Reconstruction of cracks in an inhomogeneous anisotropic elastic medium

Gen Nakamura* Gunther Uhlmann† Jenn-Nan Wang‡

June 5, 2003

Abstract

In this paper we give in two and three dimensions a reconstruction formula for determining cracks embedded in an inhomogeneous anisotropic elastic body.

1 Introduction and statement of the results

In this paper we give a reconstruction formula in two and three dimensions for determining cracks embedded in an inhomogeneous anisotropic elastic body in. by making traction and displacement measurements on an open subset of the boundary of the medium. This information is encoded in the local Neumann-to-Dirichlet map. We describe below more precisely the problem and our main result.

Let $\mathcal{B}$ be an anisotropic elastic body and the reference configuration of $\mathcal{B}$ be Ω, a bounded connected domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n = 2, 3$, with C^1 boundary Γ. Denote by $C(x) = (C_{ijkl}(x)) \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ the elastic tensor. Here and below, all Latin indices are set to be from 1 to n ($n = 2$ or 3). We assume that the elastic tensor C satisfies the full symmetry properties

$$C_{ijkl} = C_{jikl} = C_{klij} \quad \forall\ i, j, k, l \tag{1.1}$$

and the strong convexity condition, i.e. there exists a constant $\delta > 0$ such that

$$C(x)E \cdot E \geq \delta |E|^2 \tag{1.2}$$

*Department of Mathematics, Hokkaido University, Sapporo 060-0810, Japan. (Email:gnaka@math.sci.hokudai.ac.jp)
Partially supported by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (B)(2)(No. 14340038) of Japan Society for Promotion of Science.
†Department of Mathematics, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195-4350, USA. (Email:gunther@math.washington.edu)
Partially supported by NSF and a John Simon Guggenheim fellowship.
‡Department of Mathematics, National Taiwan University, Taipei 106, Taiwan. (Email:jnwang@math.ntu.edu.tw)
Partially supported by the National Science Council of Taiwan

for any symmetric matrix E and all $x \in \Omega$. Here we have used the conventions

$$(CG)_{ij} = \sum_{ijkl} C_{ijkl} g_{kl} \quad \text{and} \quad G \cdot H = \sum_{ij} g_{ij} h_{ij},$$

where $G = (g_{ij})$ and $H = (h_{ij})$ are real matrices. Let $u = {}^t(u_1, \cdots, u_n)$ be the displacement vector, then the equation of equilibrium, when there are no exterior forces acting on the domain, is given by [7]

$$\mathcal{L}_C u = \nabla \cdot \sigma_C(u) = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega, \tag{1.3}$$

where $(\nabla \cdot G)_i = \sum_j \partial_j g_{ij}$ for any matrix function $G = (g_{ij})$ and $\sigma_C(u) = C\nabla u$. It is evident that $\sigma_C(u) = C\varepsilon(u)$ with $\varepsilon(u) = \mathrm{Sym}\nabla u = \frac{1}{2}({}^t\nabla u + \nabla u)$ if C satisfies (1.1). Here the superscript t denotes the transpose of vectors or matrices.

Throughout the paper we use the following notations and assumptions. Let X be an open submanifold of a manifold Y. If F is a space of distributions in Y, we set

$$\bar{F}(X) := \{f|_X; f \in F\}, \quad \dot{F}(\bar{X}) := \{f \in F; \mathrm{supp}\,(f) \subset \bar{X}\},$$

where $f|_X$ is the restriction of f to X. These notations will be used for some Sobolev spaces defined in X and when X, Y and the boundary ∂X have sufficient regularities. Assume that $S \subset \Omega$ is a C^2 closed Jordan curve ($n = 2$) or closed connected surface ($n = 3$) and $\Sigma \subset S$ is an open curve or surface. When $n = 3$ we suppose that the boundary $\partial\Sigma$ of Σ is C^2. Here Σ will be considered as a crack. We can have several number of cracks. For this case our theory also works without any essential change. Let Ω_- be the open subset of Ω with boundary S and $\Omega_+ := \Omega \setminus \bar{\Omega}_-$. The trace operator to Γ is denoted by γ and those from $\Omega_\pm$ to S is denoted by $\gamma_\pm$. The directions of the unit normal ν to Γ and S are directed into $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bar{\Omega}$ and Ω_+, respectively.

In our problem, we take $X = \Sigma$, $k \in \mathbb{R}$ (with $|k| \leq 1$) and define the Sobolev spaces $\bar{H}^k(\Sigma)$ and $\dot{H}^k(\bar{\Sigma})$, which are subspaces of $H^k(S)$. Also, we denote $\bar{H}^k(\Sigma)^*$ the dual space of $\bar{H}^k(\Sigma)$. For $1/2 < s \leq 1$, we define $H^s(\Omega \setminus \Sigma)$ by

$$H^s(\Omega \setminus \Sigma) := \{u \in \mathfrak{D}'(\Omega); u_\pm := u|_{\Omega_\pm} \in \bar{H}^s(\Omega_\pm); [u] := \gamma_+ u_+ - \gamma_- u_- = 0 \text{ on } S \setminus \bar{\Sigma}\}$$

with the norm $\|u\|_{H^s(\Omega\setminus\Sigma)} := \|u_+\|_{\bar{H}^s(\Omega_+)} + \|u_-\|_{\bar{H}^s(\Omega_-)}$.

To study different types of boundary measurements, we divide Γ into two parts:

$$\Gamma = \bar{\Gamma}_D \cup \bar{\Gamma}_N, \quad \Gamma_D \cap \Gamma_N = \varnothing$$

where $\Gamma_D, \Gamma_N \subset \Gamma$ are open subsets with C^1 boundaries $\partial\Gamma_D$, $\partial\Gamma_N$. One of Γ_D and Γ_N will be considered as the place where we perform the measurements. Note that we do not exclude the case $\Gamma_D = \varnothing$ or $\Gamma_N = \varnothing$.

We will give several mixed type boundary conditions. For example, fixing Dirichlet data on one part of the boundary, we measure the corresponding Dirichlet data on the other part of the boundary for given Neumann data on the same part of the boundary. By changing the fixed data, given data and measured data we obtain another type of traction and displacement measurements at the boundary. More precisely we consider two types of boundary value problems as direct problems.

Type 1 For any $g \in H_{\#}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma) := \{g \in H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma); \int_\Gamma g \cdot (o + Wx) ds = 0\}$, where o is a constant n-vector and W is a skew-symmetric $n \times n$ matrix, find a solution $u \in H^1_{\#}(\Omega \setminus \Sigma) := \{u \in H^1(\Omega \setminus \Sigma); \int_\Gamma u ds = 0, \text{ Skew} \int_\Gamma \nabla u ds = 0\}$ to

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_C u = 0 & \text{in} \quad \Omega \setminus \bar{\Sigma} \\ \sigma_C(u)\nu = 0 & \text{on} \quad \Sigma \\ \sigma_C(u)\nu = g & \text{on} \quad \Gamma \end{cases} \tag{1.4}$$

where ds is the line or surface element and Skew $\int_\Gamma \nabla u ds$ is the skew symmetric part of $\int_\Gamma \nabla u ds$. Here $o + Wx$ is usually called an *infinitesimal rigid displacement* (see [19]).

Type 2 Assume $\Gamma_D \neq \varnothing$. For any given $f \in \bar{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma_D)$ and $g \in \bar{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma_N)$, find a solution $u \in H^1(\Omega \setminus \Sigma)$ to

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_C u = 0 & \text{in} \quad \Omega \setminus \bar{\Sigma} \\ \sigma_C(u)\nu = 0 & \text{on} \quad \Sigma \\ u = f \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_D, & \sigma_C(u)\nu = g \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_N. \end{cases} \tag{1.5}$$

In section 2 (see Theorem 2.1) we prove that the corresponding boundary problems (1.4) and (1.5) are well posed. The local Neumann-to-Dirichlet map is defined by

Definition 1.1 (i) *For Type 1 direct problem, we define* $\Lambda_\Sigma : H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma) \to H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)$ *by*

$$\Lambda_\Sigma g = u|_\Gamma,$$

where $u \in H^1_{\#}(\Omega \setminus \Sigma)$ *is the solution to 1.4 with* $g \in H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)$.
(ii) *For Type 2 direct problem, we define* $\Lambda_\Sigma : \bar{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma_N) \to \bar{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma_N)$ *by*

$$\Lambda_\Sigma g = u|_{\Gamma_N},$$

where $u \in H^1(\Omega \setminus \Sigma)$ *is the solution to* (1.5) *with* $g \in \bar{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma_N)$.
(iii) *For both types of direct problems, we denote* Λ_Σ *by* $\Lambda_\varnothing$ *if* $\Sigma = \varnothing$.

In this paper we are concerned with reconstructing Σ from Λ_Σ. In fact, we present a reconstruction formula along the lines of the probe method [11]. This method has similarities with the point source method [18]. The probe method relies on the indicator function defined by

$$I(t, r) := \lim_{j \to \infty} < g_j, (\Lambda_\Sigma - \Lambda_\varnothing) g_j >, \tag{1.6}$$

where $< \cdot, \cdot >$ is the pairing between $\bar{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma_N)$ and $\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\bar{\Gamma}_N)$. By make an appropriate choice of the Neumann data g_j to search for the location of the crack. In order to construct this data we impose the technical assumption that the elasticity system possesses the *Runge property with constraints.*

Assumption 1.1 *Suppose that U is an open subset of Ω with C^1 boundary such that $\bar{U} \subset \Omega$ and $\Omega \setminus \bar{U}$ is connected. Let X be the set of all functions $u|_U$ satisfying $u \in H^1$ in an open neighborhood of $\bar{U}$ and therein $\mathcal{L}_C u = 0$; let Y denote the set of all functions $v|_U$ satisfying $v \in H^1(\Omega)$ and $\mathcal{L}_C v = 0$ in Ω with $\mathrm{supp}\,(v) \subset \Gamma_0$, where Γ_0 is any fixed open subset of Γ. Then Y is dense in X with respect to the H^1 topology.*

It is well-known that the Runge property with constraints is an easy consequence of the unique continuation property. When the elastic medium is homogeneous or analytic, the unique continuation property is obvious. Recently, the first and third authors proved the unique continuation property for a generic class of two-dimensional inhomogeneous anisotropic elasticity systems [17]. The unique continuation property for three-dimensional inhomogeneous anisotropic elasticity systems is still an open problem. We would like to emphasize that our method is valid in greater generality than the unique continuation property; we only need the Runge property. Therefore, in the two dimensional case, our method works for any inhomogeneous anisotropic elasticity system satisfying some generic conditions (see [17] for the precise conditions).

Now we state the main result of the paper.

Main Theorem *Let Assumption 1.1 hold. Then there is a reconstruction formula for identifying Σ from Λ_Σ.*

We will summarize the reconstruction formula of our method at the end of the last section.

In the paper we only consider a single crack. Nevertheless, the same method works without any change for multiple cracks. A similar problem is considered in [13] of determination of crack embedded in an inhomogeneous isotropic conductive medium. There are several difficulties in generalizing the approach to the case of anisotropic elastic medium. The analysis of the blow-up behavior of the indicator function at the crack is considerably more complicated. The indicator function, although is defined in terms of boundary measurements, can be expressed as an integral which contains a special solution for the cracked domain (see (3.10)). This special solution is called *reflected solution.* The construction of the reflected solution and the analysis of the behavior of the indicator function become extremely complicated in the case of an inhomogeneous anisotropic medium. We construct the reflected solution by suitable change of local coordinates near the crack, freezing the elastic coefficients, and the Fourier transform method which is based on a factorization of the elasticity system (see Section 4) . Then we analyze the behavior of the indicator function by the Plancherel formula and the form of the reflected solution. In section 3 we outline the proof and the steps in the reconstruction method. In section 4 we give the details of the proofs.

In addition to the recent paper [13], there are several related results on crack determination in different contexts. We mention Bryan and Vogelius [6], Kress [16], Ben Abda et al [1], [2], [3], Brühl et al [5]. Ben Abda et al assumed the non-vanishing of the stress intensity factor for a surface breaking crack in a two dimensional medium and the non-vanishing of the displacement gap across a two dimensional crack in a plane and used the reciprocity gap principle to reconstruct the crack. Brühl et al used Kirsch's linear sampling method (see [15]). Others' results reduce the problems to some optimization problems and use a Newton type algorithm to solve these.

2 The direct problem

In the following theorem we prove the well posedness for the Type 1 and Type 2 mixed boundary value problem stated in the introduction including the case $\Gamma_D = \varnothing$.

Theorem 2.1 *For any given $p \in \bar{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma)$, $f \in \bar{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma_D)$ and $g \in \bar{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma_N)$, there exists a unique solution $u \in H^1(\Omega \setminus \Sigma)$ to*

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_C u = 0 \quad in \quad \Omega \setminus \bar{\Sigma} \\ \sigma_C(u)\nu = p \quad on \quad \Sigma \\ u = f \quad on \quad \Gamma_D, \quad \sigma_C(u)\nu = g \quad on \quad \Gamma_N. \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

Moreover it satisfies the estimate

$$\|u\|_{H^1(\Omega\setminus\Sigma)} \leq c(\|p\|_{\bar{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma)} + \|f\|_{\bar{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma_D)} + \|g\|_{\bar{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma_N)}), \tag{2.2}$$

where, hereafter, c denotes a general positive constant. In the case where $\Gamma_D = \varnothing$, we assume $g \in H_{\#}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)$ and take $u \in H_{\#}^1(\Omega \setminus \Sigma)$.

Proof. The same theorem for the conductivity equation was proved in [13]. Here we modify their arguments to handle the elasticity system. We first consider the case $\Gamma_D \neq \varnothing$. By virtue of the definition $\bar{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma_D)$, there exists an extension $\tilde{f} \in H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)$ of f such that $\|\tilde{f}\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)} \leq \|f\|_{\bar{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma_D)}$. Let $u_0 \in H^1(\Omega)$ be the solution to

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_C u_0 = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega \\ u_0 = \tilde{f} \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma, \end{cases}$$

then we can easily show that u_0 satisfies

$$\|u_0\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq c\|\tilde{f}\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\sigma_C(u_0)\nu\|_{\bar{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma_N)} \leq c\|\tilde{f}\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)}.$$

Now let $\chi \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ satisfy $\mathrm{supp}\,(\chi) \cap \Sigma = \varnothing$ and $\chi = 1$ near Γ. Define $u_1 := u - \chi u_0$. We obtain from (2.1) that u_1 solves

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_C u_1 = F \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega \setminus \bar{\Sigma} \\ \sigma_C(u_1)\nu = p \quad \text{on} \quad \Sigma \\ u_1 = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_D, \quad \sigma_C(u_1)\nu = h \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_N, \end{cases} \tag{2.3}$$

where $F = -\nabla \cdot (C(u_0 \otimes \nabla\chi)) - (C\nabla u_0)\nabla\chi \in H^1(\Omega \setminus \Sigma)^*$ and $h = g - \chi\sigma_C(u_0)\nu \in \bar{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma_N)$. Here the tensor product of two vectors a and b is defined as $(a \otimes b)_{ij} = a_i b_j$. We now formulate (2.3) in a variational form, namely, finding u_1 solving

$$\int_{\Omega\setminus\Sigma} C\varepsilon(u_1) \cdot \varepsilon(v) dx = -\int_{\Omega\setminus\Sigma} F \cdot v dx + \int_{\Gamma_N} h \cdot v ds - \int_{\Sigma} p \cdot [v] ds \tag{2.4}$$

for any $v \in \mathcal{V} := \{v \in H^1(\Omega\setminus\Sigma); v = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_D\}$. Note that $[v] = \gamma_+ v_+ - \gamma_- v_- \in \dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\bar{\Sigma})$ and $\gamma v \in \dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\bar{\Gamma}_N)$. Also, we can see that $\bar{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma_N) = \dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\bar{\Gamma}_N)^*$. Therefore, to prove (2.4) has a unique solution in $\mathcal{V}$ with the estimate

$$\|u_1\|_{H^1(\Omega\setminus\Sigma)} \le c(\|F\|_{H^1(\Omega\setminus\Sigma)^*} + \|h\|_{\bar{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma_N)} + \|p\|_{\bar{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma)}) \tag{2.5}$$

by using the Lax-Milgram theorem, it suffices to establish the coercive estimate

$$a(v,v) := \int_{\Omega\setminus\Sigma} C\varepsilon(v) \cdot \varepsilon(v)\ dx \ge c\|v\|^2_{H^1(\Omega\setminus\Sigma)} \quad \forall\ v \in \mathcal{V}. \tag{2.6}$$

It is obvious that (2.5) implies (2.2). In view of the strong convexity condition (1.2), to prove (2.6), we only need to show that $\|v\|^2_{H^1(\Omega\setminus\Sigma)}$ and $\alpha(v) := \int_{\Omega\setminus\Sigma} |\varepsilon(v)|^2 dx$ are equivalent norms in $\mathcal{V}$. It is easy to see that $\alpha(v) = 0$ if and only if v is an infinitesimal rigid displacement, i.e. $v = o + Wx$. Since $v = 0$ on Γ_D, $v \equiv 0$ in $\Omega \setminus \Sigma$. In other words, $\alpha(\cdot)$ defines a norm on $\mathcal{V}$. To prove that $\|\cdot\|^2_{H^1(\Omega\setminus\Sigma)}$ and $\alpha(\cdot)$ are equivalent, it is enough to show

$$\alpha(v) \ge c\|v\|^2_{L^2(\Omega\setminus\Sigma)} \quad \forall v \in \mathcal{V} \tag{2.7}$$

due to Korn's inequality

$$\int_{\Omega\setminus\Sigma} |\varepsilon(v)|^2 dx + \int_{\Omega\setminus\Sigma} |v|^2 dx \ge c\|v\|^2_{H^1(\Omega\setminus\Sigma)}.$$

The estimate (2.7) can be proved by standard contradiction arguments as in [8, Theorem 3.3]. So we omit the details here.

When $\Gamma_D = \varnothing$, the existence and uniqueness of solution u to (2.1) can be shown using a similar variational formulation. Note that in this case we take $\mathcal{V} = H^1_{\#}(\Omega \setminus \Sigma)$. $\square$

3 Proof of Main Theorem

Here we will only prove the theorem for Type 2 problem. The same proof works for Type 1 problem. As mentioned above, we will design our reconstruction formula based on the probe method.

To begin, let $r := \{r(t) \in \bar{\Omega}; 0 \leq t \leq 1\}$ be a non-selfintersecting continuous curve joining $r(0), r(1) \in \Gamma$ with $r(t) \in \Omega$ for $0 < t < 1$. This curve r is called a needle. Define

$$T(r, \Sigma) := \sup\{t; 0 < t < 1, r(s) \notin \bar{\Sigma} \text{ for } 0 < s < t\}.$$

Physically, $T(r, \Sigma)$ can be interpreted as the first hitting time of the needle r to Σ. It is clear that if $T(r, \Sigma) = 1$ then the needle r does not touch the crack Σ. For any given needle r, we would like to find a characterization of $T(r, \Sigma)$. To do this, as indicated in the introduction, we define the indicator function $I(t, r)$ by

$$I(t, r) := \lim_{j \to \infty} < g_j, (\Lambda_\Sigma - \Lambda_\varnothing) g_j >, \tag{3.1}$$

where here $< \cdot, \cdot >$ is the pairing between $\bar{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma_N)$ and $\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\bar{\Gamma}_N)$. The Neumann data g_j requires further explanations. Let $v', v_j'' \in H^1(\Omega)$ ($j \in \mathbb{N}$) be defined as follows. v' is the solution to

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_C v' = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega \\ v' = f \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_D, \ \sigma_C(v')\nu = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_N \end{cases} \tag{3.2}$$

and v_j'' satisfy

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_C v_j'' = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega \\ \text{supp}\,(v_j'') \subset \Gamma_0 \\ v_j'' \to G(\cdot, r(t)) \ (j \to \infty) \quad \text{in} \quad H^1_{loc}(\Omega \setminus r_t), \end{cases} \tag{3.3}$$

where Γ_0 is a fixed open subset of Γ_N and

$$r_t := \{r(s); 0 < s \leq t\}.$$

Here the distribution $G(\cdot, x^0)$ in $x^0 \in \Omega$ satisfies

$$\mathcal{L}_C G(\cdot, x^0) + \delta(x - x^0) I_n = 0$$

and

$$\forall\ b \in \mathbb{R}^n, (G(\cdot, x^0) - E(\cdot, x^0)b)_{x^0 \in \Omega} \quad \text{is bounded in} \quad H^1(\Omega), \tag{3.4}$$

where the distribution $E(x, x^0)$ in $x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfies

$$\mathcal{L}_{C(x^0)} E(x, x^0) + \delta(x - x^0) I_n = 0. \tag{3.5}$$

Note that $C(x^0)$ is a homogeneous elastic tensor with $C(x) = C(x^0)$ for all $x \in \Omega$ and I_n the identity matrix. The existence v_j'' is guaranteed by the Runge property with constraints (Assumption 1.1). The proof for the existence of $G(x, x^0)$ can be found in [12]. To deal with the inverse problem here, we will give an explicit construction of E in the next section. Now we define

$$v_j = v' + v_j''$$

and

$$g_j = \sigma_C(v_j)\nu|_{\Gamma_N}.$$

To relate the indicator function $I(t, r)$ to $T(r, \Sigma)$, we define the quantity

$$t(r, \Sigma) := \sup\{0 < t < 1;\ \sup_{0<s<t} |I(s, r)| < \infty\}.$$

Our aim now is to show that

$$t(r, \Sigma) = T(r, \Sigma) \quad \text{if} \quad r \cap \Sigma \neq \varnothing, \tag{3.6}$$

namely, the indicator function $I(t, r)$ will become unbounded once the tip of the needle touches the crack. Proving (3.6) requires some delicate analysis. It is the main technical part of the proof.

First of all, we would like to rewrite the indicator function $I(t, r)$ which involves the so-called *reflected solution* defined as follows. Let $u_j \in H^1(\Omega \setminus \Sigma)$ be the solution of

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_C u_j = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega \setminus \bar{\Sigma} \\ \sigma_C(u_j)\nu = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \Sigma \\ u_j = f \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_D,\ \sigma_C(u_j)\nu = g_j \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_N \end{cases}$$

and $w_j = u_j - v_j \in H^1(\Omega \setminus \Sigma)$, then we can show that

Lemma 3.1 *(reflected solution) If $r_t \cap \bar{\Sigma} = \varnothing$, then $w_j \to w'$ in $H^1(\Omega \setminus \Sigma)$ and $w' \in H^1(\Omega \setminus \Sigma)$ satisfies*

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_C w' = 0 \quad \textit{in} \quad \Omega \setminus \bar{\Sigma} \\ \sigma_C(w')\nu = -\sigma_C(v' + G(\cdot, r(t)))\nu \quad \textit{on} \quad \Sigma \\ w' = 0 \quad \textit{on} \quad \Gamma_D,\ \sigma_C(w')\nu = 0 \quad \textit{on} \quad \Gamma_N. \end{cases} \tag{3.7}$$

Proof. In view of the definitions of v_j and u_j, we obtain that

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_C w_j = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega \setminus \bar{\Sigma} \\ \sigma_C(w_j)\nu = -\sigma_C(v_j)\nu \quad \text{on} \quad \Sigma \\ w_j = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_D,\ \sigma_C(w_j)\nu = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_N. \end{cases} \tag{3.8}$$

Applying Theorem 2.1 to (3.8) yields

$$\|w_j - w_k\|_{H^1(\Omega\setminus\Sigma)} \le c\|\sigma_C(v_j - v_k)\nu\|_{\tilde{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma)} = c\|\sigma_C(v_j'' - v_k'')\nu\|_{\tilde{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma)}. \tag{3.9}$$

Now let D be a bounded domain with C^1 boundary such that $\bar{\Sigma} \subset D \subset \bar{D} \subset \Omega \setminus r_t$. We can see that $v_j'' - v_k'' \in H^1(D)$ and $\mathcal{L}_C(v_j'' - v_k'') = 0$ in D. So by the trace theorem (Lemma A.2 in Appendix), we have that

$$\|\sigma_C(v_j'' - v_k'')\nu\|_{\tilde{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma)} \le c\|v_j'' - v_k''\|_{H^1(D)}.$$

Thus, this lemma is proved using (3.3) and (3.9). □

With the reflected solution w, we can give another form of the indicator $I(t, r)$.

Lemma 3.2 *Assume $r_t \cap \bar{\Sigma} = \varnothing$. Then we have*

$$I(t, r) = \int_{\Omega\setminus\Sigma} \sigma_C(w') \cdot \varepsilon(w')dx + \int_{\Gamma_D} f\sigma_C(w')\nu ds. \tag{3.10}$$

Proof. In view of Lemma 3.1 and the definition of $I(t, r)$, it suffices to show that

$$< g_j, (\Lambda_\Sigma - \Lambda_\varnothing)g_j >= \int_{\Omega\setminus\Sigma} \sigma_C(w_j) \cdot \varepsilon(w_j)dx + \int_{\Gamma_D} f\sigma_C(w_j)\nu ds. \tag{3.11}$$

By the definitions of $\Lambda_\Sigma, \Lambda_\varnothing$ and Green's formula (A.1) in Lemma A.3, we can get that

$$< g_j, (\Lambda_\Sigma - \Lambda_\varnothing)g_j >= \int_{\Sigma_\pm} u_j\sigma_C(v_j)\nu ds + \int_{\Gamma_D} f\sigma_C(w_j)ds, \tag{3.12}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \textstyle\int_{\Sigma_\pm} u_j\sigma_C(v_j)\nu ds &:= \textstyle\int_{\Sigma_+} \gamma_+(u_j\sigma_C(v_j)\nu)ds - \int_{\Sigma_-} \gamma_-(u_j\sigma_C(v_j)\nu)ds \\ &= \textstyle\int_\Sigma(\gamma_+ u_j[\sigma_C(v_j)\nu] + [u_j]\gamma_-\sigma_C(v_j)\nu)ds \\ &= \textstyle\int_\Sigma[u_j]\gamma_-\sigma_C(v_j)\nu ds. \end{aligned}$$

Using Green's formula (A.1) again yields

$$\int_{\Sigma_\pm} u_j\sigma_C(v_j)\nu ds = -\int_{\Sigma_\pm} w_j\sigma_C(w_j)\nu ds = \int_{\Omega\setminus\Sigma} \sigma_C(w_j) \cdot \varepsilon(w_j)dx. \tag{3.13}$$

Combining (3.12) and (3.13) immediately gives (3.11). □

By virtue of Lemma 3.2, we can show a distinct feature of $I(t, r)$ when $r \cap \Sigma \neq \varnothing$.

Theorem 3.1 *If $r(T(r, \Sigma)) \in \Sigma$, then $|I(t, r)| \to \infty$ as $t \to T(r, \Sigma)$.*

By Theorem 3.1, we can prove (3.6) in the same way as [14]. The proof of Theorem 3.1 relies on the analysis of behavior of the reflected solution $w' = w'(x, r(t))$. We will give its proof in the next section. We end this section by giving the reconstruction algorithm of our method.

Reconstruction Algorithm.

Step 1. Given a needle $r = \{r(t) : 0 \le t \le 1\}$ and consider the domain $\Omega \setminus r_t$.

Step 2. Solve (3.2) for v' and find a sequence of functions v''_j satisfying (3.3).

Step 3. Compute $g_j = \sigma_C(v' + v''_j)\nu|_{\Gamma_N}$ and evaluate the indicator function $I(t, r) := \lim_j < g_j, (\Lambda_\Sigma - \Lambda_\varnothing)g_j >$.

Step 4. Increase t and search for t where $|I(r, t)|$ becomes very large. Denote this t by $t_a(r, \Sigma)$.

Step 5. Choose many needles r and repeat all previous steps. Draw some surface Σ_a which is close enough to the points $t_a(r, \Sigma)$ for these r. Σ_a is gives an approximation of Σ.

4 Blow-up behavior of the indicator function

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 3.1. The analysis here is different from that in [13]. There the authors worked in the space coordinates. Here we will use the inverse Fourier transform which is more flexible and can be applied to several other equations.

The main step in proving Theorem 3.1 is to analyze the behavior of the reflected solution $w'(x, r(t))$ near $r(t)$ which is sufficiently close to the crack. It turns out the behavior of $|I(t, r)|$ as $t \to T(r, \Sigma)$ is determined by the local property of $w'(x, r(t))$ near $r(t)$. To proceed the analysis, let $x^0 = r(t) \in \Omega \setminus \bar{\Sigma}$ and $a = x(T(r, \Sigma))$. Assume that x^0 is sufficiently close to a, denoted by $x^0 \sim a$. Let $y = (y_1, \cdots, y_n) = (y_1(x, x^0), \cdots, y_n(x, x^0))$ be the boundary normal coordinates near a such that

$$y(a) = 0, \quad \frac{\partial y(x, x^0)}{\partial x}|_{x=x^0} = I_n, \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega_- = \{y_1 < 0\} \quad \text{near} \quad a.$$

Let $J(x) = \frac{\partial y(x,x^0)}{\partial x} = (q_{ij}(x))$ and $x = x(y(x, x^0))$. Denote

$$\tilde{C}_{i\tilde{j}k\tilde{l}} = |J(x)|^{-1} C_{ijkl} q_{\tilde{j}j} q_{l\tilde{l}}, \quad \tilde{C} = (\tilde{C}_{i\tilde{j}k\tilde{l}}) \quad \text{for } 1 \le i, \tilde{j}, k, \tilde{l} \le n,$$

and

$$\tilde{u}(y) = u(x(y, x^0)), \quad y^0 = y(x^0, x^0) \quad \text{with} \quad y_1^0 > 0.$$

Then we can see that

(i) $\tilde{C}(y) \in C^1$ near $y = 0$;

(ii) $|J|^{-1}\mathcal{L}_C u = \mathcal{L}_{\tilde{C}}\tilde{u}$ near $y = 0$;

(iii) $\nu|_\Sigma = e_1 = (1, 0, \cdots, 0)$ near $y = 0$;

(iv) $\delta(x(y, x^0) - x^0) = \delta(y - y^0)$.

In view of this choice of the coordinates $\{y_1, \cdots, y_n\}$, we have that

$$\tilde{C}_{i\tilde{j}k\tilde{l}}(y^0) = C_{i\tilde{j}k\tilde{l}}(x^0) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{C}_{i\tilde{j}k\tilde{l}}(y) = \tilde{C}_{k\tilde{l}i\tilde{j}}(y) \quad \forall\, i, \tilde{j}, k, \tilde{l}. \tag{4.1}$$

We now adopt a definition introduced in [13] to simplify some expressions in our arguments below.

Definition 4.1 *Let X be a function space defined in an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $\{\Phi(\cdot, x^0)\}$, $\{\Psi(\cdot, x^0)\}$ be family of distributions defined in this open set depending on $x^0 \sim a$. We denote $\Phi(\cdot, x^0) \sim \Psi(\cdot, x^0)$ in X if $\{\Phi(\cdot, x^0) - \Psi(\cdot, x^0); x^0 \sim a\}$ is bounded in X.*

Let $V \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a small open neighborhood of $y = 0$ with C^1 boundary. Define $V_\pm := V \cap \mathbb{R}^n_\pm$. Assume that $\beta_\pm$, β_0 are open subsets of the boundary $\partial V_\pm$ of $V_\pm$ such that

$$\partial V_\pm = \bar{\beta}_\pm \cup \bar{\beta}_0, \;\; \beta_\pm \cap \beta_0 = \varnothing, \;\; \beta_\pm \subset \mathbb{R}^n_\pm, \text{ and } \beta_0 \subset \{y_1 = 0\}.$$

Now let $E(y, y^0)$ satisfy

$$\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{C}(y^0)} E(y, y^0) + \delta(y - y^0) I_n = 0.$$

It turns out the distribution $E(y, y^0)$ plays an important role in the analysis of the indicator function $I(t, r)$. Here, we would like to construct a particular $E(y, y^0)$ which will meet our needs. In what follows, to simply the notation, the homogeneous tensor $\tilde{C}(y^0)$ is denoted by $\tilde{C}$. Also, we denote $y' = (y_2, \cdots, y_n)$ and $y^{0\prime} = (y^0_2, \cdots, y^0_n)$.

Lemma 4.1 *Assume that $y^0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $E_\pm(y, y^0) \in C^\infty(\{\pm(y_1 - y^0_1) \geq 0\}, \mathfrak{D}'(\mathbb{R}^{n-1}_{y'}))$ satisfy*

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_{\tilde{C}} E_\pm = 0 \quad in \quad \pm(y_1 - y^0_1) > 0 \\ E_+|_{y_1 = y^0_1 + 0} - E_-|_{y_1 = y^0_1 - 0} = 0 \\ \sigma_{\tilde{C}}(E_+) e_1|_{y_1 = y^0_1 + 0} - \sigma_{\tilde{C}}(E_-) e_1|_{y_1 = y^0_1 - 0} = -\delta(y' - y^{0\prime}) I_n. \end{cases} \tag{4.2}$$

Let E be defined by

$$E(y, y^0) = \begin{cases} E_+(y, y^0) \quad in \quad y_1 - y^0_1 \geq 0 \\ E_-(y, y^0) \quad in \quad y_1 - y^0_1 \leq 0 \end{cases}$$

then

$$\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{C}} E + \delta(y - y^0) I_n = 0 \quad in \quad \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we take $y^0 = 0$. For all $\varphi \in \mathfrak{D}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we have

$$< E, \mathcal{L}_{\tilde{C}}\varphi >= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} E_+ \mathcal{L}_{\tilde{C}}\varphi dy + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_-} E_- \mathcal{L}_{\tilde{C}}\varphi dxy.$$

For further computations, we introduce some notations

$$\begin{aligned}
&Q(\xi') = (\textstyle\sum_{j,l=2}^n \tilde{C}_{ijkl}\xi_j\xi_l;\ {}^{i\downarrow 1,\cdots,n}_{k\to 1,\cdots,n}), \quad \xi' = (\xi_2, \cdots, \xi_n),\\
&R(\xi') = (\textstyle\sum_{j=2}^n \tilde{C}_{ijk1}\xi_j;\ {}^{i\downarrow 1,\cdots,n}_{k\to 1,\cdots,n}), \quad A(\xi') = R(\xi') + {}^tR(\xi'),\\
&T = (\tilde{C}_{i1k1};\ {}^{i\downarrow 1,\cdots,n}_{k\to 1,\cdots,n}).
\end{aligned}$$

Then we can see that

$$\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{C}} = T\partial_1^2 + A(\partial')\partial_1 + Q(\partial')$$

which immediately gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&< E, \mathcal{L}_{\tilde{C}}\varphi >\\
&= \textstyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} E(T\partial_1^2 + A\partial_1)\varphi dy + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} EQ\varphi dy\\
&= -\textstyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} TE_+\partial_1\varphi dy'|_{y_1=+0} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} TE_-\partial_1\varphi dy'|_{y_1=-0}\\
&\quad -\textstyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} T\partial_1 E\partial_1\varphi dy - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_-} T\partial_1 E\partial_1\varphi dy\\
&\quad -\textstyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} E_+A\varphi dy'|_{y_1=+0} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} E_-A\varphi dy'|_{y_1=-0}\\
&\quad -\textstyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} \partial_1 EA\varphi dy - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_-} \partial_1 EA\varphi dy\\
&\quad +\textstyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} EQ\varphi dy + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_-} EQ\varphi dy\\
&= \textstyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} T\partial_1 E\varphi dy'|_{y_1=+0} - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} T\partial_1 E\varphi dy'|_{y_1=-0}\\
&\quad +\textstyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} T\partial_1^2 E\varphi dy + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_-} T\partial_1^2 E\varphi dy\\
&\quad +\textstyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} A\partial_1 E\varphi dy + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_-} A\partial_1 E\varphi dy\\
&\quad +\textstyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} QE\varphi dy + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_-} QE\varphi dy\\
&= \textstyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} (T\partial_1 E|_{y_1=+0} - T\partial_1 E|_{y_1=-0})\varphi(0, y')dy' + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} (\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{C}}E_+)\varphi dy + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_-} (\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{C}}E_-)\varphi dy\\
&= \textstyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} (T\partial_1 E|_{y_1=+0} - T\partial_1 E|_{y_1=-0})\varphi(0, y')dy'\\
&= -\varphi(0),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the facts that

$$\sigma_{\tilde{C}}(E_\pm) = (T\partial_1 + {}^tR(\partial'))E_\pm,$$

$${}^tR(\partial')E_+|_{y_1=+0} = {}^tR(\partial')E_-|_{y_1=-0},$$

and

$$\sigma_{\tilde{C}}(E_+)e_1|_{y_1=y_1^0+0} - \sigma_{\tilde{C}}(E_-)e_1|_{y_1=y_1^0-0} = -\delta(y' - y^{0\prime})I_n.$$

Therefore, we obtain that

$$\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{C}}E + \delta(y - y^0)I_n = 0.$$

□

Now let $M(\xi) := T\xi_1^2 + A(\xi')\xi_1 + Q(\xi')$, i.e. the symbol of $\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{C}}$, then M admits the factorization

$$M(\xi) = (\xi_1 - B_\pm(\xi')^*)T(\xi_1 - B_\pm(\xi')),$$

where

$$B_\pm(\xi') = \Big(\oint_{\ell_\pm} \zeta M(\zeta,\xi')^{-1}d\zeta\Big)\Big(\oint_{\ell_\pm} M(\zeta,\xi')^{-1}d\zeta\Big)^{-1}$$

and $\ell_+ \subset \mathbb{C}_+$ (or $\ell_- \subset \mathbb{C}_-$) is a C^1 Jordan closed curves enclosing all roots of $\det M = 0$ in ξ_1 with positive (or negative) imaginary parts (see [10]). As defined in [4],

$$Z_\pm(\xi') := \mp i(TB_\pm(\xi') + {}^tR(\xi'))$$

is called the surface impedance tensor for the half space $\mathbb{R}^n_\pm$. Also, it is known that $Z_\pm(\xi')$ are positive Hermitian matrices. It is not difficult to show that

Lemma 4.2 (i) $\overline{B}_+(\xi') = B_-(\xi')$; (ii) $\overline{Z}_+(\xi') = Z_-(\xi')$.

Taking advantage of the surface impedance tensor, we can give an explicit representation of $E_\pm$ in terms of the oscillatory integral.

Lemma 4.3 *Let $E_\pm(y,y^0)$ satisfy (4.2), then $E_\pm(y,y^0)$ can be written as*

$$E_\pm(y,y^0) = \mathrm{Os} - \int e^{i(y'-y^{0\prime})\cdot\xi'} e^{i(y_1-y_1^0)B_\pm(\xi')}(\frac{1}{2})(\mathrm{Re}Z_+)^{-1}\, đ\xi' \quad (\pm(y_1-y_1^0)>0), \tag{4.3}$$

where $đ\xi' = (2\pi)^{-(n-1)}d\xi'$.

We use the notation Os$-$ to refer to an oscillatory integral.

Remark. Note that $\mathrm{Re}Z_+$ is invertible since Z_+ is positive Hermitian.

Proof. For simplicity, we let $y^{0\prime} = 0$. In view of the factorization of M, it is clear that $E_\pm$ defined in (4.3) satisfy

$$\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{C}}E_\pm = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \pm(y_1 - y_1^0) > 0.$$

So we only need to check jump conditions. We first note that

$$E_+|_{y_1=y_1^0+0} = E_-|_{y_1=y_1^0-0}.$$

Next we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_{\tilde{C}}(E_+)e_1|_{y_1=y_1^0+0} &= \mathrm{Os} - \textstyle\int e^{iy'\cdot\xi'} i(TB_+(\xi') + {}^tR(\xi'))(\frac{1}{2})(\mathrm{Re}Z_+(\xi'))^{-1}\, đ\xi' \\ &= \mathrm{Os} - \textstyle\int e^{iy'\cdot\xi'}(-Z_+(\xi'))(\frac{1}{2})(\mathrm{Re}Z_+(\xi'))^{-1}\, đ\xi'\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_{\tilde{C}}(E_-)e_1|_{y_1=y_1^0-0} &= \mathrm{Os} - \textstyle\int e^{iy'\cdot\xi'} i(TB_-(\xi') + {}^tR(\xi'))(\frac{1}{2})(\mathrm{Re}Z_+(\xi'))^{-1}\, đ\xi' \\ &= \mathrm{Os} - \textstyle\int e^{iy'\cdot\xi'}(Z_-(\xi'))(\frac{1}{2})(\mathrm{Re}Z_+(\xi'))^{-1}\, đ\xi'.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, from (ii) of Lemma 4.2 we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sigma_{\tilde{C}}(E_+)e_1|_{y_1=y_1^0+0} - \sigma_{\tilde{C}}(E_-)e_1|_{y_1=y_1^0-0} \\
&= \mathrm{Os}-\int e^{iy'\cdot\xi'}(-1)(Z_+(\xi')+Z_-(\xi'))(\tfrac{1}{2})(\mathrm{Re}Z_+(\xi'))^{-1}\,đ\xi' \\
&= \mathrm{Os}-\int e^{iy'\cdot\xi'}(-1)(2\mathrm{Re}Z_+(\xi'))(\tfrac{1}{2})(\mathrm{Re}Z_+(\xi'))^{-1}\,đ\xi' \\
&= -\delta(y').
\end{aligned}$$

□

For a constant vector $b \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$, we define $\widetilde{w}_\pm^0$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_{\tilde{C}}\widetilde{w}_\pm^0 = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^n_\pm \\ \sigma_{\tilde{C}}(\widetilde{w}_\pm^0)e_1 = -\sigma_{\tilde{C}}(E_-(y,y^0)b)e_1 \quad \text{on} \quad \{y_1=0\}. \end{cases}$$

Then we can show that

Lemma 4.4 *$\widetilde{w}_\pm^0$ can be given by*

$$\widetilde{w}_\pm^0(y,y^0) = \pm\mathrm{Os}-\int e^{i(y'-y^{0\prime})\cdot\eta'}e^{iy_1B_\pm(\eta')}e^{-iy_1^0B_-(\eta')}(\frac{1}{2})Z_\pm(\eta')^{-1}Z_-(\eta')(\mathrm{Re}Z_+(\eta'))^{-1}b\,đ\eta'.$$

Proof. It suffices to verify the boundary condition. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_{\tilde{C}}(\widetilde{w}_\pm^0)e_1|_{y_1=0} &= \mathrm{Os}-\int e^{i(y'-y^{0\prime})\cdot\eta'}e^{-iy_1^0B_-(\eta')}(\pm)(\tfrac{1}{2})(\mp)Z_\pm(\eta')Z_\pm(\eta')^{-1} \\
&\qquad\times Z_-(\eta')(\mathrm{Re}Z_+(\eta'))^{-1}b\,đ\eta' \\
&= \mathrm{Os}-\int e^{i(y'-y^{0\prime})\cdot\eta'}e^{-iy_1^0B_-(\eta')}(-\tfrac{1}{2})Z_-(\eta')(\mathrm{Re}Z_+(\eta'))^{-1}b\,đ\eta'.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\sigma_{\tilde{C}}(E_-(y,y^0)b)e_1|_{y_1=0} = \mathrm{Os}-\int e^{i(y'-y^{0\prime})\cdot\eta'}e^{-iy_1^0B_-(\eta')}(\frac{1}{2})Z_-(\eta')(\mathrm{Re}Z_+(\eta'))^{-1}b\,đ\eta'.$$

So this lemma is proved. □

To avoid confusion, we would like to point out that $E_\pm$ is defined for $\pm(y_1-y_1^0)>0$ while $\widetilde{w}_\pm^0$ is defined for $\pm y_1>0$. Let $\widetilde{W}_\pm$ solve

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_{\tilde{C}(y)}\widetilde{W}_\pm = -\mathcal{L}_{\{\tilde{C}(y)-\tilde{C}\}}(\widetilde{w}_\pm^0 + E(y,y^0)b) \quad \text{in} \quad V_\pm \\ \sigma_{\tilde{C}(y)}(\widetilde{W}_\pm)e_1 = -\sigma_{\tilde{C}(y)}(\widetilde{w}_\pm^0 + E(y,y^0)b)e_1 \text{ on } \beta_0,\ \widetilde{W}_\pm = 0 \text{ on } \beta_\pm. \end{cases} \tag{4.4}$$

We would like to show that $\widetilde{W}_\pm \sim 0$ in $\bar{H}^1(V_\pm)$. To verify this, it is enough to prove

$$\sigma_{\{\tilde{C}(y)-\tilde{C}\}}(\widetilde{w}_\pm^0 + E(y,y^0)b) \sim 0 \text{ in } L^2(V_\pm)$$

and

$$\sigma_{\tilde{C}(y)}(\widetilde{w}_\pm^0 + E(y,y^0)b)e_1 \sim 0 \text{ in } \bar{H}^{-1/2}(\beta_0).$$

We first observe that

$$\widetilde{w}^0_-(y,y^0)+E(y,y^0)b=\widetilde{w}^0_-(y,y^0)+E_-(y,y^0)b\sim 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \bar{H}^1(V_-),$$

which implies $\widetilde{W}_-\sim 0$ in $\bar{H}^1(V_-)$. So we only need to check that

$$\sigma_{\{\tilde{C}(y)-\tilde{C}\}}(\widetilde{w}^0_+ + E(y,y^0)b)\sim 0 \quad \text{in} \quad L^2(V_+)$$

and

$$\sigma_{\tilde{C}(y)}(\widetilde{w}^0_+ + E(y,y^0)b)e_1\sim 0 \text{ in } L^2(\beta_0).$$

Lemma 4.5 (i) $\sigma_{\{\tilde{C}(y)-\tilde{C}\}}(\widetilde{w}^0_+)\sim 0$ *in* $L^2(V_+)$; (ii) $\sigma_{\{\tilde{C}(y)-\tilde{C}\}}(E(y,y^0)b)\sim 0$ *in* $L^2(V_+)$; (iii) $\sigma_{\tilde{C}(y)}(\widetilde{w}^0_+ + E(y,y^0)b)e_1\sim 0$ *in* $\bar{H}^{-1/2}(\beta_0)$.

Proof. (i) It suffices to prove that $(y_j-y_j^0)\varepsilon(\widetilde{w}^0_+)\sim 0$ in $L^2(V_+)$ for $1\le j\le n$. Without loss of generality, we choose $y^{0\prime}=0$. Note that $B_\pm(\eta')$ and $Z_\pm(\eta')$ are homogeneous of degree one in η'. We will estimate $\varepsilon(\widetilde{w}^0_+)$ by the Plancherel formula and the way to estimate them is essentially the same as estimating

$$A(y,y^0)=\mathrm{Os}-\int e^{iy'\cdot\eta'}e^{-\alpha|\eta'|y_1}e^{-\alpha|\eta'|y_1^0}a(\eta')\,đ\eta', \tag{4.5}$$

where $a(\eta')\in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n-1}\setminus\{0\})$ is homogeneous of degree zero in η' and α is a positive constant. Notice that α is related to $\inf\{\mathrm{Im}\zeta;\zeta\in\mathrm{Spec}(B_+(\eta')|\eta'|^{-1})\}$ $(=-\sup\{\mathrm{Im}\zeta;\zeta\in\mathrm{Spec}(B_-(\eta')|\eta'|^{-1})\})$. Let $\delta>0$ such that $0<y_1<\delta$ for all $y=(y_1,\cdots,y_n)\in V_+$ and $\phi(\eta')\in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n-1})$ so that $0\le\phi(\eta')\le 1$ with

$$\phi(\eta')=\begin{cases}1 & \text{if} \quad |\eta'|\le 1\\ 0 & \text{if} \quad |\eta'|\ge 2.\end{cases}$$

Let $A(y,y^0)$ be decomposed into $A=A_1+A_2$ with

$$\begin{aligned}A_1(y,y^0)\ &:=\mathrm{Os}-\textstyle\int e^{iy'\cdot\eta'}e^{-\alpha|\eta'|y_1}e^{-\alpha|\eta'|y_1^0}\phi(\eta')a(\eta')\,đ\eta'\\ &=\textstyle\int e^{iy'\cdot\eta'}e^{-\alpha|\eta'|y_1}e^{-\alpha|\eta'|y_1^0}\phi(\eta')a(\eta')\,đ\eta'\end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

and

$$A_2(y,y^0):=\mathrm{Os}-\int e^{iy'\cdot\eta'}e^{-\alpha|\eta'|y_1}e^{-\alpha|\eta'|y_1^0}(1-\phi(\eta'))a(\eta')\,đ\eta'. \tag{4.7}$$

It is clear that

$$\begin{aligned}&\textstyle\int_{V_+}|(y_j-y_j^0)A_1(y,y^0)|^2dy\\ &\le c\textstyle\int_0^\delta\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}}e^{-2\alpha|\eta'|y_1}e^{-2\alpha|\eta'|y_1^0}\phi^2(\eta')|a(\eta')|^2\,d\eta'dy_1\\ &<\infty \quad \text{(uniformly in } y_1^0\sim 0)\end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

for $1\le j\le n$.

Next we observe that

$$((y_1 - y_1^0)e^{-\alpha|\eta'|y_1}e^{-\alpha|\eta'|y_1^0})^2 \le 2(y_1^2 + (y_1^0)^2)e^{-2\alpha|\eta'|y_1}e^{-2\alpha|\eta'|y_1^0}$$

and

$$\int_0^\infty y_1^2 e^{-2\alpha|\eta'|y_1}dy_1 = 2(2\alpha|\eta'|)^{-3}.$$

Thus, we can find that

$$\begin{array}{l} \int_{V_+} |(y_1 - y_1^0)A_2(y, y^0)|^2 dy \\ \le \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \int_0^\infty (y_1 - y_1^0)^2 e^{-2\alpha|\eta'|y_1}e^{-2\alpha|\eta'|y_1^0}(1 - \varphi(\eta'))^2|a(\eta')|^2 dy_1 d\eta' \\ \le c\int_{|\eta'|\ge 1}(|\eta'|^{-3} + (y_1^0)^2|\eta'|^{-1})e^{-2\alpha|\eta'|y_1^0}d\eta'. \end{array} \tag{4.9}$$

We now check the right hand side of (4.9) term by term. It is obvious that

$$\int_{|\eta'|\ge 1} |\eta'|^{-3}e^{-2\alpha|\eta'|y_1^0}d\eta' \le c\int_1^\infty s^{-3}s^{n-2}ds < \infty \tag{4.10}$$

since $n = 2, 3$. Furthermore, we note that

$$(y_1^0)^2\int_{|\eta'|\ge 1} |\eta'|^{-1}e^{-2\alpha|\eta'|y_1^0}d\eta' \to 0 \quad \text{as } y_1^0 \to 0. \tag{4.11}$$

Combining (4.9), (4.10) and (4.11) yields

$$\int_{V_+} |(y_1 - y_1^0)A_2(y, y^0)|^2 dy < \infty \quad \text{uniformly in } y_1^0 \sim 0. \tag{4.12}$$

Finally, for $j \ne 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} y_j A_2(y, y^0) &= \mathrm{Os} - \int y_j e^{iy'\cdot\eta'}e^{-\alpha|\eta'|y_1}e^{-\alpha|\eta'|y_1^0}(1 - \phi(\eta'))a(\eta')\, đ\eta' \\ &= \mathrm{Os} - i\int e^{iy'\cdot\eta'}\partial_{\eta_j}\{e^{-\alpha|\eta'|y_1}e^{-\alpha|\eta'|y_1^0}(1 - \phi(\eta'))a(\eta')\}\, đ\eta'. \end{aligned}$$

It is readily seen that

$$\begin{array}{l} |\partial_{\eta_j}\{e^{-\alpha|\eta'|y_1}e^{-\alpha|\eta'|y_1^0}(1 - \phi(\eta'))a(\eta')\}| \\ \le c(y_1 + y_1^0 + |\eta'|^{-1})e^{-\alpha|\eta'|y_1}e^{-\alpha|\eta'|y_1^0}(1 - \phi(\eta')) + ce^{-\alpha|\eta'|y_1}e^{-\alpha|\eta'|y_1^0}|\partial_{\eta_j}(1 - \varphi)|. \end{array}$$

Therefore, carrying out the same arguments as above, we can show that

$$\int_{V_+} |y_j A_2(y, y^0)|^2 dy < \infty \quad \text{uniformly in } y_1^0 \sim 0. \tag{4.13}$$

The estimates (4.8), (4.12) and (4.13) immediately lead to the result (i).

(ii) Using the same idea, we can see that the way to estimate $\varepsilon(E(y, y^0)b)$ is essentially the same as estimating

$$B_1(y, y^0) := \mathrm{Os} - \int e^{iy'\cdot\eta'}e^{-\alpha(y_1 - y_1^0)|\eta'|}a(\eta')\, đ\eta' \quad \text{for } (y_1 - y_1^0) > 0$$

and

$$B_2(y,y^0) := \mathrm{Os}-\int e^{iy'\cdot\eta'}e^{-\alpha(y_1^0-y_1)|\eta'|}a(\eta')\,đ\eta' \quad \text{for } (y_1-y_1^0)<0,$$

where α and $a(\eta')$ are defined as in (4.5). Now it is easy to compute

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{y_1^0}^{\infty}(y_1-y_1^0)^2e^{-2\alpha(y_1-y_1^0)|\eta'|}dy_1\\&=\int_0^\infty \tilde{y}_1^2e^{-2\alpha\tilde{y}_1|\eta'|}d\tilde{y}_1\\&=2(2\alpha|\eta'|)^{-3}\end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^{y_1^0}(y_1^0-y_1)^2e^{-2\alpha(y_1^0-y_1)|\eta'|}dy_1\\&=\int_0^{y_1^0}\tilde{y}_1^2e^{-2\alpha\tilde{y}_1|\eta'|}d\tilde{y}_1\\&\le\int_0^\infty \tilde{y}_1^2e^{-2\alpha\tilde{y}_1|\eta'|}d\tilde{y}_1\\&=2(2\alpha|\eta'|)^{-3}\end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

By virtue of (4.14) and (4.15) and using the same arguments in (i), we can prove that $(y_1-y_1^0)\varepsilon(E(y,y^0)b)$ belongs to $L^2(V_+)$ uniformly in $y_1^0\sim 0$. Additionally, the same estimates can be obtained for $y_j\varepsilon(E(y,y^0)b)$ $(j\neq 1)$ by the similar derivations.

(iii) Observe that $\sigma_{\tilde{C}(y)}(\widetilde{w}_+^0+E(y,y^0)b)e_1=\sigma_{\{\tilde{C}(y)-\tilde{C}\}}(\widetilde{w}_+^0+E(y,y^0)b)e_1$ on $\{y_1=0\}$ since

$$\sigma_{\tilde{C}}(\widetilde{w}_+^0+E(y,y^0)b)e_1=\sigma_{\tilde{C}}(\widetilde{w}_+^0+E_-(y,y^0)b)e_1=0 \quad \text{on} \quad \{y_1=0\}.$$

Argued as above, to derive the estimate, it suffices to estimate

$$y_j\tilde{A}(y',y^0)=\mathrm{Os}-\int y_je^{iy'\cdot\eta'}e^{-\alpha|\eta'|y_1^0}a(\eta')\,đ\eta' \quad \text{for} \quad j=2,3,$$

where $a(\eta')$ and α are defined similarly. Here we also set $y^{0\prime}=0$. Decompose $y_j\tilde{A}=y_j\tilde{A}_1+y_j\tilde{A}_2$ as in (4.6) and (4.7). Then $y_j\tilde{A}_1$ clearly satisfies the estimate, i.e., $y_j\tilde{A}_1\sim 0$ in $\bar{H}^{-1/2}(\beta_0)$. For $y_j\tilde{A}_2$ we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}y_jA_2(y,y^0)&=\mathrm{Os}-\int y_je^{iy'\cdot\eta'}e^{-\alpha|\eta'|y_1^0}(1-\phi(\eta'))a(\eta')\,đ\eta'\\&=\mathrm{Os}-i\int e^{iy'\cdot\eta'}\partial_{\eta_j}\{e^{-\alpha|\eta'|y_1^0}(1-\phi(\eta'))a(\eta')\}\,đ\eta'\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&|\partial_{\eta_j}\{e^{-\alpha|\eta'|y_1^0}(1-\phi(\eta'))a(\eta')\}|\\&\le c(y_1^0+|\eta'|^{-1})e^{-\alpha|\eta'|y_1^0}(1-\phi(\eta'))+ce^{-\alpha|\eta'|y_1^0}|\partial_{\eta_j}(1-\varphi)|.\end{aligned}$$

Obviously, we have that $e^{-\alpha|\eta'|y_1^0}|\partial_{\eta_j}(1-\varphi)|\in L^2(\mathbb{R}^{n-1})$ uniformly in $y_1^0\sim 0$. By virtue of the inequality

$$(y_1^0+|\eta'|^{-1})^2\le 2(y_1^0)^2+2|\eta'|^{-2}$$

and the estimate

$$(y_1^0)^2 \int_{|\eta'|\geq 1} e^{-2\alpha|\eta'|y_1^0} d\eta' < \infty \quad \text{uniformly in} \quad y_1^0 \sim 0,$$

to get the estimate (iii), it remains to compute

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{|\eta'|\geq 1}(1+|\eta'|^2)^{-1/2}|\eta'|^{-2}e^{-2\alpha|\eta'|y_1^0}d\eta' \\ & \leq \int_{|\eta'|\geq 1}(1+|\eta'|^2)^{-1/2}|\eta'|^{-2}d\eta' \\ & \leq c\int_1^\infty s^{-3}s^{n-2}ds \\ & < \infty \quad \text{uniformly in} \quad y_1^0 \sim 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

The results in Lemma 4.5 justify the estimate $\widetilde{W}_\pm \sim 0$ in $H^1(V_\pm)$, where $\widetilde{W}_\pm$ are defined in (4.4). Now we set

$$\widetilde{w}_\pm = (\widetilde{w}_\pm^0 + \widetilde{W}_\pm) - (\widetilde{E}b - Eb). \tag{4.16}$$

By a straightforward computation, we can easily find that

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_{\tilde{C}(y)}\widetilde{w}_\pm = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad V_\pm \\ \sigma_{\tilde{C}(y)}(\widetilde{w}_\pm)e_1 = -\sigma_{\tilde{C}(y)}(\widetilde{E}(y,y^0)b)e_1 \quad \text{on} \quad \beta_0. \end{cases}$$

Now let $0 \leq \chi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ satisfy $\chi = 1$ in a sufficiently small neighborhood of a and be supported near a such that $\operatorname{supp}(\chi) \cap S \subset \Sigma$. Recall that S is the closed hypersurface where the crack lies. We then define $w \in H^1(\Omega \setminus \Sigma)$ by

$$w = \chi w_0' \quad \text{with} \quad w_0' = \begin{cases} \widetilde{w}_+(y(x,x^0),y^0) & \text{in} \quad \Omega_+ \cap \operatorname{supp}(\chi) \\ \widetilde{w}_-(y(x,x^0),y^0) & \text{in} \quad \Omega_- \cap \operatorname{supp}(\chi). \end{cases} \tag{4.17}$$

It follows from (3.7) that $\tilde{w} := w' - w$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_C\tilde{w} = -\nabla\cdot(C(w_0'\otimes\nabla\chi)) - (C\nabla w_0')\nabla\chi \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega\setminus\bar{\Sigma} \\ \sigma_C(\tilde{w})\nu = -\sigma_C(v'+G-Eb)\nu - B(x,\nabla\chi,\nu)w_0' + (\chi-1)\sigma_C(Eb)\nu \quad \text{on} \quad \Sigma \\ \tilde{w} = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_D, \ \sigma_C(\tilde{w})\nu = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_N, \end{cases} \tag{4.18}$$

where $B(x,\nabla\chi,\nu) = (\sum_{j,l} C_{ijkl}\partial_l\chi\nu_j)$. Note that $\nabla\chi$ and $B(x,\nabla\chi,\nu)$ are supported away from a. Therefore, by taking into account of (3.4), we obtain that $\tilde{w} \sim 0$ in $H^1(\Omega\setminus\Sigma)$. In other words, the behavior of the reflected solution w' as x_0 approaching to a is determined by that of w.

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 3.1. To begin, we note that the second term $\int_{\Gamma_D} f\sigma_C(w')\nu ds$ stays bounded as $t \to T(r,\Sigma)$. Thus, we only need to deal with the first term of $I(t,r)$. By the strong convexity condition (1.2), we know that the "inverse" of C exists, which is called the compliance tensor, satisfies the same condition. Therefore, to get the blow-up behavior of $I(r,t)$, it suffices to consider the integral

$$\int_{\Omega\setminus\Sigma} |\sigma_C(w')|^2 dx. \tag{4.19}$$

Based on the previous analysis, we can replace the reflected solution w' in (4.19) by the localized function w defined in (4.17) near $a = T(r,\Sigma)$. Working in the local coordinates $y = (y_1, \cdots, y_n)$ near a as described before, we aim to show that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n_\pm} \varrho |\sigma_{\tilde{C}}(\widetilde{w}_\pm)|^2 dy \to \infty \quad \text{as} \quad y_1^0 \to 0, \tag{4.20}$$

where $\varrho(y) = \chi(x(y,x^0))$ which is supported near $y = 0$. In view of the definition of $\widetilde{w}_\pm$ (see (4.16)), proving (4.20) is equivalent to showing that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n_\pm} \varrho |\sigma_{\tilde{C}}(\widetilde{w}^0_\pm)|^2 dy \to \infty \quad \text{as} \quad y_1^0 \to 0. \tag{4.21}$$

To this end, we first prove the following estimate

Lemma 4.6

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n_\pm \cap V_\delta} |\sigma_{\tilde{C}}(\widetilde{w}^0_\pm)|^2 dy \to \infty \quad \textit{as} \quad y_1^0 \to 0,$$

where $V_\delta := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : |y_1| \le \delta\}$ *such that* $\mathrm{supp}\,(\varrho) \cap V_\delta \subsetneqq \mathrm{supp}\,(\varrho)$.

Proof. Clearly, $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n_\pm \cap V_\delta} |\sigma_{\tilde{C}}(\widetilde{w}^0_\pm)|^2 dy \ge \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_\pm \cap V_\delta} |\sigma_{\tilde{C}}(\widetilde{w}^0_\pm)e_1|^2 dy$. In the proof of Lemma 4.4, we note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_{\tilde{C}}(\widetilde{w}^0_\pm)e_1 &= \mathrm{Os} - \textstyle\int e^{i(y'-y^{0\prime})\cdot\eta'} e^{iy_1 B_\pm(\eta')} e^{-iy_1^0 B_-(\eta')} (\pm)(\tfrac{1}{2})(\mp) Z_\pm(\eta') Z_\pm(\eta')^{-1} \\
&\qquad \times Z_-(\eta')(\mathrm{Re}Z_+(\eta'))^{-1} b \, đ\eta' \\
&= \mathrm{Os} - \textstyle\int e^{i(y'-y^{0\prime})\cdot\eta'} e^{iy_1 B_\pm(\eta')} e^{-iy_1^0 B_-(\eta')} (-\tfrac{1}{2}) Z_-(\eta')(\mathrm{Re}Z_+(\eta'))^{-1} b \, đ\eta'.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $Z_-(\eta')$ and $\mathrm{Re}Z_+(\eta')$ are homogeneous of degree one in η' and nonsingular for all $\eta' \ne 0$, we can deduce that

$$|Z_-(\eta')(\mathrm{Re}Z_+(\eta'))^{-1} b| \ge c|b| \quad \text{with} \quad c > 0, \quad \forall\, \eta' \ne 0.$$

On the other hand, let $\beta := \sup\{\mathrm{Im}\zeta; \zeta \in \mathrm{Spec}(B_+(\eta')|\eta'|^{-1})\}$ $(= -\inf\{\mathrm{Im}\zeta; \zeta \in \mathrm{Spec}(B_-(\eta')|\eta'|^{-1})\})$ then we can get that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n_\pm \cap V_\delta} |\sigma_{\tilde{C}}(\widetilde{w}^0_\pm)e_1|^2 dy \ge \pm c \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \int_0^{\pm\delta} e^{\mp 2\beta y_1|\eta'|} e^{-2\beta y_1^0|\eta'|} dy_1 d\eta'.$$

It is enough compute

$$\begin{array}{l}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}}\int_0^\delta e^{-2\beta y_1|\eta'|}e^{-2\beta y_1^0|\eta'|}dy_1 d\eta' \\ = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}}(1-e^{-2\beta\delta|\eta'|})(2\beta|\eta'|)^{-1}e^{-2\beta y_1^0|\eta'|}d\eta' \\ \geq c\int_0^\infty(1-e^{-2\beta\delta\rho})e^{-2\beta y_1^0\rho}\rho^{n-3}d\rho.\end{array}$$

Thus, when $n=3$, we have

$$\int_0^\infty(1-e^{-2\beta\delta\rho})e^{-2\beta y_1^0\rho}d\rho = \frac{1}{2\beta y_1^0}-\frac{1}{2\beta(y_1^0+\delta)} \to \infty \text{ as } y_1^0\to 0.$$

On the other hand, for $n=2$, we see that

$$\begin{array}{l}\int_0^\infty \rho^{-1}(1-e^{-2\beta\delta\rho})e^{-2\beta y_1^0\rho}d\rho \\ = \int_0^\epsilon \rho^{-1}(1-e^{-2\beta\delta\rho})e^{-2\beta y_1^0\rho}d\rho + \int_\epsilon^\infty \rho^{-1}(1-e^{-2\beta\delta\rho})e^{-2\beta y_1^0\rho}d\rho \\ = c' + \int_\epsilon^\infty \rho^{-1}(1-e^{-2\beta\delta\rho})e^{-2\beta y_1^0\rho}d\rho \\ = c' + \int_{2\beta y_1^0\epsilon}^\infty \rho^{-1}(1-e^{-(\delta/y_1^0)\rho})e^{-\rho}d\rho \to \infty \quad \text{as } y_1^0\to 0.\end{array}$$

Consequently, we conclude that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}}\int_0^\delta e^{-2\beta y_1|\eta'|}e^{-2\beta y_1^0|\eta'|}dy_1 d\eta' \to \infty$ as $y_1^0\to 0$ and the proof of the lemma is complete. $\square$

By virtue of Lemma 4.6, we can arrive at the conclusion (4.21) if we can show that the integral $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n_\pm\cap V_\delta}(1-\varrho)|\sigma_{\tilde{C}}(\widetilde{w}^0_\pm)|^2 dy$ stays bounded as $y_1^0\to 0$.

Lemma 4.7

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n_\pm\cap V_\delta}(1-\varrho)|\sigma_{\tilde{C}}(\widetilde{w}^0_\pm)|^2 dy < \infty \quad \textit{uniformly in} \quad y_1^0\sim 0.$$

Proof. Notice that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n_\pm\cap V_\delta}(1-\varrho)|\sigma_{\tilde{C}}(\widetilde{w}^0_\pm)|^2 dy \leq \int_{\{|y|>\tilde{\epsilon},\pm y_1>0\}\cap V_\delta}|\sigma_{\tilde{C}}(\widetilde{w}^0_\pm)|^2 dy$$

for some small positive number $\tilde{\epsilon}$. Let $D_{\pm,2},\cdots,D_{\pm,n}$ be open domains in $\mathbb{R}^n$ defined by

$$D_{\pm,j} = \{y\in\mathbb{R}^n : \pm y_1>0, |y_j|>\tilde{\epsilon}/2\}, \quad j=2,\cdots,n.$$

It is clear that $\{|y|>\tilde{\epsilon},\pm y_1>0\}\cap V_\delta \subset \bigcup_{j=2,\cdots,n}(D_{\pm,j}\cap V_\delta)$. Now we observe that

$$\int_{D_{\pm,j}\cap V_\delta}|\sigma_{\tilde{C}}(\widetilde{w}^0_\pm)|^2 dy \leq (2/\tilde{\epsilon})\int_{\mathbb{R}^n_\pm\cap V_\delta}|y_j\sigma_{\tilde{C}}(\widetilde{w}^0_\pm)|^2 dy.$$

Repeating the arguments in the proof of Lemma 4.4 (see the part (i)), we can derive that for $2\leq j\leq n$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n_\pm\cap V_\delta}|y_j\sigma_{\tilde{C}}(\widetilde{w}^0_\pm)|^2 dy < \infty$$

uniformly in $y_1^0\sim 0$. So the lemma is proved and the proof of Theorem 3.1 is now complete. $\square$

Appendix

In this Appendix, we state a trace theorem and Green's formula in an elastic medium with a crack. These results can be proved along the same lines of Eller's paper [9] where he consider the Laplace equation. Let us define

$$C^\infty(\widetilde{\Omega}) = \{u : u_+ \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega}_+) \text{ and } u_- \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega}_-),\ \gamma_+\partial^\alpha u = \gamma_-\partial^\alpha u \text{ on } S\setminus\Sigma\ \forall\ \alpha\}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} E(\mathcal{L}, \Omega\setminus\Sigma) = \{&u \in H^1(\Omega\setminus\Sigma) : \exists h \in L^2(\Omega) \text{ such that} \\ &\textstyle\int_\Omega \sigma_C(u)\cdot\varepsilon(\varphi)dx = -\int_\Omega h\cdot\varphi dx,\ \forall\ \varphi \in \mathfrak{D}(\Omega\setminus\bar{\Sigma})\}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma A.1 [9, Lemma 2.8] *The space $C^\infty(\widetilde{\Omega})$ is dense in $E(\mathcal{L}, \Omega\setminus\Sigma)$.*

Lemma A.2 [9, Lemma 2.9] *The mapping*

$$u \to \{\gamma\sigma_C(u)\nu, [\sigma_C(u)\nu], \gamma_-\sigma_C(u)\nu\}$$

which is defined on $C^\infty(\widetilde{\Omega})$ has a unique extension to an operator from $E(\mathcal{L}, \Omega\setminus\Sigma)$ into $H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega)\times H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma)\times(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\bar{\Sigma}))^*$.

Note that Eller used the notation $\tilde{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma)$ in his paper [9], which is nothing but $\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\bar{\Sigma})$. Also, it is easily seen that $(\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\bar{\Sigma}))^* = \bar{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma)$.

Lemma A.3 [9, Lemma 2.10] *Let $u \in E(\mathcal{L}, \Omega\setminus\Sigma)$ and $v \in H^1(\Omega\setminus\Sigma)$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} &\textstyle\int_{\Omega\setminus\Sigma} v\mathcal{L}_C u dx + \int_{\Omega\setminus\Sigma}\sigma_C(u)\cdot\varepsilon(v)dx \\ &=<\gamma\sigma_C(u)\nu, \gamma v>_{H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega), H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega)} - <[\sigma_C(u)\nu], \gamma_+ v>_{H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma), H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma)} \\ &\quad - <\gamma_-\sigma_C(u)\nu, [v]>_{\bar{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma), \dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\bar{\Sigma})}. \end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

References

[1] S. Andrieux, A. Ben Abda, and H.D. Bui, *Reciprocity principle and crack identification*, Inverse Problems, 15(1999), 59-65.

[2] A. Ben Abda, H. Ben Ameur, and M. Jaoua, *Identification of 2D cracks by elastic boundary measurements*, Inverse Problems, 15(1999), 67-77.

[3] A. Ben Abda and H.D. Bui, *Reciprocity principle and crack identification in transient thermal problems*, J. Inverse Ill-Posed Prob., 9(2001), 1-6.

[4] D.M. Barnett and J. Lothe, *Free surface (Rayleigh) waves in anisotropic elastic half spaces: the surface impedance method*, Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A, 402(1985), 135-152.

[5] M. Brühl, M. Hanke, and M. Pidcock, *Crack detection using electrostatic measurements*, M2AN Math. Model. Numer. Anal., 35(2001), 595-605.

[6] K. Bryan and M. Vogelius, *A computational algorithm to determine crack locations from electrostatic boundary measurements. The case of multiple cracks*, Int. J. Eng. Sci., 32(1994), 579-603.

[7] P. Ciarlet, *Mathematical Elasticity*, Elsevier, 1988.

[8] G. Duvaut and J.L. Lions, *Inequalities in Mechanics and Physics*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1976.

[9] M. Eller, *Identification of cracks in three-dimensional bodies by many boundary measurements*, Inverse Problems, 12(1996), 395-408.

[10] I. Gohberg, P. Lancaster and L. Rodman, *Matrix Polynomials*, Academic Press, New York (1982).

[11] M. Ikehata, *Reconstruction of the shape of the inclusion by boundary measurements*, Comm. PDE., 23(1998), 1459-1474.

[12] M. Ikehata and G. Nakamura, *Reconstruction of cavity from boundary measurements*, preprint.

[13] M. Ikehata and G. Nakamura, *Reconstruction procedure for identifying cracks*, submitted.

[14] M. Ikehata, G. Nakamura, and K. Tanuma, *Identification of the shape of the inclusion in the anisotropic elastic body*, Appl. Anal., 72(1999), 17-26.

[15] A. Kirsch and S. Ritter, *The linear sampling method for inverse scattering from an open arc*, Inverse Problems, 16(2000), 89-105.

[16] R. Kress, *Inverse elastic scattering from a crack*, Inverse Problems, 12(1996), 667-684.

[17] G. Nakamura and J.-N. Wang, *Unique continuation for the two-dimensional anisotropic elasticity system and its applications to inverse problems*, preprint.

[18] R. Potthast, *Point sources and multipoles in inverse scattering theory.* Chapman& Hall/CRC Research Notes in Mathematics, 427. Chapman& Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL, 2001.

[19] T. Valent, *Boundary Value Problems of Finite Elasticity*, Vol 31, Springer Tracts in Natural Philosophy, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1987.