RENORMALIZED ENERGY AND PEACH-KÖHLER FORCES FOR SCREW DISLOCATIONS WITH ANTIPLANE SHEAR

TIMOTHY BLASS AND MARCO MORANDOTTI

ABSTRACT. We present a variational framework for studying screw dislocations subject to antiplane shear. Using a classical model developed by Cermelli & Gurtin [5], methods of Calculus of Variations are exploited to prove existence of solutions, and to derive a useful expression of the Peach-Köhler forces acting on a system of dislocation. This provides a setting for studying the dynamics of the dislocations, which is done in [4].

Keywords: Dislocations, variational methods, renormalized energy, Peach-Köhler force.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 70G75 (74B05, 49J99, 70F99).

1. INTRODUCTION

Dislocations are one-dimensional defects in crystalline materials [13]. Their modeling is of great interest in materials science since important material properties, such as rigidity and conductivity, can be strongly affected by the presence of dislocations. For example, large collections of dislocations can result in plastic deformations in solids under applied loads.

In this paper we derive an expression for the renormalized energy associated to a system screw dislocations in cylindrical crystalline materials using a continuum model introduced by Cermelli and Gurtin [5]. We use the renormalized energy to derive a characterization for the forces on the dislocations, called Peach-Köhler forces. These forces drive the dynamics of the system, which is studied in [4]. The proofs of some results that are used in [4] are contained in this paper.

Following [5], we consider an elastic body $B \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, $B := \Omega \times \mathbb{R}$, where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a bounded simply connected open set with Lipschitz boundary. B undergoes antiplane shear deformations $\Phi : B \to B$ of the form

$$\Phi(x_1, x_2, x_3) := (x_1, x_2, x_3 + u(x_1, x_2)),$$

with $u : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$. The deformation gradient $\mathbf{F}$ is given by

$$\mathbf{F} := \nabla\Phi = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}u & \frac{\partial}{\partial x_2}u & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{e}_3 \otimes \begin{pmatrix} \nabla u \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{1.1}$$

The assumption of antiplane shear allows us to reduce the three-dimensional problem to a two-dimensional problem. We will consider strain fields $\mathbf{h}$ that are defined on the cross-section Ω, taking values in $\mathbb{R}^2$. In the absence of dislocations, $\mathbf{h} = \nabla u$. If dislocations are present, then the strain field is singular at the sites of the dislocations, and in the case of screw dislocations this will be a line singularity.

A screw dislocation is a lattice defect at the atomic scale of the material, and is represented at the continuum level by a line singularity in the strain field for the body B. In the antiplane shear setting, this line is parallel to the x_3 axis; in the cross-section Ω a screw dislocation is represented as a point singularity. A screw dislocation is characterized by a position $\mathbf{z} \in \Omega$ and a vector $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^3$, called the *Burgers* vector. The position $\mathbf{z} \in \Omega$ is a point where the strain field fails to be the gradient of a smooth function, and the Burgers vector measures the severity of this failure. To be precise, a strain field, $\mathbf{h}$, associated with a system of N screw dislocations at positions

$$\mathcal{Z} := \{\mathbf{z}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_N\}$$

with corresponding Burgers vectors

$$\mathcal{B} := \{\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_N\}$$

satisfies the relation

$$\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{h} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} b_i \delta_{\mathbf{z}_i} \quad \text{in } \Omega \tag{1.2}$$

in the sense of distributions, with $b_i := |\mathbf{b}_i|$. The notation $\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{h}$ denotes the scalar curl, $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} h_2 - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_2} h_1$. Thus, in the antiplane shear setting, the Burgers vectors can be written as $\mathbf{b}_i = b_i \mathbf{e}_3$. The scalar b_i is called the *Burgers modulus* for the dislocation at $\mathbf{z}_i$, and in view of (1.2) it is given by

$$b_i = \int_{\ell_i} \mathbf{h} \cdot \mathbf{t} \, \mathrm{d}s,$$

where ℓ_i is any counterclockwise loop surrounding the dislocation point $\mathbf{z}_i$ and no other dislocation points, $\mathbf{t}$ is the tangent to ℓ_i, and $\mathrm{d}s$ is the line element. Since $\mathbf{b}_i = b_i \mathbf{e}_3$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$, by abuse of notation from now on we will use the symbol $\mathcal{B}$ both for the set of Burgers vectors and for the set of Burgers moduli. When dislocations are present, the deformation gradient $\mathbf{F}$ can no longer be represented by the last expression in (1.1), which needs to be replaced with

$$\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{e}_3 \otimes \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{h} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Our goal is to derive an energy associated to systems of screw dislocation and obtain the characterization of the Peach-Köhler forces on the dislocations. This, together with the energy dissipation criterion described in [5], will lead to an evolution equation for the system of dislocations.

Our investigation of the energy associated to a system of dislocations will be undertaken in the context of linear elasticity for singular strains $\mathbf{h}$. The energy density W is given by

$$W(\mathbf{h}) := \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{h} \cdot \mathbf{Lh}$$

where the elasticity tensor $\mathbf{L}$ is a symmetric, positive-definite matrix and, in suitable coordinates, $\mathbf{L}$ is written in terms of the Lamé moduli λ, μ of the material as

$$\mathbf{L} := \begin{pmatrix} \mu & 0 \\ 0 & \mu\lambda^2 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{1.3}$$

We require $\lambda, \mu > 0$, and the energy is isotropic if and only if $\lambda = 1$. The energy of a strain field $\mathbf{h}$ is given by

$$J(\mathbf{h}) := \int_\Omega W(\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x}))\, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x},$$

and the equilibrium equation is

$$\operatorname{div} \mathbf{Lh} = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega. \tag{1.4}$$

Equations (1.2) and (1.4) provide a characterization of strain fields describing screw dislocation systems in linearly elastic materials. To be precise, we say that a strain field $\mathbf{h} \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$ corresponds to a *system of dislocations* at the positions $\mathcal{Z}$ with Burgers vectors $\mathcal{B}$ if $\mathbf{h}$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{h} = \sum_{i=1}^N b_i \delta_{\mathbf{z}_i} \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{Lh} = 0 \end{cases} \quad \text{in } \Omega, \tag{1.5}$$

in the sense of distributions.

In analogy to the theory of Ginzburg-Landau vortices [3], no variational principle can be associated with (1.5) because the elastic energy of a system of screw dislocations is not finite (see, e.g., [6, 5, 13]), therefore the study of (1.5) cannot be undertaken directly in terms of energy minimization. Indeed, the simultaneous requirements of finite energy and (1.2) are incompatible, since if $\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{h} = \delta_{\mathbf{z}_0}$, $\mathbf{z}_0 \in \Omega$, and if $B_\varepsilon(\mathbf{z}_0) \subset\subset \Omega$, then

$$\int_{\Omega \backslash B_\varepsilon(\mathbf{z}_0)} W(\mathbf{h})\, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} = O(|\log \varepsilon|).$$

In the engineering literature (see, e.g., [5, 13]), this problem is usually overcome by regularizing the energy. By removing small cores of size $\varepsilon > 0$ centered at the dislocations, we will replace J by J_ε (see (2.2)) and obtain finite-energy strains $\mathbf{h}_\varepsilon$, as minimizers of J_ε. Letting $\varepsilon \to 0$ we will recover

a unique limiting strain $\mathbf{h}_0 = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \mathbf{h}_\varepsilon$, satisfying (1.5). From this, we can derive a *renormalized energy U* associated with the limiting strain, see (3.1) and (3.2). The energy of a minimizing strain takes the form

$$J_\varepsilon(\mathbf{h}_\varepsilon) = C \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + U(\mathbf{z}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_N) + O(\varepsilon), \tag{1.6}$$

where the first term, $C \log(1/\varepsilon)$, is the *core energy*, and the renormalized energy, U, is the physically meaningful quantity. This type of asymptotic expansion was first proved by Bethuel, Brezis, and Hélein in [2] for Ginzburg-Landau vortices. The case of edge dislocations was studied in [6], and also using Γ-convergence techniques (see, e.g., [1, 14] and the references therein for Ginzburg-Landau vortices, [7, 11, 10]). Finally, it is important to mention that we ignore here the core energy. We refer to [13, 15, 16] for more details.

The renormalized energy U is a function only of the positions $\{\mathbf{z}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_N\}$, and its gradient with respect to $\mathbf{z}_i$ gives the negative of the Peach-Köhler force on $\mathbf{z}_i$, denoted $\mathbf{j}_i$. In Theorem. 4.1 we show that

$$\mathbf{j}_i = -\nabla_{\mathbf{z}_i} U = \int_{\ell_i} \{W(\mathbf{h}_0)\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{h}_0 \otimes (\mathbf{L}\mathbf{h}_0)\} \, \mathbf{n} \, ds,$$

where ℓ_i is a suitably chosen loop around $\mathbf{z}_i$ and $\mathbf{n}$ is the outer unit normal to the set bounded by ℓ_i and containing $\mathbf{z}_i$. The quantity $W(\mathbf{h}_0)\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{h}_0 \otimes (\mathbf{L}\mathbf{h}_0)$ is the *Eshelby stress tensor*, see [8, 12].

The expression for $\mathbf{j}_i$ given below contains two contributions accounting for the two different kinds of forces acting on a dislocation when other dislocations are present: the interactions with the other dislocations and the interactions with $\partial\Omega$. The latter balances the tractions of the forces generated by all the dislocations, and it is the (rotated) gradient of the solution u_0 to an elliptic problem with Neumann boundary conditions (2.21). Precisely (see (4.5)) we show that $\mathbf{j}_i$ has the form

$$\mathbf{j}_i(\mathbf{z}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_N) = b_i \mathbf{J} \mathbf{L} \Big[\nabla u_0(\mathbf{z}_i; \mathbf{z}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_N) + \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbf{k}_j(\mathbf{z}_i; \mathbf{z}_j) \Big],$$

where $\mathbf{J}$ is the rotation matrix of an angle $\pi/2$, and $\mathbf{k}_j(\cdot; \mathbf{z}_j)$ is the fundamental singular strain generated by the dislocation $\mathbf{z}_j$ (see (2.5)). It is important to notice that the force on the i-th dislocation is a function of the positions *all* the dislocations. This explicit formula is useful for calculating $\mathbf{j}_i$, and is employed in [4] to study the motion of the dislocations.

In Section 2 we show how to regularize the energy to use variational techniques to study the problem. In Section 3 we derive the renormalized energy, which we use in Section 4 to derive the Peach-Köhler force.

2. Regularized Energies and Singular Strains

Consider a system of dislocations at the positions $\mathcal{Z} = \{\mathbf{z}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_N\}$ with Burgers vectors $\mathcal{B} = \{\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_N\}$. Regularize the energy J by removing the singular points from the domain Ω, and define the sets

$$\Omega_\varepsilon := \Omega \setminus \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^N \overline{E}_{\varepsilon,i} \right) \quad \text{for} \quad \varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0), \tag{2.1}$$

where, for every $i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$, $E_{\varepsilon,i} := E_\varepsilon(\mathbf{z}_i)$, and

$$E_r(\mathbf{z}) := \left\{ (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : (x_1 - z_1)^2 + \left(\frac{x_2 - z_2}{\lambda} \right)^2 < r^2 \right\}$$

is an ellipse centered at $\mathbf{z}$ for $r > 0$; the parameter λ is one of the the Lamé moduli of the material (cf. (1.3)). Let $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ be fixed (depending on Ω, $\mathcal{Z}$, and λ) such that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ we have $E_{\varepsilon,i} \subset\subset \Omega$, and $\overline{E}_{\varepsilon,i} \cap \overline{E}_{\varepsilon,j} = \emptyset$ for all $i \neq j$. (The shape of the cores $E_{\varepsilon,i}$ is not crucial, but ellipses $E_{\varepsilon,i}$ centered at $\mathbf{z}_i$ will be convenient in the sequel.)

We define

$$J_\varepsilon(\mathbf{h}) := \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} W(\mathbf{h}) \, d\mathbf{x}. \tag{2.2}$$

Note that by removing cores around the singular set $\mathcal{Z}$, we have regularized the energy in the sense that it will not necessarily be infinite on strains satisfying (1.5). However, since we have effectively removed the dislocations from the problem, we account for their presence by a judicious choice of function space. We define

$$H^{\mathrm{curl}}(\Omega_\varepsilon) := \{\mathbf{h} \in L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon, \mathbb{R}^2) : \mathrm{curl}\,\mathbf{h} \in L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon)\}$$

and

$$H_0^{\mathrm{curl}}(\Omega_\varepsilon, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{B}) := \left\{ \mathbf{h} \in H^{\mathrm{curl}}(\Omega_\varepsilon), \, \mathrm{curl}\,\mathbf{h} = 0, \, \int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,i}} \mathbf{h} \cdot \mathbf{t} \, ds = b_i, \, i = 1, \ldots, N \right\}, \tag{2.3}$$

where $\mathbf{t}$ is the unit tangent vector to $\partial E_{\varepsilon,i}$. The condition on $\mathbf{h}$ involving the Burgers moduli b_i in (2.3) reintroduces the dislocations into the regularized problem, and it prevents the minimizers of J_ε from being gradients of H^1 functions. In order to abbreviate the notation, we will write only $H_0^{\mathrm{curl}}(\Omega_\varepsilon)$ in place of $H_0^{\mathrm{curl}}(\Omega_\varepsilon, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{B})$ whenever it is possible to do so without confusion. We will denote by $\mathbf{n}$ the unit outward normal to $\partial \Omega_\varepsilon$.

The following lemma concerns the properties of minimizers of J_ε, the existence of which is proved in Lemma 2.3. See also Remark 2.4.

Lemma 2.1. *Assume that $\mathbf{h}_\varepsilon$ is a minimizer of J_ε in $H_0^{\mathrm{curl}}(\Omega_\varepsilon)$. Then it satisfies the Euler equations*

$$\begin{cases} \mathrm{div}(\mathbf{L}\mathbf{h}_\varepsilon) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega_\varepsilon\,, \\ \mathbf{L}\mathbf{h}_\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega_\varepsilon\,. \end{cases} \tag{2.4}$$

Moreover, the solution to (2.4) is unique.

Proof. Given that the functional J_ε is quadratic, the result is achieved by calculating the vanishing of its first variation. Let $w \in H^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)$; then

$$\begin{aligned} \delta J_\varepsilon(\mathbf{h}_\varepsilon)[w] &= \lim_{t\to 0} \frac{J_\varepsilon(\mathbf{h}_\varepsilon + t\nabla w) - J_\varepsilon(\mathbf{h}_\varepsilon)}{t} \\ &= \lim_{t\to 0} \frac{1}{t}\left(\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} t\nabla w \cdot \mathbf{L}\mathbf{h}_\varepsilon + \frac{1}{2}t^2\nabla w \cdot \mathbf{L}\nabla w \, d\mathbf{x}\right) \\ &= \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \nabla w \cdot \mathbf{L}\mathbf{h}_\varepsilon \, d\mathbf{x} = -\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} w\,\mathrm{div}(\mathbf{L}\mathbf{h}_\varepsilon)\,d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\partial\Omega_\varepsilon} w\,\mathbf{L}\mathbf{h}_\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{n}\,ds(\mathbf{x}). \end{aligned}$$

By setting $\delta J_\varepsilon(\mathbf{h}_\varepsilon)[w] = 0$ for all $w \in H^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)$, we get (2.4).

To prove uniqueness, assume that $\mathbf{h}_\varepsilon$ and $\widetilde{\mathbf{h}}_\varepsilon$ both solve system (2.4). Then the path integral of the difference $\mathbf{h}_\varepsilon - \widetilde{\mathbf{h}}_\varepsilon$ over any loop in Ω_ε must vanish, and so $\mathbf{h}_\varepsilon - \widetilde{\mathbf{h}}_\varepsilon = \nabla u$ for some function $u \in H^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)$. Since u solves the weak Euler equation

$$\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \nabla w \cdot \mathbf{L}\nabla u \, d\mathbf{x} = 0, \qquad \text{for all } w \in H^1(\Omega_\varepsilon),$$

taking $w = u$ we obtain $J_\varepsilon(\nabla u) = 0$, and as $\mathbf{L}$ is positive definite, we conclude that $\nabla u = 0$. $\quad\square$

2.1. Singular Strains and the Limit $\varepsilon \to 0$. We introduce the *singular strains* $\mathbf{k}_i$ which will be the building blocks of the singular part of the strain field $\mathbf{h}$ that represents the system of dislocations. Define $\mathbf{k}_i(\cdot; \mathbf{z}_i) : \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{\mathbf{z}_i\} \to \mathbb{R}^2$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, as

$$\mathbf{k}_i(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{z}_i) = \frac{b_i\lambda}{2\pi(\lambda^2(x_1 - z_{i,1})^2 + (x_2 - z_{i,2})^2)}\begin{pmatrix} -(x_2 - z_{i,2}) \\ x_1 - z_{i,1} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.5}$$

We will often abbreviate $\mathbf{k}_i(\cdot; \mathbf{z}_i)$ as $\mathbf{k}_i$. Each $\mathbf{k}_i$ can be written as the gradient of a multi-valued function, precisely

$$\mathbf{k}_i(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{z}_i) = \frac{b_i}{2\pi}\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \arctan\left(\frac{x_2 - z_{i,2}}{\lambda(x_1 - z_{i,1})}\right),$$

and it is straightforward to calculate directly that

$$\mathrm{curl}_{\mathbf{x}}\,\mathbf{k}_i(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{z}_i) = b_i\delta_{\mathbf{z}_i}(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2, \tag{2.6a}$$

$$\mathrm{div}_{\mathbf{x}}\,(\mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_i(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{z}_i)) = 0 \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{\mathbf{z}_i\}, \tag{2.6b}$$

$$\mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_i(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{z}_i) \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0 \qquad \text{on } \partial E_{\varepsilon,i}. \tag{2.6c}$$

6

In particular, by (2.6c) and (2.6b),

$$\int_{\partial\Omega} \mathbf{L} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbf{k}_i(\mathbf{y}; \mathbf{z}_i) \cdot \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{y}) \, ds(\mathbf{y}) = \int_{\partial\Omega_\varepsilon} \mathbf{L} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbf{k}_i(\mathbf{y}; \mathbf{z}_i) \cdot \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{y}) \, ds(\mathbf{y}) = 0. \tag{2.7}$$

Note that the integral in (2.7) is only well-defined when the dislocations are away from the boundary ($\varepsilon_0 > 0$).

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ be fixed as in (2.1). For every $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$, let $\mathbf{h} \in H_0^{\mathrm{curl}}(\Omega_\varepsilon, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{B})$. Then*

$$\mathbf{h} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbf{k}_i + \nabla u \tag{2.8}$$

for some $u \in H^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)$. Moreover, the minimization problem

$$\min\left\{ J_\varepsilon(\mathbf{h}) \;\middle|\; \mathbf{h} \in H_0^{\mathrm{curl}}(\Omega_\varepsilon, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{B}) \right\} \tag{2.9}$$

is equivalent to the minimization problem

$$\min\left\{ I_\varepsilon(u) \;\middle|\; u \in H^1(\Omega_\varepsilon), \; \int_{\Omega_{\varepsilon_0}} u(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = 0 \right\}, \tag{2.10}$$

where

$$I_\varepsilon(u) = \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} W(\nabla u) d\mathbf{x} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_{\partial\Omega} u \mathbf{L} \mathbf{k}_i \cdot \mathbf{n} \, ds - \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j \neq i} \int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,i}} u \mathbf{L} \mathbf{k}_j \cdot \mathbf{n} \, ds \tag{2.11}$$

Minimizers u_ε of (2.10) are solutions of the Neumann problem

$$\begin{cases} \mathrm{div}\,(\mathbf{L}\nabla u) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega_\varepsilon, \\ \mathbf{L}\left(\nabla u + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbf{k}_i\right) \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ \mathbf{L}\left(\nabla u + \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbf{k}_j\right) \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0 & \text{on } \partial E_{\varepsilon,i}, \; i = 1, 2, \dots, N. \end{cases} \tag{2.12}$$

Proof. Let $\mathbf{h} \in H_0^{\mathrm{curl}}(\Omega_\varepsilon, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{B})$. By (2.6a), $\int_\ell (\mathbf{h} - \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbf{k}_i) \cdot d\mathbf{x} = 0$ for any loop $\ell \subset \Omega_\varepsilon$ and thus, $\mathbf{h} - \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbf{k}_i = \nabla u$ for some $u \in H^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)$. In turn

$$J_\varepsilon(\mathbf{h}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} J_\varepsilon(\mathbf{k}_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{N} \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \mathbf{L} \mathbf{k}_i \cdot \mathbf{k}_j d\mathbf{x} + I_\varepsilon(u) \tag{2.13}$$

where $I_\varepsilon(u)$ is given by (2.11) and where in the last sum in the expression for I_ε we omit the terms with $i = j$ because $\mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_i \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0$ on each $\partial E_{\varepsilon,i}$ (see (2.6c)). (Note that the last integral in (2.11) has a minus sign because $\mathbf{n}$ points outside $E_{\varepsilon,i}$, by definition of outer normal). Hence, the minimization of J_ε over $\mathbf{h} \in H_0^{\mathrm{curl}}(\Omega_\varepsilon, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{B})$ is achieved by minimizing I_ε over $u \in H^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)$. The normalization condition in (2.10) is introduced in order to make the problem coercive, and has the effect of changing u in (2.8) by an additive constant. Since ∇u is the relevant quantity, this does not affect the minimization problem.

To show that minimizers solve the Neumann problem (2.12), we calculate the first variation of I_ε and apply Stokes's theorem to find that, given $\varphi \in H^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)$,

$$\delta I_\varepsilon(u)[\varphi] = - \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \varphi \operatorname{div}(\mathbf{L}\nabla u)\, \mathrm{d}x + \int_{\partial\Omega} \varphi \mathbf{L}\left(\nabla u + \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{k}_i\right) \cdot \mathbf{n}\, \mathrm{d}s - \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,i}} \varphi \mathbf{L}\left(\nabla u + \sum_{j\neq i} \mathbf{k}_j\right) \cdot \mathbf{n}\, \mathrm{d}s.$$

By requiring that $\delta I_\varepsilon(u)[\varphi] = 0$ for all $\varphi \in H^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)$, we obtain that (2.12) is satisfied. $\qquad\square$

The following two lemmas are slight adaptations of [6, Lemmas 4.2, 4.3], so we do not present the full proofs here. The key tool is an ε-independent Poincaré inequality for Ω_ε, [6, Proposition A.2].

Lemma 2.3. *Let $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ be fixed as in (2.1). Assume that $\mathbf{L}$ is positive definite. Then there exist positive constants c_1 and c_2, depending only on $\mathbf{L}$ and ε_0 (in particular, independent of ε), such that*

$$I_\varepsilon(u) \geqslant c_1 \|u\|_{H^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)}^2 - c_2 \|u\|_{H^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)}. \tag{2.14}$$

for all $u \in H^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)$ subject to the constraint

$$\int_{\Omega_{\varepsilon_0}} u(\mathbf{x})\, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} = 0. \tag{2.15}$$

Moreover, for every $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ the minimization problem (2.10) admits a unique solution $u_\varepsilon \in H^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)$ satisfying (2.15). Each u_ε satisfies

$$\|u\|_{H^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)} \leqslant M, \tag{2.16}$$

where $M > 0$ is a constant independent of ε.

Sketch of Proof. Since $\mathbf{L}$ is positive definite, we have

$$I_\varepsilon(u) \geqslant C \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} |\nabla u|^2\, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} - \sum_{i=1}^N \sup_{\mathbf{x}\in\partial\Omega} |\mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_i(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_i)| \int_{\partial\Omega} |u_\varepsilon|\, \mathrm{d}s - \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j\neq i} \sup_{\mathbf{x}\in\partial E_{\varepsilon,i}} |\mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_j(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_j)| \int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,i}} |u_\varepsilon|\, \mathrm{d}s$$

Adapting the proof of [6, Proposition A.2], for which (2.15) is crucial, we can find a constant $c_1 = c_1(\lambda, \varepsilon_0)$ such that

$$\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} |\nabla u|^2\, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} \geqslant c_1 \|u\|_{H^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)}^2. \tag{2.17}$$

Moreover, in [6] it is proved that there exist constants C_1, C_2 independent of ε such that

$$\int_{\partial\Omega} |u_\varepsilon|\, \mathrm{d}s \leqslant C_1 \|u_\varepsilon\|_{H^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)}, \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,i}} |u_\varepsilon|\, \mathrm{d}s \leqslant C_2 \|u_\varepsilon\|_{H^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)}. \tag{2.18}$$

From the definition of $\mathbf{k}_i(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_i)$ (see (2.5)), it is easy to see that there exist constants $c' = c'(\lambda, \varepsilon_0)$ and $c'' = c''(\lambda, \varepsilon_0)$ such that

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \partial\Omega} |\mathbf{Lk}_i(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_i)| < c', \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \partial E_{\varepsilon,i}} |\mathbf{Lk}_j(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_j)| < c'', \ i \neq j. \tag{2.19}$$

Estimates (2.17), (2.18), and (2.19) prove (2.14). The existence and uniqueness of the solution, and the bound (2.16) are straightforward conclusions from the convexity and coercivity of the functional I_ε and the fact that $I_\varepsilon(0) = 0$. $\qquad\square$

Remark 2.4. Lemma 2.2 guarantees the equivalence of the minimization problems (2.9) and (2.10), and Lemma 2.3 gives the existence of minimizers for (2.10), thus establishing the existence of minimizers for (2.9).

Lemma 2.5. *Assume that* $\mathbf{L}$ *is positive definite, and let* u_ε *be the unique solution to* (2.10) *that satisfies* (2.15). *Then, as* $\varepsilon \to 0$, *the sequence* $\{u_\varepsilon\}$ *converges strongly in* $H^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega \setminus \mathcal{Z})$ *to a solution* u_0 *of the problem*

$$\min\left\{ I_0(u) \ \Big| \ u \in H^1(\Omega), \int_{\Omega_{\varepsilon_0}} u(\mathbf{x}) \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} = 0 \right\}, \tag{2.20}$$

where

$$I_0(u) := \int_\Omega W(\nabla u)\, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} + \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\partial\Omega} u\, \mathbf{Lk}_i \cdot \mathbf{n}\, \mathrm{d}s.$$

Moreover, $I_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) \to I_0(u_0)$.

Sketch of Proof. One can extend u_ε to Ω and obtain an inequality $\|u_\varepsilon\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leqslant cM$, with M as in (2.16) [6, Prop. A.7], which leads to $\int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,i}} u_\varepsilon \mathbf{Lk}_k \cdot \mathbf{n}\, \mathrm{d}s \to 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$. Also, a subsequence (not relabeled) of $\{u_\varepsilon\}$ converges $u_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup u_0$ weakly in $H^1(\Omega)$. Now, if we fix $\delta \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ and consider $\varepsilon < \delta$, from (2.11) we have

$$I_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) \geqslant \int_{\Omega_\delta} W(\nabla u_\varepsilon) \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} + \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\partial\Omega} u_\varepsilon \mathbf{Lk}_i \cdot \mathbf{n}\, \mathrm{d}s - \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j\neq i} \int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,i}} u_\varepsilon \mathbf{Lk}_j \cdot \mathbf{n}\, \mathrm{d}s.$$

Taking $\varepsilon \to 0$ gives $\liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0} I_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) \geqslant \int_{\Omega_\delta} W(\nabla u_0)\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} + \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\partial\Omega} u_0 \mathbf{Lk}_i \cdot \mathbf{n}\, \mathrm{d}s$. Taking $\delta \to 0$ gives $\liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0} I_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) \geqslant I_0(u_0)$. But $I_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) \leqslant I_\varepsilon(u_0)$, so $\limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0} I_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) \leqslant I_0(u_0)$, and $I_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) \to I_0(u_0)$. Strong convergence of $u_\varepsilon \to u_0$ in $H^1(\Omega \setminus \mathcal{Z})$ follows from convergence of the energies, see [9]. $\quad\square$

Remark 2.6. The solutions u_0 to (2.20) are also solutions of the Neumann problem

$$\begin{cases} \mathrm{div}\,(\mathbf{L}\nabla u) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \mathbf{L}\left(\nabla u + \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{k}_i\right) \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{2.21}$$

9

and therefore u_0 can be represented in terms of a Green's function

$$u_0(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{z}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_N) = \int_{\partial\Omega} G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \mathbf{L} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbf{k}_i(\mathbf{y}; \mathbf{z}_i) \cdot \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{y}) \, \mathrm{d}s(\mathbf{y}), \qquad (2.22)$$

exhibiting the explicit dependence on the parameters $\mathbf{z}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_N$. The function $\nabla u_0(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{z}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_N)$ represents the elastic strain at the point $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$ due to the presence of $\partial\Omega$ and the dislocations at $\mathbf{z}_i$ with Burgers moduli b_i. For this reason, we refer to $\nabla u_0(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{z}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_N)$ as the boundary-response strain at $\mathbf{x}$ due to $\mathcal{Z}$.

Combining the results of Lemmas 2.2, 2.3, and 2.5, we conclude the following theorem, which characterizes the strain field associated to a system of dislocations.

Theorem 2.7. *Let $\mathcal{Z}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ be given, and let $\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^2$ be a bounded domain with Lipschitz boundary $\partial\Omega$. Then the minimization problem*

$$\min_{\mathbf{h} \in H_0^{\mathrm{curl}}(\Omega_\varepsilon, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{B})} \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} W(\mathbf{h}) \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}$$

admits a unique solution, $\mathbf{h}_\varepsilon$. Moreover, $\mathbf{h}_\varepsilon \to \mathbf{h}_0$ strongly in $L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega \setminus \mathcal{Z})$, where

$$\mathbf{h}_0(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbf{k}_i(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{z}_i) + \nabla u_0(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{z}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_N) \qquad (2.23)$$

is a solution of

$$\begin{cases} \mathrm{curl}\,\mathbf{h} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbf{b}_i \delta_{\mathbf{z}_i} \\ \mathrm{div}\,\mathbf{L}\mathbf{h} = 0 \end{cases} \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

in the sense of distributions, and u_0 is a minimizer of (2.20) *and solves the Neumann problem* (2.21).

2.2. **Alternative form of the fundamental singular strains.** In the isotropic case, $\lambda = 1$, it can be convenient to use polar coordinates (r_i, θ_i) centered at $\mathbf{z}_i$, rather than Cartesian coordinates. In the anisotropic case, when calculating integrals over the cores $E_{R,i}$, we find some calculations are simplified by using eccentric anomaly, τ_i, centered at $\mathbf{z}_i$, which is defined as

$$\tau_i := \arctan\left(\frac{\tan \theta_i}{\lambda}\right).$$

Using τ, the ellipse $\partial E_{R,i}$ is parametrized by the curve $\rho(\tau_i) = \mathbf{z}_i + (R \cos \tau_i, \lambda R \sin \tau_i)$, so

$$\mathbf{n} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda^2 \cos^2 \tau_i + \sin^2 \tau_i}} \begin{pmatrix} \lambda \cos \tau_i \\ \sin \tau_i \end{pmatrix}.$$

For any $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$, we can find $r > 0$ and τ_i such that $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{z}_i + (r \cos \tau_i, \lambda r \sin \tau_i)$. Substituting the form of $\mathbf{x}$ into (2.5) yields

$$\mathbf{k}_i(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{z}_i) = \frac{b_i}{2\pi\lambda r} \begin{pmatrix} -\lambda \sin \tau_i \\ \cos \tau_i \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.24}$$

3. The Renormalized Energy

Theorem 3.1. *Let $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ be as in (2.1) and let $\mathbf{h}_\varepsilon$ be a solution of (2.9). Then*

$$J_\varepsilon(\mathbf{h}_\varepsilon) = \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{h}_\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{L}\mathbf{h}_\varepsilon \, d\mathbf{x} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\mu\lambda b_i^2}{4\pi} \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + U(\mathbf{z}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_N) + O(\varepsilon), \tag{3.1}$$

where

$$U(\mathbf{z}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_N) := U_S(\mathbf{z}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_N) + U_I(\mathbf{z}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_N) + U_E(\mathbf{z}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_N) \tag{3.2}$$

and, using (2.23), for any $\varepsilon < R < \varepsilon_0$

$$U_S(\mathbf{z}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_N) := \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\mu\lambda b_i^2}{4\pi} \log R + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_{\Omega \setminus E_{R,i}} W(\mathbf{k}_i) \, d\mathbf{x}, \tag{3.3}$$

$$U_I(\mathbf{z}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_N) := \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{N} \int_\Omega \mathbf{k}_j \cdot \mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_i \, d\mathbf{x},$$

$$U_E(\mathbf{z}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_N) := \int_\Omega W(\nabla u_0) \, d\mathbf{x} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_{\partial\Omega} u_0 \mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_i \cdot \mathbf{n} \, ds. \tag{3.4}$$

Remark 3.2. We refer to the energy U in (3.2) as the *renormalized energy*. U_S is the "self" energy associated to the presence of a dislocation, U_I is the energy associated to the interaction between dislocations, and U_E is the energy associated to the elastic medium. Note that Theorem 3.1 asserts that the renormalized energy is independent of ε, and we will show that it can be written in terms of the limit shear $\mathbf{h}_0$ as in Theorem 2.7. This fact will be used in identifying the force on a dislocation in Section 4.

Proof. If we expand $J_\varepsilon(\mathbf{h}_\varepsilon)$ as in (2.13), we see that the three terms on the right side of (2.13) correspond to the terms U_S, U_I, U_E. We begin with $\sum_{i=1}^{N} J_\varepsilon(\mathbf{k}_i)$ and fix $R \in (\varepsilon, \varepsilon_0)$. Each term in this sum can be written as

$$J_\varepsilon(\mathbf{k}_i) = \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon \setminus E_{R,i}} W(\mathbf{k}_i) \, d\mathbf{x} + \int_{A_{i,R,\varepsilon}} W(\mathbf{k}_i) \, d\mathbf{x},$$

where $A_{i,R,\varepsilon} := E_{R,i} \setminus E_{\varepsilon,i}$. Using the representation for $\mathbf{k}_i$ in (2.24), we have

$$\int_{A_{i,R,\varepsilon}} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{k}_i \cdot \mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_i \, d\mathbf{x} = \frac{\mu\lambda b_i^2}{4\pi} \log\left(\frac{R}{\varepsilon}\right), \tag{3.5}$$

11

and this accounts for the $\log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$ term in the energy (3.1) and the $\log R$ term in (3.3).

To show that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{N} \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \mathbf{k}_j \cdot \mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_i \, d\mathbf{x} \longrightarrow \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{N} \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{k}_j \cdot \mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_i \, d\mathbf{x} \qquad \text{as} \quad \varepsilon \to 0, \tag{3.6}$$

we note that $\mathbf{k}_i$ is integrable in $E_{R,i}$ (it grows like r_i^{-1}) and $\mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_j$ is bounded on $E_{R,i}$ for $j \neq i$, hence (3.6) holds by Lebesgue Dominated Convergence Theorem. From Lemma 2.5, we have that $I_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) \to I_0(u_0)$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$, whence (3.4) follows.

To show that U is independent of R, we need only show that U_S is independent of R. If we take $R' \neq R$, without loss of generality we can assume $R' < R$, then by (3.5)

$$\int_{\Omega \setminus E_{R',i}} W(\mathbf{k}_i) \, d\mathbf{x} - \int_{\Omega \setminus E_{R,i}} W(\mathbf{k}_i) \, d\mathbf{x} = \int_{A_{i,R,R'}} W(\mathbf{k}_i) \, d\mathbf{x} = \frac{\mu \lambda b_i^2}{4\pi} \log \frac{R}{R'},$$

so that

$$\int_{\Omega \setminus E_{R',i}} W(\mathbf{k}_i) \, d\mathbf{x} + \frac{\mu \lambda b_i^2}{4\pi} \log R' = \int_{\Omega \setminus E_{R,i}} W(\mathbf{k}_i) \, d\mathbf{x} + \frac{\mu \lambda b_i^2}{4\pi} \log R,$$

which shows that (3.3) is independent of the choice of $R < \varepsilon_0$. $\qquad \square$

The renormalized energy U will blow up like the log of the distance between dislocations, i.e. $U \sim -\log |\mathbf{z}_i - \mathbf{z}_j|$. This is made precise in [4].

4. The Force on a Dislocation

In this section we determine the force $\mathbf{j}_i$ on the dislocation at $\mathbf{z}_i$ for a given a system of dislocations $\mathcal{Z}$ with Burgers vectors $\mathcal{B}$, and show that $\mathbf{j}_i = -\nabla_{\mathbf{z}_i} U$. Following [5], the Peach-Köhler force on the dislocation at $\mathbf{z}_i$ (also called the net configurational traction) is given by

$$\mathbf{j}_i := \lim_{R \to 0} \int_{\partial E_{R,i}} \mathbf{C}\mathbf{n} \, ds, \tag{4.1}$$

where the stress tensor is the Eshelby stress ([8, 12])

$$\mathbf{C} := W(\mathbf{h}_0)\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{h}_0 \otimes (\mathbf{L}\mathbf{h}_0). \tag{4.2}$$

Here $\mathbf{I}$ is the identity matrix and $\mathbf{h}_0$ is defined in (2.23).

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\mathbf{h}_0$ be the limiting singular strain defined by (2.23) and let U the associated renormalized energy given in (3.2). Then for $\ell \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$ and any $R \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$*

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{z}_\ell} U(\mathbf{z}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_N) = -\int_{\partial E_{R,\ell}} \{W(\mathbf{h}_0)\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{h}_0 \otimes (\mathbf{L}\mathbf{h}_0)\} \, \mathbf{n} \, ds, \tag{4.3}$$

12

and so the force on the dislocation at $\mathbf{z}_\ell$ is given by

$$\mathbf{j}_\ell = -\nabla_{\mathbf{z}_\ell} U. \tag{4.4}$$

Moreover,

$$\mathbf{j}_\ell(\mathbf{z}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_N) = b_\ell \mathbf{J} \mathbf{L} \left(\nabla u_0(\mathbf{z}_\ell; \mathbf{z}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_N) + \sum_{i \neq \ell} \mathbf{k}_i(\mathbf{z}_\ell; \mathbf{z}_i) \right), \quad \text{where} \quad \mathbf{J} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4.5}$$

and u_0 is the solution to (2.21).

Proof. Formula (4.3) is proved in the Appendix. From (4.3), we show (4.4) and (4.5) as follows. Recall that the renormalized energy is independent of $R < \varepsilon_0$ (see the proof of Theorem 3.1), so

$$-\nabla_{\mathbf{z}_\ell} U = \int_{\partial E_{R,\ell}} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s = \lim_{R \to 0} \int_{\partial E_{R,\ell}} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s = \mathbf{j}_\ell, \tag{4.6}$$

establishing (4.4) in view of (4.1).

The field $\mathbf{h}_0$ has a singularity at $\mathbf{z}_\ell$ which comes from the term $\mathbf{k}_\ell$ (see (2.23)), and we decompose $\mathbf{h}_0$ into the *singular part at $\mathbf{z}_\ell$* and the *regular part at $\mathbf{z}_\ell$*,

$$\mathbf{h}_0(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{k}_\ell(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{z}_\ell) + \widetilde{\mathbf{h}}(\mathbf{x}), \qquad \text{where} \quad \widetilde{\mathbf{h}}(\mathbf{x}) := \nabla u_0(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{i \neq \ell} \mathbf{k}_i(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{z}_i). \tag{4.7}$$

Using (4.7), we write the Eshelby stress $\mathbf{C}$ from (4.2) as

$$\mathbf{C} = \left(\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{k}_\ell \cdot \mathbf{L} \mathbf{k}_\ell + \mathbf{k}_\ell \cdot \mathbf{L} \widetilde{\mathbf{h}} + \frac{1}{2} \widetilde{\mathbf{h}} \cdot \mathbf{L} \widetilde{\mathbf{h}} \right) \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{k}_\ell \otimes (\mathbf{L} \mathbf{k}_\ell) - \mathbf{k}_\ell \otimes (\mathbf{L} \widetilde{\mathbf{h}}) - \widetilde{\mathbf{h}} \otimes (\mathbf{L} \mathbf{k}_\ell) - \widetilde{\mathbf{h}} \otimes (\mathbf{L} \widetilde{\mathbf{h}}).$$

Since $\widetilde{\mathbf{h}}$ is smooth and bounded on $\overline{E}_{R,\ell}$ we have

$$\lim_{R \to 0} \int_{\partial E_{R,\ell}} \left(\frac{1}{2} \widetilde{\mathbf{h}} \cdot \mathbf{L} \widetilde{\mathbf{h}} \right) \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{R \to 0} \int_{\partial E_{R,\ell}} \widetilde{\mathbf{h}} \otimes (\mathbf{L} \widetilde{\mathbf{h}}) \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s = 0.$$

Using the fact that $\mathbf{L} \mathbf{k}_\ell \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0$ on $\partial E_{R,\ell}$ (see (2.6c)) we have

$$\int_{\partial E_{R,\ell}} \widetilde{\mathbf{h}} \otimes (\mathbf{L} \mathbf{k}_\ell) \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\partial E_{R,\ell}} \mathbf{k}_\ell \otimes (\mathbf{L} \mathbf{k}_\ell) \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s = 0, \quad \forall R < \bar{R}.$$

Using (2.24) we have $\mathbf{k}_\ell \cdot \mathbf{L} \mathbf{k}_\ell = \mu b_\ell^2 / (4\pi^2 R^2)$ on $\partial E_{R,\ell}$, and so

$$\int_{\partial E_{R,\ell}} \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{k}_\ell \cdot \mathbf{L} \mathbf{k}_\ell) \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s = \frac{\mu b_\ell^2}{8\pi^2 R^2} \int_{\partial E_{R,\ell}} \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s = 0,$$

for all $R < \varepsilon_0$. Therefore the only contribution in (4.6) will come from

$$\left(\left(\mathbf{k}_\ell \cdot \mathbf{L} \widetilde{\mathbf{h}} \right) \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{k}_\ell \otimes (\mathbf{L} \widetilde{\mathbf{h}}) \right) \mathbf{n} = (\mathbf{n} \otimes \mathbf{k}_\ell) \mathbf{L} \widetilde{\mathbf{h}} - (\mathbf{k}_\ell \otimes \mathbf{n}) \mathbf{L} \widetilde{\mathbf{h}}.$$

13

Now, using (2.24), it is easy to see that

$$\mathbf{n} \otimes \mathbf{k}_\ell - \mathbf{k}_\ell \otimes \mathbf{n} = \frac{b_\ell}{2\pi \lambda R \sqrt{\lambda^2 \cos^2 \tau + \sin^2 \tau}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \lambda \\ -\lambda & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and, since $\mathrm{d}s = R \sqrt{\lambda^2 \cos^2 \tau + \sin^2 \tau} \, \mathrm{d}\tau$,

$$\int_{\partial E_{R,\ell}} (\mathbf{n} \otimes \mathbf{k}_\ell - \mathbf{k}_\ell \otimes \mathbf{n}) \, \mathbf{L} \widetilde{\mathbf{h}} \, \mathrm{d}s = \frac{b_\ell}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \mathbf{J} \mathbf{L} \widetilde{\mathbf{h}} \, \mathrm{d}\tau.$$

Since the integrand is smooth on $E_{R,\ell}$, we conclude that

$$\lim_{R \to 0} \int_{\partial E_{R,\ell}} (\mathbf{n} \otimes \mathbf{k}_\ell - \mathbf{k}_\ell \otimes \mathbf{n}) \, \mathbf{L} \widetilde{\mathbf{h}} \, \mathrm{d}s = \frac{b_\ell}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \mathbf{J} \mathbf{L} \widetilde{\mathbf{h}}(\mathbf{z}_\ell) \, \mathrm{d}\tau = b_\ell \mathbf{J} \mathbf{L} \widetilde{\mathbf{h}}(\mathbf{z}_\ell),$$

which, in view of (4.6), establishes (4.5). □

Remark 4.2. The formula (4.5) gives the force on the dislocation at $\mathbf{z}_\ell$, and it shows that, as a function of $\mathbf{z}_\ell$, the force $\mathbf{j}_\ell$ is smooth in the interior of $\Omega \setminus \{\mathbf{z}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_{\ell-1}, \mathbf{z}_{\ell+1}, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_N\}$. That is, provided $\mathbf{z}_\ell$ is not colliding with another dislocation or with $\partial \Omega$, then the force is given by a smooth function. Of course, $\mathbf{j}_\ell$ depends on the positions of *all* the dislocations, and the same reasoning applies to $\mathbf{j}_\ell$ as a function of any $\mathbf{z}_i$.

Remark 4.3. We find agreement between (4.5) and equation (8.18) from [5], where the force on $\mathbf{z}_\ell$ is given by b_ℓ times a $\pi/2$-rotation of the regular part of the strain at $\mathbf{z}_\ell$ (i.e., $\widetilde{\mathbf{h}}$). Since we have a formula for the regular part, we are able to write the Peach-Köhler force more explicitly (in terms of the solution to (2.21)). We have also shown that assumption (A3) from [5] holds for screw dislocations, validating the derivation of (8.18) in [5].

5. Appendix

We present the proof of (4.3) along with some necessary lemmas. We begin by noting that
$U(\mathbf{z}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_N) = \widehat{U}(\mathbf{z}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_N) + \overline{U}(\mathbf{z}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_N)$ where

$$\widehat{U}(\mathbf{z}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_N) = \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} W(\mathbf{h}_0)\, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x},$$

$$\overline{U}(\mathbf{z}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_N) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{m \neq i} \int_{E_{\varepsilon,m}} W(\mathbf{k}_i)\, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} + \sum_{m=1}^{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{N} \int_{E_{\varepsilon,m}} \mathbf{k}_j \cdot \mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_i\, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} +$$

$$+ \sum_{m=1}^{N} \int_{E_{\varepsilon,m}} W(\nabla u_0)\, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} + \sum_{m=1}^{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,m}} u_0 \mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_i \cdot \mathbf{n}\, \mathrm{d}s, \tag{5.1}$$

which follows from a direct calculation and integration by parts to eliminate the integral over $\partial\Omega$ from U_E.

We introduce the notation $D_\ell^{\mathbf{v}} u$ for the derivative of a function $u = u(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{z}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_N)$ with respect to the ℓ-th dislocation location in the direction $\mathbf{v}$,

$$D_\ell^{\mathbf{v}} u(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\xi} u(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{z}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_\ell + \xi\mathbf{v}, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_N)\Big|_{\xi=0}.$$

Lemma 5.1. *The fields $\mathbf{k}_i(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{z}_i)$, $u_0(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{z}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_N)$, and $\mathbf{h}_0(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{z}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_N)$ are smooth with respect to $\mathbf{z}_\ell$ for every $\ell \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$. Moreover, $D_\ell^{\mathbf{v}} \mathbf{k}_i(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ if $\ell \neq i$,*

$$D_\ell^{\mathbf{v}} \mathbf{k}_\ell(\mathbf{x}) = -D\mathbf{k}_\ell(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{v} = -\nabla(\mathbf{k}_\ell(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{v}) \tag{5.2}$$

$$D_\ell^{\mathbf{v}} \mathbf{h}_0(\mathbf{x}) = \nabla w(\mathbf{x}), \quad \text{where} \quad w(\mathbf{x}) = D_\ell^{\mathbf{v}} u_0(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{k}_\ell(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{v} \tag{5.3}$$

Proof. The form of $\mathbf{k}$ in (2.5) shows that $\mathbf{k}_i$ is smooth with respect to $\mathbf{z}_\ell$ for all $i, \ell = 1, \ldots, N$, and in particular that $\mathbf{k}_i(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{k}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{z}_i)$ is independent of $\mathbf{z}_\ell$ if $\ell \neq i$ so $D_\ell^{\mathbf{v}} \mathbf{k}_i = 0$. That form also shows that $\mathbf{k}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{z}_\ell + \xi\mathbf{v}) = \mathbf{k}(\mathbf{x} - \xi\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{z}_\ell) = \mathbf{k}_\ell(\mathbf{x} - \xi\mathbf{v})$ so that $D_\ell^{\mathbf{v}} \mathbf{k}_\ell(\mathbf{x}) = -(D\mathbf{k}_\ell)\mathbf{v}$, where $D\mathbf{k}_\ell$ is the derivative of $\mathbf{k}_\ell$ with respect to $\mathbf{x}$. Now because $\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{k}_\ell = 0$, we have $D\mathbf{k}_\ell(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{v} = \nabla(\mathbf{k}_\ell(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{v})$, which establishes (5.2).

Since u_0 solves the elliptic problem (2.21), it can be represented as in (2.22), in terms of the Green's function $G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$. The smoothness of u_0 in $\mathbf{z}_\ell$ follows from the smoothness of $\mathbf{k}_i$ for each $i, \ell = 1, \ldots, N$. Hence, $\mathbf{h}_0$ is smooth in $\mathbf{z}_\ell$ and $D_\ell^{\mathbf{v}} \mathbf{h}_0 = D_\ell^{\mathbf{v}} \nabla u_0 + D_\ell^{\mathbf{v}} \mathbf{k}_\ell = \nabla(D_\ell^{\mathbf{v}} u_0 - \mathbf{k}_\ell \cdot \mathbf{v})$, which establishes (5.3). $\square$

We will take derivatives of the energy with respect to the dislocations positions. This will involve integrals over cores that are centered at $\mathbf{z}_\ell + \xi\mathbf{v}$ whose integrands are evaluated on these shifted cores or on their complements in Ω. Thus, we will need to be able to take derivatives of integrals over sets that depend on ξ and whose integrands are functions that depend on ξ.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $f = f(\mathbf{x}, \xi)$, $g = g(\mathbf{x}, \xi)$, and $r = r(\mathbf{x}, \xi)$ be defined on $E_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}_0 + \xi\mathbf{v})$, $\partial E_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}_0 + \xi\mathbf{v})$, and $\Omega \setminus E_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}_0 + \xi\mathbf{v})$, respectively, for ξ a real parameter, $\varepsilon > 0$, $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Then*

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\xi} \int_{E_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}_0 + \xi\mathbf{v})} f(\mathbf{x}, \xi) \, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} \bigg|_{\xi=0} = \int_{E_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}_0)} D_\xi f(\mathbf{x}, 0) \, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}$$

$$= \int_{E_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}_0)} \partial_\xi f(\mathbf{x}, 0) \, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} + \int_{\partial E_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}_0)} f(\mathbf{x}, 0) \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s, \tag{5.4}$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\xi} \int_{\partial E_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}_0 + \xi\mathbf{v})} g(\mathbf{x}, \xi) \, \mathrm{d}s \bigg|_{\xi=0} = \int_{\partial E_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}_0)} D_\xi g(\mathbf{x}, 0) \, \mathrm{d}s, \tag{5.5}$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\xi} \int_{\Omega \setminus E_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}_0 + \xi\mathbf{v})} r(\mathbf{x}, \xi) \, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} \bigg|_{\xi=0} = \int_{\Omega \setminus E_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}_0)} \partial_\xi r(\mathbf{x}, 0) \, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} - \int_{\partial E_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}_0)} r(\mathbf{x}, 0) \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s, \tag{5.6}$$

where $D_\xi f := \partial_\xi f + \nabla f \cdot \mathbf{v}$.

Proof. We calculate

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\xi} \int_{E_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}_0 + \xi\mathbf{v})} f(\mathbf{x}, \xi) \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} = \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\xi} \int_{E_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}_0)} f(\mathbf{x} + \xi\mathbf{v}, \xi) \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} = \int_{E_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}_0)} (\partial_\xi f(\mathbf{x} + \xi\mathbf{v}, \xi) + \nabla f(\mathbf{x} + \xi\mathbf{v}, \xi) \cdot \mathbf{v}) \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}.$$

If we send $\xi \to 0$ and apply the divergence theorem we obtain (5.4). A similar calculation gives (5.5) but the divergence theorem is not applied. If $\hat{r}$ is a smooth extension of r to Ω then

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\xi} \int_{\Omega \setminus E_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}_0 + \xi\mathbf{v})} r(\mathbf{x}, \xi) \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} = \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\xi} \int_\Omega \hat{r}(\mathbf{x}, \xi) \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} - \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\xi} \int_{E_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}_0 + \xi\mathbf{v})} \hat{r}(\mathbf{x}, \xi) \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}$$

$$= \int_\Omega \partial_\xi \hat{r}(\mathbf{x}, \xi) \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} - \int_{E_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}_0)} \partial_\xi \hat{r}(\mathbf{x} + \xi\mathbf{v}, \xi) \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} - \int_{\partial E_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}_0)} \hat{r}(\mathbf{x} + \xi\mathbf{v}, \xi) \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s.$$

Setting $\xi = 0$ and combining the first two integrals on the right side yields (5.6). $\qquad\square$

Remark 5.3. Lemma 5.2 applies to the vector-valued $\mathbf{k}_i$. When applying Lemma 5.2 to integrals of $\mathbf{k}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{z}_\ell + \xi\mathbf{v})$ over $E_\varepsilon(\mathbf{z}_\ell + \xi\mathbf{v})$ we will get cancellations from

$$D_\xi \mathbf{k}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{z}_\ell + \xi\mathbf{v}) = \partial_\xi \mathbf{k}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{z}_\ell + \xi\mathbf{v}) + D\mathbf{k}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{z}_\ell + \xi\mathbf{v})\mathbf{v} = D_\ell^{\mathbf{v}} \mathbf{k}_\ell(\mathbf{x}) + D\mathbf{k}_\ell \mathbf{v} = 0. \tag{5.7}$$

The last equality follows from (5.2).

Proof of Equation (4.3). The $-\log\varepsilon$ term in the energy is independent of the positions of the dislocations so it vanishes upon taking the derivative of the energy with respect to $\mathbf{z}_\ell$. To calculate the derivative of U with respect to $\mathbf{z}_\ell$ will split $\nabla_{\mathbf{z}_\ell} U$ into $\nabla_{\mathbf{z}_\ell} \widehat{U} + \nabla_{\mathbf{z}_\ell} \overline{U}$. To calculate $\nabla_{\mathbf{z}_\ell} \widehat{U}$ we apply (5.6) to get

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{z}_\ell} \widehat{U} = D_\ell^{\mathbf{v}} \left(\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} W(\mathbf{h}_0) \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} \right) = \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} D_\ell^{\mathbf{v}} \mathbf{h}_0 \cdot \mathbf{L}\mathbf{h}_0 \, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} - \int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon, \ell}} W(\mathbf{h}_0) \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s \tag{5.8}$$

16

Using (5.3), $\mathrm{div}(\mathbf{Lh}_0) = 0$ in Ω, and $\mathbf{Lh}_0 \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, we have

$$\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} D_\ell^{\mathbf{v}} \mathbf{h}_0 \cdot \mathbf{Lh}_0 \, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} = \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \nabla(D_\ell^{\mathbf{v}} u_0 - \mathbf{k}_\ell \cdot \mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbf{Lh}_0 \, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} = \int_{\partial\Omega_\varepsilon} (D_\ell^{\mathbf{v}} u_0 - \mathbf{k}_\ell \cdot \mathbf{v})\mathbf{Lh}_0 \cdot \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s$$

$$= -\sum_{j=1}^{N} \int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,j}} (D_\ell^{\mathbf{v}} u_0 - \mathbf{k}_\ell \cdot \mathbf{v})\mathbf{Lh}_0 \cdot \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s = -\sum_{j=1}^{N} \int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,j}} w\mathbf{Lh}_0 \cdot \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s \tag{5.9}$$

using the notation $w = D_\ell^{\mathbf{v}} u_0 - \mathbf{k}_\ell \cdot \mathbf{v}$ from (5.3). Combining (5.8) and (5.9), and adding and subtracting $\mathbf{h}_0 \otimes (\mathbf{Lh}_0)\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{v}$ from the integrand, we have

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{z}_\ell} \widehat{U} = -\sum_{j=1}^{N} \int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,j}} (D_\ell^{\mathbf{v}} u_0 - \mathbf{k}_\ell \cdot \mathbf{v})\mathbf{Lh}_0 \cdot \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s - \int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,\ell}} W(\mathbf{h}_0)\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s$$

$$= -\int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,\ell}} \{W(\mathbf{h}_0)\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{h}_0 \otimes (\mathbf{Lh}_0)\} \, \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{v} \, \mathrm{d}s - \sum_{j\neq\ell} \int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,j}} (D_\ell^{\mathbf{v}} u_0 - \mathbf{k}_\ell \cdot \mathbf{v})\mathbf{Lh}_0 \cdot \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s +$$

$$-\int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,\ell}} [(D_\ell^{\mathbf{v}} u_0 - \mathbf{k}_\ell \cdot \mathbf{v})\mathbf{Lh}_0 \cdot \mathbf{n} + \mathbf{h}_0 \otimes (\mathbf{Lh}_0)\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{v}] \, \mathrm{d}s;$$

also, $\mathbf{h}_0 \otimes (\mathbf{Lh}_0)\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{v} = (\mathbf{h}_0 \cdot \mathbf{v})(\mathbf{Lh}_0 \cdot \mathbf{n}) = (\nabla u_0 \cdot \mathbf{v} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbf{k}_i \cdot \mathbf{v})(\mathbf{Lh}_0 \cdot \mathbf{n})$, so

$$(D_\ell^{\mathbf{v}} u_0 - \mathbf{k}_\ell \cdot \mathbf{v})\mathbf{Lh}_0 \cdot \mathbf{n} + \mathbf{h}_0 \otimes (\mathbf{Lh}_0)\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{v} = \left(D_\ell^{\mathbf{v}} u_0 - \mathbf{k}_\ell \cdot \mathbf{v} + \nabla u_0 \cdot \mathbf{v} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbf{k}_i \cdot \mathbf{v} \right) \mathbf{Lh}_0 \cdot \mathbf{n}$$

$$= \left(D_\xi u_0 + \sum_{i\neq\ell} \mathbf{k}_i \cdot \mathbf{v} \right) \mathbf{Lh}_0 \cdot \mathbf{n}$$

where $D_\xi u_0 = D_\ell^{\mathbf{v}} u_0 + \nabla u_0 \cdot \mathbf{v}$. Hence,

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{z}_\ell} \widehat{U} = -\int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,\ell}} \{W(\mathbf{h}_0)\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{h}_0 \otimes (\mathbf{Lh}_0)\} \, \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{v} \, \mathrm{d}s$$

$$-\sum_{j\neq\ell} \int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,j}} (D_\ell^{\mathbf{v}} u_0 - \mathbf{k}_\ell \cdot \mathbf{v})\mathbf{Lh}_0 \cdot \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s - \int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,\ell}} \left(D_\xi u_0 + \sum_{i\neq\ell} \mathbf{k}_i \cdot \mathbf{v} \right) \mathbf{Lh}_0 \cdot \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s \tag{5.10}$$

We calculate $\nabla_{\mathbf{z}_\ell} \overline{U}$ in several steps. We split the first sum in the right side of (5.1) into the integral over $E_{\varepsilon,\ell}$ and the rest of the terms

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{m\neq i} \int_{E_{\varepsilon,m}} W(\mathbf{k}_i)\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} = \int_{E_{\varepsilon,\ell}} \sum_{m\neq\ell} W(\mathbf{k}_m)\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} + \sum_{m\neq\ell} \int_{E_{\varepsilon,m}} \sum_{i\neq m} W(\mathbf{k}_i)\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}. \tag{5.11}$$

17

In the first of these, each $\mathbf{k}_m$ does not vary as $\mathbf{z}_\ell \to \mathbf{z}_\ell + \xi\mathbf{v}$ because $m \neq \ell$. Hence we apply (5.4) directly with $D_\xi \mathbf{k}_m = \partial_\xi \mathbf{k}_m + D_\ell^\mathbf{v} \mathbf{k}_m = \nabla(\mathbf{k}_m \cdot \mathbf{v})$ because $\partial_\xi \mathbf{k}_m = 0$. We have

$$
\begin{aligned}
D_\ell^\mathbf{v}\left(\sum_{m \neq \ell} \int_{E_{\varepsilon,\ell}} W(\mathbf{k}_m)\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}\right) &= \sum_{m \neq \ell} \int_{E_{\varepsilon,\ell}} D_\xi \mathbf{k}_m \cdot \mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_m\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} = \sum_{m \neq \ell} \int_{E_{\varepsilon,\ell}} \nabla(\mathbf{k}_m \cdot \mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_m\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} \\
&= \int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,\ell}} \sum_{m \neq \ell} (\mathbf{k}_m \cdot \mathbf{v})\mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_m \cdot \mathbf{n}\,\mathrm{d}s,
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.12}
$$

where we used $\mathrm{div}(\mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_m) = 0$.

The second term from (5.11) involves integrals over $E_{\varepsilon,m}$ for $m \neq \ell$, so these domains do not move as $\mathbf{z}_\ell \to \mathbf{z}_\ell + \xi\mathbf{v}$. Also, the terms $W(\mathbf{k}_i)$ for $i \neq \ell$ vanish when we apply $D_\ell^\mathbf{v}$, so

$$
\begin{aligned}
D_\ell^\mathbf{v}\left(\sum_{m \neq \ell} \int_{E_{\varepsilon,m}} \sum_{i \neq m} W(\mathbf{k}_i)\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}\right) &= \sum_{m \neq \ell} \int_{E_{\varepsilon,m}} D_\ell^\mathbf{v}\mathbf{k}_\ell \cdot \mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_\ell\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} = \sum_{m \neq \ell} \int_{E_{\varepsilon,m}} -\nabla(\mathbf{k}_\ell \cdot \mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_\ell\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} \\
&= -\sum_{m \neq \ell} \int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,m}} (\mathbf{k}_\ell \cdot \mathbf{v})\mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_\ell \cdot \mathbf{n}\,\mathrm{d}s,
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.13}
$$

where we used (5.2) and $\mathrm{div}(\mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_\ell) = 0$.

The second sum from (5.1) is split into the integral over $E_{\varepsilon,\ell}$ and the rest of the terms

$$
\sum_{m=1}^{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{N} \int_{E_{\varepsilon,m}} \mathbf{k}_j \cdot \mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_i\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} = \int_{E_{\varepsilon,\ell}} \sum_{i<j} \mathbf{k}_j \cdot \mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_i\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} + \sum_{m \neq \ell} \int_{E_{\varepsilon,m}} \sum_{i<j} \mathbf{k}_j \cdot \mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_i\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}.
\tag{5.14}
$$

Applying (5.4) to the first term on the right side yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
D_\ell^\mathbf{v}\left(\int_{E_{\varepsilon,\ell}} \sum_{i<j} \mathbf{k}_j \cdot \mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_i\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}\right) &= \int_{E_{\varepsilon,\ell}} \sum_{i<j} D_\xi \mathbf{k}_j \cdot \mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_i + D_\xi \mathbf{k}_i \cdot \mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_j\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} \\
&= \int_{E_{\varepsilon,\ell}} \sum_{i,j \neq \ell, i<j} \nabla(\mathbf{k}_j \cdot \mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_i + \nabla(\mathbf{k}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_j\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} \\
&= \sum_{i \neq \ell} \sum_{j \neq i} \int_{E_{\varepsilon,\ell}} \nabla(\mathbf{k}_j \cdot \mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_i\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} = \sum_{i \neq \ell} \sum_{j \neq i} \int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,\ell}} (\mathbf{k}_j \cdot \mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_i \cdot \mathbf{n}\,\mathrm{d}s
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.15}
$$

Between the first and second lines we used $D_\xi \mathbf{k}_i = \nabla(\mathbf{k}_i \cdot \mathbf{v})$ for $i \neq \ell$ and $D_\xi \mathbf{k}_\ell = 0$ by (5.7), and in the third line we used $\mathrm{div}(\mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_i) = 0$.

18

For the second sum of (5.14), using (5.2) from Lemma 5.1, we have

$$D_\ell^{\mathbf{v}} \left(\sum_{m \neq \ell} \int_{E_{\varepsilon,m}} \sum_{i<j} \mathbf{k}_j \cdot \mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_i \, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} \right) = \sum_{m \neq \ell} \sum_{i \neq \ell} \int_{E_{\varepsilon,m}} D_\ell^{\mathbf{v}} \mathbf{k}_\ell \cdot \mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_i \, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} = -\sum_{m \neq \ell} \sum_{i \neq \ell} \int_{E_{\varepsilon,m}} \nabla(\mathbf{k}_\ell \cdot \mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_i \, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}$$

$$= -\sum_{m \neq \ell} \sum_{i \neq \ell} \int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,m}} (\mathbf{k}_\ell \cdot \mathbf{v}) \mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_i \cdot \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s$$

$$(5.16)$$

The third term comprising $\overline{U}$ in (5.1) is split as

$$\sum_{m=1}^N \int_{E_{\varepsilon,m}} W(\nabla u_0) \, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} = \int_{E_{\varepsilon,\ell}} W(\nabla u_0) \, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} + \sum_{m \neq \ell} \int_{E_{\varepsilon,m}} W(\nabla u_0) \, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}. \qquad (5.17)$$

To calculate the derivative of the first term on the right side of (5.17), we use (5.4), but integrate the D_ξ term by parts directly. Using $D_\xi u_0 = D_\ell^{\mathbf{v}} u_0 + \nabla u_0 \cdot \mathbf{v}$ and $\mathrm{div}(\mathbf{L}\nabla u_0) = 0$ we have

$$D_\ell^{\mathbf{v}} \left(\int_{E_{\varepsilon,\ell}} W(\nabla u_0) \, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} \right) = \int_{E_{\varepsilon,\ell}} \nabla(D_\xi u_0) \mathbf{L}\nabla u_0 \, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} = \int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,\ell}} (D_\xi u_0) \mathbf{L}\nabla u_0 \cdot \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s$$

$$= \int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,\ell}} (D_\ell^{\mathbf{v}} u_0 + \nabla u_0 \cdot \mathbf{v}) \mathbf{L}\nabla u_0 \cdot \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s.$$

$$(5.18)$$

Calculating the derivative of the second term on the right side of (5.17) is almost the same as in (5.18) except the domains $E_{\varepsilon,m}$ do not depend on $\mathbf{z}_\ell$ because $m \neq \ell$. Hence

$$D_\ell^{\mathbf{v}} \left(\sum_{m \neq \ell} \int_{E_{\varepsilon,m}} W(\nabla u_0) \, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} \right) = \sum_{m \neq \ell} \int_{E_{\varepsilon,m}} \nabla(D_\ell^{\mathbf{v}} u_0) \cdot \mathbf{L}\nabla u_0 \, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} = \sum_{m \neq \ell} \int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,m}} D_\ell^{\mathbf{v}} u_0 \cdot \mathbf{L}\nabla u_0 \cdot \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s.$$

$$(5.19)$$

Turning to the the final term in (5.1), which we split as

$$\sum_{m=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,m}} u_0 \mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_i \cdot \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s = \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,\ell}} u_0 \mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_i \cdot \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s + \sum_{m \neq \ell} \int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,m}} \sum_{i=1}^N u_0 \mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_i \cdot \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s, \qquad (5.20)$$

we calculate the derivative of the first term using (5.5) to get

$$D_\ell^{\mathbf{v}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,\ell}} u_0 \mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_i \cdot \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s \right) = \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,\ell}} (D_\xi u_0) \mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_i \cdot \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s + \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,\ell}} u_0 \mathbf{L}(D_\xi \mathbf{k}_i) \cdot \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s. \quad (5.21)$$

19

From (5.7) we have $D_\xi \mathbf{k}_\ell = 0$ and from (5.2) we have $D_\xi \mathbf{k}_i = \nabla(\mathbf{k}_i \cdot \mathbf{v})$ for $i \neq \ell$. Hence, for $i \neq \ell$ we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,\ell}} u_0 \mathbf{L}(D_\xi \mathbf{k}_i) \cdot \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s &= \int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,\ell}} u_0 \mathbf{L} \nabla(\mathbf{k}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s = \int_{E_{\varepsilon,\ell}} \mathrm{div}\,(u_0 \mathbf{L} \nabla(\mathbf{k}_i \cdot \mathbf{v})) \, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} \\
&= \int_{E_{\varepsilon,\ell}} \nabla u_0 \cdot \mathbf{L} \nabla(\mathbf{k}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}) \, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} + \int_{E_{\varepsilon,\ell}} u_0 \, \mathrm{div}\,(\mathbf{L} \nabla(\mathbf{k}_i \cdot \mathbf{v})) \, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} \qquad (5.22) \\
&= \int_{E_{\varepsilon,\ell}} \nabla(\mathbf{k}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbf{L} \nabla u_0 \, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} = \int_{E_{\varepsilon,\ell}} (\mathbf{k}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbf{L} \nabla u_0 \cdot \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s.
\end{aligned}
$$

We used $\mathrm{div}\,(\mathbf{L} \nabla(\mathbf{k}_i \cdot \mathbf{v})) = (\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla)(\mathrm{div}(\mathbf{L} \mathbf{k}_i)) = 0$, which follows from $\mathrm{curl}\, \mathbf{k}_i = 0$ and $\mathrm{div}(\mathbf{L} \mathbf{k}_i) = 0$. Combining (5.21) and (5.22) we get

$$
D_\ell^\mathbf{v} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,\ell}} u_0 \mathbf{L} \mathbf{k}_i \cdot \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s \right) = \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,\ell}} (D_\xi u_0) \mathbf{L} \mathbf{k}_i \cdot \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s + \sum_{i \neq \ell} \int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,\ell}} (\mathbf{k}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}) \mathbf{L} \nabla u_0 \cdot \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s \quad (5.23)
$$

Finally, the derivative of the second term in (5.20) is calculated similarly to the first, but is simpler because the domains of integration are independent of $\mathbf{z}_\ell$. Hence,

$$
D_\ell^\mathbf{v} \left(\sum_{m \neq \ell} \int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,m}} \sum_{i=1}^N u_0 \mathbf{L} \mathbf{k}_i \cdot \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s \right) = \sum_{m \neq \ell} \int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,m}} u_0 \mathbf{L}(D_\ell^\mathbf{v} \mathbf{k}_\ell) \cdot \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s + \sum_{m \neq \ell} \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,m}} (D_\ell^\mathbf{v} u_0) \mathbf{L} \mathbf{k}_i \cdot \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s
$$

$$(5.24)$$

because $D_\ell^\mathbf{v} \mathbf{k}_i = 0$ when $i \neq \ell$. Using $\mathrm{div}\,(\mathbf{L} \nabla(\mathbf{k}_i \cdot \mathbf{v})) = 0$, as we did to get (5.22), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,m}} u_0 \mathbf{L}(D_\ell^\mathbf{v} \mathbf{k}_\ell) \cdot \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s &= -\int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,m}} u_0 \mathbf{L} \nabla(\mathbf{k}_\ell \cdot \mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s = -\int_{E_{\varepsilon,m}} \mathrm{div}(u_0 \mathbf{L} \nabla(\mathbf{k}_\ell \cdot \mathbf{v})) \, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} \\
&= -\int_{E_{\varepsilon,m}} \nabla u_0 \mathbf{L} \nabla(\mathbf{k}_\ell \cdot \mathbf{v}) \, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} = -\int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,m}} (\mathbf{k}_\ell \cdot \mathbf{v}) \mathbf{L} \nabla u_0 \cdot \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s
\end{aligned}
$$

$$(5.25)$$

Then (5.24) and (5.25) give

$$
D_\ell^\mathbf{v} \left(\sum_{m=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,m}} u_0 \mathbf{L} \mathbf{k}_i \cdot \mathbf{n} \, \mathrm{d}s \right) = \sum_{m \neq \ell} \int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,m}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N D_\ell^\mathbf{v} u_0 \cdot \mathbf{L} \mathbf{k}_i \cdot \mathbf{n} - (\mathbf{k}_\ell \cdot \mathbf{v}) \mathbf{L} \nabla u_0 \cdot \mathbf{n} \right) \mathrm{d}s
$$

$$(5.26)$$

20

Combining (5.12), (5.15), (5.18), and (5.23) we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,\ell}} & \left\{ \sum_{i\neq\ell}(\mathbf{k}_i\cdot\mathbf{v})\mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_i\cdot\mathbf{n} + \sum_{i\neq\ell}\sum_{j\neq i}(\mathbf{k}_j\cdot\mathbf{v})\cdot\mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_i\cdot\mathbf{n} + \right. \\
& \left. + (D_\xi u_0)\mathbf{L}\nabla u_0\cdot\mathbf{n} + \sum_{i=1}^{N}(D_\xi u_0)\mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_i\cdot\mathbf{n} + \sum_{i\neq\ell}(\mathbf{k}_i\cdot\mathbf{v})\mathbf{L}\nabla u_0\cdot\mathbf{n} \right\}\mathrm{d}s \\
& = \int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,\ell}}\left\{\sum_{i\neq\ell}(\mathbf{k}_i\cdot\mathbf{v})\left(\mathbf{L}\nabla u_0+\sum_{j=1}^{N}\mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_j\right)+D_\xi u_0\left(\mathbf{L}\nabla u_0+\sum_{j=1}^{N}\mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_j\right)\right\}\cdot\mathbf{n}\,\mathrm{d}s \\
& = \int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,\ell}}\left(D_\xi u_0+\sum_{i\neq\ell}\mathbf{k}_i\cdot\mathbf{v}\right)\mathbf{L}\mathbf{h}_0\cdot\mathbf{n}\,\mathrm{d}s
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.27}
$$

Combining (5.13), (5.16), (5.19), and (5.26) we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{m\neq\ell}\int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,m}} & \left\{ -(\mathbf{k}_\ell\cdot\mathbf{v})\mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_\ell - \sum_{i\neq\ell}(\mathbf{k}_\ell\cdot\mathbf{v})\mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_i + D_\ell^{\mathbf{v}} u_0\cdot\mathbf{L}\nabla u_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{N}D_\ell^{\mathbf{v}}u_0\cdot\mathbf{L}\mathbf{k}_i - (\mathbf{k}_\ell\cdot\mathbf{v})\mathbf{L}\nabla u_0 \right\}\cdot\mathbf{n}\,\mathrm{d}s \\
& = \sum_{m\neq\ell}\int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,m}}\left(D_\ell^{\mathbf{v}}u_0-\mathbf{k}_\ell\cdot\mathbf{v}\right)\mathbf{L}\mathbf{h}_0\cdot\mathbf{n}\,\mathrm{d}s.
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.28}
$$

Thus, (5.10), (5.27), and (5.28) together give

$$
D_{\mathbf{z}_\ell}U(\mathbf{v}) = \nabla_{\mathbf{z}_\ell}U\cdot\mathbf{v} = \left(\nabla_{\mathbf{z}_\ell}\widehat{U}+\nabla_{\mathbf{z}_\ell}\overline{U}\right)\cdot\mathbf{v} = -\int_{\partial E_{\varepsilon,\ell}}\left\{W(\mathbf{h}_0)\mathbf{I}-\mathbf{h}_0\otimes(\mathbf{L}\mathbf{h}_0)\right\}\mathbf{n}\,\mathrm{d}s\cdot\mathbf{v},
$$

which establishes (4.3). $\qquad\square$

References

[1] R. Alicandro and M. Ponsiglione. Ginzburg–Landau functionals and renormalized energy: A revised Γ-convergence approach. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 266(8):4890–4907, 2014.

[2] F. Bethuel, H. Brezis, and F. Hélein. Tourbillons de Ginzburg-Landau et énergie renormalisée. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 317(2):165–171, 1993.

[3] F. Bethuel, H. Brezis, and F. Hélein. *Ginzburg-Landau vortices*. Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications, 13. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1994.

[4] T. Blass, I. Fonseca, G. Leoni, and M. Morandotti. Dynamics for systems of screw dislocations. In preparation, 2014.

[5] P. Cermelli and M. E. Gurtin. The motion of screw dislocations in crystalline materials undergoing antiplane shear: glide, cross-slip, fine cross-slip. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 148(1):3–52, 1999.

[6] P. Cermelli and G. Leoni. Renormalized energy and forces on dislocations. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 37(4):1131–1160 (electronic), 2005.

[7] L. De Luca, A. Garroni, and M. Ponsiglione. Γ-convergence analysis of systems of edge dislocations: the self energy regime. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 206(3):885–910, 2012.

[8] J. D. Eshelby. The force on an elastic singularity. *Philos. Trans. Roy. Soc. London. Ser. A.*, 244:84–112, 1951.

[9] Lawrence C. Evans. *Weak convergence methods for nonlinear partial differential equations*, volume 74 of *CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics*. Published for the Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, Washington, DC; by the American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1990.

[10] A. Garroni, G. Leoni, and M. Ponsiglione. Gradient theory for plasticity via homogenization of discrete dislocations. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 12(5):1231–1266, 2010.

[11] M. G. D. Geers, R. H. J. Peerlings, M. A. Peletier, and L. Scardia. Asymptotic behaviour of a pile-up of infinite walls of edge dislocations. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 209(2):495–539, 2013.

[12] M. E. Gurtin. The nature of configurational forces. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 131(1):67–100, 1995.

[13] F. R. N. Nabarro. *Theory of crystal dislocations*. International series of monographs on physics. Clarendon P., 1967.

[14] E. Sandier and S. Serfaty. Limiting vorticities for the Ginzburg-Landau equations. *Duke Math. J.*, 117(3):403–446, 2003.

[15] E. B. Tadmor, M. Ortiz, and R. Phillips. Quasicontinuum analysis of defects in solids. *Philosophocal Magazine A- Physics of Condensed Matter Structure Defects and Mechanical Properties*, 73(6):1529–1563, JUN 1996.

[16] B. Van Koten, X. Helen Li, M. Luskin, and C. Ortner. A computational and theoretical investigation of the accuracy of quasicontinuum methods. In *Numerical analysis of multiscale problems*, volume 83 of *Lect. Notes Comput. Sci. Eng.*, pages 67–96. Springer, Heidelberg, 2012.

University of California, Riverside, Department of Mathematics, 900 University Ave. Riverside, CA 92521, USA

E-mail address, T. Blass: `timothy.blass@ucr.edu`

SISSA - International School for Advanced Studies, Via Bonomea, 265, 34136 Trieste, Italy

E-mail address, M. Morandotti (✉): `marco.morandotti@sissa.it`