

This article was downloaded by: [Victor Kovtunenکو]

On: 01 August 2012, At: 07:29

Publisher: Taylor & Francis

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



Optimization Methods and Software

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/goms20>

From shape variation to topological changes in constrained minimization: a velocity method-based concept

M. Hintermüller^{a b} & V. A. Kovtunenکو^{a c}

^a Institute for Mathematics and Scientific Computing, Karl-Franzens University, A-8010, Graz, Austria

^b Institute for Mathematics, Humboldt University, D-10099, Berlin, Germany

^c Lavrent'ev Institute of Hydrodynamics, RUS-630090, Novosibirsk, Russia

Version of record first published: 15 Aug 2011

To cite this article: M. Hintermüller & V. A. Kovtunenکو (2011): From shape variation to topological changes in constrained minimization: a velocity method-based concept, Optimization Methods and Software, 26:4-5, 513-532

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10556788.2011.559548>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use: <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae, and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand, or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

From shape variation to topological changes in constrained minimization: a velocity method-based concept

M. Hintermüller^{a,b} and V.A. Kovtunenکو^{a,c,*}

^aInstitute for Mathematics and Scientific Computing, Karl-Franzens University, A-8010 Graz, Austria;

^bInstitute for Mathematics, Humboldt University, D-10099 Berlin, Germany; ^cLavrent'ev Institute of Hydrodynamics, RUS-630090 Novosibirsk, Russia

(Received 20 August 2010; final version received 28 January 2011)

The ability of velocity methods to describe changes in topology by creating defects such as holes is investigated. For shape optimization, energy-type objective functions are considered, which depend on the geometry by means of the state variables. The state system is represented by abstract, quadratic and constrained minimization problems stated over domains with defects. The velocity method provides the shape derivative of the objective function due to finite variations of a defect. Sufficient conditions are derived, which allow us to pass the shape derivative to the limit with respect to the diminishing defect and, thus, to obtain the 'topological derivative' of the objective function due to a topological change. An illustrative example is presented for a circular hole bored at the tip of a crack.

Keywords: velocity method; structure optimization; shape and topological derivative; constrained minimization; variational methods; domain with hole

AMS Subject Classification: 49J40; 49K40; 49Q10

1. Introduction

A rigorous description of topological changes plays a crucial role in structure optimization [1,6,10,23,30]. Our specific interest concerns the topological changes produced by creating holes, cuts, cracks and so on; for techniques and applications in the optimization context, see [2,8,12,34]. While the engineering and numerical applications are rather extensive, the difficulty in analysing the state systems when changing their topological properties is connected with the singular character of the problem. In order to treat the latter, singular perturbation techniques are available, however, mostly for linear partial differential equations (PDEs) with homogeneous coefficients (see [16,28]). For semi-linear problems, see [15,32].

On the other hand, velocity-based regular perturbations are well known as a very powerful tool meeting shape optimization goals, which is well established for variational problems. We refer to [7,35] for the foundation of velocity methods and to [14,18–20,26] for the specific applications to constrained minimization problems. Moreover, level-set (implicit surface) methods can be

*Corresponding author. Email: victor.kovtunenکو@uni-graz.at

naturally incorporated into the velocity context as described in [11,13,27] and other works. In this paper, we discuss concepts adapting the velocity method to topological sensitivity analysis.

We start with a description of admissible geometries. For this purpose, let $\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, be a domain and \mathbf{x}_0 be a trial point in Ω . Moreover, we fix a bounded measurable set D in \mathbb{R}^d , associated with a generic defect, of Hausdorff dimension $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $m \leq d$, such that $\mathbf{0} \in D$. For $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$, we introduce the perturbed set

$$D(r) := \{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d : r^{-1}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_0) \in D\}. \quad (\text{D})$$

Since $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \Omega$, there exists $R > 0$ sufficiently small such that $D(R) \subset \Omega$. Therefore, for all $r \in (0, R]$, we have $D(r) \subset \Omega$, and it is possible to define the domain with a finite defect as $\Omega(r) := \Omega \setminus \overline{D(r)}$. Furthermore, we refer to such r as the ‘size’ of the defect. As $r \rightarrow 0$, $D(r)$ reduces to the point \mathbf{x}_0 . The limit domain $\Omega(0) = \Omega \setminus \{\mathbf{x}_0\}$ exists (with infinitesimal defect), and it has a ‘continuous’ topology in comparison with $\Omega(r)$ for $r > 0$. In this sense, we claim that the change in topology occurs when $r \rightarrow 0$.

Since \mathbf{x}_0 corresponding to $r = 0$ is excluded from the limit domain $\Omega(0)$, we complete the set of parameters $r \in (0, R]$ to $[0, R]$ with the limit from above $r \rightarrow 0^+$. In fact, the limit from below $r \rightarrow 0^-$ is not defined in the geometric model. We take care of these features through all our subsequent constructions.

On every fixed domain $\Omega(r)$ with defect $D(r)$ of the size $r \in [0, R]$, we look for a state variable (scalar or vector valued) $\mathbf{u}^r(\mathbf{x})$, $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega(r)$, associated with a solution of a PDE. More generally, we refer to the variational solutions of associated minimization problems. Here, we consider abstract objective functionals

$$\Pi : H(\Omega(r)) \mapsto \mathbb{R}, \quad \mathbf{u} \mapsto \Pi(\mathbf{u}; \Omega(r))$$

and constrained minimization problems of the type

$$\text{minimize } \Pi(\mathbf{u}; \Omega(r)) \quad \text{over } \mathbf{u} \in H(\Omega(r)) \quad \text{subject to } \mathbf{u} \in K(\Omega(r)). \quad (\text{CMP})$$

Constraints are reflected by the admissible sets $K(\Omega(r))$ in vector spaces $H(\Omega(r))$ for $r \in [0, R]$. If there exists a solution $\mathbf{u}^r \in K(\Omega(r))$ of (CMP), the associated optimal value functional is defined by $P(r) := \Pi(\mathbf{u}^r; \Omega(r))$ with

$$P : [0, R] \mapsto \mathbb{R}, \quad r \mapsto \Pi(\mathbf{u}^r; \Omega(r)). \quad (\text{DF})$$

We call P in (DF) a ‘defect function’, since it serves to qualify the defects. Indeed, while $P(r)$ with $r > 0$ corresponds to the geometries having finite defects $D(r)$, the reference value of $P(0)$ belongs to the continuous geometry of Ω , that is, with the point \mathbf{x}_0 removed only. Therefore, the increment $\Delta P := P(r) - P(0)$ compares the geometries pertinent to the two different topological situations. If $\Delta P \geq 0$, that is, $P(0) \leq P(r)$, then the optimal objective prefers the continuous geometry; otherwise, if $\Delta P < 0$, then a change in topology by creating a finite defect at \mathbf{x}_0 is suggested. For topology optimization of Ω as well as for the identification of a defect in the domain, one needs to examine all trial points $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \Omega$.

Generally, ΔP admits a discontinuity or oscillations as $r \rightarrow 0$. Thus, it can be ill-defined. In this paper, we restrict ourselves to well-posed cases and look for continuous functions $P \in C([0, R])$ satisfying an asymptotic expansion

$$P(r) - P(0) = f(r)DP(\mathbf{x}_0) + o(f(r)), \quad \text{with } \frac{o(f(r))}{f(r)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } f(r) \rightarrow 0, \quad (\text{AE})$$

written with respect to a strictly monotonically increasing function $f(r)$ with $f(0) = 0$. We refer to the first asymptotic term in (AE) as a ‘topological derivative’, since $DP(\mathbf{x}_0)$ describes exactly

the sign of ΔP as $r \rightarrow 0$. Moreover, $DP(x_0)$ yields a quantitative measure for creating a defect at x_0 . The order of $f(r)$ of the asymptotic expansion (AE) may depend on the underlying application (see, e.g. (67) and (70) in Section 5 for examples of $f(r)$). Here, based on the known results in mechanics, we consider differentiable functions P implying $f(r) = r$ only. Hence, we have the first-order asymptotic expansion

$$P(r) - P(0) = rP'(0) + o(r), \quad \frac{o(r)}{r} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } r \rightarrow 0, \tag{AE1}$$

where

$$P'(0) := \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{r} (P(r) - P(0)) \tag{DD}$$

is of order r . It yields $DP(x_0) = P'(0)$ in (AE).

The expansion in (AE1) is available for a rather general class of variational problems related to elliptic PDEs [16,28]. Note that $P'(0) = 0$ in the case of $u^0 \in K(\Omega(0))$ solves (CMP) at $r = 0$ and enjoys extra smoothness (i.e. exceeding the variational smoothness) (see, e.g. [34]). If $P'(0) = 0$, then $DP(x_0)$ is identified with the next term in the asymptotic expansion (AE1). This results in (AE) with $f(r) = o(r)$. On the other hand, $P'(0) \neq 0$ for solutions u^0 in *a priori* non-smooth domains Ω containing cracks and so on (see [3,20,21]). Even for smooth domains Ω , the assumption of extra smoothness of u^0 fails when singular data, such as point sources or δ -functions as those adopted in the theory of fundamental solutions, are involved. For this reason, we generalize the notion of a topological derivative to the first-order asymptotic term in (AE1) in the spirit of the method of singular perturbations [28,29]. In this paper, we provide a mathematical tool which is suitable for the calculation of $P'(0)$ and which allows us to conclude whether $P'(0) = 0$ or not.

From the point of view of perturbation theory, the principal difficulty of the sensitivity analysis of the defect function $P(r)$ as $r \rightarrow 0$ lies in the fact that it is related to singular perturbations. In order to explain the latter, observe that the definition of defects in (D) yields the flow (with respect to r) $y = x_0 + (r/R)(x - x_0) \in D(r)$ for $x \in D(R)$, which solves the dynamic system

$$\frac{dy}{dr} = \frac{y - x_0}{r} \quad \text{for } r \in (0, R], \quad y = x \text{ at } r = R. \tag{DS}$$

The associated velocity of the defect transport is $r^{-1}(y - x_0)$. Obviously, it becomes singular at $r = 0$, which corresponds to a change in topology. We note that homeomorphic maps can be established between $\Omega(r)$ for $r > 0$ and $\Omega(0)$ as $r = 0$, but diffeomorphic properties fail. The latter, however, are essential for obtaining sensitivities. This is the reason for the asymptotic expansion based on singular perturbations in the topological context being different from sensitivities coming from shape variations, which are based on regular perturbations with smooth velocities.

We note that from $r = 0$ to $r > 0$, it is assumed that the topology of the underlying geometry changes, whence from $r > 0$ to $r + s > 0$, with $s \neq 0$, only changes in the shape of the geometry do occur. This structure is utilized to derive (AE1) by the following strategy: due to the local character of the geometric singularity at $r = 0$, we start with the shape sensitivity analysis at $r > 0$. From the *shape derivative*

$$P'(r) := \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{s} (P(r + s) - P(r)) \quad \text{for } r > 0, \tag{SD}$$

under proper assumptions, we derive a weak form of (AE1) given by

$$P(r) - P(0) = \int_0^r P'(\tau) d\tau. \tag{AE1'}$$

This results in an alternative representation of (DD) as

$$P'(0) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{r} \int_0^r P'(\tau) \, d\tau, \quad (\text{DD}')$$

which has to be calculated from the shape derivative (SD). This approach is justified for the specific problem of the kinking of a crack in [21]. A related concept known in the literature on topological sensitivity is based on the assertion $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} P'(r) = P'(0)$, which is shown in [31] for smooth optimal value functions.

Motivated by the applications in mechanics, in this paper, we rely on the quadratic objective functionals Π for (CMP) which are associated with the energy. In Section 2, we start with a velocity-based kinematic description of the motion of geometric objects with defects. While finite movements serve for the sake of shape sensitivities, infinitesimal movements belong to topological changes. In Section 3, we derive the shape derivative (SD). In Section 4, we discuss sufficient conditions allowing us to pass to the limit in (DD'). Finally, in Section 5, we present an illustrative example of the topological change when a circular hole occurs at the tip of a crack.

2. Movement of geometries with defects within implicit surfaces

In this section, we derive a kinematic description of the motion of geometric objects with defects for further use in the sensitivity analysis of geometry-dependent problems.

For 'time' (a kinematic parameter) $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we consider an evolution of sets Ω_t in \mathbb{R}^d and refer these sets to an initial set Ω_0 at $t = 0$. The reference set Ω_0 is supposed to contain the finite defect $D(R)$, that is, $\Omega_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{D(R)}$. The evolving sets are $\Omega_t \subset \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{D(r)}$. In view of Section 1, we relate t to the defect size r by the relation

$$|t| = -\ln\left(\frac{r}{R}\right) \quad \text{for } r \in (0, R], \quad (1)$$

or, more generally, in the sense of the relations specified in (35). The notation of Ω_t generalizes the geometric construction $\Omega(r) := \Omega \setminus \overline{D(r)}$ in Section 1 when varying the external boundary $\partial\Omega$ with t and allowing multiple defects. Conversely, to specify the geometry, we can identify $\Omega_0 = \Omega(R)$ and $\Omega_t = \Omega(r)$.

The substitution of $t = -\ln(r/R)$ from (1) into (DS) yields the dynamic (autonomous) system with respect to $t \geq 0$:

$$\frac{dy}{dt} = -(y - x_0) \quad \text{for } t > 0, \quad y = x \text{ at } t = 0. \quad (2)$$

The benefit of the substitution (1) is that the corresponding velocity of the defect transport $\mathcal{V}(y) = -(y - x_0)$ is non-singular. Note that we can similarly use the negative parameters $t = \ln(r/R)$. In Section 4, we proceed with the limit case of $|t| \rightarrow \infty$, which corresponds to $r \rightarrow 0$ when the defect $D(r)$ diminishes.

Let a time-independent kinematic velocity

$$V = (V_1, \dots, V_d)^T \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)^d \quad (3)$$

be given. We require that

$$V(x) = \mathcal{V}(x) \quad \text{for } x \in D(R).$$

This condition guarantees the transport of defects $D(r)$ subject to (2). In other words, we consider V as a proper extension of \mathcal{V} from $D(R)$ to \mathbb{R}^d . For example, set $V = \mathcal{V}\chi$ with a smooth cut-off

function χ supported in Ω such that $\chi(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{1}$ for $\mathbf{x} \in D(R)$ is a proper extension. In this case, $\Omega_0 = \Omega \setminus \overline{D(R)}$, and $V = \mathcal{V}\chi$ yields $\Omega_t = \Omega(r)$.

Let an open, connected, bounded set (domain) Ω_0 be given by the implicit surface $\rho_0 \in W_{loc}^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_0 &= \{\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d)^T \in \mathbb{R}^d : \rho_0(\mathbf{x}) > 0\}, \\ \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \bar{\Omega}_0 &= \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \rho_0(\mathbf{x}) < 0\}, \quad \partial\Omega_0 = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \rho_0(\mathbf{x}) = 0\}. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

The sets Ω_t evolving with respect to t are represented by implicit surfaces:

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_t &= \{\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_d)^T \in \mathbb{R}^d : \rho(t, \mathbf{y}) > 0\}, \\ \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \bar{\Omega}_t &= \{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \rho(t, \mathbf{y}) < 0\}, \quad \partial\Omega_t = \{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \rho(t, \mathbf{y}) = 0\}. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

In order to determine ρ in (5), the velocity method is utilized as specified below. In fact, for the velocity V given in (3), we require that $\rho(t, \mathbf{y})$ satisfies the linear transport equation

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + V^T \nabla \rho = 0 \quad \text{for } t \neq 0, \quad \rho = \rho_0 \quad \text{at } t = 0. \tag{6}$$

The characteristics $\mathbf{y} = \Phi_t(\mathbf{x})$ of (6) imply the autonomous system

$$\frac{d}{dt} \Phi_t = V(\Phi_t) \quad \text{for } t \neq 0, \quad \Phi_0 = \mathbf{x}. \tag{7}$$

From the classical results of [7,35], we infer the following lemma on the solvability of (6) and (7).

LEMMA 2.1 *For arbitrary finite interval $\Delta_T = (0, T)$ as $t > 0$, or $\Delta_T = (-T, 0)$ as $t < 0$ with $0 < T < \infty$, there exists a unique solution of (6) given by*

$$\rho(t, \mathbf{y}) = \rho_0 \circ \Phi_{-t}(\mathbf{y}) \in W_{loc}^{1,\infty}(\Delta_T \times \mathbb{R}^d). \tag{8}$$

The backward characteristics Φ_{-t} imply a solution of (7) corresponding to $-t$:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \Phi_{-t} = -V(\Phi_{-t}) \quad \text{for } t \neq 0, \quad \Phi_0 = \mathbf{y}. \tag{9}$$

The unique solutions of (7) and (9) exist, respectively,

$$\Phi_t, \Phi_{-t} \in C^1(\bar{\Delta}_T; W_{loc}^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d))^d, \tag{10}$$

and both functions are inverse to each other in the sense that

$$\mathbf{y} = \Phi_t \circ \Phi_{-t}(\mathbf{y}), \quad \mathbf{x} = \Phi_{-t} \circ \Phi_t(\mathbf{x}). \tag{11}$$

For the detailed derivation of Lemma 2.1 and its specific application to cracks, see [20,26,27].

Note that the additional spatial smoothness $\Phi_t, \Phi_{-t} \in C^1(\Delta_T; W_{loc}^{k,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d))^d$ in (10) is provided by $V \in W_{loc}^{k,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)^d$ for arbitrary $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

In our context, Lemma 2.1 implies a diffeomorphism between the sets in (4) and (5) for $t \in \bar{\Delta}_T$ in the sense that

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_t : \Omega_0 &\mapsto \Omega_t, & \mathbf{x} &\mapsto \Phi_t(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{y}; \\ \Phi_{-t} : \Omega_t &\mapsto \Omega_0, & \mathbf{y} &\mapsto \Phi_{-t}(\mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{x}.\end{aligned}\tag{12}$$

The initial condition at $t = 0$ can be shifted to $\tau = 0$ due to the semi-group property:

$$\Phi_{t+\tau} \circ \Phi_{-\tau}(\mathbf{y}) = \Phi_t(\mathbf{y}) \quad \text{for } \tau \in \mathbb{R}.\tag{13}$$

Indeed, from (7), we infer for every fixed τ that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \Phi_{t+\tau} = \frac{d}{d(t+\tau)} \Phi_{t+\tau} = V(\Phi_{t+\tau}) \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi_{t+\tau}|_{\tau=0} = \Phi_t.$$

Hence, $\Phi_{t+\tau}(\mathbf{x}) = \Phi_\tau \circ \Phi_t(\mathbf{x})$ together with (11) imply (13).

Using (12) and (13), from Lemma 2.1, we arrive at the following consequence.

LEMMA 2.2 *For arbitrarily fixed $T > 0$ and $t \in \bar{\Delta}_T$, the coordinate transformations*

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_\tau : \Omega_t &\mapsto \Omega_{t+\tau}, & \mathbf{y} &\mapsto \Phi_\tau(\mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{z}, \\ \Phi_{-\tau} : \Omega_{t+\tau} &\mapsto \Omega_t, & \mathbf{z} &\mapsto \Phi_{-\tau}(\mathbf{z}) = \mathbf{y}\end{aligned}\tag{14}$$

form a diffeomorphism with respect to τ such that $t + \tau \in \bar{\Delta}_T$.

For illustration, we present the following example.

Example 2.3 Let $\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be a domain with a boundary $\partial\Omega$ and $\Gamma_D \subset \partial\Omega$ with $|\Gamma_D| > 0$, where $|\Gamma_D|$ denotes the measure of Γ_D . Suppose that the finite defect $D(R) \subset \Omega$ introduced in Section 1 is a domain, or $D(R)$ is a manifold. We consider the reference domain $\Omega_0 = \Omega \setminus \overline{D(R)}$ ($= \Omega(R)$). Furthermore, let a velocity \mathbf{V} be given such that it satisfies (3), the boundary condition $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{0}$ at Γ_D and $\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{x}) = -(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0)$ for $\mathbf{x} \in D(R)$. Then, domains Ω_t evolving in $t > 0$ are determined from (5) by the implicit surface $\rho(t, \cdot)$ solving the transport equation (6) for this velocity \mathbf{V} . For $\mathbf{x} \in D(R)$, the characteristics $\Phi_t(\mathbf{x})$ of (6) satisfy the Cauchy problem

$$\frac{d}{dt} \Phi_t = -(\Phi_t - \mathbf{x}_0) \quad \text{for } t > 0, \quad \Phi_0 = \mathbf{x}.$$

Its solution is given by $\Phi_t = \mathbf{x}_0 + (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0)e^{-t}$. Consequently, from (D), we infer that the evolving sets Ω_t contain defects $D(r)$ of the size $r = Re^{-t}$ (see (1)). For $\tau > -t$, $t > 0$, we can rewrite $\Phi_{t+\tau} = \mathbf{x}_0 + (\Phi_t - \mathbf{x}_0)e^{-\tau}$ for $\Phi_t \in D(r)$ (compare with (13)).

Note that taking the reference domain as $\Omega_0 = \Omega \setminus \cup_{i=1}^N \overline{D(R_i)}$ with N finite defects $D(R_i) \subset \Omega$ of the size $R_i > 0$ given at points $\mathbf{x}_0^i \in \Omega$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$, we arrive at a multi-defect problem, which can be treated similarly as above.

3. Shape derivative of quadratic geometry-dependent functionals

In this section, we employ the diffeomorphic maps (14) for the shape sensitivity analysis of abstract constrained minimization problems.

For all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, let $K(\Omega_t)$ be a convex cone in the Hilbert space $H(\Omega_t)$ defined over the domain Ω_t , and let $H(\Omega_t)^*$ stand for the dual space. We invoke the following assumption.

ASSUMPTION 3.1 *The mapping (14) is bijective between $H(\Omega_t)$ and $H(\Omega_{t+\tau})$ and between $K(\Omega_t)$ and $K(\Omega_{t+\tau})$ for $t \in \bar{\Delta}_T$ and τ such that $t + \tau \in \bar{\Delta}_T$ in the following sense:*

$$\mathbf{u} \in H(\Omega_t) \implies \mathbf{u} \circ \Phi_{-\tau} \in H(\Omega_{t+\tau}), \quad \mathbf{v} \in H(\Omega_{t+\tau}) \implies \mathbf{v} \circ \Phi_\tau \in H(\Omega_t); \quad (15a)$$

$$\mathbf{u} \in K(\Omega_t) \implies \mathbf{u} \circ \Phi_{-\tau} \in K(\Omega_{t+\tau}), \quad \mathbf{v} \in K(\Omega_{t+\tau}) \implies \mathbf{v} \circ \Phi_\tau \in K(\Omega_t). \quad (15b)$$

These assumptions are needed to derive the shape derivative in Theorem 3.4. While the bijection in (15a) is provided by Lemma 2.2 and a sufficient regularity of the involved transformations, the bijection in (15b) can be limiting in Assumption 3.1. In this context, we note that for concrete problems, the shape derivative exists under assumptions weaker than (15b). In fact, the bijection between primal cones K can be replaced with the bijection property for dual cones as suggested in [25]. Alternatively, if from $\mathbf{v} \in K(\Omega_{t+\tau})$ it follows that $\mathbf{v} \circ \Phi_\tau \in K_\tau(\Omega_t)$ with $K_\tau(\Omega_t) \neq K(\Omega_t)$, then the convergence $K_\tau(\Omega_t) \rightarrow K(\Omega_t)$ as $\tau \rightarrow 0$ in the Mosco sense can be helpful (see the related topic in [33]). When the bijection between $K(\Omega_t)$ and $K(\Omega_{t+\tau})$ fails, then an extra term determined by the type of constraints in K appears in formula (25) in Theorem 3.4.

In what follows, we confine ourselves to the quadratic functionals $\Pi : H(\Omega_t) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\Pi(\mathbf{u}; \Omega_t) := \left\langle \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{u} \right\rangle_{\Omega_t} \quad \text{for } \mathbf{u} \in H(\Omega_t) \quad (16)$$

with the duality pairing $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\Omega_t}$ between $H(\Omega_t)^*$ and $H(\Omega_t)$. We assume that $\mathbf{A} : H(\Omega_t) \mapsto H(\Omega_t)^*$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ is a linear, symmetric, everywhere defined operator, which is bounded and uniformly positive definite, that is,

$$c_0 \|\mathbf{u}\|_{H(\Omega_t)}^2 \leq \langle \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u} \rangle_{\Omega_t} \leq C_0 \|\mathbf{u}\|_{H(\Omega_t)}^2 \quad \text{for } \mathbf{u} \in H(\Omega_t)$$

with $0 < c_0 \leq C_0 < \infty$ independent of t . The right-hand side $\mathbf{F} \in L$ is given, where the space L satisfies

$$H(\Omega_t) \overset{u}{\hookrightarrow} L = L^* \overset{u}{\hookrightarrow} H(\Omega_t)^*,$$

and $\overset{u}{\hookrightarrow}$ stands for the uniformly continuous embedding with respect to $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Note that according to (16), $\mathbf{v} \mapsto \Pi(\mathbf{v})$ is determined also over $H(\Omega_{t+\tau})$ at the time $t + \tau$:

$$\Pi(\mathbf{v}; \Omega_{t+\tau}) = \left\langle \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{v} \right\rangle_{\Omega_{t+\tau}} \quad \text{for } \mathbf{v} \in H(\Omega_{t+\tau}). \quad (17)$$

After the application to (17) of the coordinate transformation (14), we get the functional with transformed operators $J(\mathbf{A} \circ \Phi_\tau)$ and $J(\mathbf{F} \circ \Phi_\tau)$, where $J := J(\Phi_\tau)$ is the Jacobian. The transformed functional is defined well over $\mathbf{v} \circ \Phi_\tau \in H(\Omega_t)$ according to (15a) in Assumption 3.1, and we denote it by

$$[\Pi \circ \Phi_\tau](\mathbf{u}; \Omega_t) := \left\langle \frac{1}{2} J(\mathbf{A} \circ \Phi_\tau) \mathbf{u} - J(\mathbf{F} \circ \Phi_\tau), \mathbf{u} \right\rangle_{\Omega_t} \in \mathbb{R} \quad \text{for } \mathbf{u} \in H(\Omega_t). \quad (18)$$

This construction is illustrated in the example below.

For the sensitivity analysis of the transformed functional, we need the following assumption.

ASSUMPTION 3.2 *The transformed functional (18) admits the following expansion with respect to small $|\tau|$:*

$$[\Pi \circ \Phi_\tau](\mathbf{u}; \Omega_t) = \Pi(\mathbf{u}; \Omega_t) + \tau \Pi^1(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}; \Omega_t) + \text{Res}_\tau(\mathbf{u}), \tag{19a}$$

$$|\text{Res}_\tau(\mathbf{u})| \leq a(\tau)(\|\mathbf{u}\|_{H(\Omega_t)}^2 + b), \quad 0 \leq a(\tau) = o(|\tau|), \tag{19b}$$

where $a(\cdot)$ and $b \geq 0$ are independent of Ω_t . The first asymptotic term is given by

$$\Pi^1(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}; \Omega_t) := \left\langle \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{A}^1 \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{F}^1, \mathbf{v} \right\rangle_{\Omega_t} \quad \text{for } \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in H(\Omega_t) \tag{20}$$

with a linear, symmetric, everywhere defined, bounded operator $\mathbf{A}^1 : H(\Omega_t) \mapsto H(\Omega_t)^*$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\mathbf{F}^1 \in L$. Note that Π^1 in (20) is not symmetric in \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} in the latter linear term.

We illustrate the construction by means of the scalar-valued Laplace operator.

Example 3.3 We continue the geometric description of Example 2.3 and set

$$\mathbf{A} := -\Delta, \quad H(\Omega_t) := W^{1,2}(\Omega_t), \quad L := L_{\text{loc}}^2(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

$$K(\Omega_t) := \{u \in W^{1,2}(\Omega_t) : u = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_D, u \geq 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega_t \setminus \Gamma_D\},$$

with the functional in (16) given by

$$\Pi(u; \Omega_t) = \int_{\Omega_t} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\nabla u|^2 - Fu \right) dy \quad \text{for } u \in W^{1,2}(\Omega_t).$$

The notation in the definition of K implies that the traces of u are well defined on $\partial\Omega_t$. Moreover, we assume that the Poincaré–Friedrichs inequality provides a strict positive definiteness of the Laplace operator in $W^{1,2}(\Omega_0)$ and, hence, in all spaces $W^{1,2}(\Omega_t)$. We further assume that $F \in L \cap C_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Assumption 3.1 holds true for this example. In fact, the bijection property in (15a) is satisfied due to (10). Indeed, the norm $\|u \circ \Phi_{-\tau}\|_{W^{1,2}(\Omega_{t+\tau})}$ after the transformation $\mathbf{z} = \Phi_\tau(\mathbf{y})$ yields

$$\int_{\Omega_{t+\tau}} \{ |u \circ \Phi_{-\tau}|^2 + |\nabla(u \circ \Phi_{-\tau})|^2 \} dz = \int_{\Omega_t} \left\{ |u|^2 + \left| \left(\frac{\partial \Phi_{-\tau}}{\partial \mathbf{y}} \right)^T \nabla u \right|^2 \right\} \left| \det \frac{\partial \Phi_\tau}{\partial \mathbf{y}} \right| dy.$$

Hence, the norm estimation $\|u \circ \Phi_{-\tau}\|_{W^{1,2}(\Omega_{t+\tau})} \leq c \|u\|_{W^{1,2}(\Omega_t)}$ follows, and similarly, $\|v \circ \Phi_\tau\|_{W^{1,2}(\Omega_t)} \leq c \|v\|_{W^{1,2}(\Omega_{t+\tau})}$ for some $c > 0$ independent of τ . The bijection in (15b) is provided by the condition $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{0}$ at Γ_D , since the Dirichlet boundary Γ_D remains fixed during the evolution of Ω_t with such a velocity \mathbf{V} .

Next, we justify Assumption 3.2. Applying the coordinate transformation $\mathbf{z} = \Phi_\tau(\mathbf{y})$ to the perturbed functional

$$\Pi(v; \Omega_{t+\tau}) = \int_{\Omega_{t+\tau}} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\nabla v|^2 - Fv \right) dz \quad \text{for } v \in W^{1,2}(\Omega_{t+\tau}),$$

we obtain the transformed functional

$$[\Pi \circ \Phi_\tau](u; \Omega_t) = \int_{\Omega_t} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} (\nabla u)^T \frac{\partial \Phi_{-\tau}}{\partial \mathbf{y}} \left(\frac{\partial \Phi_{-\tau}}{\partial \mathbf{y}} \right)^T \nabla u - (F \circ \Phi_\tau) u \right\} \left| \det \frac{\partial \Phi_\tau}{\partial \mathbf{y}} \right| dy$$

with $u \in W^{1,2}(\Omega_t)$. From (7), (10) in Lemma 2.1, and for small $|\tau|$, we derive the expansions

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{\pm\tau}(\mathbf{y}) &= \mathbf{y} \pm \tau \mathbf{V}(\mathbf{y}) + \mathbf{Res}_\tau(\mathbf{y}), \quad \|\mathbf{Res}_\tau(\mathbf{y})\| = o(|\tau|) \quad \text{in } W_{\text{loc}}^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)^d, \\ \frac{\partial \Phi_{\pm\tau}}{\partial \mathbf{y}} &= \mathbf{I} \pm \tau \frac{\partial \mathbf{V}(\mathbf{y})}{\partial \mathbf{y}} + \mathbf{Res}_\tau(\mathbf{y}), \quad \|\mathbf{Res}_\tau(\mathbf{y})\| = o(|\tau|) \quad \text{in } L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)^{d \times d}, \\ \det \frac{\partial \Phi_\tau}{\partial \mathbf{y}} &= 1 + \tau \operatorname{div} \mathbf{V}(\mathbf{y}) + \mathbf{Res}_\tau(\mathbf{y}), \quad \|\mathbf{Res}_\tau(\mathbf{y})\| = o(|\tau|) \quad \text{in } L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d), \end{aligned}$$

where \mathbf{I} stands for the identity matrix. Moreover, the assumed smoothness of F provides the Taylor series $F \circ \Phi_\tau = F + \tau \mathbf{V}^T \nabla F + \mathbf{Res}_\tau(\nabla F)$ with $|\mathbf{Res}_\tau(\nabla F)| = o(|\tau|)$. Substituting these expansions into the integral over Ω_t , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} [\Pi \circ \Phi_\tau](u; \Omega_t) &= \int_{\Omega_t} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} (\nabla u)^T \left(\mathbf{I} - \tau \frac{\partial \mathbf{V}}{\partial \mathbf{y}} - \tau \frac{\partial \mathbf{V}^T}{\partial \mathbf{y}} \right) \nabla u \right. \\ &\quad \left. - (F + \tau \mathbf{V}^T \nabla F) u \right\} (1 + \tau \operatorname{div} \mathbf{V}) \, d\mathbf{y} + \mathbf{Res}_\tau(u), \\ |\mathbf{Res}_\tau(u)| &\leq a(\tau) (\|u\|_{W^{1,2}(\Omega_t)}^2 + \|\nabla F\|_{C(\mathbb{R}^d)^d}^2), \quad 0 \leq a(\tau) = o(|\tau|), \end{aligned}$$

which leads to the asymptotic formula (19), where the first asymptotic term

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi^1(u, v; \Omega_t) &= \int_{\Omega_t} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} (\nabla u)^T \left(\operatorname{div}(\mathbf{V}) \mathbf{I} - \frac{\partial \mathbf{V}}{\partial \mathbf{y}} - \frac{\partial \mathbf{V}^T}{\partial \mathbf{y}} \right) \nabla v - \operatorname{div}(\mathbf{V}F)v \right\} \, d\mathbf{y} \\ \text{for } u, v &\in W^{1,2}(\Omega_t) \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

is well known (see, e.g. [35]). Thus, the assumptions are true for this example.

We emphasize that this technique is also suitable for vector-valued problems and elliptic operators \mathbf{A} with non-homogeneous coefficients (see [24,26]).

Next, we investigate the constrained minimization problems of the type

$$\text{minimize } \Pi(\mathbf{u}; \Omega_t) \quad \text{over } \mathbf{u} \in H(\Omega_t) \quad \text{subject to } \mathbf{u} \in K(\Omega_t). \tag{22}$$

Due to the Dirichlet principle and the Lax–Milgram theorem, there exists a unique solution $\mathbf{u}^t \in K(\Omega_t)$ of (22). By the first-order optimality, (22) is equivalent to the variational inequality:

$$\mathbf{u}^t \in K(\Omega_t), \quad \langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{u}^t - \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^t \rangle_{\Omega_t} \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{u} \in K(\Omega_t). \tag{23}$$

Our aim is to analyse the optimal value function

$$t \longmapsto \Pi(\mathbf{u}^t; \Omega_t) : \quad \Delta_T \longmapsto \mathbb{R}, \tag{24}$$

where \mathbf{u}^t is the unique solution of (22). For fixed $0 < T < \infty$, (24) represents the variation in shape, and further we relate it to the topological changes when $T \rightarrow \infty$.

THEOREM 3.4 *Under Assumptions 3.1 and 3.2, the optimal value function (24) is continuously differentiable with the shape derivative*

$$\frac{d}{dt} \Pi(\mathbf{u}^t; \Omega_t) := \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \frac{\Pi(\mathbf{u}^{t+\tau}; \Omega_{t+\tau}) - \Pi(\mathbf{u}^t; \Omega_t)}{\tau} = \Pi^1(\mathbf{u}^t, \mathbf{u}^t; \Omega_t). \tag{25}$$

Proof For the proof of the assertion, we proceed as follows: for fixed $t \in \Delta_T$, we start by establishing the strong convergence of the solutions $\mathbf{u}^{t+\tau} \circ \Phi_\tau \rightarrow \mathbf{u}^t$ as $\tau \rightarrow 0$. Based on the convergence, we find the limit inferior and the limit superior in (25), which occur to be equal, thus yielding the desired derivative.

We consider the solution $\mathbf{u}^{t+\tau} \in K(\Omega_{t+\tau})$ of the perturbed problem (22) such that

$$\Pi(\mathbf{u}^{t+\tau}; \Omega_{t+\tau}) \leq \Pi(\mathbf{v}; \Omega_{t+\tau}) \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{v} \in K(\Omega_{t+\tau}). \quad (26)$$

Applying the coordinate transformation $\mathbf{z} = \Phi_\tau(\mathbf{y})$ to (26), from (15b) and (18), it follows that $\mathbf{u}^{t+\tau} \circ \Phi_\tau \in K(\Omega_t)$ satisfies

$$[\Pi \circ \Phi_\tau](\mathbf{u}^{t+\tau} \circ \Phi_\tau; \Omega_t) \leq [\Pi \circ \Phi_\tau](\mathbf{u}; \Omega_t) \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{u} \in K(\Omega_t). \quad (27)$$

Use of $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}^t$ in (27) results in the estimate

$$\|\mathbf{u}^{t+\tau} \circ \Phi_\tau\|_{H(\Omega_t)} \leq c_1 + c_2 \|\mathbf{u}^t\|_{H(\Omega_t)} + O(|\tau|),$$

which is uniform for small $|\tau| \leq \delta$. Here, we used (19). Hence, there exists a weakly convergent subsequence of $\mathbf{u}^{t+\tau} \circ \Phi_\tau$, which converges to \mathbf{u}^t as $\tau \rightarrow 0$ due to the weak lower semi-continuity of convex quadratic functionals. In view of (19), estimation of the difference of the solutions yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{c_0}{2} \|\mathbf{u}^{t+\tau} \circ \Phi_\tau - \mathbf{u}^t\|_{H(\Omega_t)}^2 &\leq \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{u}^{t+\tau} \circ \Phi_\tau - \mathbf{u}^t), \mathbf{u}^{t+\tau} \circ \Phi_\tau - \mathbf{u}^t \rangle_{\Omega_t} \\ &\leq \Pi(\mathbf{u}^{t+\tau} \circ \Phi_\tau; \Omega_t) - \Pi(\mathbf{u}^t; \Omega_t) = [\Pi \circ \Phi_\tau](\mathbf{u}^{t+\tau} \circ \Phi_\tau; \Omega_t) \\ &\quad - \Pi(\mathbf{u}^t; \Omega_t) + O(|\tau|) \\ &\leq [\Pi \circ \Phi_\tau](\mathbf{u}^t; \Omega_t) - \Pi(\mathbf{u}^t; \Omega_t) + O(|\tau|) = O(|\tau|), \end{aligned}$$

which implies the strong convergence

$$\mathbf{u}^{t+\tau} \circ \Phi_\tau \longrightarrow \mathbf{u}^t \quad \text{in } H(\Omega_t) \quad \text{as } \tau \longrightarrow 0. \quad (28)$$

Applying Assumption 3.2 and using (27), we estimate the numerator in (25) from above by

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi(\mathbf{u}^{t+\tau}; \Omega_{t+\tau}) - \Pi(\mathbf{u}^t; \Omega_t) &= [\Pi \circ \Phi_\tau](\mathbf{u}^{t+\tau} \circ \Phi_\tau; \Omega_t) - \Pi(\mathbf{u}^t; \Omega_t) \\ &\leq [\Pi \circ \Phi_\tau](\mathbf{u}^t; \Omega_t) - \Pi(\mathbf{u}^t; \Omega_t) = \tau \Pi^1(\mathbf{u}^t, \mathbf{u}^t; \Omega_t) + \text{Res}_\tau(\mathbf{u}^t), \quad \text{Res}_\tau(\mathbf{u}^t) = o(|\tau|). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, from (22), one finds the following estimate from below:

$$\begin{aligned} [\Pi \circ \Phi_\tau](\mathbf{u}^{t+\tau} \circ \Phi_\tau; \Omega_t) - \Pi(\mathbf{u}^t; \Omega_t) &\geq [\Pi \circ \Phi_\tau](\mathbf{u}^{t+\tau} \circ \Phi_\tau; \Omega_t) - \Pi(\mathbf{u}^{t+\tau} \circ \Phi_\tau; \Omega_t) \\ &= \tau \Pi^1(\mathbf{u}^{t+\tau} \circ \Phi_\tau, \mathbf{u}^{t+\tau} \circ \Phi_\tau; \Omega_t) + \text{Res}_\tau(\mathbf{u}^{t+\tau} \circ \Phi_\tau), \quad \text{Res}_\tau(\mathbf{u}^{t+\tau} \circ \Phi_\tau) = o(|\tau|). \end{aligned}$$

For $\tau \rightarrow 0$ due to (28), we arrive at the limit in (25). ■

The following corollary addresses the special case of identical transformations, which will be useful below.

COROLLARY 3.5 *If the mapping Φ_τ in (14) transforms Ω_t into itself, that is,*

$$\Omega_{t+\tau} \equiv \Omega_t \quad \text{for small } |\tau|, \quad (29)$$

then under Assumptions 3.1 and 3.2, it holds that

$$\Pi^1(\mathbf{u}^t, \mathbf{u}^t; \Omega_t) = 0. \quad (30)$$

Proof Let $\Omega_t \circ \Phi_{\pm\tau} = \Omega_t$. Applying the transformation Φ_τ to (22), due to Assumption 3.1, we conclude that $\mathbf{u}^t \circ \Phi_\tau \in K(\Omega_t)$ satisfies

$$[\Pi \circ \Phi_\tau](\mathbf{u}^t \circ \Phi_\tau; \Omega_t) \leq [\Pi \circ \Phi_\tau](\mathbf{u}; \Omega_t) \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{u} \in K(\Omega_t). \quad (31)$$

Using Assumption 3.2, in the spirit of the proof of Theorem 3.4, we derive that

$$\mathbf{u}^t \circ \Phi_\tau \longrightarrow \mathbf{u}^t \quad \text{strongly in } H(\Omega_t) \quad \text{as } \tau \longrightarrow 0. \quad (32)$$

From (19) and (22), we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi(\mathbf{u}^t; \Omega_t) &= [\Pi \circ \Phi_\tau](\mathbf{u}^t \circ \Phi_\tau; \Omega_t) \\ &= \Pi(\mathbf{u}^t \circ \Phi_\tau; \Omega_t) + \tau \Pi^1(\mathbf{u}^t \circ \Phi_\tau, \mathbf{u}^t \circ \Phi_\tau; \Omega_t) + o(|\tau|) \\ &\geq \Pi(\mathbf{u}^t; \Omega_t) + \tau \Pi^1(\mathbf{u}^t \circ \Phi_\tau, \mathbf{u}^t \circ \Phi_\tau; \Omega_t) + o(|\tau|). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\Pi^1(\mathbf{u}^t \circ \Phi_\tau, \mathbf{u}^t \circ \Phi_\tau; \Omega_t) + o(|\tau|)/\tau \leq 0$, and for $\tau \rightarrow 0$, due to (32), we obtain $\Pi^1(\mathbf{u}^t, \mathbf{u}^t; \Omega_t) \leq 0$. Conversely, using (31) and (19), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi(\mathbf{u}^t; \Omega_t) &= [\Pi \circ \Phi_\tau](\mathbf{u}^t \circ \Phi_\tau; \Omega_t) \leq [\Pi \circ \Phi_\tau](\mathbf{u}^t; \Omega_t) \\ &= \Pi(\mathbf{u}^t; \Omega_t) + \tau \Pi^1(\mathbf{u}^t, \mathbf{u}^t; \Omega_t) + o(|\tau|). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\Pi^1(\mathbf{u}^t, \mathbf{u}^t; \Omega_t) + o(|\tau|)/\tau \geq 0$, and the passage $\tau \rightarrow 0$ yields in the limit $\Pi^1(\mathbf{u}^t, \mathbf{u}^t; \Omega_t) \geq 0$. Hence, (30) follows. ■

For a differentiability analysis of the optimal value functions for abstract optimization problems, we refer to [5]. It is interesting to note that formula (25) does not include any variation in \mathbf{u}^t with respect to changing domains (such as material or shape derivatives, see [35] for the definition of these two concepts). This nice feature is due to the fact that the functionals in the objective (24) and in the state problem (22) coincide. In the general case, shape derivatives of objective functions include variations in the state variables with respect to geometry changes. Further investigations on this theme can be found in [17]. In contrast to the situation above, we will see that the expansions of the solution \mathbf{u}^t (the state variable) play a crucial role in the topological changes considered in the next section.

4. Derivative of objective functions when topology changes

Our aim is to apply the results of the previous section to describe the topological changes. In particular, we consider the diminishing defects in a continuous domain. These features can be described as the limit case when $t \rightarrow \infty$ (we rely on $t > 0$).

In view of Section 1, the geometric construction of $\Omega_t = \Omega(r)$ with $\Omega(r) := \Omega \setminus \overline{D(r)}$ provides that for $t \rightarrow \infty$ (equivalently, as $r \rightarrow 0$) the limit domain $\Omega_\infty = \Omega \setminus \{x_0\}$ exists. Motivated by this construction, we suggest the following generalization.

ASSUMPTION 4.1 *There exists a limit domain $\Omega_\infty \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ such that*

$$\Omega_\infty = \bigcup_{t=0}^{\infty} \Omega_t. \quad (33)$$

$$D_t := \Omega_\infty \setminus \Omega_t, \quad \text{meas}(D_t) \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \longrightarrow \infty. \quad (34)$$

In the specific case of $\Omega_t = \Omega(r)$, Assumption 4.1 is satisfied, and we associate D_t in (34) with the diminishing defect $D(r)$ of the size r due to relation (1). We consider (1) as a particular case of general connection between the kinematic parameter t and the defect size r given by

$$\begin{aligned} t &= \psi(r) : [0, R] \mapsto \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+ \text{ strictly monotonically decreasing,} \\ \psi &\in C_{\text{loc}}^1((0, R]), \quad \psi(R) = 0, \quad \psi(r) \longrightarrow \infty \text{ as } r \longrightarrow 0. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Note that $\psi'(r) < 0$ and $\psi'(r) \rightarrow -\infty$ as $r \rightarrow 0$ in (35). In this notation, (1) reads $\psi(r) = -\ln(r/R)$ and $\psi'(r) = -1/r$.

Based on Assumption 4.1 and using notation (35), we can state the constrained minimization problem (22) in $\Omega_{\psi(0)} = \Omega_\infty$:

$$\text{minimize } \Pi(\mathbf{u}; \Omega_{\psi(0)}) \quad \text{over } \mathbf{u} \in H(\Omega_{\psi(0)}) \quad \text{subject to } \mathbf{u} \in K(\Omega_{\psi(0)}). \quad (36)$$

Problem (36) admits a unique solution $\mathbf{u}^{\psi(0)} \in K(\Omega_{\psi(0)})$ in the Hilbert space $H(\Omega_{\psi(0)})$. Restating the optimal value function (24) in terms of r given in (35), we get

$$P : [0, R] \mapsto \mathbb{R}, \quad r \mapsto \Pi(\mathbf{u}^{\psi(r)}; \Omega_{\psi(r)}), \quad (37)$$

where $\mathbf{u}^{\psi(r)} = \mathbf{u}^t$ is the solution of (22). After substitution of (35) into (7), we arrive at the system

$$\frac{d}{dr} \Phi_{\psi(r)} = \psi'(r) \mathbf{V}(\Phi_{\psi(r)}) \quad \text{for } r \in (0, R), \quad \Phi_{\psi(R)} = \mathbf{x}. \quad (38)$$

Hence, applying the chain rule to (25) and using the velocity $\psi'(r) \mathbf{V}$ due to (38), from Theorem 3.4, we conclude the following result.

THEOREM 4.2 *The objective function (37) is continuously differentiable in $(0, R]$ with the derivative*

$$P'(r) = \psi'(r) \Pi^1(\mathbf{u}^{\psi(r)}, \mathbf{u}^{\psi(r)}; \Omega_{\psi(r)}) \quad \text{for } r > 0. \quad (39)$$

Formula (39) becomes singular at $r = 0$ due to the presence of $\psi'(r)$. Below, however, we shall find that $\Pi^1(\mathbf{u}^{\psi(r)}, \mathbf{u}^{\psi(r)}; \Omega_{\psi(r)})$ balances this singularity of $\psi'(r)$ as $r \rightarrow 0$. In Lemma 4.3, we establish an auxiliary result concerning the limit value of $\Pi^1(\mathbf{u}^{\psi(0)}, \mathbf{u}^{\psi(0)}; \Omega_{\psi(0)})$ as $r \rightarrow 0$. Indeed, for any τ , the mapping Φ_τ transforms $\Omega_{\psi(0)}$ into itself due to (33). Therefore, from Theorem 3.4 and Corollary 3.5, the next result follows immediately.

LEMMA 4.3 *If Assumptions 3.1 and 3.2 are satisfied in the limit domain $\Omega_{\psi(0)}$, that is,*

$$\begin{aligned} (15a) : & \quad \mathbf{u} \in H(\Omega_{\psi(0)}) \Rightarrow \mathbf{u} \circ \Phi_\tau \in H(\Omega_{\psi(0)}), \\ (15b) : & \quad \mathbf{u} \in K(\Omega_{\psi(0)}) \Rightarrow \mathbf{u} \circ \Phi_\tau \in K(\Omega_{\psi(0)}) \quad \text{for all } \tau \in \mathbb{R}; \\ (19a) : & \quad [\Pi \circ \Phi_\tau](\mathbf{u}; \Omega_{\psi(0)}) = \Pi(\mathbf{u}; \Omega_{\psi(0)}) + \tau \Pi^1(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}; \Omega_{\psi(0)}) + \text{Res}_\tau(\mathbf{u}), \\ (19b) : & \quad |\text{Res}_\tau(\mathbf{u})| \leq a(\tau)(\|\mathbf{u}\|_{H(\Omega_{\psi(0)})}^2 + b), \quad 0 \leq a(\tau) = o(|\tau|), \quad b \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

then it holds that

$$\Pi^1(\mathbf{u}^{\psi(0)}, \mathbf{u}^{\psi(0)}; \Omega_{\psi(0)}) = 0. \quad (40)$$

Now, Theorem 4.2 and Lemma 4.3 allow us to use (39) in order to describe the topological changes in $\Omega_\infty = \Omega_{\psi(0)}$. Therefore, our aim is to study the limit

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\Pi(\mathbf{u}^{\psi(r)}; \Omega_{\psi(r)}) - \Pi(\mathbf{u}^{\psi(0)}; \Omega_{\psi(0)})}{r} := P'(0). \tag{41}$$

Based on Theorem 4.2, we represent (41) equivalently as

$$P'(0) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{r} \int_0^r P'(\tau) \, d\tau = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{r} \int_0^r \psi'(\tau) \Pi^1(\mathbf{u}^{\psi(\tau)}, \mathbf{u}^{\psi(\tau)}; \Omega_{\psi(\tau)}) \, d\tau. \tag{42}$$

As we observe from Lemma 4.3, the formal passage to the limit in (42) is indefinite because of $\Pi^1(\mathbf{u}^{\psi(r)}, \mathbf{u}^{\psi(r)}; \Omega_{\psi(r)}) \rightarrow 0$ and $\psi'(r) \rightarrow -\infty$ as $r \rightarrow 0$. To clarify this indefiniteness, an expansion of the state variable $\mathbf{u}^{\psi(r)}$ with respect to $r \rightarrow 0$ is needed. Moreover, a local expansion is sufficient when the shape derivative is determined locally in $\Omega_{\psi(r)}$. Such a localization of shape derivatives on subsets was established in the structure theorems in [9,35]. As another example, we mention the well-known path-independent Cherepanov–Rice integral of energy representing the shape derivative due to crack propagation (see (55) in the example below). These considerations motivate the following assumption.

ASSUMPTION 4.4 *For all $r \in (0, R]$, there exist subdomains $\mathcal{O}_r \subset \Omega_{\psi(r)}$ such that*

$$\Pi^1(\mathbf{u}^{\psi(r)}, \mathbf{u}^{\psi(r)}; \Omega_{\psi(r)}) = \Pi^1(\mathbf{u}^{\psi(r)}, \mathbf{u}^{\psi(r)}; \mathcal{O}_r), \tag{43a}$$

$$\Pi^1(\mathbf{u}^{\psi(0)}, \mathbf{u}^{\psi(0)}; \Omega_{\psi(0)}) = \Pi^1(\mathbf{u}^{\psi(0)}, \mathbf{u}^{\psi(0)}; \mathcal{O}_r). \tag{43b}$$

Based on Assumption 4.4, in the following proposition, we state sufficient conditions on the solution to obtain the limit in (42).

PROPOSITION 4.5 *If the conditions*

$$(i) \quad \|\mathbf{u}^{\psi(r)} - \mathbf{u}^{\psi(0)}\|_{H(\Omega_{\psi(r)})} \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } r \longrightarrow 0, \tag{44a}$$

$$(ii) \quad 0 \leq -\psi'(r) \|\mathbf{u}^{\psi(r)} - \mathbf{u}^{\psi(0)}\|_{H(\mathcal{O}_r)} \leq \text{const} \tag{44b}$$

hold, then the mapping $r \mapsto P(r)$ in (37) obeys the expansion:

$$P(r) = P(0) + Q(r) + O\left(-\int_0^r \frac{d\tau}{\psi'(\tau)}\right), \quad \text{where } -\int_0^r \frac{d\tau}{\psi'(\tau)} = o(r), \tag{45a}$$

$$Q(r) := \int_0^r \Pi^1(2\mathbf{u}^{\psi(0)}, \psi'(\tau)(\mathbf{u}^{\psi(\tau)} - \mathbf{u}^{\psi(0)}); \mathcal{O}_\tau) \, d\tau = O(r). \tag{45b}$$

If the mapping $r \mapsto P'(r)$ defined in (39) is monotone, then the limit in (42) exists and it is given by

$$P'(0) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} r^{-1} Q(r). \tag{46}$$

Proof The relations (39) and (43a) imply that

$$P(r+s) = P(r) + \int_r^{r+s} \psi'(\tau) \Pi^1(\mathbf{u}^{\psi(\tau)}, \mathbf{u}^{\psi(\tau)}; \mathcal{O}_\tau) d\tau. \quad (47)$$

We represent $\mathbf{u}^{\psi(\tau)} = \mathbf{u}^{\psi(0)} + (\mathbf{u}^{\psi(\tau)} - \mathbf{u}^{\psi(0)})$ in (47). Applying Lemma 4.3 and (43b), we obtain the following decomposition for small τ

$$\begin{aligned} \psi'(\tau) \Pi^1(\mathbf{u}^{\psi(\tau)}, \mathbf{u}^{\psi(\tau)}; \mathcal{O}_\tau) &= \Pi^1(2\mathbf{u}^{\psi(0)}, \psi'(\tau)(\mathbf{u}^{\psi(\tau)} - \mathbf{u}^{\psi(0)}); \mathcal{O}_\tau) \\ &+ \Pi^1(\mathbf{u}^{\psi(\tau)} - \mathbf{u}^{\psi(0)}, \psi'(\tau)(\mathbf{u}^{\psi(\tau)} - \mathbf{u}^{\psi(0)}); \mathcal{O}_\tau), \end{aligned} \quad (48a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi^1(\mathbf{u}^{\psi(\tau)} - \mathbf{u}^{\psi(0)}, \psi'(\tau)(\mathbf{u}^{\psi(\tau)} - \mathbf{u}^{\psi(0)}); \mathcal{O}_\tau) &= O(-(\psi'(\tau))^{-1}), \\ \text{where } -(\psi'(\tau))^{-1} &\longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \tau \longrightarrow 0. \end{aligned} \quad (48b)$$

Here, the estimate (48b) is provided by (20) and (44b). Using (48), from (47), we obtain the expansion

$$P(r+s) = P(r) + \int_r^{r+s} \Pi^1(2\mathbf{u}^{\psi(0)}, \psi'(\tau)(\mathbf{u}^{\psi(\tau)} - \mathbf{u}^{\psi(0)}); \mathcal{O}_\tau) d\tau + O\left(-\int_0^s \frac{d\tau}{\psi'(\tau)}\right). \quad (49)$$

The convergence $P(r) \rightarrow P(0)$ as $r \rightarrow 0$ in (49) is ensured by the condition (44a). From (28) with $t + \tau = \psi(r+s)$ and $t = \psi(s)$, thus $\tau = r\psi'(s) + o(r)$, we infer

$$\begin{aligned} P(r+s) &= \Pi(\mathbf{u}^{\psi(r+s)}; \Omega_{\psi(r+s)}) = [\Pi \circ \Phi_\tau](\mathbf{u}^{\psi(r+s)} \circ \Phi_\tau; \Omega_{\psi(s)}) \\ &= \Pi(\mathbf{u}^{\psi(r+s)} \circ \Phi_\tau; \Omega_{\psi(s)}) + O(r) \longrightarrow \Pi(\mathbf{u}^{\psi(s)}; \Omega_{\psi(s)}) = P(s) \quad \text{as } r \longrightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, passing $r \rightarrow 0$ in (49), applying the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem and changing the notation of s to r , we obtain (45).

The existence of the unique limit in (46) is not guaranteed when the sequence $P'(r)$ admits oscillations as $r \rightarrow 0$. Indeed, the uniform bound in (44b) implies that particular limits $\{Q\} = \lim_{r_n \rightarrow 0} P'(r_n)$, $|Q| < \infty$, exist on subsequences r_n only. Nevertheless, if $r \mapsto P'(r)$ is monotone, then $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} P'(r) = P'(0)$ is unique, and it coincides with the limit in (46) with Q from (45). ■

We conclude Proposition 4.5 with remarks on the conditions in (44). Note that (44a) yields the necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of $P'(0)$. The convergence in (44a) can be justified by variational methods. In contrast, to obtain the sufficient condition (44b) in the subdomain \mathcal{O}_r , one needs asymptotics of the solution. In practical applications, the asymptotic analysis usually utilizes the Fourier series. Its justification in varying domains, however, needs a Saint-Venant principle (see the related topic in [4,22]). In the next section, we give an example illustrating the expansion of the solution which provides $P'(0)$ in Proposition 4.5.

5. Example: circular hole at the tip of a crack

We present an example of a topological change produced by the creation of a circular hole in a reference domain, which is non-smooth due to the presence of a crack inside. Our consideration follows the structure of Sections 2–4.

5.1 Kinematic description

We start with a kinematic description. In view of Section 1, let the reference domain Ω in \mathbb{R}^2 contain a rectilinear crack Γ_C of length $l > 0$ with one end tip located at the trial point \mathbf{x}_0 . For convenience of notation, we set the origin $\mathbf{0}$ at \mathbf{x}_0 and associate a Cartesian coordinate system (x_1, x_2) such that $\Gamma_C = \{\mathbf{x} : x_1 \in [-l, 0], x_2 = 0\}$. Let the boundary $\partial\Omega$ of Ω consist of a simple contour Γ (referred to as the external boundary) and the two crack faces Γ_C^+ and Γ_C^- . We assume that Γ is a Lipschitz curve.

We take the generic defect D in the form of a unit disk. For further use, we denote by B_r the open disk of radius $r > 0$ centred at $\mathbf{0}$ (the trial point). There exists $R \in (0, l)$ sufficiently small such that, for all $r \in (0, R)$, the disks B_r represent defects $D(r)$ of the size r in Ω . Then, the evolving domains $\Omega(r) = \Omega \setminus \overline{B(r)}$ are well defined. Furthermore, we denote by \mathbf{n} the unit normal vector at the boundary $\partial\Omega(r)$ consisting of Γ , ∂B_r and $\Gamma_C^\pm \setminus B_r$.

We choose the defect velocity $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x}) = -\mathbf{x}$, for $\mathbf{x} \in B_R$, and the kinematic velocity $\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{y}) := -\mathbf{y}\chi(\mathbf{y})$ with a smooth cut-off function χ , with $\chi : \mathbb{R}^2 \mapsto [0, 1]$ such that $\chi(\mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{1}$ for $\mathbf{y} \in B_{R/2}$, and $\chi(\mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{0}$ for $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B_R$. Introduction of the kinematic parameter $t \in [0, \infty]$ by $t = \psi(r)$ with $\psi(r) := -\ln(r/R)$ yields the kinematic description of Section 2 of the evolving domains $\Omega_t = \Omega_{\psi(r)} = \Omega(r)$. In this section, we rely on the unified notation $\Omega_{\psi(r)}$ for the domain with the fixed crack Γ_C and the diminishing defect (disk B_r) of size $r \in [0, R]$ at the crack tip.

5.2 Problem formulation

We consider the following boundary value problem stated in $\Omega_{\psi(r)}$: for all $r \in [0, R]$, find $u^{\psi(r)}$ satisfying

$$-\Delta u^{\psi(r)} = F \quad \text{in } \Omega_{\psi(r)}, \tag{50a}$$

$$u^{\psi(r)} = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma, \tag{50b}$$

$$\frac{\partial u^{\psi(r)}}{\partial \mathbf{n}} = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial B_r \cup (\Gamma_C^\pm \setminus B_r). \tag{50c}$$

Here, $F \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ is given, and we assume $F = 0$ in $B_{R/2}$. For $r = 0$, (50) turns into the following problem stated in the reference domain $\Omega_{\psi(0)}$: find $u^{\psi(0)}$ satisfying

$$-\Delta u^{\psi(0)} = F \quad \text{in } \Omega_{\psi(0)}, \tag{51a}$$

$$u^{\psi(0)} = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma, \tag{51b}$$

$$\frac{\partial u^{\psi(0)}}{\partial \mathbf{n}} = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_C^\pm. \tag{51c}$$

For the feasible set

$$K(\Omega_{\psi(r)}) := \{u \in W^{1,2}(\Omega_{\psi(r)}) : u = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma\},$$

the weak solution $u^{\psi(r)} \in K(\Omega_{\psi(r)})$ of (50) is guaranteed to exist uniquely as the minimizer of the energy functional

$$\Pi(u; \Omega_{\psi(r)}) := \int_{\Omega_{\psi(r)}} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\nabla u|^2 - Fu \right) dy \tag{52}$$

over $u \in W^{1,2}(\Omega_{\psi(r)})$ subject to $u \in K(\Omega_{\psi(r)})$.

5.3 Shape derivative and its structure

The optimal value (defect) function is given by

$$P : [0, R] \mapsto \mathbb{R}, \quad r \mapsto \Pi(u^{\psi(r)}; \Omega_{\psi(r)}) = \int_{\Omega_{\psi(r)}} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\nabla u^{\psi(r)}|^2 - F u^{\psi(r)} \right) dy.$$

From Theorems 3.4 and 4.2, for $r \in (0, R)$, the existence of the limit

$$\lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \frac{\Pi(u^{\psi(r+\tau)}; \Omega_{\psi(r+\tau)}) - \Pi(u^{\psi(r)}; \Omega_{\psi(r)})}{\tau} = -\frac{1}{r} \Pi^1(u^{\psi(r)}, u^{\psi(r)}; \Omega_{\psi(r)}) =: P'(r) \quad (53)$$

with $-1/r = \psi'(r)$ follows. Using the calculation of Example 3.3, from (21), we infer that

$$\Pi^1(u, v; \Omega_{\psi(r)}) = \int_{\Omega_{\psi(r)}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} (\nabla u)^T \left(\operatorname{div}(\mathbf{V}) \mathbf{I} - \frac{\partial \mathbf{V}}{\partial \mathbf{y}} - \frac{\partial \mathbf{V}^T}{\partial \mathbf{y}} \right) \nabla v - \operatorname{div}(\mathbf{V} F) v \right\} dy. \quad (54)$$

Note that $\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{y}) = -\mathbf{y}$ for $\mathbf{y} \in B_\rho$, $\rho \in (0, R/2)$, in view of our construction of the velocity. This yields $\operatorname{div}(\mathbf{V}) \mathbf{I} - \partial \mathbf{V} / \partial \mathbf{y} - (\partial \mathbf{V} / \partial \mathbf{y})^T = 0$ in B_ρ . Moreover, $F = 0$ in B_ρ , and $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{0}$ in $\Omega \setminus B_R$. Hence, the domain of integration in (54) reduces to the annulus $\mathcal{O}_r := (B_R \setminus B_r) \setminus \Gamma_C$, and Assumption 4.4 of the structure of the shape derivative holds true in this example. Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pi^1(u^{\psi(r)}, u^{\psi(r)}; \mathcal{O}_r) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{O}_r} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} (\nabla u^{\psi(r)})^T \left(\operatorname{div}(\mathbf{V}) \mathbf{I} - \frac{\partial \mathbf{V}}{\partial \mathbf{y}} - \frac{\partial \mathbf{V}^T}{\partial \mathbf{y}} \right) \nabla u^{\psi(r)} - \operatorname{div}(\mathbf{V} F) u^{\psi(r)} \right\} dy. \end{aligned}$$

The solution of (50) enjoys extra $W^{2,2}$ -smoothness away from the crack tips. Therefore, integration by parts yields

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi^1(u^{\psi(r)}, u^{\psi(r)}; \mathcal{O}_r) &= \int_{\mathcal{O}_r} (\Delta u^{\psi(r)} + F) (\mathbf{V}^T \nabla u^{\psi(r)}) dy \\ &\quad + \int_{\partial B_r} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{V}^T \mathbf{n}) |\nabla u^{\psi(r)}|^2 - (\mathbf{V}^T \nabla u^{\psi(r)}) (\mathbf{n}^T \nabla u^{\psi(r)}) \right\} dS_y. \end{aligned}$$

Using Equation (50a), $\mathbf{n} = -\mathbf{y}/|\mathbf{y}|$, $\mathbf{V} = -\mathbf{y}$ and $|\mathbf{y}| = r$ at ∂B_r , we obtain

$$\Pi^1(u^{\psi(r)}, u^{\psi(r)}; \mathcal{O}_r) = r \int_{\partial B_r} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} |\nabla u^{\psi(r)}|^2 - \left(\frac{\partial u^{\psi(r)}}{\partial \mathbf{n}} \right)^2 \right\} dS_y. \quad (55)$$

In fracture mechanics, (55) is well known as the Cherepanov–Rice integral. We note that the latter term in (55) is zero due to (50c).

5.4 Expansion of solutions

To calculate the integral in (55), we construct a local representation of the solution $u^{\psi(r)}$ in \mathcal{O}_r . For this aim, we follow the method of matched asymptotic expansions of [16,28].

We introduce a polar coordinate system $\rho = |\mathbf{y}|$, $\theta \in (-\pi, \pi)$ at $\mathbf{0}$ such that the crack faces Γ_C^\pm correspond to $\theta = \pm\pi$. For the solution $u^{\psi(0)}$ of the reference problem (51), its local asymptotic

expansion is known, and it is given by the Fourier series in $B_R \setminus \Gamma_C$ as

$$u^{\psi(0)}(\mathbf{y}) = u^{\psi(0)}(\mathbf{0}) + c_1 \rho^{1/2} \sin \frac{\theta}{2} + a_1 \rho \cos \theta + b_1 \rho \sin \theta + U, \quad U = O(\rho^{3/2}). \quad (56)$$

The unique coefficients $c_1, a_1, b_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ in (56) can be calculated using the weight functions of the respective order.

For fixed $r \in (0, R/2)$, let us denote the difference of solutions by $w^r := u^{\psi(r)} - u^{\psi(0)}$. Due to (50) and (51), the function $w^r \in K(\Omega_{\psi(r)})$ satisfies the following equations:

$$-\Delta w^r(\mathbf{y}) = 0 \quad \text{for } \mathbf{y} \in \Omega_{\psi(r)}, \quad (57a)$$

$$w^r(\mathbf{y}) = 0 \quad \text{for } \mathbf{y} \in \Gamma, \quad \frac{\partial w^r}{\partial \mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{y}) = 0 \quad \text{for } \mathbf{y} \in \Gamma_C^\pm, \quad (57b)$$

$$\frac{\partial w^r}{\partial \mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{y}) = -\frac{\partial u^{\psi(0)}}{\partial \mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{y}) \quad \text{for } \mathbf{y} \in \partial B_r. \quad (57c)$$

Rewriting (57) in the stretched variable $\xi := \mathbf{y}/r$ and passing $|\xi| \rightarrow \infty$, we arrive at the second limit problem in the exterior domain: find W^r satisfying

$$-\Delta W^r(\xi) = 0 \quad \text{for } \xi \in (\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \overline{B_1}) \setminus \Gamma_\infty, \quad (58a)$$

$$\frac{\partial W^r}{\partial \mathbf{n}}(\xi) = 0 \quad \text{for } \xi \in (\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \overline{B_1}) \cap \Gamma_\infty^\pm, \quad (58b)$$

$$\frac{\partial W^r}{\partial \mathbf{n}}(\xi) = -r \frac{\partial u^{\psi(0)}}{\partial \mathbf{n}}(r\xi) \quad \text{for } \xi \in \partial B_1, \quad (58c)$$

with the semi-infinite crack $\Gamma_\infty := \{(\xi_1, \xi_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \xi_1 \leq 0, \xi_2 = 0\}$. From (56), we have $\int_{\partial B_1} \partial u^{\psi(0)} / \partial \mathbf{n} \, dS_\xi = 0$, which implies the solvability condition of the exterior Neumann problem (58) in the weighted Sobolev space

$$X := \{\mu v, \nabla v \in L^2((\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \overline{B_1}) \setminus \Gamma_\infty)\}, \quad \mu \sim (|\xi| \ln |\xi|)^{-1} \quad \text{as } |\xi| \rightarrow \infty.$$

The weight μ is due to the Poincaré inequality in the exterior domains. Excluding constant values, there exists the unique solution $W^r \in X \setminus \mathbb{R}$ to (58) yielding the Fourier series in $(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \overline{B_1}) \setminus \Gamma_\infty$ as

$$W^r(\xi) = c_1^r |\xi|^{-1/2} \sin \frac{\theta}{2} + \frac{a_1^r}{|\xi|} \cos \theta + \frac{b_1^r}{|\xi|} \sin \theta + V(\xi), \quad V = O(|\xi|^{-3/2}). \quad (59)$$

Substituting expansions (56) and (59) into (58c), we determine the unknown coefficients c_1^r, a_1^r, b_1^r from the orthogonal decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} \left. \frac{\partial W^r}{\partial \mathbf{n}}(\xi) \right|_{|\xi|=1} &= \frac{c_1^r}{2} \sin \frac{\theta}{2} + a_1^r \cos \theta + b_1^r \sin \theta + \left. \frac{\partial V}{\partial \mathbf{n}}(\xi) \right|_{|\xi|=1} \\ &= -r \left. \frac{\partial u^{\psi(0)}}{\partial \mathbf{n}}(r\xi) \right|_{|\xi|=1} = \frac{c_1}{2} r^{1/2} \sin \frac{\theta}{2} + a_1 \cos \theta + b_1 \sin \theta - r \left. \frac{\partial U}{\partial \mathbf{n}}(r\xi) \right|_{|\xi|=1}. \end{aligned}$$

Henceforth, $c_1^r = r^{1/2} c_1, a_1^r = r a_1, b_1^r = r b_1$. Using the inverse substitution $\mathbf{y} = r\xi$ in (59), we get in $(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \overline{B_r}) \setminus \Gamma_\infty$ the Fourier series

$$\begin{aligned} W^r\left(\frac{\mathbf{y}}{r}\right) &= r c_1 \rho^{-1/2} \sin \frac{\theta}{2} + r^2 a_1 \rho^{-1} \cos \theta + r^2 b_1 \rho^{-1} \sin \theta + V^1 \\ \text{with } V^1(\mathbf{y}) &:= V\left(\frac{\mathbf{y}}{r}\right) = O(r^3 \rho^{-3/2}). \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

The asymptotic formulas yield the expansion $u^{\psi(r)} = u^{\psi(0)} + W^r + Q$ in \mathcal{O}_r , where $W^r = O(r^{1/2})$ in $\Omega_{\psi(r)}$ due to $W^r = O(r^{1/2})$ at ∂B_r . The residual $Q := w^r(\mathbf{y}) - W^r(\mathbf{y}/r) \in H(\Omega_{\psi(r)})$

satisfies the equations

$$-\Delta Q(\mathbf{y}) = 0 \quad \text{for } \mathbf{y} \in \Omega_{\psi(r)}, \quad (61a)$$

$$Q(\mathbf{y}) = -W^r\left(\frac{\mathbf{y}}{r}\right) \quad \text{for } \mathbf{y} \in \Gamma, \quad \frac{\partial Q}{\partial \mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{y}) = 0 \quad \text{for } \mathbf{y} \in \Gamma_C^\pm, \quad (61b)$$

$$\frac{\partial Q}{\partial \mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{y}) = 0 \quad \text{for } \mathbf{y} \in \partial B_r. \quad (61c)$$

Since $W^r(\mathbf{y}/r) = O(|c_1|r + r^2)$ at Γ , from (61), we can estimate $Q = O(|c_1|r + r^2)$ in $\Omega_{\psi(r)}$. Thus, (60) results in the local asymptotic expansion of the solution $u^{\psi(r)}$ of (50) in \mathcal{O}_r given by the expression

$$u^{\psi(r)} = u^{\psi(0)} + r c_1 \rho^{-1/2} \sin \frac{\theta}{2} + r^2 a_1 \rho^{-1} \cos \theta + r^2 b_1 \rho^{-1} \sin \theta + Q + V^1. \quad (62)$$

We note that the residual $Q + V^1$ does not impact the formulas of topological derivatives derived in the following section.

5.5 Topological derivatives

Now, we are in a position to calculate the integral in (55), which we rewrite in polar coordinates as

$$\Pi^1(u^{\psi(r)}, u^{\psi(r)}; \mathcal{O}_r) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left\{ \left(\frac{\partial u^{\psi(r)}}{\partial \theta} \right)^2 - r^2 \left(\frac{\partial u^{\psi(r)}}{\partial \rho} \right)^2 \right\} \Bigg|_{\rho=r} d\theta. \quad (63)$$

We remind that $\partial u^{\psi(r)}/\partial \rho = 0$ at $\rho = r$ according to (50c). Inserting the expansions (56) and (62) in (63), some technical calculations lead to

$$\Pi^1(u^{\psi(r)}, u^{\psi(r)}; \mathcal{O}_r) = \frac{\pi}{2} c_1^2 r + 2\pi(a_1^2 + b_1^2)r^2 + O(|c_1|(r^{3/2} + r^2) + r^3), \quad (64)$$

with the terms of order $O(|c_1|(r^{3/2} + r^2))$ due to Q in (62). By using (64), from (53), we obtain the expansion of the shape derivative

$$P'(r) = -\frac{\pi}{2} c_1^2 - 2\pi(a_1^2 + b_1^2)r + O(|c_1|(r^{1/2} + r) + r^2). \quad (65)$$

Passing with $r \rightarrow 0$ in (65), we obtain the existence of the topological derivative

$$P'(0) = -\frac{\pi}{2} c_1^2. \quad (66)$$

The coefficient c_1 in (66) is uniquely defined. It characterizes the leading singularity of the reference solution $u^{\psi(0)}$ near the trial point $\mathbf{0}$, and it is called the stress intensity factor in fracture mechanics.

Now, we justify the assertion of Proposition 4.5. Indeed, similar to (63), some manipulations yield

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi^1(2u^{\psi(0)}, \psi'(r)w^r; \mathcal{O}_r) &= -\frac{1}{r} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left\{ \frac{\partial u^{\psi(0)}}{\partial \theta} \frac{\partial w^r}{\partial \theta} - r^2 \frac{\partial u^{\psi(0)}}{\partial \rho} \frac{\partial w^r}{\partial \rho} \right\} \Bigg|_{\rho=r} d\theta \\ &= -\frac{\pi}{2} c_1^2 - 8\pi c_1 b_1 r^{1/2} - 2\pi(a_1^2 + b_1^2)r + O(|c_1|(r^{1/2} + r) + r^2) \end{aligned}$$

with $\psi'(r) = -1/r$. Therefore, in the notation of (45), we have $Q(r) = -(\pi/2)c_1^2 r + O(r^{3/2})$, and $P'(0) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} Q(r)/r$ coincides with (66). We conclude that Proposition 4.5 becomes useful when an exact analytic expansion of shape derivatives like (64) is not available directly.

The knowledge of the exact analytic expansion (64) provides us with the following results. Using $P(r) - P(0) = \int_0^r P'(\tau) d\tau$, from (65), one finds the asymptotic expansion of the defect function P with respect to $r \rightarrow 0$ as

$$P(r) = P(0) - \frac{\pi}{2}c_1^2r - \pi(a_1^2 + b_1^2)r^2 + O(|c_1|(r^{3/2} + r^2) + r^3). \tag{67}$$

Finally, we consider the specific case when the solution of the reference problem (51) enjoys extra smoothness. Let $u^{\psi(0)} \in W^{2,2}(B_R \setminus \Gamma_C)$, which exceeds the variational $W^{1,2}$ -smoothness of the solution justified by the minimization problem. In this case, $c_1 = 0$ in (56) and one obtains

$$u^{\psi(0)}(\mathbf{y}) = u^{\psi(0)}(\mathbf{0}) + a_1\rho \cos \theta + b_1\rho \sin \theta + O(\rho^{3/2}) \quad \text{in } B_R \setminus \Gamma_C.$$

Differentiation of this equality and then passing with $\rho \rightarrow 0$ ensure that $(a_1, b_1)^T = \nabla u^{\psi(0)}(\mathbf{0})$. Therefore, (56) turns into

$$u^{\psi(0)}(\mathbf{y}) = u^{\psi(0)}(\mathbf{0}) + \mathbf{y}^T \nabla u^{\psi(0)}(\mathbf{0}) + O(|\mathbf{y}|^{3/2}) \quad \text{in } B_R \setminus \Gamma_C, \tag{68}$$

and, similarly, (62) reads

$$u^{\psi(r)}(\mathbf{y}) = u^{\psi(0)}(\mathbf{y}) + \frac{r^2}{|\mathbf{y}|^2}(\mathbf{y}^T \nabla u^{\psi(0)}(\mathbf{0})) + O(r^3|\mathbf{y}|^{-3/2}) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{O}_r. \tag{69}$$

If $c_1 = 0$, from (67), we infer the second-order expansion

$$P(r) = P(0) - \pi r^2 |\nabla u^{\psi(0)}(\mathbf{0})|^2 + O(r^3). \tag{70}$$

The term $-\pi r^2 |\nabla u^{\psi(0)}(\mathbf{0})|^2$ in (70) implies the topological derivative presented in [31,34].

6. Conclusion

Based on these findings, we conclude the following. While the ‘topological derivative’ is suitable for the description of the changes in topology restricted to smooth data, our generalization of the concept within singular perturbations has a rather broad scope for the generally non-smooth data subject to topological changes.

Acknowledgements

The research results were obtained with the support of the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) in the framework of the research project P21411-N13, the START-program Y305 ‘Interfaces and Free Boundaries’ and the SFB F32 ‘Mathematical Optimization and Applications in Biomedical Sciences’; the DGF-Research Center MATHEON in Berlin (subproject C28) and DFG SPP 1253 ‘Optimization with PDE constraints’; the Russian Foundation for Basic Research (project 10-01-00054) and the Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences (project N 90).

References

- [1] G. Allaire, F. Jouve, and A.-M. Toader, *Structural optimization using sensitivity analysis and a level-set method*, J. Comput. Phys. 194 (2004), pp. 363–393.
- [2] S. Amstutz, I. Horchani, and M. Masmoudi, *Crack detection by the topological gradient method*, Control Cybernet. 34 (2005), pp. 81–101.
- [3] I.I. Argatov and V.A. Kovtunenکو, *A kinking crack: Generalization of the concept of the topological derivative*, Bull. Aust. Inst. High Energ. Mater. 1 (2010), pp. 124–130.
- [4] C. Barbarosie and A.-M. Toader, *Saint-Venant’s principle and its connections to shape and topology optimization*, Z. Angew. Math. Mech. 88 (2008), pp. 23–32.

- [5] J.F. Bonnans and A. Shapiro, *Perturbation Analysis of Optimization Problems*, Springer, New York, 2000.
- [6] J. Céa, S. Garreau, P. Guillaume, and M. Masmoudi, *The shape and topological optimizations connection*, *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Eng.* 188 (2000), pp. 713–726.
- [7] M.C. Delfour and J.-P. Zolesio, *Shapes and Geometries. Analysis, Differential Calculus, and Optimization*, SIAM, Philadelphia, 2001.
- [8] H.A. Eschenauer, V.V. Kobelev, and A. Schumacher, *Bubble method for topology and shape optimization of structures*, *Struct. Multidiscip. Optim.* 8 (1994), pp. 42–51.
- [9] G. Fremiot, W. Horn, A. Laurain, M. Rao, and J. Sokolowski, *On the analysis of boundary value problems in nonsmooth domains*, *Dissertationes Mathematicae*, Polish Acad. Sci. Inst. Math., Warsaw, Vol. 462, 2009.
- [10] J. Haslinger, T. Kozubek, K. Kunisch, and G. Peichl, *Shape differentiability of the solution to a fictitious domain formulation*, *Adv. Math. Sci. Appl.* 16 (2006) pp. 95–109.
- [11] M. Hintermüller, *Fast level set based algorithms using shape and topological sensitivity information*, *Control Cybernet.* 34 (2005), pp. 305–324.
- [12] M. Hintermüller and A. Laurain, *Where to place a hole?* *ECMI Newsl.* 41 (2007), pp. 1–6.
- [13] M. Hintermüller and W. Ring, *A level set approach for the solution of a state-constrained optimal control problem*, *Numer. Math.* 98 (2004), pp. 135–166.
- [14] M. Hintermüller, V.A. Kovtunenکو, and K. Kunisch, *An optimization approach for the delamination of a composite material with non-penetration*, in *Free and Moving Boundaries*, R. Glowinski and J.-P. Zolesio, eds., Vol. 252, *Lecture Notes in Pure Applied Mathematics*, Chapman & Hall, Boca Raton, FL, USA, 2007, pp. 331–348.
- [15] M. Iguernane, S.A. Nazarov, J.-R. Roche, J. Sokolowski, and K. Szulc, *Topological derivatives for semilinear elliptic equations*, *Int. J. Appl. Math. Comput. Sci.* 19 (2009), pp. 191–205.
- [16] A.M. Il'in, *Matching of Asymptotic Expansions of Solutions of Boundary Value Problems*, AMS, Providence, RI, 1992.
- [17] K. Ito, K. Kunisch, and G. Peichl, *Variational approach to shape derivatives*, *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.* 14 (2008), pp. 517–539.
- [18] A.M. Khudnev and V.A. Kovtunenکو, *Analysis of Cracks in Solids*, WIT-Press, Southampton, Boston, 2000.
- [19] A.M. Khudnev and J. Sokolowski, *Modelling and Control in Solid Mechanics*, Birkhäuser-Verlag, Boston, Basel, Berlin, 1997.
- [20] A.M. Khudnev, V.A. Kovtunenکو, and A. Tani, *Evolution of a crack with kink and non-penetration*, *J. Math. Soc. Jpn* 60 (2008), pp. 1219–1253.
- [21] A.M. Khudnev, V.A. Kovtunenکو, and A. Tani, *On the topological derivative due to kink of a crack with non-penetration. Anti-plane model*, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* 94 (2010), pp. 571–596.
- [22] J.K. Knowles, *A Saint-Venant principle for a class of second-order elliptic boundary value problems*, *Z. Angew. Math. Phys.* 18 (1967), pp. 473–490.
- [23] P. Kogut and G. Leugering, *Homogenization of optimal control problems in variable domains. Principle of the fictitious homogenization*, *Asymptotic Anal.* 26 (2001), pp. 37–72.
- [24] V.A. Kovtunenکو, *Invariant energy integrals for the non-linear crack problem with possible contact of the crack surfaces*, *J. Appl. Maths. Mech.* 67 (2003), pp. 99–110.
- [25] V.A. Kovtunenکو, *Primal-dual methods of shape sensitivity analysis for curvilinear cracks with non-penetration*, *IMA J. Appl. Math.* 71 (2006), pp. 635–657.
- [26] V.A. Kovtunenکو and K. Kunisch, *Problem of crack perturbation based on level sets and velocities*, *Z. Angew. Math. Mech.* 87 (2007), pp. 809–830.
- [27] V.A. Kovtunenکو, K. Kunisch, and W. Ring, *Propagation and bifurcation of cracks based on implicit surfaces and discontinuous velocities*, *Comput. Vis. Sci.* 12 (2009), pp. 397–408.
- [28] W.G. Mazja, S.A. Nasarow, and B.A. Plamenevski, *Asymptotische Theorie elliptischer Randwertaufgaben in singular gestörten Gebieten*, Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, 1991.
- [29] S.A. Nazarov and J. Sokolowski, *Asymptotic analysis of shape functionals*, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* 82 (2003), pp. 125–196.
- [30] J.A. Norato, M.P. Bendsoe, R.B. Haber, and D.A. Tortorelli, *A topological derivative method for topology optimization*, *Struct. Multidiscip. Optim.* 33 (2007), pp. 375–386.
- [31] A.A. Novotny, R.A. Feijóo, E. Taroco, and C. Padra, *Topological sensitivity analysis*, *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Eng.* 192 (2003), 803–829.
- [32] P.I. Plotnikov and J. Sokolowski, *Shape derivative of drag functional*, *SIAM J. Control Optim.* 48 (2010), pp. 4680–4706.
- [33] E.M. Rudoy, *Differentiation of energy functionals in two-dimensional elasticity theory for solids with curvilinear cracks*, *J. Appl. Mech. Tech. Phys.* 45 (2004), pp. 843–852.
- [34] J. Sokolowski and A. Zochowski, *On the topological derivative in shape optimization*, *SIAM J. Control Optim.* 37 (1999), pp. 1251–1272.
- [35] J. Sokolowski and J.-P. Zolesio, *Introduction to Shape Optimization. Shape Sensitivity Analysis*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1992.