

Homogenization of a thin linear elastic plate reinforced with a periodic mosaic of small rigid plates

Amartya Chakraborty¹Georges Griso²Julia Orlik³

Abstract

In the framework of linearized elasticity, we study thin elastic composite plates with thickness δ . The plates contain small, rigid rectangular plates distributed periodically along ε . Between two neighboring rigid plates is an elastic beam with thickness $\delta < \varepsilon/3 < 1$. Through a simultaneous process of homogenization and dimension reduction, we obtain the limit model. Our analysis yields Korn-type inequalities adapted to the rigid-elastic geometry of the structure and provides a precise characterization of the limit deformation and displacement fields. In the 2D limit problem, the bending is the sum of two functions, each depending on only one variable. This is due to the fact that the mixed derivatives of the outer-plane displacement vanish. Finally, the limiting 2D problem is two decoupled plates or strips, each one with just three degrees of freedom: shear along the strip axis, the cross-contraction (-extension), and the cross-bending. The corresponding correctors are defined in the same way in the periodicity cell. In the linearized setting, all the correctors are decomposed.

Keywords: Homogenization, dimension reduction, Kirchhoff-Love plate theory, rigid inclusions, non-penetration condition.

MSC 2020: 74K20, 74Q05, 74B05, 35B27, 74E30, 35Q74

1 Introduction

The mathematical analysis of thin elastic structures has a long history. Starting from the classical Kirchhoff–Love and Reissner–Mindlin theories, a variety of reduced models have been derived from three-dimensional elasticity by means of asymptotic analysis or Γ -convergence methods (see, e.g., [11, 21, 12]). In parallel, the homogenization of heterogeneous elastic materials with periodic structures has been extensively studied (see [2, 1, 40, 13, 41]), leading to the concept of effective elastic tensors that capture the influence of micro-scale heterogeneity.

When both small thickness and periodic heterogeneity are present, the mechanical behavior of the structure depends on the interplay between the two small parameters: the plate thickness δ and the periodicity ε . The simultaneous limit $(\varepsilon, \delta) \rightarrow (0, 0)$ therefore requires a careful multiscale analysis, since the corresponding limits do not commute [5]. Several studies have addressed related problems for thin periodic plates, shells, textiles, tubes and general 3D structures (see, for instance, [33, 34, 35, 39, 20, 25, 32, 30, 31, 42, 36, 29, 44, 22]), but the presence of rigid inclusions with a non-penetration constraint introduces additional challenges. In particular, the rigidity constraint in the inclusions restricts the admissible displacement fields and affects the limit behavior in a nontrivial way.

For homogenization of high-contrast composites, see [8, 9]. For homogenization without dimension reduction of composites with rigid inclusions, we refer to [10, 17, 16]. Simultaneous homogenization and dimension reduction have been addressed in [6, 46] for high-contrast composites with soft inclusions, and in [7] for thin composites with rigid inclusions subjected to nonlinear elasticity in the von Kármán regime.

In this work, we focus on thin elastic composites containing periodically distributed rigid inclusions; such composites play a crucial role in modern engineering applications (see [43, 24]) because of their ability to conform to prescribed shapes without folding. Understanding their effective (or homogenized) two-dimensional mechanical behavior is therefore of significant theoretical and practical importance for design optimization.

This paper presents a derivation of a limit model obtained through the simultaneous homogenization and dimension reduction of thin elastic plates reinforced with rigid substructures, within the framework of linearized elasticity. The structure under consideration, denoted by Ω_δ , consists of a connected elastic matrix forming a periodic framework of thin, straight rods intersecting along two mutually orthogonal in-plane directions, thereby creating a periodic structural frame $\Omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^S$ (the connected soft part). The resulting perforations are filled with rigid inclusions $\Omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^H$ (the disconnected hard part), see Figure 1. The rigidity of the hard inclusions is enforced by requiring that the infinitesimal (linearized) strain tensor $e(u)$ vanishes in $\Omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^H$.

¹SMS, Fraunhofer ITWM, Kaiserslautern 67663, Germany. amartya.chakraborty@itwm.fraunhofer.de

²Laboratoire Jacques-Louis Lions (LJLL), Sorbonne Université, CNRS, Université de Paris, F-75005 Paris, France. griso@ljl.math.upmc.fr

³SMS, Fraunhofer ITWM, Kaiserslautern 67663, Germany. julia.orlik@itwm.fraunhofer.de

Unlike [32, 30, 42, 36], which deal with beam structures with free lateral boundaries (homogeneous Neumann conditions on the lateral beam surfaces), in our setting the pores are filled with rigid (strain-free) subdomains that preserve distances. This corresponds to imposing inhomogeneous Dirichlet conditions on the holes, i.e., on the corresponding parts of the lateral beam surfaces. These Dirichlet boundary data are obtained by restricting an interpolation of the rigid displacements of the inclusions to their boundaries. A similar concept of inclusions in contact with the matrix, controlled via tangential jumps, was developed in [15, 35, 33]. We also refer to [3, 4] for related results on masonry structures.

This study concerns three main aspects: (i) the thickness and periodicity parameters δ and ε , respectively, satisfying

$$0 < 3\delta < \varepsilon < 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{(\varepsilon, \delta) \rightarrow (0, 0)} \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon} = 0, \quad (1.1)$$

(ii) rigidity on the disconnected hard parts, and (iii) a non-penetration constraint. With this perspective, we assume that two consecutive rigid plates in the in-plane directions satisfy a non-penetration condition (NPC). Due to this constraint, the elasticity problem is formulated as a variational inequality. In the linearized setting, this assumption requires some justification, since violation of the non-penetration condition can occur only in rather degenerate situations, such as loss of coercivity of the linear material or special choices of the Poisson ratio that allow the inter-layer to shear until its thickness effectively collapses to a line. However, in the context of large deformations, as considered in our later studies, a multiaxial deformation of the elastic part may lead to contact between contiguous rigid substructures. We therefore impose the non-penetration conditions on the admissible fields and formulate the problem from the outset as a variational inequality (similar to [15, 35, 36, 42]), so as to obtain a formulation that remains valid for other regimes, such as the von Kármán and large-deformation regimes.

Next, we recall a few mathematical tools, mostly developed by the second author, that are used in this paper. The orthotropic character of the structure allows us to improve the Kirchhoff–Love plate decomposition from [25], [14, Chapter 11], [31], and [27] by cancelling the shear terms (see the proof in the Appendix). By an interpolation technique, the rigid displacements of the disconnected rigid substructures are extended to the whole domain. Such extensions are often used for perforated structures with Neumann conditions on the perforations; see, for example, [14, 31, 32, 30, 34]. In contrast, under homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions one usually extends by zero.

In this paper, we also present polynomial approximations (in this case even the exact solutions $\mathcal{U}^\blacktriangle$ and $\mathcal{U}^{\blacktriangle\blacktriangle}$), which strongly converge to the main limiting fields and correctors. Similar tools can be found in [19, 18, 38].

We also point out that, in our setting, the inter-layer between two contiguous plates is thin and elastic, i.e. softer than the plates themselves. If we fix ε and let $\delta \rightarrow 0$, then the corrector problems and their corresponding macroscopic strain components coincide with those obtained in [23] and [33]. The third corrector corresponds to a cylindrical hinge between two rigid plates.

The main mathematical novelty of this work lies in the analytical framework developed to handle the interplay between dimension reduction, high-contrast homogenization, and unilateral (non-penetration) constraints within linearized elasticity. In particular, the paper introduces a new decomposition of displacements consistent with the rigidity constraint, establishes uniform Korn-type estimates adapted to the hard/soft composite structure, and employs rescaled unfolding operators to capture the multiscale limit behavior. These tools allow for the derivation of the limit variational equation governing the effective plate model. Below, we summarize the main analytical techniques and results.

- In Section 3, we establish that every admissible displacement can be decomposed into a Kirchhoff–Love (KL) type displacement and a residual part satisfying the rigidity constraint, i.e.,

$$u(x) = U_{KL}(x) + \tilde{u}(x) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathfrak{U}_1(x') - x_3 \partial_1 \mathfrak{U}_3(x') \\ \mathfrak{U}_2(x') - x_3 \partial_2 \mathfrak{U}_3(x') \\ \mathfrak{U}_3(x') + u(x') \end{pmatrix} + \tilde{u}(x), \quad \text{for a.e. } x = (x', x_3) \in \Omega_\delta,$$

such that

$$e(u) = e(U_{KL}) = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{u} = 0 \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^H.$$

The membrane displacement $\mathfrak{U}_m = \mathfrak{U}_1 \mathbf{e}_1 + \mathfrak{U}_2 \mathbf{e}_2$ and the bending displacement \mathfrak{U}_3 satisfy the following Korn-type estimates:

$$\|\mathfrak{U}_3\|_{H^1(\omega_\delta)} \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{1/2}\delta} \|e(u)\|_{L^2(\Omega_\delta)}, \quad \|\mathfrak{U}_m\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{1/2}} \|e(u)\|_{L^2(\Omega_\delta)},$$

which are sharper than those obtained using classical tools such as the Poincaré inequality.

- We also derive estimates of different orders for higher derivatives:

$$\|\partial_{\alpha\beta}^2 \mathfrak{U}_3\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} \leq \frac{C}{\delta^{3/2}} \|e(u)\|_{L^2(\Omega_\delta)}, \quad \|\partial_\alpha \mathfrak{U}_m\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} \leq \frac{C}{\delta^{1/2}} \|e(u)\|_{L^2(\Omega_\delta)}.$$

Due to the difference in sharpness of these estimates, in Section 4 we construct additional global fields using \mathcal{Q}_1 -interpolation to ensure sufficient regularity of the unfolded limits of \mathfrak{U}_m and \mathfrak{U}_3 . In particular, we construct \mathcal{U}° and \mathcal{R}° in Subsection 4.1, using \mathcal{Q}_1 -interpolation on cells isomorphic to $(0, \varepsilon)^2$, to ensure sufficient regularity for the limit macroscopic fields. In Subsections 4.2–4.3, we define \mathcal{R} , \mathcal{U} , $\mathcal{U}^\blacktriangle$, and $\mathcal{U}^{\blacktriangle\blacktriangle}$ to obtain the exact unfolded limits presented in Section 7, specifically in Lemma 7.1. For this construction, we divide each cell $(-\frac{\delta}{2}, \varepsilon - \frac{\delta}{2})^2$ into the union of two squares and two rectangles (see Figure 2), and perform \mathcal{Q}_1 -interpolation on each of these subdomains.

- The main tool used to derive the explicit form of the limit strain tensor in Section 7 relies on two rescaled unfolding operators (introduced in Section 6), together with the KL-decomposition and the global fields. First, in Lemma 7.1, we derive the macroscopic displacement fields. Then, using the two-dimensional rescaled unfolding operator, we obtain the unfolded limits of these fields. Finally, in Lemma 7.2, we establish the unfolded limit of the infinitesimal (linearized) strain tensor by means of the three-dimensional rescaled unfolding operator. All microscopic fields depend on the direction corresponding to the two in-plane axes.
- The construction of global fields in Section 4 also provides insight into the definition of the recovery sequence. The recovery sequence itself is constructed in Section 8.1. In particular, in Theorems B.3–B.5, we show that the spaces $W^{1,\infty}(\omega_\delta)$ with vanishing gradient, and $W^{2,\infty}((-\delta/2, L + \delta/2))$ with vanishing second derivative on the hard part, are dense in $W^{1,\infty}(\omega)$ and $W^{2,\infty}(0, L)$, respectively, in the sense of the unfolding operators.
- In Section 8 (see Subsection 7.3 for the derivation), we define the set of limit displacements, denoted by \mathbb{D}_0 . In Theorem 8.2, we formulate the limit unfolded problem and establish the strong convergence of the strain tensor via the convergence of the energy, given by

$$\lim_{(\varepsilon, \delta) \rightarrow (0,0)} \frac{1}{\varepsilon \delta^4} \int_{\Omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^S} \mathbb{A}_{\varepsilon\delta,ijkl}(x) e_{ij}(u_{\varepsilon\delta}) e_{kl}(u_{\varepsilon\delta}) dx = \sum_{\alpha=1}^2 \int_{\omega} \mathcal{A}^{(\alpha)} E^{(\alpha)}(\mathfrak{U}) \cdot E^{(\alpha)}(\mathfrak{V}) dx',$$

where

$$E^{(1)}(\mathfrak{V}) = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_2 \mathfrak{V}_1 \\ \partial_2 \mathfrak{V}_2 \\ \partial_{22}^2 \mathfrak{V}_3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad E^{(2)}(\mathfrak{V}) = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_1 \mathfrak{V}_2 \\ \partial_1 \mathfrak{V}_1 \\ \partial_{11}^2 \mathfrak{V}_3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \forall \mathfrak{V} \in \mathbb{D}_0.$$

Then, by solving the associated cell problems and introducing suitable correctors, which are the solutions of the following auxiliary problems

$$\int_{\mathcal{Y}_\alpha} \mathbb{A}_{ijkl}^{(\alpha)}(y) (\mathbf{M}_{r,ij}^{(\alpha)} + E_{ij}^{(\alpha)}(0, \chi_r^{(\alpha)})) E_{kl}^{(\alpha)}(0, \widehat{v}^{(\alpha)}) dy = 0, \quad \forall \widehat{v}^{(\alpha)} \in \mathbf{L}^2((0, 1)_{y_\alpha}, H^1(\mathfrak{I}^2)),$$

where $\mathbf{M}_r^{(\alpha)}$ for $\alpha = 1, 2$ and $r = 1, 2, 3$ are 3×3 symmetric matrices given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}_1^{(1)} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \mathbf{M}_2^{(1)} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \mathbf{M}_3^{(1)} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -y_3 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \mathbf{M}_1^{(2)} &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \mathbf{M}_2^{(2)} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \mathbf{M}_3^{(2)} &= \begin{pmatrix} -y_3 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that the correctors have zero values on the lateral boundary parts with the normal belonging to the plate midplane and have zero Neumann conditions on the lateral parts with the normal in the x_3 -direction.

Finally, we characterize the homogenized problem and compute the effective (homogenized) tensor, given by

$$\mathcal{A}_{rs}^{(\alpha)} = \int_{\mathcal{Y}_\alpha} \mathbb{A}_{ijkl}^{(\alpha)}(y) \left[\mathbf{M}_{r,ij}^{(\alpha)} + E_{ij}^{(\alpha)}(0, \chi_r^{(\alpha)}) \right] \left[\mathbf{M}_{s,kl}^{(\alpha)} + E_{kl}^{(\alpha)}(0, \chi_s^{(\alpha)}) \right] dy$$

for $r, s \in \{1, 2, 3\}$.

- Technical proofs are presented in Appendix A–C.

We end the introduction by drawing the reader's attention to the limit problem, in which the out-of-plane limit field decomposes into two components (i.e. $\partial_{12}^2 \mathcal{U}_3 = 0$ a.e. in ω), and for each α the corresponding component depends only on the single in-plane variable $x_{3-\alpha}$. In the linear setting this decomposition extends to all quantities, including the three correctors. In future studies of nonlinear problems on the same topology, this decomposition will yield natural macroscopic constraints, which are particularly relevant for applications such as 3D-printing technologies.

Notations

The following notation will be used:

- $\omega \doteq (0, L)^2$, $\gamma \doteq \{0\} \times (0, l) \cup (0, l) \times \{0\}$ with $0 < l < L$, $\omega_\delta \doteq \left(-\frac{\delta}{2}, L + \frac{\delta}{2}\right)^2$,
- $\mathcal{I} \doteq \left(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right)$, $\mathcal{I}_\kappa \doteq \left(-\frac{\kappa}{2}, \frac{\kappa}{2}\right)$, $\kappa > 0$,
- $Y_1 \doteq (0, 1) \times \mathcal{I}$, $Y_2 \doteq \mathcal{I} \times (0, 1)$, and $\mathcal{Y}_\alpha \doteq Y_\alpha \times \mathcal{I}$, $\alpha \in \{1, 2\}$,
- we choose ε such that $\frac{L}{\varepsilon} \doteq N_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $\frac{l}{\varepsilon} \doteq n_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}^{*4}$,
- $\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon \doteq \{0, \dots, N_\varepsilon\}^2$, $\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^* \doteq \{0, \dots, N_\varepsilon - 1\}^2$, $\overline{\mathcal{K}}_\varepsilon \doteq \{-1, \dots, N_\varepsilon\}^2$,
 $\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^{(1)} \doteq \{0, \dots, N_\varepsilon - 1\} \times \{0, \dots, N_\varepsilon\}$, $\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^{(2)} \doteq \{0, \dots, N_\varepsilon\} \times \{0, \dots, N_\varepsilon - 1\}$,
- $\omega_{pq} \doteq (p\varepsilon, p\varepsilon + \varepsilon) \times (q\varepsilon, q\varepsilon + \varepsilon)$,
 $\tilde{\omega}_{pq} \doteq \left(p\varepsilon - \frac{\delta}{2}, (p+1)\varepsilon + \frac{\delta}{2}\right) \times \left(q\varepsilon - \frac{\delta}{2}, (q+1)\varepsilon + \frac{\delta}{2}\right)$,
 $\omega_{pq}^H \doteq \left(p\varepsilon + \frac{\delta}{2}, (p+1)\varepsilon - \frac{\delta}{2}\right) \times \left(q\varepsilon + \frac{\delta}{2}, (q+1)\varepsilon - \frac{\delta}{2}\right)$, $(p, q) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$,
- \mathbf{M}_3 is the space of 3×3 real matrices, \mathbf{S}_3 the space space of real 3×3 symmetric matrices, \mathbf{I}_3 the identity matrix of \mathbf{M}_3 ,
- $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ the standard basis of \mathbb{R}^n , $n \geq 1$, $|\cdot|$ the standard Euclidean norm in \mathbb{R}^n , $n \geq 1$, and Frobenius norm in \mathbf{M}_3 ,
- $x' \doteq (x_1, x_2)$ the current point in \mathbb{R}^2 and $x \doteq (x', x_3) \doteq (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ the current point in \mathbb{R}^3 ,
- $\partial_i \doteq \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}$, $\partial_{ij}^2 \doteq \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}$ for $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, and $d_\alpha \doteq \frac{d}{dx_\alpha}$, $d_{\alpha\alpha}^2 \doteq \frac{d^2}{dx_\alpha^2}$, $\alpha \in \{1, 2\}$,
- $\partial_{y_i} \doteq \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i}$, for $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$,
- for any $u \in H^1(\Omega_\delta)^3$ the linearized strain tensor $e(u)$ is the 3×3 symmetric matrix whose entries are

$$e_{ij}(u) = \frac{1}{2}(\partial_i u_j + \partial_j u_i), \quad \forall (i, j) \in \{1, 2, 3\}^2.$$

Throughout this paper, we choose the parameters ε and δ such that $0 < 3\delta < \varepsilon$ and

$$\lim_{(\varepsilon, \delta) \rightarrow (0, 0)} \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon} = 0. \quad (1.2)$$

The Greek letters α, β belong to $\{1, 2\}$ and the Latin letters i, j, k, l to $\{1, 2, 3\}$ (if not specified). We use the Einstein convention of summation over repeated indices.

2 Problem setting

In this section, we describe the domain, the set of admissible displacements and the linearized elasticity problem.

⁴ This implies that $\frac{L}{l} \in \mathbb{Q}^*$.




Figure 1: Blue (hard) tiles placed periodically, and red (soft) rod grid.

2.1 Domain description

The rigid re-enforced composite plate in its reference free-stressed form is occupying the region given by

$$\Omega_\delta \doteq \omega_\delta \times \mathcal{I}_\delta = \text{Interior}(\overline{\Omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^S} \cup \overline{\Omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^H}).$$

Ω_δ is the union of small plates and beams given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{pq}^H &= \omega_{pq}^H \times \mathcal{I}_\delta, \quad \forall (p, q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^*, \\ \omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^H &= \bigcup_{(p,q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^*} \omega_{pq}^H, \quad \omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^S \doteq \omega_\delta \setminus \overline{\omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^H}, \quad \Omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^H = \omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^H \times \mathcal{I}_\delta, \quad \Omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^S = \Omega_\delta \setminus \overline{\Omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^H} = \omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^S \times \mathcal{I}_\delta. \end{aligned}$$

We also define the set of beams of direction \mathbf{e}_1 and \mathbf{e}_2 by

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)} &\doteq \omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)} \times \mathcal{I}_\delta, \quad \omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)} \doteq \bigcup_{q=0}^{N_\varepsilon} \left(-\frac{\delta}{2}, L + \frac{\delta}{2} \right) \times \left(q\varepsilon - \frac{\delta}{2}, q\varepsilon + \frac{\delta}{2} \right), \\ \Omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)} &\doteq \omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)} \times \mathcal{I}_\delta, \quad \omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)} \doteq \bigcup_{p=0}^{N_\varepsilon} \left(p\varepsilon - \frac{\delta}{2}, p\varepsilon + \frac{\delta}{2} \right) \times \left(-\frac{\delta}{2}, L + \frac{\delta}{2} \right) \quad \text{so} \quad \Omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^S = \Omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)} \cup \Omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}. \end{aligned}$$

2.2 Set of admissible displacements

In this paper, we deal with displacements $u \in H^1(\Omega_\delta)^3$ satisfying the following conditions:

- on a part of the boundary of soft part, we have homogeneous boundary condition

$$u = 0, \quad \text{a.e. on } \Gamma_\delta = \left[\mathcal{I}_\delta \times \left(-\frac{\delta}{2}, l - \frac{\delta}{2} \right) \cup \left(-\frac{\delta}{2}, l - \frac{\delta}{2} \right) \times \mathcal{I}_\delta \right] \times \mathcal{I}_\delta = \gamma_\delta \times \mathcal{I}_\delta. \quad (2.1)$$

- the displacements are rigid displacements in $\Omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^H$

$$e(u) = 0 \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^H. \quad (2.2)$$

So, we have

$$\begin{aligned} u(x) &= \mathbf{a}_{pq} + \mathcal{R}_{pq} \wedge \bar{x}_{pq} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{a}_{pq,1} + \mathcal{R}_{pq,2} \bar{x}_{pq,3} - \mathcal{R}_{pq,3} \bar{x}_{pq,2} \\ \mathbf{a}_{pq,2} + \mathcal{R}_{pq,3} \bar{x}_{pq,1} - \mathcal{R}_{pq,1} \bar{x}_{pq,3} \\ \mathbf{a}_{pq,3} + \mathcal{R}_{pq,1} \bar{x}_{pq,2} - \mathcal{R}_{pq,2} \bar{x}_{pq,1} \end{pmatrix} \quad \forall (p, q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^*, \\ \bar{x}_{pq} &= x - \varepsilon \left(p + \frac{1}{2} \right) \mathbf{e}_1 - \varepsilon \left(q + \frac{1}{2} \right) \mathbf{e}_2, \quad \forall (p, q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^*, \quad (\mathbf{a}_{pq}, \mathcal{R}_{pq}) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3. \end{aligned}$$

- they satisfy the non-penetration condition between two consecutive rigid bodies

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[\left(q\varepsilon + \frac{\delta}{2} \right) + u_2 \left(p\varepsilon + z_1, q\varepsilon + \frac{\delta}{2}, z_3 \right) \right] - \left[\left(q\varepsilon - \frac{\delta}{2} \right) + u_2 \left(p\varepsilon + z_1, q\varepsilon - \frac{\delta}{2}, z_3 \right) \right] \geq 0, \\ & \text{for all } (p, q) \in \{1, \dots, N_\varepsilon - 1\} \times \{0, \dots, N_\varepsilon - 1\} \text{ and for a.e. } (z_1, z_3) \in \left(\frac{\delta}{2}, \varepsilon - \frac{\delta}{2} \right) \times \mathcal{I}_\delta, \\ & \left[\left(p\varepsilon + \frac{\delta}{2} \right) + u_1 \left(p\varepsilon + \frac{\delta}{2}, q\varepsilon + z_2, z_3 \right) \right] - \left[\left(p\varepsilon - \frac{\delta}{2} \right) + u_1 \left(p\varepsilon - \frac{\delta}{2}, q\varepsilon + z_2, z_3 \right) \right] \geq 0, \\ & \text{for all } (p, q) \in \{0, \dots, N_\varepsilon - 1\} \times \{1, \dots, N_\varepsilon - 1\} \text{ and for a.e. } (z_1, z_3) \in \left(\frac{\delta}{2}, \varepsilon - \frac{\delta}{2} \right) \times \mathcal{I}_\delta. \end{aligned}$$

This is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} & u_2 \left(p\varepsilon + z_1, q\varepsilon + \frac{\delta}{2}, z_3 \right) - u_2 \left(p\varepsilon + z_1, q\varepsilon - \frac{\delta}{2}, z_3 \right) \geq -\delta, \\ & \text{for all } (p, q) \in \{1, \dots, N_\varepsilon - 1\} \times \{0, \dots, N_\varepsilon - 1\} \text{ and for a.e. } (z_1, z_3) \in \left(\frac{\delta}{2}, \varepsilon - \frac{\delta}{2} \right) \times \mathcal{I}_\delta, \\ & u_1 \left(p\varepsilon + \frac{\delta}{2}, q\varepsilon + z_2, z_3 \right) - u_1 \left(p\varepsilon - \frac{\delta}{2}, q\varepsilon + z_2, z_3 \right) \geq -\delta, \\ & \text{for all } (p, q) \in \{0, \dots, N_\varepsilon - 1\} \times \{1, \dots, N_\varepsilon - 1\} \text{ and for a.e. } (z_1, z_3) \in \left(\frac{\delta}{2}, \varepsilon - \frac{\delta}{2} \right) \times \mathcal{I}_\delta. \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

Observe that

$$\nabla u = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\mathcal{R}_{pq,3} & \mathcal{R}_{pq,2} \\ \mathcal{R}_{pq,3} & 0 & -\mathcal{R}_{pq,1} \\ -\mathcal{R}_{pq,2} & \mathcal{R}_{pq,1} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \text{ a.e. in } \Omega_{pq}^H. \tag{2.4}$$

Since the soft part is glued to the hard part, we have continuity of displacement and response function at interface.

The set of admissible displacements $\mathbf{U}_{\varepsilon\delta}$ is a closed convex subset of $H^1(\Omega_\delta)^3$

$$\mathbf{U}_{\varepsilon\delta} \doteq \{u \in H^1(\Omega_\delta)^3 \mid \text{such that } u \text{ satisfies (2.1) -- (2.2) -- (2.3)}\}.$$

Note that for any displacement u belonging to $\mathbf{U}_{\varepsilon\delta}$, we have

$$\|e(u)\|_{L^2(\Omega_\delta)} = \|e(u)\|_{L^2(\Omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^S)} = \mathbf{E}(u).$$

2.3 Linearized elasticity problem

We consider the following elasticity problem, given in the form of a variational inequality (see [45, 37]):

$$\begin{cases} \text{Find } u_{\varepsilon\delta} \in \mathbf{U}_{\varepsilon\delta} \text{ such that,} \\ \int_{\Omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^S} \mathbb{A}_{\varepsilon\delta,ijkl}(x) e_{ij}(u_{\varepsilon\delta}) e_{kl}(u_{\varepsilon\delta} - v) dx \leq \int_{\Omega_\delta} f_{\varepsilon\delta} \cdot (u_{\varepsilon\delta} - v) dx, \quad \forall v \in \mathbf{U}_{\varepsilon\delta}. \end{cases} \tag{2.5}$$

We assume that the Hooke's coefficients $\mathbb{A}_{\varepsilon\delta,ijkl} \in L^\infty(\Omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^S)$ satisfy:

- there exists $c_0 > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{A}_{\varepsilon\delta,ijkl} \mathbf{S}_{ij} \mathbf{S}_{kl} \geq c_0 |\mathbf{S}|^2, \quad \forall \mathbf{S} \in \mathbf{S}_3. \tag{2.6}$$

- $\mathbb{A}_{\varepsilon\delta,ijkl} = \mathbb{A}_{\varepsilon\delta,ijlk} = \mathbb{A}_{\varepsilon\delta,klji}$, for all $(i, j, k, l) \in \{1, 2, 3\}^4$.

For $f_{\varepsilon\delta} \in L^2(\Omega_\delta)^3$, we have using Stampacchia's lemma in [37], that exist a unique weak solution (due to the boundary condition (2.1)) $u_{\varepsilon\delta} \in \mathbf{U}_{\varepsilon\delta}$ to the problem (2.5).

3 Decomposition of the displacements of the structure

We consider the following subspace of $H^1(\Omega_\delta)^3$:

$$\mathcal{H}^1(\Omega_\delta)^3 \doteq \left\{ u \in H^1(\Omega_\delta)^3 \mid e(u) = 0 \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^H \right\}.$$

The theorem below is a variant of [27, Theorem 2].

Theorem 3.1. Any displacement u in $\mathcal{H}^1(\Omega_\delta)^3$ is decomposed as follows:

$$u(x) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathfrak{U}_1(x') - x_3 \partial_1 \mathfrak{U}_3(x') \\ \mathfrak{U}_2(x') - x_3 \partial_2 \mathfrak{U}_3(x') \\ \mathfrak{U}_3(x') + \mathfrak{u}(x') \end{pmatrix} + \tilde{u}(x) \quad \text{for a.e. } x \text{ in } \Omega_\delta. \quad (3.1)$$

where $\mathfrak{U}_\alpha \in H^1(\omega_\delta)$, $\mathfrak{U}_3 \in H^2(\omega_\delta)$, $\mathfrak{u} \in H^1(\omega_\delta)$ and $\tilde{u} \in H^1(\Omega_\delta)^3$ satisfies

$$\tilde{u} = 0 \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^H, \quad \int_{\mathcal{I}_\delta} \tilde{u}(\cdot, x_3) dx_3 = 0 \quad \text{a.e. in } \omega_\delta. \quad (3.2)$$

We set $\mathfrak{U}_m = \mathfrak{U}_1 \mathbf{e}_1 + \mathfrak{U}_2 \mathbf{e}_2$. The following estimates hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \|e_{\alpha\beta}(\mathfrak{U}_m)\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} + \delta \|\partial_{\alpha\beta}^2 \mathfrak{U}_3\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} &\leq \frac{C}{\delta^{1/2}} \|e(u)\|_{L^2(\Omega_\delta)}, \\ \|\mathfrak{u}\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} + \delta \|\nabla \mathfrak{u}\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} &\leq C \delta^{1/2} \|e(u)\|_{L^2(\Omega_\delta)}, \\ \|\tilde{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_\delta)} + \delta \|\nabla \tilde{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_\delta)} &\leq C \delta \|e(u)\|_{L^2(\Omega_\delta)}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

The constants depend only on ω .

Moreover, if $u = 0$ a.e. on Γ_δ then, the terms of the decomposition (3.1) satisfy

$$\mathfrak{U}_m = 0, \quad \mathfrak{U}_3 = \mathfrak{u} = 0, \quad \nabla \mathfrak{U}_3 = 0, \quad \tilde{u} = 0 \quad \text{a.e. on } \gamma.$$

The proof of the above theorem is given in Appendix A. This kind of decomposition was first introduced in [26] and later extended in [14, 27].

3.1 Global estimates

Let u be a displacement in $\mathbf{U}_{\varepsilon\delta}$. We decompose u as (3.1), then this along with (2.4) leads to the following equalities:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} -\partial_1 \mathfrak{U}_3 &= \mathcal{R}_{pq,2}, \quad -\partial_2 \mathfrak{U}_3 = -\mathcal{R}_{pq,1}, \\ \mathfrak{U}_1 &= \mathbf{a}_{pq,1} - \mathcal{R}_{pq,3} \bar{x}_{pq,2}, \quad \mathfrak{U}_2 = \mathbf{a}_{pq,2} + \mathcal{R}_{pq,3} \bar{x}_{pq,1}, \\ \mathfrak{U}_3 &= \mathbf{a}_{pq,3} + \mathcal{R}_{pq,1} \bar{x}_{pq,2} - \mathcal{R}_{pq,2} \bar{x}_{pq,1}, \end{aligned} \right\} \quad \text{a.e. in } \omega_{pq}^H, \quad \forall (p, q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^*. \quad (3.4)$$

Below, we give the first global estimates of the Kirchhoff-Love part of a displacement $u \in \mathbf{U}_{\varepsilon\delta}$.

Proposition 3.2. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla \mathfrak{U}_3\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} &\leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{1/2} \delta} \mathbf{E}(u), & \|\mathfrak{U}_3\|_{H^1(\omega_\delta)} &\leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{1/2} \delta} \mathbf{E}(u), \\ \|\nabla \mathfrak{U}_m\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} &\leq \frac{C}{\delta^{1/2}} \mathbf{E}(u), & \|\mathfrak{U}_m\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} &\leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{1/2}} \mathbf{E}(u). \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

The constants do not depend on ε and δ .

Proof. The estimate (3.5)₁ is a consequence of (3.4)_{1,2}, (3.3)₂ and Lemma B.1, from which and the boundary condition we obtain (3.5)₂. The 2D Korn inequality and (3.3)₁ yield (3.5)₃. The proof of (3.5)₄ is given after the proof of Lemma 4.1. \square

As a consequence of the above theorem,

Lemma 3.3. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{p=1}^{N_\varepsilon-1} \sum_{q=0}^{N_\varepsilon-1} |\mathcal{R}_{pq,2} - \mathcal{R}_{p-1q,2}|^2 &\leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon \delta^2} \mathbf{E}(u)^2, & \sum_{q=1}^{N_\varepsilon-1} \sum_{p=0}^{N_\varepsilon-1} |\mathcal{R}_{pq,1} - \mathcal{R}_{pq-1,1}|^2 &\leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon \delta^2} \mathbf{E}(u)^2, \\ \sum_{p=1}^{N_\varepsilon-1} \sum_{q=0}^{N_\varepsilon-1} |\mathcal{R}_{pq,1} - \mathcal{R}_{p-1q,1}|^2 &\leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^3} \mathbf{E}(u)^2, & \sum_{q=1}^{N_\varepsilon-1} \sum_{p=0}^{N_\varepsilon-1} |\mathcal{R}_{pq,2} - \mathcal{R}_{pq-1,2}|^2 &\leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^3} \mathbf{E}(u)^2, \\ \sum_{p=1}^{N_\varepsilon-1} \sum_{q=0}^{N_\varepsilon-1} |\mathcal{R}_{pq,3} - \mathcal{R}_{p-1q,3}|^2 &\leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^3} \mathbf{E}(u)^2, & \sum_{q=1}^{N_\varepsilon-1} \sum_{p=0}^{N_\varepsilon-1} |\mathcal{R}_{pq,3} - \mathcal{R}_{pq-1,3}|^2 &\leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^3} \mathbf{E}(u)^2 \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{q=0}^{N_\varepsilon-1} \sum_{p=1}^{N_\varepsilon-1} \left| \mathbf{a}_{pq} - \mathbf{a}_{p-1q} - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}(\mathcal{R}_{pq} + \mathcal{R}_{p-1q}) \wedge \mathbf{e}_1 \right|^2 &\leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \mathbf{E}(u)^2, \\ \sum_{p=0}^{N_\varepsilon-1} \sum_{q=1}^{N_\varepsilon-1} \left| \mathbf{a}_{pq} - \mathbf{a}_{pq-1} - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}(\mathcal{R}_{pq} + \mathcal{R}_{pq-1}) \wedge \mathbf{e}_2 \right|^2 &\leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \mathbf{E}(u)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

The constants do not depend on ε , δ and L .

Proof. First, we set

$$\tilde{\Omega}_{pq} \doteq \tilde{\omega}_{pq} \times \mathfrak{J}_\delta, \quad \forall (p, q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^*. \quad (3.8)$$

The proof is organized in the following steps.

Step 1. We recall the following classical result:

For any $\psi \in H^1(\tilde{\omega}_{pq})$ and $\Psi \in H^1(\tilde{\Omega}_{pq})^3$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi\|_{L^2(\tilde{\omega}_{pq})} &\leq C(\|\psi\|_{L^2(\omega_{pq}^H)} + \delta\|\nabla\psi\|_{L^2(\tilde{\omega}_{pq})}), \\ \|\Psi\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_{pq})} &\leq C(\|\Psi\|_{L^2(\Omega_{pq}^H)} + \delta\|e(\Psi)\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_{pq})}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

The constant does not depend on ε and δ .

Below, we give a brief proof of these inequalities. Theorem 2.3 in [26] gives a rigid displacement $\mathbf{R}_{pq} = \mathbf{A}_{pq} + \mathbf{B}_{pq} \wedge \bar{x}_{pq}$, $\mathbf{A}_{pq}, \mathbf{B}_{pq} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ such that

$$\|\Psi - \mathbf{R}_{pq}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_{pq})} \leq C\delta\|e(\Psi)\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_{pq})}.$$

Thus

$$\|\Psi\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_{pq})}^2 \leq C(\|\mathbf{R}_{pq}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_{pq})}^2 + \delta^2\|e(\Psi)\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_{pq})}^2) \leq C((\varepsilon + \delta)^2|\mathbf{A}_{pq}|^2 + (\varepsilon + \delta)^4|\mathbf{B}_{pq}|^2 + \delta^2\|e(\Psi)\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_{pq})}^2).$$

Besides, we have

$$(\varepsilon - \delta)^2|\mathbf{A}_{pq}|^2 + (\varepsilon - \delta)^4|\mathbf{B}_{pq}|^2 \leq C\|\mathbf{R}_{pq}\|_{L^2(\Omega_{pq}^H)}^2 \leq 2(\|\Psi - \mathbf{R}_{pq}\|_{L^2(\Omega_{pq}^H)}^2 + \|\Psi\|_{L^2(\Omega_{pq}^H)}^2).$$

This ends the proof of (3.9)₂. We obtain (3.9)₁ with the field $\Psi = \psi\mathbf{e}_1$ and thanks to (3.9)₂.

Step 2. A preliminary result.

Let v and w be two rigid displacements

$$v(x) = \mathbf{a} + \mathcal{R} \wedge x = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{a}_1 + \mathcal{R}_2 x_3 - \mathcal{R}_3 x_2 \\ \mathbf{a}_2 + \mathcal{R}_3(x_1 - \varepsilon/2) - \mathcal{R}_1 x_3 \\ \mathbf{a}_3 + \mathcal{R}_1 x_2 - \mathcal{R}_2(x_1 - \varepsilon/2) \end{pmatrix} \text{ a.e. in } \left(-\frac{\delta}{2}, \varepsilon\right) \times \mathfrak{J}_\varepsilon \times \mathfrak{J}_\delta, \quad (\mathbf{a}, \mathcal{R}) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3$$

and

$$w(x) = \mathbf{a}' + \mathcal{R}' \wedge x = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{a}'_1 + \mathcal{R}'_2 x_3 - \mathcal{R}'_3 x_2 \\ \mathbf{a}'_2 + \mathcal{R}'_3(x_1 + \varepsilon/2) - \mathcal{R}'_1 x_3 \\ \mathbf{a}'_3 + \mathcal{R}'_1 x_2 - \mathcal{R}'_2(x_1 + \varepsilon/2) \end{pmatrix} \text{ a.e. in } \left(-\varepsilon, \frac{\delta}{2}\right) \times \mathfrak{J}_\varepsilon \times \mathfrak{J}_\delta, \quad (\mathbf{a}', \mathcal{R}') \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3$$

In $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta} \doteq \mathfrak{J}_\delta \times \mathfrak{J}_\varepsilon \times \mathfrak{J}_\delta$ the components of $\mathbf{u} = v - w$ are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{u}_1 &= \mathbf{a}_1 - \mathbf{a}'_1 + (\mathcal{R}_2 - \mathcal{R}'_2)x_3 - (\mathcal{R}_3 - \mathcal{R}'_3)x_2, \\ \mathbf{u}_2 &= \mathbf{a}_2 - \mathbf{a}'_2 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}(\mathcal{R}_3 + \mathcal{R}'_3) + (\mathcal{R}_3 - \mathcal{R}'_3)x_1 - (\mathcal{R}_1 - \mathcal{R}'_1)x_3, \quad \text{in } \mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta}, \\ \mathbf{u}_3 &= \mathbf{a}_3 - \mathbf{a}'_3 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}(\mathcal{R}_2 + \mathcal{R}'_2) + (\mathcal{R}_1 - \mathcal{R}'_1)x_2 - (\mathcal{R}_2 - \mathcal{R}'_2)x_1. \end{aligned}$$

The L^2 norm of the components of $v - w$ in $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta}$ are

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})}^2 &= \varepsilon\delta^2 \left(|\mathbf{a}_1 - \mathbf{a}'_1|^2 + \left| \mathbf{a}_2 - \mathbf{a}'_2 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}(\mathcal{R}_3 + \mathcal{R}'_3) \right|^2 + \left| \mathbf{a}_3 - \mathbf{a}'_3 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}(\mathcal{R}_2 + \mathcal{R}'_2) \right|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{\delta^2}{6}|\mathcal{R}_2 - \mathcal{R}'_2|^2 + \left(\frac{\varepsilon^2}{12} + \frac{\delta^2}{12}\right)|\mathcal{R}_3 - \mathcal{R}'_3|^2 + \left(\frac{\delta^2}{12} + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{12}\right)|\mathcal{R}_1 - \mathcal{R}'_1|^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

Step 3. We prove (3.6)-(3.7).

We apply (3.9)₂ with the displacements $v = u$ and $w_{pq} = \mathbf{a}_{pq} + \mathcal{R}_{pq} \wedge \bar{x}_{pq}$ in $\tilde{\Omega}_{pq}$. Then, with $v = u$ and $w_{p-1q} = \mathbf{a}_{p-1q} + \mathcal{R}_{p-1q} \wedge \bar{x}_{p-1q}$ in $\tilde{\Omega}_{p-1q}$. This allows to estimate $w_{pq} - w_{p-1q}$ in $\tilde{\Omega}_{pq} \cap \tilde{\Omega}_{p-1q}$ using (3.10). We obtain (3.6)_{1,3,5}- (3.7)₁.

Similarly, proceeding as above we estimate $w_{pq} - w_{pq-1}$ in $\tilde{\Omega}_{pq} \cap \tilde{\Omega}_{pq-1}$, which along with (3.10) give (3.6)_{2,4,6}- (3.7)₂. This completes the proof. \square

4 The tools: Global fields using \mathcal{Q}_1 -interpolations

In this section, we construct several global displacement fields using \mathcal{Q}_1 -interpolation. These fields serve as tools to obtain the unfolded limits of the macroscopic Kirchhoff–Love displacements \mathfrak{U} .

More precisely, we first define $\mathcal{U}^\diamond, \mathcal{R}^\diamond \in H^1(\omega_\delta)^3$ to obtain sufficient regularity for the macroscopic limits of \mathfrak{U} . Then we define $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{R} \in H^1(\omega_\delta)^3$ and $\mathcal{U}_\alpha^\blacktriangle, \mathcal{U}_\alpha^\blacktriangle\blacktriangle \in H^1(\omega_\delta)$ to derive the exact expressions of the unfolded limits of \mathfrak{U} . Details on the corresponding convergence results are provided in Lemma 7.1.

4.1 The fields \mathcal{U}^\diamond and \mathcal{R}^\diamond

Let u be in $\mathbf{U}_{\varepsilon\delta}$, from the previous subsection, we decompose u as (3.1).

First, we need to define \mathbf{a}_{pq} and \mathcal{R}_{pq} for all $(p, q) \in \overline{\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon} \setminus \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^*$. We set ⁵

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{a}_{-1,q} &= \mathbf{a}_{0,q}, & \mathcal{R}_{-1,q} &= \mathcal{R}_{0,q}, & \mathbf{a}_{N_\varepsilon,q} &= \mathbf{a}_{N_\varepsilon-1,q}, & \mathcal{R}_{N_\varepsilon,q} &= \mathcal{R}_{N_\varepsilon-1,q}, & q &\in \{0, \dots, N_\varepsilon - 1\}, \\ \mathbf{a}_{p,-1} &= \mathbf{a}_{p,0}, & \mathcal{R}_{p,-1} &= \mathcal{R}_{p,0}, & \mathbf{a}_{p,N_\varepsilon} &= \mathbf{a}_{p,N_\varepsilon-1}, & \mathcal{R}_{p,N_\varepsilon} &= \mathcal{R}_{p,N_\varepsilon-1}, & p &\in \{-1, \dots, N_\varepsilon\}. \end{aligned}$$

If the displacement u vanishes on Γ_δ , then we set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{a}_{-1,q} &= \mathcal{R}_{-1,q} = \mathbf{a}_{0,q} = \mathcal{R}_{0,q} = 0 & q &\in \{0, \dots, n_\varepsilon - 1\}, \\ \mathbf{a}_{p,-1} &= \mathcal{R}_{p,-1} = \mathbf{a}_{p,0} = \mathcal{R}_{p,0} = 0 & p &\in \{-1, \dots, n_\varepsilon - 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

In order to complete the asymptotic behavior of the function \mathfrak{U} , we introduce the fields $\mathcal{R}^\diamond, \mathcal{U}^\diamond$ belonging to $H^1(\omega_\delta)^3$ by

$$\mathcal{R}^\diamond(p\varepsilon, q\varepsilon) = \mathcal{R}_{pq}, \quad \mathcal{U}^\diamond(p\varepsilon, q\varepsilon) = \mathbf{a}_{pq} \quad (p, q) \in \overline{\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon}$$

and then, in $\overline{\omega}_{pq}$, $(p, q) \in \overline{\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon}$, the fields $\mathcal{R}^\diamond, \mathcal{U}^\diamond$ are the \mathcal{Q}_1 interpolation of their values at the vertices of this square. By construction, the field $\mathcal{R}^\diamond, \mathcal{U}^\diamond$ belong to $H^1((-\varepsilon, L + \varepsilon)^2)^3$ and satisfy the following boundary conditions:

$$\mathcal{U}^\diamond = \mathcal{R}^\diamond = 0 \quad \text{on } \gamma.$$

In the lemma below, we give the estimates of the restrictions of these fields to ω_δ .

Lemma 4.1. *We have*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla \mathcal{R}^\diamond\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} + \|\mathcal{R}^\diamond\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} &\leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{1/2}\delta} \mathbf{E}(u), \\ \|\nabla \mathcal{R}_3^\diamond\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} &\leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{3/2}} \mathbf{E}(u), \quad \|\mathcal{R}_3^\diamond\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{1/2}} \mathbf{E}(u), \\ \|\partial_1 \mathcal{R}_1^\diamond\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} + \|\partial_2 \mathcal{R}_2^\diamond\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} &\leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{3/2}} \mathbf{E}(u) \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_1 \mathcal{U}_1^\diamond\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} + \|\partial_2 \mathcal{U}_2^\diamond\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} &\leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{1/2}} \mathbf{E}(u), \\ \|\partial_1 \mathcal{U}_2^\diamond - \mathcal{R}_3^\diamond\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} + \|\partial_2 \mathcal{U}_1^\diamond + \mathcal{R}_3^\diamond\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} &\leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{1/2}} \mathbf{E}(u), \\ \|\partial_1 \mathcal{U}_3^\diamond + \mathcal{R}_2^\diamond\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} + \|\partial_2 \mathcal{U}_3^\diamond - \mathcal{R}_1^\diamond\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} &\leq C \frac{\varepsilon^{1/2}}{\delta} \mathbf{E}(u). \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

Moreover, we have

$$\|\mathcal{U}_\alpha^\diamond\|_{H^1(\omega_\delta)} \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{1/2}} \mathbf{E}(u), \quad \|\mathcal{U}_3^\diamond\|_{H^1(\omega_\delta)} \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{1/2}\delta} \mathbf{E}(u). \tag{4.3}$$

The constants do not depend on ε and δ .

Proof. The estimates (4.1)_{1,3,5,6} are the immediate consequences of (3.6)_{1,2,3,4,5,6} and the \mathcal{Q}_1 -character of \mathcal{R}^\diamond . Then, the boundary condition satisfied by \mathcal{R}^\diamond leads to (4.1)₂.

⁵ We use \mathcal{R}_{pq} and $\mathcal{R}_{p,q}$ interchangeably for $(p, q) \in \overline{\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon}$, as they refer to the same field. Similarly, \mathbf{a}_{pq} and $\mathbf{a}_{p,q}$ are used to denote the same quantity.

Now, in ω_{pq} , for any $(z_1, z_2) \in (0, \varepsilon)^2$. we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{U}^\diamond(p\varepsilon + z_1, q\varepsilon + z_2) &= \mathbf{a}_{pq} \frac{(\varepsilon - z_1)(\varepsilon - z_2)}{\varepsilon^2} + \mathbf{a}_{p+1q} \frac{z_1(\varepsilon - z_2)}{\varepsilon^2} + \mathbf{a}_{pq+1} \frac{(\varepsilon - z_1)z_2}{\varepsilon^2} + \mathbf{a}_{p+1q+1} \frac{z_1 z_2}{\varepsilon^2}, \\ \partial_1 \mathcal{U}^\diamond(p\varepsilon + z_1, q\varepsilon + z_2) &= \frac{\mathbf{a}_{p+1q} - \mathbf{a}_{pq}}{\varepsilon} \frac{\varepsilon - z_2}{\varepsilon} + \frac{\mathbf{a}_{p+1q+1} - \mathbf{a}_{pq+1}}{\varepsilon} \frac{z_2}{\varepsilon}, \\ \mathcal{R}^\diamond(p\varepsilon + z_1, q\varepsilon + z_2) &= \mathcal{R}_{pq} \frac{(\varepsilon - z_1)(\varepsilon - z_2)}{\varepsilon^2} + \mathcal{R}_{p+1q} \frac{z_1(\varepsilon - z_2)}{\varepsilon^2} + \mathcal{R}_{pq+1} \frac{(\varepsilon - z_1)z_2}{\varepsilon^2} + \mathcal{R}_{p+1q+1} \frac{z_1 z_2}{\varepsilon^2}, \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2}(\mathcal{R}_{p+1q} + \mathcal{R}_{pq}) + \frac{z_1 - \varepsilon/2}{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{R}_{p+1q} - \mathcal{R}_{pq}) \right) \frac{\varepsilon - z_2}{\varepsilon} \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{1}{2}(\mathcal{R}_{p+1q+1} + \mathcal{R}_{pq+1}) + \frac{z_1 - \varepsilon/2}{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{R}_{p+1q+1} - \mathcal{R}_{pq+1}) \right) \frac{z_2}{\varepsilon}.\end{aligned}$$

Then, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}(\partial_1 \mathcal{U}^\diamond - \mathcal{R}^\diamond \wedge \mathbf{e}_1)(p\varepsilon + z_1, q\varepsilon + z_2) &= \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left(\mathbf{a}_{p+1q} - \mathbf{a}_{pq} - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}(\mathcal{R}_{p+1q} + \mathcal{R}_{pq}) \wedge \mathbf{e}_1 \right) \frac{\varepsilon - z_2}{\varepsilon} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left(\mathbf{a}_{p+1q+1} - \mathbf{a}_{pq+1} - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}(\mathcal{R}_{p+1q+1} + \mathcal{R}_{pq+1}) \wedge \mathbf{e}_1 \right) \frac{z_2}{\varepsilon} \\ &\quad + (\mathcal{R}_{p+1q} - \mathcal{R}_{pq}) \wedge \mathbf{e}_1 \frac{2z_1 - \varepsilon}{2\varepsilon} \frac{\varepsilon - z_2}{\varepsilon} + (\mathcal{R}_{p+1q+1} - \mathcal{R}_{pq+1}) \wedge \mathbf{e}_1 \frac{2z_1 - \varepsilon}{2\varepsilon} \frac{z_2}{\varepsilon}.\end{aligned}$$

Thanks to the estimates (3.6) this gives (4.2)_{1,3,5}. Similarly we prove (4.2)_{2,4,6}.

The estimate (4.3)₂ is direct consequence of (4.1)₂-(4.2)_{5,6} and Poincaré inequality. Estimates (4.2)_{1,2,3,4} lead to

$$\|e_{\alpha\beta}(\mathcal{U}^\diamond)\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{1/2}} \mathbf{E}(u)$$

which along with the 2D Korn's inequality give (4.3)₁ from which and (4.2)_{3,4} we obtain (4.1)₄.

Finally, from (4.3)₁ and (4.2)₃ we deduce (4.1)₄. This ends the proof of the lemma. \square

Proof of the estimate (3.5)₄. From (4.1)₄-(4.3)₁ and the \mathcal{Q}_1 character of $\mathcal{U}_\alpha^\diamond$, \mathcal{R}_3^\diamond we obtain

$$\sum_{(p,q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^*} |\mathbf{a}_{pq,\alpha}|^2 \varepsilon^2 \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \mathbf{E}(u)^2, \quad \sum_{(p,q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^*} |\mathcal{R}_{pq,3}|^2 \varepsilon^2 \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \mathbf{E}(u)^2. \quad (4.4)$$

Therefore, we get

$$\sum_{(p,q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^*} \|\mathcal{U}_\alpha\|_{L^2(\omega_{pq}^H)}^2 \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \mathbf{E}(u)^2$$

which along with (3.5)₃ and inequality (3.9)₁, give the required result (3.5)₄. \square

Lemma 4.2. *We have*

$$\begin{aligned}\|\partial_1 \mathcal{U}_3 + \mathcal{R}_2^\diamond\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} + \|\partial_2 \mathcal{U}_3 - \mathcal{R}_1^\diamond\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} &\leq C \frac{\varepsilon^{1/2}}{\delta} \mathbf{E}(u), \\ \|\mathcal{U}_\alpha - \mathcal{U}_\alpha^\diamond\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} &\leq C \varepsilon^{1/2} \mathbf{E}(u), \\ \|\mathcal{U}_3 - \mathcal{U}_3^\diamond\|_{H^1(\omega_\delta)} &\leq C \frac{\varepsilon^{1/2}}{\delta} \mathbf{E}(u).\end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

The constants do not depend on ε and δ .

Proof. First, due to the \mathcal{Q}_1 character of \mathcal{R}^\diamond we have

$$\sum_{(p,q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^*} \|\mathcal{R}_\alpha^\diamond - \mathcal{R}_{pq,\alpha}\|_{L^2(\omega_{pq})}^2 \leq C \varepsilon^2 \|\nabla \mathcal{R}_\alpha^\diamond\|_{L^2(\omega)}^2. \quad (4.6)$$

The equality (3.4)₁ and estimate (3.9)₁ yield

$$\sum_{(p,q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^*} \|\partial_1 \mathcal{U}_3 + \mathcal{R}_2^\diamond\|_{L^2(\tilde{\omega}_{pq})}^2 \leq C \sum_{(p,q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^*} \left\{ \|\mathcal{R}_2^\diamond - \mathcal{R}_{pq,2}\|_{L^2(\omega_{pq}^H)}^2 + \delta^2 (\|\nabla \mathcal{R}_2^\diamond\|_{L^2(\tilde{\omega}_{pq})}^2 + \|\nabla(\partial_1 \mathcal{U}_3)\|_{L^2(\tilde{\omega}_{pq})}^2) \right\}.$$

Then, (4.1)₁ together with (3.3)₂ give (4.5)₁. Similarly, we show (4.5)₂.

From the equalities (3.4)_{3,4} and estimate (4.4)₁ we obtain

$$\sum_{(p,q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^*} \|\mathcal{U}_\alpha - \mathbf{a}_{pq,\alpha}\|_{L^2(\omega_{pq}^H)}^2 \leq C \varepsilon \mathbf{E}(u)^2.$$

The \mathcal{Q}_1 -character of \mathcal{U}_α° together with estimate (4.3)₁ give

$$\sum_{(p,q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^*} \|\mathcal{U}_\alpha^\circ - \mathbf{a}_{pq,\alpha}\|_{L^2(\omega_{pq})}^2 \leq C\varepsilon^2 \|\nabla \mathcal{U}_\alpha^\circ\|_{L^2(\omega)}^2 \leq C\varepsilon \mathbf{E}(u)^2.$$

The above inequalities along with (3.9)₁, (4.3)₁ and (3.5)₃ give (4.5)₃.

Now, equality (3.4)₅ and estimates (4.1)₂ give

$$\sum_{(p,q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^*} \|\mathcal{U}_3 - \mathbf{a}_{pq,3}\|_{L^2(\omega_{pq}^H)}^2 \leq C \frac{\varepsilon}{\delta^2} \mathbf{E}(u)^2.$$

Besides, due to the \mathcal{Q}_1 -character of \mathcal{U}_3° together with estimate (4.3)₂ give

$$\sum_{(p,q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^*} \|\mathcal{U}_3^\circ - \mathbf{a}_{pq,3}\|_{L^2(\omega_{pq})}^2 \leq C\varepsilon^2 \|\nabla \mathcal{U}_3^\circ\|_{L^2(\omega)}^2 \leq C \frac{\varepsilon}{\delta^2} \mathbf{E}(u)^2. \quad (4.7)$$

Using the above estimates along with (3.9)₁, (4.3)₂ and (3.5)₂ we obtain the estimate of the L^2 norm of $\mathcal{U}_3 - \mathcal{U}_3^\circ$. The estimate of the gradient of this difference is a consequence of (4.2)_{5,6} and (4.5)_{1,2}. \square

4.2 The fields \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{R}

Set

$$\begin{aligned} R_{pq}^1 &: (p\varepsilon, q\varepsilon) + \mathfrak{J}_{\varepsilon-\delta} \times \mathfrak{J}_\delta, & (p, q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^{(1)}, \\ R_{pq}^2 &: (p\varepsilon, q\varepsilon) + \mathfrak{J}_\delta \times \mathfrak{J}_{\varepsilon-\delta}, & (p, q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^{(2)}, \\ R_{pq}^3 &: (p\varepsilon, q\varepsilon) + \mathfrak{J}_\delta^2, & (p, q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

Let ϕ_{pq} , $(p, q) \in \overline{\mathcal{K}}_\varepsilon$ be real numbers. To this family of real numbers we associate a function ϕ defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{in } \omega_{pq}: \quad & \phi(p\varepsilon + z_1, q\varepsilon + z_2) = \phi_{pq}, \quad (z_1, z_2) \in \mathfrak{J}_{\varepsilon-\delta}^2 \\ \text{in } R_{pq}^1: \quad & \phi(p\varepsilon + z_1, q\varepsilon + z_2) = \phi_{pq} \frac{\delta + 2z_2}{2\delta} + \phi_{pq-1} \frac{\delta - 2z_2}{2\delta}, \quad (z_1, z_2) \in \mathfrak{J}_{\varepsilon-\delta} \times \mathfrak{J}_\delta, \\ \text{in } R_{pq}^2: \quad & \phi(p\varepsilon + z_1, q\varepsilon + z_2) = \phi_{pq} \frac{\delta + 2z_1}{2\delta} + \phi_{p-1q} \frac{\delta - 2z_1}{2\delta}, \quad (z_1, z_2) \in \mathfrak{J}_\delta \times \mathfrak{J}_{\varepsilon-\delta}, \\ \text{in } R_{pq}^3: \quad & \phi(p\varepsilon + z_1, q\varepsilon + z_2) = \phi_{pq} \frac{\delta + 2z_1}{2\delta} \frac{\delta + 2z_2}{2\delta} + \phi_{pq-1} \frac{\delta + 2z_1}{2\delta} \frac{\delta - 2z_2}{2\delta} \\ & + \phi_{p-1q} \frac{\delta - 2z_1}{2\delta} \frac{\delta + 2z_2}{2\delta} + \phi_{p-1q-1} \frac{\delta - 2z_1}{2\delta} \frac{\delta - 2z_2}{2\delta}, \quad (z_1, z_2) \in \mathfrak{J}_\delta^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

Now, we are going to define the global fields $\mathcal{U} \in H^1(\omega_\delta)^3$ and $\mathcal{R} \in H^1(\omega_\delta)^3$, for that we set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(p\varepsilon + z_1, q\varepsilon + z_2) &= \mathcal{R}_{pq}, \\ \mathcal{U}(p\varepsilon + z_1, q\varepsilon + z_2) &= \mathbf{a}_{pq} + \mathcal{R}_{pq} \wedge \begin{pmatrix} z_1 \\ z_2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{for all } z' = (z_1, z_2) \in \mathfrak{J}_{\varepsilon-\delta}^2, \quad (p, q) \in \overline{\mathcal{K}}_\varepsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

the field \mathcal{R} is defined from the family of real numbers \mathcal{R}_{pq} , $(p, q) \in \overline{\mathcal{K}}_\varepsilon$. \mathcal{U} is defined as the \mathcal{Q}_1 -interpolate of its values at the vertices of the above rectangles or squares (4.8). At this point, these fields are defined in $\left(-\frac{\delta}{2}, L + \frac{\delta}{2}\right)^2$ and the above constructions give $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{U} \in H^1(\omega_\delta)^3$. We have the following expressions of \mathcal{U} :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{in } R_{pq}^1: \quad & \mathcal{U}(p\varepsilon + z_1, q\varepsilon + z_2) \\ &= \left(\mathbf{a}_{pq} + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}_{pq} \wedge \begin{pmatrix} 2z_1 \\ -\varepsilon + \delta \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}\right) \frac{\delta + 2z_2}{2\delta} + \left(\mathbf{a}_{pq-1} + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}_{pq-1} \wedge \begin{pmatrix} 2z_1 \\ \varepsilon - \delta \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}\right) \frac{\delta - 2z_2}{2\delta}, \quad (z_1, z_2) \in \mathfrak{J}_{\varepsilon-\delta} \times \mathfrak{J}_\delta, \\ \text{in } R_{pq}^2: \quad & \mathcal{U}(p\varepsilon + z_1, q\varepsilon + z_2) \\ &= \left(\mathbf{a}_{pq} + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}_{pq} \wedge \begin{pmatrix} -\varepsilon + \delta \\ 2z_2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}\right) \frac{\delta + 2z_1}{2\delta} + \left(\mathbf{a}_{p-1q} + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}_{p-1q} \wedge \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon - \delta \\ 2z_2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}\right) \frac{\delta - 2z_1}{2\delta}, \quad (z_1, z_2) \in \mathfrak{J}_\delta \times \mathfrak{J}_{\varepsilon-\delta}, \\ \text{in } R_{pq}^3: \quad & \mathcal{U}(p\varepsilon + z_1, q\varepsilon + z_2) \\ &= \left(\mathbf{a}_{pq} + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}_{pq} \wedge \begin{pmatrix} -\varepsilon + \delta \\ -\varepsilon + \delta \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}\right) \frac{\delta + 2z_1}{2\delta} \frac{\delta + 2z_2}{2\delta} + \left(\mathbf{a}_{pq-1} + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}_{pq-1} \wedge \begin{pmatrix} -\varepsilon + \delta \\ \varepsilon - \delta \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}\right) \frac{\delta + 2z_1}{2\delta} \frac{\delta - 2z_2}{2\delta} \\ &+ \left(\mathbf{a}_{p-1q} + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}_{p-1q} \wedge \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon - \delta \\ -\varepsilon + \delta \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}\right) \frac{\delta - 2z_1}{2\delta} \frac{\delta + 2z_2}{2\delta} + \left(\mathbf{a}_{p-1q-1} + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}_{p-1q-1} \wedge \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon - \delta \\ \varepsilon - \delta \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}\right) \frac{\delta - 2z_1}{2\delta} \frac{\delta - 2z_2}{2\delta}, \quad (z_1, z_2) \in \mathfrak{J}_\delta^2. \end{aligned}$$




Figure 2: Covering a part of ω_δ .

Observe that by construction, the fields \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{R} satisfy

$$\partial_\alpha \mathcal{U} = \mathcal{R} \wedge \mathbf{e}_\alpha \quad \text{a.e. in } \omega_{pq}^H \text{ for all } (p, q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^* \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{U} = \mathcal{R} = 0 \quad \text{a.e. in } \gamma_\delta.$$

Below, we give estimates for $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{R} \in H^1(\omega_\delta)^3$.

Lemma 4.3. *We have*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla \mathcal{R}_\alpha\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} &\leq \frac{C}{\delta^{3/2}} \mathbf{E}(u), \quad \|\mathcal{R}_\alpha\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{1/2} \delta} \mathbf{E}(u), \\ \|\partial_1 \mathcal{R}_1\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} + \|\partial_2 \mathcal{R}_2\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} &\leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}} \mathbf{E}(u), \\ \|\partial_1 \mathcal{U}_3 + \mathcal{R}_2\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} + \|\partial_2 \mathcal{U}_3 - \mathcal{R}_1\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} &\leq \frac{C}{\delta^{1/2}} \mathbf{E}(u), \\ \|\nabla \mathcal{R}_3\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} &\leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}} \mathbf{E}(u), \quad \|\mathcal{R}_3\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{1/2}} \mathbf{E}(u), \\ \|\nabla \mathcal{U}_\alpha\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} &\leq \frac{C}{\delta^{1/2}} \mathbf{E}(u), \quad \|\mathcal{U}_\alpha\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{1/2}} \mathbf{E}(u), \quad \|\mathcal{U}_3\|_{H^1(\omega_\delta)} \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{1/2} \delta} \mathbf{E}(u) \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

and also

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{R}_\alpha - \mathcal{R}_\alpha^\diamond\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} &\leq C \frac{\varepsilon^{1/2}}{\delta} \mathbf{E}(u), \quad \|\mathcal{R}_3 - \mathcal{R}_3^\diamond\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{1/2}} \mathbf{E}(u), \\ \|\mathcal{U}_\alpha - \mathcal{U}_\alpha^\diamond\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} &\leq C \varepsilon^{1/2} \mathbf{E}(u), \quad \|\mathcal{U}_3 - \mathcal{U}_3^\diamond\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} \leq C \frac{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}{\delta} \mathbf{E}(u). \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

The constants do not depend on ε and δ .

Proof. The proof is divided into four steps given below.

Step 1. We prove (4.11)_{1,3,4,7}.

In the rectangles R_{pq}^2 for $(p, q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^{(2)}$, we have

$$\partial_1 \mathcal{R}(p\varepsilon + z_1, q\varepsilon + z_2) = \frac{\mathcal{R}_{pq} - \mathcal{R}_{p-1q}}{\delta}, \quad \forall (z_1, z_2) \in \mathcal{I}_\delta \times \left(\frac{\delta}{2}, \varepsilon - \frac{\delta}{2}\right).$$

So, we have

$$\|\partial_1 \mathcal{R}_i\|_{L^2(R_{pq}^2)}^2 \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\delta} |\mathcal{R}_{pq,i} - \mathcal{R}_{p-1q,i}|^2. \quad (4.13)$$

Similarly, in the rectangles R_{pq}^1 for $(p, q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^{(1)}$, we have

$$\|\partial_2 \mathcal{R}_i\|_{L^2(R_{pq}^1)}^2 \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\delta} |\mathcal{R}_{pq,i} - \mathcal{R}_{pq-1,i}|^2. \quad (4.14)$$

In the squares R_{pq}^3 for $(p, q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon$, we have

$$\partial_2 \mathcal{R}(p\varepsilon + z_1, q\varepsilon + z_2) = \frac{\mathcal{R}_{p-1q} - \mathcal{R}_{p-1q-1}}{\delta} \frac{\delta - 2z_1}{2\delta} + \frac{\mathcal{R}_{pq} - \mathcal{R}_{pq-1}}{\delta} \frac{\delta + 2z_1}{2\delta} \quad \forall (z_1, z_2) \in \mathcal{I}_\delta^2. \quad (4.15)$$

Similarly, we compute $\partial_2 \mathcal{R}_i$. We therefore obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_1 \mathcal{R}_i\|_{L^2(R_{pq}^3)}^2 &\leq C (|\mathcal{R}_{pq-1,i} - \mathcal{R}_{p-1q-1,i}|^2 + |\mathcal{R}_{pq,i} - \mathcal{R}_{p-1q,i}|^2) \\ \text{and } \|\partial_2 \mathcal{R}_i\|_{L^2(R_{pq}^3)}^2 &\leq C (|\mathcal{R}_{p-1q,i} - \mathcal{R}_{p-1q-1,i}|^2 + |\mathcal{R}_{pq,i} - \mathcal{R}_{pq-1,i}|^2). \end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

Then, using the above results (4.13)–(4.16), we get

$$\|\nabla \mathcal{R}_i\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)}^2 \leq \frac{C\varepsilon}{\delta} \left(\sum_{p=0}^{N_\varepsilon-1} \sum_{q=0}^{N_\varepsilon} |\mathcal{R}_{pq,i} - \mathcal{R}_{p-1q,i}|^2 + \sum_{q=0}^{N_\varepsilon} \sum_{p=0}^{N_\varepsilon-1} |\mathcal{R}_{pq,i} - \mathcal{R}_{pq-1,i}|^2 \right). \quad (4.17)$$

The above estimate with (3.6)₃, (3.6)₄ and (3.6)_{5,6} give (4.11)_{3,4,7} respectively. The estimate (4.11)₁ is a consequence of (3.6)_{1,2,3,4} and (4.17).

Step 2. We prove (4.11)_{2,8} and (4.12)_{1,2}

Observe that, since \mathcal{R} is constant and equal to \mathcal{R}_{pq} in ω_{pq}^H , due to (3.9)₁ and (4.11)₁ we have

$$\sum_{(p,q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^*} \|\mathcal{R}_i - \mathcal{R}_{pq,i}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\omega}_{pq})}^2 \leq C\delta^2 \|\nabla \mathcal{R}_i\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)}^2 \leq \frac{C}{\delta} \mathbf{E}(u)^2. \quad (4.18)$$

The above estimate with (4.6) give (4.12)_{1,2}. Then, (4.1)_{2,4} and (4.12)_{1,2} give (4.11)_{2,8}.

Step 3. We prove (4.11)_{5,6,7}.

Using the definition of \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{R} , we have $\partial_1 \mathcal{U} - \mathcal{R} \wedge \mathbf{e}_1$ vanishes in ω_{pq}^H for $(p, q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^*$ and in rectangle R_{pq}^1 for $(p, q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^{(1)}$. In R_{pq}^2 for $(p, q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^{(2)}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_1 \mathcal{U} - \mathcal{R} \wedge \mathbf{e}_1)(p\varepsilon + z_1, q\varepsilon + z_2) &= \frac{1}{\delta} \left(\mathbf{a}_{pq} - \mathbf{a}_{p-1q} - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} (\mathcal{R}_{pq} + \mathcal{R}_{p-1q}) \wedge \mathbf{e}_1 \right) - \frac{z_1}{\delta} (\mathcal{R}_{pq} - \mathcal{R}_{p-1q}) \wedge \mathbf{e}_1 \\ &\quad + \frac{z_2}{\delta} (\mathcal{R}_{pq} - \mathcal{R}_{p-1q}) \wedge \mathbf{e}_2, \quad (z_1, z_2) \in \mathfrak{I}_\delta \times \mathfrak{I}_{\varepsilon-\delta} \end{aligned}$$

We also have in R_{pq}^3

$$\begin{aligned} &(\partial_1 \mathcal{U} - \mathcal{R} \wedge \mathbf{e}_1)(p\varepsilon + z_1, q\varepsilon + z_2) \\ &= \frac{1}{\delta} \left(\left(\mathbf{a}_{pq} - \mathbf{a}_{p-1q} - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} (\mathcal{R}_{pq} + \mathcal{R}_{p-1q}) \wedge \mathbf{e}_1 \right) - z_1 (\mathcal{R}_{pq} - \mathcal{R}_{p-1q}) \wedge \mathbf{e}_1 \right) \frac{\delta + 2z_2}{2\delta} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\delta} \left(\left(\mathbf{a}_{pq-1} - \mathbf{a}_{p-1q-1} - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} (\mathcal{R}_{pq-1} + \mathcal{R}_{p-1q-1}) \wedge \mathbf{e}_1 \right) - z_1 (\mathcal{R}_{pq-1} - \mathcal{R}_{p-1q-1}) \wedge \mathbf{e}_1 \right) \frac{\delta - 2z_2}{2\delta} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\delta + 2z_2}{2\delta} (\mathcal{R}_{pq} - \mathcal{R}_{p-1q}) \wedge \mathbf{e}_2 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\delta - 2z_2}{2\delta} (\mathcal{R}_{pq-1} - \mathcal{R}_{p-1q-1}) \wedge \mathbf{e}_2, \quad (z_1, z_2) \in \mathfrak{I}_\delta^2, \end{aligned}$$

which along with (3.6) implies

$$\sum_{q=0}^{N_\varepsilon} \sum_{p=0}^{N_\varepsilon} \|\partial_1 \mathcal{U} - \mathcal{R} \wedge \mathbf{e}_1\|_{L^2(R_{pq}^3)}^2 \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \mathbf{E}(u) \|L^2(\Omega_\delta)\|.$$

Finally, we obtain (4.11)₅, in the same way we prove (4.11)₆. The estimate (4.11)₁₁ is consequence of (4.11)_{2,5,6} and Poincaré inequality.

Step 4. We prove (4.12)_{3,4}.

As a consequence of (4.11)_{5,6} and the 2D Korn inequality, we obtain (4.11)₉. Then, using (4.1)₄ and the \mathcal{Q}_1 character of \mathcal{R}_3° yield

$$\|\mathcal{U}_\alpha^\circ - \mathbf{a}_{pq,\alpha}\|_{L^2(\omega_{pq}^H)}^2 \leq C\varepsilon^2 \|\nabla \mathcal{U}_\alpha^\circ\|_{L^2(\omega_{pq})}^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathcal{U}_\alpha - \mathbf{a}_{pq,\alpha}\|_{L^2(\omega_{pq}^H)}^2 \leq C\varepsilon^4 |\mathcal{R}_{pq,3}|^2. \quad (4.19)$$

From (3.9)₁ and the above, we obtain

$$\|\mathcal{U}_\alpha - \mathcal{U}_\alpha^\circ\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)}^2 \leq C(\varepsilon^2 \|\nabla \mathcal{U}_\alpha^\circ\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)}^2 + \varepsilon^2 \|\mathcal{R}_3\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)}^2 + \delta^2 \|\nabla(\mathcal{U}_\alpha - \mathcal{U}_\alpha^\circ)\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)}^2)$$

which with (4.3)₁–(4.11)_{8,9} lead to

$$\|\mathcal{U}_\alpha - \mathcal{U}_\alpha^\circ\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)}^2 \leq C\varepsilon \mathbf{E}(u)^2.$$

Hence, (4.11)₁₀, (4.12)₃ hold.

Besides, we also have

$$\|\mathcal{U}_3^\circ - \mathbf{a}_{pq,3}\|_{L^2(\omega_{pq}^H)}^2 \leq C\varepsilon^2 \|\nabla \mathcal{U}_3^\circ\|_{L^2(\omega_{pq})}^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathcal{U}_3 - \mathbf{a}_{pq,3}\|_{L^2(\omega_{pq}^H)}^2 \leq C\varepsilon^4 (|\mathcal{R}_{pq,1}|^2 + |\mathcal{R}_{pq,2}|^2).$$

Then, we obtain

$$\|\mathcal{U}_3 - \mathcal{U}_3^\circ\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)}^2 \leq C(\varepsilon^2 \|\nabla \mathcal{U}_3^\circ\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)}^2 + \varepsilon^2 \|\mathcal{R}_\alpha\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)}^2 + \delta^2 \|\nabla(\mathcal{U}_3 - \mathcal{U}_3^\circ)\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)}^2)$$

which with (4.3)₂–(4.11)_{2,11} lead to (4.12)₄. This completes the proof. \square

As a consequence of above lemmas, we get

Lemma 4.4. *We have*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla(\partial_1 \mathfrak{U}_3 + \mathcal{R}_2)\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} + \|\nabla(\partial_2 \mathfrak{U}_3 - \mathcal{R}_1)\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} &\leq \frac{C}{\delta^{3/2}} \mathbf{E}(u), \\ \|\partial_1 \mathfrak{U}_3 + \mathcal{R}_2\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} + \|\partial_2 \mathfrak{U}_3 - \mathcal{R}_1\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} &\leq \frac{C}{\delta^{1/2}} \mathbf{E}(u), \\ \|\mathfrak{U} - \mathcal{U}\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} &\leq C\delta^{1/2} \mathbf{E}(u), \quad \|\nabla(\mathfrak{U}_3 - \mathcal{U}_3)\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} \leq \frac{C}{\delta^{1/2}} \mathbf{E}(u). \end{aligned} \quad (4.20)$$

The constants do not depend on ε and δ .

Proof. The estimates in (4.20)_{1,2} follow directly from (3.3)₂ and (4.11)₁. Next, (4.20)_{3,4} are obtained from the equalities (3.4)_{1,2} together with the estimates (4.20)_{1,2} and (3.9)₁.

For the third component, we deduce

$$\|\mathfrak{U}_3 - \mathcal{U}_3\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} \leq C\delta^{1/2} \mathbf{E}(u)$$

using equality (3.4)₅ in combination with (3.9)₁. Similarly, for the in-plane components we have

$$\|\mathfrak{U}_\alpha - \mathcal{U}_\alpha\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} \leq C\delta^{1/2} \mathbf{E}(u),$$

which follows from (4.11)₁, (3.5)₃, and again (3.9)₁.

Finally, estimate (4.20)₆ is a consequence of (4.11)_{5,6} together with (4.20)_{3,4}. \square

4.3 The functions $\mathcal{U}_\alpha^\blacktriangle$ and $\mathcal{U}_\alpha^{\blacktriangle\blacktriangle}$

To the family $\mathbf{a}_{pq,\alpha}$, $(p, q) \in \overline{\mathcal{K}}_\varepsilon$ we associate the field $\mathcal{U}_\alpha^\blacktriangle$ (constructed using (4.9)) and we set

$$\mathcal{U}_\alpha^{\blacktriangle\blacktriangle} = \mathcal{U}_\alpha - \mathcal{U}_\alpha^\blacktriangle.$$

From the expression of \mathcal{U}_α and $\mathcal{U}_\alpha^\blacktriangle$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}_1^{\blacktriangle\blacktriangle}(p\varepsilon + z_1, q\varepsilon + z_2) &= -\mathcal{R}_{pq,3}z_2, \quad \mathcal{U}_2^{\blacktriangle\blacktriangle}(p\varepsilon + z_1, q\varepsilon + z_2) = \mathcal{R}_{pq,3}z_1 \quad \text{a.e. in } \omega_{pq}^H, \quad (z_1, z_2) \in \mathfrak{I}_{\varepsilon-\delta}^2, \\ \mathcal{U}_1^{\blacktriangle\blacktriangle}(p\varepsilon + z_1, q\varepsilon + z_2) &= \frac{\varepsilon - \delta}{2} \left(\frac{\delta + 2z_2}{2\delta} \mathcal{R}_{pq,3} - \frac{\delta - 2z_2}{2\delta} \mathcal{R}_{pq-1,3} \right) \quad \text{a.e. in } R_{pq}^1, \quad (z_1, z_2) \in \mathfrak{I}_{\varepsilon-\delta} \times \mathfrak{I}_\delta, \\ \mathcal{U}_2^{\blacktriangle\blacktriangle}(p\varepsilon + z_1, q\varepsilon + z_2) &= z_1 \left(\frac{\delta + 2z_2}{2\delta} \mathcal{R}_{pq,3} + \frac{\delta - 2z_2}{2\delta} \mathcal{R}_{pq-1,3} \right) \quad \text{a.e. in } R_{pq}^1, \quad (z_1, z_2) \in \mathfrak{I}_{\varepsilon-\delta} \times \mathfrak{I}_\delta, \\ \mathcal{U}_1^{\blacktriangle\blacktriangle}(p\varepsilon + z_1, q\varepsilon + z_2) &= -z_2 \left(\frac{\delta + 2z_1}{2\delta} \mathcal{R}_{pq,3} + \frac{\delta - 2z_1}{2\delta} \mathcal{R}_{p-1q,3} \right) \quad \text{a.e. in } R_{pq}^2, \quad (z_1, z_2) \in \mathfrak{I}_\delta \times \mathfrak{I}_{\varepsilon-\delta}, \\ \mathcal{U}_2^{\blacktriangle\blacktriangle}(p\varepsilon + z_1, q\varepsilon + z_2) &= \frac{\varepsilon - \delta}{2} \left(-\frac{\delta + 2z_1}{2\delta} \mathcal{R}_{pq,3} + \frac{\delta - 2z_1}{2\delta} \mathcal{R}_{p-1q,3} \right) \quad \text{a.e. in } R_{pq}^2, \quad (z_1, z_2) \in \mathfrak{I}_\delta \times \mathfrak{I}_{\varepsilon-\delta}, \\ \mathcal{U}_1^{\blacktriangle\blacktriangle}(p\varepsilon + z_1, q\varepsilon + z_2) &= \frac{\varepsilon - \delta}{2} \left(\frac{\delta + 2z_2}{2\delta} \mathcal{R}_{pq,3} - \frac{\delta - 2z_2}{2\delta} \mathcal{R}_{pq-1,3} \right) \frac{\delta + 2z_1}{2\delta} \\ &\quad + \frac{\varepsilon - \delta}{2} \left(\frac{\delta + 2z_2}{2\delta} \mathcal{R}_{p-1q,3} - \frac{\delta - 2z_2}{2\delta} \mathcal{R}_{p-1q-1,3} \right) \frac{\delta - 2z_1}{2\delta} \quad \text{a.e. in } R_{pq}^3, \quad (z_1, z_2) \in \mathfrak{I}_\delta^2, \\ \mathcal{U}_2^{\blacktriangle\blacktriangle}(p\varepsilon + z_1, q\varepsilon + z_2) &= -\frac{\varepsilon - \delta}{2} \left(\frac{\delta + 2z_2}{2\delta} \mathcal{R}_{pq,3} + \frac{\delta - 2z_2}{2\delta} \mathcal{R}_{pq-1,3} \right) \frac{\delta + 2z_1}{2\delta} \\ &\quad + \frac{\varepsilon - \delta}{2} \left(\frac{\delta + 2z_2}{2\delta} \mathcal{R}_{p-1q,3} + \frac{\delta - 2z_2}{2\delta} \mathcal{R}_{p-1q-1,3} \right) \frac{\delta - 2z_1}{2\delta} \quad \text{a.e. in } R_{pq}^3, \quad (z_1, z_2) \in \mathfrak{I}_\delta^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.21)$$

Lemma 4.5. *We have*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla \mathcal{U}_\alpha^\blacktriangle\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} &\leq \frac{C}{\delta^{1/2}} \mathbf{E}(u), \quad \|\mathcal{U}_\alpha^\blacktriangle\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{1/2}} \mathbf{E}(u), \\ \|\nabla \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{\blacktriangle\blacktriangle}\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} &\leq \frac{C}{\delta^{1/2}} \mathbf{E}(u), \quad \|\mathcal{U}_\alpha^{\blacktriangle\blacktriangle}\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} \leq C\varepsilon^{1/2} \mathbf{E}(u) \end{aligned} \quad (4.22)$$

and

$$\|\mathcal{U}_\alpha^{\blacktriangle\blacktriangle}\|_{L^2(\omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^S)} \leq C\delta^{1/2} \mathbf{E}(u). \quad (4.23)$$

The constants do not depend on ε and δ .

Proof. First, we have using (3.7)_{1,2} and (4.4)₂,

$$\sum_{q=0}^{N_\varepsilon-1} \sum_{p=1}^{N_\varepsilon-1} |(\mathbf{a}_{pq} - \mathbf{a}_{p-1q}) \cdot \mathbf{e}_\alpha|^2 + \sum_{p=0}^{N_\varepsilon-1} \sum_{q=1}^{N_\varepsilon-1} |(\mathbf{a}_{pq} - \mathbf{a}_{pq-1}) \cdot \mathbf{e}_\alpha|^2 \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \mathbf{E}(u)^2. \quad (4.24)$$

Proceeding as in the derivation of the estimates for \mathcal{R} (see Steps 1 and 2 in the proof of Lemma 4.3), and using (4.24), we obtain (4.22)_{1,2}. Then, from (4.22)₁ and (4.11)₉ the estimate (4.22)₃ follows. Equalities (4.21)_{1,2} and estimate (4.4)₂ yield

$$\|\mathcal{U}_\alpha^{\blacktriangle\blacktriangle}\|_{L^2(\omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^H)} \leq C\varepsilon^{1/2} \mathbf{E}(u).$$

Then, from the above together with (3.9)₁ and (4.22)₃ we obtain (4.22)₄.

From the expressions (4.21) of $\mathcal{U}_\alpha^{\blacktriangle\blacktriangle}$, the estimates (3.6)_{5,6}-(4.4)₂, we obtain (4.23). \square

5 The applied body forces

In this subsection, we introduce the applied body forces and then using the estimates derived in the previous sections, we give the upper bound for the L^2 -norm of the linearized strain tensor.

Let f be in $L^2(\omega)^3$, we set

$$f_{\varepsilon\delta}(x) = \varepsilon^\kappa [\delta(f_1(x')\mathbf{e}_1 + f_2(x')\mathbf{e}_2) + \delta^2 f_3(x')\mathbf{e}_3] \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega_\delta, \quad \kappa \geq 0. \quad (5.1)$$

where $f = f_1\mathbf{e}_1 + f_2\mathbf{e}_2 + f_3\mathbf{e}_3$ (we extend f by 0 outside of ω).

Lemma 5.1. *The solution $u_{\varepsilon\delta} \in \mathbf{U}_{\varepsilon\delta}$ to problem (2.5) satisfies*

$$\mathbf{E}(u_{\varepsilon\delta}) \leq C\varepsilon^{\kappa-1/2} \delta^2 \|f\|_{L^2(\omega)}, \quad (5.2)$$

The constant is independent of ε and δ .

Proof. First, the solution $u_{\varepsilon\delta}$ satisfying (choosing $v = 0$)

$$c_0 \|e(u_{\varepsilon\delta})\|_{L^2(\Omega_\delta)}^2 \leq \int_{\Omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^S} \mathbb{A}_{\varepsilon\delta,ijkl}(x) e_{ij}(u_{\varepsilon\delta}) e_{kl}(u_{\varepsilon\delta}) dx \leq \int_{\Omega_\delta} f_{\varepsilon\delta} \cdot u_{\varepsilon\delta} dx, \quad (5.3)$$

Using the decomposition (3.1), we have

$$\int_{\Omega_{\varepsilon\delta}} f_{\varepsilon\delta} \cdot u dx = \delta \int_{\omega_\delta} f_{\varepsilon\delta} \cdot \mathcal{U} dx' + \int_{\Omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^S} f_{\varepsilon\delta} \cdot \tilde{u} dx. \quad (5.4)$$

Now, the expression (5.1) of the applied forces, the estimates (3.5)_{2,4} and equality (3.2) lead to (5.2). \square

From now on, we assume $\kappa = 1$, so that we are in the critical regime of von-Kármán.

6 Unfolding operators and their properties

In this section, we introduce two rescaled unfolding operators, which play a central role in deriving the asymptotic limits.

Definition 6.1 (3D re-scaled unfolding operators). *For every measurable function ψ on $\Omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}$ (resp. $\Omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}$), we define the measurable functions $\Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\psi)$ (resp. $\Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(\psi)$) by*

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\psi)(x', y) &\doteq \psi\left(\varepsilon\left[\frac{x'}{\varepsilon}\right] + \varepsilon y_1 \mathbf{e}_1 + \delta y_2 \mathbf{e}_2, \delta y_3\right) \quad \text{for a.e. } (x', y') \in \omega \times \mathcal{Y}_1, \\ (\text{resp. } \Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(\psi)(x', y) &\doteq \psi\left(\varepsilon\left[\frac{x'}{\varepsilon}\right] + \delta y_1 \mathbf{e}_1 + \varepsilon y_2 \mathbf{e}_2, \delta y_3\right) \quad \text{for a.e. } (x', y') \in \omega \times \mathcal{Y}_2). \end{aligned} \quad (6.1)$$

Below, we recall some of the properties and inequalities related to the 3D re-scaled unfolding operator.

- For every $\psi \in L^2(\Omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)})$, we have

$$\|\Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)}(\psi)\|_{L^2(\omega \times \mathcal{Y}_\alpha)} \leq \frac{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}{\delta} \|\psi\|_{L^2(\Omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)})}. \quad (6.2)$$

- For any $\phi \in H^1(\Omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)})$, one has

$$\partial_{y_\alpha} \Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)}(\phi) = \varepsilon \Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)}(\partial_\alpha \phi), \quad \partial_{y_{3-\alpha}} \Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)}(\phi) = \delta \Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)}(\partial_{3-\alpha} \phi), \quad \partial_{y_3} \Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)}(\phi) = \delta \Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)}(\partial_3 \phi). \quad (6.3)$$

Definition 6.2 (2D re-scaled unfolding operators). *For every measurable function ψ on $\omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}$ (resp. $\omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}$) we define the measurable functions $\mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\psi)$ (resp. $\mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(\psi)$) by*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\psi)(x', y') &\doteq \psi\left(\varepsilon\left[\frac{x'}{\varepsilon}\right] + \varepsilon y_1 \mathbf{e}_1 + \delta y_2 \mathbf{e}_2\right) \quad \text{for a.e. } (x', y) \in \omega \times Y_1, \\ (\text{resp. } \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(\psi)(x', y') &\doteq \psi\left(\varepsilon\left[\frac{x'}{\varepsilon}\right] + \delta y_1 \mathbf{e}_1 + \varepsilon y_2 \mathbf{e}_2\right) \quad \text{for a.e. } (x', y) \in \omega \times Y_2). \end{aligned} \quad (6.4)$$

Below, we briefly give the properties of the 2D re-scaling unfolding operator.

- For every $\psi \in L^2(\omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)})$, we have

$$\|\mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)}(\psi)\|_{L^2(\omega \times Y_\alpha)} \leq \sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta}} \|\psi\|_{L^2(\omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)})}. \quad (6.5)$$

- For any $\phi \in H^1(\omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)})$, one has

$$\partial_{y_\alpha} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)}(\phi) = \varepsilon \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)}(\partial_\alpha \phi), \quad \partial_{y_{3-\alpha}} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)}(\phi) = \delta \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)}(\partial_{3-\alpha} \phi). \quad (6.6)$$

- For $\phi \in L^2(\omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)})$, we have

$$\Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)}(\phi)(x', y', 0) = \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)}(\phi)(x', y').$$

7 Asymptotic limit of the strain tensor

In this section, we present the limit of the strain tensor when both ε and δ tend to zero simultaneously, satisfying (1.2). To this end, we consider a sequence of admissible displacements $\{u_{\varepsilon\delta}\}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \subset \mathbf{U}_{\varepsilon\delta}$ such that

$$\mathbf{E}(u_{\varepsilon\delta}) \leq C\varepsilon^{1/2}\delta^2. \quad (7.1)$$

The constant is independent of ε and δ .

Then, we decompose each $u_{\varepsilon\delta}$ as (3.1), then from (3.3) and (3.5) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,3}\|_{H^1(\omega_\delta)} &\leq C\delta, \quad \|\partial_{\alpha\beta}^2 \mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,3}\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} \leq C\sqrt{\varepsilon\delta}, \\ \|\nabla \mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha}\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} &\leq C\delta\sqrt{\varepsilon\delta}, \quad \|\mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha}\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} \leq C\delta^2, \\ \|\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon\delta}\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} + \delta \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon\delta}\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} &\leq C\delta^2\sqrt{\varepsilon\delta}, \end{aligned} \quad (7.2)$$

and using the properties of the rescaled unfolding operators (6.2)-(6.3), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)}(\tilde{u}_{\varepsilon\delta})\|_{L^2(\omega \times \mathcal{Y}_\alpha)} + \|\partial_{y_3} \Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)}(\tilde{u}_{\varepsilon\delta})\|_{L^2(\omega \times \mathcal{Y}_\alpha)} + \|\partial_{y_{3-\alpha}} \Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)}(\tilde{u}_{\varepsilon\delta})\|_{L^2(\omega \times \mathcal{Y}_\alpha)} &\leq C\varepsilon\delta^2, \\ \|\partial_{y_\alpha} \Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)}(\tilde{u}_{\varepsilon\delta})\|_{L^2(\omega \times \mathcal{Y}_\alpha)} &\leq C\varepsilon^2\delta. \end{aligned} \quad (7.3)$$

The constants are independent of ε and δ .

In all the lemmas below, we extract a subsequence of $\{\varepsilon\delta\}_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ (still denoted by $\{\varepsilon\delta\}_{\varepsilon,\delta}$) in order to get the desired convergences.

7.1 Limit behavior of the macroscopic fields

We define the following spaces

$$\begin{aligned} H_\gamma^1(\omega) &\doteq \{\psi \in H^1(\omega) \mid \psi = 0 \text{ a.e. in } \gamma\}, \\ H_{(0,l)}^2((0,L)_{x_\alpha}) &\doteq \{\psi \in H^2(0,L) \mid \psi = 0 \text{ a.e. in } (0,l)\}. \end{aligned}$$

The following convergences hold for the macroscopic fields:

Lemma 7.1. *There exist $\mathfrak{F} \in H_{(0,l)}^2((0,L)_{x_1})$, $\mathfrak{G} \in H_{(0,l)}^2((0,L)_{x_2})$, $\mathfrak{U}_\alpha \in H_\gamma^1(\omega)$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\delta^2} \mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha} &\rightarrow \mathfrak{U}_\alpha \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(\omega), \\ \frac{1}{\delta} \mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,3} &\rightarrow \mathfrak{U}_3 = \mathfrak{F} + \mathfrak{G} \quad \text{strongly in } H_\gamma^1(\omega). \end{aligned} \quad (7.4)$$

Moreover, there exist $\widehat{U}_\alpha^{(1)} \in L^2(\omega \times (0, 1)_{y_1}; H_0^1(\mathfrak{I}))$ and $\widehat{U}_\alpha^{(2)} \in L^2(\omega \times (0, 1)_{y_2}; H_0^1(\mathfrak{I}))$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\partial_2 \mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta, \alpha}) &\rightharpoonup \partial_2 \mathfrak{U}_\alpha + \partial_{y_2} \widehat{U}_\alpha^{(1)} && \text{weakly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_1), \\
\frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\partial_1 \mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta, \alpha}) &\rightharpoonup 0 && \text{weakly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_1), \\
\frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(\partial_1 \mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta, \alpha}) &\rightharpoonup \partial_1 \mathfrak{U}_\alpha + \partial_{y_1} \widehat{U}_\alpha^{(2)} && \text{weakly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_2), \\
\frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(\partial_2 \mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta, \alpha}) &\rightharpoonup 0 && \text{weakly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_2), \\
\frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\beta)}(\partial_\alpha \mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta}) &\rightharpoonup 0 && \text{weakly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_\beta).
\end{aligned} \tag{7.5}$$

Furthermore, there exist $\widehat{U}_3^{(\alpha)} \in L^2(\omega \times (0, 1)_{y_\alpha}; H_0^1(\mathfrak{I}))$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\partial_{22}^2 \mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta, 3}) &\rightharpoonup \partial_{22}^2 \mathfrak{U}_3 + \partial_{y_2} \widehat{U}_3^{(1)} && \text{weakly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_1), \\
\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\partial_{21}^2 \mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta, 3}) &\rightharpoonup 0 && \text{weakly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_1), \\
\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\partial_{11}^2 \mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta, 3}) &\rightharpoonup 0 && \text{weakly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_1), \\
\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(\partial_{11}^2 \mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta, 3}) &\rightharpoonup \partial_{11}^2 \mathfrak{U}_3 + \partial_{y_1} \widehat{U}_3^{(2)} && \text{weakly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_2), \\
\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(\partial_{22}^2 \mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta, 3}) &\rightharpoonup 0 && \text{weakly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_2), \\
\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(\partial_{12}^2 \mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta, 3}) &\rightharpoonup 0 && \text{weakly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_2).
\end{aligned} \tag{7.6}$$

Proof. The proof is given in the following steps.

Step 1. We prove (7.4)₁.

The estimates (4.3)₁ and (4.5)₃ give

$$\|\mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta, \alpha}^\diamond\|_{H^1(\omega_\delta)} \leq C\delta^2, \quad \|\mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta, \alpha} - \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta, \alpha}^\diamond\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} \leq C\varepsilon\delta^2.$$

Then, there exists $\mathfrak{U}_\alpha \in H_\gamma^1(\omega)$ such that

$$\frac{1}{\delta^2} \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta, \alpha}^\diamond \rightharpoonup \mathfrak{U}_\alpha \quad \text{weakly in } H_\gamma^1(\omega) \text{ and strongly in } L^2(\omega). \tag{7.7}$$

The above gives (7.4)₁.

Step 2. We prove (7.4)₂.

The estimates (4.1)_{1,2,5,6}, (4.2)_{5,6}, (4.3)₂ and (4.5)_{1,2,4} give

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta, 3}^\diamond\|_{H^1(\omega_\delta)} &\leq C\delta, \quad \|\mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta}^\diamond\|_{H^1(\omega_\delta)} \leq C\delta, \\
\|\partial_1 \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta, 3}^\diamond + \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta, 2}^\diamond\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} + \|\partial_2 \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta, 3}^\diamond - \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta, 1}^\diamond\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} &\leq C\varepsilon\delta, \\
\|\partial_1 \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta, 1}^\diamond\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} + \|\partial_2 \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta, 2}^\diamond\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} &\leq C\frac{\delta^2}{\varepsilon}, \\
\|\partial_1 \mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta, 3} + \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta, 2}^\diamond\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} + \|\partial_2 \mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta, 3} - \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta, 1}^\diamond\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} + \|\mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta, 3} - \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta, 3}^\diamond\|_{H^1(\omega_\delta)} &\leq C\varepsilon\delta.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, there exists $\mathfrak{U}_3, \mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}_2 \in H_\gamma^1(\omega)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\delta} \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta, 3}^\diamond &\rightharpoonup \mathfrak{U}_3 \quad \text{weakly in } H_\gamma^1(\omega) \text{ and strongly in } L^2(\omega), \\
\frac{1}{\delta} \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta, \alpha}^\diamond &\rightharpoonup \mathcal{R}_\alpha \quad \text{weakly in } H_\gamma^1(\omega) \text{ and strongly in } L^2(\omega)
\end{aligned} \tag{7.8}$$

with

$$\partial_1 \mathfrak{U}_3 = -\mathcal{R}_2, \quad \partial_2 \mathfrak{U}_3 = \mathcal{R}_1, \quad \partial_\alpha \mathcal{R}_\alpha = 0, \quad \text{a.e. in } \omega. \tag{7.9}$$

So, we get $\mathfrak{U}_3 \in H^2(\omega)$ with $\partial_{12}^2 \mathfrak{U}_3 = 0$ a.e. in ω and

$$\frac{1}{\delta} \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta, 3}^\diamond \rightarrow \mathfrak{U}_3 \quad \text{strongly in } H^1(\omega).$$

This implies there exist $\mathfrak{F} \in H^2_{(0,l)}((0,L)_{x_1})$ and $\mathfrak{G} \in H^2_{(0,l)}((0,L)_{x_2})$ such that

$$\mathfrak{U}_3(x_1, x_2) = \mathfrak{F}(x_1) + \mathfrak{G}(x_2), \quad \text{for a.e. } (x_1, x_2) \in \omega.$$

This completes (7.4)₂.

Step 3. We prove (7.5)_{1,2,3,4}.

From the expression (4.21) and (4.9), we obtain

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \partial_{y_1} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,1}^{\bullet\bullet})(x', y_1, y_2) &= 0, \\ \partial_{y_2} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,1}^{\bullet\bullet})(x', y_1, y_2) &= (\varepsilon - \delta) \int_{\mathcal{J}} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,3})(x', y_1, t) dt, \\ \partial_{y_1} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,2}^{\bullet\bullet})(x', y_1, y_2) &= \varepsilon \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,3}), \\ \partial_{y_2} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,2}^{\bullet\bullet})(x', y_1, y_2) &= \varepsilon y_1 \partial_{y_2} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,3}), \end{aligned} \right\} \quad \text{a.e. in } \omega \times \left(\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}, 1 - \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon} \right) \times \mathcal{J}. \quad (7.10)$$

Using the estimates (4.11)_{7,8}, (6.5), (6.6) and (B.1)₂ (see Lemma B.1 in Appendix), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,3}\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} &\leq C\delta^2, \quad \|\mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,3}\|_{L^2(\omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^S)} \leq C\delta^2 \sqrt{\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}}, \quad \|\nabla \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,3}\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} \leq C\delta \sqrt{\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}}, \\ \|\mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,3})\|_{L^2(\omega \times Y_1)} + \|\partial_{y_2} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,3})\|_{L^2(\omega \times Y_1)} &\leq C\delta^2, \quad \|\partial_{y_1} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,3})\|_{L^2(\omega \times Y_1)} \leq C\varepsilon\delta. \end{aligned} \quad (7.11)$$

The estimates (7.11)_{1,3} can also be read as follows:

$$\left\| \frac{\varepsilon}{\delta^2} \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,3} \right\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} \leq C\varepsilon, \quad \left\| \frac{\varepsilon}{\delta^2} \nabla \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,3} \right\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} \leq C \sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta}}.$$

Now, the above and Lemma B.2 give

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\varepsilon}{\delta^2} \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,3} &\rightarrow 0 \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(\omega), \\ \frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta} \partial_{y_1} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,3}) &\rightharpoonup 0 \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_1), \\ \frac{1}{\delta^2} \partial_{y_2} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,3}) &\rightharpoonup 0 \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_1). \end{aligned}$$

The above together with the expressions (7.10) give

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2\delta} \partial_{y_1} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha}^{\bullet\bullet}) &\rightharpoonup 0 \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_1), \\ \frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta^2} \partial_{y_2} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha}^{\bullet\bullet}) &\rightharpoonup 0 \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_1). \end{aligned} \quad (7.12)$$

Below, we consider the asymptotic behavior of $\{\mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha}^{\bullet\bullet})\}_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ and its partial derivatives.

First, using the estimates (4.22)_{1,2}, (4.12)₃-(4.23) and (4.22)₂, we have

$$\|\mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha}^{\bullet\bullet}\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} \leq C\delta^2, \quad \|\nabla \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha}^{\bullet\bullet}\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} \leq C\delta \sqrt{\varepsilon\delta}, \quad \|\mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha}^{\bullet\bullet} - \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha}^\diamond\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} \leq C\varepsilon\delta^2,$$

which together with the convergence (7.7), give

$$\frac{1}{\delta^2} \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha}^{\bullet\bullet} \rightarrow \mathfrak{U}_\alpha \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(\omega). \quad (7.13)$$

The above estimate of $\nabla \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha}^{\bullet\bullet}$ can also be read as follows:

$$\left\| \frac{1}{\delta^2} \nabla \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha}^{\bullet\bullet} \right\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} \leq C \sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta}}.$$

Then, from Lemma B.2 and convergence (7.13), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta^2} \partial_{y_2} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha}^{\bullet\bullet}) &\rightharpoonup \partial_2 \mathfrak{U}_\alpha \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_1), \\ \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2\delta} \partial_{y_1} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha}^{\bullet\bullet}) &\rightharpoonup 0 \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_1). \end{aligned} \quad (7.14)$$

The above convergences and those in (7.12) lead to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta^2} \partial_{y_2} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha}) &\rightharpoonup \partial_2 \mathcal{U}_\alpha && \text{weakly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_1), \\ \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2\delta} \partial_{y_1} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha}) &\rightharpoonup 0 && \text{weakly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_1). \end{aligned} \quad (7.15)$$

Observe that using (4.11)₉, (4.20)₅ and (7.2)₃, we have

$$\|\nabla(\mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha} - \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha})\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} \leq \delta\sqrt{\varepsilon\delta}, \quad \|\mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha} - \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha}\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} \leq C\varepsilon\delta^2\sqrt{\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}}. \quad (7.16)$$

Transforming using $\mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}$ (see (6.5)-(6.6)) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha} - \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha})\|_{L^2(\omega \times Y_1)} &\leq C\varepsilon\delta^2, \quad \|\partial_{y_2} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha} - \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha})\|_{L^2(\omega \times Y_1)} \leq C\varepsilon\delta^2, \\ \|\partial_{y_1} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha} - \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha})\|_{L^2(\omega \times Y_1)} &\leq C\varepsilon\delta. \end{aligned}$$

From the above inequalities, combined with the fact that $\mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha} - \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha}$ vanishes in $\omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^H$, we deduce that there exist $\widehat{U}_\alpha^{(1)} \in L^2(\omega \times (0, 1)_{y_1}; H_0^1(\mathcal{J}))$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta^2} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha} - \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha}) &\rightharpoonup \widehat{U}_\alpha^{(1)} && \text{weakly in } L^2(\omega \times (0, 1)_{y_1}; H^1(\mathcal{J})), \\ \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2\delta} \partial_{y_1} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha} - \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha}) &\rightharpoonup 0 && \text{weakly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_1). \end{aligned}$$

So, the above convergences and those in (7.15) yield (7.5)_{1,2}. Similarly, we get (7.5)_{3,4}.

Step 4. We prove (7.5)₅.

From the estimates (7.2)_{5,6} and the properties of the operator $\mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}$, we get

$$\|\mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon\delta})\|_{L^2(\omega \times Y_1)} + \|\partial_{y_2} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon\delta})\|_{L^2(\omega \times Y_1)} \leq C\varepsilon^2\delta^2, \quad \|\partial_{y_1} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon\delta})\|_{L^2(\omega \times Y_1)} \leq C\varepsilon^2\delta.$$

These estimates give (7.5)₅ for $\beta = 1$. Similarly, we prove the convergence (7.5)₅ for $\beta = 2$.

Step 5. We prove (7.6).

From (4.11)_{1,2}, (4.20)_{1,2,3,4} and (4.12)₁ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha}\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} &\leq C\delta, \quad \|\nabla \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha}\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} \leq C\sqrt{\varepsilon\delta}, \quad \|\mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha} - \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha}^\diamond\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} \leq C\varepsilon\delta, \\ \|\partial_1 \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,3} + \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,2}\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} + \|\partial_2 \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,3} - \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,1}\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} &\leq C\delta\sqrt{\varepsilon\delta}, \\ \|\nabla(\partial_1 \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,3} + \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,2})\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} + \|\nabla(\partial_2 \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,3} - \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,1})\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} &\leq C\delta\sqrt{\varepsilon\delta}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.17)$$

Using these inequalities together with the convergence (7.8)₂ and equalities (7.9), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\delta} \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,2} &\rightarrow -\partial_1 \mathcal{U}_3 && \text{strongly in } L^2(\omega), \\ \frac{1}{\delta} \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,1} &\rightarrow \partial_2 \mathcal{U}_3 && \text{strongly in } L^2(\omega). \end{aligned}$$

Next, by the definition of $\mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha}$ and the estimates (7.17)_{1,2} together with Lemma B.2, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\partial_2 \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,2}) &\rightharpoonup -\partial_{21}^2 \mathcal{U}_3 = 0 && \text{weakly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_1), \\ \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\partial_1 \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,2}) &\rightharpoonup 0, && \text{weakly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_1), \\ \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\partial_2 \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,1}) &\rightharpoonup \partial_{22}^2 \mathcal{U}_3 && \text{weakly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_1), \\ \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\partial_1 \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,1}) &\rightharpoonup 0 && \text{weakly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_1). \end{aligned} \quad (7.18)$$

From (7.17)_{4,5,6,7} and (6.5) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\partial_1 \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,3} + \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,2})\|_{L^2(\omega \times Y_1)} + \|\mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\partial_2 \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,3} - \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,1})\|_{L^2(\omega \times Y_1)} &\leq C\varepsilon\delta, \\ \|\partial_{y_2} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\partial_1 \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,3} + \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,2})\|_{L^2(\omega \times Y_1)} + \|\partial_{y_2} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\partial_2 \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,3} - \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,1})\|_{L^2(\omega \times Y_1)} &\leq C\varepsilon\delta, \\ \|\partial_{y_1} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\partial_1 \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,3} + \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,2})\|_{L^2(\omega \times Y_1)} + \|\partial_{y_1} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\partial_2 \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,3} - \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,1})\|_{L^2(\omega \times Y_1)} &\leq C\varepsilon^2. \end{aligned}$$

Besides, we recall that from (3.4)_{1,2}, the functions $\partial_1 \mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,3} + \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,2}$ and $\partial_2 \mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,3} - \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,1}$ vanish in $\omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^H$, so there exist $\widehat{U}_3^{(1)}, \widehat{U}_3^{(1,2)} \in L^2(\omega \times (0,1)_{y_1}; H_0^1(\mathcal{J}))$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\partial_2 \mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,3} - \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,1}) &\rightharpoonup \widehat{U}_3^{(1)} && \text{weakly in } L^2(\omega \times (0,1)_{y_1}; H^1(\mathcal{J})), \\ \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \partial_{y_1} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\partial_2 \mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,3} - \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,1}) &\rightharpoonup 0 && \text{weakly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_1), \\ \frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\partial_1 \mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,3} + \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,2}) &\rightharpoonup \widehat{U}_3^{(1,2)} && \text{weakly in } L^2(\omega \times (0,1)_{y_2}; H^1(\mathcal{J})), \\ \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \partial_{y_1} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\partial_1 \mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,3} + \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,2}) &\rightharpoonup 0 && \text{weakly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_1). \end{aligned} \quad (7.19)$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\partial_{22}^2 \mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,3}) &= \frac{1}{\delta} \partial_{y_2} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\partial_2 \mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,3} - \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,1}) + \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\partial_2 \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,1}), \\ \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\partial_{11}^2 \mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,3}) &= \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \partial_{y_1} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\partial_1 \mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,3} + \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,2}) - \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\partial_1 \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,2}), \\ \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\partial_{12}^2 \mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,3}) &= \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \partial_{y_1} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\partial_2 \mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,3} - \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,1}) + \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\partial_1 \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,1}), \\ \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\partial_{12}^2 \mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,3}) &= \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\partial_{21}^2 \mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,3}) = \frac{1}{\delta} \partial_{y_2} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\partial_1 \mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,3} + \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,2}) - \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\partial_2 \mathcal{R}_{\varepsilon\delta,2}). \end{aligned}$$

The last two above expressions together with those in (7.18) and (7.19) give

$$0 = \partial_{y_2} \widehat{U}_3^{(1,2)} - \partial_{21}^2 \mathfrak{U}_3 = \partial_{y_2} \widehat{U}_3^{(1,2)}.$$

So, we have

$$\partial_{y_2} \widehat{U}_3^{(1,2)}(x', y') = 0 \quad \text{for a.e. } (x', y') \in \omega \times Y_1.$$

As a consequence, since $\widehat{U}_3^{(1,2)} \in L^2(\omega \times (0,1)_{y_1}; H_0^1(\mathcal{J}))$, we have $\widehat{U}_3^{(1,2)} = 0$. This and the convergences (7.18)-(7.19) give (7.6)_{1,2,3}. Similarly, we show (7.6)_{4,5,6}. \square

7.2 Limit behavior of the strain tensor

First, we introduce the limit microscopic displacement space by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{L}^2(\omega \times (0,1)_{y_1}; H^1(\mathcal{J}^2)) &= \left\{ \widehat{v}^{(1)} \in L^2(\omega \times (0,1)_{y_1}; H^1(\mathcal{J}^2))^3 \mid \widehat{v}^{(1)} \text{ satisfying (7.20)}_1 \right\}, \\ \mathbf{L}^2(\omega \times (0,1)_{y_2}; H^1(\mathcal{J}^2)) &= \left\{ \widehat{u}^{(2)} \in L^2(\omega \times (0,1)_{y_2}; H^1(\mathcal{J}^2))^3 \mid \widehat{v}^{(2)} \text{ satisfying (7.20)}_2 \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{v}^{(1)}(x', y) &= 0, \quad \text{for a.e. } (x', y) \text{ in } \omega \times (0,1) \times \left\{ \pm \frac{1}{2} \right\} \times \mathcal{J}, \\ \widehat{v}^{(2)}(x', y) &= 0, \quad \text{for a.e. } (x', y) \text{ in } \omega \times \left\{ \pm \frac{1}{2} \right\} \times (0,1) \times \mathcal{J}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.20)$$

Using the decomposition (3.1), we have the following expression for the strain tensor

$$e(u_{\varepsilon\delta}) = \begin{pmatrix} e_{11}(\mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,m}) - x_3 \partial_{11}^2 \mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,3} & * & * \\ e_{12}(\mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,m}) - x_3 \partial_{12}^2 \mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,3} & e_{22}(\mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,m}) - x_3 \partial_{22}^2 \mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,3} & * \\ \partial_1 u_{\varepsilon\delta} & \partial_2 u_{\varepsilon\delta} & 0 \end{pmatrix} + e(\widetilde{u}_{\varepsilon\delta}). \quad (7.21)$$

We have following convergences of the unfolded fields:

Lemma 7.2. *We have the following convergences for the linearized strain tensor:*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta} \Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(e(u_{\varepsilon\delta})) &\rightharpoonup E^{(1)}(\mathfrak{U}, \widehat{u}^{(1)}) && \text{weakly in } L^2(\omega \times \mathcal{Y}_1)^{3 \times 3}, \\ \frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta} \Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(e(u_{\varepsilon\delta})) &\rightharpoonup E^{(2)}(\mathfrak{U}, \widehat{u}^{(2)}) && \text{weakly in } L^2(\omega \times \mathcal{Y}_2)^{3 \times 3}, \end{aligned} \quad (7.22)$$

where

$$E^{(1)}(\mathfrak{U}, \widehat{u}^{(1)}) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{1}{2}\partial_2 \mathfrak{U}_1 + \frac{1}{2}\partial_{y_2} \widehat{u}_1^{(1)} & * \\ * & \partial_2 \mathfrak{U}_2 - y_3 \partial_{22}^2 \mathfrak{U}_3 + e_{y,22}(\widehat{u}^{(1)}) & * \\ \frac{1}{2}\partial_{y_3} \widehat{u}_1^{(1)} & e_{y,23}(\widehat{u}^{(2)}) & e_{y,33}(\widehat{u}^{(1)}) \end{pmatrix}$$

$$E^{(2)}(\mathfrak{U}, \widehat{u}^{(2)}) = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_1 \mathfrak{U}_1 - y_3 \partial_{11}^2 \mathfrak{U}_3 + e_{y,11}(\widehat{u}^{(2)}) & * & * \\ \frac{1}{2}\partial_1 \mathfrak{U}_2 + \frac{1}{2}\partial_{y_1} \widehat{u}_2^{(2)} & 0 & * \\ e_{y,13}(\widehat{u}^{(2)}) & \frac{1}{2}\partial_{y_3} \widehat{u}_2^{(2)} & e_{y,33}(\widehat{u}^{(2)}) \end{pmatrix},$$

with the microscopic displacements $\widehat{u}^{(\alpha)} \in \mathbf{L}^2(\omega \times (0, 1)_{y_\alpha}; H^1(\mathcal{I}^2))^3$.

Proof. First, from the estimates (7.3) and the fact that $\widetilde{u}_{\varepsilon\delta}$ vanish in $\omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^H$, we have: There exist $\widetilde{u}^{(\alpha)} \in \mathbf{L}^2(\omega \times (0, 1)_{y_\alpha}; H^1(\mathcal{I}^2))^3$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta^2} \Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)}(\widetilde{u}_{\varepsilon\delta}) &\rightharpoonup \widetilde{u}^{(\alpha)} \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(\omega \times (0, 1)_{y_\alpha}; H^1(\mathcal{I}^2))^3, \\ \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2\delta} \partial_{y_\alpha} \Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)}(\widetilde{u}_{\varepsilon\delta}) &\rightharpoonup 0 \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(\omega \times \mathcal{Y}_\alpha)^3. \end{aligned} \quad (7.23)$$

The convergences (7.5), (7.6) and (7.23) along with the expression (7.21) give (7.22) by defining $\widehat{u}^{(\alpha)}$ as

$$\widehat{u}^{(1)} = \widehat{U}_1^{(1)} \mathbf{e}_1 + (\widehat{U}_2^{(1)} - y_3 \widehat{U}_3^{(1)}) \mathbf{e}_2 + \widetilde{u}^{(1)}, \quad \widehat{u}^{(2)} = (\widehat{U}_1^{(2)} - y_3 \widehat{U}_3^{(2)}) \mathbf{e}_1 + \widehat{U}_2^{(2)} \mathbf{e}_2 + \widetilde{u}^{(2)}. \quad (7.24)$$

So, we get $\widehat{u}^{(\alpha)} \in \mathbf{L}^2(\omega \times (0, 1)_{y_\alpha}; H^1(\mathcal{I}^2))^3$. This completes the proof. \square

7.3 Limit non-penetration condition

The non-penetration condition (2.3)₂ using decomposition (3.1) and equality (3.2)₁, then transforming by $\mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(\mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,1})\left(x', \frac{1}{2}, y_2\right) - \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(\mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,1})\left(x', -\frac{1}{2}, y_2\right) \\ &- \delta y_3 \left(\mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(\partial_1 \mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,3})\left(x', \frac{1}{2}, y_2\right) - \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(\partial_1 \mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,3})\left(x', -\frac{1}{2}, y_2\right) \right) \geq -\delta, \quad \text{for a.e. } (x', y_2, y_3) \in \omega \times \left(\frac{\delta}{2\varepsilon}, 1 - \frac{\delta}{2\varepsilon}\right) \times \mathcal{I}. \end{aligned}$$

The above and (6.6)₂ imply

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathcal{I}} \partial_{y_1} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(\mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,1})(x', y_1, y_2) dy_1 - \delta y_3 \int_{\mathcal{I}} \partial_{y_1} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(\partial_1 \mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,3})(x', y_1, y_2) dy_1 \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{I}} \delta \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(\partial_1 \mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,1})(x', y_1, y_2) dy_1 - \delta^2 y_3 \int_{\mathcal{I}} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(\partial_{11}^2 \mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,3})(x', y_1, y_2) dy_1 \geq -\delta, \\ &\quad \text{for a.e. } (x', y_2, y_3) \in \omega \times \left(\frac{\delta}{2\varepsilon}, 1 - \frac{\delta}{2\varepsilon}\right) \times \mathcal{I}. \end{aligned}$$

So, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathcal{I}} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(\partial_1 \mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,1})(x', y_1, y_2) dy_1 - \delta y_3 \int_{\mathcal{I}} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(\partial_{11}^2 \mathfrak{U}_{\varepsilon\delta,3})(x', y_1, y_2) dy_1 \geq -1, \\ &\quad \text{for a.e. } (x', y_2, y_3) \in \omega \times \left(\frac{\delta}{2\varepsilon}, 1 - \frac{\delta}{2\varepsilon}\right) \times \mathcal{I}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.25)$$

We divide the above inequality by $\varepsilon\delta$ and then we pass to the limit. Due to the convergences (7.5)₁ and (7.6)₁ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathcal{I}} (\partial_1 \mathfrak{U}_1(x') + \partial_{y_1} \widehat{U}_1^{(2)}(x', y_1, y_2)) dy_1 - y_3 \int_{\mathcal{I}} (\partial_{11}^2 \mathfrak{U}_3(x') + \partial_{y_1} \widehat{U}_3^{(2)}(x', y_1, y_2)) dy_1 \geq -\infty, \\ &\quad \text{for a.e. } (x', y_2, y_3) \in \omega \times (0, 1) \times \mathcal{I}, \end{aligned}$$

which imply

$$\partial_1 \mathfrak{U}_1(x') - y_3 \partial_{11}^2 \mathfrak{U}_3(x') \geq -\infty, \quad \text{for a.e. } (x', y_3) \in \omega \times \mathcal{I}.$$

Similarly, we treat the non-penetration condition (2.3)₁. There is therefore no additional condition on the limit displacements arising from the non-penetration condition.

8 Homogenized limit problem

The limit macroscopic displacement set is defined as

$$\mathbb{D}_0 \doteq [H_\gamma^1(\omega)]^2 \times \mathbf{H}^2(\omega),$$

where

$$\mathbf{H}^2(\omega) \doteq \left\{ \mathfrak{U}_3 \in H^2(\omega) \mid \mathfrak{U}_3 = \mathfrak{F} + \mathfrak{G}, \text{ with } \mathfrak{F} \in H_{(0,l)}^2((0, L)_{x_1}), \mathfrak{G} \in H_{(0,l)}^2((0, L)_{x_2}) \right\}.$$

The set of limit displacements is defined as

$$\mathbb{D} = \mathbb{D}_0 \times \mathbf{L}^2(\omega \times (0, 1)_{y_1}; H^1(\mathcal{J}^2)) \times \mathbf{L}^2(\omega \times (0, 1)_{y_2}; H^1(\mathcal{J}^2)).$$

To define the limit elasticity problem, we assume the following: there exist $\mathbb{A}_{ijkl}^{(\alpha)} \in L^\infty(\mathcal{Y}_\alpha)$, for $\alpha \in \{1, 2\}$ such that

$$\Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)}(\mathbb{A}_{\varepsilon\delta,ijkl})(x', y) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_{ijkl}^{(\alpha)}(y) \quad \text{a.e. in } \omega \times \mathcal{Y}_\alpha, \quad (8.1)$$

Observe that (see Assumption (2.6)) $\mathbb{A}^{(\alpha)}$ satisfy the following for a.e. $y \in \mathcal{Y}_\alpha$ and for all $\mathbf{S} \in \mathbf{S}_3$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{A}_{ijkl}^{(\alpha)}(y) &= \mathbb{A}_{ijlk}^{(\alpha)} = \mathbb{A}_{klij}^{(\alpha)}(y), \\ \mathbb{A}_{ijkl}^{(\alpha)}(y) \mathbf{S}_{ij} \mathbf{S}_{kl} &= \lim_{(\varepsilon, \delta) \rightarrow (0,0)} \Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)}(\mathbb{A}_{\varepsilon\delta,ijkl})(x', y) \mathbf{S}_{ij} \mathbf{S}_{kl} \geq c_0 |\mathbf{S}|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (8.2)$$

8.1 Construction of the recovery sequence

In this subsection, we construct the recovery sequence.

Lemma 8.1. *For every $(\mathfrak{V}, \widehat{v}^{(1)}, \widehat{v}^{(2)}) \in \mathbb{D}$, there exist a sequence $\{v_{\varepsilon\delta}\}_{\varepsilon, \delta}$ in $\mathbf{U}_{\varepsilon\delta}$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta} \Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(e(v_{\varepsilon\delta})) &\rightarrow E^{(1)}(\mathfrak{V}, \widehat{v}^{(1)}) \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(\omega \times \mathcal{Y}_1)^{3 \times 3}, \\ \frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta} \Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(e(v_{\varepsilon\delta})) &\rightarrow E^{(2)}(\mathfrak{V}, \widehat{v}^{(2)}) \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(\omega \times \mathcal{Y}_2)^{3 \times 3}, \end{aligned} \quad (8.3)$$

and

$$\lim_{(\varepsilon, \delta) \rightarrow (0,0)} \frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta^4} \int_{\Omega_\delta} f_{\varepsilon\delta} \cdot v_{\varepsilon\delta} \, dx = \int_\omega f \cdot \mathfrak{V} \, dx'.$$

Proof. By density argument, it is enough to prove that main result for $\widehat{v}^{(\alpha)} \in L^2(\omega; \mathbf{L}^2((0, 1)_{y_\alpha}; H^1(\mathcal{J}^2))^3) \cap \mathcal{C}_c^2(\overline{\omega} \times \overline{\mathcal{Y}}_\alpha; H^1(\mathcal{J}))^3$ and $\mathfrak{V} \in \mathbb{D}_0 \cap [W^{1,\infty}(\omega)]^2 \times W^{2,\infty}(\omega)$.

So, there exist $\mathfrak{F} \in W^{2,\infty}((0, L)_{x_1})$ and $\mathfrak{G} \in W^{2,\infty}((0, L)_{x_2})$ such that

$$\mathfrak{V}_3(x_1, x_2) = \mathfrak{F}(x_1) + \mathfrak{G}(x_2), \quad \text{for a.e. } (x_1, x_2) \in \omega.$$

Step 1. We defined $\mathfrak{V}_{\varepsilon\delta,3} \in W^{2,\infty}(\omega_\delta)$.

We set

$$\mathfrak{V}_{\varepsilon\delta,3}(x_1, x_2) = \mathfrak{F}_{\varepsilon\delta}(x_1) + \mathfrak{G}_{\varepsilon\delta}(x_2), \quad \text{for a.e. } (x_1, x_2) \in \omega_\delta \quad (8.4)$$

where $\mathfrak{F}_{\varepsilon\delta}$ and $\mathfrak{G}_{\varepsilon\delta}$ are defined from \mathfrak{F} and \mathfrak{G} using Lemma B.5.

Step 2. In this step we construct the sequence of admissible displacements $\{v_{\varepsilon\delta}\}_{\varepsilon, \delta} \subset \mathbf{U}_{\varepsilon\delta}$.

The sequence of test displacements $v_{\varepsilon\delta}$ is

$$v_{\varepsilon\delta} = \begin{cases} V_{e,\varepsilon\delta} + \widehat{v}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)} & \text{in } \Omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}, \\ V_{e,\varepsilon\delta} + \widehat{v}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)} & \text{in } \Omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}, \\ V_{e,\varepsilon\delta} & \text{in } \Omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^H \end{cases} \quad (8.5)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{v}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(p\varepsilon + \delta y_1, q\varepsilon + \varepsilon y_2, \delta y_3) &= \varepsilon \delta^2 \widehat{v}^{(1)}(p\varepsilon, q\varepsilon, y) \quad \text{for a.e. } y \in \mathcal{Y}_1 \text{ and for all } (p, q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon, \\ \widehat{v}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(p\varepsilon + \delta y_1, q\varepsilon + \varepsilon y_2, \delta y_3) &= \varepsilon \delta^2 \widehat{v}^{(2)}(p\varepsilon, q\varepsilon, y) \quad \text{for a.e. } y \in \mathcal{Y}_2 \text{ and for all } (p, q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

The field $V_{e,\varepsilon\delta}$ is defined as follows: In Ω_δ by

$$V_{e,\varepsilon\delta}(x) = \begin{pmatrix} \delta^2 \mathfrak{V}_{\varepsilon\delta,1} - \delta x_3 \partial_1 \mathfrak{V}_{\varepsilon\delta,3} \\ \delta^2 \mathfrak{V}_{\varepsilon\delta,2} - \delta x_3 \partial_2 \mathfrak{V}_{\varepsilon\delta,3} \\ \delta \mathfrak{V}_{\varepsilon\delta,3} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (8.6)$$

where the field $\mathfrak{V}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha} \in W^{1,\infty}(\omega_\delta)$ is constructed using Lemma B.3 from $\mathfrak{V}_\alpha \in W^{1,\infty}(\omega)$.

So, by construction, we have $v_{\varepsilon\delta} \in H^1(\Omega_\delta)^3$ and $v_{\varepsilon\delta} = 0$ a.e. on Γ_δ due to the boundary condition satisfied by \mathfrak{V} and $\widehat{v}^{(\alpha)}$.

Due to (8.6), we have the following:

$$e(v_{\varepsilon\delta}) = e(V_{e,\varepsilon\delta}) = 0, \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega_{pq}^H, \quad (p, q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^*$$

since by construction of $\mathfrak{V}_{\varepsilon\delta}$ we have

$$\partial_\alpha \mathfrak{V}_{\varepsilon\delta,\beta} = \partial_{\alpha\beta}^2 \mathfrak{V}_{\varepsilon\delta,3} = 0, \quad \text{a.e. in } \omega_{pq}^H \text{ for } (p, q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^*.$$

Observe that we have for a.e. $(z_2, z_3) \in \left(\frac{\delta}{2}, \varepsilon - \frac{\delta}{2}\right) \times \mathcal{I}_\delta$

$$\begin{aligned} v_{\varepsilon\delta,1}\left(p\varepsilon + \frac{\delta}{2}, q\varepsilon + z_2, z_3\right) - v_{\varepsilon\delta,1}\left(p\varepsilon - \frac{\delta}{2}, q\varepsilon + z_2, z_3\right) &= \delta^2 \left(\mathfrak{V}_{\varepsilon\delta,1}\left(p\varepsilon + \frac{\delta}{2}, q\varepsilon + z_2\right) - \mathfrak{V}_{\varepsilon\delta,1}\left(p\varepsilon - \frac{\delta}{2}, q\varepsilon + z_2\right) \right) \\ &\quad - z_3 \delta \left(\partial_1 \mathfrak{V}_{\varepsilon\delta,3}\left(p\varepsilon + \frac{\delta}{2}, q\varepsilon + z_2\right) - \partial_1 \mathfrak{V}_{\varepsilon\delta,3}\left(p\varepsilon - \frac{\delta}{2}, q\varepsilon + z_2\right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Due to the definition of $\mathfrak{V}_{\varepsilon\delta,3}$ in Lemma B.5, we have (see (B.6))

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \mathfrak{V}_{\varepsilon\delta,3}(p\varepsilon + z_1, q\varepsilon + z_2) &= \mathfrak{F}_{\varepsilon\delta}(p\varepsilon + z_1) + \mathfrak{G}_{\varepsilon\delta}(q\varepsilon + z_2), \\ \partial_1 \mathfrak{V}_{\varepsilon\delta,3}\left(p\varepsilon + \frac{\delta}{2}, q\varepsilon + z_2\right) &= d_1 \mathfrak{F}_{\varepsilon\delta}\left(p\varepsilon + \frac{\delta}{2}\right) = d_1 \mathfrak{F}\left(p\varepsilon + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right), \\ \partial_1 \mathfrak{V}_{\varepsilon\delta,3}\left(p\varepsilon - \frac{\delta}{2}, q\varepsilon + z_2\right) &= d_1 \mathfrak{F}_{\varepsilon\delta}\left(p\varepsilon - \frac{\delta}{2}\right) = d_1 \mathfrak{F}\left(p\varepsilon - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (z_1, z_2) \in \mathcal{I}_\delta \times \left(\frac{\delta}{2}, \varepsilon - \frac{\delta}{2}\right).$$

From the definition of $\mathfrak{V}_{\varepsilon\delta,1}$ in Lemma B.3, we have (see (4.9)₃)

$$\mathfrak{V}_{\varepsilon\delta,1}\left(p\varepsilon + \frac{\delta}{2}, q\varepsilon + z_2\right) = \mathfrak{V}_1(p\varepsilon + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, q\varepsilon + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}), \quad \mathfrak{V}_{\varepsilon\delta,1}\left(p\varepsilon - \frac{\delta}{2}, q\varepsilon + z_2\right) = \mathfrak{V}_1(p\varepsilon - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, q\varepsilon + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}), \quad \forall z_2 \in \left(\frac{\delta}{2}, \varepsilon - \frac{\delta}{2}\right).$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} d_1 \mathfrak{F}\left(p\varepsilon + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) - d_1 \mathfrak{F}\left(p\varepsilon - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) &= \int_{p\varepsilon - \varepsilon/2}^{p\varepsilon + \varepsilon/2} d_{11}^2 \mathfrak{F}(t) dt, \\ \mathfrak{V}_1(p\varepsilon + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, q\varepsilon + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}) - \mathfrak{V}_1(p\varepsilon - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, q\varepsilon + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}) &= \int_{p\varepsilon - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{p\varepsilon + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}} \partial_1 \mathfrak{V}_1(t, q\varepsilon + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}) dt. \end{aligned}$$

So for a.e. $(z_2, z_3) \in \left(\frac{\delta}{2}, \varepsilon - \frac{\delta}{2}\right) \times \mathcal{I}_\delta$ we have

$$v_{\varepsilon\delta,1}\left(p\varepsilon + \frac{\delta}{2}, q\varepsilon + z_2, z_3\right) - v_{\varepsilon\delta,1}\left(p\varepsilon - \frac{\delta}{2}, q\varepsilon + z_2, z_3\right) = \delta^2 \int_{p\varepsilon - \varepsilon}^{p\varepsilon} \partial_1 \mathfrak{V}_1(t, q\varepsilon) dt - z_3 \delta \int_{p\varepsilon - \varepsilon/2}^{p\varepsilon + \varepsilon/2} d_{11}^2 \mathfrak{F}(t) dt.$$

So for a.e. $(z_2, z_3) \in \left(\frac{\delta}{2}, \varepsilon - \frac{\delta}{2}\right) \times \mathcal{I}_\delta$ since $d_{11}^2 \mathfrak{F} = \partial_{11}^2 \mathfrak{V}_3$ is independent of x_2 , we have

$$\begin{aligned} &v_{\varepsilon\delta,1}\left(p\varepsilon + \frac{\delta}{2}, q\varepsilon + z_2, z_3\right) - v_{\varepsilon\delta,1}\left(p\varepsilon - \frac{\delta}{2}, q\varepsilon + z_2, z_3\right) \\ &= \delta^2 \int_{p\varepsilon - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{p\varepsilon + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}} \mathfrak{V}_1(t, q\varepsilon + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}) dt - z_3 \delta \int_{p\varepsilon - \varepsilon/2}^{p\varepsilon + \varepsilon/2} d_{11}^2 \mathfrak{V}_3(t, q\varepsilon + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}) dt \\ &\geq \delta^2 \int_{p\varepsilon - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{p\varepsilon + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}} \left(\partial_1 \mathfrak{V}_1(t, q\varepsilon + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}) - \frac{1}{2} |\partial_{11}^2 \mathfrak{V}_3(t, q\varepsilon + \frac{\varepsilon}{2})| \right) dt \\ &\geq -\delta^2 \int_{p\varepsilon - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{p\varepsilon + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}} (\|\partial_1 \mathfrak{V}_1\|_{L^\infty(\omega)} + \frac{1}{2} \|\partial_{11}^2 \mathfrak{V}_3\|_{L^\infty(\omega)}) dt \\ &\geq -\varepsilon \delta^2 (\|\partial_1 \mathfrak{V}_1\|_{L^\infty(\omega)} + \frac{1}{2} \|\partial_{11}^2 \mathfrak{V}_3\|_{L^\infty(\omega)}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if ε and δ are small enough, the non-penetration condition $(2.3)_2$ is satisfied by $v_{\varepsilon\delta}$. Similarly, $v_{\varepsilon\delta}$ satisfy $(2.3)_1$. This implies $v_{\varepsilon\delta} \in \mathbf{U}_{\varepsilon\delta}$.

Step 3. In this step, we give convergence of the fields.

Observe that

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta^2} \Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)}(\widehat{v}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)}) \rightarrow \widehat{v}^{(\alpha)} \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(\omega; L^2((0,1)_{y_\alpha}; H^1(\mathcal{I}^2)))^3. \quad (8.7)$$

The definition $\mathfrak{V}_{\varepsilon\delta,3}$ (see Lemma B.5 in Appendix B) give the following convergences:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(\partial_{11}^2 \mathfrak{V}_{\varepsilon\delta,3}) &\rightarrow \partial_{11}^2 \mathfrak{F} && \text{strongly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_2), \\ \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(\partial_{22}^2 \mathfrak{V}_{\varepsilon\delta,3}) &\rightarrow 0 && \text{strongly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_2), \\ \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\partial_{22}^2 \mathfrak{V}_{\varepsilon\delta,3}) &\rightarrow \partial_{22}^2 \mathfrak{G} && \text{strongly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_1), \\ \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\partial_{11}^2 \mathfrak{V}_{\varepsilon\delta,3}) &\rightarrow 0 && \text{strongly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_1), \\ \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)}(\partial_{12} \mathfrak{V}_{\varepsilon\delta,3}) &\rightarrow 0 && \text{strongly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_\alpha). \end{aligned} \quad (8.8)$$

We also have from Lemma B.3 in Appendix B)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(\partial_1 \mathfrak{V}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha}) &\rightarrow \partial_1 \mathfrak{V}_\alpha && \text{strongly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_2), \\ \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(\partial_2 \mathfrak{V}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha}) &\rightarrow 0 && \text{strongly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_2), \\ \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\partial_2 \mathfrak{V}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha}) &\rightarrow \partial_2 \mathfrak{V}_\alpha && \text{strongly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_1), \\ \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\partial_1 \mathfrak{V}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha}) &\rightarrow 0 && \text{strongly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_1). \end{aligned} \quad (8.9)$$

Step 4. In this step, we present the convergence of the strain tensor and the right hand side.

Observe that

$$\Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(e(V_{e,\varepsilon\delta})) = \delta^2 \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(e_{11}(\mathfrak{V}_{\varepsilon\delta})) - y_3 \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(\partial_{11}^2 \mathfrak{V}_{\varepsilon\delta,3}) & * & * \\ \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(e_{12}(\mathfrak{V}_{\varepsilon\delta})) - y_3 \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(\partial_{12}^2 \mathfrak{V}_{\varepsilon\delta,3}) & \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(e_{22}(\mathfrak{V}_{\varepsilon\delta})) - y_3 \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(\partial_{22}^2 \mathfrak{V}_{\varepsilon\delta,3}) & * \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

a.e. in $\omega \times \mathcal{Y}_2$, which along with the convergences (8.7), (8.8)_{1,2,5} and (8.9)_{1,2} give

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta} \Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(e(v_{\varepsilon\delta})) \rightarrow E^{(2)}(\mathfrak{V}, \widehat{v}^{(2)}) \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(\omega \times \mathcal{Y}_2)^{3 \times 3}.$$

Similarly, using the convergences (8.7), (8.8)_{3,4,5} and (8.9)_{3,4}

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta} \Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(e(v_{\varepsilon\delta})) \rightarrow E^{(1)}(\mathfrak{V}, \widehat{v}^{(1)}) \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(\omega \times \mathcal{Y}_1)^{3 \times 3}.$$

With definition of forces (5.1) and $V_{e,\varepsilon\delta}$ (8.6), we get

$$\lim_{(\varepsilon,\delta) \rightarrow (0,0)} \frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta^4} \int_{\Omega_\delta} f_{\varepsilon\delta} \cdot v_{\varepsilon\delta} \, dx = \int_\omega f \cdot \mathfrak{V} \, dx',$$

since from Lemma B.3 and B.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{V}_{\varepsilon\delta,\alpha} &\rightarrow \mathfrak{V}_\alpha, && \text{strongly in } L^2(\omega), \\ \mathfrak{V}_{\varepsilon\delta,3} &\rightarrow \mathfrak{V}_3, && \text{strongly in } H^1(\omega). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

8.2 Unfolded limit problem

Theorem 8.2. *Let $u_{\varepsilon\delta} \in \mathbf{U}_{\varepsilon\delta}$ be the solution of the elasticity problem (2.5). Then, for the whole sequence $\{\varepsilon\delta\}_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ the following convergences hold:*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta} \Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(e(u_{\varepsilon\delta})) &\rightarrow E^{(1)}(\mathfrak{U}, \widehat{u}^{(1)}) && \text{strongly in } L^2(\omega \times \mathcal{Y}_1)^{3 \times 3}, \\ \frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta} \Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(e(u_{\varepsilon\delta})) &\rightarrow E^{(2)}(\mathfrak{U}, \widehat{u}^{(2)}) && \text{strongly in } L^2(\omega \times \mathcal{Y}_2)^{3 \times 3}, \end{aligned} \quad (8.10)$$

and $(\mathfrak{U}, \widehat{u}^{(1)}, \widehat{u}^{(2)}) \in \mathbb{D}$ is the solution of the following rescaled unfolded problem:

$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^2 \int_{\omega \times \mathcal{Y}_\alpha} \mathbb{A}_{ijkl}^{(\alpha)} E_{ij}^{(\alpha)}(\mathfrak{U}, \widehat{u}^{(\alpha)}) E_{kl}^{(\alpha)}(\mathfrak{V}, \widehat{v}^{(\alpha)}) dx' dy = \int_{\omega} f \cdot \mathfrak{V} dx', \quad \forall (\mathfrak{V}, \widehat{v}^{(1)}, \widehat{v}^{(2)}) \in \mathbb{D}. \quad (8.11)$$

Proof. The proof is given as follows.

Step 1. We prove the convergences (8.10) in weak sense and (8.11).

Since $u_{\varepsilon\delta} \in \mathbf{U}_{\varepsilon\delta}$, then using Theorem 3.1 and the assumption on forces (5.1), we have (5.2) and (7.2). Then, we have the convergences as in Lemmas 7.1–7.2, so we got the convergence at least for a subsequence

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta} \Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(e(u_{\varepsilon\delta})) &\rightharpoonup E^{(1)}(\mathfrak{U}, \widehat{u}^{(1)}) && \text{weakly in } L^2(\omega \times \mathcal{Y}_1)^{3 \times 3}, \\ \frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta} \Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(e(u_{\varepsilon\delta})) &\rightharpoonup E^{(2)}(\mathfrak{U}, \widehat{u}^{(2)}) && \text{weakly in } L^2(\omega \times \mathcal{Y}_2)^{3 \times 3}, \end{aligned} \quad (8.12)$$

and $(\mathfrak{U}, \widehat{u}^{(1)}, \widehat{u}^{(2)}) \in \mathbb{D}$.

Multiplying (2.5) by $\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta^4}$ then, using Lemma 8.1 and the convergences (7.5), (7.6) and (7.22), we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\alpha=1}^2 \int_{\omega \times \mathcal{Y}_\alpha} \mathbb{A}_{ijkl}^{(\alpha)} E_{ij}^{(\alpha)}(\mathfrak{U}, \widehat{u}^{(\alpha)}) E_{kl}^{(\alpha)}(\mathfrak{U} - \mathfrak{V}, \widehat{u}^{(\alpha)} - \widehat{v}^{(\alpha)}) dx' dy \\ &\leq \liminf_{(\varepsilon, \delta) \rightarrow (0,0)} \sum_{\alpha=1}^2 \int_{\omega \times \mathcal{Y}_\alpha} \Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)}(\mathbb{A}_{\varepsilon\delta,ijkl}) \frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta} \Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)}(e_{ij}(u_{\varepsilon\delta})) \frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta} \Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)}(e_{kl}(u_{\varepsilon\delta} - v_{\varepsilon\delta})) dx' dy \\ &\leq \liminf_{(\varepsilon, \delta) \rightarrow (0,0)} \frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta^4} \int_{\Omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^S} \mathbb{A}_{\varepsilon\delta,ijkl}(x) e_{ij}(u_{\varepsilon\delta}) e_{kl}(u_{\varepsilon\delta} - v_{\varepsilon\delta}) dx \\ &\leq \limsup_{(\varepsilon, \delta) \rightarrow (0,0)} \frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta^4} \int_{\Omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^S} \mathbb{A}_{\varepsilon\delta,ijkl}(x) e_{ij}(u_{\varepsilon\delta}) e_{kl}(u_{\varepsilon\delta} - v_{\varepsilon\delta}) dx \\ &\leq \limsup_{(\varepsilon, \delta) \rightarrow (0,0)} \frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta^4} \int_{\Omega_\delta} f_{\varepsilon\delta} \cdot (u_{\varepsilon\delta} - v_{\varepsilon\delta}) dx = \int_{\omega} f \cdot (\mathfrak{U} - \mathfrak{V}) dx', \quad \forall (\mathfrak{V}, \widehat{v}^{(1)}, \widehat{v}^{(2)}) \in \mathbb{D}. \end{aligned} \quad (8.13)$$

The first inequality in the above expression is due to the identity

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\omega \times \mathcal{Y}_\alpha} \Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)}(\mathbb{A}_{\varepsilon\delta,ijkl}) \frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta} \Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)}(e_{ij}(u_{\varepsilon\delta})) \frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta} \Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)}(e_{kl}(u_{\varepsilon\delta} - v_{\varepsilon\delta})) dx' dy \\ &= \int_{\omega \times \mathcal{Y}_\alpha} \Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)}(\mathbb{A}_{\varepsilon\delta,ijkl}) \frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta} \Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)}(e_{ij}(u_{\varepsilon\delta})) \frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta} \Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)}(e_{kl}(u_{\varepsilon\delta})) dx' dy \\ &\quad - \int_{\omega \times \mathcal{Y}_\alpha} \Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)}(\mathbb{A}_{\varepsilon\delta,ijkl}) \frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta} \Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)}(e_{ij}(u_{\varepsilon\delta})) \frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta} \Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)}(e_{kl}(v_{\varepsilon\delta})) dx' dy. \end{aligned}$$

We obtain a liminf bound for the first term by weak lower semicontinuity of the convex Carathéodory integrand, and the second term converges by weak–strong convergence of the solution sequence and the recovery sequence, respectively.

Since the set of limit displacement \mathbb{D} is a subspace without any limit non-penetration condition, we can take $2\mathfrak{U} - \mathfrak{V}$ and $2\widehat{u}^{(\alpha)} - \widehat{v}^{(\alpha)}$ as test function to get

$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^2 \int_{\omega \times \mathcal{Y}_\alpha} \mathbb{A}_{ijkl}^{(\alpha)} E_{ij}^{(\alpha)}(\mathfrak{U}, \widehat{u}^{(\alpha)}) E_{kl}^{(\alpha)}(\mathfrak{U} - \mathfrak{V}, \widehat{u}^{(\alpha)} - \widehat{v}^{(\alpha)}) dx' dy \geq \int_{\omega} f \cdot (\mathfrak{U} - \mathfrak{V}) dx', \quad \forall (\mathfrak{V}, \widehat{v}^{(1)}, \widehat{v}^{(2)}) \in \mathbb{D}.$$

So, we have proved (8.11), by replacing $\mathfrak{U} - \mathfrak{V}$ and $\widehat{u}^{(\alpha)} - \widehat{v}^{(\alpha)}$ by \mathfrak{V} and $\widehat{v}^{(\alpha)}$ respectively.

Using the coercivity result (C.1) together with (8.2) and using Lax Milgram's lemma, we have unique solution to the unfolded problem (8.11). So, the convergences (8.12) hold for the whole sequence.

Finally, passing in the problem (2.5) with $v = 0$, and proceeding as in (8.13) with (8.11) for $\mathfrak{V} = \mathfrak{U}$ and $\widehat{v}^{(\alpha)} = \widehat{u}^{(\alpha)}$ give

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{(\varepsilon, \delta) \rightarrow (0,0)} \frac{1}{\varepsilon \delta^4} \int_{\Omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^S} \mathbb{A}_{\varepsilon\delta,ijkl}(x) e_{ij}(u_{\varepsilon\delta}) e_{kl}(u_{\varepsilon\delta}) dx \\ &= \lim_{(\varepsilon, \delta) \rightarrow (0,0)} \sum_{\alpha=1}^2 \int_{\omega \times \mathcal{Y}_\alpha} \Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)}(\mathbb{A}_{\varepsilon\delta,ijkl}) \frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta} \Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)}(e_{ij}(u_{\varepsilon\delta})) \frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta} \Pi_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)}(e_{kl}(u_{\varepsilon\delta})) dx' dy \\ &= \sum_{\alpha=1}^2 \int_{\omega \times \mathcal{Y}_\alpha} \mathbb{A}_{ijkl}^{(\alpha)} E_{ij}^{(\alpha)}(\mathfrak{U}, \widehat{u}^{(\alpha)}) E_{kl}^{(\alpha)}(\mathfrak{U}, \widehat{u}^{(\alpha)}) dx' dy, \end{aligned}$$

which leads to the strong convergences (8.10).

This completes the proof. \square

8.3 Cell problems

In this subsection, we derive the homogenized problem. For that we express the microscopic displacements $\widehat{u}^{(\alpha)}$ in-terms of the macroscopic displacement \mathfrak{U} and some correctors.

In the problem (8.11) taking $\mathfrak{V} = 0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{Y}_\alpha} \mathbb{A}_{ijkl}^{(\alpha)} E_{ijkl}^{(\alpha)}(0, \widehat{u}^{(\alpha)}) E_{kl}^{(\alpha)}(0, \widehat{v}^{(\alpha)}) &= - \int_{\mathcal{Y}_\alpha} \mathbb{A}_{ijkl}^{(\alpha)} E_{ijkl}^{(\alpha)}(\mathfrak{U}, 0) E_{kl}^{(\alpha)}(0, \widehat{v}^{(\alpha)}) dy, \\ &\forall \widehat{v}^{(\alpha)} \in L^2(\omega; \mathbf{L}^2((0,1)_{\mathcal{Y}_\alpha}; H^1(\mathcal{J}^2))). \end{aligned}$$

We define the following 3×3 symmetric matrices by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}_1^{(1)} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1/2 & 0 \\ 1/2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \mathbf{M}_2^{(1)} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \mathbf{M}_3^{(1)} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -y_3 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \mathbf{M}_1^{(2)} &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \mathbf{M}_2^{(2)} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1/2 & 0 \\ 1/2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \mathbf{M}_3^{(2)} &= \begin{pmatrix} -y_3 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\chi_r^{(\alpha)}$ be in $\mathbf{L}^2((0,1)_{\mathcal{Y}_\alpha}; H^1(\mathcal{J}^2))$, $r = 1, 2, 3$, the solutions of the following cell problems ($\alpha \in \{1, 2\}$):

$$\int_{\mathcal{Y}_\alpha} \mathbb{A}_{ijkl}^{(\alpha)}(y) (\mathbf{M}_{r,ij}^{(\alpha)} + E_{ij}^{(\alpha)}(0, \chi_r^{(\alpha)})) E_{kl}^{(\alpha)}(0, \widehat{v}^{(\alpha)}) = 0, \quad \forall \widehat{v}^{(\alpha)} \in \mathbf{L}^2((0,1)_{\mathcal{Y}_\alpha}, H^1(\mathcal{J}^2)). \quad (8.14)$$

The six correctors above allow us to express $\widehat{u}^{(\alpha)}$ in terms of the partial derivatives of \mathfrak{U} . We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{u}^{(1)}(x', y) &= \partial_2 \mathfrak{U}_1 \chi_1^{(1)}(y) + \partial_2 \mathfrak{U}_2 \chi_2^{(1)}(y) + \partial_{22}^2 \mathfrak{U}_3 \chi_3^{(1)}(y), & \text{a.e. in } \omega \times \mathcal{Y}_1, \\ \widehat{u}^{(2)}(x', y) &= \partial_1 \mathfrak{U}_2 \chi_1^{(2)}(y) + \partial_1 \mathfrak{U}_1 \chi_2^{(2)}(y) + \partial_{11}^2 \mathfrak{U}_3 \chi_3^{(2)}(y), & \text{a.e. in } \omega \times \mathcal{Y}_2, \end{aligned}$$

We define the homogenized coefficients as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{rs}^{(\alpha)} &= \int_{\mathcal{Y}_\alpha} \mathbb{A}_{ijkl}^{(\alpha)}(y) [\mathbf{M}_{r,ij}^{(\alpha)} + E_{ij}^{(\alpha)}(0, \chi_r^{(\alpha)})] \mathbf{M}_{s,kl}^{(\alpha)} dy \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{Y}_\alpha} \mathbb{A}_{ijkl}^{(\alpha)}(y) [\mathbf{M}_{r,ij}^{(\alpha)} + E_{ij}^{(\alpha)}(0, \chi_r^{(\alpha)})] [\mathbf{M}_{s,kl}^{(\alpha)} + E_{kl}^{(\alpha)}(0, \chi_s^{(\alpha)})] dy \end{aligned} \quad \text{for } r, s \in \{1, 2, 3\}. \quad (8.15)$$

Hence, by setting $\mathcal{A}^{(\alpha)} = [\mathcal{A}_{rs}^{(\alpha)}] \in \mathbf{M}_3$, we get the homogenized varitional inequality, given by

$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^2 \int_{\omega} \mathcal{A}^{(\alpha)} E^{(\alpha)}(\mathfrak{U}) \cdot E^{(\alpha)}(\mathfrak{V}) dx' = \int_{\omega} f \cdot \mathfrak{V} dx', \quad \forall \mathfrak{V} \in \mathbb{D}_0,$$

where

$$E^{(1)}(\mathfrak{V}) = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_2 \mathfrak{V}_1 \\ \partial_2 \mathfrak{V}_2 \\ \partial_{22}^2 \mathfrak{V}_3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad E^{(2)}(\mathfrak{V}) = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_1 \mathfrak{V}_2 \\ \partial_1 \mathfrak{V}_1 \\ \partial_{11}^2 \mathfrak{V}_3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \forall \mathfrak{V} \in \mathbb{D}_0. \quad (8.16)$$

The following is the final result of this paper

Theorem 8.3. *The limit macroscopic displacements $\mathfrak{U} \in \mathbb{D}_0$ is the unique solution to the homogenized problem*

$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^2 \int_{\omega} \mathcal{A}^{(\alpha)} E^{(\alpha)}(\mathfrak{U}) \cdot E^{(\alpha)}(\mathfrak{V}) dx' = \int_{\omega} f \cdot \mathfrak{V} dx', \quad \forall \mathfrak{V} \in \mathbb{D}_0,$$

where the homogenized tensor is given by (8.16) with the coefficients (8.15).

Proof. Observe that for $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^3$, we have, using (8.14)-(8.15))

$$\mathcal{A}^{(\alpha)} \xi \cdot \xi = \int_{\mathcal{Y}_{\alpha}} \mathbb{A}_{ijkl}^{(\alpha)}(y) \left[\xi_r \mathbf{M}_{r,ij}^{(\alpha)} + E_{ij}^{(\alpha)}(0, \xi_r \chi_r^{(\alpha)}) \right] \left[\xi_s \mathbf{M}_{s,kl}^{(\alpha)} + E_{ij}^{(\alpha)}(0, \xi_s \chi_s^{(\alpha)}) \right] dy.$$

Then, using (8.1)–(8.2), we get $\mathcal{A}^{(\alpha)}$ is symmetric, non-negative and coercive. Then, the estimate (C.1) and using Lax-Milgram’s lemma with boundary condition satisfied by elements in the subspace \mathbb{D}_0 give that there exist a unique solution to the homogenized problem. Finally, using the Theorem (8.2) along with cell problems completes the proof. \square

References

- [1] G. Allaire. Homogenization and two-scale convergence. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 23(6):1482–1518, 1992.
- [2] A. Bensoussan, J. L. Lions, and G. Papanicolaou. *Asymptotic Analysis for Periodic Structures*. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1978.
- [3] A. Braides and V. Chiadò Piat. Another brick in the wall. In *Variational Problems in Materials Science*, pages 13–24. Birkhäuser, Basel, 2006.
- [4] A. Braides and N. A. Nodargi. Homogenization of cohesive fracture in masonry structures. *Mathematics and Mechanics of Solids*, 25(2):181–200, 2020.
- [5] D. Caillerie and J. C. Nédélec. Thin elastic and periodic plates. *Mathematical Methods in the Applied Sciences*, 6(1):159–191, 1984.
- [6] A. Chakraborty, G. Griso, and J. Orlik. Dimension reduction and homogenization of a composite plate with matrix pre-strain. *Asymptotic Analysis*, 138(4):255–310, 2024.
- [7] A. Chakraborty, G. Griso, and J. Orlik. Dimension reduction and homogenization for thin plates with disconnected rigid inclusions. HAL preprint hal-05176256, 2025.
- [8] M. Cherdantsev, K. Cherednichenko, and S. Neukamm. High-contrast homogenization in nonlinear elasticity under small loads. *Asymptotic Analysis*, 104(1–2):67–102, 2017.
- [9] K. D. Cherednichenko and J. A. Evans. Homogenization of thin periodic frameworks with high-contrast inclusions. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 473(2):658–679, 2019.
- [10] F. Christowiak and C. Kreisbeck. Asymptotic rigidity of layered structures and its application in homogenization theory. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 235(1):51–98, 2020.
- [11] P. G. Ciarlet. *Mathematical Elasticity, Vol. II: Theory of Plates*. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1997.
- [12] P. G. Ciarlet and C. Mardare. An introduction to shell theory. In *Differential Geometry: Theory and Applications*, pages 94–184. 2008.
- [13] D. Cioranescu, A. Damlamian, and G. Griso. The periodic unfolding method in homogenization. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 40(4):1585–1620, 2008.
- [14] D. Cioranescu, A. Damlamian, and G. Griso. *The Periodic Unfolding Method: Theory and Applications to Partial Differential Equations*. Springer, Singapore, 2018.
- [15] D. Cioranescu, A. Damlamian, and J. Orlik. Homogenization via unfolding in periodic elasticity with contact on closed and open cracks. *Asymptotic Analysis*, 82(3–4):201–232, 2013.
- [16] W. P. Düll, D. Engl, and C. Kreisbeck. A variational perspective on auxetic metamaterials of checkerboard type. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 248(3):46, 2024.

- [17] D. Engl, C. Kreisbeck, and A. Ritorto. Asymptotic analysis of deformation behavior in high-contrast fiber-reinforced materials: rigidity and anisotropy. *Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences*, 32(8):1633–1669, 2022.
- [18] R. Falconi, G. Griso, and J. Orlik. Periodic unfolding for anisotropically bounded sequences. *Asymptotic Analysis*, 132(3–4):383–407, 2023.
- [19] R. Falconi, G. Griso, and J. Orlik. Periodic unfolding for lattice structures. *Ricerche di Matematica*, 73(5):2505–2539, 2024.
- [20] M. Friedrich, L. Kreutz, and K. Zemas. Derivation of kirchhoff-type plate theories for elastic materials with voids. arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.05837, 2025.
- [21] G. Friesecke, R. D. James, and S. Müller. A theorem on geometric rigidity and the derivation of nonlinear plate theory from three-dimensional elasticity. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 55(11):1461–1506, 2002.
- [22] A. Gaudiello and G. Panasenko. Stokes–brinkman equations with diffusion and convection in thin tube structures. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 450:113728, 2026.
- [23] G. Geymonat, F. Krasucki, and S. Lenci. Mathematical analysis of a bonded joint with a soft thin adhesive. *Mathematics and Mechanics of Solids*, 4:201–225, 1999.
- [24] A. Sydney Gladman, E. A. Matsumoto, R. G. Nuzzo, L. Mahadevan, and J. A. Lewis. Biomimetic 4d printing. *Nature Materials*, (4):413–418, 2016.
- [25] G. Griso. Asymptotic behavior of structures made of plates. *Analysis and Applications*, 3(4):325–356, 2005.
- [26] G. Griso. Decomposition of displacements of thin structures. *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées*, 89:199–233, 2008.
- [27] G. Griso. Decomposition of plate displacements via kirchhoff–love displacements. *Mathematical Methods in the Applied Sciences*, 46(17):18234–18257, 2023.
- [28] G. Griso. Dimension reduction and homogenization in a like-mosaic domain. HAL preprint hal-05388525, 2025.
- [29] G. Griso, M. Hauck, and J. Orlik. Asymptotic analysis for periodic perforated shells. *ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis*, 55(1):1–36, 2021.
- [30] G. Griso, L. Khilkova, and J. Orlik. Asymptotic behavior of 3d unstable structures made of beams. *Journal of Elasticity*, 150(1):7–76, 2022.
- [31] G. Griso, L. Khilkova, J. Orlik, and O. Sivak. Homogenization of perforated elastic structures. *Journal of Elasticity*, 141(2):181–225, 2020.
- [32] G. Griso, L. Khilkova, J. Orlik, and O. Sivak. Asymptotic behavior of stable structures made of beams. *Journal of Elasticity*, 143(2):239–299, 2021.
- [33] G. Griso, A. Migunova, and J. Orlik. Homogenization via unfolding in periodic layer with contact. *Asymptotic Analysis*, 99(1–2):23–52, 2016.
- [34] G. Griso, A. Migunova, and J. Orlik. Asymptotic analysis for domains separated by a thin layer made of periodic vertical beams. *Journal of Elasticity*, 128(2):291–331, 2017.
- [35] G. Griso and J. Orlik. Homogenization of a contact problem with coulomb’s friction on periodic cracks. *Mathematical Methods in the Applied Sciences*, 42(18):6435–6458, 2019.
- [36] G. Griso, J. Orlik, and S. Wackerle. Asymptotic behavior for textiles. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 52(2):1639–1689, 2020.
- [37] D. Kinderlehrer and G. Stampacchia. *An Introduction to Variational Inequalities and Their Applications*. SIAM, Philadelphia, 2000.
- [38] L. Merzougui, G. Griso, and N. Bengouga. Dimension reduction and error estimates. *Asymptotic Analysis*, page 09217134251356902, 2025.

- [39] S. Neukamm and I. Velčić. Derivation of a homogenized von-Kármán plate theory from 3d nonlinear elasticity. *Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences*, 23(14):2701–2748, 2013.
- [40] G. Nguetseng. A general convergence result for a functional related to the theory of homogenization. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 20(3):608–623, 1989.
- [41] O. A. Oleĭnik, A. S. Shamaev, and G. A. Yosifian. *Mathematical Problems in Elasticity and Homogenization*. Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1992.
- [42] J. Orlik, R. Falconi, G. Griso, and S. Wackerle. Asymptotic behavior for textiles with loose contact. *Mathematical Methods in the Applied Sciences*, 46(16):17082–17127, 2023.
- [43] J. Orlik, D. Neusius, A. Chakraborty, S. Backes, T. Gries, and K. Steiner. Modelling of flat pre-strain driven structures, folding to desired surfaces and application to 3d-printing on textiles. *International Journal of Engineering Science*, 208:104201, 2025.
- [44] G. Panasenko and K. Pileckas. *Multiscale Analysis of Viscous Flows in Thin Tube Structures*. Birkhäuser, 2024.
- [45] V. L. Popov, M. Heß, and E. Willert. *Handbook of Contact Mechanics: Exact Solutions of Axisymmetric Contact Problems*. Springer Nature, Cham, 2019.
- [46] M. Santilli and B. Schmidt. A blake–zisserman–kirchhoff theory for plates with soft inclusions. *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées*, 175:143–180, 2023.

A Appendix: Proof of Theorem 3.1

Proof. The proof is divided into three steps given below.

Step 1. Below we recall two theorems concerning the decomposition of plate displacements.

The first statements of the theorem below is found in [25, Theorem 2.3] and [26, Theorem 4.1], and it was completed by [14, Theorem 11.4].

Theorem A.1 (First decomposition of a plate displacement). *Any displacement u in $H^1(\Omega_\delta)^3$ can be decomposed as follows:*

$$u(x) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{U}_1(x') + x_3 \mathcal{R}_1(x') \\ \mathcal{U}_2(x') + x_3 \mathcal{R}_2(x') \\ \mathcal{U}_3(x') \end{pmatrix} + \bar{u}(x) \quad \text{for a.e. } x \text{ in } \Omega_\delta. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where $\mathcal{U} \in H^1(\omega_\delta)^3$, $\mathcal{R}_\alpha \in H^2(\omega_\delta)$ and $\bar{u} \in H^1(\Omega_\delta)^3$ satisfies

$$\int_{\mathcal{I}_\delta} \bar{u} \, dx_3 = 0, \quad \int_{\mathcal{I}_\delta} x_3 \bar{u}_\alpha \, dx_3 = 0, \quad \text{a.e. in } \omega_\delta. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

We set

$$\mathcal{U}_m = \mathcal{U}_1 \mathbf{e}_1 + \mathcal{U}_2 \mathbf{e}_2, \quad \mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}_1 \mathbf{e}_1 + \mathcal{R}_2 \mathbf{e}_2.$$

The following estimates hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \|e_{\alpha\beta}(\mathcal{U}_m)\|_{L^2(\omega)} + \delta \|\nabla \mathcal{R}\|_{L^2(\omega)} &\leq \frac{C}{\delta^{1/2}} \|e(u)\|_{L^2(\Omega_\delta)}, \\ \|\nabla \mathcal{U}_3 + \mathcal{R}\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} &\leq \frac{C}{\delta^{1/2}} \|e(u)\|_{L^2(\Omega_\delta)}, \\ \|\bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_\delta)} + \delta \|\nabla \bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_\delta)} &\leq C \delta \|e(u)\|_{L^2(\Omega_\delta)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

The constants depend only on ω .

Moreover, if $u = 0$ a.e. on Γ_δ then, the terms of the decomposition (A.1) satisfy

$$\mathcal{U} = 0, \quad \mathcal{R} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{u} = 0 \quad \text{a.e. on } \gamma.$$

Theorem below is an immediate consequence of [27, Theorem 2].

Theorem A.2 (Complete decomposition of a plate displacement). *Any displacement u in $H^1(\Omega_\delta)^3$ can be decomposed as follows:*

$$u(x) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathfrak{U}_1(x') - x_3 \partial_1 \mathfrak{U}_3(x') + x_3 \mathfrak{r}_1(x') \\ \mathfrak{U}_2(x') - x_3 \partial_2 \mathfrak{U}_3(x') + x_3 \mathfrak{r}_2(x') \\ \mathfrak{U}_3(x') + \mathfrak{u}(x') \end{pmatrix} + \bar{u}(x) \quad \text{for a.e. } x \text{ in } \Omega_\delta. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

where $\mathfrak{U}_\alpha \in H^1(\omega_\delta)$, $\mathfrak{U}_3 \in H^2(\omega_\delta)$, $\mathfrak{r}_\alpha, \mathfrak{u} \in H^1(\omega_\delta)$ and $\bar{u} \in H^1(\Omega_\delta)^3$ satisfies

$$\int_{\mathfrak{I}_\delta} \bar{u} dx_3 = 0, \quad \int_{\mathfrak{I}_\delta} x_3 \bar{u}_\alpha dx_3 = 0, \quad \text{a.e. in } \omega_\delta. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

We set

$$\mathfrak{U}_m = \mathfrak{U}_1 \mathbf{e}_1 + \mathfrak{U}_2 \mathbf{e}_2, \quad \mathfrak{r} = \mathfrak{r}_1 \mathbf{e}_1 + \mathfrak{r}_2 \mathbf{e}_2 \in H^1(\omega_\delta)^2.$$

The following estimates hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \|e_{\alpha\beta}(\mathfrak{U}_m)\|_{L^2(\omega)} + \delta \|\partial_{\alpha\beta}^2 \mathfrak{U}_3\|_{L^2(\omega)} &\leq \frac{C}{\delta^{1/2}} \|e(u)\|_{L^2(\Omega_\delta)}, \\ \|\mathfrak{r}\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} + \delta \|\nabla \mathfrak{r}\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} &\leq \frac{C}{\delta^{1/2}} \|e(u)\|_{L^2(\Omega_\delta)}, \\ \|\mathfrak{u}\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} + \delta \|\nabla \mathfrak{u}\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} &\leq C \delta^{1/2} \|e(u)\|_{L^2(\Omega_\delta)}, \\ \|\bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_\delta)} + \delta \|\nabla \bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_\delta)} &\leq C \delta \|e(u)\|_{L^2(\Omega_\delta)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

The constants depend only on ω .

Moreover, if $u = 0$ a.e. on Γ_δ then, the terms of the decomposition (A.4) satisfy

$$\mathfrak{U}_m = 0, \quad \mathfrak{U}_3 = 0, \quad \nabla \mathfrak{U}_3 = 0, \quad \mathfrak{r} = 0, \quad \mathfrak{u} = 0, \quad \bar{u} = 0 \quad \text{a.e. on } \gamma.$$

We proved Theorem A.1 from Theorem A.2 by setting $\mathfrak{U}_\alpha = \mathcal{U}_\alpha$ and using the same deformation of the fibers \bar{u} , then constructed the field $\mathfrak{U}_3 \in H^2(\omega_\delta)$ and defined $\mathfrak{r} \in H^1(\omega_\delta)^2$ and $\mathfrak{u} \in H^1(\omega_\delta)$ to get

$$\mathcal{U}_3 = \mathfrak{U}_3 + \mathfrak{u}, \quad \mathcal{R} = -\nabla \mathfrak{U}_3 + \mathfrak{r}.$$




Figure 3: The different open sets: $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta}^H$ (blue), $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon}$, $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta}$ (red+blue) and $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta}^E$ (empty+red+blue).

Step 2. In this step we explain how to modify \mathcal{U}_3 in a cell.

Denote (see Figure 3)

$$\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon} \doteq (0, \varepsilon)^2, \quad \mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta} \doteq \left(-\frac{\delta}{2}, \varepsilon + \frac{\delta}{2}\right)^2, \quad \mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta}^H \doteq \left(\frac{\delta}{2}, \varepsilon - \frac{\delta}{2}\right)^2, \quad \mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta}^E \doteq \left(-\frac{3\delta}{2}, \varepsilon + \frac{3\delta}{2}\right)^2.$$

For the sake of simplicity we assume that $\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta}$ is an integer greater than 4.

We recall that there exists an extension operator P from $H^1(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta} \times \mathfrak{I}_\delta)^3$ into $H^1(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta}^E \times \mathfrak{I}_\delta)^3$ such that (see [26, Lemma 4.2])

$$\forall v \in H^1(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta} \times \mathfrak{I}_\delta)^3, \quad \|e(P(v))\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta}^E \times \mathfrak{I}_\delta)} \leq C \|e(v)\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta} \times \mathfrak{I}_\delta)}.$$

The constant is independent of ε and δ .

Below, since v satisfies $e(v) = 0$ a.e. in $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta}^H \times \mathcal{I}_\delta$ we have $v = \mathbf{R}$ in $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta}^H \times \mathcal{I}_\delta$, where \mathbf{R} is a rigid displacement. To extend v , we consider $v - \mathbf{R}$ and first make reflections with respect to two opposite sides of $\partial\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta} \times \mathcal{I}_\delta$, then reflections with respect to the other two sides of this domain, finally adding the rigid displacement \mathbf{R} to the result.⁶

Let v be a displacement in $H^1(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta} \times \mathcal{I}_\delta)^3$, satisfying $e(v) = 0$ a.e. in $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta}^H \times \mathcal{I}_\delta$ and extended in a displacement, still denoted v , belonging to $H^1(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta}^E \times \mathcal{I}_\delta)^3$. Note that with this displacement, applying Theorem A.1, gives estimates with constants independent of ε and δ . We have $v = \mathbf{R}$ in $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta}^H \times \mathcal{I}_\delta$, where \mathbf{R} is a rigid displacement. Below, we consider v as a displacement of $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta}^E \times \mathcal{I}_\delta$. Theorem A.1 allows to decompose v as

$$v(x) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{V}_1(x') + x_3 \mathcal{S}_1(x') \\ \mathcal{V}_2(x') + x_3 \mathcal{S}_2(x') \\ \mathcal{V}_3(x') \end{pmatrix} + \bar{v}(x) \quad \text{for a.e. } x \text{ in } \mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta} \times \mathcal{I}_\delta. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

We have

$$\mathcal{V}(x') + x_3 \mathcal{S}(x') = \mathbf{R}(x) \quad \text{a.e. in } x \in \mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta}^H, \quad \bar{v} = 0 \quad \text{a.e. in } \mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta}^H \times \mathcal{I}_\delta.$$

We cover $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta}$ with squares whose edges have length δ . To define \mathfrak{V}_3 , we have four possible strategies. In the




Figure 4: $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta}$ is covered with squares; below are four strategies for defining \mathcal{V}_3 .

first, we consider four cells included in $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta}^E$, the first four cells under the domain $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta}$ (see Figure 4), such that the red cell is included in $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta}$. Then, we consider the mean values in these four cells of \mathcal{V}_3 , \mathcal{S}_1 and \mathcal{S}_2 . Thanks to these values we define \mathfrak{V}_3 in the red cell (see [27, Section 8]). In this way, and because we have extended v to the domain $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta}^E \times \mathcal{I}_\delta$, we obtain a function denoted $\mathfrak{V}_{3,A}$. The values obtained for $\mathfrak{V}_{3,A}$ do not allow to obtain a Kirchhoff-Love displacement equals to \mathbf{R} in the hatched part of $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta}^H \times \mathcal{I}_\delta$ (see Figure 4c).

Then, we use the other possibilities to construct \mathfrak{V}_3 (see Figure 4). This gives the fields $\mathfrak{V}_{3,B}$, $\mathfrak{V}_{3,C}$ and $\mathfrak{V}_{3,D}$. Of course, the values of these fields do not allow us to obtain Kirchhoff-Love displacements equal to \mathbf{R} in some cells close the boundary of $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta}^H \times \mathcal{I}_\delta$.

Now, let ψ be in $\mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R})$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \psi(t) \in [0, 1], & \forall t \in \mathbb{R}, \\ \psi(t) = 1, & \forall t \leq 0, \\ \psi(t) = 0, & \forall t \geq 1, \\ \psi'(0) = \psi'(1) = 0 \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

and

$$\psi_\delta(t) = \psi\left(\frac{t}{\delta} + \frac{3}{2}\right), \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

It satisfies

$$\|\psi_\delta\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq 1, \quad \|\psi'_\delta\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq \frac{C}{\delta}, \quad \|\psi''_\delta\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq \frac{C}{\delta^2}. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

The constant is independent of δ .

We set

$$\mathcal{V}_3 = \mathfrak{V}_{3,Z} + \mathbf{v}_Z, \quad \mathcal{S} = -\nabla \mathfrak{V}_{3,Z} + \mathbf{s}_Z, \quad Z \in \{A, B, C, D\}.$$

⁶ In the third step, using this result, we will extend the restriction of a displacement u to $\Omega_{pq,\varepsilon\delta} \doteq \left(p\varepsilon - \frac{\delta}{2}, p\varepsilon + \varepsilon + \frac{\delta}{2}\right) \times \left(q\varepsilon - \frac{\delta}{2}, q\varepsilon + \varepsilon + \frac{\delta}{2}\right) \times \mathcal{I}_\delta$, $(p, q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^*$, into a displacement of $\left(p\varepsilon - \frac{3\delta}{2}, p\varepsilon + \varepsilon + \frac{3\delta}{2}\right) \times \left(q\varepsilon - \frac{3\delta}{2}, q\varepsilon + \varepsilon + \frac{3\delta}{2}\right) \times \mathcal{I}_\delta$, if necessary. For simplicity, the extensions will always be denoted u .

We have

$$v(x) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{V}_1(x') - x_3 \partial_1 \mathfrak{V}_{3,Z}(x') + x_3 \mathfrak{s}_{1,Z}(x') \\ \mathcal{V}_2(x') - x_3 \partial_2 \mathfrak{V}_{3,Z}(x') + x_3 \mathfrak{s}_{2,Z}(x') \\ \mathfrak{V}_{3,Z}(x') + \mathfrak{v}_Z(x') \end{pmatrix} + \bar{v}(x) \quad \text{for a.e. } x \text{ in } \mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta} \times \mathfrak{I}_\delta. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

where $\mathfrak{V}_{3,Z} \in H^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})$ and $\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,Z}, \mathfrak{v}_Z \in H^1(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})$. The estimates are given by Theorem A.2 with constants independent of ε and δ . They are for any $Z \in \{A, B, C, D\}$

$$\delta \|\partial_{\alpha\beta}^2 \mathfrak{V}_{3,Z}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})} + \|\mathfrak{s}_Z\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})} + \delta \|\nabla \mathfrak{s}_Z\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})} + \frac{1}{\delta} \|\mathfrak{v}_Z\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})} + \|\nabla \mathfrak{v}_Z\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})} \leq \frac{C}{\delta^{1/2}} \|e(v)\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta} \times \mathfrak{I}_\delta)}.$$

By construction, we have

$$\mathfrak{V}_{3,Z} - \mathcal{V}_3 = \mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,Z} = \mathfrak{v}_Z = 0 \quad \text{a.e. in } \mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta}^H, \quad Z \in \{A, B, C, D\}.$$

Now, we define $\mathfrak{V}_3, \mathfrak{s}$ and \mathfrak{v} . We set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{V}_3 &= \mathfrak{V}_{3,A} \psi_{\delta,A} + \mathfrak{V}_{3,B} \psi_{\delta,B} + \mathfrak{V}_{3,C} \psi_{\delta,C} + \mathfrak{V}_{3,D} \psi_{\delta,D}, \\ \mathfrak{v} &= \mathfrak{v}_A \psi_{\delta,A} + \mathfrak{v}_B \psi_{\delta,B} + \mathfrak{v}_C \psi_{\delta,C} + \mathfrak{v}_D \psi_{\delta,D}, \\ \mathfrak{s}_\alpha &= \mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,A} \psi_{\delta,A} + \mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,B} \psi_{\delta,B} + \mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,C} \psi_{\delta,C} + \mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,D} \psi_{\delta,D} - (\mathfrak{V}_{3,A} \partial_\alpha \psi_{\delta,A} + \mathfrak{V}_{3,B} \partial_\alpha \psi_{\delta,B} + \mathfrak{V}_{3,C} \partial_\alpha \psi_{\delta,C} + \mathfrak{V}_{3,D} \partial_\alpha \psi_{\delta,D}), \\ &= \mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,A} \psi_{\delta,A} + \mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,B} \psi_{\delta,B} + \mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,C} \psi_{\delta,C} + \mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,D} \psi_{\delta,D} - (\mathfrak{v}_A \partial_\alpha \psi_{\delta,A} + \mathfrak{v}_B \partial_\alpha \psi_{\delta,B} + \mathfrak{v}_C \partial_\alpha \psi_{\delta,C} + \mathfrak{v}_D \partial_\alpha \psi_{\delta,D}), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{\delta,A}(x') &= \psi_\delta(x_2) \psi_\delta(x_1), & \psi_{\delta,B}(x') &= \psi_\delta(x_2) (1 - \psi_\delta(x_1)), \\ \psi_{\delta,C}(x') &= (1 - \psi_\delta(x_2)) (1 - \psi_\delta(x_1)), & \psi_{\delta,D}(x') &= (1 - \psi_\delta(x_2)) \psi_\delta(x_1), \end{aligned} \quad \forall x' \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta}}.$$

Observe that by construction

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathfrak{V}_{3,A} - \mathcal{V}_3) \psi_{\delta,A} + (\mathfrak{V}_{3,B} - \mathcal{V}_3) \psi_{\delta,B} + (\mathfrak{V}_{3,C} - \mathcal{V}_3) \psi_{\delta,C} + (\mathfrak{V}_{3,D} - \mathcal{V}_3) \psi_{\delta,D} &= 0, \\ \mathfrak{V}_{3,A} \partial_1 \psi_{\delta,A} + \mathfrak{V}_{3,B} \partial_1 \psi_{\delta,B} + \mathfrak{V}_{3,C} \partial_1 \psi_{\delta,C} + \mathfrak{V}_{3,D} \partial_1 \psi_{\delta,D} &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad \text{a.e. in } \mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta}^H.$$

So, we obtain the desired decomposition of v .

$$v(x) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{V}_1(x') - x_3 \partial_1 \mathfrak{V}_3(x') + x_3 \mathfrak{s}_1(x') \\ \mathcal{V}_2(x') - x_3 \partial_2 \mathfrak{V}_3(x') + x_3 \mathfrak{s}_2(x') \\ \mathfrak{V}_3(x') + \mathfrak{v}(x') \end{pmatrix} + \bar{v}(x) \quad \text{for a.e. } x \text{ in } \mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta} \times \mathfrak{I}_\delta. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

where $\mathfrak{V}_3 \in H^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})$ and $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha, \mathfrak{v} \in H^1(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})$. By construction, we have

$$\mathfrak{V}_3 - \mathcal{V}_3 = \mathfrak{s}_\alpha = \mathfrak{v} = 0 \quad \text{a.e. in } \mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta}^H.$$

Bellow, we give the estimates satisfied by \mathfrak{V}_3 and $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha, \mathfrak{v}$. First, from (A.9) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathfrak{v}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})} &\leq \|\mathfrak{v}_A\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})} + \|\mathfrak{v}_B\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})} + \|\mathfrak{v}_C\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})} + \|\mathfrak{v}_D\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})} \leq C \delta^{1/2} \|e(v)\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta} \times \mathfrak{I}_\delta)}, \\ \|\nabla \mathfrak{v}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})} &\leq \|\nabla \mathfrak{v}_A\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})} + \|\nabla \mathfrak{v}_B\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})} + \|\nabla \mathfrak{v}_C\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})} + \|\nabla \mathfrak{v}_D\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})} \\ &\quad + \frac{C}{\delta} (\|\mathfrak{v}_A\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})} + \|\mathfrak{v}_B\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})} + \|\mathfrak{v}_C\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})} + \|\mathfrak{v}_D\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})}) \leq \frac{C}{\delta^{1/2}} \|e(v)\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta} \times \mathfrak{I}_\delta)}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, again with (A.9) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathfrak{s}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})} &\leq \|\mathfrak{s}_A\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})} + \|\mathfrak{s}_B\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})} + \|\mathfrak{s}_C\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})} + \|\mathfrak{s}_D\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})} \\ &\quad + \frac{C}{\delta} (\|\mathfrak{v}_A\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})} + \|\mathfrak{v}_B\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})} + \|\mathfrak{v}_C\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})} + \|\mathfrak{v}_D\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})}) \leq \frac{C}{\delta^{1/2}} \|e(v)\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta} \times \mathfrak{I}_\delta)}, \\ \|\nabla \mathfrak{s}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})} &\leq \|\nabla \mathfrak{s}_A\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})} + \|\nabla \mathfrak{s}_B\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})} + \|\nabla \mathfrak{s}_C\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})} + \|\nabla \mathfrak{s}_D\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})} \\ &\quad + \frac{C}{\delta} (\|\mathfrak{s}_A\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})} + \|\mathfrak{s}_B\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})} + \|\mathfrak{s}_C\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})} + \|\mathfrak{s}_D\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})}) \\ &\quad + \frac{C}{\delta^2} (\|\mathfrak{v}_A\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})} + \|\mathfrak{v}_B\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})} + \|\mathfrak{v}_C\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})} + \|\mathfrak{v}_D\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})}) \\ &\quad + \frac{C}{\delta} \|\nabla \mathfrak{v}_A\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})} + \|\nabla \mathfrak{v}_B\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})} + \|\nabla \mathfrak{v}_C\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})} + \|\nabla \mathfrak{v}_D\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})} \leq \frac{C}{\delta^{3/2}} \|e(v)\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta} \times \mathfrak{I}_\delta)}. \end{aligned}$$

Below, we estimate $\partial_{\alpha\beta}^2 \mathfrak{V}_3$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_{\alpha\beta}^2 \mathfrak{V}_3 &= \sum_{Z \in \{A, B, C, D\}} (\partial_{\alpha\beta}^2 \mathfrak{V}_{3,Z} \psi_{\delta,Z} + \partial_\alpha \mathfrak{V}_{3,Z} \partial_\beta \psi_Z + \partial_\beta \mathfrak{V}_{3,Z} \partial_\alpha \psi_Z + \mathfrak{V}_{3,Z} \partial_{\alpha\beta}^2 \psi_{\delta,Z}) \\ &= \sum_{Z \in \{A, B, C, D\}} (\partial_{\alpha\beta}^2 \mathfrak{V}_{3,Z} \psi_{\delta,Z} + \partial_\alpha \mathfrak{v}_Z \partial_\beta \psi_Z + \partial_\beta \mathfrak{v}_Z \partial_\alpha \psi_Z + \mathfrak{v}_Z \partial_{\alpha\beta}^2 \psi_{\delta,Z}).\end{aligned}$$

The estimates (A.6) and (A.9) lead to the following estimate:

$$\|\partial_{\alpha\beta}^2 \mathfrak{V}_3\|_{L^2(\omega)} \leq \frac{C}{\delta^{3/2}} \|e(u)\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon\delta})}.$$

The constants are independent of ε and δ .

Step 3. We apply Step 2 in every cell $\Omega_{pq,\varepsilon\delta}$. With the help of function ψ we construct the desired decomposition.

Denote

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_{pq,\varepsilon\delta}(x') &= \psi\left(\frac{x_1 - (p+1)\varepsilon}{\delta} - \frac{1}{2}\right) \left(1 - \psi\left(\frac{x_1 - p\varepsilon}{\delta} + \frac{1}{2}\right)\right) \psi\left(\frac{x_2 - (q+1)\varepsilon}{\delta} - \frac{1}{2}\right) \left(1 - \psi\left(\frac{x_2 - q\varepsilon}{\delta} + \frac{1}{2}\right)\right), \\ &\quad (p, q) \in \{1, \dots, N_\varepsilon - 2\} \times \{1, \dots, N_\varepsilon - 2\}, \\ \psi_{0q,\varepsilon\delta}(x') &= \psi\left(\frac{x_1 - \varepsilon}{\delta} - \frac{1}{2}\right) \psi\left(\frac{x_2 - (q+1)\varepsilon}{\delta} - \frac{1}{2}\right) \left(1 - \psi\left(\frac{x_2 - q\varepsilon}{\delta} + \frac{1}{2}\right)\right), \quad q \in \{1, \dots, N_\varepsilon - 2\}, \\ \psi_{N_\varepsilon - 1, q, \varepsilon\delta}(x') &= \left(1 - \psi\left(\frac{x_1 - (N_\varepsilon - 1)\varepsilon}{\delta} + \frac{1}{2}\right)\right) \psi\left(\frac{x_2 - (q+1)\varepsilon}{\delta} - \frac{1}{2}\right) \left(1 - \psi\left(\frac{x_2 - q\varepsilon}{\delta} + \frac{1}{2}\right)\right), \\ &\quad q \in \{1, \dots, N_\varepsilon - 2\}, \\ \psi_{p0,\varepsilon\delta}(x') &= \psi\left(\frac{x_1 - (p+1)\varepsilon}{\delta} - \frac{1}{2}\right) \left(1 - \psi\left(\frac{x_1 - p\varepsilon}{\delta} + \frac{1}{2}\right)\right) \psi\left(\frac{x_2 - \varepsilon}{\delta} - \frac{1}{2}\right), \quad p \in \{1, \dots, N_\varepsilon - 1\}, \\ \psi_{pN_\varepsilon - 1, \varepsilon\delta}(x') &= \psi\left(\frac{x_1 - (p+1)\varepsilon}{\delta} - \frac{1}{2}\right) \left(1 - \psi\left(\frac{x_1 - p\varepsilon}{\delta} + \frac{1}{2}\right)\right) \left(1 - \psi\left(\frac{x_2 - (N_\varepsilon - 1)\varepsilon}{\delta} - \frac{1}{2}\right)\right), \\ &\quad p \in \{1, \dots, N_\varepsilon - 1\}.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we define

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_{00,\varepsilon\delta}(x') &= \psi\left(\frac{x_1 - \varepsilon}{\delta} - \frac{1}{2}\right) \left(1 - \psi\left(\frac{x_1}{\delta} + \frac{1}{2}\right)\right) \psi\left(\frac{x_2 - \varepsilon}{\delta} - \frac{1}{2}\right) \left(1 - \psi\left(\frac{x_2}{\delta} + \frac{1}{2}\right)\right), \\ \psi_{0N_\varepsilon - 1, \varepsilon\delta}(x') &= \psi\left(\frac{x_1 - \varepsilon}{\delta} - \frac{1}{2}\right) \left(1 - \psi\left(\frac{x_1}{\delta} + \frac{1}{2}\right)\right) \psi\left(\frac{x_2 - N_\varepsilon \varepsilon}{\delta} - \frac{1}{2}\right) \left(1 - \psi\left(\frac{x_2 - (N_\varepsilon - 1)\varepsilon}{\delta} + \frac{1}{2}\right)\right), \\ \psi_{N_\varepsilon - 10, \varepsilon\delta}(x') &= \psi\left(\frac{x_1 - N_\varepsilon \varepsilon}{\delta} - \frac{1}{2}\right) \left(1 - \psi\left(\frac{x_1 - (N_\varepsilon - 1)\varepsilon}{\delta} + \frac{1}{2}\right)\right) \psi\left(\frac{x_2 - \varepsilon}{\delta} - \frac{1}{2}\right) \left(1 - \psi\left(\frac{x_2}{\delta} + \frac{1}{2}\right)\right), \\ \psi_{N_\varepsilon - 1, N_\varepsilon - 1, \varepsilon\delta}(x') &= \psi\left(\frac{x_1 - N_\varepsilon \varepsilon}{\delta} - \frac{1}{2}\right) \left(1 - \psi\left(\frac{x_1 - (N_\varepsilon - 1)\varepsilon}{\delta} + \frac{1}{2}\right)\right) \psi\left(\frac{x_2 - N_\varepsilon \varepsilon}{\delta} - \frac{1}{2}\right) \left(1 - \psi\left(\frac{x_2 - (N_\varepsilon - 1)\varepsilon}{\delta} - \frac{1}{2}\right)\right).\end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\sum_{(p,q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^*} \psi_{pq,\varepsilon\delta}(x') = 1 \quad \forall x' \in \omega_\delta$$

and

$$\|\psi_{pq,\varepsilon\delta}\|_{L^\infty(\omega_\delta)} \leq 1, \quad \|\nabla \psi_{pq,\varepsilon\delta}\|_{L^\infty(\omega_\delta)} \leq \frac{C}{\delta}, \quad \|\partial_{\alpha\beta}^2 \psi\|_{L^\infty(\omega_\delta)} \leq \frac{C}{\delta^2}. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

The constants are independent of ε and δ .

Now, let u be in $\mathcal{H}^1(\Omega_\delta)^3$, we decompose u as (A.7). Then, we apply the result obtained in Step 2 to all the restrictions to u to the sets $\Omega_{pq,\varepsilon\delta}$, $(p, q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon$. This gives

$$u(x) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{U}_1(x') - x_3 \partial_1 \mathfrak{U}_{3pq}(x') + x_3 \mathfrak{r}_{1,pq}(x') \\ \mathcal{U}_2(x') - x_3 \partial_2 \mathfrak{U}_{3,pq}(x') + x_3 \mathfrak{r}_{2,pq}(x') \\ \mathfrak{U}_{3,pq}(x') + \mathfrak{u}_{pq}(x') \end{pmatrix} + \bar{v}(x) \quad \text{for a.e. } x \text{ in } \Omega_{pq,\varepsilon\delta} \times \mathfrak{J}_\delta. \quad (\text{A.13})$$

where $\mathfrak{U}_{3,pq} \in H^2(\Omega_{pq,\varepsilon\delta})$ and $\mathfrak{r}_{\alpha,pq}, \mathfrak{u}_{pq} \in H^1(\Omega_{pq,\varepsilon\delta})$. Of course, the fields $\mathfrak{U}_{3,pq}$ and $\mathfrak{r}_{\alpha,pq}, \mathfrak{u}_{pq}$ satisfy the estimates obtained in the previous step with constants independent of ε and δ . By construction, we have

$$\mathfrak{V}_{3,pq} - \mathcal{V}_3 = \mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,pq} = \mathfrak{v}_{pq} = 0 \quad \text{a.e. in } \omega_{pq}^H \quad \forall (p, q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon.$$

Now, we define \mathfrak{U}_3 , \mathfrak{r} and \mathfrak{u} . We set

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{U}_3 &= \sum_{(p,q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon} \mathfrak{U}_{3,pq} \psi_{pq,\varepsilon\delta}, & \mathfrak{u} &= \sum_{(p,q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon} \mathfrak{u}_{pq} \psi_{pq,\varepsilon\delta}, \\ \mathfrak{r}_\alpha &= \sum_{(p,q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon} \mathfrak{r}_{\alpha,pq} \psi_{pq,\varepsilon\delta} - \sum_{(p,q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon} \mathfrak{U}_{3,pq} \partial_\alpha \psi_{pq,\varepsilon\delta}, & \text{a.e. in } \Omega_{pq,\varepsilon\delta}. \\ &= \sum_{(p,q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon} \mathfrak{r}_{\alpha,pq} \psi_{pq,\varepsilon\delta} - \sum_{(p,q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon} \mathfrak{u}_{pq} \partial_\alpha \psi_{pq,\varepsilon\delta},\end{aligned}$$

So, $\mathfrak{U}_3 \in H^2(\omega_\delta)$ and $\mathfrak{r}_\alpha, \mathfrak{u} \in H^1(\omega_\delta)$ and by construction, we have

$$\mathfrak{U}_3 - \mathcal{U}_3 = \mathfrak{r}_\alpha = \mathfrak{u} = 0 \quad \text{a.e. in } \omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^H.$$

Bellow, we give the estimates satisfied by \mathfrak{U}_3 and $\mathfrak{r}_\alpha, \mathfrak{u}$. First, from (A.12) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathfrak{u}\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} &\leq \sum_{(p,q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon} \|\mathfrak{u}_{pq}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\omega}_{pq})} \leq C\delta^{1/2} \|e(u)\|_{L^2(\Omega_\delta)}, \\ \|\nabla \mathfrak{u}\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} &\leq \sum_{(p,q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon} \|\nabla \mathfrak{u}_{pq}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\omega}_{pq})} + \frac{C}{\delta} \sum_{(p,q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon} \|\mathfrak{u}_{pq}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\omega}_{pq})} \leq \frac{C}{\delta^{1/2}} \|e(u)\|_{L^2(\Omega_\delta)}.\end{aligned}$$

Then, again with (A.9) we get

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathfrak{r}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\omega}_{pq})} &\leq \sum_{(p,q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon} \|\mathfrak{r}_{pq}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\omega}_{pq})} + \frac{C}{\delta} \sum_{(p,q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon} \|\mathfrak{u}_{pq}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\omega}_{pq})} \leq \frac{C}{\delta^{1/2}} \|e(u)\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)}, \\ \|\nabla \mathfrak{r}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\omega}_{pq})} &\leq \sum_{(p,q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon} \|\nabla \mathfrak{r}_{pq}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\omega}_{pq})} + \frac{C}{\delta} \sum_{(p,q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon} \|\mathfrak{r}_{pq}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\omega}_{pq})} + \frac{C}{\delta^2} \sum_{(p,q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon} (\|\mathfrak{u}_{pq}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\omega}_{pq})} \\ &\quad + \frac{C}{\delta} \sum_{(p,q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon} \|\nabla \mathfrak{u}_{pq}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\omega}_{pq})}) \leq \frac{C}{\delta^{3/2}} \|e(u)\|_{L^2(\Omega_\delta)}.\end{aligned}$$

Below, we estimate $\partial_{\alpha\beta}^2 \mathfrak{U}_3$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_{\alpha\beta}^2 \mathfrak{U}_3 &= \sum_{(p,q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon} (\partial_{\alpha\beta}^2 \mathfrak{U}_{3,pq} \psi_{pq,\varepsilon\delta} + \partial_\alpha \mathfrak{U}_{3,pq} \partial_\beta \psi_{pq,\varepsilon\delta} + \partial_\beta \mathfrak{U}_{3,pq} \partial_\alpha \psi_{pq,\varepsilon\delta} + \mathfrak{U}_{3,pq} \partial_{\alpha\beta}^2 \psi_{pq,\varepsilon\delta}) \\ &= \sum_{(p,q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon} (\partial_{\alpha\beta}^2 \mathfrak{U}_{3,pq} \psi_{pq,\varepsilon\delta} + \partial_\alpha \mathfrak{u}_{pq} \partial_\beta \psi_{pq,\varepsilon\delta} + \partial_\beta \mathfrak{u}_{pq} \partial_\alpha \psi_{pq,\varepsilon\delta} + \mathfrak{u}_{pq} \partial_{\alpha\beta}^2 \psi_{pq,\varepsilon\delta}).\end{aligned}$$

The estimates obtained in Step 2 together with (A.12) lead to the following estimate of $\partial_{\alpha\beta}^2 \mathfrak{U}_3$:

$$\|\partial_{\alpha\beta}^2 \mathfrak{U}_3\|_{L^2(\omega)} \leq \frac{C}{\delta^{3/2}} \|e(u)\|_{L^2(\Omega_\delta)}.$$

The constants are independent of ε and δ . Finally, we set

$$\tilde{u} = \bar{u} + x_3 \mathfrak{r}.$$

This ends the proof of Theorem 3.1. □

B Appendix: Some Lemmas

Denote

$$\mathbf{V} \doteq \{\phi \in H^1(\omega_\delta) \mid \nabla \phi = 0 \quad \text{a.e. in } \omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^H, \text{ and } \phi = 0 \text{ a.e. on } \gamma \text{ and } \phi \text{ defined by (4.9)}\},$$

Below, we recall a few results from [28] (see Lemmas 5.1, 5.2, 6.1 and 6.3 in this article).

Lemma B.1. *[Poincaré inequality] For any $\phi \in \mathbf{V}$ we have the following inequalities:*

$$\|\phi\|_{L^2(\omega_{\varepsilon\delta}^S)} \leq C \sqrt{\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}} \|\phi\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)}, \quad \|\phi\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} \leq C \sqrt{\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}} \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)}. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

The constants do not depend on ε and δ .

Lemma B.2. Let $\{\phi_{\varepsilon\delta}\}_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ be a sequence of functions belonging to \mathbf{V} and satisfying

$$\|\nabla\phi_{\varepsilon\delta}\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} \leq C\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta}}. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

There exist a subsequence of $\{(\varepsilon,\delta)\}$, still denoted $\{(\varepsilon,\delta)\}$, and $\phi \in H^1(\omega)$ satisfying $\phi = 0$ a.e. on γ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{\varepsilon\delta} &\rightarrow \phi && \text{strongly in } L^2(\omega), \\ \sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta}}\mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\phi_{\varepsilon\delta}) &\rightarrow \phi && \text{strongly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_1), \\ \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}\mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\partial_2\phi_{\varepsilon\delta}) &= \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\partial_{y_2}\mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\phi_{\varepsilon\delta}) \rightharpoonup \partial_2\phi && \text{weakly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_1), \\ \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}\mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\partial_1\phi_{\varepsilon\delta}) &= \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon^2}\partial_{y_1}\mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\phi_{\varepsilon\delta}) \rightharpoonup 0 && \text{weakly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_1), \\ \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}\mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(\partial_1\phi_{\varepsilon\delta}) &= \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\partial_{y_1}\mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(\phi_{\varepsilon\delta}) \rightharpoonup \partial_1\phi && \text{weakly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_2), \\ \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}\mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(\partial_2\phi_{\varepsilon\delta}) &= \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon^2}\partial_{y_2}\mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(\phi_{\varepsilon\delta}) \rightharpoonup 0 && \text{weakly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_2). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Lemma B.3. [Test function] For any $\phi \in W^{1,\infty}(\omega)$ there exists $\phi_{\varepsilon\delta} \in W^{1,\infty}(\omega_\delta) \cap \mathbf{V}$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{\varepsilon\delta} &\rightarrow \phi && \text{strongly in } L^2(\omega), \\ \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}\mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\partial_2\phi_{\varepsilon\delta}) &\rightarrow \partial_2\phi && \text{strongly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_1), \\ \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}\mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(\partial_1\phi_{\varepsilon\delta}) &\rightarrow \partial_1\phi && \text{strongly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_2). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Proof. First, thanks to symmetries with respect to the edges of ω , we extend ϕ into a function, still denoted ϕ , belonging to $W^{1,\infty}(\omega_\delta)$. Then, proceeding as in Subsection 4.1 to construct \mathcal{R} , setting

$$\phi_{\varepsilon\delta,pq} = \phi\left(p\varepsilon + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, q\varepsilon + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \quad \forall (p,q) \in \overline{\mathcal{K}}_\varepsilon$$

we construct the function $\phi_{\varepsilon\delta}$ belonging to $W^{1,\infty}(\omega_\delta)$. We easily show that

$$\|\phi_{\varepsilon\delta}\|_{L^\infty(\omega_\delta)} \leq \|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\omega)}, \quad \sum_{(p,q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon} \|\nabla\phi_{\varepsilon\delta}\|_{L^2(R_{pq}^3)}^2 \leq C\|\nabla\phi\|_{L^\infty(\omega)}^2$$

and (similarly as in Lemma B.1)

$$\sum_{(p,q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^{(1)}} \|\partial_2\phi_{\varepsilon\delta}\|_{L^2(R_{pq}^1)}^2 \leq C\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta}\|\partial_2\phi\|_{L^\infty(\omega)}^2, \quad \sum_{(p,q) \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^{(2)}} \|\partial_1\phi_{\varepsilon\delta}\|_{L^2(R_{pq}^2)}^2 \leq C\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta}\|\partial_1\phi\|_{L^\infty(\omega)}^2.$$

We recall that (see (7.18)) $\partial_1\phi_{\varepsilon\delta} = 0$ in R_{pq}^1 and $\partial_2\phi_{\varepsilon\delta} = 0$ in R_{pq}^2 .

From (6.5)-(6.6) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\partial_2\phi_{\varepsilon\delta})\|_{L^2(\omega \times Y_1)} &\leq C\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta}\|\partial_2\phi\|_{L^\infty(\omega)}, & \|\mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(\partial_1\phi_{\varepsilon\delta})\|_{L^2(\omega \times Y_2)} &\leq C\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta}\|\partial_1\phi\|_{L^\infty(\omega)}, \\ \Rightarrow \left\| \frac{\partial\mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\phi_{\varepsilon\delta})}{\partial y_2} \right\|_{L^2(\omega \times Y_1)} &\leq C\varepsilon\|\partial_2\phi\|_{L^\infty(\omega)}, & \left\| \frac{\partial\mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(\phi_{\varepsilon\delta})}{\partial y_1} \right\|_{L^2(\omega \times Y_2)} &\leq C\varepsilon\|\partial_1\phi\|_{L^\infty(\omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

By construction of $\phi_{\varepsilon\delta}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial\mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(\phi_{\varepsilon\delta})}{\partial y_2}(x', y') &= \phi\left(\varepsilon\left[\frac{x'}{\varepsilon}\right] + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\mathbf{e}_2\right) - \phi\left(\varepsilon\left[\frac{x'}{\varepsilon}\right] - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\mathbf{e}_2\right), \quad \text{for a.e. } (x', y') \in \omega \times \left(\frac{\delta}{2\varepsilon}, 1 - \frac{\delta}{2\varepsilon}\right) \times \mathcal{I}, \\ \frac{\partial\mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(\phi_{\varepsilon\delta})}{\partial y_1}(x', y') &= \phi\left(\varepsilon\left[\frac{x'}{\varepsilon}\right] + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\mathbf{e}_1\right) - \phi\left(\varepsilon\left[\frac{x'}{\varepsilon}\right] - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\mathbf{e}_1\right), \quad \text{for a.e. } (x', y') \in \omega \times \mathcal{I} \times \left(\frac{\delta}{2\varepsilon}, 1 - \frac{\delta}{2\varepsilon}\right). \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence of the above estimates and equalities we obtain the convergences (B.4)_{2,3}. \square

Remark B.4. In the above lemma, if ϕ vanishes on γ we construct $\phi_{\varepsilon\delta}$ by setting

$$\phi_{pq} = 0 \quad \text{for any } (p,q) \in \{-1, 0\} \times \{0, \dots, n_\varepsilon\} \cup \{0, \dots, n_\varepsilon\} \times \{-1, 0\}$$

in order to obtain a test function vanishing in the neighborhood of γ . The results of Lemma B.3 remain valid.

Lemma B.5. To any $\Phi \in W^{2,\infty}(0, L)$ we associate a sequence of functions $\Phi_{\varepsilon\delta} \in W^{2,\infty}\left(-\frac{\delta}{2}, L + \frac{\delta}{2}\right)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{\varepsilon\delta} &\rightarrow \Phi && \text{strongly in } H^1(0, L), \\ \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(d^2\Phi_{\varepsilon\delta}) &\rightarrow d^2\Phi && \text{strongly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_2), \\ \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(d^2\Phi_{\varepsilon\delta}) &\rightarrow 0 && \text{strongly in } L^2(\omega \times Y_1). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.5})$$

Moreover, if $\Phi = d\Phi = 0$ a.e. on $(0, l)$, then we have $\Phi_{\varepsilon\delta} = d\Phi_{\varepsilon\delta} = 0$ a.e. on $(-\frac{\delta}{2}, l)$.

Proof. First, we extend Φ to a function belonging to $W^{2,\infty}\left(-\frac{\delta}{2}, L + \frac{\delta}{2}\right)$ by setting

$$\begin{cases} \Phi(0) + t\Phi'(0), & t \in (-\frac{\delta}{2}, 0], \\ \Phi(t), & t \in (0, L), \\ \Phi(L) + (t - L)\Phi'(L), & t \in [L, L + \frac{\delta}{2}). \end{cases}$$

This extension of Φ is still denoted Φ .

Now, we define the function $\Phi_{\varepsilon\delta}$. For that first we set

$$d\Phi_{\varepsilon\delta}(p\varepsilon + z) = \begin{cases} d\Phi\left(p\varepsilon + \frac{\varepsilon}{\delta}z\right) & z \in \mathfrak{I}_\delta, & p \in \{0, \dots, N_\varepsilon\}, \\ d\Phi\left(p\varepsilon + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) & z \in \left(\frac{\delta}{2}, \varepsilon - \frac{\delta}{2}\right), & p \in \{0, \dots, N_\varepsilon - 1\} \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.6})$$

and

$$\Phi_{\varepsilon\delta}(z) = \Phi(0) + \int_0^z d\Phi_{\varepsilon\delta}(t) dt, \quad z \in \left(-\frac{\delta}{2}, L + \frac{\delta}{2}\right).$$

We have $\Phi_{\varepsilon\delta} \in W^{2,\infty}\left(-\frac{\delta}{2}, L + \frac{\delta}{2}\right)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \|d\Phi_{\varepsilon\delta}\|_{L^\infty(-\frac{\delta}{2}, L + \frac{\delta}{2})} &\leq \|d\Phi\|_{L^\infty(-\frac{\delta}{2}, L + \frac{\delta}{2})}, \quad \|d^2\Phi_{\varepsilon\delta}\|_{L^\infty(-\frac{\delta}{2}, L + \frac{\delta}{2})} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\delta} \|d^2\Phi\|_{L^\infty(-\frac{\delta}{2}, L + \frac{\delta}{2})}, \\ \|d\Phi_{\varepsilon\delta} - d\Phi\|_{L^2(-\frac{\delta}{2}, L + \frac{\delta}{2})} &\leq C\varepsilon, \quad \|\Phi_{\varepsilon\delta} - \Phi\|_{L^2(-\frac{\delta}{2}, L + \frac{\delta}{2})} \leq C\varepsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.7})$$

For the last estimate, we use 1D anchored Poincaré inequality, since $\Phi_{\varepsilon\delta}(0) = \Phi(0)$ and $0 \in (-\frac{\delta}{2}, L + \frac{\delta}{2})$. So, we get (B.5)₂. We also have

$$\begin{aligned} d^2\Phi_{\varepsilon\delta}(p\varepsilon + z_1) &= 0, \quad z_1 \in \left(\frac{\delta}{2}, \varepsilon - \frac{\delta}{2}\right), \quad p \in \{0, \dots, N_\varepsilon - 1\}, \\ d^2\Phi_{\varepsilon\delta}(p\varepsilon + z_1) &= \frac{\varepsilon}{\delta} d^2\Phi\left(p\varepsilon + \frac{\varepsilon}{\delta}z_1\right), \quad z_1 \in \mathfrak{I}_\delta, \quad p \in \{0, \dots, N_\varepsilon\}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.8})$$

Below, we consider the function $x_1 \mapsto \Phi_{\varepsilon\delta}(x_1)$ (variable x_1) we have due to the definition of $\mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(\alpha)}$ and (B.8)_{2,3}

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(2)}(d_{11}^2\Phi_{\varepsilon\delta})(x', y') &= d_{11}^2\Phi(p\varepsilon + \varepsilon y_1), && \text{for a.e. } (x', y') \in \omega \times \mathfrak{I} \times \left(\frac{\delta}{2\varepsilon}, 1 - \frac{\delta}{2\varepsilon}\right), \\ \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon\delta}^{(1)}(d_{11}^2\Phi_{\varepsilon\delta})(x', y') &= 0, && \text{for a.e. } (x', y') \in \omega \times \left(\frac{\delta}{2\varepsilon}, 1 - \frac{\delta}{2\varepsilon}\right) \times \mathfrak{I}, \end{aligned}$$

which give the strong convergence (B.5)_{3,4}.

Observe that if $\Phi = d\Phi = 0$ on $(0, l)$, then we have the following

$$\Phi_{\varepsilon\delta} = d\Phi_{\varepsilon\delta} = 0, \quad \text{a.e. on } \left(-\frac{\delta}{2}, l\right).$$

This completes the proof. □

C Appendix: Coercivity results

In this subsection, we give a coercivity result required for the proof of the existence of a unique weak solution to the limit unfolded problem.

Lemma C.1. *For every $(\mathcal{V}, \widehat{v}^{(1)}, \widehat{v}^{(2)}) \in \mathbb{D}$, the following estimate hold:*

$$\|\mathcal{V}_1\|_{H^1(\omega)}^2 + \|\mathcal{V}_2\|_{H^1(\omega)}^2 + \|\mathcal{V}_3\|_{H^2(\omega)}^2 + \sum_{\alpha=1}^2 \|\widehat{v}^{(\alpha)}\|_{L^2(\omega \times (0,1)_{y_\alpha}; H^1(\mathcal{I}^2))}^2 \leq C \sum_{\alpha=1}^2 \|E^{(\alpha)}(\mathcal{V}, \widehat{v}^{(\alpha)})\|_{L^2(\omega \times \mathcal{Y}_\alpha)}^2. \quad (\text{C.1})$$

Proof. Since, we have

$$\widehat{v}^{(1)} = 0, \quad \text{a.e. on } \omega \times (0,1) \times \{\pm \frac{1}{2}\} \times \mathcal{I}, \quad \widehat{v}^{(2)} = 0, \quad \text{a.e. on } \omega \times \{\pm \frac{1}{2}\} \times (0,1) \times \mathcal{I},$$

after a straightforward calculation we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\nabla \mathcal{U}_1\|_{L^2(\omega)}^2 + \|\nabla \mathcal{U}_2\|_{L^2(\omega)}^2 + \|\partial_{11}^2 \mathcal{V}_3\|_{L^2(\omega)}^2 + \|\partial_{22}^2 \mathcal{V}_3\|_{L^2(\omega)}^2 + \|\partial_{y_2} \widehat{u}_1^{(1)}\|_{L^2(\omega \times \mathcal{Y}_1)}^2 + \|\partial_{y_3} \widehat{u}_1^{(1)}\|_{L^2(\omega \times \mathcal{Y}_1)}^2 \\ & + \|\partial_{y_1} \widehat{u}_2^{(2)}\|_{L^2(\omega \times \mathcal{Y}_2)}^2 + \|\partial_{y_3} \widehat{u}_2^{(2)}\|_{L^2(\omega \times \mathcal{Y}_2)}^2 + \|e_{y,22}(\widehat{u}^{(1)})\|_{L^2(\omega \times \mathcal{Y}_1)}^2 + \|e_{y,23}(\widehat{u}^{(1)})\|_{L^2(\omega \times \mathcal{Y}_1)}^2 \\ & + \|e_{y,33}(\widehat{u}^{(1)})\|_{L^2(\omega \times \mathcal{Y}_1)}^2 + \|e_{y,11}(\widehat{u}^{(2)})\|_{L^2(\omega \times \mathcal{Y}_2)}^2 + \|e_{y,13}(\widehat{u}^{(2)})\|_{L^2(\omega \times \mathcal{Y}_2)}^2 + \|e_{y,33}(\widehat{u}^{(2)})\|_{L^2(\omega \times \mathcal{Y}_2)}^2 \\ & \leq C \sum_{\alpha=1}^2 \|E^{(\alpha)}(\mathcal{V}, \widehat{v}^{(\alpha)})\|_{L^2(\omega \times \mathcal{Y}_\alpha)}^2 \end{aligned}$$

from which we easily deduce (C.1). □