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ABSTRACT. In this paper we consider a mass optimization problem in the case of scalar state function, where instead of imposing a constraint on the total mass of the competitors, we penalize the classical compliance by a convex functional defined on the space of measures. We obtain a characterization of optimal solutions to the problem through a suitable PDE. This generalizes the case considered in the literature of a linear cost and applies to the optimization of a conductor where very low and very high conductivities have both a high cost, and then the study of nonlinear models becomes relevant.

1. Introduction

A kind of optimization problem that plays a central role in many questions in Applied Mathematics is the so-called mass optimization problem. A version of such a problem, in the scalar case, provides a mathematical framework for the study of stationary heat conduction models, for instance in finding optimal mixtures of two conductors (see for example [25]). It has been studied in the celebrated paper [7] and reads as follows: let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded Lipschitz domain, whose closure represents a given design region, and let a signed measure $f \in M(\Omega)$ with finite total variation represent a given heat source density.

The energy associated to some distribution $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\overline{\Omega})$ of conducting material is given by:

$$
E_f(\mu) := \inf \left\{ \int \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{2} \, d\mu - \langle f, u \rangle : u \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega) \right\},
$$

(1.1)

where $\mathcal{D}(\Omega)$ is the class of smooth functions compactly supported in $\Omega$. The optimization problem one wants to consider is that of finding a distribution $\mu$, of a given total amount $m > 0$ of material, which provides the minimal compliance $\mathcal{J}_f(\mu)$, defined as $\mathcal{J}_f(\mu) := -E_f(\mu)$. Namely:

$$
\min \left\{ \mathcal{J}_f(\mu) : \mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\overline{\Omega}), \mu(\Omega) = m \right\}. 
$$

(MOP)

The term “scalar case” associated to this problem is related to the fact that the competitors $u \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega)$ in the minimization problem (1.1) take values in $\mathbb{R}$, and represent the temperature profiles. In [7], the characterization of the optimal masses for (MOP) is shown to be related to the Monge-Kantorovich PDE:

$$
-\text{div}_\mu (\nabla u) = f, \quad |\nabla u| = 1 \, \mu\text{-a.e.,} \quad u \in \text{LIP}_{0,1}(\Omega).
$$

(PDE)

In the above equation the notation $\nabla u$ stands for the $\mu$-tangential gradient of $u$, introduced in [8]; we recall its precise definition in Subsection 2.3, while the notion of $\mu$-divergence $\text{div}_\mu$ is recalled in Subsection 4.1; for the definition of the space $\text{LIP}_{0,1}(\Omega)$ see (2.8). Let us mention at this point that, as it is evident from the above PDE, the study and the characterization of the solutions to the
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problem (MOP) rely on the notion of Sobolev functions with respect to an arbitrary measure \( \mu \) on \( \mathbb{R}^n \). Such a notion has been introduced for the first time in [8], and has been followed up to now by the new results concerning Sobolev and BV theory in this framework [3, 10, 16, 22, 30], as well as the applications in mass optimization problems (see [9]), in homogenization theory (see [18]), or in optimal transport (see [21]), just to name a few.

For the forthcoming discussion, let us set

\[
\Pi_f := \inf \left\{ - \langle f, u \rangle : u \in \text{LIP}_{0,1}(\Omega) \right\}.
\]

It is proven in [7] that (MOP) admits a solution whenever \( f \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \) and the following fact holds:

\[
\mu \text{ solves (MOP) and } u \text{ solves } \Pi_f \iff (\mu, u) \text{ satisfy (PDE). (1.2)}
\]

The theory has been then extended to more general settings, some of which are listed below.

- Problem (MOP) has been considered also in the framework of Riemannian manifolds (see [27]).
- The optimizer \( \mu \) has been characterized via (PDE) also in the vectorial case (the term “vectorial” indicating that the competitors \( u \) in (1.1) take values in \( \mathbb{R}^n \)), where also the Dirichlet regions (namely, the closed subsets of \( \Omega \) on which the Dirichlet boundary conditions may be imposed) has been taken into consideration (see [7]).
- Mass optimization problems in the vectorial case has been used in structural mechanics in order to find a distribution of a given amount of an elastic material which, for a given system of loads, gives the best resistance in terms of minimal compliance (see for instance [1]).
- In [11] a kind of mass optimization problem involving an arbitrary linear operator \( A \) defined on the space of smooth functions \( \mathcal{D}(\Omega) \) instead of the gradient operator has been considered, together with the applications to the elasticity theory of thin plates.
- In [4], instead of looking for the optimal mass distributions \( \mu \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \), the problem of looking for an optimal conductivity tensor \( \sigma \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}_{\text{sym}}) \) has been addressed.
- Integrands more general than \( | \cdot |^2 \) have been considered in the definition of \( \mathcal{E}_f \), satisfying a suitable \( p \)-growth conditions with \( p > 1 \) (see [7]).
- Without any intent of being complete, we mention also some other recent contributions to the topic, in which different variants, motivated by some precise applications, have been considered (see [5], [20]).

In this paper we provide a generalization of problem (MOP) in the scalar case, in a new and different direction with respect to the above mentioned papers in the literature. Namely, instead of imposing a constraint on the total mass for the competitors in (MOP), we look at the functional \(-\mathcal{E}_f\) penalized by a convex functional \( C \) defined on the space of measures. This corresponds to rephrase the constraint in terms of Lagrangian multipliers (for a related discussion see [29]). More precisely, let \( C : \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \to [0, +\infty] \) be a cost functional defined as

\[
C(\mu) := \int_{\Omega} c(\mu_a(x)) \, dx + c^{\infty}(1) \mu_s(\Omega), \quad \text{for every } \mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega),
\]

where \( \mu_a \) and \( \mu_s \) are respectively the absolute continuous part and the singular part of \( \mu \) with respect to the Lebesgue measure. The function \( c : \mathbb{R} \to [0, +\infty] \) above is referred to as a (homogeneous) cost function; it is assumed to be proper, convex, lower semicontinuous, and to satisfy the following properties:

\[
c(t) \geq \beta t \text{ with } \beta > 0, \quad c(0) = 0, \quad c(t) = +\infty \text{ for all } t < 0.
\]
We thus consider the following minimization problem, to which we refer to as a mass optimization problem with convex cost:

\[
\min \left\{ -E_f(\mu) + C(\mu) : \mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega) \right\}.
\] (MOP\textsubscript{c})

Roughly speaking, by adding the penalization term given by the functional \(C\) we are taking into account the cost to select conducting properties of the material and not only its total amount.

For the sake of generality all the results contained in the paper are obtained in the case of heterogeneous cost functions \(c = c(x,t)\), which may depend also on the spatial variable \(x \in \Omega\) (see Subsection 3.1 for a deeper insight on results and relative hypotheses). In the following we prefer to present the results in the homogeneous case, that is of particular interest and allows a simpler presentation.

Under the above hypotheses on the cost function \(c\), the functional \(C\) turns out to be convex and lower semicontinuous with respect to the \(w^*-\)topology on \(\mathcal{M}(\Omega)\). Thus, whenever the distribution \(f\) is such that the domain of the functional \(\mu \mapsto -E_f(\mu) + C(\mu)\) is non-empty, we obtain, by means of Direct Methods in the Calculus of Variations, the existence result for (MOP\textsubscript{c}) in Subsection 3.2, Theorem 3.3.

Further, in order to provide a characterization of the optimizers for (MOP\textsubscript{c}), we have to study the following quantity (which, in a sense, plays a role of the quantity \(\Pi_f\) in the problem (MOP)):

\[
\Pi_{f,c} := \inf_{u \in W^{1,2}_0(\Omega)} \int_\Omega c^* \left( \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{2} \right) \, dx + \chi_{C_\infty} \left( \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{2} \right) - \langle f, u \rangle,
\]

where

\[
C_\infty := \{ g \in L^1(\Omega) : g \leq c^\infty(1) \ L^n \text{-a.e.} \}.
\]

The notation \(c^*\) above stands for the conjugate function of the cost function \(c\) (cf. Subsection 2.2), while by \(c^\infty\) we denote its associated recession function (cf. Subsection 2.1). In particular, in the case \(c(t) = t/2\) for \(t \geq 0\) and \(+\infty\) otherwise, we have that the quantity \(\Pi_{f,c}\) above coincides with \(\Pi_f\) and the conditions obtained in Theorem 1.1 case (L) below coincide with the Monge-Kantorovich PDE in [7].

We state here our main theorem (in the particular case of homogeneous cost). It is convenient to distinguish two cases: the first one called linear case, or briefly (L), concerning cost functions \(c\) such that \(c^\infty(1) < +\infty\) (i.e. that have a linear growth at infinity), and the second one called superlinear case, or briefly (SL), concerning cost functions \(c\) such that \(c^\infty(1) = +\infty\).

**Theorem 1.1** (Optimality conditions in the homogeneous case). Assume that \(\Omega\) is a bounded Lipschitz domain and that \(c\) is a homogeneous cost function.

- In the linear case (L), for every \(f \in \mathcal{M}(\overline{\Omega})\) the following conditions are equivalent:
(i) \( (\bar{\mu}, \bar{u}) \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega) \times \text{LIP}_{0,c}(\Omega) \) satisfies the system of equations

\[
\begin{align*}
1) & \quad - \text{div}_\mu(\nabla \bar{u}) = f \text{ in } \mathcal{D}'(\Omega), \\
2) & \quad \frac{|\nabla \bar{u}(x)|^2}{2} \in \partial c(\bar{\mu}_a(x)) \text{ for } \mathcal{L}^n\text{-a.e. } x \in \{y \in \Omega : \bar{\mu}_a(y) > 0\}, \\
3) & \quad \frac{|\nabla \bar{\mu}|^2}{2} = c^\infty(1) \text{ holds } \bar{\mu}_a \text{-a.e. in } \Omega, \\
4) & \quad \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{2} \leq c^\infty(1) \text{ holds } \mathcal{L}^n\text{-a.e.}, \\
5) & \quad \bar{\mu}(\partial \Omega) = 0;
\end{align*}
\]

(1.3)

(ii) \( \bar{\mu} \) is a solution of problem \( \text{MOP}_{c} \) and \( \bar{u} \) is a solution to problem \( \Pi_{f,c} \).

- In the superlinear case (SL), for every \( f \in (W^{1,2}_0(\Omega))' \) the following conditions are equivalent:

  (i) The triple \( (\bar{\mu}, \bar{\sigma}, \bar{u}) \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n) \times W^{1,2}_0(\Omega) \) satisfies the conditions

  \[
  \begin{align*}
  1) & \quad \bar{\mu} = \bar{\mu}_a \mathcal{L}^n \text{ with } \bar{\mu}_a \in L^1(\Omega); \\
  2) & \quad - \text{div}_\bar{\mu}(\bar{\sigma}) = f \text{ in } \mathcal{D}'(\Omega); \\
  3) & \quad \int_\Omega \frac{|\bar{\sigma}(x)|^2}{2} \bar{\mu}_a(x) \, dx = \int_\Omega c^* \left( \frac{|\nabla \bar{u}(x)|^2}{2} \right) \, dx + \int_\Omega \bar{c}(\bar{\mu}_a(x)) \, dx; \\
  4) & \quad \text{for any sequence } (u_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{D}(\Omega) \text{ such that } u_i \rightharpoonup \bar{u} \text{ weakly in } W^{1,2}_0(\Omega) \text{ and}
  \int_\Omega c^* \left( \frac{|\nabla u_i|^2}{2} \right) \, dx = \lim_{i \to +\infty} \int_\Omega c^* \left( \frac{|\nabla u_i|^2}{2} \right) \, dx,
  \\
  \text{we have, up to a subsequence, that } \nabla u_i \rightharpoonup \bar{\sigma} \text{ weakly in } L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n), \text{ as } i \to +\infty. \\
  \end{align*}
\]

(1.4)

(ii) \( \bar{\mu} \) is a solution of problem \( \text{MOP}_{c} \), \( \bar{\sigma} \) solves the dual problem associated to \( \mathcal{E}_{f,c}(\bar{\mu}) \) via a standard duality arguments (see Subsection 4.1), and \( \bar{u} \) is a solution to the problem \( \Pi_{f,c} \).

A couple of comments about the case (SL) are in order. First, note that, even if the optimal measure \( \bar{\mu} \) is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure, the \( \bar{\mu} \)-divergence operator and the vector field \( \bar{\sigma} \) might not have, in general, a more concrete representation. This has to do with the fact that the dimension of tangent fibers associated to measure \( \bar{\mu} \) could be less than \( n \) (see for instance [21]). Second, the presence of the condition 4) is needed in order to provide a relation between the function \( \bar{u} \in W^{1,2}_0(\Omega) \) and a measure \( \bar{\mu} \). The counterpart of this feature in the case (L) is the fact that \( \bar{u} \) belongs to the space \( \text{LIP}_{0,c}(\Omega) \), and thus admits a tangential gradient with respect to any measure \( \mu \). Therefore, \( \bar{\sigma} \) in the case (L) is nothing but \( \nabla \mu \bar{u} \). Note, however, that in the case in which the cost function \( c \) is of the form \( c = | \cdot |^p \), \( p > 1 \), the vector field \( \bar{\sigma} \) coincides \( \bar{\mu} \)-a.e. with \( \nabla \bar{u} \) (cf. Example 6.1).

We conclude this Introduction by briefly describing the strategy used for proving Theorem 1.1, which is a particular case of Theorem 5.1, Theorem 5.2 and Lemma 5.3 obtained in Section 5 for more general cost functions \( c \) also depending on the space variable \( x \). A preliminary result one needs to show, in order to obtain the optimality conditions, is that any optimal measure \( \mu \) for the problem \( \text{MOP}_{c} \) satisfies

\[
\mathcal{E}_f(\mu) - C(\mu) = \Pi_{f,c}.
\]
The above equality is a consequence of the results obtained in Subsection 3.2 and Section 4. Firstly, in Theorem 3.3 we show that our problem can be seen as a min/max type problem and in this way, by using the result in [12] giving the possibility to exchange min and max, we get in Lemma 4.3 and Remark 4.4 that the inequality $E_f(\mu) - C(\mu) \leq \Pi_{f,c}'$, always holds true, with $\Pi_{f,c}'$ being defined as in $\Pi_{f,c}$ but with the infimum taken among the elements of $\mathcal{D}(\Omega)$. In the homogeneous case, the equality $\Pi_{f,c} = \Pi_{f,c}'$ holds true, due to Lemma 4.10. In the general case, this might be false (and has to do with the so-called Lavrentiev phenomenon, see Remark 4.9) and thus it becomes a hypotheses in Theorem 5.1 and Theorem 5.2. The inequality $E_f(\mu) - C(\mu) \geq \Pi_{f,c}$ is a consequence of $\Gamma$-convergence results obtained in Section 4, see Lemma 4.5 and Lemma 4.7.

In the last section of this paper (Section 6) we provide some examples and discuss possible variants of the problem.

2. Preliminaries

Throughout the paper we shall (mainly) use the following notation: the space of all finite real-valued Borel measures on $\mathbb{R}^n$ will be denoted by $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, while $\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^n)$ stands for the set of all non-negative $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Given any compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, we set

$$\mathcal{M}(K) := \{\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^n) : \text{supp}(\mu) \subset K\},$$

$$\mathcal{M}^+(K) := \{\mu \in \mathcal{M}(K) : \mu \text{ non-negative}\}.$$ 

Given any $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $p \in [1, +\infty)$, we denote by $L^p_\mu(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$ the space of $p$-integrable maps from $\Omega$ into $\mathbb{R}^n$; in the case of real valued functions we simply write $L^p_\mu(\Omega)$. We denote by $\mathcal{L}^n$ the $n$-dimensional Lebesgue measure in $\mathbb{R}^n$. In the case of $\mu = \mathcal{L}^n$ we omit the subscript $\mu$ in the notation and we simply write $L^p(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$. In the integration of functions, we use equivalently the notations $\int_{\Omega} u(x) \, d\mathcal{L}^n(x)$ and $\int_{\Omega} u(x) \, dx$.

The space of smooth functions with compact support in $\Omega$ is denoted by $\mathcal{D}(\Omega)$. The notation $\mathcal{D}(\Omega)$ stands for the space of distributions on $\Omega$, while we denote by $\mathcal{D}'(\Omega)$ the subset of $\mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R}^n)$ of distributions whose support is contained in $\Omega$. The space of continuous functions on a compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is denoted by $\mathcal{C}(K)$, while $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ stands for the maximum norm.

2.1. Convex functionals on the space of measures. In this subsection we recall some terminology and results regarding the lower semicontinuity of convex functionals defined on the space of measures.

Let $(X, \mathcal{B}(X), \mathfrak{m})$ be a Borel space, with $X$ a separable, locally compact metric space, $\mathcal{B}(X)$ a Borel $\sigma$-algebra on $X$ and $\mathfrak{m}$ a non-negative, non-atomic and finite measure on $X$. A function $\varphi : X \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ is said to be an integrand if it is Borel measurable. An integrand $\varphi$ is said to be normal if $\varphi(x, \cdot)$ is lower semicontinuous for $\mathfrak{m}$-a.e. $x \in X$, while it is said to be convex if $\varphi(x, \cdot)$ is convex for $\mathfrak{m}$-a.e. $x \in X$.

Given a convex function $g : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$, we define the recession function $g^\infty : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ of $g$ as

$$g^\infty(t) = \lim_{s \to +\infty} \frac{g(t_0 + st)}{s}, \quad \text{for every } t \in \mathbb{R},$$

(2.1)

where $t_0$ is an arbitrary point in $\text{Dom}(g) \neq \emptyset$ (for the definition of proper function and its domain see Subsection 2.2 below). The following properties of the recession function $g^\infty$ can be easily deduced:

1) $g^\infty$ is positively one-homogeneous, i.e. $g^\infty(\lambda t) = \lambda g^\infty(t)$ for every $\lambda > 0$ and all $t \in \mathbb{R}$;
2) if \( g(0) = 0 \) then \( g(t) \leq g^\infty(t) \) for all \( t \in \mathbb{R} \).

Below, we use the notation \( \mathcal{M}(X) \) for the space of all real-valued measures with finite variation on \( X \), while \( \mathcal{C}_0(X) \) stands for the space of continuous functions vanishing on the boundary: namely, those continuous function \( g: X \to \mathbb{R} \) such that for every \( \varepsilon > 0 \) there exists \( K_\varepsilon \subseteq X \) compact for which \( |g(x)| < \varepsilon \) holds everywhere on \( X \setminus K_\varepsilon \). We shall denote by \( \| \cdot \|_{TV} \) the total variation norm on the space \( \mathcal{M}(X) \). The space \( \mathcal{M}(X) \) can be also characterized as the dual of the Banach space \( (\mathcal{C}_0(X), \| \cdot \|_\infty) \), where the duality pairing between \( \mu \in \mathcal{M}(X) \) and \( g \in \mathcal{C}_0(X) \) is given by

\[
\langle \mu, g \rangle := \int g \, d\mu.
\]

We shall often consider the weak*-topology on \( \mathcal{M}(X) \); recall that a sequence \( (\mu_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{M}(X) \) weakly*-converges to \( \mu \in \mathcal{M}(X) \) if for every \( g \in \mathcal{C}_0(X) \) it holds that

\[
\int g \, d\mu_i \to \int g \, d\mu \quad \text{as} \quad i \to +\infty.
\]

Let us also recall that for any \( \mu \in \mathcal{M}(X) \) there exists a unique 1-integrable (with respect to \( m \)) function \( \mu_\alpha \in L^1_m(X) \) and a unique measure \( \mu_\sigma \in \mathcal{M}(X) \) singular with respect to \( m \), such that

\[
\mu = \mu_\alpha m + \mu_\sigma. \tag{2.2}
\]

In what follows our interest is in the convex functional \( \Phi: \mathcal{M}(X) \to [0, +\infty] \) given by

\[
\Phi(\mu) := \int \varphi(x, \mu_\alpha(x)) \, d\mu_\alpha(x) + \int \varphi^\infty(x, \cdot) \left( \frac{d\mu_\sigma}{d|m_\sigma|}(x) \right) \, d|m_\sigma|(x), \quad \text{for every} \ \mu \in \mathcal{M}(X), \tag{2.3}
\]

where \( \varphi: X \times \mathbb{R} \to [0, +\infty] \) is a normal convex integrand and \( \varphi^\infty(x, \cdot) := (\varphi(x, \cdot))^\infty \) for every \( x \in X \). In the particular case when \( \varphi \) is independent of the variable \( x \), the functional \( \Phi \) is nothing but the lower semicontinuous envelope of its restriction to the space \( L^1_m(X) \), which provides its weak* lower semicontinuity (see [2]). This is not always the case when we deal with an \( x \)-dependent integrand \( \varphi \); see for instance [2], [14], [6] and [26] for the integral representation of the lower semicontinuous envelope \( \tilde{\Phi} \) of the functional \( \Phi|_{L^1_m} \) as well as for some sufficient conditions granting the equality \( \Phi = \tilde{\Phi} \).

Nevertheless, motivated by the \( x \)-independent case, we shall concentrate directly on the functional \( \Phi \) and the conditions on \( \varphi \) which ensure its lower semicontinuity. We recall the following result from [17] (see also [13]).

**Theorem 2.1.** Let \( (X, \mathcal{B}(X), m) \) be a Borel space and let \( \varphi: X \times \mathbb{R} \to [0, +\infty] \) be a convex integrand. If \( \varphi \) is lower semicontinuous on \( X \times \mathbb{R} \), then the convex functional \( \Phi: \mathcal{M}(X) \to [0, +\infty] \) given by (2.3) is lower semicontinuous in the weak*-topology of \( \mathcal{M}(X) \).

### 2.2. Conjugate functions.

Let \( V \) be a normed vector space and denote by \( V^* \) its topological dual. In what follows, we consider \( V \) and \( V^* \) endowed with weak and weak* topology, respectively, which make them Hausdorff locally convex topological spaces. We denote by \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \) bilinear pairing between \( V \) and \( V^* \). Given a function \( F: V \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\} \), we set

\[
\text{Dom}(F) := \{ v \in V : F(v) < +\infty \},
\]

and call it the effective domain of \( F \). A function \( F \) is said to be proper if \( \text{Dom}(F) \neq \emptyset \). Given a proper function \( F \), the Fenchel conjugate (or briefly, conjugate) of \( F \) is the function \( F^*: V^* \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\} \)
\[ F^*(v^*) := \sup_{v \in V} \{ \langle v, v^* \rangle - F(v) \} = \sup_{v \in \text{Dom}(F)} \{ \langle v, v^* \rangle - F(v) \}, \text{ for every } v^* \in V^*. \]  

We list below some useful properties of conjugate functions: fix any \( F, G : V \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{ +\infty \} \). Then we have

1) \( F^* \) is convex and lower semicontinuous with respect to the weak* topology on \( V^* \);
2) if \( F \leq G \) then \( F^* \geq G^* \);
3) for every \((v, v^*) \in V \times V^* \) it holds that
\[
\langle v, v^* \rangle \leq F(v) + F^*(v^*).
\]

The subdifferential of \( F \) at \( v \) is defined as
\[
\partial F(v) := \{ v^* \in V^* : \langle v, v^* \rangle = F(v) + F^*(v^*) \}.
\]

**Theorem 2.2** ([15, Chapter IX, Proposition 1.2 and Proposition 2.1]). Let \( A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \) be an open bounded set and let \( \varphi : A \times \mathbb{R} \to [0, +\infty] \) be a normal convex integrand. Then the function \( \varphi^* : A \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \) defined as
\[
\varphi^*(x, t) := \sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}} s \cdot t - \varphi(x, s) \quad \text{for all } (x, t) \in A \times \mathbb{R}
\]
is a normal convex integrand as well. Moreover, if we define the functional \( \Phi : L^1(A) \to [0, +\infty] \) as
\[
\Phi(g) := \int_A \varphi(x, g(x)) \, d\mathcal{L}^n(x), \quad \text{for every } g \in L^1(A)
\]
and assume that there exists \( g_0 \in L^\infty(A) \) such that \( \Phi(g_0) < +\infty \), then we have
\[
\Phi^*(h) = \int_A \varphi^*(x, h(x)) \, d\mathcal{L}^n(x), \quad \text{for every } h \in L^\infty(A).
\]

We recall here a result from min/max theory that is useful for our purposes (for its proof see, for instance, [28] or [12]).

**Theorem 2.3.** Let \( V, W \) be two topological vector spaces, let \( K \subseteq V \) be a compact and convex set, and let \( C \subseteq W \) be a convex set. Suppose that the function \( L : K \times C \to \mathbb{R} \) satisfies

a) for each \( v \in K \), the function \( L(v, \cdot) : V \to \mathbb{R} \) is convex,

b) for each \( w \in C \), the function \( L(\cdot, w) : W \to \mathbb{R} \) is upper semicontinuous and concave.

Then we have that
\[
\sup_{v \in K} \inf_{w \in C} L(v, w) = \inf_{w \in C} \sup_{v \in K} L(v, w).
\]

**2.3. Sobolev spaces with respect to a measure.** Let us consider a bounded open set \( \Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \) and a measure \( \mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\bar{\Omega}) \). In this subsection we recall the notion of Sobolev space \( W^{1,2}_{0,\mu}(\Omega) \), following the approaches in [8] and [30], which turn out to be equivalent (see [22]). We first fix some terminology: given a function \( u \in L^2_{\mu}(\Omega) \) we say that a vector field \( w \in L^2_{\mu}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n) \) is a \( \mu \)-gradient of \( u \) if there exists a sequence \( (u_i)_i \subseteq \mathcal{D}(\Omega) \) such that
\[
u_i \to u \text{ strongly in } L^2_{\mu}(\Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla u_i \to w \text{ strongly in } L^2_{\mu}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n).
\]

We denote the set of all \( \mu \)-gradients of \( u \) by \( G_{\mu}(u) \) and define
\[
W^{1,2}_{0,\mu}(\Omega) := \{ u \in L^2_{\mu}(\Omega) : G_{\mu}(u) \neq \emptyset \}.
\]
It is not difficult to check that the set $G_{\mu}(u)$ is a closed and convex subset of $L^2_\mu(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$, thus it admits the element of minimal $L^2$-norm, denoted by $\nabla_{\mu} u$. The space $W^{1,2}_{0,\mu}(\Omega)$ is a Banach space, when endowed with the norm

$$\|u\|_{W^{1,2}_{0,\mu}} := \|u\|_{L^2_\mu(\Omega)} + \|\nabla_{\mu} u\|_{L^2_\mu(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)}.$$ 

Notice that, thanks to Mazur’s theorem, we could equivalently require the weak convergence of gradients in (2.7) instead of the strong one. Also, when $\mu = \mathcal{L}^n|_{\Omega}$, due to the closability of the norm $\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)}$ on $\mathcal{D}(\Omega)$, the above definition reduces to the standard definition of the space of Sobolev functions on $\Omega$ with ‘zero boundary values’. We shall thus in this case use the standard notation $W^{1,2}_{0}(\Omega)$ and the $L^n$-gradient will be denoted by $\nabla u$ (this will not cause any ambiguity with the same notation of the strong gradient of smooth functions).

Given any positive constant $M > 0$, we set

$$\text{LIP}_{0,M}(\Omega) := \text{cl}_{\mathcal{C}(\Omega)} \{u \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega) : \|\nabla u\|_\infty \leq M\}. \quad (2.8)$$

We have that $\text{LIP}_{0,M}(\Omega) \subseteq W^{1,2}_{0}(\Omega)$ for every measure $\mu$. Note also that every $u \in \text{LIP}_{0,M}(\Omega)$ is locally Lipschitz function with respect to the Euclidean distance. We recall that (see for instance [19], [22]) for every (locally) Lipschitz function $u \in W^{1,2}_{0}(\Omega)$, we have

$$|\nabla_{\mu} u| \leq \text{lip}(u) \quad \mu\text{-a.e. in } \Omega, \quad (2.9)$$

where

$$\text{lip}(u) := \limsup_{y \to x \atop y \neq x} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|}{|x - y|},$$

for all accumulation points $x$, and 0 otherwise. In particular, for every locally Lipschitz function $u \in W^{1,2}_{0}(\Omega)$ it holds that $|\nabla u| = \text{lip}(u) \mathcal{L}^n$-a.e. in $\Omega$.

**Remark 2.4.** For clarity, let us remark that, whenever $\Omega$ has a Lipschitz boundary, then $\text{LIP}_{0,M}(\Omega)$ consist of (globally) Lipschitz functions with respect to the Euclidean distance (but non-necessarily $M$-Lipschitz). The elements of $\text{LIP}_{0,M}(\Omega)$ are $M$-Lipschitz with respect to the geodesic distance on $\Omega$; for more details we refer the reader to [7].

### 3. Mass optimization problem with convex cost

#### 3.1. Introduction to the problem.

From now on, we fix a bounded domain (i.e. open, bounded and connected set) $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ with Lipschitz boundary, whose closure $\overline{\Omega}$ represents a given design region. Given $f \in \mathcal{D}'(\Omega)$, representing a heat source density, the total energy of the system associated with a distribution of a given conductor $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)$ and a smooth temperature profile $u \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega)$ is given by the quantity

$$\mathcal{F}_f(\mu, u) := \frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla u|^2 \, d\mu - \langle f, u \rangle. \quad (3.1)$$

We consider the energy functional $\mathcal{E}_f : \mathcal{M}(\overline{\Omega}) \to \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$\mathcal{E}_f(\mu) := \begin{cases} \inf \{ \mathcal{F}_f(\mu, u) : u \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega) \}, & \text{for } \mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\overline{\Omega}), \\ -\infty, & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

Namely, the quantity $\mathcal{E}_f(\mu)$ will be considered as the energy associated with the distribution $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\overline{\Omega})$ of a given conductor.
We are interested in finding the best distribution of a given conductor, in order to achieve the minimal compliance, under the presence of a convex penalization term (that we shall also refer to as convex cost). More precisely, we define the cost functional \( C : \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \to [0, +\infty] \)

\[
C(\mu) := \int_\Omega c(x, \mu_a(x)) \, dx + \int c^\infty \left( x, \frac{d\mu_s}{|d\mu_s|} \right) \, d|\mu_s|(x), \quad \text{for every } \mu \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega),
\]

where the (heterogeneous) cost function \( c : \overline{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R} \to [0, +\infty] \) is a convex integrand (in the Borel space \( (\Omega, \mathcal{B}(\Omega), \mathcal{L}^n) \)), satisfying the following assumptions.

(P1) It holds that

\[
c(x, 0) = 0, \quad \text{for all } x \in \overline{\Omega}
\]

\[
c(x, t) \geq t, \quad \text{for all } x \in \overline{\Omega} \text{ and all } t \geq 0,
\]

\[
c(x, t) = +\infty, \quad \text{for all } x \in \overline{\Omega} \text{ and all } t < 0.
\]

(P2) There exists \( a_0 \in L^\infty(\Omega) \) and \( \lambda_0 > 0 \) such that

\[
a_0(x) \geq \lambda_0 \text{ for } \mathcal{L}^n\text{-a.e. } x \in \Omega \quad \text{and} \quad c(\cdot, a_0(\cdot)) \in L^1(\Omega).
\]

(P3) \( c \) is lower semicontinuous on \( \overline{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R} \).

Any cost functions \( c \) that is \( x \)-independent and satisfies the above hypotheses will be called homogeneous cost function.

Remark 3.1. Notice that any \( x \)-independent, non-negative normal convex integrand fulfilling (P1) satisfies also the other two hypotheses above and is an example of homogeneous cost function which motivates our investigation (cf. Introduction). In light of this, in the general \( x \)-dependent case, (P1) and (P3) are needed for the existence result for our mass optimization problem: (P1) is giving us compactness property, while (P3) provides us with the lower semicontinuity of the functional \( C \) (with respect to the \( w^* \)-topology on \( \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \)), due to Theorem 2.1. The property (P2) plays a role in the derivation of optimality conditions, where a \( \Gamma \)-convergence argument will be required.

Having fixed a cost function \( c \) as above, and having fixed any distribution \( f \in \mathcal{D}'(\Omega) \), we define the functional \( J_{c,f} : \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \to [0, +\infty] \) by

\[
J_{c,f}(\mu) := -E_f(\mu) + C(\mu), \quad \text{for every } \mu \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega).
\]

Notice that, depending on the cost function \( c \), for some heat sources \( f \) it might happen that \( J_{c,f} \equiv +\infty \). In order to avoid these degenerate cases, we define the set of \( c \)-admissible sources

\[
\text{Adm}_c := \{ f \in \mathcal{D}'(\Omega) : \text{Dom}(J_{c,f}) \neq \emptyset \}.
\]

Remark 3.2. It is not difficult to see that, due to the property (P2) of the cost function \( c \), it holds that \( (W_0^{1,2}(\Omega))' \subseteq \text{Adm}_c \). In the case in which \( c \) has the property \( \sup_{x \in \Omega} c^\infty(x,1) < +\infty \) (that we shall refer to as the linear (or briefly, (L)) case), we will show in Section 4 that \( \mathcal{M}(\overline{\Omega}) \subseteq \text{Adm}_c \). See also Remark 4.11.

Thus, given a cost function \( c \) as above and given \( f \in \text{Adm}_c \), our aim is to study the following minimization problem:

\[
\inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\overline{\Omega})} J_{c,f}(\mu),
\]
3.2. The existence of minimizers.

**Theorem 3.3.** Let \( f \in \text{Adm}_c \). Then, the set
\[
\mathcal{M}_{\text{opt}} := \{ \mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega) : \mathcal{J}_{c,f}(\mu) = \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)} \mathcal{J}_{c,f}(\mu) \}
\]
is nonempty. Moreover, there exists \( k > 0 \) such that for every \( \mu \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{opt}} \) and every \( k \geq k \) we have
\[
\inf_{u \in \mathcal{G}(\Omega)} F_f(\mu, u) - C(\mu) = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{G}(\Omega)} \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{K}_k^+} F_f(\mu, u) - C(\mu)
\]
where we set
\[
\mathcal{K}_k^+ := \{ \mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega) : \mu(\Omega) \leq k \}, \quad \text{for every } k \in \mathbb{N}.
\]

**Proof.** The functional \(-E_f\) is convex and \( w^*\)-lower semicontinuous, being the supremum of the linear and \( w^*\)-continuous functionals \(-F_f(\cdot, u)\), with \( u \in \mathcal{G}(\Omega)\). By Theorem 2.1, we also have that the convex functional \( C \) is \( w^*\)-lower semicontinuous. Thus the functional \( \mathcal{J}_{c,f} = -E_f + C \) is convex and \( w^*\)-lower semicontinuous. Further, due to the growth condition of the cost function \( c \) (see (3.4)), we have
\[
C(\mu) \geq \mu(\Omega), \quad \text{for all } \mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega).
\]
This, together with the fact that \( f \in \text{Adm}_c \), implies that there exists \( k > 0 \) such that
\[
\emptyset \neq \{ \mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega) : \mathcal{J}_{c,f}(\mu) \leq k \} \subseteq \mathcal{K}_k^+.
\]
Being the set \( \mathcal{K}_k^+ \) \( w^*\)-compact, the set \( \{ \mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega) : \mathcal{J}_{c,f}(\mu) \leq k \} \) (which is \( w^*\)-closed due to the \( w^*\)-lower semicontinuity of \( \mathcal{J}_{c,f} \)) is \( w^*\)-compact as well. By the direct method of the Calculus of Variations, we conclude that \( \mathcal{M}_{\text{opt}} \neq \emptyset \).

In order to show (3.9), we observe that for any \( k \geq k \) the set \( \mathcal{K}_k^+ \) is nonempty, and
\[
\inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)} \mathcal{J}_{c,f}(\mu) = \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{K}_k^+} \mathcal{J}_{c,f}(\mu).
\]
For any \( k \geq k \) our minimization problem (3.7) can be written as a min/max-type problem in the following way:
\[
\inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{K}_k^+} \mathcal{J}_{c,f}(\mu) = \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{K}_k^+} \left( -\inf_{u \in \mathcal{G}(\Omega)} F_f(\mu, u) + C(\mu) \right) = -\sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{K}_k^+} \inf_{u \in \mathcal{G}(\Omega)} F_f(\mu, u) - C(\mu).
\]
Thus, by applying Theorem 2.3 with the compact convex set \( K = \mathcal{K}_k^+ \subseteq \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \), the convex set \( C = \mathcal{G}(\Omega) \), and the function \( L: K \times C \to \mathbb{R} \) given by \( L(\mu, u) := F_f(\mu, u) - C(\mu) \), we obtain
\[
\sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{K}_k^+} \inf_{u \in \mathcal{G}(\Omega)} F_f(\mu, u) - C(\mu) = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{G}(\Omega)} \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{K}_k^+} F_f(\mu, u) - C(\mu).
\]
Putting together (3.10), (3.11) and (3.12), we have that (3.9) holds, concluding the proof. \( \square \)
4. Relaxation of the minimization problems

In this section we aim to provide relaxed (and dual) versions of the minimization problems appearing in the left-hand and the right-hand side of (3.9). For the sake of brevity, we shall introduce some notation. Let $f \in \mathcal{D}'(\Omega)$. For any $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)$ we set

$$I_\mu := \inf_{u \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega)} \mathcal{F}_f(\mu, u) - \mathcal{C}(\mu).$$

Given any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we set

$$II_{f,c} := \inf_{u \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega)} \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{K}_k^+(\Omega)} \mathcal{F}_f(\mu, u) - \mathcal{C}(\mu),$$

where the set $\mathcal{K}_k^+(\Omega)$ is defined as in the statement of the Theorem 3.3.

4.1. The minimization problem $I_\mu$. Fix any $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)$. Let us first observe that, by standard duality arguments (see [15] for the general theory and [7], [11] for the applications in mass optimization problems), we have

$$I_\mu = \sup \left\{ - \int \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \, d\mu : \sigma \in L^2_\mu(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n), \, -\text{div}_\mu(\sigma) = f \text{ in } \mathcal{D}'(\Omega) \right\} - \mathcal{C}(\mu). \tag{4.1}$$

In the above formula, the notation $\text{div}_\mu(\sigma)$ stands for the distributional $\mu$-divergence of a vector field $\sigma$. Namely, $\text{div}_\mu(\sigma) \in \mathcal{D}'(\Omega)$ is defined by

$$\langle \text{div}_\mu(\sigma), u \rangle = -\int \sigma \cdot \nabla u \, d\mu, \quad \text{for every } u \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega).$$

Recall that, whenever $f \in \text{Adm}_c$ and $\mu \in \text{Dom}(\mathcal{J}_{f,c})$, we have that $I_\mu$ is finite and consequently the supremum in (4.1) is achieved. Let us also observe that every $f \in \text{Adm}_c$ admits a (unique) linear and continuous extension $\hat{f}$ to the Banach space

$$S^2_{0,\mu}(\Omega) := \text{cl}L^2_\mu(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n) \{ \nabla u : u \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega) \}$$

endowed with the norm $\| \cdot \|_{L^2_\mu(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)}$ and $\mu \in \text{Dom}(\mathcal{J}_{f,c})$. The extension $\hat{f}$ has the property $\hat{f}[\nabla u] = \langle f, u \rangle$, for every $u \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega)$. Thus, a standard relaxation argument gives

$$I_\mu = \inf_{w \in S^2_{0,\mu}(\Omega)} \int \frac{|w|^2}{2} \, d\mu - \hat{f}[w] - \mathcal{C}(\mu). \tag{4.2}$$

4.2. The minimization problem $II_{f,c}$. We start by setting some auxiliary notation and results, in order to provide a relaxed version of the minimization problem $II_{f,c}$.

Let $c : \overline{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R} \to [0, +\infty]$ be the cost function defined in (3.4). For the sake of brevity in the presentation of the results below, we rename it as $c_\infty := c$. For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we set

$$A_k := \{ t \in \mathbb{R} : 0 \leq t \leq k/\mathcal{L}^n(\Omega) \}, \quad \chi_k := \chi_{A_k}, \quad c_k := c_\infty + \chi_k = \begin{cases} c_\infty(t, t) & \text{if } t \in A_k, \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases} \tag{4.3}$$

It is not difficult to check that the sequence $(c_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a decreasing sequence of normal convex integrands, which pointwise converges to the cost function $c_\infty$. The following lemma is an immediate consequence of Theorem 2.2 (and its proof):
Lemma 4.1. Consider the sequence \((c_k^*)_{k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}}\) of functions \(c_k^* : \overline{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}\) given by
\[
c_k^*(x,t) = (c_k(x,\cdot))^*(t) = \sup_{s \in A_k} s \cdot t - c_k(x,s), \quad \text{for all } (x,t) \in \overline{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R},
\]
and set \(k_0 := \|a_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} L^n(\Omega)\). Then

(a) For every \(k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}\), the function \(c_k^*\) is a normal convex integrand.

(b) \((c_k^*)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}\) is an increasing sequence.

(c) \(c_k^*(x,t) \nearrow c_\infty^*(x,t) := (c_\infty(x,\cdot))^*(t)\) for every \((x,t) \in \overline{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}\).

(d) For every \(k \geq k_0\) we have
\[
c_k^*(x,t) \geq \lambda_0 t - c_\infty(x,a_0(x)), \quad \text{for every } (x,t) \in \overline{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}.
\]

For every \(k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}\) we define the function \(\varphi_k : \overline{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}\) as
\[
\varphi_k(x,z) := c_k^*\left(x,\frac{|z|^2}{2}\right), \quad \text{for every } (x,z) \in \overline{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}^n,
\]
and we consider the functionals \(\Phi_k : W^{1,2}_0(\Omega) \to \mathbb{R}\) given by
\[
\Phi_k(u) := \int_\Omega \varphi_k(x,\nabla u(x)) \, dx, \quad \text{for every } u \in W^{1,2}_0(\Omega).
\]

Lemma 4.2. Let \(k_0\) be as in Lemma 4.1. For all \(\mathbb{N} \ni k \geq k_0\) we have

i) The functional \(\Phi_k\) is lower semicontinuous in the weak \(W^{1,2}_0(\Omega)\)-topology.

ii) The functionals \(\Phi_k\) are equicoercive with respect to the weak \(W^{1,2}_0(\Omega)\)-topology.

In addition, the sequence \(\{\Phi_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}\) is increasing and pointwise converging to the functional \(\Phi_\infty\).

Proof. i). Let \(k \geq k_0\) and note that for \(L^n\)-a.e. \(x \in \Omega\) the functions \(\varphi_k(x,\cdot)\) are convex and lower semicontinuous, being the supremum of convex and continuous functions (cf. (4.5) and (4.4)). Moreover, due to the property (d) of \(c_k^*\) in Lemma 4.1 above, we have
\[
\varphi_k(x,z) \geq \lambda_0 \frac{|z|^2}{2} - c_\infty(x,a_0(x)), \quad \text{for } L^n\text{-a.e. } x \in \Omega \text{ and every } z \in \mathbb{R}^n.
\]
Thus, the lower semicontinuity of \(\Phi_k\) follows from \([24, \text{Example 1.24}]\) and the fact that \(W^{1,2}_0(\Omega)\) is a closed convex subset of \(W^{1,2}(\Omega)\).

ii). The equicoercivity of functionals \(\Phi_k\) follows from (4.6), the validity of Poincaré inequality on \(W^{1,2}_0(\Omega)\) and the fact that \(W^{1,2}_0(\Omega)\) is reflexive.

The last claim follows from the properties (b) and (c) in Lemma 4.1 of the functions \(c_k^*\) and by the Monotone Convergence Theorem.

We now set
\[
C_\infty := \{g \in \mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega}) : g(x) \leq c_\infty(x,1) \text{ for all } x \in \overline{\Omega} \} \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega}) \quad \text{and} \quad c^\infty := \sup_{x \in \overline{\Omega}} c_\infty(x,1).
\]

Lemma 4.3. For every \(u \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega)\) we have
\[
\sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\overline{\Omega})} F_f(\mu,u) - C(\mu) = \int c^*(x,\frac{|
abla u(x)|^2}{2}) \, dx + \chi_{C_\infty}(\frac{|
abla u|^2}{2}) - \langle f, u \rangle.
\]
Proof. Given any \( h \in \mathcal{C}(\Omega) \), by the definition of the Fenchel conjugate in (2.4) and the decomposition property for measures (2.2), we have

\[
\mathcal{C}^*(h) = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)} \int h \, d\mu - \mathcal{C}(\mu)
\]

\[
= \sup_{a \in L^1(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{M}(\Omega)} \int_\Omega (h(x)a(x) - c(x,a(x))) \, dx + \sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{L}^n \cap \mathcal{M}(\Omega)} \int_\Omega (h - c^\infty(\cdot,1)) \, d\eta.
\]

By using Theorem 2.2 applied to the functional \( L^1(\Omega) \ni g \mapsto \int_\Omega c(x,g(x)) \, dx \), which is proper, since the functional \( \mathcal{C} \) enjoys the same property, we have that

\[
\sup_{a \in L^1(\Omega)} \int_\Omega (a(x)h(x) - c(x,a(x))) \, dx = \int_\Omega c^*(x,h(x)) \, dx.
\]

On the other hand, a direct computation shows that

\[
\sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{L}^n \cap \mathcal{M}(\Omega)} \int_\Omega (h - c^\infty(\cdot,1)) \, d\eta = \chi_{C^\infty}(h).
\]

Taking any \( u \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega) \) and using in the above computations \( h = \frac{\|\nabla u\|^2}{2} \in \mathcal{C}(\Omega) \), we get (4.7). □

Remark 4.4. Let us observe at this point that we have the following upper bound for \( \Pi_{f,c} \):

\[
\Pi_{f,c} \leq \inf_{u \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega)} \Phi_{\infty}(u) + \chi_{C^\infty} \left( \frac{\|\nabla u\|^2}{2} \right) - \langle f, u \rangle.
\] (4.8)

This follows by simply observing that

\[
\sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)} \mathcal{F}_f(\mu, u) - \mathcal{C}(\mu) \leq \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)} \mathcal{F}_f(\mu, u) - \mathcal{C}(\mu)
\]

by using the integral representation of the right-hand side above obtained in Lemma 4.3, and by recalling the definition of the functional \( \Phi_{\infty} \). ■

In order to provide a relaxed version of the minimization problem \( \Pi_{f,c} \) in (3.9), which will further allow us to characterize the elements of \( \mathcal{M}_{\text{opt}} \), we shall consider separately two cases:

(SL): Superlinear case, i.e. \( c^\infty \equiv +\infty \).

(L): Linear case, i.e. \( c^\infty < +\infty \).

Lemma 4.5 (SL: Lower bound for \( \Pi_{f,c} \)). Assume that \( c^\infty \equiv +\infty \). Let \( f \in (W^{1,2}_0(\Omega))^\prime \). Then

\[
\Pi_{f,c} \geq \lim_{k \to +\infty} \inf_{u \in W^{1,2}_0(\Omega)} \Phi_k(u) - \langle f, u \rangle = \min_{u \in W^{1,2}_0(\Omega)} \Phi_{\infty}(u) - \langle f, u \rangle.
\] (4.9)

Proof. Since \( c^\infty \equiv +\infty \), the functional \( \mathcal{C} \) evaluated at any \( \mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega) \) reads \( \mathcal{C}(\mu) = \int_\Omega c(x,\mu_a(x)) \, dx \). Consequently, we have that

\[
\sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)} \mathcal{F}_f(\mu, u) - \mathcal{C}(\mu) = \sup_{a \in L^1(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{M}(\Omega)} \int_\Omega \frac{\|\nabla u(x)\|^2}{2} a(x) - c(x,a(x)) \, dx - \langle f, u \rangle.
\]
By noticing that $L^\infty_{k/\mathcal{L}^n(\Omega)}(\Omega) \subseteq L^1_k(\Omega)$ and taking $N \ni k \geq \|a_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ we get the following bound

$$\sup_{a \in L^1_k(\Omega)} \int_\Omega \frac{|\nabla u(x)|^2}{2} a(x) - c(x, a(x)) \, dx \geq \sup_{a \in L^\infty_{k/\mathcal{L}^n(\Omega)}(\Omega)} \int_\Omega \frac{|\nabla u(x)|^2}{2} a(x) - c_k(x, a(x)) \, dx$$

$$= \int_\Omega c_k^e(x, |\nabla u(x)|^2) \, dx = \Phi_k(u).$$

Due to the assumptions on $f$, in the next passage to the $\Gamma$-limit the functional $\langle f, \cdot \rangle$ is treated via continuity, thus we only need to take care about the sequence of functionals $\{\Phi_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. Being $\{\Phi_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ the sequence of weak $W^{1,2}_0(\Omega)$-lower semicontinuous and increasing functionals, as granted by Lemma 4.2, its $\Gamma$-limit in the weak $W^{1,2}_0(\Omega)$-topology coincides with its pointwise limit (see [24, Proposition 5.4 and Remark 5.5]). Moreover, since the functionals $\Phi_k$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ are equicoercive, it follows from [24, Theorem 7.8] that the last equality in (4.9) holds.

Before proving the corresponding lower bound in the case (L), we need an auxiliary lemma:

**Lemma 4.6.** Assume that $c^\infty < +\infty$ and that $f \in \mathcal{M}(\overline{\Omega})$. Fix $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Then there exists $k_3 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $k \geq k_3$ and any $u \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega)$ having the property $\||\nabla u|^2|_\infty > (2 + \delta)c^\infty$, it holds that

$$\sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{X}^+_k(\overline{\Omega})} \mathcal{F}_f(\mu, u) - \mathcal{C}(\mu) > 0. \quad (4.10)$$

**Proof.** Firstly note that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, by the decomposition result for measures, we may write

$$\sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{X}^+_k(\overline{\Omega})} \mathcal{F}_f(\mu, u) - \mathcal{C}(\mu)$$

$$= \sup_{a \in L^1_k(\Omega)} \int_\Omega \frac{|\nabla u(x)|^2}{2} a(x) - c(x, a(x)) \, dx + \sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{X}^+_k(\Omega)} \int_\Omega \frac{|\nabla u(x)|^2}{2} - c^\infty(x, 1) \, d\eta(x) - \langle f, u \rangle.$$  

Due to the fact that $L^\infty_{k/\mathcal{L}^n(\Omega)}(\Omega) \subseteq L^1_k(\Omega)$ and taking $N \ni k \geq \|a_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\mathcal{L}^n(\Omega)$ we have that the first summand above is bounded below by the quantity

$$\sup_{a \in L^\infty_{k/\mathcal{L}^n(\Omega)}(\Omega)} \int_\Omega \frac{|\nabla u(x)|^2}{2} a(x) - c_k(x, a(x)) \, dx \geq \int_\Omega \frac{|\nabla u(x)|^2}{2} a_0(x) - c(x, a_0(x)) \, dx$$

$$\geq - \int_\Omega c(x, a_0(x)) \, dx =: C_0$$

On the other hand for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have that

$$\sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{X}^+_k(\Omega)} \int_\Omega \frac{|\nabla u(x)|^2}{2} - c^\infty(x, 1) \, d\eta(x) = k \sup_{x \in \overline{\Omega}} \left\{ \max \left\{ (|\nabla u(x)|^2 - 2c^\infty(x, 1)), 0 \right\} \right\}$$

$$\geq k \sup_{x \in \Omega} \left\{ \max \left\{ (|\nabla u(x)|^2 - 2c^\infty), 0 \right\} \right\}$$

$$\geq k (\|\nabla u\|^2_\infty - 2c^\infty).$$

Putting together the above calculations and taking into account that $f \in \mathcal{M}(\overline{\Omega})$, we obtain the following inequality for any $N \ni k \geq \|a_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\mathcal{L}^n(\Omega)$:

$$\sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{X}^+_k(\overline{\Omega})} \mathcal{F}_f(\mu, u) - \mathcal{C}(\mu) \geq C_0 + k (\|\nabla u\|^2_\infty - 2c^\infty) - M(\Omega)\|f\|_{TV}\|\nabla u\|^2_\infty,$$
where $M(\Omega) > 0$ is a constant such that $\|u\|_{W^{1,\infty}_0(\Omega)} \leq M(\Omega)\|\nabla u\|_\infty$. In particular, by choosing

$$\mathbb{N} \ni k_\delta \geq k_\delta' + M(\Omega)\|f\|_{TV} \text{ with } k_\delta' > \max \left\{ \frac{2c^\infty M(\Omega)\|f\|_\infty - C_0, \|a_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}L^n(\Omega)}{\delta c^\infty} \right\},$$

we get for any $k \geq k_\delta$ that

$$\sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{X}_k^+(\Omega)} \mathcal{F}_f(\mu, u) - \mathcal{C}(\mu) \geq \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{X}_k^+(\Omega)} \mathcal{F}_f(\mu, u) - \mathcal{C}(\mu) \geq C_0 + k_\delta' \left( \|\nabla u\|_\infty - 2c^\infty \right) - 2c^\infty M(\Omega)\|f\|_{TV} \geq C_0 + k_\delta' \delta c^\infty - 2c^\infty M(\Omega)\|f\|_{TV} > 0.$$  

Thus, the claim follows.

In order to state and prove the next lemma, we introduce the following notation:

$$\overline{\mathcal{C}}_\infty := \{g \in L^1(\Omega) : g(x) \leq c^\infty(x, 1) \text{ holds for } \mathcal{L}^n\text{-a.e. } x \in \Omega\}. \quad (4.12)$$

**Lemma 4.7 (L): Lower bound for $\Pi_{f,c}$**. Assume that $c^\infty < +\infty$ and let $f \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)$. Then it holds that

$$\Pi_{f,c} \geq \lim_{\delta \to 0} \inf_{u \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)} \Phi_{k_\delta}(u) + \chi_{C^\delta_\infty} \left( \frac{\|\nabla u\|_2^2}{2} \right) - \langle f, u \rangle$$

$$= \min_{u \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)} \Phi_{\infty}(u) + \chi_{\overline{\mathcal{C}}_\infty} \left( \frac{\|\nabla u\|_2^2}{2} \right) - \langle f, u \rangle. \quad (4.13)$$

**Proof.** We define

$$C^\delta_\infty := \left\{ g \in L^1(\Omega) : g(x) \leq \left( 1 + \frac{\delta}{2} \right) c^\infty \text{ for } \mathcal{L}^n\text{-a.e. } x \in \Omega \right\}, \quad \text{for all } \delta \in (0,1).$$

Given $\delta \in (0,1)$, let $k_\delta \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that the result in Lemma 4.7 holds. Then we have that

$$\Pi_{f,c} \geq \inf_{u \in \mathcal{X}_k^+(\Omega)} \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{X}_k^+(\Omega)} \mathcal{F}_f(\mu, u) - \mathcal{C}(\mu) + \chi_{C^\delta_\infty} \left( \frac{\|\nabla u\|_2^2}{2} \right) - \langle f, u \rangle$$

$$\geq \inf_{u \in \mathcal{X}_k^+(\Omega)} \int_\Omega c^\delta_{k_\delta} \left( x, \frac{|\nabla u(x)|^2}{2} \right) \text{d}x + \chi_{C^\delta_\infty} \left( \frac{\|\nabla u\|^2}{2} \right) - \langle f, u \rangle$$

$$= \min_{u \in \mathcal{X}_k^+(\Omega)} \Phi_{k_\delta}(u) + \chi_{C^\delta_\infty} \left( \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{2} \right) - \langle f, u \rangle$$

where, in order to get the first inequality above, we have essentially repeated the steps done in the proof of Lemma 4.7 and use the fact that

$$\sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{X}_k^+(\Omega)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|\nabla u(x)|^2}{2} - c^\infty(x, 1) \text{d}\eta(x) \geq 0.$$  

We shall now pass to the limit as $\delta \downarrow 0$ in the above inequality. To this aim, we recall from Lemma 4.7 (see (4.11)) that $k_\delta \nearrow +\infty$ as $\delta \downarrow 0$. Note that the set $\{ u \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega) : |\nabla u|^2/2 \in C^\delta_\infty \}$ is a closed and convex subset of $W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$. Also, it is not difficult to check that $(C^\delta_\infty)_{\delta \in [0,1]}$ is an increasing family as $\delta \downarrow 0$. All in all, we have that the functionals $\Phi_{k_\delta} + \chi_{C^\delta_\infty} \left( \frac{|\nabla (\cdot)|^2}{2} \right)$ are lower
lemmas and Lemma 4.13) and treating the term \( \langle f, \cdot \rangle \) again via continuity, we get
\[
\lim_{\delta \to 0} \inf_{u \in W^{1,2}_0(\Omega)} \Phi_{k_\delta}(u) + \chi_{C_\infty} \left( \frac{|\nabla u(x)|^2}{2} \right) - \langle f, u \rangle = \min_{u \in W^{1,2}_0(\Omega)} \Phi_\infty(u) + \chi_{C_\infty} \left( \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{2} \right) - \langle f, u \rangle.
\]

The fact that the infimum in the right-hand side above is actually the minimum is due to the property (4.11) of \( k_\delta \in \mathbb{N} \) and thus due to the equicoerciveness of the functionals \( \{ \Phi_{k_\delta} \}_{\delta \in [0,1)} \). In order to achieve (4.13), we have to show that instead of the set \( C_\infty \) in the right-hand side of the above equality, we actually have the smaller set \( \overline{C}_\infty \). To prove it, we argue by contradiction: assume that the minimum is achieved at some \( u \in W^{1,2}_0(\Omega) \) such that \( \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{2} \in C_\infty \cap (\overline{C}_\infty) \). Recalling the property (P1) of the cost function \( c \), it follows from (2.1) item 2) that
\[
\int_\Omega c^*(x, \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{2}) \, dx \geq \int_\Omega (c^\infty)^*(x, \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{2}) \, dx = \int_\Omega \chi_{\{ t \in \mathbb{R} : t \leq c^\infty(x,1) \}} \left( \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{2} \right) \, dx.
\]
Due to the fact that \( \Pi_{f,c} \leq 0 \), the above inequality forces \( \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{2} \in \overline{C}_\infty \), getting the contradiction and accordingly (4.13).

\[
\textbf{Theorem 4.8. (SL): } \text{Assume that } c^\infty \equiv +\infty \text{ and } f \in (W^{1,2}_0(\Omega))'. \text{ If no Lavrentiev phenomenon occurs, i.e. if }
\[
\inf_{\mathcal{H}(\Omega)} \Phi_\infty(u) - \langle f, u \rangle = \inf_{u \in W^{1,2}_0(\Omega)} \Phi_\infty(u) - \langle f, u \rangle,
\]
then the problem \( \Pi_{f,c} \) admits a relaxed solution in the following sense: there exists \( \tilde{u} \in W^{1,2}_0(\Omega) \) such that
\[
\Pi_{f,c} = \Phi_\infty(\tilde{u}) - \langle f, \tilde{u} \rangle.
\]

\( \text{(L): } \text{Assume that } c^\infty < +\infty \text{ and } f \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \text{. If no Lavrentiev phenomenon occurs, i.e. if }
\[
\inf_{\mathcal{H}(\Omega)} \Phi_\infty(u) + \chi_{C_\infty} \left( \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{2} \right) - \langle f, u \rangle = \inf_{u \in W^{1,2}_0(\Omega)} \Phi_\infty(u) + \chi_{C_\infty} \left( \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{2} \right) - \langle f, u \rangle,
\]
then the problem \( \Pi_{f,c} \) admits a relaxed solution in the following sense: there exists \( \tilde{u} \in \text{LIP}_{0,c}(\Omega) \) with \( c := \sqrt{2e^\infty} \) and satisfying \( |\nabla \tilde{u}(x)|^2 \leq 2e^\infty(x,1) \) for \( \mathcal{L}^n \)-a.e. \( x \in \Omega \) such that it holds
\[
\Pi_{f,c} = \Phi_\infty(\tilde{u}) - \langle f, \tilde{u} \rangle.
\]

\textbf{Proof. } The proof of the case (SL) (resp. (L)) follows directly from Lemma 4.5 and Lemma 4.3 (resp. Lemma 4.7 and Lemma 4.3) taking into account the assumption (4.14) (resp. (4.15)).

\[
\textbf{Remark 4.9 (About the Lavrentiev phenomenon). } \text{Recall that the functional } \Phi_\infty \text{ is lower semicontinuous in the weak } W^{1,2}_0(\Omega) \text{-topology. Thus, to determine the validity of (4.14) (and similarly for (4.15)), it is common to check a slightly stronger condition, namely weather } \Phi_\infty \text{ coincides with the lower semicontinuous envelope of the restricted functional } \tilde{\Phi}_\infty := \Phi_\infty|_{\mathcal{H}(\Omega)}. \text{ In the case of heterogeneous costs this might be false; for the related discussion see [23] and the references therein.}
\]

Nevertheless, when the function the cost function \( c \) is homogeneous and thus \( c^* \) is \( x \)-independent, the situation improves:
Lemma 4.10 (No Lavrentiev phenomenon for homogeneous costs). Assume that \( c \) is a homogeneous cost function. Then

(SL) if \( f \in (W^{1,2}_0(\Omega))' \), the equality in (4.14) is satisfied;

(L) if \( f \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \), the equality in (4.15) is satisfied.

Proof. It follows directly from [15, Chapter X, Proposition 2.6] and the growth condition from below on the function \( \varphi_\infty \) (see Lemma 4.1 and (4.5)). \( \square \)

Remark 4.11. By exchanging \( \inf \) and \( \sup \) in the quantity \( \Pi_{f,c} \) and taking into account Lemma 4.7 above, we have shown indeed that in the case (L) it holds that \( \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \subseteq \text{Adm}_c \).

We remark also that the above results in the case (SL) hold even under less restrictive assumptions on the admissible distribution \( f \in \text{Adm}_c \). Namely, it is enough to require that \( f \) is continuous with respect to the convergence \( u_i \rightharpoonup u \) in \( W^{1,2}_0(\Omega) \) weakly and \( \sup_i \Phi_\infty(u_i) \) being finite. \( \blacksquare \)

5. Optimality conditions

Our next goal is to characterize the elements of \( \mathcal{M}_{\text{opt}} \) by means of necessary and sufficient optimality conditions. Again, we treat separately the cases (SL) and (L).

Theorem 5.1. Assume \( c^\infty \equiv +\infty \). Let \( f \in (W^{1,2}_0(\Omega))' \) and assume that no Lavrentiev phenomenon occurs, i.e. (4.14) holds. Then, the following are equivalent:

the triple \( (\bar{\mu}, \bar{\sigma}, \bar{u}) \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega) \times L^2_\mu(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n) \times W^{1,2}_0(\Omega) \) satisfies the conditions (referred to as the optimality conditions)

1) \( \bar{\mu} = \bar{\mu}_a L^n \) with \( \bar{\mu}_a \in L^1(\Omega) \);

2) \( -\text{div}_\mu(\bar{\sigma}) = f \) in \( \mathcal{D}(\Omega) \);

3) \( \int_\Omega |\bar{\sigma}(x)|^2 \bar{\mu}_a(x) \, dx = \int_\Omega c^*(x, |\nabla \bar{u}(x)|^2) \, dx + \int_\Omega c(x, \bar{\mu}_a(x)) \, dx \) \hfill (5.1)

4) Fix any sequence \( (u_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{D}(\Omega) \) such that \( u_i \rightharpoonup \bar{u} \) weakly in \( W^{1,2}_0(\Omega) \) and

\( \int_\Omega c^*(x, |\nabla \bar{u_i}|^2) \, dx = \lim_{i \to +\infty} \int_\Omega c^*(x, |\nabla u_i|^2) \, dx \).

Then, up to a subsequence, we have that \( \nabla u_i \rightharpoonup \bar{\sigma} \) weakly in \( L^2_\mu(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n) \), as \( i \to +\infty \).

if and only if

a) \( \bar{\mu} \) is a solution of the problem (3.7);

b) \( \bar{\sigma} \) solves the dual problem to \( I_{\bar{\mu}} \) given in (4.1);

c) \( \bar{u} \) is a relaxed solution to the problem \( \Pi_{f,c} \) in the sense of Theorem 4.8, case (SL).

Proof. (\( \Rightarrow \)). From the condition 2), we have that \( \bar{\sigma} \) is candidate for the dual problem in (4.1), while \( \bar{u} \in W^{1,2}_0(\Omega) \) is a candidate for the problem \( \Pi_{f,c} \). Hence, the following chain of inequalities holds:

\[
- \int \frac{|\bar{\sigma}|^2}{2} \, d\bar{\mu} - \int c(x, \bar{\mu}_a(x)) \, dx \leq I_{\bar{\mu}} \leq \Pi_{f,c} \leq \int \Omega c^*(x, \frac{|\nabla \bar{u}(x)|^2}{2}) \, dx - \langle f, \bar{u} \rangle = \int \Omega \frac{|\bar{\sigma}|^2}{2} \, d\bar{\mu} - \int c(x, \bar{\mu}_a(x)) \, dx - \langle f, \bar{u} \rangle, \tag{5.2}
\]
where the last equality follows from the condition \(3\). Notice that, by combining conditions \(2\) and \(4\) we get that

\[
(f, \bar{u}) = \lim_{i \to +\infty} \langle -\text{div} \bar{\mu}, u_i \rangle = \lim_{i \to +\infty} \int \bar{\sigma} \cdot \nabla u_i \, d\bar{\mu} = \int \bar{\sigma} \cdot \bar{\sigma} \, d\bar{\mu} = \int |\bar{\sigma}|^2 \, d\bar{\mu}.
\]

This shows that all the inequalities in \((5.2)\) equalities. Hence, \(\bar{\sigma}\) solves the dual problem to \(I_{\bar{\mu}}\) in

\((4.1)\) and \(\bar{u}\) solves \(\Pi_{f,c}\) thus the conditions \(b)\) and \(c)\) follow. Now pick \(k \in \mathbb{N}\) big enough so that \(\bar{\mu} \in \mathcal{K}_k \). Then, by combining conditions \(2)\) and

\[
(\bar{\sigma}) \text{ solves } II_{\bar{\mu}} \text{ thus the boundedness of the sequence } (\bar{\mu}) \text{ relabeled subsequence }, \nabla \bar{\sigma} \text{ exists due to the assumption } (3).
\]

\[\text{Take now any sequence } (u_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{D}(\Omega) \text{ such that } u_i \rightharpoonup \bar{u} \text{ weakly in } W^{1,2}_0(\Omega) \text{ and } \int \Omega c^*(x, |\nabla \bar{u}|^2) \, dx = \lim_{i \to +\infty} \int \Omega c^*(x, |\nabla u_i|^2) \, dx,
\]

which exists due to the assumption \((4.14)\). Moreover, for every \(i \in \mathbb{N}\), from the conjugate duality we have that

\[
\int \Omega c^*(x, |\nabla u_i|^2) \, dx \geq \int \Omega c^*(x, |\nabla \bar{u}|^2) \, dx,
\]

which yields the boundedness of the sequence \((\nabla u_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}\) in the space \(L^2_\bar{\mu}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)\). Thus, up to a non-relabeled subsequence, \(\nabla u_i\) weakly converge in \(L^2_\bar{\mu}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)\) to some \(\bar{w}\). Notice also that due to the lower semicontinuity of the norm, we have that

\[
\int |\bar{\sigma}|^2 \, d\bar{\mu} \leq \lim_{i \to +\infty} \int \frac{|\nabla u_i|^2}{2} \, d\bar{\mu} \leq \int \Omega c^*(x, |\nabla \bar{u}|^2) \, dx + \int \Omega c(x, \mu_a(x)) \, dx.
\]

where the last inequality follows from the conjugate duality and the way in which the sequence \((u_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}\) has been chosen. Further, due to the assumptions on \(f\) and the hypotheses \(b)\), we have that

\[
(f, \bar{u}) = \lim_{i \to +\infty} \langle -\text{div} \bar{\mu}, u_i \rangle = \lim_{i \to +\infty} \int \bar{\sigma} \cdot \nabla u_i \, d\bar{\mu} = \int \bar{\sigma} \cdot \bar{w} \, d\bar{\mu}.
\]

Combining the latter equality with \((5.3)\) we get that

\[
-\int \frac{|\bar{\sigma}|^2}{2} \, d\bar{\mu} - \int \Omega c(x, \mu_a(x)) \, dx = \int \Omega c^*(x, |\nabla \bar{u}|^2) \, dx - \int \bar{\sigma} \cdot \bar{w} \, d\bar{\mu} \\
\geq \int |\bar{w}|^2 \, d\bar{\mu} - \int \Omega c(x, \mu_a(x)) \, dx - \int \bar{\sigma} \cdot \bar{w} \, d\bar{\mu}.
\]

This implies that \(\bar{\sigma} - \bar{w} = 0\) holds \(\bar{\mu}\)-a.e., proving the condition \(4)\). Now also the condition \(3)\) follows, since, by repeating the latter calculation, we get

\[
-\int \frac{|\bar{\sigma}|^2}{2} \, d\bar{\mu} - \int \Omega c(x, \mu_a(x)) \, dx = \int \Omega c^*(x, |\nabla \bar{u}|^2) \, dx - \int \bar{\sigma} \cdot \bar{w} \, d\bar{\mu} = \int \Omega c^*(x, |\nabla \bar{u}|^2) \, dx - \int |\bar{\sigma}|^2 \, d\bar{\mu},
\]

showing the claim. This concludes the proof. □
Theorem 5.2. Assume $c^\infty < +\infty$. Let $f \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)$ and assume that no Lavrentiev phenomenon occurs, i.e. (4.15) holds. Then, the following are equivalent:
the couple $(\bar{\mu}, \bar{u}) \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega) \times \text{LIP}_{0,c}(\Omega)$ satisfies the system of equations (referred to as the optimality conditions)

1) $-\text{div}_w(\nabla_{\bar{\mu}} \bar{u}) = f$ in $\mathcal{D}'(\Omega);
2) \int \frac{|\nabla_{\bar{\mu}} \bar{u}|^2}{2} \bar{\mu}_a(x) \, dx = \int \mu^* (x, \frac{|\nabla \bar{u}(x)|^2}{2}) \, dx + \int c(x, \bar{\mu}_a(x)) \, dx;
3) \int \frac{|\nabla_{\bar{\mu}} \bar{u}|^2}{2} \, d\bar{\mu}_s = \int c^\infty (\cdot, 1) \, d\bar{\mu}_s;
4) \frac{|\nabla \bar{u}(x)|^2}{2} \leq c^\infty (x, 1)$ holds for $\mathcal{L}^n$-a.e. $x \in \Omega.$

if and only if

a) $\bar{\mu}$ is a solution of the problem (3.7);

b) $\bar{u}$ is a relaxed solution to the problem $\Pi_{f,c}$ in the sense of Theorem 4.8, case (L).

Proof. ($\Rightarrow$). Recall that $\bar{u} \in \text{LIP}_{0,c}(\Omega) \subseteq W^{1,2}_{0,\bar{\mu}}(\Omega)$. Taking into account the hypotheses 1) and 2), we have that $\nabla_{\bar{\mu}} \bar{u}$ is a competitor for the dual problem to $I_{\bar{\mu}}$ in (4.1). Take any sequence $(u_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{D}(\Omega)$ such that $u_i \rightharpoonup \bar{u}$ in $W^{1,2}_{0,\bar{\mu}}(\Omega)$ as $i \to +\infty$, $\lim_{i \to +\infty} \Phi_{\infty}(u_i) = \Phi_{\infty}(\bar{u})$ and $\sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} |\nabla u_i| \leq c$ (whose existence is granted by the validity of (4.15)). Then, up to a subsequence we have that $u_i \rightharpoonup \bar{u}$ weakly in $L^2_\bar{\mu}(\Omega)$ and $\nabla u_i \rightharpoonup \bar{\omega}$ weakly in $L^2_\bar{\mu}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$, for some $\bar{\omega} \in L^2_\bar{\mu}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$. In particular, $\bar{\omega} \in \text{G}_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{u})$. Then due to the hypotheses 1) and 2), we get (as in the proof of Theorem 5.1 above) $\langle f, \bar{u} \rangle = \int \nabla_{\bar{\mu}} \bar{u} \cdot \bar{\omega} \, d\bar{\mu}$. Due to the lower semicontinuity of the norm we further get that

$$\int \frac{|\bar{\omega}|^2}{2} \, d\bar{\mu} \leq \lim_{i \to +\infty} \int \frac{|\nabla u_i|^2}{2} \, d\bar{\mu} \leq \lim_{i \to +\infty} C^* \left( \frac{|\nabla u_i|^2}{2} \right) + C(\bar{\mu}) = \int \frac{|\nabla_{\bar{\mu}} \bar{u}|^2}{2} \, d\bar{\mu},$$

where the last equality follows from the hypotheses 3) and 4). In particular, due to the minimality of $\nabla_{\bar{\mu}} \bar{u}$, we deduce that $\bar{\omega} = \nabla_{\bar{\mu}} \bar{u}$ holds $\bar{\mu}$-a.e. Therefore, it follows that

$$\int \frac{|\nabla_{\bar{\mu}} \bar{u}|^2}{2} \, d\bar{\mu} - C(\bar{\mu}) \leq \Pi_{f,c} \leq \int c^* (x, \frac{|\nabla \bar{u}(x)|^2}{2}) \, dx - \langle f, \bar{u} \rangle$$

$$= \int \frac{|\nabla_{\bar{\mu}} \bar{u}|^2}{2} \, d\bar{\mu} - \langle f, \bar{u} \rangle - C(\bar{\mu}) = - \int \frac{|\nabla_{\bar{\mu}} \bar{u}|^2}{2} \, d\bar{\mu} - C(\bar{\mu}),$$

which proves b). The point a) follows along the same lines as in the proof of Theorem 5.1.

($\Leftarrow$). Due to the hypotheses b), we have that the item 5) holds. Moreover, we may pick a sequence $(u_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{D}(\Omega) \cap \text{LIP}_{0,c}(\Omega)$ converging weakly in $W^{1,2}_{0,\bar{\mu}}(\Omega)$ to $\bar{u}$ and such that $C^* (|\nabla u_i|^2/2) \to \int c^* (x, |\nabla \bar{u}(x)|^2/2) \, dx$ as $i \to +\infty$. From the conjugate inequality

$$\sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \int \frac{|u_i|^2}{2} \, d\bar{\mu} \leq \sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} C^* \left( \frac{|u_i|^2}{2} \right) + C(\bar{\mu}) < +\infty.$$

Thus, up to a (non-relabeled) subsequence we have that there is $\bar{w} \in L^2_\bar{\mu}(\Omega)$

$$u_i \rightharpoonup \bar{u} \text{ weakly in } L^2_\bar{\mu}(\Omega) \text{ and } \nabla u_i \rightharpoonup \bar{\omega} \text{ weakly in } L^2_\bar{\mu}(\Omega).$$
In particular, \( \bar{w} \in G_\mu(\bar{u}) \) and, due to the lower semicontinuity of the norm we have that
\[
\int \frac{|\bar{u}|^2}{2} \, d\bar{\mu} \leq \int_{\Omega} c^*(x, \frac{\nabla \bar{u}|^2}{2}) \, dx + C(\bar{\mu}).
\]
Due to the hypotheses a), the quantity in the right-hand side of (4.1) is finite; denote by \( \bar{\sigma} \) a solution for the dual problem in (4.1). Then, taking the above into account, we have that \( \langle f, \bar{u} \rangle = \int \bar{\sigma} \cdot \bar{w} \, d\bar{\mu} \). Finally, by using the equality
\[
- \int \frac{|\bar{\sigma}|^2}{2} \, d\bar{\mu} - C(\bar{\mu}) \overset{(4.1)}{=} I_{\bar{\mu}} = \Pi_{f,c} = \int_{\Omega} c^*(x, \frac{\nabla \bar{u}|^2}{2}) \, dx - \langle f, \bar{u} \rangle,
\]
we have that \( \bar{w} = \bar{\sigma} \) holds \( \bar{\mu} \)-a.e. and that
\[
\int \frac{|\bar{u}|^2}{2} \, d\bar{\mu} - C(\bar{\mu}) = \int_{\Omega} c^*(x, \frac{\nabla \bar{u}|^2}{2}) \, dx.
\]
Given that \( \bar{u} \in \text{LIP}_0(\Omega) \subseteq W^{1,2}_0(\Omega) \), its \( \mu \)-gradient \( \nabla \bar{\mu} \bar{u} \) is a competitor for the relaxed problem of \( I_{\bar{\mu}} \) given in (4.2). Also, being \( \nabla \bar{\mu} \bar{u} \) the element of \( G_\mu(\bar{u}) \) of the minimal \( L^2_\mu \)-norm, we have that
\[
\int \frac{|\bar{u}|^2}{2} \, d\bar{\mu} - \langle f, \bar{u} \rangle - C(\bar{\mu}) \geq \int \frac{|\nabla \mu \bar{u}|^2}{2} \, d\bar{\mu} - \langle f, \bar{u} \rangle - C(\bar{\mu}) \overset{(4.2)}{=} I_{\bar{\mu}} = \Pi_{f,c} = \int_{\Omega} c^*(x, \frac{\nabla \bar{u}|^2}{2}) \, dx - \langle f, \bar{u} \rangle,
\]
proving that \( \bar{\sigma} = \nabla \bar{\mu} \bar{u} \) holds \( \bar{\mu} \)-a.e.. Thus the item 1) and 2) follow, as well as the validity of the condition 3) and 4). This concludes the proof.

\[ \Box \]

Lemma 5.3.
- The condition 2) of Theorem 5.2 is equivalent to
  \[
  \frac{|\nabla \bar{u}(x)|^2}{2} \mu_a(x) = c^*(x, \frac{\nabla \bar{u}(x)|^2}{2}) + c(x, \mu_a(x)) \quad \text{holds } \mu_a \text{-} \mathcal{L}^a \text{-} \text{a.e. } x \in \Omega,
  \]
or briefly, \( \frac{|\nabla \bar{u}(x)|^2}{2} \in \partial c(x, \mu_a(x)) \) holds for \( \mu_a \mathcal{L}^a \text{-} \text{a.e. } x \in \Omega \).
- The condition 3) of Theorem 5.2 is equivalent to
  \[
  \bar{\mu}(\partial \Omega) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{|\nabla \bar{\mu} \bar{u}(x)|^2}{2} = c^\infty(x, 1) \quad \text{holds for } \bar{\mu}_s \text{-} \text{a.e. } x \in \Omega.
  \]

Proof. In order to get the first statement, recall that \( |\nabla \bar{u}| = \text{lip}(\bar{u}) \) (see Subsection 2.3) holds \( \mathcal{L}^a \)-a.e. in \( \Omega \) (and thus \( \mu_a \mathcal{L}^a \text{-} \text{a.e. in } \Omega \)). On the other hand, we have that \( |\nabla \bar{u}| \leq \text{lip}(\bar{u}) \) holds \( \bar{\mu} \)-a.e. (and thus \( \mu_a \mathcal{L}^a \text{-} \text{a.e. in } \Omega \)). Hence we deduce that \( |\nabla \bar{\mu}| \leq |\nabla \bar{u}| \) holds \( \bar{\mu}_a \mathcal{L}^a \text{-} \text{a.e. in } \Omega \). This property, together with the conjugate inequality gives
\[
c^*(x, \frac{|\nabla \bar{u}|^2}{2}) + c(x, \bar{\mu}_a(x)) \geq \frac{|\nabla \bar{\mu} \bar{u}(x)|^2}{2} \mu_a(x) \geq \frac{|\nabla \bar{\mu} \bar{u}(x)|^2}{2} \bar{\mu}_a(x) \quad \mu_a \text{-} \mathcal{L}^a \text{-} \text{a.e. } x \in \Omega,
\]
and provide us with the claimed equivalence between the integral and the pointwise version of the optimality conditions.

The second statement is due to the fact that \( \nabla \bar{\mu} \bar{u} \) is a weak \( L^2_\mu \) limit of a sequence of smooth gradients \( \nabla u_i \) satisfying the property \( \frac{|\nabla u_i(x)|^2}{2} \leq c^\infty(x, 1) \) for all \( x \in \Omega \). Thus, up to applying Mazzur’s lemma and getting the strong (and thus, up to a subsequence, pointwise) convergence, we have that \( \frac{|\nabla \bar{\mu} \bar{u}(x)|^2}{2} \leq c^\infty(x, 1) \) for \( \bar{\mu} \)-a.e. \( x \in \Omega \). This together with 3) implies that \( \bar{\mu}(\partial \Omega) = \bar{\mu}_s(\partial \Omega) = 0 \) and that \( \frac{|\nabla \bar{\mu} \bar{u}(x)|^2}{2} = c^\infty(x, 1) \) holds for \( \bar{\mu}_s \text{-} \text{a.e. } x \in \Omega \), as claimed. The vice-versa holds trivially. \( \Box \)
6. Examples and variants of the problem

In this section, we provide some concrete examples of interest.

Example 6.1. Let us consider the function \( c(t) := \frac{t^2}{2} \) for \( t \geq 0 \) and set to \( +\infty \) elsewhere in \( \mathbb{R} \). It is easy to check that this is indeed an example of homogeneous cost function, with \( c^\infty(1) \equiv +\infty \). Thus, we end up in the superlinear case (SL). Also, a direct calculation gives that \( c^*(t) = \frac{t^2}{2} \) for all \( t \in [0, +\infty) \) and 0 otherwise in \( \mathbb{R} \). Notice also that \( \text{Dom}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq L^2(\Omega) \). Let us now pick a solution \( \bar{u} = \bar{\mu_a} \mathcal{L}^n \) with \( \bar{\mu_a} \in L^2(\Omega) \) of \( (\text{MOP}_c) \) and a solution \( \hat{u} \in W^{1,2}_0(\Omega) \) of \( \Pi_{f,c} \). The point 2) in the system of equations (1.4) in this particular case reads as follows:

\[
\int_{\Omega} \frac{|\sigma(x)|^2}{2} \mu_a(x) \, dx = \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla \bar{u}|^4}{8} \, dx + \int_{\Omega} \frac{(|\mu_a(x)|^2}{2} \, dx,
\]

We claim that \( \bar{u} \in W^{1,4}_0(\Omega) \) and that \( \sigma = \nabla \bar{u} \). Once this claim is proven, it follows from the above equality that

\[
\bar{\mu}_a = \frac{\nabla \bar{u}^2}{2}.
\]

The claim easily follows by combining the fact that \( \sigma \) is an \( L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n) \)-weak limit of the sequence of smooth gradients which converge in weakly in \( L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n) \) and the fact that \( \bar{\mu} = \bar{\mu}_a \mathcal{L}^n \) with \( \bar{\mu}_a \in L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n) \).

Example 6.2. Let us consider the cost function \( c(t) := t + \frac{1}{t} - 2 \) for \( t \geq 1 \), \( c(t) := 0 \) for \( 0 \leq t < 1 \) and set to be \( +\infty \) elsewhere in \( \mathbb{R} \). Again, \( c \) is a homogeneous cost function, with \( c^\infty(1) = 1 \). Thus, we end up in the case (L). Direct calculation gives that the domain of the conjugate function \( c^* \) is \( [-\infty, 1] \) and that \( c^*(t) = -2\sqrt{1 - t} \) for all \( t \in [0, 1] \), while it is equal to 0 for \( t < 0 \). In particular, the property 2) in the system of equations (1.3) becomes

\[
\frac{|\nabla \bar{u}(x)|^2}{2} \bar{\mu}_a(x) = -2 \sqrt{1 - \frac{|\nabla \bar{u}(x)|^2}{2}} + \bar{\mu}_a(x) + \frac{1}{\bar{\mu}_a(x)}, \quad \text{for } L^n\text{-a.e. } x \in \{ x \in \Omega : \bar{\mu}_a(x) > 0 \}.
\]

An easy calculation shows that the above is equivalent to

\[
\bar{\mu}_a(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{|\nabla \bar{u}|^2}{2}}}, \quad \text{for } L^n\text{-a.e. } x \in \{ x \in \Omega : \bar{\mu}_a(x) > 0 \}.
\]

\( \triangle \)

Example 6.3 (Comparison with [7]). Let us consider the homogeneous cost function \( c(t) = \frac{1}{2} t \) for all \( t \geq 0 \) and set to be \( +\infty \) elsewhere in \( \mathbb{R} \). Clearly, we are in the case (L), with \( c^\infty(1) = \frac{1}{2} \) and \( c^* = \chi_{[-\infty, 1/2]} \). Let \( \bar{\mu} \) and \( \bar{u} \) be solutions of \( (\text{MOP}_c) \) and \( \Pi_{f,c} \), respectively. Note that the point 2) in (1.3) gives us that

\[
\frac{|\nabla \bar{\mu} \bar{u}|^2}{2} = \frac{|\nabla \bar{u}|^2}{2} = 1, \quad \bar{\mu}_a L^n\text{-a.e. in } \Omega,
\]

while by the point 3) we have that \( \frac{|\nabla \bar{u}|^2}{2} = \frac{1}{2} \) holds \( \bar{\mu}_a \text{-a.e. in } \Omega \). All in all, we get that \( |\nabla \bar{\mu} \bar{u}| = 1 \) holds \( \bar{\mu} \text{-a.e. in } \Omega \). This, together with the conditions 1), 4) and 5) gives precisely the optimality conditions given in [7, Equation (4.1)] with \( \Sigma = \partial \Omega \). On the other hand, it is clear that the couples \( (\bar{\mu}, \bar{u}) \) satisfying [7, Equation (4.1)] in \( \Omega \) and with \( \Sigma = \partial \Omega \) satisfy also the optimality conditions given in (1.3).

\( \triangle \)
Remark 6.4. Let us also remark that all the stated results can be obtained by means of the same techniques also in the case of energies $F(\mu, u)$ involving $|\nabla u|^p$ for any $1 < p < +\infty$. It would be further interesting to investigate, in light of recent results in [16], the case $p = 1$. ■
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