Asymptotic justification of models of plates containing inside hard thin inclusions

Rudoy E.M.[1,2]

[1]Lavrentyev Institute of Hydrodynamics of SB RAS, 15 Ac. Lavrentiev ave., 630090 Novosibirsk, Russia
[2]Novosibirsk State University, 1 Pirogov str., 630090 Novosibirsk, Russia
e-mail: rem@hydro.nsc.ru

Abstract

An equilibrium problem of the Kirchhoff-Love plate containing a nonhomogeneous inclusion is considered. It is assumed that elastic properties of the inclusion depend on a small parameter characterizing width of the inclusion ε as ε^N with $N < 1$. The passage to the limit as the parameter ε tends to zero is justified, and an asymptotic model of a plate containing a thin inhomogeneous hard inclusion is constructed. It is shown that there exists two types of thin inclusions: rigid inclusion ($N < -1$) and elastic inclusion ($N = -1$). The inhomogeneity disappears in the case of $N \in (-1, 1)$.

Keywords: Kirchhoff-Love plate; Composite material; Thin inclusion; Asymptotic analysis

1 Introduction

An equilibrium problem of a Kirchhoff-Love plate containing a nonhomogeneous inclusion is considered. It is assumed that elastic properties of the inclusion depend on a small parameter characterizing width of the inclusion ε as ε^N with $N < 1$. The problem is formulated as a variational one, namely, as a minimization problem of the energy functional over a set of admissible deflections in the Sobolev space H^2. This imply that the deflections function is a solution of a boundary value problem for bi-harmonic operator (pure bending, see, e.g., [1, 2, 3, 4]).

The aim of the present work is to justify passing to the limit as $\varepsilon \to 0$. To do this, we apply a method originally introduced in [5, 6] for problems of gluing plates. The method is based on variational properties of the solution to the corresponding minimization problem and allows to find a limit problem for any $N < 1$ simultaneously. It is shown that there exist two types of hard inclusions in dependence of N: thin rigid inclusion ($N < -1$) and thin elastic inclusion ($N = -1$). In case $N \in (-1, 1)$, the influence of the inhomogeneity disappears in the limit. We get limit problems in a variational form, which is convenient, for example, for numerical analysis by the finite element method.

Let us give a short survey of works close to the present investigation. Note that there are not so many works devoted to study of models of thin inclusions in plates. We mention [7, 8, 9], in which thin elastic inclusions in pates were studied. Papers [10, 11, 12, 13] are devoted investigations of thin rigid inclusions. At last, we refer to [14, 15, 16, 17, 18] for asymptotic analyses for different models of bonded structures in Elasticity.

2 Statement of problem

Let us fix a small parameter $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and consider an inhomogeneous rectangular plate $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ with a thin rectangular inclusion $\Omega^\varepsilon_{inc} \subset \Omega$ of width $2\varepsilon d$, where d is diameter of Ω. Let us specify some notations:

$$\Omega = (-a_1, a_2) \times (-b_1, b_2),\ a_\alpha, b_\alpha > 0,\ \alpha = 1, 2,$$

$$\Omega^\varepsilon_{inc} = (-\varepsilon d, \varepsilon d) \times (-c_1, c_2),\quad 0 < c_\alpha < b_\alpha,\ \alpha = 1, 2,$$

$$\Omega_\pm = \{(y_1, y_2) \in \Omega \ \ | \ \ \pm y_1 > 0\},$$

$$S = \partial\Omega_- \cap \partial\Omega_+,$$

$$S_{inc} = S \cap \Omega^\varepsilon_{inc},$$

$$\Omega^\varepsilon_{mat} = \Omega \setminus \overline{\Omega}^\varepsilon_{inc},\quad \Omega^\varepsilon_\pm = \Omega^\varepsilon_{mat} \cap \Omega_\pm,$$

Note that for all small enough $\varepsilon > 0$ a family of subdomains Ω^ε_{inc} lies strictly inside Ω. Besides, let us define the following notations:

$$\Omega^\varepsilon_{mid} = \{(y_1, y_2) \in \Omega \ \ | \ \ -\varepsilon d < y_1 < \varepsilon d,\ y_2 \in S\},$$

$$S_{\pm}^{\varepsilon} = \{(y_1, y_2) \in \Omega \ \mid \ y_1 = \pm\varepsilon d, \ y_2 \in S\},$$

We assume that S_{inc} is divided into three subsets $S_\alpha \subset S_{inc}$, where each S_α is an union of finite number of segments or empty set, $\alpha = 1, 2, 3$.

In our consideration, Ω is a composite plate, consisting of the elastic matrix $\Omega_{mat}^{\varepsilon}$ and the inhomogeneous inclusion $\Omega_{inc}^{\varepsilon} = \cup_{\alpha=1}^{3} \Omega_{\alpha}^{\varepsilon}$, where

$$\Omega_{\alpha}^{\varepsilon} = \{(y_1, y_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \ \mid \ -\varepsilon d < y_1 < \varepsilon d, \ y_2 \in S_\alpha\}, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, 3.$$

Moreover, in the sequel we will use the following notations:

$$\Omega_0^{\varepsilon} = \Omega_{mid}^{\varepsilon} \setminus \cup_{\alpha=1}^{3} \overline{\Omega}_{\alpha}^{\varepsilon},$$

$$S_0 = S \setminus \overline{S}_{inc}.$$

Denote by E_0, E_α^ε and k_0, k_α Young's modules and Poisson's ratios of parts Ω_{mat} and $\Omega_\alpha^\varepsilon$ of the composite plate Ω, respectively, $\alpha = 1, 2, 3$. The compound character of the structure is expressed by the fact that E_0, k_0, and k_α are constants while Young's modulus E_α^ε depends on ε as follows:

$$E_\alpha^\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{N_\alpha} E_\alpha \ \text{ in } \ \Omega_\alpha^\varepsilon, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, 3,$$

where N_1, N_2, N_3 are real numbers such that

$$N_1 < -1, \quad N_2 = -1, \quad N_3 \in (-1, 1).$$

Such parameters correspond to hard inclusions in the plate Ω (see [6, 19, 20]). Moreover, put $N_0 = 0$.

Denote by w deflections of the composite plate Ω. Then the bending moments are defined by formulae (see, e.g., [21, 22])

$$m_{ij}(w) = d_{ijkl}^{\varepsilon} w_{,kl}, \quad i, j = 1, 2, \ w_{,kl} = \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial y_k \partial y_l},$$

where the tensor $\{d_{ijkl}\}$ has the following components:

$$\begin{aligned} d_{iiii}^{\varepsilon}(y) = D^{\varepsilon}(y), \ d_{iijj}^{\varepsilon}(y) = D^{\varepsilon}(y) k^{\varepsilon}(y), \\ d_{ijij}^{\varepsilon}(y) = d_{ijji}^{\varepsilon}(y) = D^{\varepsilon}(y)(1 - k^{\varepsilon}(y))/2, \ i \neq j, \ i, j = 1, 2, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

$$D^{\varepsilon}(y) = \begin{cases} D_0 \ \text{ in } \ \Omega_{mat}^{\varepsilon}, \\ \varepsilon^{N_\alpha} D_\alpha \ \text{ in } \ \Omega_\alpha^\varepsilon, \ \alpha = 1, 2, 3, \end{cases}$$

$$D_\alpha = \frac{E_\alpha h^3}{12(1-k_\alpha^2)},\ \ \alpha = 0,1,2,3,$$

$$k^\varepsilon(y) = \begin{cases} k_0 \text{ in } \Omega^\varepsilon_{mat}, \\ k^\varepsilon_\alpha, \text{ in } \Omega^\varepsilon_\alpha,\ \ \alpha = 1,2,3, \end{cases}$$

h is a thickness of the plate Ω.

The potential energy functional of the plate has the following representation (see [22]):

$$\Pi(w) = \frac{1}{2}\int\limits_\Omega d^\varepsilon_{ijkl} w_{,kl} w_{,ij}\, dy - \int\limits_\Omega f w\, dy,$$

where $f \in L_2(\Omega)$ is a bulk force acting on the plate Ω. Then the equilibrium problem of nonhomogeneous plate clamped on the external boundary $\partial\Omega$ can be formulated as the minimization problem: find a function $w_\varepsilon \in H^2_0(\Omega)$ such that

$$\Pi(w_\varepsilon) = \inf_{w \in H^2_0(\Omega)} \Pi(w). \tag{2}$$

Problem (2) is known to have a unique solution w_ε (see, e.g., [21, 23]), which satisfies the variational equality:

$$\int\limits_\Omega d^\varepsilon_{ijkl} w_{\varepsilon,kl} w_{,ij}\, dy = \int\limits_\Omega f w\, dy \quad \forall w \in H^2_0(\Omega). \tag{3}$$

Moreover, the function w_ε is a unique solution the following boundary value problem:

$$(d^\varepsilon_{ijkl} w_{\varepsilon,kl})_{,ij} = f \ \text{ in } \ \Omega,$$

$$w_\varepsilon = \frac{\partial w_\varepsilon}{\partial \nu} = 0 \ \text{ on } \ \partial\Omega,$$

where ν is a unit normal vector $\partial\Omega$.

3 Decomposition of the problem and coordinate transformations

In the sequel we will have deal with the problem (3). Let us rewrite it in an equivalent form. For this we introduce the following set:

$$K_\varepsilon = \{v = (v_-, v_+, v_m) \in H^2(\Omega^\varepsilon_-) \times H^2(\Omega^\varepsilon_+) \times H^2(\Omega^\varepsilon_m) \;\; | \\ v_\pm = v_m, \;\; v_{\pm,1} = v_{m,1} \text{ a.e. on } S^\varepsilon_\pm, \\ v_\pm = \frac{\partial v_\pm}{\partial \nu} = 0 \text{ a.e. on } \partial\Omega^\varepsilon_\pm \cap \partial\Omega\}.$$

Taking into account (1), problem (3) can be reformulated as follows: find a triplet $(w_{\varepsilon-}, w_{\varepsilon+}, w_{\varepsilon m}) \in K_\varepsilon$ satisfying a variational equality

$$b_{\varepsilon-}(w_{\varepsilon-}, v_-) + b_{\varepsilon+}(w_{\varepsilon+}, v_+) + b_{\varepsilon m}(w_{\varepsilon m}, v_m) = \\ = l_-(v_-) + l_+(v_+) + l_m(v_m) \;\; \forall (v_-, v_+, v_m) \in K_\varepsilon, \quad (4)$$

where

$$b_{\varepsilon\pm}(u,v) = D_0 \int\limits_{\Omega^\varepsilon_\pm} (u_{,11}v_{,11} + u_{,22}v_{,22} + k_0(u_{,11}v_{,22} + u_{,22}v_{,11}) + 2(1-k_0)u_{,12}v_{,12})\, dy,$$

$$b_{\varepsilon m}(u,v) = \sum_{\alpha=0}^{3} D^\varepsilon_\alpha \int\limits_{\Omega^\varepsilon_\alpha} (u_{,11}v_{,11} + u_{,22}v_{,22} + k_\alpha(u_{,11}v_{,22} + u_{,22}v_{,11}) + 2(1-k_\alpha)u_{,12}v_{,12})\, dy.$$

$$l_{\varepsilon\pm}(u) = \int\limits_{\Omega^\varepsilon_\pm} fu\, dy, \quad l_{\varepsilon m}(u) = \int\limits_{\Omega^\varepsilon_m} fu\, dy.$$

From Calculus of Variations, it follows that problem (4) has a unique solution $(w_{\varepsilon-}, w_{\varepsilon+,\varepsilon m}) \in K_\varepsilon$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough (see, e.g., [2, 21]). Herewith, $w_{\varepsilon\pm}$ and $w_{\varepsilon m}$ are restrictions of w_ε on subdomains $\Omega^\varepsilon_\pm$ and Ω^ε_m, respectively.

Next, we introduce coordinate transformations that map domains $\Omega^\varepsilon_\pm$ and Ω^ε_m onto domains independent of ε. For this, we consider two convex domains ω_1 and ω_2 such that

$$\overline{S} \subset \omega_1, \; \overline{\omega}_1 \subset \omega_2, \; \partial\omega_2 \cap \{y_1 = -a_1\} = \emptyset, \; \partial\omega_2 \cap \{y_1 = a_2\} = \emptyset,$$

and a smooth cut-off function θ such that

$$\theta = 1 \text{ in } \overline{\omega}_1,\ 0 < \theta < 1 \text{ in } \omega_2,\ \theta = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \overline{\omega}_2.$$

Let us introduce the following notations:

$$\Omega_m = \{(z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \ \mid \ -d < z_1 < d,\ z_2 \in S\},$$

$$S_\pm = \{(z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \ \mid \ z_1 = \pm d,\ z_2 \in S\},$$

$$\Omega_\alpha = \{(z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \ \mid \ -d < z_1 < d,\ z_2 \in S_\alpha\},\ \alpha = 0, 1, 2, 3,$$

$$S_\alpha^\pm = \{(z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{R}_z^2 \ \mid \ z_1 = \pm d,\ z_2 \in S_\alpha\},\ \alpha = 0, 1, 2, 3.$$

and define coordinate transformations in the domains $\Omega_\pm$ and Ω_m as follows:

$$y_1 = x_1 \pm \varepsilon d\theta(x_1, x_2), \quad y_2 = x_2, \ \ (x_1, x_2) \in \Omega_\pm, \ \ (y_1, y_2) \in \Omega_\pm^\varepsilon, \tag{5}$$

$$y_1 = \varepsilon z_1, \quad y_2 = z_2, \ \ (z_1, z_2) \in \Omega_m, \ \ (y_1, y_2) \in \Omega_m^\varepsilon. \tag{6}$$

It is not difficult to show that for all sufficiently small coordinate transformations (5) and (6) map bijectively the domains $\Omega_\pm$ and Ω_m onto $\Omega_\pm^\varepsilon$ and Ω_m^ε, respectively, (see, e.g., [24, 25]). Note that the subdomains $\Omega_\alpha^\varepsilon$ is mapped into subdomains Ω_α, $\alpha = 0, 1, 2, 3$.

Denote by $\Phi_\varepsilon^\pm(x)$ and $J_\varepsilon^\pm$ Jacobian matrices and Jacobians of transformations (5), respectively,

$$\Phi_\varepsilon^\pm(x_1, x_2) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \pm \varepsilon d\theta_{,1}(x_1, x_2) & \pm\varepsilon d\theta_{,2}(x_1, x_2)) \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$J_\varepsilon^\pm(x_1, x_2) = \det \Phi_\varepsilon^\pm(x_1, x_2) = 1 \pm \varepsilon d\theta_{,1}(x_1, x_2).$$

Coordinate transformations (5) and (6) establish one-to-one correspondences between spaces $H^2(\Omega_\pm)$, $H^2(\Omega_m)$ and $H^2(\Omega_\pm^\varepsilon)$, $H^2(\Omega_m^\varepsilon)$, respectively. Moreover, the set K^ε is transformed into a set K_ε,

$$K_\varepsilon = \{v = (v_-, v_+, v_m) \in H^{2,0}(\Omega_-) \times H^{2,0}(\Omega_+) \times H^2(\Omega_m) \ \mid \\ v_\pm|_S = v_m|_{S_\pm}, \ \ v_{\pm,1}|_S = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} v_{m,1}|_{S_\pm}\},$$

where

$$H^{2,0}(\Omega_\pm) = \{v_\pm \in H^2(\Omega_\pm) \ \mid \ v_\pm = \frac{\partial v_\pm}{\partial \nu} = 0 \text{ a.e. on } \partial\Omega_\pm^\varepsilon \cap \partial\Omega\}.$$

Hereinafter, we assume that for any functions $v_\pm(x)$, $x \in \Omega_\pm$, and $v_m(z)$, $z \in \Omega_m$, equality $v_\pm|_S = v_m|_{S_\pm}$ means that

$$v_\pm(0, x_2) = v_m(\pm d, z_2), \quad x_2 = z_2 \in S.$$

Introduce the following notations:

$$w^\varepsilon_\pm(x_1, x_2) = w_{\varepsilon\pm}(x_1 \pm \varepsilon d\theta(x_1, x_2), x_2), \quad (x_1, x_2) \in \Omega_\pm,$$

$$w^\varepsilon_m(z_1, z_2) = w_{\varepsilon m}(\varepsilon z_1, z_2), \quad (z_1, z_2) \in \Omega_m.$$

Due to smoothness of coordinate transformations (5), we have asymptotic expansions for the transformations of the second-order derivatives for (5) (see, e.g., [24, 25, 26, 27])

$$w_{\varepsilon\pm,ij} = w^\varepsilon_{\pm,ij} + \varepsilon P^\pm_{ij}(\varepsilon, w^\varepsilon_\pm), \tag{7}$$

with

$$|P^\pm_{ij}(\varepsilon, w^\varepsilon_\pm)| \leq C(|w^\varepsilon_{\pm,k}| + |w^\varepsilon_{\pm,kl}|), \quad i, j, k, l = 1, 2.$$

Besides, we have for (6)

$$w_{\varepsilon m,11}(y_1, y_2) = \frac{w^\varepsilon_{m,11}(z_1, z_2)}{\varepsilon^2}, \; w_{\varepsilon m,12}(y_1, y_2) = \frac{w^\varepsilon_{m,12}(z_1, z_2)}{\varepsilon},$$
$$w_{\varepsilon m,22}(y_1, y_2) = w^\varepsilon_{m,22}(z_1, z_2).$$

After applying coordinate transformations (5) and (6) to (4) we get that the triplet $(w^\varepsilon_-, w^\varepsilon_+, uw^\varepsilon_m) \in K_\varepsilon$ is a unique solution to the following variational equality:

$$b^\varepsilon_-(w^\varepsilon_-, v_-) + b^\varepsilon_+(w^\varepsilon_+, v_+) + b^\varepsilon_m(w^\varepsilon_m, v_m) = l^\varepsilon_-(v_-) + l^\varepsilon_+(v_+) + l^\varepsilon_m(v_m)$$
$$\forall (v_-, v_+, v_m) \in K_\varepsilon, \tag{8}$$

where, taking into account (7) and (1),

$$b^\varepsilon_\pm(u, v) = b_\pm(u, v) + r_\pm(\varepsilon, u, v),$$

$$b_\pm(u, v) = D_0 \int\limits_{\Omega_\pm} (u_{,11}v_{,11} + u_{,22}v_{,22} + k_\pm(u_{,11}v_{,22} + u_{,22}v_{,11}) + 2(1-k_\pm)u_{,12}v_{,12})\, dx,$$

$$|r_\pm(\varepsilon,u,v)| \le c_\pm(\varepsilon)\left(\|u\|^2_{H^2(\Omega_\pm)} + \|v\|^2_{H^2(\Omega_\pm)}\right),\ \ 0 \le c_\pm(\varepsilon) = o(1) \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0, \tag{9}$$

$$b^\varepsilon_m(u,v) =$$

$$= D_0 \int\limits_{\Omega_m} \left(\frac{u_{,11}v_{,11}}{\varepsilon^3} + \varepsilon u_{,22}v_{,22} + \frac{k_m}{\varepsilon}(u_{,11}v_{,22} + v_{,22}w_{,11}) + \frac{2(1-k_m)}{\varepsilon}u_{,12}v_{,12}\right) dz +$$

$$= D_1 \int\limits_{\Omega_m} \left(\frac{u_{,11}v_{,11}}{\varepsilon^{3-N_1}} + \frac{u_{,22}v_{,22}}{\varepsilon^{-N_1-1}} + \frac{k_m}{\varepsilon^{1-N_1}}(u_{,11}v_{,22} + v_{,22}w_{,11}) + \frac{2(1-k_m)}{\varepsilon^{1-N_1}}u_{,12}v_{,12}\right) dz +$$

$$+ D_2 \int\limits_{\Omega_m} \left(\frac{u_{,11}v_{,11}}{\varepsilon^4} + u_{,22}v_{,22} + \frac{k_m}{\varepsilon^2}(u_{,11}v_{,22} + v_{,22}w_{,11}) + \frac{2(1-k_m)}{\varepsilon^2}u_{,12}v_{,12}\right) dz +$$

$$+ D_3 \int\limits_{\Omega_m} \left(\frac{u_{,11}v_{,11}}{\varepsilon^{3-N_3}} + \varepsilon^{N_3+1}u_{,22}v_{,22} + \frac{k_m}{\varepsilon^{1-N_3}}(u_{,11}v_{,22} + v_{,22}w_{,11}) + \frac{2(1-k_m)}{\varepsilon^{1-N_3}}u_{,12}v_{,12}\right) dz,$$

$$l^\varepsilon_\pm(v) \int\limits_{\Omega_\pm} f(x_1 \pm d\theta(x_1,x_2),x_2)(1 \pm d\theta_{,1}(x_1,x_2)v\,dx$$

$$l^\varepsilon_m(v) = \varepsilon \int\limits_{\Omega_m} f(\varepsilon z_1, z_2)v\,dz,$$

$$|l^\varepsilon_\pm(v)| \le C\|v\|_{L_2(\Omega_\pm)}, \tag{10}$$

$$|l^\varepsilon_m(v)| \le C\varepsilon\|v\|_{L_2(\Omega_m)}. \tag{11}$$

4 Limit problem

To justify passing to the limit as $\varepsilon \to 0$ we need some auxiliary lemma proved in [5, 6].

Lemma. For any triplet $(v_-, v_+, v_m) \in K_\varepsilon$ and $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$, the inequalities

$$\|v_m\|^2_{L_2(\Omega_m)} \le C\left(\|v_{m,11}\|^2_{L_2(\Omega_m)} + \|v_\pm\|^2_{H^{2,0}(\Omega_\pm)}\right),$$
$$\|v_{m,1}\|^2_{L_2(\Omega_m)} \le C\left(\|v_{m,11}\|^2_{L_2(\Omega_m)} + \varepsilon^2\|v_{\pm,1}\|^2_{L_2(S)}\right)$$

hold, where a constant $C > 0$ does not depend on (v_-, v_+, v_m) and $\varepsilon > 0$.

Our main result is the following theorem.

Theorem. Let $w^\varepsilon = (w^\varepsilon_-, w^\varepsilon_+, w^\varepsilon_m)$ be a solution to (8); let $w_0 \in K_0$ be a solution to the following variational equality:

$$b(w_0, w) + 4d(1-k_2)D_m \int\limits_{S_2} \frac{\partial(w_{0,1}|_{S_2})}{\partial z_2}\frac{\partial(w_{,1}|_{S_2})}{\partial z_2}\, dz_2 = l(w)\ \forall w \in K_0, \quad (12)$$

where

$$K_0 = \{w \in H^2_0(\Omega)\ \mid\ w = \alpha x_2 + \beta \text{ a.e. on } S_1,\ \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R};\ w_{,1} \in H^1(S_2)\}.$$

Denote by $w_\pm$ a restriction of w to subdomain $\Omega_\pm$ and, moreover, put

$$w_m(z_1, z_2) = w_0(z_1, 0) \quad \text{for} \quad (z_1, z_2) \in \Omega_m.$$

Then the following convergences

$$w^\varepsilon_\pm \to w_\pm \quad \text{weakly in} \quad H^2(\Omega_\pm),$$

$$w^\varepsilon_m \to w_m \quad \text{weakly in} \quad L_2(\Omega_m),$$

take place as $\varepsilon \to 0$.

Proof. Let us substitute $(w^\varepsilon_-, w^\varepsilon_+, w^\varepsilon_m)$ in (8) as a test function. Taking into account Lemma, (9), (10), and (11), we get an estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|w^\varepsilon_-\|^2_{H^{2,0}(\Omega_-)} + \|w^\varepsilon_+\|^2_{H^{2,0}(\Omega_+)} + \\
&\left\|\frac{w^\varepsilon_{m_0,11}}{\varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}}\right\|^2_{L_2(\Omega_0)} + \left\|\frac{w^\varepsilon_{m_0,12}}{\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}}\right\|^2_{L_2(\Omega_0)} + \|\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} w^\varepsilon_{m_0,22}\|^2_{L_2(\Omega_0)} + \\
&+ \left\|\frac{w^\varepsilon_{m_1,11}}{\varepsilon^{\frac{3-N_1}{2}}}\right\|^2_{L_2(\Omega_1)} + \left\|\frac{w^\varepsilon_{m_1,12}}{\varepsilon^{\frac{1-N_1}{2}}}\right\|^2_{L_2(\Omega_1)} + \left\|\frac{w^\varepsilon_{m_1,22}}{\varepsilon^{\frac{-N_1-1}{2}}}\right\|^2_{L_2(\Omega_1)} + \\
&\left\|\frac{w^\varepsilon_{m_2,11}}{\varepsilon^{2}}\right\|^2_{L_2(\Omega_2)} + \left\|\frac{w^\varepsilon_{m_2,12}}{\varepsilon}\right\|^2_{L_2(\Omega_2)} + \|w^\varepsilon_{m_2,22}\|^2_{L_2(\Omega_2)} + \\
&\left\|\frac{w^\varepsilon_{m_3,11}}{\varepsilon^{\frac{3-N_3}{2}}}\right\|^2_{L_2(\Omega_3)} + \left\|\frac{w^\varepsilon_{m_3,12}}{\varepsilon^{\frac{1-N_3}{2}}}\right\|^2_{L_2(\Omega_3)} + \|\varepsilon^{\frac{N_3+1}{2}} w^\varepsilon_{m_3,22}\|^2_{L_2(\Omega_3)} \le C \quad (13)
\end{aligned}$$

with a constant C independent of ε. Here by $w^\varepsilon_{m_\alpha}$ denote a restriction of w^ε to Ω_α, $\alpha = 0, 1, 2, 3$. Moreover, from (13), Lemma, and definition of the set K_ε, we additionally have

$$\|w^\varepsilon_m\|_{L_2(\Omega_m)} \le C, \quad \|w^\varepsilon_{m,1}\|_{L_2(\Omega_m)} \le C\varepsilon. \quad (14)$$

Estimates (13) and (14) entail the existence of functions $w_\pm \in H^{2,0}(\Omega_\pm)$, $w_m \in L_2(\Omega_m)$, $p_\alpha, q_\alpha, r_\alpha \in L_2(\Omega_\alpha)$, $\alpha = 0,1,2,3$, such that for some subsequence $\{\varepsilon_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ still denoted by ε, the following convergences:

$$\begin{aligned}
w_\pm^\varepsilon \to w_\pm \quad &\text{weakly in} \quad H^2(\Omega_\pm),\\
w_m^\varepsilon \to w_m \quad &\text{weakly in} \quad L_2(\Omega_m),\\
\frac{w_{m,11}^\varepsilon}{\varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}} \to p_0 \quad &\text{weakly in} \quad L_2(\Omega_0),\\
\frac{w_{m,12}^\varepsilon}{\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}} \to q_0 \quad &\text{weakly in} \quad L_2(\Omega_0),\\
\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} u_{m,22}^\varepsilon \to r_0 \quad &\text{weakly in} \quad L_2(\Omega_0),\\
\frac{w_{m,11}^\varepsilon}{\varepsilon^{\frac{3-N_1}{2}}} \to p_1 \quad &\text{weakly in} \quad L_2(\Omega_1),\\
\frac{w_{m,22}^\varepsilon}{\varepsilon^{\frac{-1-N_1}{2}}} \to q_1 \quad &\text{weakly in} \quad L_2(\Omega_1),\\
\frac{w_{m,12}^\varepsilon}{\varepsilon_n^{\frac{1-N_1}{2}}} \to r_1 \quad &\text{weakly in} \quad L_2(\Omega_1),\\
\frac{w_{m,11}^\varepsilon}{\varepsilon^2} \to p_2 \quad &\text{weakly in} \quad L_2(\Omega_2),\\
w_{m,22}^\varepsilon \to u_{m,22} \quad &\text{weakly in} \quad L_2(\Omega_2),\\
\frac{w_{m,12}^{\varepsilon_n}}{\varepsilon} \to q_2 \quad &\text{weakly in} \quad L_2(\Omega_2),\\
\frac{w_{m,1}^{\varepsilon_n}}{\varepsilon_n} \to r_2 \quad &\text{weakly in} \quad L_2(\Omega_2),\\
\frac{w_{m,11}^\varepsilon}{\varepsilon^{\frac{3-N_3}{2}}} \to p_3 \quad &\text{weakly in} \quad L_2(\Omega_3),\\
\frac{w_{m,12}^\varepsilon}{\varepsilon^{\frac{1-N_3}{2}}} \to q_3 \quad &\text{weakly in} \quad L_2(\Omega_3),\\
\varepsilon^{\frac{N_3+1}{2}} u_{m,22}^\varepsilon \to r_3 \quad &\text{weakly in} \quad L_2(\Omega_3)
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

hold as $\varepsilon \to 0$. Moreover, from (13) and (14) it follows that

$$w_{m,1}^\varepsilon \to w_{m,1} = 0 \quad \text{strongly in} \quad L_2(\Omega_m), \tag{16}$$

$$w_{m,11}^\varepsilon \to w_{m,11} = 0 \quad \text{strongly in} \quad L_2(\Omega_m), \tag{17}$$

$$w^{\varepsilon}_{m,22} \to w_{m,22} = 0 \quad \text{strongly in} \quad L_2(\Omega_1). \tag{18}$$

From definition of the set K_ε, after passing to the limit as $\varepsilon \to 0$, we get

$$w_m|_{S_\pm} = w_\pm|_S. \tag{19}$$

Since $w_{m,1} = 0$ in Ω_m (see (16)), w_m does not depend on z_2. Therefore, taking into account (17), we conclude that there exists a function $\beta(z_2) \in L_2(\Omega_m)$ such that

$$w_m(z_1, z_2) = \beta(z_2), \quad (z_1, z_2) \in \Omega_m.$$

Condition (18) means that the function w_m is affine in the domain Ω_m with respect to z_2, i.e., there exists $\delta, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$w_m(z_1, z_2) = \delta z_2 + \gamma \ \text{ in } \ \Omega_1. \tag{20}$$

Due to (19), we have

$$w_-|_S = w_+|_S. \tag{21}$$

Now let us show that $w_\pm$ satisfy the following equality:

$$w_{+,1} = w_{-,1} \quad \text{on} \quad S. \tag{22}$$

Indeed, from the relation

$$\int\limits_{-d}^{d} w^{\varepsilon}_{m,11}(z_1, z_2) dz_1 = w^{\varepsilon}_{m,1}(d, z_2) - w^{\varepsilon}_{m,1}(-d, z_2),$$

it follows that

$$\int\limits_{a}^{b} |w^{\varepsilon}_{m,1}(d, z_2) - w^{\varepsilon}_{m,1}(-d, z_2)|^2 \, dz_2 \le 2d \|w^{\varepsilon}_{m,11}\|^2_{L_2(\Omega_m)}.$$

Due to estimate (13) and the equalities $w^{\varepsilon}_{m,1}(\pm d, z_2) = \varepsilon w^{\varepsilon}_{\pm}(0, z_2)$ for $z_2 \in (a, b)$ (see definition of the set K_ε), we obtain

$$\|w^{\varepsilon}_{+,1} - w^{\varepsilon}_{-,1}\|_{L_2(S)} \le \frac{2d}{\varepsilon} \|w^{\varepsilon}_{m,11}\|_{L_2(\Omega_m)} \to 0$$

as $\varepsilon \to 0$. From (15) (the first line) and the compactness of trace operator, it follows

$$w^{\varepsilon}_{\pm,1} \to w_{\pm,1} \ \text{ strongly in } \ L_2(S)$$

as $\varepsilon \to 0$, and (22) holds.

At last, using the same arguments as in [6] we can prove additionally that

$$w_{\pm,1}|_{S_2} \in H^1(S_2) \tag{23}$$

and, moreover,

$$p_2 = -k_m w_{m,22} \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega_2,$$

$$q_2 = \frac{\partial(w_{-,1}|_{S_2})}{\partial z_2} \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega_2,$$

$$r_2 = w_{-,1}|_{S_2} \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega_2.$$

Now let us define a function

$$w_0(x) = \begin{cases} w_-(x) & x \in \Omega_-, \\ w_+(x) & x \in \Omega_+. \end{cases} \tag{24}$$

Conditions (19), (20), (21), (22), and (23) imply that the function w_0 belongs to the set K_0.

In order to proceed with a problem defining the function w_0, we take arbitrary function $v \in C^2(\Omega) \cap K_0$ and define three functions v_-, v_+, v_m by

$$v_- = v|_{\Omega_-}, \quad v_+ = v|_{\Omega_+},$$

$$v_m(z_1, z_2) = v(0, z_2), \quad (z_1, z_2) \in \Omega_m.$$

Then for these functions we consider a triplet $(v_-+\varepsilon\psi_-, v_++\varepsilon\psi_+, v_m+\varepsilon\psi_m) \in K_\varepsilon$, where $\psi_m(z_1, z_2) = v_{,1}(0, z_2)z_1$ for $(z_1, z_2) \in \Omega_m$, and $\psi_\pm \in H^{2,0}(\Omega_\pm)$ is arbitrary extensions of ψ_m in domains $\Omega_\pm$ such that

$$\psi_\pm|_S = \psi_m|_{S_m^\pm}, \quad \psi_{\pm,1} = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad S,$$

and substitute it in (8). Since $v_{m,11} = 0$ and $\psi_{m,11} = 0$ in Ω_m, weak convergences in (15) and formulas (23) allows us to pass to the limit as $\varepsilon \to 0$ and obtain the following relation:

$$b_-(w_-, v_-) + b_+(w_+, v_+) + 4d(1-k_2)D_2 \int\limits_{S_2} \frac{\partial(w_{-,1}|_{S_2})}{\partial z_2} \frac{\partial(v_{-,1}|_{S_2})}{\partial z_2}\, dz_2 =$$

$$= l_-(v_-) + l_+(v_+) \quad \forall v \in C^2(\Omega) \cap K_0.$$

Taking into account (24) and the fact that $C^2(\Omega) \cap K_0$ is dense in K_0, we obtain (12). Theorem is proved.

Assuming that the solution w_0 to variational problem (12) has additional regularity, by applying the generalized Green formula (see, e.g., [2, 21]), we are about to deduce differential equations and boundary conditions for the functions w_0:

$$D_0 \Delta^2 w_0 = f \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega \setminus (\overline{S}_1 \cup \overline{S}_2),$$

$$w_0 = \frac{\partial w_0}{\partial \nu} = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega,$$

$$w_0 = \delta_0 x_2 + \beta_0 \quad \text{on} \quad S_1, \quad \delta_0, \beta_0 \in \mathbb{R},$$

$$[m^1(w_0)] = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad S_1,$$

$$\int\limits_{S_1} [t^1(w_0)] \, dx_2 = 0, \quad \int\limits_{S_1} [t^1(w_0)] x_2 \, dx_2 = 0,$$

$$[t^2(w_0)] = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad S_2,$$

$$4dD_2(1 - k_2) w_{0,122} = [m^2(w_0)] \quad \text{on} \quad S_2,$$

$$w_{0,12} = 0 \quad \text{at} \quad \partial S_2,$$

where $m^\alpha(w_0)$ and $t^\alpha(w_0)$ are bending moments and transverse forces, respectively, defined by

$$m^\alpha(w_0) = D_\alpha \Big(k_\alpha \Delta w_0 + (1 - k_\alpha) \frac{\partial^2 w_0}{\partial \nu^2} \Big),$$

$$t^\alpha(w_0) = D_\alpha \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} \Big(\Delta w_0 + (1 - k_\alpha) \frac{\partial^2 w_0}{\partial \tau^2} \Big),$$

$\nu = (1, 0)$ and $\tau = (-1, 0)$ are an unit normal vector and an unit tangent vector, respectively, $\alpha = 1, 2$.

The mechanical interpretation of boundary conditions can be found in [6], see also [10, 28, 29].

4.1 Concluding remarks

We proposed a method of asymptotic derivation of plate models containing hard thin inclusions lying strictly inside the plate. The method is based on the variational properties of the solution of the equilibrium problem and allows one to simultaneously construct all possible cases of hard thin inclusions. It is shown that there exist two type of thin inclusions in the Kirchhoff-Love plate, namely, the rigid inclusion S_1 for $N < -1$ and the elastic inclusion S_2 for $N = -1$. The inhomogeneity disappears in the case of $N \in (-1, 1)$. The last means that we have no any peculiarity along the set S_3.

Acknowledgements. The work is supported by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research (project 18-29-10007).

Conflict of Interest. The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

[1] *Destuynder P., Salaun M.* Mathematical analysis of thin plate models. Springer-Verlag: Berlin, Heidelberg, 1996.

[2] *Khludnev A.M., Sokolowski J.* Modelling and control in solid mechanics. Birkhäuser Basel, 1997.

[3] *Lagnese J.E., Lions J.-L.* Modelling analysis and control of thin plates. MASSON: Paris, Milan, Barcelone, Mexico, 1988

[4] *Sweers G.* A survey on boundary conditions for the biharmonic // Complex Variables and Elliptic Equations. 2009. V. 54, N 2, P. 79–93.

[5] *Rudoy E.M.* Asymptotic modelling of bonded plates by a soft thin adhesive layer // Siberian Electronic Mathematical Reports. 2020. V. 17, P. 615–625.

[6] *Furtsev A., Rudoy E.* Variational approach to modeling soft and stiff interfaces in the Kirchhoff-Love theory of plates // International Journal of Solids and Structures. 2020. V. 202, P. 562–574.

[7] *Kunets' Ya.I., Matus V.V.* Modeling of flexural vibrations of a kirchhoff plate with a thin-walled elastic inclusion of weak contrast // Journal of Mathematical Sciences (United States). 2012. V. 187, N 5, P. 667–674.

[8] *Furtsev A.I.* On Contact Between a Thin Obstacle and a Plate Containing a Thin Inclusion // Journal of Mathematical Sciences (United States). 2019. V. 237, N 4, P. 530–545.

[9] *Furtsev A.I.* The unilateral contact problem for a Timoshenko plate and a thin elastic obstacle // Siberian Electronic Mathematical Reports. 2020. V. 17, P. 364–379.

[10] *Khludnev A.* Thin rigid inclusions with delaminations in elastic plates // European Journal of Mechanics, A/Solids. 2011. V. 32, P. 69–75.

[11] *Khludnev A.M.* On bending an elastic plate with a delaminated thin rigid inclusion // Journal of Applied and Industrial Mathematics. 2011. V. 5, N 4, P. 582–594.

[12] *Fankina I.V.* A contact problem for an elastic plate with a thin rigid inclusion // Journal of Applied and Industrial Mathematics. 2016. V. 10, N 3, P. 333–340.

[13] *Shcherbakov V.V.* Existence of an optimal shape of the thin rigid inclusions in the Kirchhoff-Love plate // Journal of Applied and Industrial Mathematics. 2014. V. 8, N 1, P. 97–105.

[14] *Dumont S., Lebon F., Rizzoni R.* Imperfect interfaces with graded materials and unilateral conditions: theoretical and numerical study // Mathematics and Mechanics of Solids. 2018. V. 23, N 3, P. 445–460.

[15] *Serpilli M., Rizzoni R., Lebon F., Dumont S.* An asymptotic derivation of a general imperfect interface law for linear multiphysics composites // International Journal of Solids and Structures. 2019. V. 180-181, P. 97–107.

[16] *Dumont S., Rizzoni R., Lebon F., Sacco E.* Soft and hard interface models for bonded elements // Composites Part B: Engineering. 2018. V. 153, P. 480–490.

[17] *Schmidt P.* Modelling of adhesively bonded joints by an asymptotic method // International Journal of Engineering Science. 2008. V. 46, P. 1291–1324.

[18] *Serpilli M., Rizzoni R., Dumont S., Lebon F.* Interface laws for multiphysic composites // Lecture Notes in Mechanical Engineering. 2020. P. 441–454.

[19] *Geymonat G., Krasucki F.* Analyse asymptotique du comportement en exion de deux plaques collées // C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris. 1997. V. 325, Serie IIb, P. 307–314.

[20] *Zaittouni F., Lebon F., Licht C.* Étude théorique et numérique du comportement d'un assemblage de plaques // C. R. Mecanique. 2002. V. 330, P. 359–364.

[21] *Khludnev A.M., Kovtunenko V.A.* Analysis of cracks in solids. Southampton, Boston: WIT-Press, 2000.

[22] *Pelekh B.L.* Theory of Shells with Finite Shear Rigidity. Naukova Dumka: Kiev, 1973 (in Russian).

[23] *Lazarev N.P.* Problem of equilibrium of the timoshenko plate containing a crack on the boundary of an elastic inclusion with an infinite shear rigidity // Journal of Applied Mechanics and Technical Physics. 2013. V. 54, N 2, P. 322–330.

[24] *Rudoy E.M.* Asymptotics of the energy functional for a fourth-order mixed boundary value problem in a domain with a cut // Siberian Mathematical Journal. 2009. V. 50, N 2, P. 341–354.

[25] *Rudoy E.M.* Invariant integrals for the equilibrium problem for a plate with a crack // Siberian Mathematical Journal. 2004. V. 45, N 2, P. 388–397.

[26] *Rudoy E.M.* The Griffith formula and Cherepanov-Rice integral for a plate with a rigid inclusion and a crack // Journal of Mathematical Sciences (United States). 2012. V. 186, N 3, P. 511–529.

[27] *Furtsev A.I.* Differentiation of energy functional with respect to delamination's length in problem of contact between plate and beam // Siberian Electronic Mathematical Reports. 2018. V. 15, P. 935–949.

[28] *Furtsev A.I.* A Contact Problem for a Plate and a Beam in Presence of Adhesion // Journal of Applied and Industrial Mathematics. 2019. V. 13, N 2, P. 208–218.

[29] *Lazarev N.P., Rudoy E.M.* Optimal size of a rigid thin stiffener reinforcing an elastic plate on the outer edge // ZAMM Zeitschrift fur Angewandte Mathematik und Mechanik. 2017. V. 97, N 9, P. 1120–1127.