the contrary, due to the weaker assumptions on the functional, case (iii) is more demanding and requires a further step. In Section 4 we show that the convexity of $f_e(x, u, \cdot)$ is not necessary for (0.3). Thus, in order to find a more suitable notion of convexity, we define the weaker concept of *X-convexity* (cf. Definition 4.1), which strongly depends on the chosen family of vector fields. We show that, under a classical growth assumption on the functional, this new condition is equivalent to (0.3) (cf. Proposition 4.2). Finally, by sligthly modifying a zig-zag argument due to Buttazzo and Dal Maso ([BD2, Lemma 2.11]), we show that X-convexity is a consequence of a reasonable lower semicontinuity assumption (cf. Lemma 4.3). This procedure allows to generalize the final case as well. Finally, for each of the previous results we show that our hypotheses are also necessary, in order to give a complete characterization of the classes of functionals studied.

The structure of the paper is the following. In Section 1 we briefly recall some basic facts about vector fields and X-Sobolev spaces. In Section 2 we get an integral representation result for a class of convex functionals. In Section 3 we deal with weakly*- sequentially l.s.c functionals. In Section 4 we drop both the previous requirements, obtaining as well an integral representation result.

1. Vector Fields and X-Sobolev Spaces

1.1. **Notation.** Unless otherwise specified, we let $1 \leq p < +\infty$ and $m, n \in \mathbb{N}\setminus\{0\}$ with $m \leq n$, we denote by Ω an open and bounded subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and by $\mathcal{A}$ the family of all open subsets of Ω. Given two open sets A and B, we write $A \Subset B$ whenever $\overline{A} \subseteq B$. We set $\mathcal{A}_0$ to be the subfamily of $\mathcal{A}$ of all the open subsets A of Ω such that $A \Subset \Omega$. For any $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we denote by $\langle u, v\rangle$ the Euclidean scalar product, and by $|v|$ the induced norm. We denote by $\mathcal{L}^n$ the restriction to Ω of the n-th dimensional Lebesgue measure, and for any set $E \subseteq \Omega$ we write $|E| := \mathcal{L}^n(E)$. Given an integrable function $f : \Omega \longrightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, we write $\int_\Omega f(x)\,dx := \int_\Omega f(x)\,d\mathcal{L}^n(x)$. Given $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $R > 0$ we let $B_R(x) := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x - y| < R\}$, and given an integrable function $f : B_R(x) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we denote its integral average by $⨍_{B_R(x)} f\,dx := \frac{1}{|B_R(x)|}\int_{B_R(x)} f\,dx$. We usually omit the variable of integration when writing an integral: for instance, given two functions $f : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ and $u : \Omega \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $x \mapsto f(x, u(x))$ is integrable over Ω, we write its integral as $\int_\Omega f(x, u)\,dx$ instead of $\int_\Omega f(x, u(x))\,dx$. Finally, for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $u \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we set

$$\varphi_{x,u,\xi}(y) := u + \langle \xi, y - x\rangle. \tag{1.1}$$

1.2. **Basic Definitions and Properties.** We will always identify a first order differential operator $X := \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}$ with the map $X(x) := (c_1(x), \dots, c_n(x)) : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^n$.

Definition 1.1. *Let $m \leq n$. We say that $\boldsymbol{X} := (X_1, \dots, X_m)$ is a* family of Lipschitz vector fields *on Ω if for any $j = 1, \dots, m$ and for any $i = 1, \dots, n$ there exists a function $c_{j,i} \in \mathrm{Lip}(\Omega)$ such that $X_j(x) = (c_{j,1}(x), \dots, c_{j,n}(x))$.*
We will denote by $C(x)$ the $m \times n$ matrix defined as

$$C(x) := [c_{j,i}(x)]_{\substack{i=1,\dots,n\\ j=1,\dots,m}}$$

We say that $\boldsymbol{X}$ satisfies the linear independence condition (LIC) *on Ω if the set*

$$N_X := \{x \in \Omega \,:\, X_1(x), \dots, X_m(x) \text{ are linearly dependent}\}$$

is such that $|N_X| = 0$. In this case we set $\Omega_X := \Omega \setminus N_X$.

Let us point out that (LIC) embraces many relevant families of vector fields studied in literature. In particular neither the *Hörmander condition* for $\mathbf{X}$, that is, each vector field X_j is smooth and the rank of the Lie algebra generated by $X_1, \dots, X_m$ equals n at any point of Ω, nor the (weaker) assumption that the X-gradient induces a *Carnot-Carathéodory metric* in Ω is requested. An exhaustive account of these topics can be found in [BLU].

Definition 1.2. *Let $m \leq n$, $u \in L^1_{loc}(\Omega)$ and $v \in L^1_{loc}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$, and let $\boldsymbol{X}$ be a family of Lipschitz vector fields. We say that v is the X*-gradient *of u if for any $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that*

$$-\int_\Omega u \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}(c_{j,i}\varphi_j)\,dx = \int_\Omega \varphi \cdot v dx.$$

Whenever it exists, the X-gradient is shown to be unique a.e.. In this case we set $Xu := v$. If $p \in [1, +\infty]$ we define the vector spaces

$$W^{1,p}_X(\Omega) := \{u \in L^p(\Omega) \,:\, Xu \in L^p(\Omega)\}$$

and

$$W^{1,p}_{X,loc}(\Omega) := \{u \in L^p_{loc}(\Omega) \,:\, u|_{A'} \in W^{1,p}_X(A'), \quad \forall\, A' \in \mathcal{A}_0\}.$$

*We refer to them as X-*Sobolev spaces*, and to their elements as X-*Sobolev functions*.*

The next proposition can be found in [FS].

Proposition 1.3. *Let $p \in [1, +\infty]$. Then the vector space $W^{1,p}_X(\Omega)$, endowed with the norm*

$$\|u\|_{W^{1,p}_X(\Omega)} := \|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|Xu\|_{L^p(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^m)},$$

is a Banach space. Moreover, if $1 < p < +\infty$ it is a reflexive Banach space.

The following proposition tells us that X-Sobolev spaces are actually a generalization of the classical Sobolev spaces, both because each Sobolev function is in particular an X-Sobolev function, whatever $\mathbf{X}$ we choose, and because, as expected, the choice of the "standard" family of vector fields $\left\{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_n}\right\}$ gives rise to the classical Sobolev spaces.

Proposition 1.4. *The following facts hold:*

(i) *if $n = m$ and $c_{j,i}(x) = \delta_{j,i}$ for every $i, j = 1, \dots, n$, then $W^{1,p}(\Omega) = W^{1,p}_X(\Omega)$;*

(ii) *$W^{1,p}(\Omega) \subseteq W^{1,p}_X(\Omega)$, the inclusion is continuous and*

$$Xu(x) = C(x)Du(x)$$

for every $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and a.e. $x \in \Omega$.

Let us notice that, being Ω bounded, we have that

$$W^{1,\infty}(\Omega) \subseteq W^{1,p}(\Omega) \subseteq W^{1,p}_X(\Omega)$$

for any family $\mathbf{X}$ of Lipschitz vector fields. The following proposition tells us that the weak convergence in $W^{1,p}_X$ is weaker than the weak*- convergence in $W^{1,\infty}$.

Proposition 1.5. *Let $\boldsymbol{X}$ be a family of Lipschitz vector fields. Then, for any sequence $(u_h)_h \subseteq W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ and any $u \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$, it follows that*

$$u_h \rightharpoonup^* u \text{ in } W^{1,\infty}(\Omega) \quad \Longrightarrow \quad u_h \rightharpoonup u \text{ in } W^{1,p}_X(\Omega).$$

Proof. Follows easily from [Br, Theorem 3.10]. □

1.3. **Approximation by Regular Functions.** When dealing with representation theorems for local functionals defined on classical Sobolev spaces, a typical strategy is to exploit classical differentiation theorems for measures to get an integral representation of the form

$$F(u, A) = \int_A f_e(x, u, Du)dx$$

for classes of "simple" functions, that is for instance linear or affine functions. Then one can combine some semicontinuity properties of the functional together with approximation results by means of piecewise affine functions (see for instance [ET, Chapter X, Proposition 2.9]), in order to extend the integral representation to all Sobolev functions. In this context, one of the main difficulties is that an analogue of [ET, Chapter X, Proposition 2.9]) does not hold. We mean that, if we call X-affine a C^∞ function such that Xu is constant, then there are choices of $\mathbf{X}$ for which not all X-Sobolev functions can be approximated in $W^{1,p}_X$ by piecewiese X-affine functions [MPSC, Section 2.3]. So, as shown in Section 2, we have to adopt a different strategy. Anyway we present some useful Meyers-Serrin type results that are still true even in this non Euclidean framework and that allow us to approximate X-Sobolev functions with smooth functions. For the following fundamental theorem we refer to [FSSC2, Theorem 1.2].

Theorem 1.6. *Let Ω be an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$. For any $u \in W^{1,p}_X(\Omega)$ there exists a sequence $u_\epsilon \in W^{1,p}_X(\Omega) \cap C^\infty(\Omega)$ such that*

$$u_\epsilon \to u \text{ in } W^{1,p}_X(\Omega) \text{ as } \epsilon \to 0.$$

Proposition 1.7. *Given $u \in W^{1,p}_{X,loc}(\Omega)$ and $A' \Subset \Omega$, then there exists a function $v \in W^{1,p}_X(\Omega)$ which coincides with u on A'.*

Proof. Let φ be a smooth cut-off function between A' and Ω. It is straightforward to verify that the function $v(x) := \varphi(x)u(x)$ satisfies the desired requirements. $\square$

The previous proposition, together with Theorem 1.6, allows to prove the following result.

Proposition 1.8. *Take a function $u \in W^{1,p}_{X,loc}(\Omega)$ and an open set $A' \Subset \Omega$. Then there exists a sequence $(u_\epsilon)_\epsilon \subseteq W^{1,p}_X(\Omega)$ such that*

$$u_\epsilon|_{A'} \in W^{1,p}_X(A') \cap C^\infty(A') \text{ and } u_\epsilon|_{A'} \longrightarrow u|_{A'} \text{ in } W^{1,p}_X(A').$$

Proof. Let us fix $u \in W^{1,p}_{X,loc}(\Omega)$ and $A' \in \mathcal{A}_0$. By Proposition 1.7 we can find a function $\tilde{u} \in W^{1,p}_X(\Omega)$ such that $u|_{A'} = \tilde{u}|_{A'}$, and by Theorem 1.6 there exists a sequence $(u_\epsilon)_\epsilon \subseteq W^{1,p}_X(\Omega) \cap C^\infty(\Omega)$ converging to $\tilde{u}$ in $W^{1,p}_X(\Omega)$. It is easy to see that $(u_{\varepsilon|A'})_\epsilon \subseteq W^{1,p}_X(A') \cap C^\infty(A')$; moreover, since $u|_{A'} = \tilde{u}|_{A'}$, we conclude that $u_\epsilon|_{A'} \longrightarrow u|_{A'}$ in $W^{1,p}_X(A')$. $\square$

1.4. **Failure of a Lusin-Type Theorem.** When dealing with integral representation in classical Sobolev spaces one might exploit the following Lusin-type result (cf. [CZ, Theorem 13]):

Proposition 1.9. *Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be open and bounded, $1 \le p \le +\infty$ and $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$. Then, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $A_\epsilon \in \mathcal{A}$ and $v \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ such that $|A_\epsilon| \le \epsilon$ and $u|_{\Omega \setminus A_\epsilon} = v|_{\Omega \setminus A_\epsilon}$.*

Under reasonable assumptions (cf. [BD2, Lemma 2.7]) this result allows to extend an integral representation result from $C^1(\overline{\Omega}) \times \mathcal{A}$ to $W^{1,p}(\Omega) \times \mathcal{A}$. The following counterexample shows that an analogue of Proposition 1.9 does not hold in a general X-Sobolev space.

Counterexample. In this example we speak about *approximate differentiability* and *approximate partial derivatives* according to [Fe, Section 3.1.2]. Let us take $n = 2$, $m = 1$, $\Omega = (0,1) \times (0,1)$ and $\mathbf{X} = X_1 = \frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ (which satisfies the (LIC)). Let us consider a function $w : (0,1) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which is bounded, continuous but which is not approximately differentiable for a.e. $x \in (0,1)$ (see for instance [Sa, p. 297]), and define the function $u : \Omega \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$u(x,y) := w(y).$$

We have that $u \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and it is constant w.r.t. x. Thus, for any $\varphi \in C^\infty_c(\Omega)$, we have that

$$-\int_\Omega u \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x} dx = -\int_0^1 dy\, w(y) \int_0^1 dx\, \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x} = 0,$$

and so $Xu = 0$. Hence $u \in W^{1,\infty}_X(\Omega)$ and in particular we have that $u \in W^{1,p}_X(\Omega)$ for any $p \in [1, +\infty]$. If it was the case that u satisfies the desired property, then we would have that, for a.e. (x,y) in Ω, u is approximately differentiable at (x,y) (see [LT, Theorem 1]). Thus, according to [Sa, Theorem 12.2] and to the fact that u is constant w.r.t. x, we would have that for any $x \in (0,1)$ and for a.e. $y \in (0,1)$, the function $z \mapsto u(x,z) = w(z)$ is approximately differentiable at y, but this last assertion is in contradiction with our choice of w.

1.5. **Algebraic Properties of X.** Here we present some algebraic properties of the coefficient matrix $C : \Omega \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$. The following results have been achieved in [MPSC, Section 3.2].

Definition 1.10. *Let* $\boldsymbol{X}$ *be a family of Lipschitz vector fields. For any* $x \in \Omega$ *we define the linear map* $L_x : \mathbb{R}^n \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ *as*

$$L_x(v) := C(x)v \text{ if } v \in \mathbb{R}^n$$

and

$$N_x := \ker(L_x), \quad V_x := \{C(x)^T z \ : \ z \in \mathbb{R}^m\}.$$

From standard linear algebra we know that $\mathbb{R}^n = N_x \oplus V_x$*, and so, for any* $x \in \Omega$ *and* $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$*, there is a unique choice of* $\xi_{N_x} \in N_x$ *and* $\xi_{V_x} \in V_x$ *such that*

$$\xi = \xi_{N_x} + \xi_{V_x}.$$

Finally we define $\Pi_x : \mathbb{R}^n \to V_x \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ *as the projection* $\Pi_x(\xi) := \xi_{V_x}$.

These definitions make sense for a generic family of Lipschitz vector fields, but the following two propositions list some very useful invertibility and continuity properties that are typical of those families of vector fields satisfying the (LIC).

Proposition 1.11. *Let* $\boldsymbol{X}$ *be a family of Lipschitz vector fields satisfying the (LIC) on* Ω*. Then the following facts hold:*

(i) $\dim V_x = m$ *for each* $x \in \Omega_X$ *and* $L_x(V_x) = \mathbb{R}^m$.
In particular $L_x : V_x \to \mathbb{R}^m$ *is an isomorphism.*

(ii) *Let*

$$B(x) := C(x)\, C^T(x) \quad x \in \Omega\,.$$

Then, for each $x \in \Omega_X$*,* $B(x)$ *is a symmetric invertible matrix of order* m*. Moreover the map* $B^{-1} : \Omega_X \to \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R}^m)$*, defined as*

$$B^{-1}(x)(z) := B(x)^{-1}z \quad \text{if } z \in \mathbb{R}^m\,,$$

is continuous.

(iii) *For each* $x \in \Omega_X$*, the projection* Π_x *can be represented as*

$$\Pi_x(\xi) = \xi_{V_x} = C(x)^T B(x)^{-1} C(x)\,\xi, \quad \forall\, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n\,.$$

Remark. It is easy to see that $N_X = \{x \in \Omega \ : \ \det B(x) = 0\}$. Hence N_X is closed in Ω.

Proposition 1.12. *Let* $\boldsymbol{X}$ *be a family of Lipschitz vector fields satisfying the (LIC) on* Ω*. Then the map* $L_x : V_x \to \mathbb{R}^m$ *is invertible and the map* $L^{-1} : \Omega_X \to \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R}^n)$ *defined as*

$$L^{-1}(x) := L_x^{-1} \text{ if } x \in \Omega_X$$

belongs to $\mathbf{C}^0(\Omega_X, \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R}^n))$.

1.6. **Local Functionals.** We conclude this section by giving some definitions about increasing set functions, for which we refer to [Dal, Chapter 14], and local functionals defined on $W^{1,p}_X$. From now on we assume that $\mathbf{X}$ is a family of Lipschitz vector fields satisfying the (LIC) on Ω.

Definition 1.13. *We say that* $\omega : \Omega \times [0, +\infty) \longrightarrow [0, +\infty)$ *is a* locally integrable modulus of continuity *if and only if*

$$r \mapsto \omega(x, r) \text{ is increasing, continuous and } \omega(x, 0) = 0 \text{ for a.e. } x \in \Omega$$

and

$$x \mapsto \omega(x, r) \in L^1_{loc}(\Omega) \quad \forall r \geq 0.$$

Definition 1.14. *Let us consider a functional* $F : \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow [0, +\infty]$*, where* $\mathcal{F}$ *is a functional space such that* $C^1(\overline{\Omega}) \subseteq \mathcal{F}$*. We say that:*

(i) *F satisfies the* strong condition (ω) *if there exists a sequence $(\omega_k)_k$ of locally integrable moduli of continuity such that*

$$|F(v, A') - F(u, A')| \leq \int_{A'} \omega_k(x, r)\, dx \tag{1.2}$$

for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $A' \in \mathcal{A}_0$, $r \in [0, \infty)$, $u, v \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &|u(x)|, |v(x)|, |Du(x)|, |Dv(x)| \leq k \\ &|u(x) - v(x)|, |Du(x) - Dv(x)| \leq r; \end{aligned}$$

for all $x \in A'$.

(ii) *F satisfies the* weak condition (ω) *if there exists a sequence $(\omega_k)_k$ of locally integrable moduli of continuity such that*

$$|F(u + s, A') - F(u, A')| \leq \int_{A'} \omega_k(x, |s|) dx$$

for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $A' \in \mathcal{A}_0$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $u \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ such that

$$|u(x)|, |u(x) + s|, |s| \leq k \quad \forall x \in A'.$$

Definition 1.15. *Let $\alpha : \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow [0, +\infty]$ be a function. We say that α is*

(i) increasing *if it holds that $\alpha(A) \leq \alpha(B)$ for any $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$ s.t. $A \subseteq B$;*
(ii) inner regular *if it is increasing and $\alpha(A) = \sup\{\alpha(A') : A' \Subset A\}$ for any $A \in \mathcal{A}$;*
(iii) subadditive *if it is increasing and, for any $A, B, C \in \mathcal{A}$ with $A \subseteq B \cup C$,*

$$\alpha(A) \leq \alpha(B) + \alpha(C);$$

(iv) superadditive *if it is increasing and, for any $A, B, C \in \mathcal{A}$ with $A \cap B = \emptyset$ and $A \cup B \subseteq C$,*

$$\alpha(C) \geq \alpha(A) + \alpha(B);$$

(v) *a* measure *if it is increasing and the restriction to $\mathcal{A}$ of a non-negative Borel measure.*

Definition 1.16. *Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open and bounded set, let $1 \leq p < +\infty$ and Let $\boldsymbol{X}$ be a family of Lipschitz vector fields and consider a functional*

$$F : W^{1,p}_{X,loc}(\Omega) \times \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow [0, +\infty].$$

We say that F is:

(i) *a* measure *if, for any $u \in W^{1,p}_{X,loc}(\Omega)$, $F(u, \cdot) : \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow [0, +\infty]$ is a measure;*
(ii) local *if, for any $A' \in \mathcal{A}_0$ and $u, v \in W^{1,p}_{X,loc}(\Omega)$, then*

$$u|_{A'} = v|_{A'} \implies F(u, A') = F(v, A');$$

Let's take now a vector subspace $\mathcal{G}$ of $W^{1,p}_X(\Omega)$.

(iii) convex *if, for any $A' \in \mathcal{A}_0$, the function $F(\cdot, A') : W^{1,p}_X(\Omega) \longrightarrow [0, +\infty]$ is convex;*
(iv) p-bounded *if there exist $a \in L^1_{loc}(\Omega)$ and $b, c > 0$ such that, for any $A' \in \mathcal{A}_0$ and for any $u \in W^{1,p}_X(\Omega)$, it holds that*

$$F(u, A') \leq \int_{A'} a(x) + b|Xu|^p + c|u|^p dx;$$

We say that F is lower semicontinuous *if for any $A' \in \mathcal{A}_0$, $(u_h)_h \subseteq W^{1,p}_X(\Omega)$ and $u \in W^{1,p}_X(\Omega)$ it holds that*

$$u_h \to u \text{ in } W^{1,p}_X(\Omega) \quad \implies \quad F(u, A') \leq \liminf_{h \to +\infty} F(u_h, A');$$

(*v*) lower semicontinuous *(resp.* weakly sequentially lower semicontinuous*) if, for any* $A' \in \mathcal{A}_0$, $F(\cdot, A') : W^{1,p}_X(\Omega) \longrightarrow [0, +\infty]$ *is sequentially l.s.c. w.r.t. the strong (resp. weak) topology of* $W^{1,p}_X(\Omega)$*; We say that* F *is* weakly sequentially lower semicontinuous *if for any* $A' \in \mathcal{A}_0$, $(u_h)_h \subseteq W^{1,p}_X(\Omega)$ *and* $u \in W^{1,p}_X(\Omega)$ *it holds that*

$$u_h \rightharpoonup u \text{ in } W^{1,p}_X(\Omega) \quad \Longrightarrow \quad F(u, A') \leq \liminf_{h \to +\infty} F(u_h, A');$$

(*vi*) weakly*- sequentially lower semicontinuous *if, for any* $A' \in \mathcal{A}_0$, $F(\cdot, A') : W^{1,\infty}(\Omega) \longrightarrow [0, +\infty]$ *is sequentially l.s.c. w.r.t. the weak*- topology of* $W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$. *We say that* F *is* weakly*- sequentially lower semicontinuous *if for any* $A' \in \mathcal{A}_0$, $(u_h)_h \subseteq W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ *and* $u \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ *it holds that*

$$u_h \rightharpoonup^* u \text{ in } W^{1,\infty}(\Omega) \quad \Longrightarrow \quad F(u, A') \leq \liminf_{h \to +\infty} F(u_h, A').$$

2. Integral Representation of convex functionals

In this section we completely characterize a class of convex local functionals defined on $W^{1,p}_X$. As announced, we exploit [BD1, Lemma 4.1] to get an integral representation of the form

$$F(u, A) = \int_A f_e(x, u, Du)dx \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{A}, \, \forall u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega).$$

Then the forthcoming Propositions 2.1 and 2.2 guarantee the existence of a non Euclidean Lagrangian f such that

$$\int_A f(x, u, Xu)dx = \int_A f_e(x, u, Du)dx \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{A}, \, \forall u \in C^\infty(A).$$

Finally, we extend the integral representation to the whole $W^{1,p}_{X,loc}(\Omega)$.

The following propositions, which are almost totally inspired by [MPSC, Theorem 3.5] and [MPSC, Lemma 3.13], allow us to pass from an Euclidean to a non Euclidean integral representation.

Proposition 2.1. *Let* $f_e : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \to [0, \infty]$ *be a Carathéodory function. Define* $f : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m \to [0, \infty]$ *as*

$$f(x, u, \eta) := \begin{cases} f_e(x, u, L^{-1}(x)(\eta)) & \text{if } (x, u, \eta) \in \Omega_X \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

Then the following facts hold:

(*i*) f *is a Carathéodory function;*
(*ii*) *if* $f_e(x, \cdot, \cdot)$ *is convex for a.e.* $x \in \Omega$, *then* $f(x, \cdot, \cdot)$ *is convex for a.e.* $x \in \Omega$*;*
(*iii*) *if* $f_e(x, u, \cdot)$ *is convex for a.e.* $x \in \Omega$ *and for any* $u \in \mathbb{R}$, *then* $f(x, u, \cdot)$ *is convex for a.e.* $x \in \Omega$ *and for any* $u \in \mathbb{R}$*;*
(*iv*) *If we assume that*

$$f_e(x, u, \xi) = f_e(x, u, \Pi_x(\xi)) \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega, \; \forall (u, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n, \tag{2.2}$$

then it follows that

$$\int_A f_e(x, u, Du)\, dx = \int_A f(x, u, Xu)\, dx \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{A}, \, \forall u \in C^\infty(A). \tag{2.3}$$

Proof. (*i*) First we want to show that, for any $(u, \eta) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m$, the function $x \mapsto f(x, u, \eta)$ is measurable. Let us fix then $(u, \eta) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m$, define the function $\Phi : \Omega_X \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ as $\Phi(x) := (u, L^{-1}(x)(\eta))$ and extend it to be zero on $\Omega \setminus \Omega_X$. By Proposition 1.12, $\Phi|_{\Omega_X}$ is continuous, and so in particular Φ is measurable. Noticing that

$$f(x, u, \eta) = f_e(x, \Phi(x)) \quad \forall x \in \Omega_X,$$

being f_e a Carathéodory function and recalling [Dac, Proposition 3.7] we conclude that $x \mapsto f(x,u,\eta)$ is measurable. Let us define now the function $\Psi : \Omega_X \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m \longrightarrow \Omega_X \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ as $\Psi(x,u,\eta) := (x,u,L^{-1}(x)(\eta))$. Since on Ω_X we have that $f = f_e \circ \Psi$, then, for any fixed $x \in \Omega_X$ such that $f_e(x,\cdot,\cdot)$ is continuous, $f(x,\cdot,\cdot)$ is the composition of a continuous function and a linear function, and so it is continuous.
(ii) If $x \in \Omega_X$ is such that $f_e(x,\cdot,\cdot)$ is convex, then $f = f_e \circ \Psi$ is the composition of a convex function and a linear function, and so it is convex.
(iii) Follows as *(ii)*.
(iv) Assume that (2.2) holds. Let us fix $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and $u \in C^\infty(A)$. From the regularity of u we have that $Xu(x) = C(x)Du(x)$. By Proposition 1.11 we get

$$\begin{aligned} L_x(\Pi_x(Du)) &= L_x(C(x)^T B(x)^{-1} C(x) Du) = C(x)C(x)^T B(x)^{-1} C(x) Du \\ &= B(x)B(x)^{-1}C(x)Du = C(x)Du = L_x(Du), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} f(x,u,Xu) &= f(x,u,C(x)Du) = f(x,u,L_x(Du)) = f(x,u,L_x(\Pi_x(Du))) \\ &= f_e(x,u,L_x^{-1}(L_x(\Pi_x(Du)))) = f_e(x,u,\Pi_x(Du)) = f_e(x,u,Du). \end{aligned}$$

Now (2.3) follows by integrating over A.

□

In the following result we provide some sufficient conditions to guarantee (2.2).

Proposition 2.2. *Let $f_e : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \longrightarrow [0,+\infty]$ be a Carathéodory function such that*

(i) $f_e(x,u,\cdot)$ is convex for a.e $x \in \Omega$, for any $u \in \mathbb{R}$;
(ii) there exist $a \in L^1_{loc}(\Omega)$ and $b,c > 0$ such that

$$f_e(x,u,\xi) \le a(x) + b|C(x)\xi|^p + c|u|^p \tag{2.4}$$

for a.e. $x \in \Omega$, for any $(u,\xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$.

Then f_e satisfies (2.2).

Proof. Follows with some trivial modifications as in [MPSC, Lemma 3.13]. □

Let us now state and prove the main result of this section.

Theorem 2.3. *Let $F : W^{1,p}_{X,loc}(\Omega) \times \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow [0,+\infty]$ be such that:*

(i) *F is a measure;*
(ii) *F is local;*
(iii) *F is convex;*
(iv) *F is p-bounded.*

Then there exists a Carathéodory function $f : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m \longrightarrow [0,+\infty)$ such that

$$(u,\xi) \mapsto f(x,u,\xi) \text{ is convex for a.e. } x \in \Omega, \tag{2.5}$$

$$f(x,u,\xi) \le a(x) + b|\xi|^p + c|u|^p \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega,\ \forall (u,\xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m \tag{2.6}$$

and the following representation formula holds:

$$F(u,A) = \int_A f(x,u,Xu)dx \quad \forall u \in W^{1,p}_{X,loc}(\Omega),\ \forall A \in \mathcal{A}. \tag{2.7}$$

Moreover, if $f_1, f_2 : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m \longrightarrow [0,+\infty)$ are two Carathéodory functions satisfying (2.5), (2.6) *and* (2.7), *then there exists $\tilde{\Omega} \subseteq \Omega$ such that $|\tilde{\Omega}| = |\Omega|$ and*

$$f_1(x,u,\xi) = f_2(x,u,\xi) \quad \forall x \in \tilde{\Omega},\ \forall (u,\xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m. \tag{2.8}$$

Proof. **First Step.** Let

$$C := \max\{\sup\{|c_{j,i}(x)| \,:\, x \in \Omega\} \,:\, i = 1, \dots, n,\ j = 1, \dots, m\}.$$

Then from our assumptions on $\mathbf{X}$ it follows that $0 < C < +\infty$. Let $\tilde b := C^p b$. Using (iv) and recalling that for all $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ we have that $Xu(x) = C(x)Du(x)$ it follows that

$$F(u, A') \le \int_{A'} a(x) + c|u|^p + \tilde b |Du|^p dx \quad \forall A' \in \mathcal{A}_0,\, \forall u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega). \tag{2.9}$$

Thus we can apply [BD1, Lemma 4.1] to get a Carathéodory function $f_e : \Omega\times\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^n \longrightarrow [0, +\infty]$ such that

$$F(u, A) = \int_A f_e(x, u, Du)dx \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{A},\, \forall u \in W^{1,p}_{loc}(\Omega), \tag{2.10}$$

$$f_e(x, u, \xi) \le a(x) + \tilde b|\xi|^p + c|u|^p \quad \text{ for a.e. } x \in \Omega,\, \forall (u, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \tag{2.11}$$

and

$$f_e(x, \cdot, \cdot) : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \to [0, \infty] \text{ is convex for a.e. } x \in \Omega. \tag{2.12}$$

Second Step. We want to prove that f_e satisfies (2.2). By Proposition 2.2 and (2.12) we only need to prove (2.4). Let us take then $\Omega' \subseteq \Omega$ such that $|\Omega'| = |\Omega|$ and

$$(u, \xi) \mapsto f_e(x, u, \xi) \text{ is convex and finite } \forall x \in \Omega', \tag{2.13}$$

and fix $x \in \Omega'$, $u \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{Q}^n$. By (2.10), for any $R > 0$ small enough to ensure that $B_R(x) \Subset \Omega$, we have that

$$F(\varphi_{x,u,\xi}, B_R(x)) = \int_{B_R(x)} f_e(y, u + \langle \xi, y - x\rangle, \xi)\, dy$$

and from (iv) we have that

$$F(\varphi_{x,u,\xi}, B_R(x)) \le \int_{B_R(x)} a(y) + c|u + \langle \xi, y - x\rangle|^p + b|C(y)\xi|^p\, dy,$$

where $\varphi_{x,u,\xi}$ is as in (1.1). Combining these two facts and dividing by $|B_R(x)|$ we obtain that

$$\fint_{B_R(x)} f_e(y, u + \langle \xi, x - y\rangle, \xi)dy \le \fint_{B_R(x)} a(y) + c|u + \langle \xi, y - x\rangle|^p + b|C(y)\xi|^p dy. \tag{2.14}$$

Since the right integrand is in $L^1_{loc}(\Omega)$, and (2.14) holds indeed for all $A' \in \mathcal{A}_0$, the left one is in $L^1_{loc}(\Omega)$ as well. Therefore, thanks to Lebesgue Theorem we can find $\Omega_{u,\xi} \subseteq \Omega'$ such that $|\Omega_{u,\xi}| = |\Omega|$ and

$$f_e(x, u, \xi) \le a(x) + c|u|^p + b|C(x)\xi|^p \quad \forall x \in \Omega_{u,\xi}.$$

Setting $\tilde\Omega := \bigcap_{(u,\xi)\in\mathbb{Q}\times\mathbb{Q}^n} \Omega_{u,\xi}$, it holds that $|\tilde\Omega| = |\Omega|$ and

$$f_e(x, u, \xi) \le a(x) + c|u|^p + b|C(x)\xi|^p \quad \forall x \in \tilde\Omega,\, \forall (u, \xi) \in \mathbb{Q} \times \mathbb{Q}^n.$$

Since the map $(u, \xi) \mapsto f_e(x, u, \xi)$ is continuous for any $x \in \tilde\Omega$ and $\mathbb{Q} \times \mathbb{Q}^n$ is dense in $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ then (2.4) holds and the conclusion follows.

Third Step. Thanks to the previous step we can apply (iv) of Proposition 2.1. Hence we get

$$\int_A f_e(x, u, Du)dx = \int_A f(x, u, Xu)dx \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{A},\, u \in C^\infty(A), \tag{2.15}$$

where $f : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m \longrightarrow [0, +\infty]$ is the function defined in (2.1). First of all we can assume that f is finite up to modifying it on a set of measure zero. Moreover, thanks to (2.12) and (ii) of Proposition 2.1 we have that f satisfies (2.5). Now we want to prove that f satisfies (2.6). Let us fix $x \in \Omega$, $u \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{Q}^n$: by (iv), (2.10) and (2.15) we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B_R(x)} f(y, \varphi_{x,u,\xi}, X\varphi_{x,u,\xi})\, dy &\le \int_{B_R(x)} a(y) + c|\varphi_{x,u,\xi}|^p + b|X\varphi_{x,u,\xi}|^p dy \\ &= \int_{B_R(x)} a(y) + c|u + \langle \xi, y - x\rangle|^p + b|C(y)\xi|^p\, dy,\end{aligned}$$

and so, dividing by $|B_R(x)|$, we get that

$$\fint_{B_R(x)} f(y, u + \langle \xi, y - x\rangle, C(y)\xi)dy \le \fint_{B_R(x)} a(y) + c|u + \langle \xi, y - x\rangle|^p + b|C(y)\xi|^p dy.$$

Arguing as in the second step we can conclude that

$$f(x, u, C(x)\xi) \le a(x) + b|C(x)\xi|^p + c|u|^p \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega,\ \forall (u, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Finally, recalling that for $x \in \Omega_X$ the map $L_x : V_x \to \mathbb{R}^m$ is surjective, (2.6) follows.

Fourth Step. Here we want to prove that (2.7) holds. Let us fix $u \in W^{1,p}_X(\Omega)$ and $A' \in \mathcal{A}_0$, and consider the two functionals

$$F_{A'}, G_{A'} : (\{v|_{A'} \,:\, v \in W^{1,p}_X(\Omega)\}, \|\cdot\|_{W^{1,p}_X(A')}) \longrightarrow [0, +\infty]$$

defined as $F_{A'}(v|_{A'}) := F(v, A')$ and $G_{A'}(v|_{A'}) := \int_{A'} f(x, v, Xv)dx$ respectively. Thanks to (iii), (iv), (2.5) and (2.6), they are convex and bounded on bounded sets on $\{v|_{A'} \,:\, v \in W^{1,p}_X(\Omega)\}$. Hence, they are continuous (cf. [ET, Lemma 2.1]). Moreover, from Proposition 1.8 we can find a sequence $(u_\epsilon)_\epsilon \subseteq W^{1,p}_X(\Omega)$ such that

$$(u_\epsilon|_{A'})_\epsilon \subseteq W^{1,p}_X(A') \cap C^\infty(A') \text{ and } u_\epsilon|_{A'} \longrightarrow u|_{A'} \text{ in } W^{1,p}_X(A').$$

From (2.10) and (2.15) we get that

$$\begin{aligned} F(u, A') &= \lim_{\epsilon\to 0} F(u_\epsilon, A') = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \int_{A'} f_e(x, u_\epsilon, Du_\epsilon) \\ &= \lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \int_{A'} f(x, u_\epsilon, Xu_\epsilon) = \int_{A'} f(x, u, Xu)dx, \end{aligned}$$

and so we assert that

$$F(u, A') = \int_A f(x, u, Xu)dx \quad \forall u \in W^{1,p}_X(\Omega),\ \forall A' \in \mathcal{A}_0. \tag{2.16}$$

Let us take now $u \in W^{1,p}_{X,loc}(\Omega)$, $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and $A' \Subset A$, and, thanks to Proposition 1.7, take a function $v \in W^{1,p}_X(\Omega)$ such that $u|_{A'} = v|_{A'}$. Thus, from hypothesis (ii) and from (2.16), we have that

$$F(u, A') = F(v, A') = \int_{A'} f(x, v, Xv)dx = \int_{A'} f(x, u, Xu)dx. \tag{2.17}$$

Since by hypothesis the function $B \mapsto F(u, B)$ is inner regular (cf. [Dal, Theorem 14.23]), and noticing that the function $B \mapsto \int_B f(x, u, Xu)dx$ is inner regular, thanks to (2.17) we have that

$$\begin{aligned} F(u, A) &= \sup\{F(u, A') \,:\, A' \Subset A\} \\ &= \sup\left\{\int_{A'} f(x, u, Xu)dx \,:\, A' \Subset A\right\} = \int_A f(x, u, Xu)dx, \end{aligned}$$

and so we can conclude that (2.7) holds.

Fifth Step. Let us show the uniqueness of the Lagrangian. Fix then $x \in \Omega$, $u \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{Q}^n$: since (2.7) holds both for f_1 and f_2, for any $R > 0$ small enough we have that

$$\fint_{B_R(x)} f_1(y, u + \langle \xi, y - x\rangle, C(y)\xi)dy = \fint_{B_R(x)} f_2(y, u + \langle \xi, y - x\rangle, C(y)\xi)dy$$

Since both integrand functions satisfy (2.6), then they are both in $L^1_{loc}(\Omega)$. Again, thanks to Lebesgue theorem, there exists $\Omega_{u,\xi} \subseteq \Omega$ such that $|\Omega_{u,\xi}| = |\Omega|$ and

$$f_1(x, u, C(x)\xi) = f_2(x, u, C(x)\xi) \quad \forall x \in \Omega_{u,\xi}.$$

If we set

$$\tilde{\Omega} := \bigcap_{(u,\xi)\in\mathbb{Q}\times\mathbb{Q}^n} \Omega_{u,\xi} \cap \{x \in \Omega \,:\, (2.5) \text{ and } (2.6) \text{ hold for } f_1 \text{ and } f_2\} \cap \Omega_X,$$

clearly we have $|\tilde{\Omega}| = |\Omega|$ and it holds that

$$f_1(x, u, C(x)\xi) = f_2(x, u, C(x)\xi) \quad \forall x \in \tilde{\Omega},\ \forall (u, \xi) \in \mathbb{Q} \times \mathbb{Q}^n. \tag{2.18}$$

Since $(u, \xi) \mapsto f_1(x, u, \xi)$ and $(u, \xi) \mapsto f_2(x, u, \xi)$ are continuous for any $x \in \tilde{\Omega}$, and recalling again that for any $x \in \Omega_X$ L_x is surjective, then (2.8) follows. □

The following theorem tells us that all the hypotheses of Theorem 2.3 are also necessary.

Theorem 2.4. *Let $f : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m \longrightarrow [0, +\infty)$ be a Carathéodory function such that*

$$(u, \xi) \mapsto f(x, u, \xi) \text{ is convex for a.e. } x \in \Omega, \tag{2.19}$$

$$f(x, u, \xi) \le a(x) + b|\xi|^p + c|u|^p \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega,\ \forall (u, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m \tag{2.20}$$

for some $b, c > 0$ and $a \in L^1_{loc}(\Omega)$. If we set the functional $F : W^{1,p}_{X,loc}(\Omega) \times \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow [0, +\infty]$ as

$$F(u, A) := \int_A f(x, u, Xu)dx \quad \forall u \in W^{1,p}_{X,loc}(\Omega),\ \forall A \in \mathcal{A},$$

then F satisfies hypotheses $(i) - (iv)$ of Theorem 2.3.

Proof. Let us fix $u \in W^{1,p}_{X,loc}(\Omega)$: our aim is to prove that $\alpha(A) := F(u, A)$ is a measure. Notice that, being $f \ge 0$, α is increasing, and of course $\alpha(\emptyset) = 0$. Then, according to [Dal, Theorem 14.23], it suffices to show that α is subadditive, superadditive and inner regular. The first two properties are trivial, so let us focus on the third one. Let us fix $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and define the sequence of sets $(A_h)_h$ as $A_h := \{x \in A : \operatorname{dist}(x, \partial A) > \frac{1}{h}\}$. We have that $(A_h)_h \subseteq \mathcal{A}_0$, $A_h \Subset A_{h+1} \Subset A$ and $\bigcup_{h \in \mathbb{N}_+} A_h = A$. Thus by the Monotone Convergence Theorem we conclude that

$$\int_A f(x, u, Xu)dx = \int_A \lim_{h \to +\infty} \chi_{A_h} f(x, u, Xu)dx = \lim_{h \to +\infty} \int_{A_h} f(x, u, Xu)dx,$$

and so α is a measure. Property (ii) is straightforward, noticing that the X-gradients of two a.e. equal functions coincide a.e. Finally, (iii) and (iv) follow from (2.19) and (2.20). □

3. Integral Representation of Weakly*- Sequentially Lower Semicontinuous Functionals

In this section we characterize a class of local functionals defined on $W^{1,p}_X$ for which we do not require neither translations-invariance nor convexity, but which are weakly*- sequentially lower semicontinuous in $W^{1,\infty}$. It is well known (cf. [AF]) that, for an integral functional of the form

$$F(u, A) := \int_A f_e(x, u, Du)dx,$$

the weak*- lower semicontinuity is equivalent to the convexity in the third entry of f_e. Therefore we can adopt the same strategy employed in the previous section, exploiting [BD2, Theorem 1.10] to get an Euclidean integral representation of the form

$$F(u, A) = \int_A f_e(x, u, Du)dx \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{A},\ , \forall u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega).$$

Again, Propositions 2.1 and 2.2 guarantee the existence of a non Euclidean Lagrangian f such that

$$\int_A f(x, u, Xu)dx = \int_A f_e(x, u, Du)dx \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{A},\ , \forall u \in C^\infty(A).$$

We start by proving an useful continuity result in $W^{1,p}_X$, whose classical version is usually known as *Carathéodory continuity theorem.*

Theorem 3.1. *Let $f : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m \longrightarrow [0, +\infty]$ be a Carathéodory function such that there exist $a \in L^1_{loc}(\Omega)$ and $b, c > 0$ such that*

$$f(x, u, \xi) \leq a(x) + b|\xi|^p + c|u|^p \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega,\ \forall (u, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m. \tag{3.1}$$

Then it holds that, for any $A' \in \mathcal{A}_0$, the functional

$$F : W^{1,p}_X(A') \longrightarrow [0, +\infty)$$

defined as

$$F(u) := \int_{A'} f(x, u, Xu)dx$$

is continuous w.r.t. the strong topology of $W^{1,p}_X(A')$.

Proof. **First Step.** Let us prove that F is lower semicontinuous. Fix $u \in W^{1,p}_X(A')$ and take a sequence $(u_h)_h \subseteq W^{1,p}_X(A')$ converging to u and such that

$$\exists \lim_{h\to+\infty} F(u_h) < +\infty.$$

Up to a subsequence we can assume that $(u_h(x))_h$ converges to $u(x)$ and $(Xu_h(x))_h$ converges to $Xu(x)$ for a.e. $x \in A'$. Being f Carathéodory, it follows that $\lim_{h\to\infty} f(x, u_h(x), Xu_h(x)) = f(x, u(x), Xu(x))$ for a.e. $x \in \Omega$. Thanks to Fatou's Lemma we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} F(u) = \int_{A'} f(x, u, Xu)dx &= \int_{A'} \liminf_{h\to+\infty} f(x, u_h, Xu_h) \\ &\leq \liminf_{h\to+\infty} \int_{A'} f(x, u_h, Xu_h) = \lim_{h\to+\infty} F(u_h). \end{aligned}$$

Second Step. Here we want to prove that F is upper semicontinuous. Again, fix $u \in W^{1,p}_X(A')$ and take a sequence $(u_h)_h \subseteq W^{1,p}_X(A')$ converging to u and such that

$$\exists \lim_{h\to+\infty} F(u_h) > -\infty.$$

Up to a subsequence, we can assume that $(u_h(x))_h$ converges to $u(x)$ and $(Xu_h(x))_h$ converges to $Xu(x)$ for almost every $x \in A'$. Let us define the sequence of functions

$$g_h(x) := -f(x, u_h, Xu_h) + C(|Xu_h|^p + |u_h|^p)$$

where $C := \max\{b, c\} > 0$. Using (3.1) we get

$$g_h(x) \geq -a(x) \text{ for a.e. } x \in A',$$

and so, since the right side belongs to $L^1(A')$, we can apply Fatou's Lemma and get that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{A'} -f(x, u, Xu)dx + \|u\|_{W^{1,p}_X(A')} &= \int_{A'} \liminf_{h\to+\infty} g_h(x, u, Xu)dx \\ &= \int_{A'} \liminf_{h\to+\infty} (-f(x, u_h, Xu_h) + C(|Xu_h|^p + |u_h|^p))dx \\ &\leq \liminf_{h\to+\infty} \int_{A'} -f(x, u_h, Xu_h) + C(|Xu_h|^p + |u_h|^p))dx \\ &= \lim_{h\to+\infty} \int_{A'} -f(x, u_h, Xu_h) + C \lim_{h\to+\infty} \|u_h\|_{W^{1,p}_X(A')} \\ &= \lim_{h\to+\infty} \int_{A'} -f(x, u_h, Xu_h) + \|u\|_{W^{1,p}_X(A')}. \end{aligned}$$

□

In the following proposition we prove that the notion of lower semicontinuity introduced in Definition 1.16 is actually equivalent to a more useful condition.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $F : W^{1,p}_{X,loc}(\Omega) \times \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow [0, +\infty]$ be such that:*

(i) *F is a measure;*

(ii) *F is local.*

Then the following conditions are equivalent:

(a) *F is lower semicontinuous;*

(b) *$\forall A' \in \mathcal{A}_0$, $F_{A'} : (\{u|_{A'} : u \in W^{1,p}_X(\Omega)\}, \|\cdot\|_{W^{1,p}_X(A')}) \to [0,+\infty]$ defined as $F_{A'}(u|_{A'}) := F(u,A')$ is lower semicontinuous.*

Proof. $(b) \implies (a)$**.** It is straightforward.
$(a) \implies (b)$**.** Fix an open set $A' \in \mathcal{A}_0$ and take $(u_h)_h, u$ in $W^{1,p}_X(\Omega)$ such that $\|u_h|_{A'} - u|_{A'}\|_{W^{1,p}(A')} \to 0$. Now, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, take an open set A_k such that $A_k \Subset A_{k+1} \Subset A'$ and $\bigcup_{k=0}^{+\infty} A_k = A'$, and a smooth cut-off function φ_k between A_k and A'. For any $h,k \in \mathbb{N}$, define the functions $v^k := \varphi_k u$ and $v^k_h := \varphi_k u_h$. We have that, for any $h,k \in \mathbb{N}$, v^k_h, v^k belong to $W^{1,p}_X(\Omega)$, $v^k_h|_{A_k} = u_h|_{A_k}$, $v^k|_{A_k} = u|_{A_k}$ and moreover $\lim_{h\to\infty} \|v^k_h - v^k\|_{W^{1,p}_X(\Omega)} = 0$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Using (i) and (ii) we get

$$\begin{aligned} F(u,A') &= \lim_{k\to\infty} F(u,A_k) = \lim_{k\to\infty} F(v^k,A_k) \\ &\le \lim_{k\to\infty} \liminf_{h\to\infty} F(v^k_h,A_k) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \liminf_{h\to\infty} F(u_h,A_k) \\ &\le \lim_{k\to\infty} \liminf_{h\to\infty} F(u_h,A') = \liminf_{h\to\infty} F(u_h,A'). \end{aligned}$$

□

We are ready to state the main result of this section.

Theorem 3.3. *Let $F : W^{1,p}_{X,loc}(\Omega) \times \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow [0,+\infty]$ be such that:*

(i) *F is a measure;*
(ii) *F is local;*
(iii) *F satisfies the weak condition (ω);*
(iv) *F is p-bounded;*
(v) *F is weakly*- sequentially lower semicontinuous;*
(vi) *F is lower semicontinuous.*

Then there exists a unique Carathéodory function $f : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m \longrightarrow [0,+\infty)$ such that

$$\xi \mapsto f(x,u,\xi) \text{ is convex for a.e. } x \in \Omega,\ \forall u \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{3.2}$$

$$f(x,u,\xi) \le a(x) + b|\xi|^p + c|u|^p \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega,\ \forall (u,\xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m \tag{3.3}$$

and the following representation formula holds:

$$F(u,A) = \int_A f(x,u,Xu)dx \quad \forall u \in W^{1,p}_{X,loc}(\Omega),\ \forall A \in \mathcal{A}. \tag{3.4}$$

Remark. If we substitute hypotheses (v) and (vi) with

(v′) F is weakly sequentially lower semicontinuous,

then the conclusions of Theorem 3.3 still hold. Indeed, thanks to Proposition 1.5 the latter is stronger than both (v) and (vi), even if not equivalent in general.

Proof. **First Step.** Arguing as in the first step of the proof of Theorem 2.3, the restriction of F to $W^{1,p}_{loc}(\Omega) \times \mathcal{A}$ satisfies all the hypotheses of [BD2, Theorem 1.10]. Thus there exist $\tilde{b} > 0$ and a Carathéodory function $f_e : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \longrightarrow [0,+\infty]$ such that

$$F(u,A) = \int_A f_e(x,u,Du)dx \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{A},\ \forall u \in W^{1,p}_{loc}(\Omega), \tag{3.5}$$

$$f_e(x,u,\xi) \le a(x) + \tilde{b}|\xi|^p + c|u|^p \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega,\ \forall (u,\xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \tag{3.6}$$

and

$$f_e(x,u,\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^n \to [0,\infty] \text{ is convex} \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega,\ \forall u \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{3.7}$$

Now, arguing as in the second step of the proof of Theorem 2.3, from (3.6) and (3.7) and recalling Propositions 2.1 and 2.2, we obtain that

$$\int_A f_e(x,u,Du)dx = \int_A f(x,u,Xu)dx \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{A},\, u \in C^\infty(A), \tag{3.8}$$

where $f : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m \longrightarrow [0,+\infty]$ is the Carathéodory function defined in (2.1). Up to modifying f on a set of measure zero, we can assume that it is finite. Moreover, arguing as in the third step of the proof of Theorem 2.3, f satisfies (3.2) and (3.3).

Second Step. Here we prove that (3.4) holds. Let us start by fixing $u \in W^{1,p}_X(\Omega)$ and $A' \in \mathcal{A}_0$. Thanks to Proposition 1.8 we can find a sequence $(u_h)_h \subseteq W^{1,p}_X(\Omega)$ such that

$$(u_h|_{A'})_h \subseteq W^{1,p}_X(A') \cap C^\infty(A') \text{ and } u_h|_{A'} \longrightarrow u|_{A'} \text{ in } W^{1,p}_X(A').$$

From this, (vi), (3.5), (3.8), Theorem 3.1 and Proposition 3.2 it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} F(u,A') &\le \liminf_{h\to+\infty} F(u_h,A') = \liminf_{h\to+\infty} \int_{A'} f_e(x,u_h,Du_h)dx \\ &= \lim_{h\to+\infty} \int_{A'} f(x,u_h,Xu_h)dx = \int_{A'} f(x,u,Xu)dx, \end{aligned}$$

and hence we obtain that

$$F(u,A') \le \int_{A'} f(x,u,Xu)dx \quad \forall A' \in \mathcal{A}_0,\, \forall u \in W^{1,p}_X(\Omega). \tag{3.9}$$

To prove the converse inequality, fix $u_0 \in W^{1,p}_X(\Omega)$ and set $H : W^{1,p}_{X,loc}(\Omega) \times \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow [0,+\infty]$ as $H(u,A) := F(u+u_0,A)$. It is straightforward to check that H satisfies all the hypotheses of the theorem. Hence there exist a Carathéodory function $h : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m \longrightarrow [0,+\infty)$, $a_H \in L^1_{loc}(\Omega)$ and $b_H, c_H > 0$ such that

$$h(x,u,\xi) \le a_H(x) + b_H|\xi|^p + c_H|u|^p \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega,\, \forall (u,\xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m.$$

Moreover, it holds that

$$H(u,A) = \int_A h(x,u,Xu)dx \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{A},\, \forall u \in C^\infty(A) \tag{3.10}$$

and

$$H(u,A') \le \int_{A'} h(x,u,Xu)dx \quad \forall A' \in \mathcal{A}_0,\, \forall u \in W^{1,p}_X(\Omega). \tag{3.11}$$

Fix then $A' \in \mathcal{A}_0$. Arguing as before we can find a sequence $(u_h)_h \subseteq W^{1,p}_X(\Omega)$ such that

$$(u_h|_{A'})_h \subseteq W^{1,p}_X(A') \cap C^\infty(A') \text{ and } u_h|_{A'} \longrightarrow u_0|_{A'} \text{ in } W^{1,p}_X(A').$$

Thus, thanks to Theorem 3.1, and the following chain of inequalities we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{A'} h(x,0,0) &\overset{(3.10)}{=} H(0,A') = F(u_0,A') \overset{(3.9)}{\le} \int_{A'} f(x,u_0,Xu_0)dx \\ &= \lim_{h\to+\infty} \int_{A'} f(x,u_h,Xu_h)dx = \lim_{h\to+\infty} F(u_h,A') = \lim_{h\to+\infty} H(u_h-u_0,A') \\ &\overset{(3.11)}{\le} \lim_{h\to+\infty} \int_{A'} h(x,u_h-u_0,Xu_h-Xu_0)dx = \int_{A'} h(x,0,0)dx, \end{aligned}$$

and all inequalities are indeed equalities. Being u_0 arbitrarily chosen, we conclude that

$$F(u,A') = \int_{A'} f(x,u,Xu)dx \quad \forall u \in W^{1,p}_X(\Omega),\, \forall A' \in \mathcal{A}_0. \tag{3.12}$$

The rest of the proof follows as in the proof of Theorem 2.3. $\square$

The following theorem shows that the hypotheses of Theorem 3.3 are also necessary.

Theorem 3.4. *Let $f : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m \longrightarrow [0, +\infty)$ be a Carathéodory function such that*

$$\xi \mapsto f(x, u, \xi) \text{ is convex for a.e. } x \in \Omega, \forall u \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{3.13}$$

$$f(x, u, \xi) \leq a(x) + b|\xi|^p + c|u|^p \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega, \forall (u, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m \tag{3.14}$$

for $b, c > 0$ and $a \in L^1_{loc}(\Omega)$, and define the functional $F : W^{1,p}_{X,loc}(\Omega) \times \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow [0, +\infty]$ as

$$F(u, A) := \int_A f(x, u, Xu)dx \quad \forall u \in W^{1,p}_{X,loc}(\Omega), \forall A \in \mathcal{A}.$$

Then F satisfies hypotheses $(i) - (vi)$ of Theorem 3.3.

Proof. (i) follows as in the proof of Theorem 2.4, while (ii) is trivial. In order to prove (iii) let us show that F satisfies the strong property (ω). This suffices, according to [BD2]. Since f is Carathéodory, then the set $\Omega' := \{x \in \Omega : (u, \xi) \mapsto f(x, u, \xi) \text{ is continuous}\}$ satisfies $|\Omega'| = |\Omega|$. For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon > 0$ set $E^k_\epsilon \subseteq \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^m$ as

$$E^k_\epsilon := \{(u, v, \xi, \eta) : |u|, |v|, |\xi|, |\eta| \leq k, |u - v|, |\xi - \eta| \leq \epsilon\}$$

and the function

$$\omega_k(x, \epsilon) := \begin{cases} \sup\{|f(x, u, \xi) - f(x, v, \eta)| : (u, v, \xi, \eta) \in E^k_\epsilon\} & \text{if } x \in \Omega', \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We show that, for any k, ω_k is a locally integrable modulus of continuity. Let us fix then $\epsilon \geq 0$: since $(u, \xi) \mapsto f(x, u, \xi)$ is continuous for almost every $x \in \Omega$, then the supremum in the definition of ω_k can be taken over a countable subset of E^k_ϵ. Since for any (u, v, ξ, η) the function $x \mapsto |f(x, u, \xi) - f(x, v, \eta)|$ is measurable, then $\omega_k(\cdot, \epsilon)$ is measurable. We are left to show that it belongs to $L^1_{loc}(\Omega)$. Observe that by (3.14) it follows that, for any $(u, v, \xi, \eta) \in E^k_\epsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned} |f(x, u, \xi) - f(x, v, \eta)| &\leq 2|a(x)| + b|\xi|^p + b|\eta|^p + c|u|^p + c|v|^p \\ &\leq 2|a(x)| + 4k(b + c). \end{aligned}$$

Since the right side does not depend on $(u, v, \xi, \eta) \in E^k_\epsilon$, we conclude that

$$\omega_k(x, \epsilon) \leq 2|a(x)| + 4k(b + c).$$

Hence $\omega_k(\cdot, \epsilon) \in L^1_{loc}(\Omega)$. Fix now $x \in \Omega'$. Since $E^k_\epsilon \subseteq E^k_\delta$ for any $\epsilon \leq \delta$, then $\omega_k(x, \cdot)$ is increasing, and $\omega_k(x, 0) = 0$. Finally its continuity follows from the continuity of $f(\cdot, u, \xi)$. Then $(\omega_k)_k$ is a sequence of locally integrable moduli of continuity. Let us recall that, if we define $C := \max\{\sup\{|c_{j,i}(x)| : x \in \Omega\} : i = 1, \ldots, n, j = 1, \ldots, m\}$, it holds that $0 < C < +\infty$. Let us define now, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the function

$$\tilde{\omega}_k(x, \epsilon) := \omega_{(\lfloor C \rfloor + 1)k}(x, C\epsilon) \quad \forall x \in \Omega, \forall \epsilon \geq 0.$$

Of course we have that $(\tilde{\omega}_k)_k$ is still a sequence of locally integrable moduli of continuity: we show that such a sequence satisfies (1.2). Take $A' \in \mathcal{A}_0$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\epsilon \geq 0$, $u, v \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ such that

$$|u(x)|, |v(x)|, |Du(x)|, |Dv(x)| \leq k, \ |u(x) - v(x)|, |Du(x) - Dv(x)| \leq \epsilon \quad \forall x \in A'.$$

Then it follows that

$$|Xu(x)| = |C(x)Du(x)| \leq C|Du(x)| \leq Ck \leq (\lfloor C \rfloor + 1)k,$$
$$|Xv(x)| = |C(x)Dv(x)| \leq C|Dv(x)| \leq Ck \leq (\lfloor C \rfloor + 1)k$$

and

$$|Xu(x) - Xv(x)| = |C(x)(Du(x) - Dv(x))| \leq C|Du(x) - Dv(x)| \leq C\epsilon.$$

Thus we conclude that

$$|F(u, A') - F(v, A')| \leq \int_{A'} |f(x, u, Xu) - f(x, v, Xv)|dx \leq \int_{A'} \tilde{\omega}_k(x, \epsilon)dx,$$

and so also (iii) is proved. (iv) follows easily from (3.14), while (vi) is a direct consequence of Theorem 3.1. Let us now define $H : W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)\times\mathcal{A} \longrightarrow [0,+\infty]$ as the restriction to $W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)\times\mathcal{A}$ of F. Then, since for every $u \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ it holds that $Xu(x) = C(x)Du(x)$, if we define $f_e : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \longrightarrow [0,+\infty)$ as

$$f_e(x,u,\xi) := f(x,u,C(x)\xi)$$

we can easily notice that f_e is a Caratheodory function, convex in the third argument and such that

$$H(u,A) = \int_A f_e(x,u,Du)dx.$$

Applying [AF, Theorem 2.1], condition (v) holds for H and hence for F. □

4. Integral Representation of Non-convex Functionals

In this section we want to exploit [BD2, Theorem 1.8] to characterize a class of local functionals for which again we do not require neither translations-invariance nor convexity, and for which we want to weaken the assumption of weak*- sequential lower semicontinuity in Theorem 3.3. Convexity was a crucial assumption in Proposition 2.2 to guarantee the validity of (2.2), which can be easily seen to fail if we drop it. Indeed

Example. Let us take $\Omega = B_1(0) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$, $m = 1$ and

$$X_1 := x\frac{\partial}{\partial y}.$$

Then X_1 is a Lipschitz vector field satisfying the (LIC) on Ω, with $N_X := \{(x,y) \in \Omega \,:\, x = 0\}$. Clearly, for all $(x,y) \in \Omega_X$ we have

$$C((x,y))^T \cdot B^{-1}((x,y)) \cdot C((x,y)) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ x \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{x^2} \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 0 & x \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

thus by Proposition 1.11 it follows that

$$\Pi_{(x,y)}(\xi_1,\xi_2) = (0,\xi_2) \quad \forall(\xi_1,\xi_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2, \forall(x,y) \in \Omega_X. \tag{4.1}$$

Let us define the map $f_e : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^2 \longrightarrow [0,+\infty)$ as

$$f_e((x,y),u,(\xi_1,\xi_2)) := \begin{cases} 1 - \xi_1^2 - \xi_2^2 & \text{if } \xi_1^2 + \xi_2^2 \leq 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Clearly, f_e is a bounded Carathéodory function not convex in the third entry. Moreover, for any $(x,y) \in \Omega_X$ and $(\xi_1,\xi_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with $\xi_1^2 + \xi_2^2 \leq 1$, thanks to (4.1) it holds that

$$f_e((x,y),u,\Pi_{(x,y)}(\xi_1,\xi_2)) = 1 - \xi_2^2.$$

We conclude that (2.2) does not hold.

On the other hand it is easy to see that there are cases when Proposition 2.2 still holds even if the Lagrangian is not convex in the third argument, as the following example shows.

Example. Let us take $n, m, \mathbf{X}$ and Ω as in the previous example, and define the function $f_e : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^2 \longrightarrow [0,+\infty)$ as

$$f_e((x,y),u,(\xi_1,\xi_2)) := \begin{cases} 1 - \xi_2^2 & \text{if } |\xi_2| \leq 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Then f_e is again a bounded Carathéodory function which is not convex in the third entry. Anyway we can easily see that f_e satisfies (2.2).

At this point we may ask ourselves if there is a way to weaken the convexity of f_e in the third entry which is still able to guarantee the validity of (2.2). In the previous example we see that, even if f_e is not globally convex in the third entry, it is anyway convex along the direction indicated by N_x. This leads us to the following

Definition 4.1. *We say that a Carathéodory function $f_e : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \longrightarrow [0, +\infty]$ is X-*convex *if, for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and for any $u \in \mathbb{R}$, $t \in (0, 1)$ and $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\xi_2 - \xi_1 \in N_x$, it holds that*

$$f_e(x, u, t\xi_1 + (1 - t)\xi_2) \le t f_e(x, u, \xi_1) + (1 - t) f_e(x, u, \xi_2).$$

The following proposition tells us that X-convexity is the proper requirement that we have to assume on the Euclidean Lagrangian.

Proposition 4.2. *Let $f_e : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \longrightarrow [0, +\infty]$ be a Carathéodory function such that there exist $a \in L^1_{loc}(\Omega)$ and $b, c > 0$ such that*

$$f_e(x, u, \xi) \le a(x) + b|C(x)\xi|^p + c|u|^p \text{ for a.e. } x \in \Omega,\ \forall (u, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{4.2}$$

Then the following facts are equivalent:

(i) *f_e is X-convex;*
(ii) *for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and for any $(u, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$, the function $g : N_x \longrightarrow [0, +\infty]$ defined as $g(\eta) := f_e(x, u, \xi + \eta)$ is constant;*
(iii) *$f_e(x, u, \xi) = f_e(x, u, \Pi_x(\xi))$ for a.e. $x \in \Omega$, $\forall (u, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$;*

Proof. *(ii)* $\Leftrightarrow$ *(iii)* Fix $x \in \Omega$ such that *(ii)* holds. For any $(u, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$, we have that

$$f_e(x, u, \xi) = f_e(x, u, \xi_{N_x} + \Pi_x(\xi)) = f_e(x, u, \Pi_x(\xi)).$$

Conversely, take $x \in \Omega$ such that *(iii)* holds. For any $(u, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\eta \in N_x$, it holds that

$$f_e(x, u, \xi + \eta) = f_e(x, u, \Pi_x(\xi + \eta)) = f_e(x, u, \Pi_x(\xi)) = f_e(x, u, \xi).$$

(i) $\Leftrightarrow$ *(ii)* The right implication is trivial. Conversely, assume *(i)* and fix $x \in \Omega$ such that *(i)* holds and $a(x) < +\infty$. Thanks to (4.2) we have that, for any fixed $u \in \mathbb{R}$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\eta \in N_x$,

$$\begin{aligned} g(\eta) = f_e(x, u, \xi + \eta) &\le a(x) + b|C(x)\xi + C(x)\eta|^p + c|u|^p \\ &= a(x) + b|C(x)\xi|^p + c|u|^p < +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Since the right side does not depend on η, then g is bounded on N_x. Since by assumption it is also convex on N_x, then g is constant. ☐

In order to guarantee the X-convexity of the Euclidean Lagrangian we exploit the zig-zag argument employed in [BD2, Lemma 2.11].

Lemma 4.3. *Let $F : W^{1,p}_{loc}(\Omega) \times \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow [0, +\infty]$ be such that*

(i) *$\forall u \in W^{1,p}_{loc}(\Omega)$, the map $A \mapsto F(u, A)$ is a measure;*
(ii) *$\forall u, v \in W^{1,p}_{loc}(\Omega), \forall A' \in \mathcal{A}_0$, $u|_{A'} = v|_{A'} \implies F(u, A') = F(v, A')$;*
(iii) *F satisfies the weak condition (ω);*
(iv) *For any $A' \in \mathcal{A}_0$ and $(u_h)_h \subseteq W^{1,p}(\Omega), u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ such that $\lim_{h\to\infty} \|u_h - u\|_{W^{1,p}_X(\Omega)} = 0$, then $F(u, A') \le \liminf_{h\to\infty} F(u_h, A')$;*

Then, if for any $x \in \Omega$, $u \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we define

$$f_e(x, u, \xi) := \limsup_{R\to 0} \frac{F(\varphi_{x,u,\xi}, B_R(x))}{|B_R(x)|} \tag{4.3}$$

it holds that f_e is X-convex.

Proof. A slight modification of [BD2, Lemma 2.10] ensures the existence of a sequence $(\omega_k)_k$ of locally integrable moduli of continuity and a set $\Omega' \subseteq \Omega$ such that $|\Omega'| = |\Omega|$ and all the points in Ω' are Lebesgue points of $x \mapsto \omega_k(x, r)$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and for any $r \geq 0$. Moreover

$$|f_e(x, u, \xi) - f_e(x, v, \xi)| \leq \omega_k(x, |u - v|) \tag{4.4}$$

for any $x \in \Omega'$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $u, v \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$|\xi|, |u|, |v| \leq k.$$

Take $x \in \Omega'$, $z \in \mathbb{R}$, $t \in (0, 1)$, $\xi_1 \neq \xi_2$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\xi_2 - \xi_1 \in N_x$, and set $\xi := t\xi_1 + (1-t)\xi_2$. We want to prove that

$$f_e(x, z, \xi) \leq t f_e(x, z, \xi_1) + (1 - t) f_e(x, z, \xi_2). \tag{4.5}$$

Let us define

$$\xi_0 := \frac{\xi_2 - \xi_1}{|\xi_2 - \xi_1|},$$

and, for any $h \in \mathbb{N}$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $i = 1, 2$, set

$$\Omega^1_{h,k} := \left\{ y \in \Omega \,:\, \frac{k-1}{h} \leq (\xi_0, y) < \frac{k-1+t}{h} \right\};$$

$$\Omega^2_{h,k} := \left\{ y \in \Omega \,:\, \frac{k-1+t}{h} \leq (\xi_0, y) < \frac{k}{h} \right\};$$

$$\Omega^i_h := \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \Omega^i_{h,k};$$

$$u(y) := z + (\xi, y - x) \quad \forall y \in \Omega;$$

$$v_h(y) := \begin{cases} (1-t)\frac{k-1}{h}|\xi_2 - \xi_1| + z + \langle \xi_1, y - x \rangle & \text{if } y \in \Omega^1_{h,k} \\ -t\frac{k}{h}|\xi_2 - \xi_1| + z + \langle \xi_2, y - x \rangle & \text{if } y \in \Omega^2_{h,k} \end{cases}.$$

Arguing as in the proof of [BD1, Lemma 2.11] we have that $v_h \to u$ uniformly on Ω. Hence, in particular, $v_h \to u$ strongly in $L^p(\Omega)$. Moreover, since $\xi_2 - \xi_1$ belongs to N_x and ξ is a convex combination of ξ_1 and ξ_2, then both $\xi - \xi_1$ and $\xi - \xi_2$ belong to N_x. Thus for $i = 1, 2$ and for any $y \in \Omega^i_{h,k}$ we have that

$$|Xu(y) - Xv_h(y)| = |C(x)\xi - C(x)\xi_i| = |C(x)(\xi - \xi_i)| = 0.$$

Therefore v_h converges to u strongly in $W^{1,p}_X(\Omega)$. Take now $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$ such that, for any $y \in \Omega$ and for any $h \in \mathbb{N}_+$,

$$|\xi_1|, |\xi_2|, |u_1(y)|, |u_2(y)|, |v_h(y)| \leq k.$$

Then, thanks to (4.4) and noticing that (see [BD2, Lemma 2.4])

$$F(u, A) = \int_A f_e(x, u, Du)dx \quad \forall u \text{ affine on } \Omega, \, \forall A \in \mathcal{A},$$

arguing as in [BD1, Lemma 2.11] and setting $B^i_{h,R}(x) := B_R(x) \cap \Omega^i_h$ for $i = 1, 2$ and for any $R > 0$ such that $B_R(x) \Subset \Omega$, it holds that

$$F(v_h, B_R(x)) \leq \int_{B^1_{h,R}(x)} f_e(y, u_1, Du_1)dy + \int_{B^2_{h,R}(x)} f_e(y, u_2, Du_2)dy + \int_\Omega w_k(y, aR + \frac{b}{h}),$$

with $a := |\xi_2 - \xi_1|$ and $b := at(1 - t)$. Since v_h converges to u strongly in $W^{1,p}_X(\Omega)$ and thanks to hypothesis (iv) it is easy to see that

$$F(u, B_R(x)) \leq tF(u_1, B_R(x)) + (1 - t)F(u_2, B_R(x)) + \int_\Omega w_k(y, \epsilon),$$

where this inequality holds for any $\epsilon > 0$ and for any $R \in (0, \frac{\epsilon}{a}]$. Dividing both sides by $|B_R(x)|$, passing to the limsup and recalling that x is a Lebesgue point of $y \mapsto w_k(y, \epsilon)$, we have that

$$f_e(x, z, \xi) \leq t f_e(x, z, \xi_1) + (1-t) f_e(x, z, \xi_2) + w_k(x, \epsilon).$$

Letting ϵ go to zero, the thesis is proved. □

We are now ready to state and prove the main result of this section.

Theorem 4.4. *Let $F : W^{1,p}_{X,loc}(\Omega) \times \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow [0, +\infty]$ be such that:*

(i) *F is a measure;*
(ii) *F is local;*
(iii) *F satisfies the strong condition (ω);*
(iv) *F is p-bounded;*
(v) *F is lower semicontinuous.*

Then there exists a unique Carathéodory function $f : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m \longrightarrow [0, +\infty)$ such that

$$f(x, u, \xi) \leq a(x) + b|\xi|^p + c|u|^p \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega,\ \forall (u, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m \tag{4.6}$$

and the following representation formula holds:

$$F(u, A) = \int_A f(x, u, Xu)dx \quad \forall u \in W^{1,p}_{X,loc}(\Omega),\ \forall A \in \mathcal{A}. \tag{4.7}$$

Proof. Let us consider the restriction of F to $W^{1,p}_{loc}(\Omega) \times \mathcal{A}$. Arguing as in the first step of the proof of Theorem 2.3 it is easy to see that it satisfies all the hypotheses of [BD2, Theorem 1.8]. Thus, if f_e is defined as in (4.3), it is a Carathéodory function and moreover there exists $\tilde{b} > 0$ such that

$$F(u, A) = \int_A f_e(x, u, Du)dx \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{A},\ \forall u \in W^{1,p}_{loc}(\Omega)$$

and

$$f_e(x, u, \xi) \leq a(x) + \tilde{b}|\xi|^p + c|u|^p \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega,\ \forall (u, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m.$$

Moreover, thanks to Lemma 4.3, f_e is X-convex. So, recalling Proposition 4.2 and (iv) of Proposition 2.1, we get that

$$\int_A f_e(x, u, Du)dx = \int_A f(x, u, Xu)dx \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{A},\ u \in C^\infty(A),$$

where $f : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m \longrightarrow [0, +\infty]$ is the function defined in (2.1). Such an f can be supposed to be finite up to modifying it on a set of measure zero. Arguing as in the third step of the proof of Theorem 2.3, (4.6) holds, while (4.7) follows exactly as in the last step of the proof or Theorem 3.3. Finally, uniqueness follows as usual. □

Proceeding exactly as in Theorem 3.4 we have the following

Theorem 4.5. *Let $f : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m \longrightarrow [0, +\infty)$ be a Carathéodory function such that*

$$f(x, u, \xi) \leq a(x) + b|\xi|^p + c|u|^p \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega,\ \forall (u, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m,$$

for $b, c > 0$ and $a \in L^1_{loc}(\Omega)$. Setting the functional $F : W^{1,p}_{X,loc}(\Omega) \times \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow [0, +\infty]$ as

$$F(u, A) := \int_A f(x, u, Xu)dx \quad \forall u \in W^{1,p}_{X,loc}(\Omega),\ \forall A \in \mathcal{A},$$

then F satisfies hypotheses $(i) - (v)$ of Theorem 4.4.

References

[Alb] G. Alberti, *Integral Representation of Local Functionals* , Annali di Matematica pura ed applicata **165**, 49–86 (1993).

[AF] E. Acerbi, N. Fusco, *Semicontinuity problems in the calculus of variations*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., **86** (1984), 125-145.

[BMT] M. Biroli, U. Mosco, N. Tchou, *Homogenization for degenerate operators with periodical coefficients with respect to the Heisenberg group*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math., **322** (1996), no. 5, 439–444.

[BLU] A. Bonfiglioli, E. Lanconelli, F. Uguzzoni, *Stratified Lie Groups and Potential Theory for Their Sub-Laplacians*, Springer, 2007.

[Br] H. Brezis, *Functional Analysis, Sobolev Spaces and Partial Differential Equations*, Springer Science+Business Media, New York [etc.], 2011.

[B] G. Buttazzo, *Semicontinuity and Relaxation in the Calculus of Variations*, Pitman Res. Notes in Math., 207, New York (1989).

[BD1] G. Buttazzo, G. Dal Maso, Γ*-limits of integral functionals*, Journal d'Analyse Mathématique, **37** (1980), 145-185.

[BD2] G. Buttazzo, G. Dal Maso, *A characterization of nonlinear functionals on Sobolev spaces which admit an integral representation with a Caratheodory integrand*, Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées, **64** (1985), 337-361.

[BD3] G. Buttazzo, G. Dal Maso, *Integral representation and relaxation of local functionals*, Nonlinear Anal., **9** (1985), 515-532.

[CZ] A.P. Calderon, A. Zygmund, *Local Properties of Solutions of Elliptic Partial Differential Equations*, Studia Mathematica, **20** (1961), 181-225.

[Dac] B. Dacorogna, *Direct Methods in the Calculus of Variations*, Springer Science+Business Media, New York, 2008.

[Dal] G. Dal Maso, *An introduction to* Γ*-Convergence*, Springer Science+Business Media, New York, 1993.

[ET] I. Ekeland, R. Temam, *Convex Analysis and Variational Problems*, SIAM, Philadelphia, 1999.

[Fe] H. Federer, *Geometric Measure Theory*, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin [etc.], 1996.

[FS] G.B. Folland, E.M. Stein, *Hardy spaces on homogeneous groups*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1982.

[FSSC] B. Franchi, R.P. Serapioni, F. Serra Cassano, *Meyers-Serrin type theorems and relaxation of variational integrals depending on vector fields*, Houston Journal of Mathematics, **22** (1996), 859-889.

[FSSC2] B. Franchi, R. Serapioni, F. Serra Cassano, *Approximation and embedding theorems for weighted Sobolev spaces associated with Lipschitz continuous vector fields*, Boll. Un. Mat. Ital. B (7), **11** (1997), no. 1, 83–117.

[FT] B. Franchi, M.C. Tesi, *Two-scale homogenization in the Heisenberg group*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9), **81** (2002), no. 6, 495–532.

[LT] F. Liu, W. Tai, *Approximate Taylor Polynomial and Differentiation of Functions*, Topological Methods in Nonlinear Analysis, **3** (1994), 189-196.

[MPSC] A. Maione, A. Pinamonti, F. Serra Cassano, Γ*-convergence for functionals depending on vector fields. I. Integral representation and compactness*, Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées, **139** (2020), 109-142.

[MPSC2] A. Maione, A. Pinamonti, F. Serra Cassano, Γ*-convergence for functionals depending on vector fields. II. Convergence of minimizers.* Preprint available at https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.12892

[MV] A. Maione, E. Vecchi, *Integral representation of local left-invariant functionals in Carnot groups.* Analysis and Geometry in Metric Spaces, 2020 (8), no. 1, 1–14.

[Sa] S. Sacks, *Theory of the integral*, Monografie Matematyczne, Warsaw, 1937.

(Fares Essebei) Department of Mathematics, University of Trento, Via Sommarive 14, 38123 Povo (Trento), Italy

Email address, Fares Essebei: `fares.essebei@unitn.it`

(Andrea Pinamonti) Department of Mathematics, University of Trento, Via Sommarive 14, 38123 Povo (Trento), Italy

Email address, Andrea Pinamonti: `andrea.pinamonti@unitn.it`

(Simone Verzellesi) Department of Mathematics, University of Trento, Via Sommarive 14, 38123 Povo (Trento), Italy

Email address, Simone Verzellesi: `simone.verzellesi@unitn.it`