Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, **133A**, 307–331, *2003*

On Cahn–Hilliard systems with elasticity

Harald Garcke
NWF I–Mathematik, 93040 Regensburg, Germany
(harald.garcke@mathematik.uni-regensburg.de)

(MS received 3 January 2002; accepted 10 April 2002)

Elastic effects can have a pronounced effect on the phase-separation process in solids. The classical Ginzburg–Landau energy can be modified to account for such elastic interactions. The evolution of the system is then governed by diffusion equations for the concentrations of the alloy components and by a quasi-static equilibrium for the mechanical part. The resulting system of equations is elliptic-parabolic and can be understood as a generalization of the Cahn–Hilliard equation. In this paper we give a derivation of the system and prove an existence and uniqueness result for it.

1. Introduction

We study a mathematical model describing phase separation in multi-component alloys in the presence of elastic interactions. Our aim is to describe the following phenomena. At temperatures larger than a critical temperature θ_c, one homogeneous phase characterized by a certain mixture of the alloy components is energetically favourable. If the temperature is decreased below θ_c, two or more phases develop and the system rapidly decomposes into a microstructure consisting of many regions with different phases. Each phase is characterized by a distinct composition of the individual components and these are such that the bulk chemical energy becomes small. The formation of the microstructure is on a very fast time-scale and is called spinodal decomposition or phase separation. One observes the development of many connected regions of distinct phases, which we call particles.

Associated with the interfaces between phases is an interfacial energy. Since the phases are finely mixed, the interfacial energy is large after spinodal decomposition. In a second stage of the evolution, the microstructure coarsens and hence the interfacial energy decreases. In the case of negligible elastic effects, particles tend to become round, small particles shrink and larger ones grow. This part of the evolution called coarsening (or Ostwald ripening) is mainly driven by the reduction of the total amount of interfacial area.

If the components of the mixture have different elastic moduli or different lattice structure, elastic effects might influence the rate of coarsening and the morphology of the particles. Elastic effects can result, for example, from different lattice spacings of the alloy components. We refer to [21] for numerical simulations that demonstrate the effects that anisotropic elastic energy and different lattice spacings can have on the coarsening morphology. The elastic effects become more important at later stages of the evolution. This can be seen by comparing the energy of the elastic and surface energy (see [16]). Furthermore, numerical simulations indicate this (see [21]).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0308210500002419 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In applications of multi-component alloys, it is important to know the rate of coarsening. The famous theory of Lifshitz, Slyozov [30] and Wagner [41] (LSW theory) says that the average particle size in systems driven by diffusion without stress effects is proportional to $t^{1/3}$. If stress effects cannot be neglected, then an approach like that in the LSW theory does not seem to be possible and the late-stage evolution in phase-separating systems with elastic effects is not yet very well understood.

Material scientists hoped to find situations in which stress effects can slow down the rate of coarsening. Some experiments even suggested that inverse coarsening is possible, i.e. the average domain size decreases (see, for example, [15, 16, 24, 27, 31–34]). The understanding of the mechanisms responsible for these effects is very important for technological applications. A uniform distribution of regions of different phases is desirable in order to guarantee evenly distributed material properties of the sample. For example, mechanical properties such as the strength and the mechanical stability of the material depend on how finely mixed regions of different phases are. The control of ageing, and therefore of the lifetime of materials, depends on the ability to understand the coarsening process. This demonstrates the importance of a reliable mathematical model to describe phase separation in multi-component solids in the presence of elastic interactions.

In § 2 we introduce a model for phase transformations in solids taking elastic effects into account. The free energy of the system is a Ginzburg–Landau functional defined in terms of the concentrations of the individual components and the displacement of the lattice. Interfaces are described by a transition layer of finite, but small, thickness. Two terms in the Ginzburg–Landau free energy are classical. The first one is quadratic in the gradients of the concentrations and penalizes large gradients. The other represents the bulk chemical energy and, in the case of phase separation, its density is a non-convex function of the concentrations. In order to model effects due to stresses, we also include elastic terms in the Ginzburg–Landau free energy. Since, in the phenomena we are interested in, the strain is typically small, we present a geometrically linear theory formulated in terms of the linearized strain tensor.

The evolution of the system is governed by diffusion equations for the concentrations of the individual components and a quasi-static equilibrium for the mechanical part. The latter condition is reasonable since the mechanical equilibrium is obtained on a much faster time-scale than diffusion takes place. The overall system consists of a system of fourth-order parabolic diffusion equations coupled to an elliptic system describing mechanical equilibrium. In the two-component case with no elastic interactions, the elliptic-parabolic system reduces to the standard scalar Cahn–Hilliard equation.

In § 3 we prove an existence result for the elliptic-parabolic system. In order to obtain approximate solutions of the problem, we use the method of implicit time discretization and at each time-step solve a minimum problem taking into account the variational structure. A major difficulty of the analysis is the fact that the displacement gradient enters the diffusion equation quadratically. Hence it is necessary to show strong convergence of the displacement gradient in L^2. We also state a uniqueness result (§ 4) in the case of linear elasticity under the assumption of homogeneous elasticity, i.e. the elasticity tensor is independent of

the concentrations. In an appendix we collect some results used in this work and finally we list our notation.

Let us mention other papers on the Cahn–Hilliard equation related to this work (for an overview on the Cahn–Hilliard equation, see [10, 35]). Existence results for the scalar Cahn–Hilliard equation without elasticity have been given by Elliott and Zheng Songmu [12] for the case of a smooth free-energy density, by Elliott and Luckhaus [11] for the case of a logarithmic free-energy density and by Blowey and Elliott [4] for the case of a free-energy density of obstacle type. The results of Elliott and Luckhaus [11] also hold for systems. For more results on Cahn–Hilliard systems, we refer to [6, 14, 20].

We already referred to the work by material scientists on the Cahn–Hilliard equation taking elasticity into account. The first mathematical results on this problem are due to Carrive *et al.* [8] and Garcke [17]. Carrive *et al.* proved an existence result in the scalar case with homogeneous elasticity. This especially implies that the elasticity terms enter the diffusion equation only linearly. In this paper we instead deal with the more difficult case of heterogeneous elasticity, which, in particular, implies that the strain enters the diffusion equation in a nonlinear way. Several variations and extensions of the model have been studied recently (see, for example, [5, 18]). We refer to [5] for the study of a viscous Cahn–Hilliard equation with elasticity and to [18] for the analysis of a model with a logarithmic free-energy density.

Other descriptions of phase separation in alloys use models based on a sharp interface description of phase boundaries. In [29], the sharp interface limit of a Cahn–Hilliard equation with elasticity is identified with the help of formally matched asymptotic expansions. Garcke [19] identifies the Γ limit of the free energy in the sharp interface limit in the presence of elastic interactions.

There have been several numerical studies of the Cahn–Hilliard equation with elasticity. Most of them are based on Fourier transforms and spectral methods (see [9, 29] and the references therein). For numerical studies with a finite-element method and a numerical analysis of this approach, we refer to [21].

2. The Cahn–Hilliard model with elasticity

Assume the alloy consists of N components. We denote by c_k $(k = 1, \dots, N)$ the concentration of component k and therefore the vector $\boldsymbol{c} = (c_k)_{k=1,\dots,N}$ has to fulfil the constraint $\sum_{k=1}^{N} c_k = 1$, i.e. $\boldsymbol{c}$ lies in the affine hyperplane

$$\Sigma := \left\{ \boldsymbol{c}' = (c'_k)_{k=1,\dots N} \in \mathbb{R}^N \;\middle|\; \sum_{k=1}^{N} c'_k = 1 \right\}.$$

To describe elastic effects, we define the displacement field $\boldsymbol{u}(\boldsymbol{x})$, i.e. a material point $\boldsymbol{x}$ in the undeformed body will be at the point $\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{u}(\boldsymbol{x})$ after deformation. Since in phase-separation processes the displacement gradient usually is small, we consider an approximative theory based on the linearized strain tensor

$$\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u}) = \tfrac{1}{2}(\nabla \boldsymbol{u} + (\nabla \boldsymbol{u})^{\mathrm{T}}).$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0308210500002419 Published online by Cambridge University Press

A generalized Ginzburg–Landau free energy taking elastic effects into account is of the form

$$E(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{u}) = \int_\Omega \{\tfrac{1}{2}\nabla \boldsymbol{c} : \boldsymbol{\Gamma}\nabla \boldsymbol{c} + \Psi(\boldsymbol{c}) + W(\boldsymbol{c},\mathcal{E}) + W^*(\mathcal{E})\}, \tag{2.1}$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, is a bounded domain with Lipschitz boundary and ':' is the Euclidean inner product of two tensors. The first term in the energy is the gradient part penalizing rapid spatial variations in the concentrations. The tensor $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$ mapping $\mathbb{R}^{N\times n}$ into itself is assumed to be symmetric and positive-definite. The second summand Ψ is the homogeneous (or 'coarse-grain') free-energy density at zero stress taking into account the chemical energy of the system. The function Ψ depends on temperature and is convex above a critical temperature θ_c and non-convex for temperatures less than the critical temperature. In the latter case, Ψ has several local minimizers giving rise to the appearance of different phases. These first summands in the total free energy E are classical contributions to a Ginzburg–Landau free energy. Energies consisting of two terms of this form go back to van der Waals [40]. In the theory of phase separation in alloys, they have been introduced by Cahn and Hilliard [7].

The last two terms in the free energy take elastic effects into account. The term $W(\boldsymbol{c},\mathcal{E})$ is the elastic free-energy density and a typical form is

$$W(\boldsymbol{c},\mathcal{E}) = \tfrac{1}{2}(\mathcal{E} - \mathcal{E}^\star(\boldsymbol{c})) : \mathcal{C}(\boldsymbol{c})(\mathcal{E} - \mathcal{E}^\star(\boldsymbol{c})). \tag{2.2}$$

Here, $\mathcal{C}(\boldsymbol{c})$ is the concentration dependent elasticity tensor mapping symmetric tensors in $\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ into itself. We require $\mathcal{C}(\boldsymbol{c})$ to be symmetric and positive-definite. The quantity $\mathcal{E}^\star(\boldsymbol{c})$ is the symmetric stress free strain (or eigenstrain) at concentration $\boldsymbol{c}$. This is the value the strain tensor attains if the material were uniform with concentration $\boldsymbol{c}$ and unstressed. If the vector $\boldsymbol{c}$ is equal to one of the standard Cartesian basis vectors $\boldsymbol{e}_1,\dots,\boldsymbol{e}_N$, then the system is equal to a pure component. Hence $\mathcal{E}^\star(\boldsymbol{e}_k)$ is the value of the strain tensor if the material consists only of component k and is unstressed. The function $\mathcal{E}^\star$ is a suitable extension to all of Σ. Usually, a linear extension of the form

$$\mathcal{E}^\star(\boldsymbol{c}) = \sum_{k=1}^{N} c_k \mathcal{E}^\star(\boldsymbol{e}_k)$$

is assumed (Vegard's law). The elastic-energy density (2.2) is the standard choice that goes back to the early work of Eshelby [13] and Khachaturyan [25] (see also [16, 29]). However, we will obtain results for more general densities.

The remaining term $W^\star(\mathcal{E})$ represents energy effects due to externally applied forces. For simplicity, we assume that there are no body forces and that the boundary tractions are dead loads given by a constant and symmetric tensor $\mathcal{S}^*$, i.e. the tractions applied to $\partial\Omega$ are given by $\mathcal{S}^*\boldsymbol{n}$. The work needed to bring the undeformed body into the state with displacement $\boldsymbol{u} : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^3$ is then given by

$$-\int_{\partial\Omega} \boldsymbol{u}\cdot\mathcal{S}^*\boldsymbol{n} = -\int_\Omega \nabla\boldsymbol{u} : \mathcal{S}^* = -\int_\Omega \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u}) : \mathcal{S}^*,$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0308210500002419 Published online by Cambridge University Press

where $\boldsymbol{n}$ is the outer unit normal to Ω. Hence

$$W^*(\mathcal{E}') := -\mathcal{E}' : \mathcal{S}^*$$

is the energy density of the applied outer forces.

To describe evolution phenomena in the system, we consider mass diffusion for the individual components leading to diffusion equations for the concentrations. Mechanical equilibrium is attained on a much faster time-scale than diffusion takes place. Therefore, we will assume a quasi-static equilibrium for $\boldsymbol{u}$, i.e. for all times,

$$\nabla \cdot \mathcal{S} = 0,$$

where

$$\mathcal{S} = W_{,\mathcal{E}}(\boldsymbol{c}, \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u}))$$

is the stress tensor. We remark that the solution of the elastic system, in general, depends on time, since $\boldsymbol{c}$, in general, is time dependent. It is always assumed that W depends on its second argument only through its symmetric part, i.e. $W(\boldsymbol{c}', \mathcal{E}') = W(\boldsymbol{c}', (\mathcal{E}')^{\mathrm{T}})$. This implies that $\mathcal{S} = W_{,\mathcal{E}}(\boldsymbol{c}', \mathcal{E}')$ is symmetric.

The diffusion equations for the concentrations c_k $(k = 1, \dots, N)$ are based on mass balances for the individual components. To define the mass balance, we need to introduce chemical potentials μ_k, which are defined as the variational derivative of the total free energy E with respect to c_k, i.e.

$$\mu_k = -(\nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\Gamma} \nabla \boldsymbol{c})_k + \Psi_{,c_k}(\boldsymbol{c}) + W_{,c_k}(\boldsymbol{c}, \boldsymbol{u}).$$

Now Onsager's postulate [26, 36, 37] says that each thermodynamic flux is linearly related to every thermodynamic force. Since, in our case, the thermodynamic forces are the negative chemical potential gradients, we obtain the phenomenological equations (see [26, p. 137])

$$\boldsymbol{J}_k = -\sum_{l=1}^{N} L_{kl} \nabla \mu_l, \tag{2.3}$$

with a constant matrix $\boldsymbol{L} = (L_{kl})_{k=1,\dots,N;\, l=1,\dots,N} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$. The Onsager reciprocity law (see [26, p. 137] and [36, 37]) states that the matrix $\boldsymbol{L}$ has to be symmetric, which we assume in the following. Having defined the flux, the diffusion equations follow from the balance of mass as

$$\partial_t c_k = -\nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{J}_k. \tag{2.4}$$

To ensure that the diffusion equations (2.4) are consistent with the constraint $\sum_{k=1}^{N} c_k = 1$, the fluxes have to fulfil a linear dependency of the form

$$\sum_{k=1}^{N} \boldsymbol{J}_k = 0. \tag{2.5}$$

Since the identities (2.3) and (2.5) have to hold for all possible chemical potentials, we have to impose

$$\sum_{l=1}^{N} L_{kl} = 0. \tag{2.6}$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0308210500002419 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This property of the mobility matrix $\boldsymbol{L} = (L_{kl})_{k=1,\dots,N;\, l=1,\dots,N}$ we assume from now on. As a consequence, the diffusion equations (2.4) become

$$\partial_t c_k = \nabla \cdot \left(\sum_{l=1}^{N} L_{kl} \nabla \mu_l \right) = \sum_{l=1}^{N} L_{kl} \Delta \frac{1}{N} \sum_{m=1}^{N} (\mu_l - \mu_m).$$

Hence the diffusion equations can be expressed via the chemical potential differences $(\mu_l - \mu_k)$. In particular, the evolution can be described via the vector of generalized chemical potential differences

$$\boldsymbol{w} = \frac{1}{N} \left(\sum_{m=1}^{N} (\mu_l - \mu_m) \right)_{l=1,\dots,N} = \boldsymbol{P}\boldsymbol{\mu},$$

where $\boldsymbol{P}$ is the Euclidean projection of $\mathbb{R}^N$ onto

$$T\Sigma = \left\{ \boldsymbol{d}' = (d'_k)_{k=1,\dots N} \in \mathbb{R}^N \;\middle|\; \sum_{k=1}^{N} d'_k = 0 \right\},$$

which is the tangent space to Σ. A simple computation yields that $\boldsymbol{w}$ is the variational derivative of E when one takes the constraint $\sum_{k=1}^{N} c_k = 1$ into account. In fact, introducing $\boldsymbol{e} = (1, \dots, 1)$, we get $\boldsymbol{w} = \boldsymbol{\mu} - (1/N)(\boldsymbol{\mu} \cdot \boldsymbol{e})\boldsymbol{e}$, where the second term is the Lagrange multiplier associated to the constraint $\sum_{k=1}^{N} c_k = 1$.

Altogether, we obtain the system of equations

$$\partial_t \boldsymbol{c} = \boldsymbol{L} \Delta \boldsymbol{w}, \tag{2.7}$$

$$\boldsymbol{w} = \boldsymbol{P}(-\nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\Gamma} \nabla \boldsymbol{c} + \Psi_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}) + W_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}, \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u}))), \tag{2.8}$$

$$\nabla \cdot \mathcal{S} = 0, \tag{2.9}$$

$$\mathcal{S} = W_{,\mathcal{E}}(\boldsymbol{c}, \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u})). \tag{2.10}$$

If only two components are present, one can use the constraint $c_1 + c_2 = 1$ to reduce the system for the concentrations to a single equation. In this case, the equations (2.7)–(2.10) were first stated by Larché and Cahn [28] for $\gamma = 0$ and for non-zero γ by Onuki [38].

As boundary conditions, we impose no-flux conditions for the $\boldsymbol{J}_k$ and the natural boundary conditions that one obtains from variations of the energy functional with respect to $\boldsymbol{c}$ and $\boldsymbol{u}$. Therefore, with $\boldsymbol{n}$ being the outer unit normal to Ω, we require

$$\boldsymbol{L} \nabla \boldsymbol{w} \cdot \boldsymbol{n} = 0, \tag{2.11}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\Gamma} \nabla \boldsymbol{c} \cdot \boldsymbol{n} = 0, \tag{2.12}$$

$$\mathcal{S} \cdot \boldsymbol{n} = \mathcal{S}^* \cdot \boldsymbol{n}. \tag{2.13}$$

In addition, we impose initial conditions for $\boldsymbol{c}$, i.e.

$$\boldsymbol{c}(\boldsymbol{x}, 0) = \boldsymbol{c}^0(\boldsymbol{x}) \tag{2.14}$$

for a given function $\boldsymbol{c}^0$ with $\boldsymbol{c}^0(\boldsymbol{x}) \in \Sigma$ for all $\boldsymbol{x} \in \Omega$. Since we assume that the mechanical equilibrium is obtained instantaneously, no initial conditions for $\boldsymbol{u}$ are

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0308210500002419 Published online by Cambridge University Press

needed. We remark that the no-flux boundary condition implies that the total mass of the solution to (2.7)–(2.14) is a conserved quantity, i.e. for all times $t > 0$,

$$\int_\Omega \boldsymbol{c}(\boldsymbol{x},t)\,\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} = \int_\Omega \boldsymbol{c}^0(\boldsymbol{x})\,\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}.$$

Other boundary conditions are possible. For example, we could impose Dirichlet conditions for $\boldsymbol{u}$ on parts of the boundary $\partial\Omega$. This means to prescribe the deformation on parts of the boundary and hence a unique $\boldsymbol{u}$ could be determined. The boundary condition (2.13), on the other hand, prescribes $\boldsymbol{u}$ only up to infinitesimal rigid displacements (i.e. translations and infinitesimal rotations). This is typical for problems in elasticity that are based on a linearized strain tensor $\mathcal{E}$. The non-uniqueness in $\boldsymbol{u}$ will have no effect on the evolution of $\boldsymbol{c}$, since only $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u})$ enters the equation for $\boldsymbol{w}$.

The above system of equations is thermodynamically consistent if the second law of thermodynamics holds. For isothermal systems, the second law is equivalent to a dissipation inequality for the free energy. Using the equations (2.7)–(2.10) and the symmetry of $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{S}^*$, we compute formally

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_t\big(\tfrac{1}{2}\nabla\boldsymbol{c} : \boldsymbol{\Gamma}\nabla\boldsymbol{c} + \Psi(\boldsymbol{c}) + W(\boldsymbol{c},\mathcal{E}) + W^*(\mathcal{E})\big)\\
&\qquad = \boldsymbol{\Gamma}\nabla\boldsymbol{c} : \nabla\partial_t\boldsymbol{c} + \Psi_{,\boldsymbol{c}}\cdot\partial_t\boldsymbol{c} + W_{,\boldsymbol{c}}\cdot\partial_t\boldsymbol{c} + W_{,\mathcal{E}} : \partial_t\mathcal{E} - \mathcal{S}^* : \partial_t\mathcal{E}\\
&\qquad = \nabla\cdot\{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\nabla\boldsymbol{c}\cdot\partial_t\boldsymbol{c} + \mathcal{S}\partial_t\boldsymbol{u} - \mathcal{S}^*\partial_t\boldsymbol{u}\} + \{-\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\nabla\boldsymbol{c} + \Psi_{,\boldsymbol{c}} + W_{,\boldsymbol{c}}\}\cdot\partial_t\boldsymbol{c}\\
&\qquad = \nabla\cdot\{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\nabla\boldsymbol{c}\cdot\partial_t\boldsymbol{c} + \mathcal{S}\partial_t\boldsymbol{u} - \mathcal{S}^*\partial_t\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{J}\cdot\boldsymbol{\mu}\} - \nabla\boldsymbol{\mu} : \boldsymbol{L}\nabla\boldsymbol{\mu}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, assuming that $\boldsymbol{L}$ is positive-semidefinite, we obtain the local dissipation inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_t\big(\tfrac{1}{2}\nabla\boldsymbol{c} : \boldsymbol{\Gamma}\nabla\boldsymbol{c} + \Psi(\boldsymbol{c}) + W(\mathcal{E},\boldsymbol{c}) + W^*(\mathcal{E})\big)\\
&\qquad\qquad \leqslant \nabla\cdot\{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\nabla\boldsymbol{c}\cdot\partial_t\boldsymbol{c} + \mathcal{S}\partial_t\boldsymbol{u} - \mathcal{S}^*\partial_t\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{J}\cdot\boldsymbol{\mu}\}. \qquad (2.15)
\end{aligned}$$

This shows that the rate of change of energy cannot exceed the total power expended plus the energy inflow. In inequality (2.15), the term $\mathcal{S}\partial_t\boldsymbol{u} - \mathcal{S}^*\partial_t\boldsymbol{u}$ denotes the power expended by deformation stresses, $\boldsymbol{J}\cdot\boldsymbol{\mu}$ accounts for the energy inflow by diffusion and $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\nabla\boldsymbol{c}\cdot\partial_t\boldsymbol{c}$ can be interpreted to result from flow of energy due to moving phase interfaces (see [3,22,23]). Integrating the dissipation inequality (2.15) and using the boundary conditions shows that the free energy serves as a Lyapunov functional. In the following section, the Lyapunov property of the free energy will give the main *a priori* estimate in the existence theory.

3. Existence for the diffuse interface system

In this section we prove an existence result for the elliptic-parabolic system. We use the fact that the system aims to decrease the free energy. In the concentration variables, the system has a gradient flow structure with respect to a weighted $(H^1(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^N))^*$ scalar product and, for the mechanical part, the relaxation is infinitely fast and equilibrium is achieved instantaneously. Using this property of the system, we make an implicit time discretization, which leads to a variational problem in each time-step. To formulate the variational problem, we need to understand in which sense the system can be understood as the steepest descent of the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0308210500002419 Published online by Cambridge University Press

free energy. Therefore, we introduce a suitably weighted scalar product in the dual of H^1.

3.1. The gradient flow structure

Let

$$X_1 := \{\boldsymbol{c} \in H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N) \mid \boldsymbol{c} \in \Sigma \text{ almost everywhere}\}$$

be the space of all H^1-functions fulfilling the constraint for the concentrations. Since the system (2.7)–(2.13) preserves the mean value of the vector $\boldsymbol{c}$, it will also be useful to introduce the spaces

$$X_1^{\boldsymbol{m}} := \left\{ \boldsymbol{c} \in X_1 \;\middle|\; \fint_\Omega c_k = m_k \right\},$$

where $\boldsymbol{m} = (m_k)_{k=1,\dots,N}$ is a constant vector of mean values with

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} m_k = 1.$$

We define the tangent space

$$Y = \left\{ \boldsymbol{z} \in H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N) \;\middle|\; \int_\Omega \boldsymbol{z} = \boldsymbol{0},\ \sum_{k=1}^{N} z_k = 0 \right\}$$

of $X_1^{\boldsymbol{m}}$ and the space of linear functionals $\mathcal{D}$ on $H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$ that vanish on the L^2-complement of Y,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D} = \{ \boldsymbol{f} \in (H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N))^* \mid & \langle \boldsymbol{d}, \boldsymbol{f} \rangle_{H^1,(H^1)^*} = 0 \text{ for all } \boldsymbol{d} = d(\boldsymbol{x})(1, \dots, 1), \\ & \text{where } d \text{ is a scalar valued function with} \\ & d \in H^1(\Omega) \text{ and for all } \boldsymbol{d} \equiv \boldsymbol{e}_k,\ k = 1, \dots, N \}. \end{aligned}$$

With $\langle \boldsymbol{d}, \boldsymbol{f} \rangle$ we denote the pairing of an element $\boldsymbol{d}$ of a Banach space and an element $\boldsymbol{f}$ lying in the dual of the Banach space. Then we introduce the mapping $\mathcal{L}$ associated to the differential operator $\boldsymbol{z} \mapsto -\boldsymbol{L}\Delta\boldsymbol{z}$ as a mapping from Y to $\mathcal{D}$ via

$$\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{z})(\boldsymbol{\zeta}) = \int_\Omega \boldsymbol{L}\nabla\boldsymbol{z} : \nabla\boldsymbol{\zeta}.$$

The fact that $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{z}) \in \mathcal{D}$ follows from (2.6) and the definition of Y. Later we need the inverse of the mapping $\mathcal{L}$, which we denote by $\mathcal{G}$. The invertibility of $\mathcal{L}$ follows from the Poincaré inequality and the Lax–Milgram theorem, provided that $\boldsymbol{L}$ is positive-definite on $T\Sigma$. It holds that

$$(\boldsymbol{L}\nabla\mathcal{G}\boldsymbol{f}, \nabla\boldsymbol{\zeta})_{L^2} = \langle \boldsymbol{\zeta}, \boldsymbol{f} \rangle$$

for all $\boldsymbol{\zeta} \in H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$ and $\boldsymbol{f} \in \mathcal{D}$.

For all $\boldsymbol{f}_1, \boldsymbol{f}_2 \in \mathcal{D}$, we define the scalar product

$$(\boldsymbol{f}_1, \boldsymbol{f}_2)_{\boldsymbol{L}} := (\boldsymbol{L}\nabla\mathcal{G}\boldsymbol{f}_1, \nabla\mathcal{G}\boldsymbol{f}_2)_{L^2}$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0308210500002419 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and the corresponding norm

$$\|\boldsymbol{f}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}} = \sqrt{(\boldsymbol{f},\boldsymbol{f})_{\boldsymbol{L}}} \quad \text{for all} \quad \boldsymbol{f} \in \mathcal{D}.$$

Since all functions $\bar{\boldsymbol{f}} \in Y$ can be interpreted as elements in $\mathcal{D}$ via the mapping $\boldsymbol{\zeta} \mapsto \int_\Omega \bar{\boldsymbol{f}} \cdot \boldsymbol{\zeta}$ for $\boldsymbol{\zeta} \in H^1(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^N)$, the scalar product $(\cdot,\cdot)_{\boldsymbol{L}}$ and the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\boldsymbol{L}}$ are also defined for functions in Y. Using Young's inequality, we obtain that, for all $\delta > 0$ and all $\boldsymbol{d} \in Y$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\boldsymbol{d}\|_{L^2}^2 &= (\boldsymbol{L}\nabla\mathcal{G}\boldsymbol{d}, \nabla\boldsymbol{d})_{L^2} \\ &\leqslant \|\boldsymbol{L}^{1/2}\nabla\mathcal{G}\boldsymbol{d}\|_{L^2}\|\boldsymbol{L}^{1/2}\nabla\boldsymbol{d}\|_{L^2} \\ &\leqslant \frac{C_{\boldsymbol{L}}}{\delta}\|\boldsymbol{d}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}}^2 + \delta\|\nabla\boldsymbol{d}\|_{L^2}^2, \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

where $C_{\boldsymbol{L}}$ is a constant depending on $\boldsymbol{L}$.

Introducing the Lagrange multiplier $\boldsymbol{\lambda}(t) = (\fint_\Omega \boldsymbol{w})(t)$, we can rewrite (2.7) as

$$\mathcal{G}\partial_t\boldsymbol{c} = \boldsymbol{\lambda} - \boldsymbol{w}.$$

Then (2.7), (2.8) lead to

$$\begin{aligned}(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\nabla\boldsymbol{c},\nabla\boldsymbol{\zeta})_{L^2} + (\Psi_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}),\boldsymbol{\zeta})_{L^2} + (W_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c},\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u})),\boldsymbol{\zeta})_{L^2} &= (\boldsymbol{w},\boldsymbol{\zeta})_{L^2} \\ &= -(\mathcal{G}\partial_t\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{\zeta})_{L^2} \\ &= -(\boldsymbol{L}\nabla\mathcal{G}\partial_t\boldsymbol{c},\nabla\mathcal{G}\boldsymbol{\zeta})_{L^2} \\ &= -(\partial_t\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{\zeta})_{\boldsymbol{L}},\end{aligned}$$

which holds for all $\boldsymbol{\zeta} \in Y$. The left-hand side in the above computation is the differential $D_{\boldsymbol{c}}E(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{u})$ in the direction $\boldsymbol{\zeta}$. Consequently,

$$\langle\boldsymbol{\zeta}, D_{\boldsymbol{c}}E(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{u})\rangle = -(\boldsymbol{\zeta},\partial_t\boldsymbol{c})_{\boldsymbol{L}} \quad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{\zeta} \in Y, \tag{3.2}$$

which means that (2.7), (2.8) can be interpreted as the steepest descent of E in $X_1^{\boldsymbol{m}}$ with respect to the $(\cdot,\cdot)_{\boldsymbol{L}}$ scalar product and the variable $\boldsymbol{c}$. The fact that the evolution for $\boldsymbol{c}$ has this gradient flow structure will be used in the implicit time discretization.

Since we consider boundary conditions of the second type, it will turn out that, for fixed concentrations $\boldsymbol{c}$, the displacement $\boldsymbol{u}$ is only determined up to translations and infinitesimal rotations, i.e. up to infinitesimal rigid displacements. We note that the strain $\mathcal{E}$ is uniquely determined and hence in the evolution equation for $\boldsymbol{c}$ the non-uniqueness of $\boldsymbol{u}$ will not play any role. This discussion motivates the introduction of the space

$$X_2 := \{\boldsymbol{u} \in H^1(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^n) \mid (\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{v})_{H^1} = 0 \text{ for all } \boldsymbol{v} \in X_{\mathrm{ird}}\} = X_{\mathrm{ird}}^{\perp},$$

where

$$X_{\mathrm{ird}} := \{\boldsymbol{u} \in H^1(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^n) \mid \text{there exist } \boldsymbol{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n \text{ and a skew symmetric } \boldsymbol{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n} \text{ such that } \boldsymbol{u}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \boldsymbol{b} + \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x}\}$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0308210500002419 Published online by Cambridge University Press

is the space of all infinitesimal rigid displacements. In X_2, we fix the freedom of $\boldsymbol{u}$ with respect to infinitesimal rigid displacements. With this notation, a weak formulation of (2.9) and (2.10) can be written as

$$\langle \boldsymbol{\eta}, D_{\boldsymbol{u}} E(\boldsymbol{c}, \boldsymbol{u}) \rangle = 0 \quad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{\eta} \in X_2, \tag{3.3}$$

where $D_{\boldsymbol{u}} E$ is the derivative of E with respect to $\boldsymbol{u}$ in the space X_2. Since $W_{,\mathcal{E}}(\boldsymbol{c}, \mathcal{E})$ is symmetric if $\mathcal{E}$ is symmetric, we can also allow for arbitrary $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$ in (3.3).

We remark that the above discussion was of formal nature but can be justified rigorously under suitable conditions on Ψ, W, $\boldsymbol{c}$ and $\boldsymbol{u}$.

3.2. Assumptions

We state the following assumptions.

(A1) $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a bounded domain with Lipschitz boundary.

(A2) The gradient energy tensor $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$ is a constant symmetric positive-definite linear mapping of $\mathbb{R}^{N\times n}$ into itself, i.e. in particular, there exists a constant $\gamma_0 > 0$ such that

$$\boldsymbol{A}' : \boldsymbol{\Gamma} \boldsymbol{A}' \geqslant \gamma_0 |\boldsymbol{A}'|^2$$

for all $\boldsymbol{A}' \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times n}$.

(A3) The homogeneous free-energy density Ψ can be written as

$$\Psi(\boldsymbol{c}') = \Psi^1(\boldsymbol{c}') + \Psi^2(\boldsymbol{c}') \quad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{c}' \in \mathbb{R}^N,$$

with $\Psi^1, \Psi^2 \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R})$ and Ψ^1 convex. In addition, we assume

(A3.1) $\Psi^1 \geqslant 0$;

(A3.2) for all $\delta > 0$, there exists a $C_\delta > 0$ such that

$$|\Psi^1_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}')| \leqslant \delta \Psi^1(\boldsymbol{c}') + C_\delta \quad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{c}' \in \Sigma;$$

(A3.3) there exists a constant $C_1 > 0$ such that

$$|\Psi^2_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}')| \leqslant C_1(|\boldsymbol{c}'| + 1) \quad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{c}' \in \Sigma.$$

(A4) For the elastic-energy density $W \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}, \mathbb{R})$, we assume

(A4.1) $W(\boldsymbol{c}', \mathcal{E}')$ only depends on the symmetric part of $\mathcal{E}' \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$, i.e.

$$W(\boldsymbol{c}', \mathcal{E}') = W(\boldsymbol{c}', (\mathcal{E}')^{\mathrm{T}}) \quad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{c}' \in \mathbb{R}^N \text{ and } \mathcal{E}' \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n};$$

(A4.2) $W_{,\mathcal{E}}(\boldsymbol{c}', \cdot)$ is strongly monotone uniformly in $\boldsymbol{c}'$, i.e. there exists a $c_1 > 0$ such that, for all symmetric $\mathcal{E}'_1, \mathcal{E}'_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$,

$$(W_{,\mathcal{E}}(\boldsymbol{c}', \mathcal{E}'_2) - W_{,\mathcal{E}}(\boldsymbol{c}', \mathcal{E}'_1)) : (\mathcal{E}'_2 - \mathcal{E}'_1) \geqslant c_1 |\mathcal{E}'_2 - \mathcal{E}'_1|^2;$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0308210500002419 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(A4.3) there exists a constant $C_2 > 0$ such that, for all $\boldsymbol{c}' \in \Sigma$ and all symmetric $\mathcal{E}' \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |W(\boldsymbol{c}', \mathcal{E}')| &\leqslant C_2(|\mathcal{E}'|^2 + |\boldsymbol{c}'|^2 + 1), \\ |W_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}', \mathcal{E}')| &\leqslant C_2(|\mathcal{E}'|^2 + |\boldsymbol{c}'|^2 + 1), \\ |W_{,\mathcal{E}}(\boldsymbol{c}', \mathcal{E}')| &\leqslant C_2(|\mathcal{E}'| + |\boldsymbol{c}'| + 1). \end{aligned}$$

(A5) The energy density of the applied forces is assumed to be of the form $W^*(\mathcal{E}') = -\mathcal{E}' : \mathcal{S}^*$ with a constant symmetric tensor $\mathcal{S}^*$.

(A6) The mobility matrix $\boldsymbol{L} = (L_{kl})_{k=1,\dots,N;l=1,\dots,N}$ is assumed to be

(A6.1) symmetric;

(A6.2) to fulfil $\sum_{l=1}^{N} L_{kl} = 0$;

(A6.3) to be positive-definite on $T\Sigma$.

(A7) The initial data $\boldsymbol{c}^0 \in X_1$ are assumed to fulfil $\int_\Omega \Psi(\boldsymbol{c}^0) < \infty$.

Let us comment on the stated assumptions. The assumptions on $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$ and $\boldsymbol{L}$ guarantee that the system (2.7), (2.8) defines a semilinear parabolic system of fourth order in the variable $\boldsymbol{c}$. Assumption (A3) uses a splitting of the homogeneous free-energy density Ψ. A convex part Ψ^1 is allowed to have large growth for $\boldsymbol{c}'$ large. We only assume that the derivative $\Psi^1_{,\boldsymbol{c}}$ can be controlled by Ψ^1 itself. Any polynomial growth for Ψ^1 is allowed. Note that, for example, an exponential growth in Ψ is not allowed, and we remark that a growth larger than a polynomial growth could be treated with a method analogous to the one presented in [18]. The non-convex part Ψ^2 is allowed to grow such that $\Psi^2_{,\boldsymbol{c}}$ is sublinear. Assumption (A4.1) guarantees that $W_{,\mathcal{E}}(\boldsymbol{c}, \mathcal{E}')$ is symmetric for all symmetric $\mathcal{E}' \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$. The monotonicity (A4.2) ensures that the elastic part of the equation defines a quasilinear elliptic system in $\mathcal{E}$. Since

$$W(\boldsymbol{c}', \mathcal{E}') = W(\boldsymbol{c}', \boldsymbol{0}) + \int_0^1 W_{,\mathcal{E}}(\boldsymbol{c}', t\mathcal{E}') : \mathcal{E}' \,\mathrm{d}t,$$

we can use assumptions (A4.2) and (A4.3) to conclude that there exist positive constants c_3 and C_3 such that

$$W(\boldsymbol{c}', \mathcal{E}') \geqslant c_3|\mathcal{E}'|^2 - C_3(|\boldsymbol{c}'|^2 + 1)$$

for all $\boldsymbol{c}' \in \Sigma$ and all symmetric $\mathcal{E}' \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$.

In the existence proof, we will formulate a variational problem whose Euler–Lagrange equations are an implicit time discretization of the elliptic-parabolic system. The growth conditions on Ψ and W ensure existence of a solution to the variational problem and enables us to compute the corresponding Euler–Lagrange equations. We also note that it would be enough to state assumptions on $\boldsymbol{P}\Psi^1_{,\boldsymbol{c}}$, $\boldsymbol{P}\Psi^2_{,\boldsymbol{c}}$ and $\boldsymbol{P}W_{,\boldsymbol{c}}$ rather than $\Psi^1_{,\boldsymbol{c}}$, $\Psi^2_{,\boldsymbol{c}}$ and $W_{,\boldsymbol{c}}$. The evolution law is stated solely on Σ and hence Ψ and W can be chosen arbitrary in the direction orthogonal to Σ.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0308210500002419 Published online by Cambridge University Press

3.3. Weak solutions

The goal of § 3 is to show existence of a weak solution to the problem (2.7)–(2.14). We will use the following solution concept. Let $T > 0$ be an arbitrary but fixed time and $\Omega_T := \Omega \times (0, T)$.

Definition 3.1 (weak solution). A triple

$$(\boldsymbol{c}, \boldsymbol{w}, \boldsymbol{u}) \in L^2(0,T; H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N)) \times L^2(0,T; H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N)) \times L^2(0,T; X_2)$$

with $\boldsymbol{P}\Psi_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}) \in L^1(\Omega_T)$ is called a weak solution of (2.7)–(2.14) if and only if

(i)
$$-\int_{\Omega_T} \partial_t \boldsymbol{\xi} \cdot (\boldsymbol{c} - \boldsymbol{c}^0) + \int_{\Omega_T} \boldsymbol{L} \nabla \boldsymbol{w} : \nabla \boldsymbol{\xi} = 0 \tag{3.4}$$
for all $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in L^2(0,T; H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N))$ with $\partial_t \boldsymbol{\xi} \in L^2(\Omega_T)$ and $\boldsymbol{\xi}(T) = 0$;

(ii)
$$\int_{\Omega_T} \boldsymbol{w} \cdot \boldsymbol{\zeta} = \int_{\Omega_T} \{\boldsymbol{\Gamma} \nabla \boldsymbol{c} : \nabla \boldsymbol{P}\boldsymbol{\zeta} + \boldsymbol{P}\Psi_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\zeta} + \boldsymbol{P} W_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}, \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u})) \cdot \boldsymbol{\zeta}\} \tag{3.5}$$
for all $\boldsymbol{\zeta} \in L^2(0,T; H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N)) \cap L^\infty(\Omega_T, \mathbb{R}^N)$; and

(iii)
$$\int_{\Omega_T} W_{,\mathcal{E}}(\boldsymbol{c}, \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u})) : \nabla \boldsymbol{\eta} = \int_{\Omega_T} \mathcal{S}^* : \nabla \boldsymbol{\eta} \tag{3.6}$$
for all $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in L^2(0,T; H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n))$.

Now let us state the existence theorem that will be proved in the following subsections.

Theorem 3.2. *Assume (A1)–(A7) hold. Then there exists a weak solution in the sense of definition 3.1 that has the following properties:*

(i) $\boldsymbol{c} \in C^{0,1/4}([0,T]; L^2(\Omega))$;

(ii) $\partial_t \boldsymbol{c} \in L^2(0,T; (H^1(\Omega))^*)$;

(iii) $\boldsymbol{u} \in L^\infty(0,T; H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n))$.

Remark 3.3. Using arguments of Garcke [18], it is possible to show higher integrability of $\nabla \boldsymbol{u}$, i.e. there exists a $p > 2$ such that $\nabla \boldsymbol{u} \in L^\infty(0,T; L^p(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n))$. In two space dimensions, this and the Sobolev embedding then implies that $\boldsymbol{u} \in L^\infty(0,T; C^{0,\alpha}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^2))$ for some $\alpha > 0$.

3.4. The implicit time discretization

For $T > 0$ and $M \in \mathbb{Z}$, we define $\Delta t = T/M$. Then an implicit time discretization of the system (2.7)–(2.10) is given by

$$\frac{\boldsymbol{c}^m - \boldsymbol{c}^{m-1}}{\Delta t} = \boldsymbol{L} \Delta \boldsymbol{w}^m, \tag{3.7}$$
$$\boldsymbol{w}^m = \boldsymbol{P}(-\nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\Gamma} \nabla \boldsymbol{c}^m + \Psi_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}^m) + W_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}^m, \mathcal{E}^m)), \tag{3.8}$$
$$\nabla \cdot \mathcal{S}^m = 0, \tag{3.9}$$
$$\mathcal{S}^m = W_{,\mathcal{E}}(\boldsymbol{c}^m, \mathcal{E}^m), \tag{3.10}$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0308210500002419 Published online by Cambridge University Press

for $(\boldsymbol{c}^m, \boldsymbol{w}^m, \boldsymbol{u}^m)$. By an upper index $m \in \{0, \dots, M\}$ we denote the time discrete solution at time $m\Delta t$ and $\mathcal{E}^m$ is an abbreviation for $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u}^m)$.

Assuming that $\boldsymbol{c}^0 \in X_1$ is given, we want to determine $(\boldsymbol{c}^m, \boldsymbol{w}^m, \boldsymbol{u}^m)$ and hence $\mathcal{S}^m$ inductively by solving (3.7)–(3.10) together with the boundary conditions (2.11)–(2.13) for $(\boldsymbol{c}^m, \boldsymbol{w}^m, \boldsymbol{u}^m)$.

Analogously to the discussion leading to (3.2), one can derive

$$\langle \boldsymbol{\zeta}, D_{\boldsymbol{c}} E(\boldsymbol{c}^m, \boldsymbol{u}^m) \rangle = -\left(\boldsymbol{\zeta}, \frac{\boldsymbol{c}^m - \boldsymbol{c}^{m-1}}{\Delta t} \right)_{\boldsymbol{L}} \quad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{\zeta} \in Y. \tag{3.11}$$

Also, we have

$$\langle \boldsymbol{\eta}, D_{\boldsymbol{u}} E(\boldsymbol{c}^m, \boldsymbol{u}^m) \rangle = 0 \quad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{\eta} \in X_2 \tag{3.12}$$

and we observe that (3.11) and (3.12) are the Euler–Lagrange equations of the functional

$$E^{m,\Delta t}(\boldsymbol{d}, \boldsymbol{v}) := E(\boldsymbol{d}, \boldsymbol{v}) + \frac{1}{2\Delta t} \|\boldsymbol{d} - \boldsymbol{c}^{m-1}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}}^2. \tag{3.13}$$

Our goal now is to show the existence of an absolute minimizer of $E^{m,\Delta t}$ in the class $X_1^{\boldsymbol{m}} \times X_2$, where $\boldsymbol{m} := \fint_\Omega \boldsymbol{c}^0$.

LEMMA 3.4. *Assume (A1)–(A6) hold and suppose* $\boldsymbol{c}^{m-1} \in X_1^{\boldsymbol{m}}$.

Then there exists a minimizer of $E^{m,\Delta t}$ *in* $X_1^{\boldsymbol{m}} \times X_2$, *provided that*

$$\Delta t \in \left(0, \frac{\gamma_0}{8(C_1 + C_3)^2 C_{\boldsymbol{L}}}\right).$$

Proof. The existence of a minimizer can be shown by the direct method. We outline the main steps. Using the assumptions (A2)–(A6), we deduce that there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that, for all $(\boldsymbol{d}, \boldsymbol{v}) \in X_1^{\boldsymbol{m}} \times X_2$,

$$E^{m,\Delta t}(\boldsymbol{d}, \boldsymbol{v}) \geqslant \tfrac{1}{2}\gamma_0 \|\nabla \boldsymbol{d}\|_{L^2}^2 + \tfrac{1}{2} c_3 \|\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{v})\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2\Delta t} \|\boldsymbol{d} - \boldsymbol{c}^{m-1}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}}^2 - (C_3 + C_1)\|\boldsymbol{d}\|_{L^2}^2 - C.$$

We remark that in this paper C denotes any positive constant depending on known quantities. The value of C may change from line to line in a given computation. Since $\boldsymbol{d} - \boldsymbol{c}^{m-1} \in Y$, we can use (3.1) and the fact that $\boldsymbol{c}^{m-1}$ is bounded in $H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$ to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} E^{m,\Delta t}(\boldsymbol{d}, \boldsymbol{v}) \geqslant (\tfrac{1}{2}\gamma_0 - (C_1 + C_3)\delta)\|\nabla \boldsymbol{d}\|_{L^2}^2 + \tfrac{1}{2} c_2 \|\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{v})\|_{L^2}^2 \\ + \left(\frac{1}{2\Delta t} - \frac{(C_1 + C_3) C_{\boldsymbol{L}}}{\delta} \right) \|\boldsymbol{d} - \boldsymbol{c}^{m-1}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}}^2 - C, \end{aligned}$$

where C depends on $\boldsymbol{c}^{m-1}$. Since we assumed $\Delta t < \gamma_0/(8(C_1 + C_3)^2 C_{\boldsymbol{L}})$, we can choose $\delta = \gamma_0/(4(C_1 + C_3))$ and obtain, with the help of inequalities of Korn (theorem A.2) and Poincaré, that $E^{m,\Delta t}$ is coercive on the space $X_1^{\boldsymbol{m}} \times X_2$.

The space $X_1^{\boldsymbol{m}} \times X_2$ is non-empty and hence we can choose a minimizing sequence $(\boldsymbol{d}_\kappa, \boldsymbol{v}_\kappa)_{\kappa \in \mathbb{Z}}$ with

$$\infty > E^{m,\Delta t}(\boldsymbol{d}_\kappa, \boldsymbol{v}_\kappa) \to \inf_{(\boldsymbol{d}, \boldsymbol{v}) \in X_1^{\boldsymbol{m}} \times X_2} E^{m,\Delta t}(\boldsymbol{d}, \boldsymbol{v}).$$

The coercivity of $E^{m,\Delta t}$ implies that $\{(\boldsymbol{d}_\kappa, \boldsymbol{v}_\kappa)\}_{\kappa \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is uniformly bounded in $X_1^{\boldsymbol{m}} \times X_2$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $\{(\boldsymbol{d}_\kappa, \boldsymbol{v}_\kappa)\}_{\kappa \in \mathbb{Z}}$ converges

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0308210500002419 Published online by Cambridge University Press

weakly in $X_1^{\boldsymbol{m}} \times X_2$ to a limit $(\boldsymbol{d}, \boldsymbol{v})$ (otherwise, we replace the original sequence by a converging subsequence). Furthermore, we can assume that $\boldsymbol{d}_\kappa$ converges strongly in $L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$ and almost everywhere in Ω.

All terms in the energy besides $\int_\Omega \Psi^2(\boldsymbol{d})$ and $\int_\Omega W(\boldsymbol{d}, \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u}))$ are convex and therefore sequentially weakly lower semi-continuous on $X_1^{\boldsymbol{m}} \times X_2$. Let us now discuss the remaining two terms. Condition (A3.3) implies that $\Psi^2(\boldsymbol{c}')$ has at most a quadratic growth for large $\boldsymbol{c}' \in \Sigma$ and hence the generalized dominated convergence theorem (see, for example, [1, 43]) of Lebesgue yields

$$\int_\Omega \Psi^2(\boldsymbol{d}_\kappa) \to \int_\Omega \Psi^2(\boldsymbol{d}).$$

It remains to show that

$$\int_\Omega W(\boldsymbol{d}, \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{v})) \leqslant \liminf_{\kappa \to \infty} \int_\Omega W(\boldsymbol{d}_\kappa, \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{v}_\kappa)). \tag{3.14}$$

Using the convexity of $W(\boldsymbol{c}', \cdot)$ (which follows from (A4.2)), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_\Omega \{W(\boldsymbol{d}_\kappa, \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{v}_\kappa)) - W(\boldsymbol{d}, \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{v}))\} \\
&\qquad = \int_\Omega \{W(\boldsymbol{d}_\kappa, \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{v}_\kappa)) - W(\boldsymbol{d}_\kappa, \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{v}))\} + \int_\Omega \{W(\boldsymbol{d}_\kappa, \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{v})) - W(\boldsymbol{d}, \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{v}))\} \\
&\qquad \geqslant \int_\Omega \{W_{,\mathcal{E}}(\boldsymbol{d}_\kappa, \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{v})) : (\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{v}_\kappa) - \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{v}))\} + \int_\Omega \{W(\boldsymbol{d}_\kappa, \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{v})) - W(\boldsymbol{d}, \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{v}))\}.
\end{aligned}$$

The weak convergence of $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{v}_\kappa)$ in L^2, the strong convergence of $\boldsymbol{d}_\kappa$ in L^2, the convergence almost everywhere of $\boldsymbol{d}_\kappa$ and the growth conditions in (A4.3) then give (3.14). This yields

$$E^{m,\Delta t}(\boldsymbol{d}, \boldsymbol{v}) \leqslant \liminf_{\kappa \to \infty} E^{m,\Delta t}(\boldsymbol{d}_\kappa, \boldsymbol{v}_\kappa)$$

and implies that $(\boldsymbol{d}, \boldsymbol{v})$ minimizes $E^{m,\Delta t}$ in $X_1^{\boldsymbol{m}} \times X_2$. □

From now on, we assume that Δt is small enough for a minimum to exist. We choose the value at the new time-step $(\boldsymbol{c}^m, \boldsymbol{u}^m)$ as a minimizer of $E^{m,\Delta t}$. In the following lemma, we compute the Euler–Lagrange equation associated with $E^{m,\Delta t}$, which holds for $(\boldsymbol{c}^m, \boldsymbol{u}^m)$.

Lemma 3.5 (Euler–Lagrange equations). *The minimizer* $(\boldsymbol{c}^m, \boldsymbol{u}^m)$ *fulfils*

(i)
$$\int_\Omega \left(\frac{\boldsymbol{c}^m - \boldsymbol{c}^{m-1}}{\Delta t} \right) \cdot \boldsymbol{\xi} + \int_\Omega \boldsymbol{L} \nabla \boldsymbol{w}^m : \nabla \boldsymbol{\xi} = 0 \tag{3.15}$$
for all $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$.

(ii)
$$\int_\Omega \boldsymbol{w}^m \cdot \boldsymbol{\zeta} = \int_\Omega \{\boldsymbol{\Gamma} \nabla \boldsymbol{u}^m : \nabla \boldsymbol{P}\boldsymbol{\zeta} + \boldsymbol{P}\Psi_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}^m) \cdot \boldsymbol{\zeta} + \boldsymbol{P}W_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}^m, \boldsymbol{u}^m) \cdot \boldsymbol{\zeta}\} \tag{3.16}$$
for all $\boldsymbol{\zeta} \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N) \cap H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0308210500002419 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(iii)
$$\int_\Omega W_{,\mathcal{E}}(\boldsymbol{c}^m, \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u}^m)) : \nabla \boldsymbol{\eta} = \int_\Omega \mathcal{S}^* : \nabla \boldsymbol{\eta} \tag{3.17}$$

for all $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$.

Here,

$$\boldsymbol{w}^m = \mathcal{G}\left(\frac{\boldsymbol{c}^m - \boldsymbol{c}^{m-1}}{\Delta t}\right) + \boldsymbol{\lambda}^m \in H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N),$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}^m = \fint_\Omega \{\boldsymbol{P}\Psi_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}^m) + \boldsymbol{P}W_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}^m, \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u}^m))\}$$

is a constant Lagrange multiplier. Furthermore, it holds that $\boldsymbol{P}\boldsymbol{w}^m = \boldsymbol{w}^m$.

Proof. We choose $\boldsymbol{\zeta} \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N) \cap Y$, $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in X_2$ and want to determine

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{E^{m,\Delta t}(\boldsymbol{c}^m + \varepsilon\boldsymbol{\zeta}, \boldsymbol{u}^m + \varepsilon\boldsymbol{\eta}) - E^{m,\Delta t}(\boldsymbol{c}^m, \boldsymbol{u}^m)}{\varepsilon}. \tag{3.18}$$

Since Ψ^1 is convex, it holds that

$$\Psi^1(\boldsymbol{c}^m) \geqslant \Psi^1(\boldsymbol{c}^m + \varepsilon\boldsymbol{\zeta}) - \varepsilon\Psi^1_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}^m + \varepsilon\boldsymbol{\zeta}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\zeta},$$

which implies, by assumption (A3.2), that

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi^1(\boldsymbol{c}^m + \varepsilon\boldsymbol{\zeta}) &\leqslant \Psi^1(\boldsymbol{c}^m) + |\varepsilon\boldsymbol{P}\Psi^1_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}^m + \varepsilon\boldsymbol{\zeta})|\|\boldsymbol{\zeta}\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\leqslant \Psi^1(\boldsymbol{c}^m) + |\varepsilon|\Psi^1(\boldsymbol{c}^m + \varepsilon\boldsymbol{\zeta})\|\boldsymbol{\zeta}\|_{L^\infty} + C|\varepsilon|.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, for ε small, we obtain

$$(\Psi^1(\boldsymbol{c}^m + \varepsilon\boldsymbol{\zeta}) + |\boldsymbol{P}\Psi^1_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}^m + \varepsilon\boldsymbol{\zeta})|) \leqslant C(\Psi^1(\boldsymbol{c}^m) + 1)$$

and therefore

$$\left|\frac{\Psi^1(\boldsymbol{c}^m + \varepsilon\boldsymbol{\zeta}) - \Psi^1(\boldsymbol{c}^m)}{\varepsilon}\right| \leqslant C(\Psi^1(\boldsymbol{c}^m) + 1).$$

The dominated convergence theorem of Lebesgue and assumption (A3.3) yield

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\left(\int_\Omega \Psi(\boldsymbol{c}^m + \varepsilon\boldsymbol{\zeta}) - \Psi(\boldsymbol{c}^m)\right) = \int_\Omega \Psi_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}^m) \cdot \boldsymbol{\zeta}.$$

Using the growth condition (A4.3), we compute

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \int_\Omega \frac{1}{\varepsilon}(W(\boldsymbol{c}^m + \varepsilon\boldsymbol{\zeta}, \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u}^m + \varepsilon\boldsymbol{\eta})) - W(\boldsymbol{c}^m, \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u}^m))) \\ = \int_\Omega (W_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}^m, \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u}^m))\boldsymbol{\zeta} + W_{,\mathcal{E}}(\boldsymbol{c}^m, \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u}^m)) : \nabla\boldsymbol{\eta}).\end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

Since the term $(1/2\Delta t)\|\boldsymbol{d} - \boldsymbol{c}^{m-1}\|^2_{\boldsymbol{L}}$ is quadratic, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\frac{1}{2\Delta t}(\|(\boldsymbol{c}^m + \varepsilon\boldsymbol{\zeta}) - \boldsymbol{c}^{m-1}\|^2_{\boldsymbol{L}} - \|\boldsymbol{c}^m - \boldsymbol{c}^{m-1}\|^2_{\boldsymbol{L}}) &= \left(\frac{\boldsymbol{c}^m - \boldsymbol{c}^{m-1}}{\Delta t}, \boldsymbol{\zeta}\right)_{\boldsymbol{L}} \\ &= \left(\mathcal{G}\left(\frac{\boldsymbol{c}^m - \boldsymbol{c}^{m-1}}{\Delta t}\right), \boldsymbol{\zeta}\right)_{L^2}.\end{aligned}$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0308210500002419 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Since

$$\boldsymbol{w}^m = \mathcal{G}\left(\frac{\boldsymbol{c}^m - \boldsymbol{c}^{m-1}}{\Delta t}\right) + \boldsymbol{\lambda}^m$$

and

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}^m = \fint_\Omega (\boldsymbol{P}\Psi_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}^m) + \boldsymbol{P}W_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}^m, \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u}^m))),$$

we obtain (3.15), taking into account that $\boldsymbol{w}^m$ and $\boldsymbol{c}^m - \boldsymbol{c}^{m-1}$ attain values in $T\Sigma$ almost everywhere. The identity (3.16) follows from the above computations for all $\boldsymbol{\zeta} \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N) \cap Y$, since (3.18) is equal to zero for the minimizer $(\boldsymbol{c}^m, \boldsymbol{u}^m)$. For arbitrary $\boldsymbol{\zeta} \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N) \cap H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$, equation (3.16) follows because of the definition of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^m$ and since $\boldsymbol{P}\boldsymbol{w}^m = \boldsymbol{w}^m$.

The identity (3.17) follows for all $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in X_2$ from varying $E^{m,\Delta t}$ with respect to $\boldsymbol{u}$. For arbitrary $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$, we obtain (3.17), since $W_{,\mathcal{E}}$ and $\mathcal{S}^*$ are symmetric. □

3.5. Uniform estimates

So far, we determined solutions $(\boldsymbol{c}^m, \boldsymbol{u}^m)$ and related generalized chemical potential differences $\boldsymbol{w}^m$ $(m = 1, \dots, M)$ for every fixed $M \in \mathbb{Z}$. Now we define the piecewise constant extension $(\boldsymbol{c}_M, \boldsymbol{w}_M, \boldsymbol{u}_M)$ of $\{(\boldsymbol{c}^m, \boldsymbol{w}^m, \boldsymbol{u}^m)\}_{m=1,\dots,M}$. For $t \in ((m-1)\Delta t, m\Delta t]$, we set

$$(\boldsymbol{c}_M, \boldsymbol{w}_M, \boldsymbol{u}_M)(\cdot, t) := (\boldsymbol{c}_M^m, \boldsymbol{w}_M^m, \boldsymbol{u}_M^m)(\cdot) := (\boldsymbol{c}^m, \boldsymbol{w}^m, \boldsymbol{u}^m)(\cdot).$$

The piecewise linear extension $(\bar{\boldsymbol{c}}_M, \bar{\boldsymbol{w}}_M, \bar{\boldsymbol{u}}_M)$ of $\{(\boldsymbol{c}^m, \boldsymbol{w}^m, \boldsymbol{u}^m)\}_{m=1,\dots,M}$ is defined for $t = \beta m\Delta t + (1-\beta)(m-1)\Delta t$ with $\beta \in [0,1]$ as

$$(\bar{\boldsymbol{c}}_M, \bar{\boldsymbol{w}}_M, \bar{\boldsymbol{u}}_M)(\cdot, t) := \beta(\boldsymbol{c}_M^m, \boldsymbol{w}_M^m, \boldsymbol{u}_M^m)(\cdot) + (1-\beta)(\boldsymbol{c}_M^{m-1}, \boldsymbol{w}_M^{m-1}, \boldsymbol{u}_M^{m-1})(\cdot).$$

In order to derive *a priori* estimates, we show a discrete version of the dissipation inequality (2.15) for the time discrete solutions.

LEMMA 3.6. *Assume (A1)–(A7) hold. Then the following a priori estimates hold.*

(a) *For all $M \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $t \in [0,T]$, we have*

$$E(\boldsymbol{c}_M(t), \boldsymbol{u}_M(t)) + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\Omega_t} \boldsymbol{L}\nabla \boldsymbol{w}_M : \nabla \boldsymbol{w}_M \leqslant E(\boldsymbol{c}^0, \boldsymbol{u}^0).$$

Here, $\boldsymbol{u}^0$ is chosen to be the minimizer of $\boldsymbol{v} \mapsto \int_\Omega \{W(\boldsymbol{c}^0, \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{v})) + W^*(\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{v}))\}$ in the class X_2.

(b) *There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \{\|\boldsymbol{c}_M(t)\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\boldsymbol{u}_M(t)\|_{H^1(\Omega)}\} \leqslant C \tag{3.20}$$

and

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \int_\Omega \{\Psi^1(\boldsymbol{c}_M(t)) + \|\nabla \boldsymbol{w}_M\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}\} \leqslant C. \tag{3.21}$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0308210500002419 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Proof. Taking $(\boldsymbol{c}_M^{m-1}, \boldsymbol{u}_M^{m-1})$ as a comparison function when minimizing (3.13), we obtain

$$E(\boldsymbol{c}_M^m, \boldsymbol{u}_M^m) + \frac{1}{2\Delta t}\|\boldsymbol{c}_M^m - \boldsymbol{c}_M^{m-1}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}}^2 \leqslant E(\boldsymbol{c}_M^{m-1}, \boldsymbol{u}_M^{m-1}).$$

Using this inequality iteratively and using the definitions of the product $(\cdot,\cdot)_{\boldsymbol{L}}$ and of $\boldsymbol{w}_M^m$ gives, for all $M \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $m \in \{1, \dots, M\}$,

$$E(\boldsymbol{c}_M^m, \boldsymbol{u}_M^m) + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^{m\Delta t} (\boldsymbol{L}\nabla \boldsymbol{w}_M^m, \nabla \boldsymbol{w}_M^m)_{L^2} \leqslant E(\boldsymbol{c}^0, \boldsymbol{u}^0).$$

Due to $\fint \boldsymbol{c}_M^m = \boldsymbol{m}$ and $\boldsymbol{u}_M^m \in X_2$, we can use assumptions (A2)–(A7) and the inequalities of Poincaré and Korn to conclude (3.20) and (3.21). □

Since $\bar{\boldsymbol{c}}_M$ is the piecewise linear interpolant of the $\boldsymbol{c}_M^m$, we can rewrite (3.15) as

$$\int_\Omega \partial_t \bar{\boldsymbol{c}}_M \cdot \boldsymbol{\xi} + \int_\Omega \boldsymbol{L}\nabla \boldsymbol{w}_M : \nabla \boldsymbol{\xi} = 0 \quad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{\xi} \in H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N), \tag{3.22}$$

which holds for almost all $t \in (0,T)$. This identity, together with the estimates in lemma 3.6, enables us to control time differences of $\bar{\boldsymbol{c}}_M$ and $\boldsymbol{c}_M$.

Lemma 3.7. *There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that, for all $t_1, t_2 \in [0,T]$,*

$$\|\bar{\boldsymbol{c}}_M(t_2) - \bar{\boldsymbol{c}}_M(t_1)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leqslant C|t_2 - t_1|^{1/4}.$$

Furthermore, we can choose a subsequence $\{\boldsymbol{c}_M\}_{M\in\mathcal{N}}$ with $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathbb{Z}$ and a $\boldsymbol{c} \in L^\infty(0,T;H^1(\Omega))$ such that, for all $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$,

(i) $\bar{\boldsymbol{c}}_M \to \boldsymbol{c}$ *in* $C^{0,\alpha}([0,T];L^2(\Omega))$,

(ii) $\boldsymbol{c}_M \to \boldsymbol{c}$ *in* $L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$,

(iii) $\boldsymbol{c}_M \to \boldsymbol{c}$ *almost everywhere in* Ω_T,

(iv) $\nabla \boldsymbol{c}_M \to \nabla \boldsymbol{c}$ *weak-* in* $L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$,

(v) $\Psi_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}_M) \to \Psi_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c})$ *in* $L^1(\Omega_T)$,

as $M \in \mathcal{N}$ tends to infinity.

Proof. We choose $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ with $t_1 < t_2$ and $\boldsymbol{\xi} = \bar{\boldsymbol{c}}_M(t_2) - \bar{\boldsymbol{c}}_M(t_1)$ as a test function in (3.22) and integrate from t_1 to t_2 (cf. [2]). This gives

$$\|\bar{\boldsymbol{c}}_M(t_2) - \bar{\boldsymbol{c}}_M(t_1)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int_\Omega \boldsymbol{L}\nabla \boldsymbol{w}_M : \nabla(\bar{\boldsymbol{c}}_M(t_2) - \bar{\boldsymbol{c}}_M(t_1))\,\mathrm{d}t = 0.$$

Since the $\boldsymbol{c}_M^m$ are uniformly bounded in $H^1(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^N)$, we obtain that the $\bar{\boldsymbol{c}}_M$ are uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(0,T;H^1(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^N))$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}\|\bar{\boldsymbol{c}}_M(t_2) - \bar{\boldsymbol{c}}_M(t_1)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 &\leqslant C\|\bar{\boldsymbol{c}}_M\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^1(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^N))}\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\|\nabla \boldsymbol{w}_M\|_{L^2(\Omega)}(\tau)\,\mathrm{d}\tau \\ &\leqslant C\|\bar{\boldsymbol{c}}_M\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^1(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^N))}(t_2 - t_1)^{1/2}\|\nabla \boldsymbol{w}_M\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}.\end{aligned}$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0308210500002419 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This implies the existence of a $C > 0$ such that

$$\|\bar{\boldsymbol{c}}_M(t_2) - \bar{\boldsymbol{c}}_M(t_1)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leqslant C|t_2 - t_1|^{1/4} \tag{3.23}$$

for all $t_1, t_2 \in [0,T]$.

Since $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{c}}_M\}_{M\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(0,T;H^1(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^N))$ and since the embedding from $H^1(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^N)$ into $L^2(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^N)$ is compact, we can use the equicontinuity of $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{c}}_M\}_{M\in\mathbb{Z}}$ (see (3.23)) to apply the theorem of Arzelà–Ascoli for functions with values in a Banach space (see theorem A.3). Hence there exists a $\boldsymbol{c}$ such that (possibly along a subsequence)

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{c}}_M \to \boldsymbol{c} \quad \text{in } C^{0,\alpha}(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$$

for all $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$.

Choosing for $t \in [0,T]$ values $m \in \{1,\dots,M\}$ and $\beta \in [0,1]$ such that $t = \beta m\Delta t + (1-\beta)(m-1)\Delta t$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|\bar{\boldsymbol{c}}_M(t) - \boldsymbol{c}_M(t)\|_{L^2} &= \|\beta \boldsymbol{c}_M^m + (1-\beta)\boldsymbol{c}_M^{m-1} - \boldsymbol{c}_M^m\|_{L^2}\\ &= (1-\beta)\|\boldsymbol{c}_M^m - \boldsymbol{c}_M^{m-1}\|_{L^2}\\ &\leqslant C(\Delta t)^{1/4},\end{aligned}$$

which tends to zero as M tends to infinity. Together with (i), this implies (ii). In particular, we obtain that $\boldsymbol{c}_M$ converges in $L^2(\Omega_T)$. Therefore, we can extract a subsequence that converges almost everywhere. This shows (iii). The existence of a subsequence fulfilling (iv) follows from the boundedness of $\boldsymbol{c}_M$ in $L^\infty(0,T;H^1(\Omega))$ (see (3.20)).

It remains to show (v). The continuity of $\Psi_{,\boldsymbol{c}}$ and (iii) imply

$$\Psi_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}_M) \to \Psi_{,c}(\boldsymbol{c})$$

almost everywhere. Using assumption (A3.2), we get, for all δ and all measurable sets $E \subset \Omega$,

$$\int_E |\Psi^1_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}_M)| \leqslant \delta \int_E \Psi^1(\boldsymbol{c}_M) + C_\delta|E| \leqslant \delta C + C_\delta|E|.$$

Hence $\int_E |\Psi^1_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}_M)|$ converges to zero uniformly in M as $|E|$ tends to zero. Employing the convergence theorem of Vitali (see [1, 43]), we have $\Psi^1_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}_M) \to \Psi^1_{,c}(\boldsymbol{c})$ in $L^1(\Omega_T)$. The growth condition (A3.3) and Lebesgue's theorem yield the convergence of $\Psi^2_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}_M)$. This completes the proof of the lemma. □

We proceed in showing compactness in $\{\boldsymbol{u}_M\}_{M\in\mathbb{Z}}$ and $\{\boldsymbol{w}_M\}_{M\in\mathbb{Z}}$. In general, $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u}_M)$ enters the equation for the chemical potential differences quadratically. Therefore, we will need strong convergence of $\{\nabla \boldsymbol{u}_M\}_M$ in $L^2(\Omega_T)$.

Lemma 3.8. *There exist subsequences $(\boldsymbol{u}_M)_{M\in\mathcal{N}}$, $(\boldsymbol{w}_M)_{M\in\mathcal{N}}$ with $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathbb{Z}$ and $\boldsymbol{u} \in L^\infty(0,T;H^1(\Omega))$, $\boldsymbol{w} \in L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega))$ such that*

$$\boldsymbol{u}_M \to \boldsymbol{u} \quad \textit{in } L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega))$$

and

$$\boldsymbol{w}_M \to \boldsymbol{w} \quad \textit{weakly in } L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega))$$

as $M \in \mathcal{N}$ tends to infinity.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0308210500002419 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Proof. The estimate (3.20) and Korn's inequality (see theorem A.2) imply the existence of a subsequence such that

$$\boldsymbol{u}_M \to \boldsymbol{u} \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega))$$

for a $\boldsymbol{u} \in L^2(0,T;X_2)$. Choosing $\boldsymbol{\eta} = (\boldsymbol{u}_M - \boldsymbol{u})(t)$ for $t \in ((m-1)\Delta t, m\Delta t)$ as a test function in (3.17) yields, for almost all $t \in [0,T]$,

$$\int_\Omega (W_{,\mathcal{E}}(\boldsymbol{c}_M, \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u}_M)) : \nabla(\boldsymbol{u}_M - \boldsymbol{u}))(t) = \int_\Omega (\mathcal{S}^* : \nabla(\boldsymbol{u}_M - \boldsymbol{u}))(t).$$

Integrating in time from 0 to T, taking into account the symmetry of $W_{,\mathcal{E}}$ and $\mathcal{S}^*$ and using the monotonicity of $W_{,\mathcal{E}}$, we can deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 &\|\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u}_M - \boldsymbol{u})\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_T)} \\ &\leqslant \int_{\Omega_T} (W_{,\mathcal{E}}(\boldsymbol{c}_M, \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u}_M)) - W_{,\mathcal{E}}(\boldsymbol{c}_M, \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u}))) : \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u}_M - \boldsymbol{u}) \\ &= -\int_{\Omega_T} W_{,\mathcal{E}}(\boldsymbol{c}_M, \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u})) : \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u}_M - \boldsymbol{u}) + \int_{\Omega_T} \mathcal{S}^* : \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u}_M - \boldsymbol{u}). \end{aligned}$$

Now we can show that the right-hand side converges to zero. To conclude this, we use the growth condition on $W_{,\mathcal{E}}$, the convergence of $\{\boldsymbol{c}_M\}_{M\in\mathbb{Z}}$ in $L^2(\Omega_T)$ and the weak convergence of $\{\boldsymbol{u}_M\}_{M\in\mathbb{Z}}$ in $L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega))$. Hence $\|\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u}_M - \boldsymbol{u})\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}$ converges to zero and then Korn's inequality (see theorem A.2) implies strong convergence of $\{\boldsymbol{u}_M\}_{M\in\mathbb{Z}}$ in $L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega))$.

Estimate (3.21) yields a uniform bound of $\nabla \boldsymbol{w}_M$ in $L^2(\Omega_T)$. Also, we know that, for all $t \in [0,T]$,

$$\int_\Omega \boldsymbol{w}_M(t) = \boldsymbol{\lambda}_M(t) = \int_\Omega (\boldsymbol{P}\Psi_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}^m) + \boldsymbol{P}W_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}^m, \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u}^m))).$$

Taking assumptions (A3) and (A4) into account, we conclude that the right-hand side is uniformly bounded. By the generalized Poincaré inequality, we infer that $\boldsymbol{w}_M$ is uniformly bounded in $L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega))$. This shows the existence of a subsequence of $\{\boldsymbol{w}_M\}_{M\in\mathbb{Z}}$ converging weakly in $L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega))$. □

3.6. Proof of the existence theorem

Proof of theorem 3.2. It remains to show that the triple $(\boldsymbol{c}, \boldsymbol{w}, \boldsymbol{u})$ obtained in the previous subsection is a weak solution in the sense of definition 3.1. Therefore, we need to pass to the limit in (3.15)–(3.17), using the convergence properties obtained above.

Equation (3.22) implies that, for all $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^N))$ with $\partial_t \boldsymbol{\xi} \in L^2(\Omega_T)$ and $\boldsymbol{\xi}(T) = 0$,

$$-\int_{\Omega_T} \partial_t \boldsymbol{\xi}(\bar{\boldsymbol{c}}_M - \boldsymbol{c}^0) + \int_{\Omega_T} \boldsymbol{L}\nabla \boldsymbol{w}_M : \nabla \boldsymbol{\xi} = 0.$$

Using the convergence properties of $\bar{\boldsymbol{c}}_M$ and $\boldsymbol{w}_M$ (see lemmas 3.7 and 3.8), we obtain the first equality (see (3.4)) in the definition of a weak solution.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0308210500002419 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Choosing a $\boldsymbol{\zeta} \in L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^N)) \cap L^\infty(\Omega_T,\mathbb{R}^N)$ we conclude from (3.16) that

$$\int_{\Omega_T} \boldsymbol{w}_M \cdot \boldsymbol{\zeta} = \int_{\Omega_T} \{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\nabla \boldsymbol{c}_M : \nabla \boldsymbol{P}\boldsymbol{\zeta} + \boldsymbol{P}\Psi_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}_M)\cdot\boldsymbol{\zeta} + \boldsymbol{P}W_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}_M, \nabla\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u}_M))\cdot\boldsymbol{\zeta}\}.$$

Clearly, the linear terms converge to the analogous expressions in (3.5). The convergence

$$\int_{\Omega_T} \Psi_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}_M)\cdot\boldsymbol{\zeta} \to \int_{\Omega_T} \Psi_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c})\cdot\boldsymbol{\zeta}$$

follows with the help of the convergence theorem of Vitali by using the growth condition on $\Psi_{,\boldsymbol{c}}$ (see (A3.2)), the estimate on $\Psi^1(\boldsymbol{c}_M)$ in (3.21), the convergence almost everywhere of $\boldsymbol{c}_M$ and the boundedness of $\boldsymbol{\zeta}$. The generalized convergence theorem of Lebesgue and the growth assumption (A4.3), together with the strong convergence of $\nabla\boldsymbol{u}_M$ and $\boldsymbol{c}_M$ in L^2, yield that we can pass to the limit in $\int_{\Omega_T} W_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}_M, \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u}_M))\cdot\boldsymbol{\zeta}$.

To pass to the limit in the elasticity system (3.17) is straightforward using, again, the strong convergence of $\nabla\boldsymbol{u}_M$ and $\boldsymbol{c}_M$ in $L^2(\Omega_T)$ and the growth condition (A4.3). □

4. Uniqueness for homogeneous linear elasticity

We now prove a uniqueness theorem in the case of homogeneous linear elasticity and under the assumption that the stress-free strain varies linearly with the concentration, i.e.

$$\mathcal{E}^\star(\boldsymbol{c}) = \sum_{k=1}^{N} c_k \mathcal{E}_k^\star, \tag{4.1}$$

where the $\mathcal{E}_k^\star = \mathcal{E}^\star(\boldsymbol{e}_k)$ are the stress-free strains in the case that the material were uniformly equal to component k. Altogether, the elastic part of the free energy has the form

$$W(\boldsymbol{c},\mathcal{E}) = \tfrac{1}{2}(\mathcal{E} - \mathcal{E}^\star(\boldsymbol{c})) : \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E} - \mathcal{E}^\star(\boldsymbol{c})), \tag{4.2}$$

with a constant positive-definite tensor $\mathcal{C}$, which is assumed to fulfil the usual symmetry conditions of linear elasticity (see [16]). Let us note explicitly that we do not assume that $\mathcal{C}$ is isotropic. This takes into account that, in applications, $\mathcal{C}$, in general, will be an anisotropic tensor. Now the elastically modified Cahn–Hilliard system becomes

$$\left.\begin{aligned} \partial_t \boldsymbol{c} &= \boldsymbol{L}\Delta\boldsymbol{w}, \\ \boldsymbol{w} &= \boldsymbol{P}(-\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\nabla\boldsymbol{c} + \Psi_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}) - (\mathcal{E}_k^\star : \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u}) - \mathcal{E}^*(\boldsymbol{c})))_{k=1,\dots,N}), \\ 0 &= \nabla\cdot\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u}) - \mathcal{E}^\star(\boldsymbol{c})), \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{4.3}$$

which has to be solved together with the boundary conditions (2.11)–(2.13) and the initial condition (2.14).

Assume there exist two weak solutions, $(\boldsymbol{c}_1,\boldsymbol{w}_1,\boldsymbol{u}_1)$ and $(\boldsymbol{c}_2,\boldsymbol{w}_2,\boldsymbol{u}_2)$, which solve the elastic Cahn–Hilliard system in the sense of definition 3.1. Then, formally, it

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0308210500002419 Published online by Cambridge University Press

holds (cf. § 3.1) that

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\|\boldsymbol{c}_2-\boldsymbol{c}_1\|_{\boldsymbol{L}}^2+\int_\Omega \boldsymbol{\Gamma}\nabla(\boldsymbol{c}_2-\boldsymbol{c}_1):\nabla(\boldsymbol{c}_2-\boldsymbol{c}_1)$$
$$+\int_\Omega (\Psi_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}_2)-\Psi_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}_1))\cdot(\boldsymbol{c}_2-\boldsymbol{c}_1)$$
$$+\int_\Omega (\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u}_2-\boldsymbol{u}_1)-\mathcal{E}^\star(\boldsymbol{c}_2-\boldsymbol{c}_1)):\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u}_2-\boldsymbol{u}_1)-\mathcal{E}^\star(\boldsymbol{c}_2-\boldsymbol{c}_1))=0.$$

Our goal is to use this identity, together with the convexity of Ψ^1, suitable conditions on Ψ^2 and the inequalities of Gronwall and Korn, to prove uniqueness with respect to $\boldsymbol{c}$ and $\boldsymbol{u}$. Then the identity (2.8) gives uniqueness with respect to $\boldsymbol{w}$.

THEOREM 4.1. *Assume (A1)–(A3) and (A5)–(A7) hold, suppose $\Psi^2_{,\boldsymbol{c}}$ is globally Lipschitz continuous and let W have the form (4.1), (4.2).*

Then there exists a unique weak solution of the elastic Cahn–Hilliard system in the sense of definition 3.1.

Proof. To prove the uniqueness result, we generalize an idea of Blowey and Elliott [4] to the case that elastic effects are included. Assume there are two solutions $(\boldsymbol{c}_1,\boldsymbol{w}_1,\boldsymbol{u}_1)$ and $(\boldsymbol{c}_2,\boldsymbol{w}_2,\boldsymbol{u}_2)$ in the class

$$L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^N))\times L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^N))\times L^2(0,T;X_2).$$

We define

$$\boldsymbol{c}:=\boldsymbol{c}_2-\boldsymbol{c}_1,\qquad \boldsymbol{w}:=\boldsymbol{w}_2-\boldsymbol{w}_1,\qquad \boldsymbol{u}=\boldsymbol{u}_2-\boldsymbol{u}_1.$$

Then it holds that

$$-\int_{\Omega_T}\boldsymbol{c}\cdot\partial_t\boldsymbol{\xi}+\int_{\Omega_T}\boldsymbol{L}\nabla\boldsymbol{w}:\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}=0$$

for all $\boldsymbol{\xi}\in L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^N))$ with $\partial_t\boldsymbol{\xi}\in L^2(\Omega_T)$ and $\boldsymbol{\xi}(T)=0$. For $t_0\in(0,T)$ and given $\boldsymbol{\eta}\in L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^N))$, we define

$$\boldsymbol{\xi}(\cdot,t):=\begin{cases}\displaystyle\int_t^{t_0}\boldsymbol{\eta}(\cdot,s)\,\mathrm{d}s & \text{if } t\leqslant t_0,\\ 0 & \text{if } t>t_0.\end{cases}$$

Then we have

$$0=\int_{\Omega_{t_0}}\boldsymbol{c}\cdot\boldsymbol{\eta}+\int_{\Omega_{t_0}}\boldsymbol{L}\nabla\boldsymbol{w}:\nabla\left(\int_t^{t_0}\boldsymbol{\eta}\right)$$
$$=\int_{\Omega_{t_0}}\boldsymbol{c}\cdot\boldsymbol{\eta}+\int_{\Omega_{t_0}}\boldsymbol{L}\nabla\left(\int_0^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{w}\right):\nabla\boldsymbol{\eta}. \tag{4.4}$$

This implies

$$\mathcal{G}\boldsymbol{c}(\cdot,t)=-\int_0^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{w}(\cdot,s)\,\mathrm{d}s\quad\text{and}\quad\partial_t\mathcal{G}\boldsymbol{c}=-\boldsymbol{w}.$$

Taking $\boldsymbol{\eta}=\boldsymbol{w}$ in (4.4) gives

$$0=\int_{\Omega_{t_0}}\boldsymbol{c}\cdot\boldsymbol{w}+\int_{\Omega_{t_0}}\boldsymbol{L}\nabla(\mathcal{G}\boldsymbol{c}):\nabla(\partial_t\mathcal{G}\boldsymbol{c}).$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0308210500002419 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Since the second integrand is a time derivative, we can use $\boldsymbol{c}(0) = \mathcal{G}\boldsymbol{c}(0) = 0$ to obtain

$$0 = \int_{\Omega_{t_0}} \boldsymbol{c} \cdot \boldsymbol{w} + \int_{\Omega} \boldsymbol{L}\nabla(\mathcal{G}\boldsymbol{c}) : \nabla(\mathcal{G}\boldsymbol{c})(t_0). \tag{4.5}$$

Taking the difference of (3.5) for $\boldsymbol{w}_2$ and $\boldsymbol{w}_1$, we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega_T} \boldsymbol{w} \cdot \boldsymbol{\zeta} = \int_{\Omega_T} \{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\nabla\boldsymbol{c} : \nabla\boldsymbol{\zeta} + (\Psi_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}_2) - \Psi_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}_1)) \cdot \boldsymbol{P}\boldsymbol{\zeta} - (\mathcal{E}_k^\star : \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u}) - \mathcal{E}^*(\boldsymbol{c})))_{k=1,\dots,N} \cdot \boldsymbol{P}\boldsymbol{\zeta}\}$$

for all $\boldsymbol{\zeta} \in L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^N)) \cap L^\infty(\Omega_T,\mathbb{R}^N)$. Now we choose the test function $\boldsymbol{\zeta} = \chi_{[0,t_0]}\boldsymbol{P}_M(\boldsymbol{c}) = \chi_{[0,t_0]}\boldsymbol{P}_M(\boldsymbol{c}_2 - \boldsymbol{c}_1)$, where we defined

$$\boldsymbol{P}_M(\boldsymbol{c}') := \begin{cases} \boldsymbol{c}' & \text{if } |\boldsymbol{c}'| \leqslant M, \\ \dfrac{\boldsymbol{c}'}{|\boldsymbol{c}'|} M & \text{if } |\boldsymbol{c}'| > M \end{cases}$$

for all $M > 0$ and all $\boldsymbol{c}' \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Then the inequality

$$(\Psi^1_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}_2) - \Psi^1_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}_1)) \cdot \boldsymbol{P}_M(\boldsymbol{c}_2 - \boldsymbol{c}_1) \geqslant 0$$

leads to

$$\int_{\Omega_{t_0}} \{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\nabla\boldsymbol{c} : \nabla\boldsymbol{P}_M(\boldsymbol{c}) + (\Psi^2_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}_2) - \Psi^2_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}_1)) \cdot \boldsymbol{P}_M(\boldsymbol{c}) - (\mathcal{E}_k^\star : \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u}) - \mathcal{E}^*(\boldsymbol{c})))_{k=1,\dots,N} \cdot \boldsymbol{P}_M(\boldsymbol{c}) - \boldsymbol{w} \cdot \boldsymbol{P}_M(\boldsymbol{c})\} \leqslant 0. \tag{4.6}$$

In the limit $M \to \infty$, we obtain (4.6) with $\boldsymbol{P}_M(\boldsymbol{c})$ replaced by $\boldsymbol{c}$.

Now we choose $\boldsymbol{u} = (\boldsymbol{u}_2 - \boldsymbol{u}_1)\chi_{(0,t_0)}$ as a test function in the difference of the equations for $\boldsymbol{u}_2$ and $\boldsymbol{u}_1$ (see (4.3)), to discover

$$\int_{\Omega_{t_0}} \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u}) - \mathcal{E}^\star(\boldsymbol{c})) : \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u}) = 0. \tag{4.7}$$

Using (4.5), (4.6) and (4.7), we obtain

$$\|\boldsymbol{c}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}}(t_0) + \int_{\Omega_{t_0}} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}\nabla\boldsymbol{c} : \nabla\boldsymbol{c} + \int_{\Omega_{t_0}} (\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u}) - \mathcal{E}^\star(\boldsymbol{c})) : \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u}) - \mathcal{E}^\star(\boldsymbol{c})) \leqslant - \int_{\Omega_{t_0}} (\Psi^2_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}_2) - \Psi^2_{,\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{c}_1)) \cdot \boldsymbol{c}.$$

Taking into account the Lipschitz continuity of $\Psi^2_{,\boldsymbol{c}}$, we can use (3.1) and the Gronwall inequality to conclude

$$\|\boldsymbol{c}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}} = 0 \quad \text{and hence } \boldsymbol{c} = \boldsymbol{0}.$$

Then we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega_T} \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u}) : \mathcal{C}\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u}) = 0$$

and Korn's inequality (see theorem A.2) implies that

$$\boldsymbol{u} = \boldsymbol{0}.$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0308210500002419 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Now (3.5) ensures that $\boldsymbol{w}$ is uniquely defined. This completes the proof of the uniqueness theorem. □

Acknowledgments

The author thanks Luise Blank, Barbara Niethammer and Vanessa Styles for helpful discussions and remarks. This work has been supported by the DFG (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft) through the SFB256 'Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations' and the Schwerpunktprogramm 1095 'Analysis, Modelling and Simulation of Multiscale Problems'.

Appendix A.

In this section we collect some known results used in the text.

THEOREM A.1 (generalized Lebesgue convergence theorem). *Assume $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is measurable, $g_n \to g$ in $L^q(E)$ with $1 \leqslant q < \infty$ and $f_n, f : E \to \mathbb{R}^n$ are measurable functions such that*

$$\begin{aligned} f_n &\to f \qquad \text{a.e. in } E, \\ |f_n|^p &\leqslant |g_n|^q \quad \text{a.e. in } E, \end{aligned}$$

with $1 \leqslant p < \infty$. Then $f_n \to f$ in $L^p(E)$.

For a proof, see [1].

THEOREM A.2 (Korn's inequality). *Let Ω be a bounded domain with Lipschitz boundary.*

There exists a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$\int_\Omega \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u}) : \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{u}) \geqslant c\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{H^1}^2$$

for all

$$u \in X_2 := \{\boldsymbol{u} \in H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n) \mid (\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{v})_{H^1} = 0 \text{ for all } \boldsymbol{v} \in X_{\mathrm{ird}}\} = X_{\mathrm{ird}}^\perp,$$

where

$$X_{\mathrm{ird}} := \{\boldsymbol{u} \in H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n) \mid \text{there exist } \boldsymbol{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n \text{ and a skew-symmetric } \boldsymbol{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n} \text{ such that } \boldsymbol{u}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \boldsymbol{b} + \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x}\}.$$

A proof can be found, for example, in [42].

THEOREM A.3 (Arzelà–Ascoli theorem). *Let B be a Banach space. A subset F of $C([0,T]; B)$ is relatively compact if and only if*

(i) *$\{f(t) | f \in F\}$ is relatively compact in B for all $t \in (0,T)$;*

(ii) *F is uniformly equicontinuous, i.e. for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that*

$$\|f(t_2) - f(t_1)\|_B \leqslant \varepsilon$$

for all $f \in F$, and $t_1, t_2 \in [0,T]$ such that $|t_2 - t_1| \leqslant \delta$.

For a proof, we refer to [39].

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0308210500002419 Published online by Cambridge University Press

References

1 H. W. Alt. *Lineare funktionalanalysis* (Springer, 1985).

2 H. W. Alt and S. Luckhaus. Quasilinear elliptic parabolic differential equations. *Math. Z.* **183** (1983), 311–338.

3 H. W. Alt and I. Pawlow. *Models of non-isothermal phase transitions in multicomponent systems. Part I. Theory* (Bonn University, 1992). (SFB256 Preprint no. 222.)

4 J. F. Blowey and C. M. Elliott. The Cahn–Hilliard gradient theory for phase separation with non-smooth free energy. Part I. Mathematical analysis. *Eur. J. Appl. Math.* **2** (1991), 147–179.

5 E. Bonetti, P. Colli, W. Dreyer, G. Gilardi, G. Schimperna and J. Sprekels. On a model for phase separation in binary alloys driven by mechanical effects. *Physica* D **165** (2002), 48–65.

6 L. Bronsard, H. Garcke and B. Stoth. A multi-phase Mullins–Sekerka system: matched asymptotic expansions and an implicit time discretisation for the geometric evolution problem. *Proc. R. Soc. Edinb.* A **128** (1998), 481–506.

7 J. W. Cahn and J. E. Hilliard. *Free energy of a nonuniform system. I. Interfacial free energy. J. Chem. Phys.* **28** (1958), 258–267.

8 M. Carrive, A. Miranville and A. Piétrus. *The Cahn–Hilliard equation for deformable elastic media. Adv. Math. Sci. Appl.* **10** (2000), 539–569.

9 W. Dreyer and W. H. Müller. *A study of the coarsening in tin/lead solders. Int. J. Solids Struct.* **37** (2000), 3841–3871.

10 C. M. Elliott. The Cahn–Hilliard model for the kinetics of phase transitions. In *Mathematical models for phase change problems* (ed. J. F. Rodrigues). International Series of Numerical Mathematics, vol. 88, pp. 35–73 (Birkhäuser, 1989).

11 C. M. Elliott and S. Luckhaus. *A generalised diffusion equation for phase separation of a multi-component mixture with interfacial free energy.* (Bonn University, 1991). (SFB256 Preprint no. 195.)

12 C. M. Elliott and Zheng Songmu. On the Cahn–Hilliard equation. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Analysis* **96** (1986), 339–357.

13 J. D. Eshelby. Elastic inclusions and inhomogeneities. *Prog. Solid Mech.* **2** (1961), 89–140.

14 D. J. Eyre. Systems of Cahn–Hilliard equations. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **53** (1993), 1686–1712.

15 P. Fratzl, J. L. Lebowitz, O. Penrose and J. Amar. Scaling functions, self similarity, and the morphology of phase separating systems. *Phys. Rev.* B **44** (1991), 4794–4811.

16 P. Fratzl, O. Penrose and J. L. Lebowitz. Modelling of phase separation in alloys with coherent elastic misfit. *J. Stat. Phys.* **95** (1999), 1429–1503.

17 H. Garcke. *On mathematical models for phase separation in elastically stressed solids.* PhD thesis, Bonn University (2000).

18 H. Garcke. *On a Cahn–Hilliard model for phase separation with elastic misfit.* (Preprint University Regensburg.)

19 H. Garcke. *The Γ-limit of the elastically modified Ginzburg–Landau energy.* (Preprint University Regensburg.)

20 H. Garcke and A. Novick-Cohen. A singular limit for a system of degenerate Cahn–Hilliard equations. *Adv. Diff. Eqns* **5** (2000), 401–434.

21 H. Garcke, M. Rumpf and U. Weikard. The Cahn–Hilliard equation with elasticity: Finite element approximation and qualitative studies. *Interfaces Free Boundaries* **3** (2001), 101–118.

22 M. E. Gurtin. On a nonequilibrium thermodynamics of capillarity and phase. *Q. Appl. Math.* **47** (1989), 129–145.

23 M. E. Gurtin. Generalised Ginzburg–Landau and Cahn–Hilliard equations based on a microforce balance. *Physica* D **92** (1996), 178–192.

24 M. J. Kaufman, P. W. Voorhees, W. C. Johnson and F. S. Biancaniello. An elastically induced morphological instability of a misfitting precipitate. *Metall. Trans.* A **20** (1989), 2171–2175.

25 A. G. Khachaturyan. Some questions concerning the theory of phase transitions in solids. *Fiz. Tverd. Tela.* **8** (1966), 2709–2717. (Transl. *Sov. Phys. Solid State* **8** (1966), 2163.)

26 J. S. Kirkaldy and D. J. Young. *Diffusion in the condensed state* (London: Institute of Metals, 1987).
27 F. Langmayr, P. Fratzl and G. Vogl. Crossover from ω-phase to α-phase precipitation in BCC Ti–Mo. *Phys. Rev.* B **49** (1994), 11759–11766.
28 F. C. Larché and J. W. Cahn. The effect of self-stress on diffusion in solids. *Acta Metall.* **30** (1982), 1835–1845.
29 P. H. Leo, J. S. Lowengrub and H. J. Jou. A diffuse interface model for microstructural evolution in elastically stressed solids. *Acta Mater.* **46** (1998), 2113–2130.
30 I. M. Lifshitz and V. V. Slyozov. The kinetics of precipitation from supersaturated solid solutions. *J. Phys. Chem. Solids* **19** (1961), 35–50.
31 T. Miyazaki and M. Doi. Shape bifurcations in the coarsening of precipitates in elastically constrained systems. *Mater. Sci. Engng* A **110** (1989), 175–185.
32 T. Miyazaki, M. Doi and T. Kozakai. Shape bifurcations in the coarsening of precipitates in elastically constrained systems. *Solid State Phenomena* **3** (1988), 227–237.
33 H. Nishimori and A. Onuki. Freezing of domain growth in cubic solids with elastic misfit. *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn* **60** (1991), 1208–1211.
34 H. Nishimori and A. Onuki. Anomalously slow domain growth due to a modulus inhomogeneity in phase-separating alloys. *Phys. Rev.* B **43** (1991), 13649–13652.
35 A. Novick-Cohen. The Cahn–Hilliard equation: mathematical and modelling perspectives. *Adv. Math. Sci. Appl.* **8** (1998), 965–985.
36 L. Onsager. Reciprocal relations in irreversible processes. I. *Phys. Rev.* **37** (1931), 405–426.
37 L. Onsager. Reciprocal relations in irreversible processes. II. *Phys. Rev.* **38** (1931), 2265–2279.
38 A. Onuki. Ginzburg–Landau approach to elastic effects in the phase separation of solids. *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn* **58** (1989), 3065–3068.
39 J. Simon. Compact sets in the space $L^p(0,T;B)$. *Annli Mat. Pura Appl.* **146** (1987), 65–96.
40 J. D. van der Waals. The thermodynamic theory of capillarity under the hypothesis of a continuous variation of density. *Verh. Kronik. Akad. Weten. Amsterdam* **1**(8) (1892), 1–56, Jbuch 27, 967. (In Dutch.) (Transl. J. S. Rowlinson *J. Stat. Phys.* **20** (1979), 197–244.)
41 C. Wagner. Theorie der Alterung von Niederschlägen durch Umlösen. *Z. Elektrochem.* **65** (1961), 581–594.
42 E. Zeidler. *Nonlinear functional analysis and its applications, IV* (Springer, 1988).
43 E. Zeidler. *Nonlinear functional analysis and its applications, IIb* (Springer, 1990).

(*Issued 11 April 2003*)