



HAL
open science

Quantitative stability estimate for the inverse coefficients problem in linear elasticity

H Meftahi, T Rezgui

► **To cite this version:**

H Meftahi, T Rezgui. Quantitative stability estimate for the inverse coefficients problem in linear elasticity. 2022. hal-03637007v1

HAL Id: hal-03637007

<https://hal.science/hal-03637007v1>

Preprint submitted on 11 Apr 2022 (v1), last revised 6 Jan 2024 (v5)

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Quantitative stability estimate for the inverse coefficients problem in linear elasticity

H. Meftahi ^{*1} and T. Rezgui ^{†2}

¹Laboratory of Mathematical and Numerical Modelling in Engineering Sciences, University of Tunis El-Manar.

April 11, 2022

Abstract

In this article we consider the inverse problem of reconstructing piece-wise Lamé coefficients from boundary measurements. We reformulate the inverse problem as a minimization one using a Kohn-Vogelius type functional. We study the stability of the parameters when the jump of the discontinuity is perturbed. Using tools of shape calculus, we give a quantitative stability result for local optimal solution.

Keywords: Lamé parameters, inverse problem, shape derivative, stability analysis.

1 Introduction

The inverse problem of recovering Lamé parameters consists in finding the parameters (λ, μ) from the knowledge of the so-called Neumann-to-Dirichlet operator $\Lambda_{\lambda, \mu} : H^{-1/2}(\partial\Omega)^2 \rightarrow H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)^2$. The operator $\Lambda_{\lambda, \mu}$ maps a boundary input $g \in H^{-1/2}(\partial\Omega)^2$ to the value $u|_{\partial\Omega}$ of the solution u of an elliptic problem with Neumann boundary condition g :

$$\Lambda_{\lambda, \mu}(g) = u|_{\partial\Omega}.$$

The two major questions for the inverse problem are the uniqueness and the stability of a solution (λ, μ) . The question of the uniqueness in the case of perfect data, i.e. when the Neumann-to-Neumann operator is completely known, has led to many difficult and interesting mathematical problems and an abundant literature on the topic is available.

The question of stability consists in studying the continuous dependence of the solution on the data. Stability is necessary to ensure that a variation of the given data in a sufficiently small range leads to an arbitrarily small change in the solution, which is primordial for applications. This concept was introduced by Hadamard in 1902 in connection with the study of boundary value problems for partial differential equations [1].

*houcine.meftahi@enit.utm.tn

†taher.rezgui@enit.utm.tn

There is an extended literature on stability issues for the inverse problem of Lamé parameters, in particular for interior stability estimates, which consist in proving that, given two maps $\Lambda_{\lambda,\mu}$ and $\Lambda_{\tilde{\lambda},\tilde{\mu}}$, one has

$$\max \left\{ \|\lambda - \tilde{\lambda}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}, \|\mu - \tilde{\mu}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \right\} \leq \omega \left(\|\Lambda_{\lambda,\mu} - \Lambda_{\tilde{\lambda},\tilde{\mu}}\|_* \right),$$

where $\|\cdot\|_*$ is the operator norm of $\mathcal{L}(H^{-1/2}(\Omega)^2, H^{1/2}(\Omega)^2)$ and $\omega : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous with $\omega(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow 0$. Recently Lipschitz stability result has been proved in [4]. The proof relies on the monotonicity relation between the Lamé parameters and the Neumann-to-Dirichlet operator combined with the techniques of Localized potentials.

The inverse problem of reconstructing piecewise constants Lamé parameters λ, μ and their jump sets Γ simultaneously has been considered in [8] and the question of stability is not so well-studied.

In this contribution, we aim at giving qualitative properties of the stability in this case. We transform the inverse problem to a minimization one and study how stable is the reconstruction of the parameters λ, μ when Γ is known approximately. More precisely, we quantify the first-order stability properties of a local optimal solution of the minimization problem.

The stability estimates derived in [4] is obtained when the full Neumann-to-Dirichlet map is known. For our quantitative stability estimate we only have a finite number of measurements. To our best knowledge there are no results in this kind of stability for the problem under consideration.

In the field of PDE-constrained optimization, the differentiability and stability properties of optimal solutions with respect to parameters of the problem have been studied in details theoretically and numerically; see for instance [2, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12]. Some of the ideas developed in these papers can be used for our stability analysis, unfortunately the well-known particular difficulties of differentiating with respect to the shape, in particular the fact that the set of shapes is not a vector space, prevents a direct transposition of the methods used in these papers. For our analysis on proving quantitative stability of a local optimal solution, we make use of shape calculus in the spirit of [9].

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we describe the setting of the direct problem, the inverse problem and the minimization problem. The stability analysis of a local optimal solution is performed in section 3.

2 Problem formulation

Let Ω be a bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^2 with smooth boundary $\partial\Omega = \Gamma_N \cup \Gamma_D$ and $\Gamma \in \mathcal{D}_{ad}$ with

$$\mathcal{D}_{ad} := \{ \partial D \text{ where } D \text{ is open of class } C^2, D \subset \Omega, \inf_{x \in \partial D, y \in \partial\Omega} |x - y| > \varepsilon \}$$

for some $\varepsilon > 0$. Let Ω_2 be such that $\Gamma := \partial\Omega_2$ and $\Omega_1 = \Omega \setminus \overline{\Omega_2}$. Throughout the paper we work with piecewise constant parameters

$$\lambda = \lambda_1 \chi_{\Omega_1} + \lambda_2 \chi_{\Omega_2}, \quad \mu = \mu_1 \chi_{\Omega_1} + \mu_2 \chi_{\Omega_2}$$

where $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and χ denotes an indicator function. Let $0 < c_0 \leq \lambda_1, \mu_1 \leq c_1$ be given, then we define a set of piecewise constant parameters \mathcal{P}_{ad} as :

$$\mathcal{P}_{ad} = \{ (\lambda, \mu) = (\lambda_1 \chi_{\Omega_1} + \lambda_2 \chi_{\Omega_2}, \mu_1 \chi_{\Omega_1} + \mu_2 \chi_{\Omega_2}) : c_0 \leq \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \mu_1, \mu_2 \leq c_1 \},$$

where $c_0, c_1 \in \mathbb{R}_+$. For a given load $g \in H^{-1/2}(\Gamma_N)^2$ the displacement u satisfies the following problem

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} -\operatorname{div}(\mathbb{C}\hat{\nabla}u) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega \setminus \Gamma, \\ \llbracket u \rrbracket = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma, \\ \llbracket (\mathbb{C}\hat{\nabla}u)\nu \rrbracket = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma, \\ (\mathbb{C}\hat{\nabla}u)\nu = g & \text{on } \Gamma_N, \\ u = f & \text{on } \Gamma_N, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_D, \end{array} \right. \quad (1)$$

where ν is the unit normal vector to the interface Γ or $\partial\Omega$ pointing outward of Ω_2 or Ω , respectively, $f \in H^{1/2}(\Gamma_N)^2$ and $\llbracket u \rrbracket$ denotes the jump of u across the interface Γ . It is well-known that this problem has a unique solution $u \in \mathcal{V}$, where

$$\mathcal{V} := \{u \in H^1(\Omega)^2 : u|_{\Gamma_D} = 0\}.$$

We consider the inverse problem of recovering the parameters λ_2, μ_2 from the measurements (f, g) . We are interested in the case where the interface Γ is known, but with some uncertainty. We aim to study how this uncertainty affects the reconstruction of λ_2, μ_2 . Note that the results could be straightforwardly extended to the case of more than just two phases, thus for clarity it is better to study the case of two phases.

A typical approach to solve the inverse problem in practice is to consider the so-called *Kohn-Vogelius functional*.

$$J((\lambda_2, \mu_2), \Gamma, u_n, u_d) := \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C}\hat{\nabla}(u_n - u_d) : \nabla(u_n - u_d) dx,$$

Here u_n is the solution of the Neumann problem

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} -\operatorname{div}(\mathbb{C}\hat{\nabla}u_n) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega \setminus \Gamma, \\ \llbracket u_n \rrbracket = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma, \\ \llbracket (\mathbb{C}\hat{\nabla}u_n)\nu \rrbracket = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma, \\ (\mathbb{C}\hat{\nabla}u_n)\nu = g & \text{on } \Gamma_N, \\ u_n = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_D, \end{array} \right. \quad (2)$$

and u_d is the solution of the Dirichlet problem

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} -\operatorname{div}(\mathbb{C}\hat{\nabla}u_d) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega \setminus \Gamma, \\ \llbracket u_d \rrbracket = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma, \\ \llbracket (\mathbb{C}\hat{\nabla}u_d)\nu \rrbracket = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma, \\ u_d = f & \text{on } \Gamma_N, \\ u_d = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_D. \end{array} \right. \quad (3)$$

The variational formulations of the problems (2) and (3) read respectively

$$\text{Find } u \in \mathcal{V} \text{ such that } \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C}\hat{\nabla}u : \nabla v dx - \int_{\Gamma_N} g \cdot v ds = 0 \quad \forall v \in H^1(\Omega). \quad (4)$$

Find $u \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $\int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C} \hat{\nabla} u : \nabla v \, dx - \int_{\Gamma_N} (u-f)(\mathbb{C} \hat{\nabla} u) \nu v \, ds = 0 \quad \forall v \in H_0^1(\Omega)^2$. (5)

We associate with (4) the operator $E_n((\lambda_2, \mu_2), \Gamma, u_n) : [c_0, c_1]^2 \times \mathcal{D}_{ad} \times \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(H^1(\Omega)^2, \mathbb{R})$ and with (5) the operator $E_d((\lambda_2, \mu_2), \Gamma, u_d) : [c_0, c_1]^2 \times \mathcal{D}_{ad} \times \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(H_0^1(\Omega)^2, \mathbb{R})$. We also introduce

$$E((\lambda_2, \mu_2), \Gamma, u_n, u_d) := (E_n((\lambda_2, \mu_2), \Gamma, u_n), E_d((\lambda_2, \mu_2), \Gamma, u_d)).$$

We are interested in the situation when the interface Γ is known and one wishes to reconstruct the coefficients λ_2, μ_2 , the corresponding minimization problem is:

$$\begin{cases} \text{minimize } J((\lambda_2, \mu_2), \Gamma, u_n, u_d) := \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C} \hat{\nabla} (u_n - u_d) : \hat{\nabla} (u_n - u_d) \, dx \\ \text{subject to } c_0 \leq \lambda_2, \mu_2 \leq c_1 \text{ and } E((\lambda_2, \mu_2), \Gamma, u_n, u_d) = (0, 0). \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

Note an optimal solution $(\lambda_2^*, \mu_2^*) = (\lambda_2^*(\Gamma), \mu_2^*(\Gamma))$ of (6), if it exists, depends on Γ through the state equations.

Let us define the reduced functional corresponding to problem (6).

$$\mathcal{J}((\lambda_2, \mu_2), \Gamma) := J(\lambda_2, \mu_2, \Gamma, u_n, u_d)$$

We start with the following theorem.

Theorem 1. *The minimization problem (6) has at least one solution.*

Proof. In this proof we only write $\mathcal{J}(\lambda_2, \mu_2)$ instead of $\mathcal{J}((\lambda_2, \mu_2), \Gamma)$ for simplicity since Γ is fixed. It is clear that $\inf \mathcal{J}(\lambda_2, \mu_2)$ is finite. Therefore there exists a minimizing sequence

$$(\lambda^k, \mu^k) = (\lambda_1 \chi_{\Omega_1} + \lambda_2^k \chi_{\Omega_2}, \mu_1 \chi_{\Omega_1} + \mu_2^k \chi_{\Omega_2}) \in \mathcal{P}_{ad}$$

such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{J}(\lambda_2^k, \mu_2^k) = \inf_{c_0 \leq \lambda_2, \mu_2 \leq c_1} \mathcal{J}(\lambda_2, \mu_2).$$

The sequence (λ_2^k, μ_2^k) is bounded, thus there exists a subsequence still denoted (λ_2^k, μ_2^k) and some $(\lambda_2^*, \mu_2^*) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\lambda^k, \mu^k) = (\lambda_1 \chi_{\Omega_1} + \lambda_2^* \chi_{\Omega_2}, \mu_1 \chi_{\Omega_1} + \mu_2^* \chi_{\Omega_2}).$$

By definition $u_n(\lambda_2^k, \mu_2^k)$ satisfies

$$\int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C}(\lambda_2^k, \mu_2^k) \hat{\nabla} u_n(\lambda_2^k, \mu_2^k) : \nabla v \, dx = \int_{\Gamma_N} g \cdot v \, ds \quad \forall v \in \mathcal{V}. \quad (7)$$

Taking $v = u_n(\lambda_2^k, \mu_2^k)$ in (7), we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C}(\lambda_2^k, \mu_2^k) \hat{\nabla} u_n(\lambda_2^k, \mu_2^k) : \nabla u_n(\lambda_2^k, \mu_2^k) \, dx = \int_{\Gamma_N} g \cdot u_n(\lambda_2^k, \mu_2^k) \, ds.$$

Using Korn's inequality and the trace theorem for the right-hand side of the above equation, we deduce the existence of a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$\|u_n(\lambda_2^k, \mu_2^k)\|_{H^1(\Omega)^2} \leq c \|g\|_{L^2(\Gamma_N)^2}.$$

Therefore there exists a subsequence of $u_n(\lambda_2^k, \mu_2^k)$ still denoted $u_n(\lambda_2^k, \mu_2^k)$ such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} u_n(\lambda_2^k, \mu_2^k) = u_n^* \text{ weakly in } H^1(\Omega)^2,$$

and

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} u_n(\lambda_2^k, \mu_2^k) = u_n^* \text{ strongly in } L^2(\Omega)^2.$$

Letting n goes to infinity in equation (7), we conclude that u_n^* satisfies

$$\int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C}(\lambda_2^*, \mu_2^*) \hat{\nabla} u_n^* : \nabla v \, dx = \int_{\Gamma_N} g \cdot v \, ds, \quad \forall v \in \mathcal{V}.$$

Due to the uniqueness of the weak limit we get $u_n(\lambda_2^*, \mu_2^*) = u_n^*$. This means that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} u_n(\lambda_2^k, \mu_2^k) = u_n(\lambda_2^*, \mu_2^*) \text{ weakly in } H^1(\Omega)^2 \text{ and strongly in } L^2(\Omega)^2.$$

In the same way, we can prove that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} u_d(\lambda_2^k, \mu_2^k) = u_d(\lambda_2^*, \mu_2^*) \text{ weakly in } H^1(\Omega)^2 \text{ and strongly in } L^2(\Omega)^2.$$

Using the lower semi-continuity of the H^1 -norm yields

$$\mathcal{J}(\lambda_2^*, \mu_2^*) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{J}(\lambda_2^k, \mu_2^k) = \mathcal{J}(\lambda_2, \mu_2),$$

which concludes the proof. \square

2.1 Elements of shape calculus

In this subsection we recall some basic facts about the perturbation of the identity method from shape optimization used to calculate the shape derivative. The reader is referred to [3] for more details.

Let $V \in \mathcal{D}^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^2)$, the space of continuous differentiable functions with compact support in Ω . Introduce the perturbation of identity

$$T_t = I + tV : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2. \quad (8)$$

Then there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that T_t is a diffeomorphism and $T_t(\Omega) = \Omega$ for $t \in [0, \varepsilon)$. We denote the perturbed interfaces

$$\Gamma_t := T_t(\Gamma).$$

For $t \in [0, \varepsilon)$, T_t is invertible. Furthermore, the Jacobian $\xi(t)$ is strictly positive

$$\forall t \in [0, \varepsilon), \quad \xi(t) = |\det DT_t| > 0, \quad (9)$$

where DT_t is the Jacobian matrix of the transformation T_t associated with the velocity field V . In the sequel, we use the notation M^{-1} for the inverse of M and M^{-*} for the transpose of its inverse. We also denote by

$$w(t) = \xi(t) |(DT_t)^{-*} \nu| \quad (10)$$

the tangential Jacobian of T_t on Γ .

Definition 1 (Eulerian derivative). *Suppose we are given a real valued shape function J defined on a subset D of \mathbb{R}^N . We say that J is Eulerian semi-differentiable at $\Omega \subset D$ in the direction V if the following limit exists in \mathbb{R}*

$$DJ(\Omega)(V) := \lim_{t \searrow 0} \frac{J(T_t(\Omega)) - J(\Omega)}{t}.$$

If the map $V \rightarrow DJ(\Omega)(V)$ is linear and continuous with respect to the topology of $\mathcal{D}^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^2)$, then J is said to be shape differentiable at Ω and $DJ(\Omega)(V)$ is called the shape derivative of J .

The Eulerian derivative is only a directional derivative. In this paper we also need the stronger notion of *Fréchet derivative*. To this end let $V \in \mathcal{D}^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^2)$ and consider perturbations of identity $I + V$, so that $T_V := I + V$ is a bi-Lipschitz homeomorphism. In what follows we will denote by

$$\Omega_V := T_V(\Omega)$$

Definition 2 (Fréchet derivative). *The functional $J(\Omega)$ is Fréchet-differentiable at Ω if there exists a linear and continuous functional $DJ(\Omega)$ from $\mathcal{D}^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^2)$ to \mathbb{R} called shape gradient such that*

$$J(\Omega_V) = J(\Omega) + DJ(\Omega)(V) + r(V),$$

where $|r(V)|/\|V\| \rightarrow 0$ as $\|V\| \rightarrow 0$.

In what follows we will mostly compute Fréchet derivatives given by Definition 2, however to obtain the expression of the shape derivative, it is convenient to simply compute the directional derivative given by Definition 1.

2.2 Inf-sup formulation

From the definition of the functional \mathcal{J} , and applying Green's formula once, we have

$$\mathcal{J}(\lambda_2, \mu_2) := J(\lambda_2, \mu_2, u_n, u_d) = J_0(\lambda_2, \mu_2, u_n) + J_0(\lambda_2, \mu_2, u_d) + J_1,$$

where

$$J_0(\lambda_2, \mu_2, u) = \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C}(\lambda_2, \mu_2) \hat{\nabla} u : \hat{\nabla} u \, dx, \quad J_1 = -2 \int_{\Gamma_N} f \cdot g \, ds.$$

We introduce the Lagrangian functionals

$$G_n(\lambda_2, \mu_2, \varphi, \psi) = J_0(\lambda_2, \mu_2, \varphi) + \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C} \hat{\nabla} \varphi : \hat{\nabla} \psi \, dx - \int_{\Gamma_N} g \cdot \psi \, ds \quad \text{for all } \varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{V},$$

$$G_d(\lambda_2, \mu_2, \varphi, \psi) = J_0(\lambda_2, \mu_2, \varphi) + \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C} \hat{\nabla} \varphi : \hat{\nabla} \psi \, dx + \int_{\Gamma_N} (f - u_D) \cdot (\mathbb{C} \hat{\nabla} \psi) \nu \, ds,$$

for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{V}, \psi \in H_0^1(\Omega)^2$. Then, it is easy to check that

$$J_0(\lambda_2, \mu_2, u_n) = \inf_{\varphi \in \mathcal{V}} \sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{V}} G_n(\lambda_2, \mu_2, \varphi, \psi),$$

$$J_0(\lambda_2, \mu_2, u_d) = \inf_{\varphi \in \mathcal{V}} \sup_{\psi \in H_0^1(\Omega)^2} G_d(\lambda_2, \mu_2, \varphi, \psi),$$

since

$$\sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{V}} G_n(\lambda_2, \mu_2, \varphi, \psi) = \begin{cases} J_0(\lambda_2, \mu_2, u_n) & \text{if } \varphi = u_n, \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$$\sup_{\psi \in H_0^1(\Omega)^2} G_d(\mathbb{C}, \varphi, \psi) = \begin{cases} J_0(\lambda_2, \mu_2, u_d) & \text{if } \varphi = u_d, \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is easily shown that the functional G_n (respectively G_d) is convex continuous with respect to φ and concave continuous with respect to ψ . Therefore, according to Ekeland and Temam [5], the functional G_n has a saddle point (u_n, v_n) if and only if (u_n, v_n) solves the following system:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\psi G_n(\lambda_2, \mu_2, u_n, v_n; \hat{\psi}) &= 0, \\ \partial_\varphi G_n(\lambda_2, \mu_2, u_n, v_n; \hat{\varphi}) &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

for all $\hat{\psi} \in \mathcal{V}$ and $\hat{\varphi} \in \mathcal{V}$. This yields that G_n has a saddle point (u_n, v_n) , where the state u_n is the unique solution of (2) and the adjoint state v_n is the solution of $\partial_\varphi G_n(\lambda_2, \mu_2, u_n, v_n; \hat{\varphi}) = 0$, or equivalently:

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(\mathbb{C}\hat{\nabla}v_n) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ (\mathbb{C}\hat{\nabla}v_n)\nu = -2g & \text{on } \Gamma_N, \\ v_n = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_D. \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

Similarly, the Lagrangian G_d has a unique saddle point (u_d, v_d) where the direct state u_d is the solution of the problem (3) and the adjoint state v_d is the unique solution of the following adjoint problem

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(\mathbb{C}\hat{\nabla}v_d) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ v_d = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_N, \\ v_d = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_D. \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

Summarizing the above, we have obtained the following theorem.

Theorem 2. *The functionals $J_0(\lambda_2, \mu_2, u_n)$ and $J_0(\lambda_2, \mu_2, u_d)$ are given as*

$$J_0(\lambda_2, \mu_2, u_n) = \inf_{\varphi \in \mathcal{V}} \sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{V}} G_n(\lambda_2, \mu_2, \varphi, \psi), \quad (13)$$

$$J_0(\lambda_2, \mu_2, u_d) = \inf_{\varphi \in \mathcal{V}} \sup_{\psi \in H_0^1(\Omega)^2} G_d(\lambda_2, \mu_2, \varphi, \psi). \quad (14)$$

The unique saddle points for G_n and G_d are respectively given by (u_n, v_n) and (u_d, v_d) , where $v_n = -2u_n$ and $v_d = 0$.

3 Stability of the parameters with respect to the interface

The optimality condition $D_{(\lambda_2, \mu_2)} \mathcal{J}(\lambda_2, \mu_2, \Gamma)(\alpha, \beta) = 0$ for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ for problem (6) can be rewritten as

$$\text{Find } (\lambda_2^*(\Gamma), \mu_2^*(\Gamma)) \text{ such that } D_{(\lambda_2, \mu_2)} \mathcal{J}(\lambda_2^*(\Gamma), \mu_2^*(\Gamma), \Gamma) = (0, 0). \quad (15)$$

In this paper we are interested in the stability of the optimal solution $(\lambda_2^*(\Gamma_V), \mu_2^*(\Gamma_V))$ of the minimization problem (6) with respect to the perturbed interface $\Gamma_V = (I + V)(\Gamma)$ for $V \in \mathcal{V}_0$, where \mathcal{V}_0 is a neighborhood of 0 in $\mathcal{D}^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^2)$.

Therefore we need to study the differentiability of the parameter-to-solution map $V \mapsto (\lambda_2^*(\Gamma_V), \mu_2^*(\Gamma_V))$. This is done by applying the implicit function theorem to the optimality conditions

$$D_{(\lambda_2, \mu_2)} \mathcal{J}(\lambda_2^*(\Gamma_V), \mu_2^*(\Gamma_V), \Gamma_V) = (0, 0).$$

Essentially the idea is to linearize $D_{(\lambda_2, \mu_2)} \mathcal{J}(\lambda_2^*(\Gamma_V), \mu_2^*(\Gamma_V), \Gamma_V) = (0, 0)$ to get

$$D_{(\lambda_2, \mu_2)}^2 \mathcal{J}(\lambda_2^*, \mu_2^*, \Gamma) (\partial_\Gamma \lambda_2^*(\Gamma)(V), \partial_\Gamma \mu_2^*(\Gamma)(V)) + \partial_\Gamma (D_{(\lambda_2, \mu_2), \Gamma} \mathcal{J}(\lambda_2^*, \mu_2^*, \Gamma))(V) = (0, 0),$$

which yields, when $D_{(\lambda_2, \mu_2)}^2 \mathcal{J}(\lambda_2^*, \mu_2^*, \Gamma)$ is invertible,

$$(\partial_\Gamma \lambda_2^*(\Gamma)(V), \partial_\Gamma \mu_2^*(\Gamma)(V)) = - (D_{(\lambda_2, \mu_2)}^2 \mathcal{J}(\lambda_2^*, \mu_2^*, \Gamma))^{-1} \partial_\Gamma (D_{(\lambda_2, \mu_2), \Gamma} \mathcal{J}(\lambda_2^*, \mu_2^*, \Gamma))(V).$$

In the following theorem, we prove the existence of $(\lambda_2^*(\Gamma), \mu_2^*(\Gamma))$ and we give an explicit formula for its variation with respect to Γ .

Theorem 3. *For given $\Gamma \in \mathcal{D}_{ad}$ suppose that there exists $(\lambda_2^*(\Gamma), \mu_2^*(\Gamma))$ such that*

$$D_{(\lambda_2, \mu_2)} \mathcal{J}(\lambda_2^*, \mu_2^*, \Gamma) = (0, 0),$$

and assume that $D_{(\lambda_2, \mu_2)}^2 \mathcal{J}(\lambda_2^, \mu_2^*, \Gamma)$ is invertible. Then, there exists a neighborhood \mathcal{W} of 0 in $\mathcal{D}^1(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2)$, a neighborhood \mathcal{U} of (λ_2^*, μ_2^*) in \mathbb{R}^2 and a C^1 function*

$$\mathcal{W} \ni V \longmapsto (\lambda_2^*(\Gamma_V), \mu_2^*(\Gamma_V)) \in \mathcal{U},$$

such that $D_{(\lambda_2, \mu_2)} \mathcal{J}(\lambda_2^(\Gamma_V), \mu_2^*(\Gamma_V), \Gamma_V) = (0, 0)$, and*

$$(\partial_\Gamma \lambda_2^*(\Gamma)(V), \partial_\Gamma \mu_2^*(\Gamma)(V)) = - (D_{(\lambda_2, \mu_2)}^2 \mathcal{J}(\lambda_2^*, \mu_2^*, \Gamma))^{-1} \partial_\Gamma (D_{(\lambda_2, \mu_2)} \mathcal{J}(\lambda_2^*, \mu_2^*, \Gamma))(V). \quad (16)$$

Remark 1. *Theorem 3 says that if Γ_V is the perturbation of Γ by the transformation $I + V$, then the first order variation of the optimal solution is given by*

$$(\lambda_2^*(\Gamma_V), \mu_2^*(\Gamma_V)) - (\lambda_2^*(\Gamma), \mu_2^*(\Gamma)) \approx - (D_{(\lambda_2, \mu_2)}^2 \mathcal{J}(\lambda_2^*, \mu_2^*, \Gamma))^{-1} \partial_\Gamma (D_{(\lambda_2, \mu_2)} \mathcal{J}(\lambda_2^*, \mu_2^*, \Gamma))(V).$$

Proof. According to Theorem 5 and Theorem 6, the function $D_{(\lambda_2, \mu_2)} \mathcal{J}$ is of class C^1 and in view of our assumptions satisfy $D_{(\lambda_2, \mu_2)} \mathcal{J}(\lambda_2^*, \mu_2^*, \Gamma) = (0, 0)$ and $D_{(\lambda_2, \mu_2)}^2 \mathcal{J}(\lambda_2^*, \mu_2^*, \Gamma)$ is invertible, we conclude the proof thanks to the implicit function theorem. \square

In what follows, we compute the quantities in the right-hand side of (16).

3.1 First-order derivatives of the cost functional

Theorem 4. *The functional J is differentiable, and its derivative at (λ_2, μ_2) in the direction $(\tilde{\lambda}_2, \tilde{\mu}_2)$ is given by*

$$\begin{aligned} D_{(\lambda_2, \mu_2)} J(\lambda_2, \mu_2, u_n, u_d)(\tilde{\lambda}_2, \tilde{\mu}_2) &= \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C}(\tilde{\lambda}_2, \tilde{\mu}_2) \hat{\nabla} u_d : \hat{\nabla} u_d \, dx \\ &\quad - \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C}(\tilde{\lambda}_2, \tilde{\mu}_2) \hat{\nabla} u_n : \hat{\nabla} u_n \, dx. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Proof. Let $\lambda_2^t = \lambda_2 + t\tilde{\lambda}_2$, $\mu_2^t = \mu_2 + t\tilde{\mu}_2$, $\mathbb{C} = \mathbb{C}(\lambda_2, \mu_2)$, $\tilde{\mathbb{C}} = \mathbb{C}(\tilde{\lambda}_2, \tilde{\mu}_2)$, $\mathbb{C}_t = \mathbb{C} + t\tilde{\mathbb{C}}$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$ is sufficiently small parameter. Under hypotheses of Theorem 5.1 of R. Correa and A. Seeger [3], we have

$$D_{(\lambda_2, \mu_2)} J(\lambda_2, \mu_2, u_n, u_d)(\tilde{\lambda}_2, \tilde{\mu}_2) = \partial_t \tilde{G}_n(t, u_n, v_n) \Big|_{t=0} + \partial_t \tilde{G}_d(t, u_d, v_d) \Big|_{t=0},$$

where

$$\tilde{G}_n(t, \varphi, \psi) := G_n(\lambda_2^t, \mu_2^t, \varphi, \psi) = J_0(\lambda_2^t, \mu_2^t, \varphi) + \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C}_t \hat{\nabla} \varphi : \hat{\nabla} \psi \, dx - \int_{\Gamma_N} g \cdot \psi \, ds,$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{G}_d(t, \varphi, \psi) := G_d(\lambda_2^t, \mu_2^t, \varphi, \psi) &= J_0(\lambda_2^t, \mu_2^t, \varphi) + \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C}_t \hat{\nabla} \varphi : \hat{\nabla} \psi \, dx \\ &+ \int_{\Gamma_N} (f - \varphi) \cdot (\mathbb{C} \hat{\nabla} \psi) \nu \, ds, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \tilde{G}_n(t, u_n, v_n) \Big|_{t=0} &= - \int_{\Omega} \tilde{\mathbb{C}} \hat{\nabla} u_n : \hat{\nabla} u_n \, dx, \\ \partial_t \tilde{G}_d(t, u_g, v_d) \Big|_{t=0} &= \int_{\Omega} \tilde{\mathbb{C}} \hat{\nabla} u_d : \hat{\nabla} u_d \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

The above equations yield (17). To end the proof, we should verify the four assumptions $(H_1) - (H_4)$ of Theorem 5.1 of R. Correa and A. Seeger [3]. We introduce the sets

$$\begin{aligned} X_n(t) &:= \left\{ x^t \in \mathcal{V} : \sup_{y \in \mathcal{V}} \tilde{G}_n(t, x^t, y) = \inf_{x \in \mathcal{V}} \sup_{y \in \mathcal{V}} \tilde{G}_n(t, x, y) \right\}, \\ Y_n(t) &:= \left\{ y^t \in \mathcal{V} : \inf_{x \in \mathcal{V}} \tilde{G}_n(t, x, y^t) = \sup_{y \in \mathcal{V}} \inf_{x \in \mathcal{V}} \tilde{G}_n(t, x, y) \right\}, \\ X_d(t) &:= \left\{ x^t \in \mathcal{V} : \sup_{y \in H_0^1(\Omega)^2} \tilde{G}_d(t, x^t, y) = \inf_{x \in \mathcal{V}} \sup_{y \in H_0^1(\Omega)^2} \tilde{G}_d(t, x, y) \right\}, \\ Y_d(t) &:= \left\{ y^t \in H_0^1(\Omega)^2 : \inf_{x \in \mathcal{V}} \tilde{G}_d(t, x, y^t) = \sup_{y \in H_0^1(\Omega)^2} \inf_{x \in \mathcal{V}} \tilde{G}_d(t, x, y) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

and obtain

$$\text{for all } t \in [0, \varepsilon] \quad S_n(t) = X_n(t) \times Y_n(t) = \{u_n(\mathbb{C}_t), v_n(\mathbb{C}_t)\} \neq \emptyset,$$

$$\text{for all } t \in [0, \varepsilon] \quad S_d(t) = X_d(t) \times Y_d(t) = \{u_d(\mathbb{C}_t), v_d(\mathbb{C}_t)\} \neq \emptyset,$$

and assumption (H_1) is satisfied.

Assumption (H_2) : The partial derivatives $\partial_t \tilde{G}_n(t, \varphi, \psi)$, $\partial_t \tilde{G}_d(t, \varphi, \psi)$ exist everywhere in $[0, \varepsilon)$ and the condition (H_2) is satisfied.

Assumptions (H_3) and (H_4) : We first show the boundedness of $(u_n(\mathbb{C}_t), v_n(\mathbb{C}_t))$. Letting $v = u_n(\mathbb{C}_t)$ in the variational equation

$$\int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C}_t \hat{\nabla} u_n(\mathbb{C}_t) : \hat{\nabla} v \, dx = \int_{\Gamma_N} g \cdot v \, ds, \quad (18)$$

for all $v \in \mathcal{V}$, we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C}_t \hat{\nabla} u_n : \hat{\nabla} u_n \, dx \leq \|g\|_{L^2(\Gamma_N)^2} \|u_n\|_{L^2(\Gamma_N)^2}.$$

From Korn's inequality and the trace theorem, there exists $c > 0$, depending only on Ω such that

$$\|u_n(\mathbb{C}_t)\|_{H^1(\Omega)^2} \leq c \|g\|_{L^2(\Gamma_N)^2},$$

which yields

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

We apply the same technique to the variational equation

$$\int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C}_t \hat{\nabla} u_d(\mathbb{C}_t) : \hat{\nabla} v \, dx + \int_{\Gamma_N} (f - u_d(\mathbb{C}_t)) \cdot (\mathbb{C} \hat{\nabla} v) \nu \, ds, \quad (19)$$

for all $v \in \mathcal{V}$, and we are able to show that the function $u_d(\mathbb{C}_t)$ is bounded. The next step is to show the continuity with respect to t of $(u_n(\mathbb{C}_t), u_d(\mathbb{C}_t))$. Subtracting (18) at $t > 0$ and $t = 0$ and choosing $v = u_n(\mathbb{C}) - u_n(\mathbb{C}_t)$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C} \hat{\nabla} (u_n(\mathbb{C}) - u_n(\mathbb{C}_t)) : \hat{\nabla} (u_n(\mathbb{C}) - u_n(\mathbb{C}_t)) \, dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} (\mathbb{C} - \mathbb{C}_t) \hat{\nabla} u_n(\mathbb{C}_t) : \hat{\nabla} (u_n(\mathbb{C}) - u_n(\mathbb{C}_t)) \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore due to the boundedness of $u_n(\mathbb{C}_t)$, we obtain

$$\|u_n(\mathbb{C}_t) - u_n(\mathbb{C})\|_{H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^2)} \leq C d_{\Omega}(\mathbb{C}_t, \mathbb{C}),$$

where

$$d_{\Omega}(\mathbb{C}_t, \mathbb{C}) := \max \{ \|\lambda_2^t - \lambda_2\|_{\infty}, \|\mu_2^t - \mu_2\|_{\infty} \}.$$

Due to the strong continuity of \mathbb{C}_t as a function of t , one deduces that $u_n(\mathbb{C}_t) \rightarrow u_n(\mathbb{C})$ in $H^1(\Omega)^2$ as $t \rightarrow 0$. Concerning the continuity of $u_d(\mathbb{C}_t)$, one may show from (19) that $u_d(\mathbb{C}_t) \rightarrow u_d(\mathbb{C})$ in $H^1(\Omega)^2$. Finally in view of the strong continuity of

$$\begin{aligned} (t, \varphi) &\rightarrow \partial_t \tilde{G}_n(t, \varphi, \psi), & (t, \psi) &\rightarrow \partial_t \tilde{G}_n(t, \varphi, \psi), \\ (t, \varphi) &\rightarrow \partial_t \tilde{G}_d(t, \varphi, \psi), & (t, \psi) &\rightarrow \partial_t \tilde{G}_d(t, \varphi, \psi), \end{aligned}$$

assumptions (H_3) and (H_4) are verified. \square

3.2 Second-order derivatives of the cost functional

To compute the second order derivative of $D_{(\lambda_2, \mu_2)} \mathcal{J}(\lambda_2, \mu_2, \Gamma)$, we use a Lagrangian method as in the previous section. We start by introducing the Lagrangian functionals

$$\begin{aligned} L_n(\lambda_2, \mu_2, \varphi, \psi) &= \int_{\Omega_2} \mathbb{C}(\tilde{\lambda}_2, \tilde{\mu}_2) \hat{\nabla} \varphi : \hat{\nabla} \varphi \, dx + \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C}(\lambda_2, \mu_2) \hat{\nabla} \varphi : \hat{\nabla} \psi \, dx \\ &\quad - \int_{\Gamma_N} g \cdot \psi \, ds \quad \text{for all } \varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{V}, \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
L_d(\lambda_2, \mu_2, \varphi, \psi) &= \int_{\Omega_2} \mathbb{C}(\tilde{\lambda}_2, \tilde{\mu}_2) \hat{\nabla} \varphi : \hat{\nabla} \varphi \, dx + \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C}(\lambda_2, \mu_2) \hat{\nabla} \varphi : \hat{\nabla} \psi \, dx \\
&\quad + \int_{\Gamma_N} (f - \varphi) \cdot (\mathbb{C}(\lambda_2, \mu_2) \hat{\nabla} \psi) \nu \, ds, \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in \mathcal{V}, \psi \in H_0^1(\Omega)^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

The saddle point equations of L_n and L_d are given by

$$\partial_\psi L_n(\lambda_2, \mu_2, u_n, v_n; \hat{\psi}) = 0, \quad \partial_\varphi L_n(\lambda_2, \mu_2, u_n, v_n; \hat{\varphi}) = 0,$$

$$\partial_\psi L_d(\lambda_2, \mu_2, u_d, v_d; \hat{\psi}) = 0, \quad \partial_\varphi L_d(\lambda_2, \mu_2, u_d, v_d; \hat{\varphi}) = 0,$$

or equivalently

$$\int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C}(\lambda_2, \mu_2) \hat{\nabla} u_n : \hat{\nabla} \hat{\psi} \, dx - \int_{\Gamma_N} g \cdot \hat{\psi} \, ds = 0, \tag{22}$$

$$\int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C}(\lambda_2, \mu_2) \hat{\nabla} v_n : \hat{\nabla} \hat{\varphi} \, dx = -2 \int_{\Omega_2} \mathbb{C}(\tilde{\lambda}_2, \tilde{\mu}_2) \hat{\nabla} u_n : \hat{\nabla} \varphi \, dx, \tag{23}$$

$$\int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C}(\lambda_2, \mu_2) \hat{\nabla} u_d : \hat{\nabla} \hat{\psi} \, dx + \int_{\Gamma_N} (f - u_d) \cdot (\mathbb{C}(\lambda_2, \mu_2) \nabla \hat{\psi}) \nu \, ds = 0, \tag{24}$$

$$\int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C}(\lambda_2, \mu_2) \hat{\nabla} v_d : \hat{\nabla} \hat{\varphi} \, dx = -2 \int_{\Omega_2} \mathbb{C}(\tilde{\lambda}_2, \tilde{\mu}_2) \hat{\nabla} u_d : \hat{\nabla} \varphi \, dx. \tag{25}$$

We have the following results.

Theorem 5 (second-order derivative). *The function $D_{(\lambda_2, \mu_2)} J(\lambda_2, \mu_2, \Gamma)$ is differentiable with respect to (λ_2, μ_2) and*

$$\begin{aligned}
D_{(\lambda_2, \mu_2)}^2 J(\lambda_2, \mu_2, \Gamma)(\tilde{\lambda}_2, \tilde{\mu}_2)(\hat{\lambda}_2, \hat{\mu}_2) &= \int_{\Omega_2} \mathbb{C}(\hat{\lambda}_2, \hat{\mu}_2) \hat{\nabla} u_n : \hat{\nabla} v_n \, dx \\
&\quad + \int_{\Omega_2} \mathbb{C}(\hat{\lambda}_2, \hat{\mu}_2) \hat{\nabla} u_d : \hat{\nabla} v_d \, dx,
\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

where u_n, v_n, u_d and v_d are solutions of (22), (23), (24) and (25) respectively.

Proof. As in the proof of Theorem 4, using the Lagrangian L_n and L_d for fixed Γ , and applying Theorem 5.1 of R. Correa and A. Seeger [3], we have

$$D_{(\lambda_2, \mu_2)}^2 J(\lambda_2, \mu_2, u_n, u_d)(\tilde{\lambda}_2, \tilde{\mu}_2)(\hat{\lambda}_2, \hat{\mu}_2) = \partial_t \tilde{L}_n(t, u_n, v_n) \Big|_{t=0} + \partial_t \tilde{L}_d(t, u_d, v_d) \Big|_{t=0},$$

where

$$\tilde{L}_n(t, \varphi, \psi) := G_n(\lambda_2^t, \mu_2^t, \varphi, \psi) = \int_{\Omega_2} \mathbb{C}(\tilde{\lambda}_2, \tilde{\mu}_2) \hat{\nabla} \varphi : \hat{\nabla} \varphi \, dx + \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C}_t \hat{\nabla} \varphi : \hat{\nabla} \psi \, dx - \int_{\Gamma_N} g \cdot \psi \, ds,$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{L}_d(t, \varphi, \psi) &:= G_d(\lambda_2^t, \mu_2^t, \varphi, \psi) = \int_{\Omega_2} \mathbb{C}(\tilde{\lambda}_2, \tilde{\mu}_2) \hat{\nabla} \varphi : \hat{\nabla} \varphi \, dx + \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{C}_t \hat{\nabla} \varphi : \hat{\nabla} \psi \, dx \\
&\quad + \int_{\Gamma_N} (f - \varphi) \cdot (\mathbb{C} \hat{\nabla} \psi) \nu \, ds,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t \tilde{L}_n(t, u_n, v_n) \Big|_{t=0} &= \int_{\Omega_2} \mathbb{C}(\hat{\lambda}_2, \hat{\mu}_2) \hat{\nabla} u_n : \hat{\nabla} v_n \, dx, \\ \partial_t \tilde{L}_d(t, u_d, v_d) \Big|_{t=0} &= \int_{\Omega_2} \mathbb{C}(\hat{\lambda}_2, \hat{\mu}_2) \hat{\nabla} u_d : \hat{\nabla} v_d \, dx.\end{aligned}$$

The hypotheses of Theorem 5.1 in [3] can be checked in a similar way as in the proof of Theorem 4. \square

3.3 Shape derivative of the first-order derivatives of the cost functional

Theorem 6. *The functional $D_{(\lambda_2, \mu_2)} \mathcal{J}(\lambda_2^*, \mu_2^*, \Gamma)(\tilde{\lambda}_2, \tilde{\mu}_2)$ is shape shape differentiable with respect to Γ and its shape derivative in the direction V is given by:*

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_\Gamma \left(D_{(\lambda_2, \mu_2)} \mathcal{J}(\lambda_2^*, \mu_2^*, \Gamma)(\tilde{\lambda}_2, \tilde{\mu}_2) \right) (V) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_2} \mathbb{C}(\tilde{\lambda}_2, \tilde{\mu}_2) [-\nabla u_n DV - DV^T \nabla u_n^T] : [\nabla u_n + \nabla u_n^T] \, dx \\ &+ \frac{1}{4} \int_{\Omega_2} \mathbb{C}(\tilde{\lambda}_2, \tilde{\mu}_2) [\nabla u_n + \nabla u_n^T] : [\nabla u_n + \nabla u_n^T] \operatorname{div} V \, dx \\ &+ \frac{1}{4} \int_{\Omega_2} \mathbb{C}(\tilde{\lambda}_2, \tilde{\mu}_2) [-\nabla u_n DV - DV^T \nabla u_n^T] : [\nabla v_n + \nabla v_n^T] \, dx \\ &+ \frac{1}{4} \int_{\Omega_2} \mathbb{C}(\tilde{\lambda}_2, \tilde{\mu}_2) [\nabla u_n + \nabla u_n^T] : [-\nabla v_n DV - DV^T \nabla v_n^T] \, dx \\ &+ \frac{1}{4} \int_{\Omega_2} \mathbb{C}(\tilde{\lambda}_2, \tilde{\mu}_2) [\nabla u_n + \nabla u_n^T] : [\nabla v_n + \nabla v_n^T] \operatorname{div} V \, dx \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_2} \mathbb{C}(\tilde{\lambda}_2, \tilde{\mu}_2) [-\nabla u_d DV - DV^T \nabla u_d^T] : [\nabla u_d + \nabla u_d^T] \, dx \\ &+ \frac{1}{4} \int_{\Omega_2} \mathbb{C}(\tilde{\lambda}_2, \tilde{\mu}_2) [\nabla u_d + \nabla u_d^T] : [\nabla u_d + \nabla u_d^T] \operatorname{div} V \, dx \\ &+ \frac{1}{4} \int_{\Omega_2} \mathbb{C}(\tilde{\lambda}_2, \tilde{\mu}_2) [-\nabla u_d DV - DV^T \nabla u_d^T] : [\nabla v_d + \nabla v_d^T] \, dx \\ &+ \frac{1}{4} \int_{\Omega_2} \mathbb{C}(\tilde{\lambda}_2, \tilde{\mu}_2) [\nabla u_d + \nabla u_d^T] : [-\nabla v_d DV - DV^T \nabla v_d^T] \, dx \\ &+ \frac{1}{4} \int_{\Omega_2} \mathbb{C}(\tilde{\lambda}_2, \tilde{\mu}_2) [\nabla u_d + \nabla u_d^T] : [\nabla v_d + \nabla v_d^T] \operatorname{div} V \, dx.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Theorem 6, can be proven using Theorem 5.1 of R. Correa and A. Seeger [3]). \square

References

- [1] J. Baumeister. *Stable solution of inverse problems*. Advanced Lectures in Mathematics. Friedr. Vieweg & Sohn, Braunschweig, 1987.

- [2] K. Brandes and R. Griesse. Quantitative stability analysis of optimal solutions in PDE-constrained optimization. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 206(2):908–926, 2007.
- [3] M. C. Delfour and J.-P. Zolésio. *Shapes and geometries*, volume 22 of *Advances in Design and Control*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, second edition, 2011. Metrics, analysis, differential calculus, and optimization.
- [4] S. Eberle, B. Harrach, H. Meftahi, and T. Rezgui. Lipschitz stability estimate and reconstruction of lamé parameters in linear elasticity. *Inverse Problems in Science and Engineering*, pages 1–22, 2020.
- [5] I. Ekeland and R. Temam. *Analyse convexe et problèmes variationnels*. Dunod, 1974. Collection Études Mathématiques.
- [6] R. Griesse. Parametric sensitivity analysis in optimal control of a reaction diffusion system. I. Solution differentiability. *Numer. Funct. Anal. Optim.*, 25(1-2):93–117, 2004.
- [7] R. Griesse. Parametric sensitivity analysis in optimal control of a reaction-diffusion system. II. Practical methods and examples. *Optim. Methods Softw.*, 19(2):217–242, 2004.
- [8] J. Hegemann, A. Cantarero, C. L. Richardson, and J. M. Teran. An explicit update scheme for inverse parameter and interface estimation of piecewise constant coefficients in linear elliptic PDEs. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 35(2):A1098–A1119, 2013.
- [9] H. Kasumba, K. Kunisch, and A. Laurain. A bilevel shape optimization problem for the exterior Bernoulli free boundary value problem. *Interfaces Free Bound.*, 16(4):459–487, 2014.
- [10] K. Malanowski. Sensitivity analysis for parametric optimal control of semilinear parabolic equations. *J. Convex Anal.*, 9(2):543–561, 2002. Special issue on optimization (Montpellier, 2000).
- [11] K. Malanowski and F. Tröltzsch. Lipschitz stability of solutions to parametric optimal control problems for parabolic equations. *Z. Anal. Anwendungen*, 18(2):469–489, 1999.
- [12] K. Malanowski and F. Tröltzsch. Lipschitz stability of solutions to parametric optimal control for elliptic equations. *Control Cybernet.*, 29(1):237–256, 2000.