Two subtle convex nonlocal approximations of the BV -norm

Haïm Brezis^{*†‡§} and Hoai-Minh Nguyen[¶]

January 26, 2016

*For Juan-Luis Vazquez on his 70th birthday,
wishing him continued success and inspiration in his wonderful mathematics*

1 Introduction

Throughout this paper, Ω denotes a smooth bounded open subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$ ($d \geq 1$). We first recall a formula (BBM formula) due to J. Bourgain, H. Brezis, and P. Mironescu [2] (with a refinement by J. Davila [13]). Let (ρ_n) be a sequence of radial mollifiers in the sense that

$$\rho_n \in L^1_{loc}(0, +\infty), \quad \rho_n \geq 0, \quad (1.1)$$

$$\int_0^\infty \rho_n(r) r^{d-1} dr = 1 \quad \forall n, \quad (1.2)$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_\delta^\infty \rho_n(r) r^{d-1} dr = 0 \quad \forall \delta > 0. \quad (1.3)$$

Set

$$I_n(u) = \int_\Omega \int_\Omega \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|}{|x - y|} \rho_n(|x - y|) dx dy \leq +\infty, \quad \forall u \in L^1(\Omega) \quad (1.4)$$

and

$$I(u) = \begin{cases} \gamma_d \int_\Omega |\nabla u| & \text{if } u \in BV(\Omega), \\ +\infty & \text{if } u \in L^1(\Omega) \setminus BV(\Omega), \end{cases} \quad (1.5)$$

where, for any $e \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$,

$$\gamma_d = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} |\sigma \cdot e| d\sigma = \begin{cases} \frac{2}{d-1} |\mathbb{S}^{d-2}| & \text{if } d \geq 3, \\ 4 & \text{if } d = 2, \\ 2 & \text{if } d = 1. \end{cases} \quad (1.6)$$

^{*}Rutgers University, Department of Mathematics, Hill Center, Busch Campus, 110 Frelinghuysen Road, Piscataway, NJ 08854, USA, brezis@math.rutgers.edu

[†]Department of Mathematics, Technion, Israel Institute of Technology, 32.000 Haifa, Israel

[‡]Laboratoire Jacques-Louis Lions UPMC, 4 place Jussieu, 75005 Paris, France

[§]Research partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1207793 and by ITN "FIRST" of the European Commission, Grant Number PITN-GA-2009-238702.

[¶]EPFL SB MATHAA CAMA, Station 8, CH-1015 Lausanne, Switzerland, hoai-minh.nguyen@epfl.ch

Then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} I_n(u) = I(u) \quad \forall u \in L^1(\Omega). \quad (1.7)$$

It has also been established by A. Ponce [25] that $I_n \rightarrow I$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$ in the sense of Γ -convergence in $L^1(\Omega)$. For works related to the BBM formula, see [6, 7, 8, 17, 18]. Other functionals converging to the BV-norm are considered in [3, 9, 10, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24].

One of the goals of this paper is to analyze the asymptotic behavior of sequences of functionals which “resemble” $I_n(u)$ and converge to $I(u)$ (at least when u is smooth). As we are going to see pointwise convergence of $I_n(u)$ when u is not smooth can be delicate and depends heavily on the specific choice of (ρ_n) . By contrast, Γ -convergence to I is a robust concept which is not sensitive to the choice of (ρ_n) . We first consider the sequence (Ψ_n) of functionals defined by

$$\Psi_n(u) = \left(\int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^{1+\varepsilon_n}}{|x - y|^{1+\varepsilon_n}} \rho_n(|x - y|) dx dy \right)^{\frac{1}{1+\varepsilon_n}} \leq +\infty, \quad \forall u \in L^1(\Omega), \quad (1.8)$$

where $(\varepsilon_n) \rightarrow 0_+$ and (ρ_n) is a sequence of mollifiers as above.

A general result concerning pointwise convergence is the following

Proposition 1. *We have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \Psi_n(u) = I(u) \quad \forall u \in \bigcup_{q>1} W^{1,q}(\Omega) \quad (1.9)$$

and

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \Psi_n(u) \geq I(u) \quad \forall u \in L^1(\Omega). \quad (1.10)$$

By choosing a special sequence of (ρ_n) , one may greatly improve the conclusion of Proposition 1:

Proposition 2. *There exists a sequence (ρ_n) and a constant C such that*

$$\Psi_n(u) \leq CI(u) \quad \forall n, \forall u \in L^1(\Omega). \quad (1.11)$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \Psi_n(u) = I(u) \quad \forall u \in L^1(\Omega). \quad (1.12)$$

The proof of Propositions 1 and 2 is presented in Section 2.1. By contrast, some sequences (ρ_n) may produce pathologies:

Proposition 3. *Assume $d = 1$. There exists a sequence (ρ_n) and some $v \in W^{1,1}(\Omega)$ such that*

$$\Psi_n(v) = +\infty \quad \forall n \geq 1. \quad (1.13)$$

Proposition 4. *Assume $d = 1$. Given any $M > 1$, there exists a sequence (ρ_n) and a constant C such that*

$$\Psi_n(u) \leq CI(u) \quad \forall n, \forall u \in L^1(\Omega), \quad (1.14)$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \Psi_n(u) = I(u) \quad \forall u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega), \quad (1.15)$$

and, for some nontrivial $v \in BV(\Omega)$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \Psi_n(v) = MI(v). \quad (1.16)$$

The proofs of Propositions 3 and 4 are presented in Section 2.2. In Sections 2.3 and 2.4, we return to a general sequence (ρ_n) and we establish the following results:

Proposition 5. *We have*

$$\Psi_n \rightarrow I \text{ in the sense of } \Gamma\text{-convergence in } L^1(\Omega), \text{ as } n \rightarrow +\infty. \quad (1.17)$$

Motivated by Image Processing (see, e.g., [1, 14, 15, 16, 27]), we set

$$E_n(u) = \int_{\Omega} |u - f|^q + \Psi_n(u) \quad \text{for } u \in L^q(\Omega), \quad (1.18)$$

and

$$E_0(u) = \int_{\Omega} |u - f|^q + I(u) \quad \text{for } u \in L^q(\Omega), \quad (1.19)$$

where $q > 1$ and $f \in L^q(\Omega)$. Our main result is

Proposition 6. *For each n , there exists a unique $u_n \in L^q(\Omega)$ such that*

$$E_n(u_n) = \min_{u \in L^q(\Omega)} E_n(u).$$

Let v be the unique minimizer of E_0 in $L^q(\Omega) \cap BV(\Omega)$. We have, as $n \rightarrow +\infty$,

$$u_n \rightarrow v \text{ in } L^q(\Omega)$$

and

$$E_n(u_n) \rightarrow E_0(v).$$

In Section 3, we investigate similar questions for the sequence (Φ_n) of functionals defined by

$$\Phi_n(u) = \int_{\Omega} dx \left[\int_{\Omega} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^p}{|x - y|^p} \rho_n(|x - y|) dy \right]^{1/p} \leq +\infty, \text{ for } u \in L^1(\Omega),$$

where $p > 1$. Such functionals were introduced and studied by G. Leoni and D. Spector [17, 18] (see also [28]); their motivation came from a paper by G. Gilboa and S. Osher [15] (where $p = 2$) dealing with Image Processing.

Contents

1 Introduction

1

2	Asymptotic analysis of the sequence (Ψ_n)	4
2.1	Some positive facts about the sequence (Ψ_n)	4
2.2	Some sequences (ρ_n) producing pathologies	6
2.3	Γ -convergence	8
2.4	Functionals with roots in Image Processing	10
3	A second approximation of the BV-norm	12
3.1	Some positive facts about the sequence (Φ_n)	12
3.2	More about the pointwise convergence of (Φ_n) when $d = 1$	17
3.3	More about the pointwise convergence of (Φ_n) when $d \geq 2$	19
3.4	Γ -convergence	25
3.5	Functionals with roots in Image Processing	26

2 Asymptotic analysis of the sequence (Ψ_n)

2.1 Some positive facts about the sequence (Ψ_n)

We start with the

Proof of Proposition 1. We first establish (1.10). By Hölder's inequality, we have for every $u \in L^1(\Omega)$

$$I_n(u) \leq \Psi_n(u) \left(\int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \rho_n(|x-y|) dx dy \right)^{\frac{\varepsilon_n}{1+\varepsilon_n}} \quad (2.1)$$

From (1.2), we have

$$\int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \rho_n(|x-y|) dx dy \leq |\mathbb{S}^{d-1}| |\Omega|. \quad (2.2)$$

Note that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} (|\mathbb{S}^{d-1}| |\Omega|)^{\frac{\varepsilon_n}{1+\varepsilon_n}} = 1.$$

Inserting (1.7) in (2.1) yields (1.10).

We next establish (1.9) for $u \in W^{1,q}(\Omega)$ with $q > 1$. Assuming n sufficiently large so that $1 + \varepsilon_n < q$, we may write using Hölder's inequality

$$\Psi_n(u) \leq I_n(u)^{a_n} J_{n,q}^{b_n}, \quad (2.3)$$

where

$$J_{n,q} = \left(\int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^q}{|x-y|^q} \rho_n(|x-y|) dx dy \right)^{1/q}, \quad (2.4)$$

$$a_n + b_n = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad a_n + \frac{b_n}{q} = \frac{1}{1 + \varepsilon_n}, \quad (2.5)$$

i.e.,

$$b_n \left(1 - \frac{1}{q} \right) = \frac{\varepsilon_n}{1 + \varepsilon_n} \quad \text{and} \quad a_n = 1 - b_n. \quad (2.6)$$

From [2], we know that

$$J_{n,q} \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^q}, \quad \text{with } C \text{ independent of } n. \quad (2.7)$$

Combining (2.3), (2.6), (2.7), and using (1.7), we obtain

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \Psi_n(u) \leq I(u).$$

This proves (1.9) since we already know (1.10). $\square$

Proof of Proposition 2. The sequence (ρ_n) is defined by

$$\rho_n(t) = \frac{1+d+\varepsilon_n}{\delta_n^{1+d+\varepsilon_n}} t^{1+\varepsilon_n} \mathbb{1}_{(0, \delta_n)}(t), \quad (2.8)$$

where $\mathbb{1}_A$ denotes the characteristic function of the set A , and (δ_n) is a positive sequence converging to 0 and satisfying

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \delta_n^{\varepsilon_n} = 1; \quad (2.9)$$

one may take for example

$$\delta_n = e^{-1/\sqrt{\varepsilon_n}}. \quad (2.10)$$

We have

$$\Psi_n^{1+\varepsilon_n}(u) = \frac{1+d+\varepsilon_n}{\delta_n^{1+d+\varepsilon_n}} \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} |u(x) - u(y)|^{1+\varepsilon_n} dx dy. \quad (2.11)$$

From the Sobolev embedding, we know that $BV(\Omega) \subset L^q(\Omega)$ with $q = d/(d-1)$ and moreover,

$$\left(\int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} |u(x) - u(y)|^q dx dy \right)^{1/q} \leq CI(u) \quad \forall u \in L^1(\Omega). \quad (2.12)$$

Applying Hölder's inequality as above, we find

$$\Psi_n(u) \leq \left(\frac{1+d+\varepsilon_n}{\delta_n^{1+d+\varepsilon_n}} \right)^{\frac{1}{1+\varepsilon_n}} X_n^{a_n} Y_n^{b_n}, \quad (2.13)$$

where

$$X_n = \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} |u(x) - u(y)| dx dy, \quad (2.14)$$

$$Y_n = \left(\int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} |u(x) - u(y)|^q dx dy \right)^{1/q}, \quad (2.15)$$

and a_n and b_n are as in (2.5). From [2] (applied with $\rho_n(t) = \frac{1+d}{\delta_n^{1+d}} t \mathbb{1}_{(0, \delta_n)}(t)$), we know that

$$X_n \leq C \delta_n^{1+d} I(u). \quad (2.16)$$

Moreover, by (1.7), we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1+d}{\delta_n^{1+d}} X_n = I(u). \quad (2.17)$$

On the other hand, by (2.12), we obtain

$$Y_n \leq CI(u) := Y. \quad (2.18)$$

Inserting (2.16) and (2.18) in (2.13) gives

$$\Psi_n(u) \leq C \frac{1}{\delta_n^{\alpha_n}} I(u), \quad (2.19)$$

where, by (2.6),

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_n &= \frac{1+d+\varepsilon_n}{1+\varepsilon_n} - (1+d)a_n = \frac{1+d+\varepsilon_n}{1+\varepsilon_n} - (1+d) + \frac{(1+d)q\varepsilon_n}{(q-1)(1+\varepsilon_n)} \\ &= -\frac{\varepsilon_n d}{1+\varepsilon_n} + \frac{(1+d)q\varepsilon_n}{(q-1)(1+\varepsilon_n)} = \frac{\varepsilon_n d^2}{1+\varepsilon_n}. \end{aligned}$$

From (2.19) and (2.9), we obtain (1.11).

We next prove (1.12). In view of (1.10), it suffices to verify that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \Psi_n(u) \leq I(u) \quad \forall u \in L^1(\Omega). \quad (2.20)$$

We return to (2.13) and write

$$\Psi_n(u) \leq \left(\frac{1+d+\varepsilon_n}{\delta_n^{1+d+\varepsilon_n}} \right)^{\frac{1}{1+\varepsilon_n}} \left(\frac{\delta_n^{d+1}}{d+1} \right)^{a_n} \left(\frac{(1+d)X_n}{\delta_n^{1+d}} \right)^{a_n} Y^{b_n} = \gamma_n \delta_n^{-\alpha_n} \left(\frac{(1+d)X_n}{\delta_n^{1+d}} \right)^{a_n} Y^{b_n},$$

where $\gamma_n \rightarrow 1$, $a_n \rightarrow 1$, and $b_n \rightarrow 0$. Using (2.9) and (2.17), we conclude that (2.20) holds. $\square$

2.2 Some sequences (ρ_n) producing pathologies

In this section, we establish Propositions 3 and 4.

Proof of Proposition 3. Take $\Omega = (-1/2, 1/2)$ and $\rho_n(t) = \varepsilon_n t^{\varepsilon_n-1} \mathbb{1}_{(0,1)}(t)$. Then

$$\Psi_n^{1+\varepsilon_n}(u) \geq \varepsilon_n \int_0^{1/2} dx \int_{-1/2}^0 \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^{1+\varepsilon_n}}{|x-y|^2} dy$$

If we assume in addition that $u(y) = 0$ on $(-1/2, 0)$, we obtain

$$\Psi_n^{1+\varepsilon_n}(u) \geq \varepsilon_n \int_0^{1/2} |u(x)|^{1+\varepsilon_n} \left(\frac{1}{x} - \frac{1}{x+1/2} \right) dx. \quad (2.21)$$

Choosing, for example,

$$u(x) = \begin{cases} |\ln x|^{-\alpha} & \text{on } 0 < x < 1/2, \\ 0 & \text{on } -1/2 < x \leq 0, \end{cases} \quad (2.22)$$

with $\alpha > 0$, we see that $u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega)$ while the RHS in (2.21) is $+\infty$ when $\alpha(1 + \varepsilon_n) \leq 1$; we might take, for example, $\alpha = \min_n \{1/(1 + \varepsilon_n)\}$. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 4. Take $\Omega = (-1, 1)$ and (ρ_n) as in (2.8) (but do not take δ_n as in (2.9)). Let

$$v(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } x \in (-1, 0), \\ 1 & \text{for } x \in (0, 1). \end{cases}$$

Then

$$\Psi_n(v) = \frac{2 + \varepsilon_n}{\delta_n^{2+\varepsilon_n}} \int_0^1 \int_0^1 dx dy = \frac{2 + \varepsilon_n}{\delta_n^{\varepsilon_n}}.$$

Since $I(v) = 2$ (see (1.5) and (1.6)), we deduce that

$$\Psi_n(v) = \frac{2 + \varepsilon_n}{2\delta_n^{\varepsilon_n}} I(v). \quad (2.23)$$

Given $M > 1$, let $A = \ln M > 0$ and $\delta_n = e^{-A/\varepsilon_n}$. Then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \Psi_n(v) = MI(v).$$

On the other hand, we have, for every $u \in BV(\Omega)$,

$$\Psi_n(u) \leq \frac{2 + \varepsilon_n}{\delta_n^{2+\varepsilon_n}} \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} |u(x) - u(y)|^{1+\varepsilon_n} dx dy.$$

As in the proof of Proposition 2 (see (2.19)), we find

$$\Psi_n(u) \leq C \frac{1}{\delta_n^{\alpha_n}} I(u),$$

Since $\delta_n = e^{-A/\varepsilon_n}$, we deduce that (1.14) holds.

In order to obtain (1.15), we recall (see (1.9)) that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \Psi(\tilde{u}) = I(\tilde{u}) \quad \forall \tilde{u} \in C^1(\bar{\Omega}). \quad (2.24)$$

For $u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega)$, we write

$$\Psi_n(u) - I(u) = \Psi_n(u) - \Psi_n(\tilde{u}) + \Psi_n(\tilde{u}) - I(\tilde{u}) + I(\tilde{u}) - I(u),$$

and thus by (1.14),

$$|\Psi_n(u) - I(u)| \leq CI(u - \tilde{u}) + |\Psi_n(\tilde{u}) - I(\tilde{u})|. \quad (2.25)$$

We conclude that $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} |\Psi_n(u) - I(u)| = 0$ using (2.24) and the density of $C^1(\bar{\Omega})$ in $W^{1,1}(\Omega)$.

2.3 Γ -convergence

This section is devoted to the proof of Proposition 5 and a slightly stronger variant.

Recall that (see, e.g., [4, 12]), by definition, the sequence (Ψ_n) Γ -converges to Ψ in $L^1(\Omega)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ if the following two properties hold:

(G1) For every $u \in L^1(\Omega)$ and for every sequence $(u_n) \subset L^1(\Omega)$ such that $u_n \rightarrow u$ in $L^1(\Omega)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, one has

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Psi_n(u_n) \geq \Psi(u).$$

(G2) For every $u \in L^1(\Omega)$, there exists a sequence $(u_n) \subset L^1(\Omega)$ such that $u_n \rightarrow u$ in $L^1(\Omega)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Psi_n(u_n) \leq \Psi(u).$$

Proof of (G1). Going back to (2.1), (2.2), and (2.3), we have

$$I_n(u) \leq \beta_n \Psi_n(u) \quad \forall u \in L^1(\Omega),$$

where $\beta_n \rightarrow 1$. Thus

$$I_n(u_n) \leq \beta_n \Psi_n(u_n) \quad \forall n,$$

and since $I_n \rightarrow I$ in the sense of Γ -convergence in $L^1(\Omega)$ (see [25] and also [8]), we conclude that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \Psi_n(u_n) \geq I(u).$$

Proof of (G2). Given $u \in BV(\Omega)$, we will construct a sequence (u_n) converging to u in $L^1(\Omega)$ such that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \Psi_n(u_n) \leq I(u).$$

Let $v_k \in C^1(\bar{\Omega})$ be such that

$$v_k \rightarrow u \text{ in } L^1(\Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad I(v_k) \rightarrow I(u). \quad (2.26)$$

For each k , let n_k be such that

$$\left| \Psi_n(v_k) - I(v_k) \right| \leq 1/k \text{ if } n > n_k. \quad (2.27)$$

Without loss of generality, one may assume that (n_k) is a increasing sequence with respect to k . Define

$$u_n = v_k \text{ if } n_k < n \leq n_{k+1}.$$

Combining (2.26) and (2.27) yields

$$u_n \rightarrow u \text{ in } L^1(\Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \Psi_n(u_n) = I(u).$$

□

In fact, a property stronger than (G1) holds.

Proposition 7. *For every $u \in L^1(\Omega)$ and for every sequence $(u_n) \subset L^1(\Omega)$ such that $u_n \rightharpoonup u$ weakly in $L^1(\Omega)$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$, one has*

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \Psi_n(u_n) \geq I(u). \quad (2.28)$$

Proof. We adapt a suggestion of E. Stein (personal communication to H. Brezis) described in [6]. Let (μ_k) be a sequence of smooth mollifiers such that $\mu_k \geq 0$ and $\text{supp } \mu_k \subset B_{1/k} = B_{1/k}(0) = B(0, 1/k)$. Fix D an arbitrary smooth open subset of Ω such that $\bar{D} \subset \Omega$ and let $k_0 > 0$ be large enough such that $B(x, 1/k_0) \subset \subset \Omega$ for every $x \in D$. Given $v \in L^1(\Omega)$, define in D

$$v_k = \mu_k * v \quad \text{for } k \geq k_0.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_D \int_D \frac{|v_k(x) - v_k(y)|^{1+\varepsilon_n}}{|x-y|^{1+\varepsilon_n}} \rho_n(|x-y|) dx dy \\ &= \int_D \int_D \frac{|\mu_k * v(x) - \mu_k * v(y)|^{1+\varepsilon_n}}{|x-y|^{1+\varepsilon_n}} \rho_n(|x-y|) dx dy \\ &= \int_D \int_D \frac{\left| \int_{B(0,1/k)} \mu_k(z) (v(x-z) - v(y-z)) dz \right|^{1+\varepsilon_n}}{|x-y|^{1+\varepsilon_n}} dx dy \\ &\leq \int_D \int_D \frac{\int_{B(0,1/k)} \mu_k(z) |v(x-z) - v(y-z)|^{1+\varepsilon_n} dz}{|x-y|^{1+\varepsilon_n}} \rho_n(|x-y|) dx dy, \end{aligned}$$

by Hölder's inequality. A change of variables implies, for $k \geq k_0$,

$$\int_D \int_D \frac{|v_k(x) - v_k(y)|^{1+\varepsilon_n}}{|x-y|^{1+\varepsilon_n}} \rho_n(|x-y|) dx dy \leq \int_\Omega \int_\Omega \frac{|v(x) - v(y)|^{1+\varepsilon_n}}{|x-y|^{1+\varepsilon_n}} \rho_n(|x-y|) dx dy. \quad (2.29)$$

Applying (2.29) to $v = u_n$ we find

$$\int_D \int_D \frac{|u_{k,n}(x) - u_{k,n}(y)|^{1+\varepsilon_n}}{|x-y|^{1+\varepsilon_n}} \rho_n(|x-y|) dx dy \leq \Psi_n^{1+\varepsilon_n}(u_n), \quad (2.30)$$

where $u_{k,n} = \mu_k * u_n$ is defined in D for every n and every $k \geq k_0$. Since $u_n \rightharpoonup u$ weakly in $L^1(\Omega)$ we know that for each **fixed** k ,

$$u_{k,n} \rightarrow \mu_k * u \text{ strongly in } L^1(D) \text{ as } n \rightarrow +\infty.$$

Passing to the limit in (2.29) as $n \rightarrow +\infty$ (and fixed k) and applying Proposition 5 (Property (G1)) we find that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_D \int_D \frac{|u_{k,n}(x) - u_{k,n}(y)|^{1+\varepsilon_n}}{|x-y|^{1+\varepsilon_n}} \rho_n(|x-y|) dx dy \geq \gamma_d \int_D |\nabla(\mu_k * u)| \quad (2.31)$$

Combining (2.30) and (2.31) yields

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \Psi_n(u_n) \geq \gamma_d \int_D |\nabla(\mu_k * u)| \quad \forall k \geq k_0.$$

Letting $k \rightarrow +\infty$, we obtain

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \Psi_n(u_n) \geq \gamma_d \int_D |\nabla u|.$$

Since D is arbitrary, Proposition 7 follows. $\square$

2.4 Funtionals with roots in Image Processing

We give here the

Proof of Proposition 6. For each fixed n , the functional E_n defined on $L^q(\Omega)$ by (1.18) is convex and lower semicontinuous (l.s.c.) for the strong L^q -topology (note that Ψ_n is l.s.c. by Fatou's lemma). Thus E_n is also l.s.c. for the weak L^q -topology. Since $q > 1$, L^q is reflexive and $\inf_{u \in L^q(\Omega)} E_n(u)$ is achieved. Uniqueness of the minimizer follows from strict convexity.

We next establish the second statement. Since $q > 1$, one may assume that $u_{n_k} \rightharpoonup u_0$ weakly in $L^q(\Omega)$ for some subsequence (u_{n_k}) . We claim that

$$u_0 = v. \quad (2.32)$$

By Proposition 5 (Property (G2)), there exists $(v_n) \subset L^1(\Omega)$ such that $v_n \rightarrow v$ in $L^1(\Omega)$ and

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Psi_n(v_n) \leq I(v). \quad (2.33)$$

Set, for $A > 0$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$T_A(s) = \begin{cases} s & \text{if } |s| \leq A, \\ A & \text{if } s > A, \\ -A & \text{if } s < -A. \end{cases} \quad (2.34)$$

We have, since u_n is a minimizer of E_n ,

$$E_n(u_n) \leq E_n(T_A v_n) = \int_{\Omega} |T_A v_n - f|^q + \Psi_n(T_A v_n) \leq \int_{\Omega} |T_A v_n - f|^q + \Psi_n(v_n). \quad (2.35)$$

Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ and using (2.33), we derive

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} E_n(u_n) \leq \int_{\Omega} |T_A v - f|^q + I(v).$$

This implies, by letting $A \rightarrow +\infty$,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} E_n(u_n) \leq E_0(v). \quad (2.36)$$

On the other hand, we have by Proposition 7,

$$\liminf_{n_k \rightarrow +\infty} \Psi_{n_k}(u_{n_k}) \geq I(v), \quad (2.37)$$

and therefore

$$E_0(u_0) \leq \liminf_{n_k \rightarrow +\infty} E_{n_k}(u_{n_k}). \quad (2.38)$$

From (2.36) and (2.38), we obtain claim (2.32).

Next we write

$$\int_{\Omega} |u_n - f|^q = E_n(u_n) - \Psi_n(u_n). \quad (2.39)$$

Combining (2.39) with (2.36) and (2.37) gives

$$\limsup_{n_k \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega} |u_{n_k} - f|^q \leq E_0(v) - I(v) = \int_{\Omega} |v - f|^q. \quad (2.40)$$

Since we already know that $u_{n_k} \rightharpoonup v$ weakly in $L^q(\Omega)$, we deduce from (2.40) that $u_{n_k} \rightarrow v$ strongly in $L^q(\Omega)$. The uniqueness of the limit implies that $u_n \rightarrow v$ strongly in $L^q(\Omega)$, so that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} E_n(u_n) \geq \int_{\Omega} |v - f|^q + I(v) = E_0(v).$$

Returning to (2.36) yields

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} E_n(u_n) = E_0(v).$$

□

Remark 1. There is an alternative proof of Proposition 6 which holds when $d \geq 2$ (and also when $d = 1$ provided that we make a mild additional assumptions on (ρ_n)). Instead of Proposition 7, one may rely on a compactness argument based on

Proposition 8. *Let (u_n) be a bounded sequence in $L^1(\Omega)$ such that*

$$\sup_n \Psi_n(u_n) < +\infty. \quad (2.41)$$

When $d = 1$, we also assume that for each n the function $t \mapsto \rho_n(t)$ is non-increasing. Then (u_n) is relatively compact in $L^1(\Omega)$.

Proof. From (2.1), (2.2), and (2.41), we have

$$I_n(u_n) \leq C \quad \forall n.$$

We may now invoke a result of J. Bourgain, H. Brezis, P. Mironescu in [2] when ρ_n is non-increasing. A. Ponce in [25] established that the monotonicity of ρ_n is not necessary when $d \geq 2$. □

Proof of Proposition 6 revisited. Using Proposition 8 we can assume that $u_{n_k} \rightharpoonup u_0$ weakly in $L^q(\Omega)$ and strongly in $L^1(\Omega)$. We may then rely on Proposition 5 instead of Proposition 7. The rest is unchanged. □

3 A second approximation of the BV -norm

Motivated by a suggestion of G. Gilboa and S. Osher in [15], G. Leoni and D. Spector [17], [18] studied the following functionals

$$\Phi_n(u) = \int_{\Omega} dx \left[\int_{\Omega} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^p}{|x - y|^p} \rho_n(|x - y|) dy \right]^{1/p} \leq +\infty \quad \text{for } u \in L^1(\Omega). \quad (3.1)$$

where $1 < p < +\infty$ and (ρ_n) satisfies (1.1)-(1.3). In [18], they established that (Φ_n) converges to J in the sense of Γ -convergence in $L^1(\Omega)$, where J is defined by

$$J(u) := \begin{cases} \gamma_{p,d} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u| & \text{if } u \in BV(\Omega), \\ +\infty & \text{if } u \in L^1(\Omega) \setminus BV(\Omega). \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

Here, for any $e \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$,

$$\gamma_{p,d} := \left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} |\sigma \cdot e|^p d\sigma \right)^{1/p}. \quad (3.3)$$

In particular,

$$\gamma_{p,1} = 2^{1/p}. \quad (3.4)$$

When there is no confusion, we simply write γ instead of $\gamma_{p,d}$. [In fact, G. Leoni and D. Spector considered more general functionals involving a second parameter $1 \leq q < +\infty$ and they prove that it Γ -converges in $L^1(\Omega)$ to $\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^q$ up to a positive constant. Here we are concerned only with the most delicate case $q = 1$ which produces the BV -norm in the asymptotic limit.]

Pointwise convergence of the sequence (Φ_n) turns out to be quite complex and not yet fully understood (which confirms again the importance of Γ -convergence). Several claims in [17] concerning the pointwise convergence of (Φ_n) were not correct as was pointed out in [18].

This section is organized as follows. In Sections 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3, we describe various results (both positive and negative) concerning pointwise convergence. The case $d = 1$ is of special interest because the situation there is quite satisfactory (the only remaining open problem appears in Remark 3). Our results for the case $d \geq 2$ are not as complete; see e.g. important open problems mentioned in Remarks 5 and 8. We then present a new proof of Γ -convergence in Section 3.4; as we already mentioned, this result is due to G. Leoni and D. Spector, but our proof is simpler. Finally, in Section 3.5, we discuss variational problems similar to (1.18) (where Ψ_n is replaced by Φ_n) with roots in Image Processing.

3.1 Some positive facts about the sequence (Φ_n)

A general result concerning the pointwise convergence of (Φ_n) is the following

Proposition 9. *We have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_n(u) = J(u) \quad \forall u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega) \quad (3.5)$$

and

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_n(u) \geq J(u) \quad \forall u \in L^1(\Omega). \quad (3.6)$$

Proof. The proof is divided into three steps.

Step 1: Proof of (3.5) for $u \in C^2(\bar{\Omega})$. We have

$$|u(x) - u(y) - \nabla u(x) \cdot (x - y)| \leq C|x - y|^2 \quad \forall x, y \in \Omega,$$

for some positive constant C independent of x and y . It follows that

$$|u(x) - u(y)| \leq |\nabla u(x) \cdot (x - y)| + C|x - y|^2 \quad \forall x, y \in \Omega \quad (3.7)$$

and

$$|\nabla u(x) \cdot (x - y)| \leq |u(x) - u(y)| + C|x - y|^2 \quad \forall x, y \in \Omega. \quad (3.8)$$

From (3.7), we derive that

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^p}{|x - y|^p} \rho_n(|x - y|) dy \right)^{1/p} &\leq \left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla u(x) \cdot (y - x)|^p}{|x - y|^p} \rho_n(|x - y|) dy \right)^{1/p} \\ &\quad + C \left(\int_{\Omega} |x - y|^p \rho_n(|x - y|) dy \right)^{1/p}; \end{aligned}$$

which implies, by (1.2) and (1.3),

$$\left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^p}{|x - y|^p} \rho_n(|x - y|) dy \right)^{1/p} \leq \gamma |\nabla u(x)| + o(1). \quad (3.9)$$

Here and in what follows in this proof, $o(1)$ denotes a quantity which converges to 0 (independently of x) as $n \rightarrow +\infty$. We derive that

$$\Phi_n(u) \leq \gamma \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u(x)| dx + o(1). \quad (3.10)$$

For the reverse inequality, we consider an arbitrary open subset D of Ω such that $\bar{D} \subset \Omega$. For a fixed $x \in D$, using (1.2), (1.3), and (3.8) one can verify as in (3.9) that

$$\gamma |\nabla u(x)| \leq \left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^p}{|x - y|^p} \rho_n(|x - y|) dy \right)^{1/p} + o(1).$$

It follows that

$$\gamma \int_D |\nabla u(x)| dx \leq \Phi_n(u) + o(1). \quad (3.11)$$

Combining (3.10) and (3.11) yields

$$\gamma \int_D |\nabla u(x)| dx \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \Phi_n(u) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \Phi_n(u) \leq \gamma \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u(x)| dx.$$

The conclusion of Step 1 follows since D is arbitrary,

Step 2: Proof of (3.6). We follow the same strategy as in the proof of Proposition 7. Let (μ_k) be a sequence of smooth mollifiers such that $\mu_k \geq 0$ and $\text{supp } \mu_k \subset B_{1/k}$. Fix D an

arbitrary smooth open subset of Ω such that $\bar{D} \subset \Omega$ and let $k_0 > 0$ be large enough such that $B(x, 1/k_0) \subset\subset \Omega$ for every $x \in D$. Given $u \in L^1(\Omega)$, define in D

$$u_k = \mu_k \star u \quad \text{for } k \geq k_0.$$

We have, for $k \geq k_0$,

$$\int_D \left(\int_D \frac{|u_k(x) - u_k(y)|^p}{|x - y|^p} \rho_n(|x - y|) dy \right)^{1/p} dx \leq \Phi_n(u) \quad \forall n. \quad (3.12)$$

Letting $n \rightarrow +\infty$ (for fixed k and fixed D), we find, using Step 1 on D , that, for $k \geq k_0$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_D \left(\int_D \frac{|u_k(x) - u_k(y)|^p}{|x - y|^p} \rho_n(|x - y|) dy \right)^{1/p} dx = \gamma \int_D |\nabla u_k(x)| dx.$$

We derive from (3.12) that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \Phi_n(u) \geq \gamma \int_D |\nabla u_k(x)| dx, \quad (3.13)$$

for $k \geq k_0$. Letting $k \rightarrow +\infty$, we obtain

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \Phi_n(u) \geq \gamma \int_D |\nabla u(x)| dx. \quad (3.14)$$

We deduce (3.6) since D is arbitrary.

Step 3: Proof of (3.5) for $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$. By Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\Phi_n(u) \leq |\Omega|^{1-1/p} \left(\int_\Omega \int_\Omega \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^p}{|x - y|^p} \rho_n(|x - y|) dx dy \right)^{1/p}. \quad (3.15)$$

We may then invoke a result of [2] to conclude that

$$\Phi_n(u) \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \quad \forall u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega), \quad (3.16)$$

with $C > 0$ independent of n . We next write, using triangle inequality,

$$|\Phi_n(u) - \Phi_n(\tilde{u})| \leq \Phi_n(u - \tilde{u}) \leq C \|\nabla(u - \tilde{u})\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \quad \forall u, \tilde{u} \in W^{1,p}(\Omega).$$

This implies

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi_n(u) - J(u)| &\leq |\Phi_n(u) - \Phi_n(\tilde{u})| + |\Phi_n(\tilde{u}) - J(\tilde{u})| + |J(\tilde{u}) - J(u)| \\ &\leq C \|\nabla(u - \tilde{u})\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + |\Phi_n(\tilde{u}) - J(\tilde{u})|. \end{aligned}$$

Using the density of $C^2(\bar{\Omega})$ in $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$, we obtain (3.5). $\square$

By choosing a **special** sequence (ρ_n) , we may greatly improve the conclusion of Proposition 9. More precisely, let (δ_n) be a positive sequence converging to 0 and define

$$\rho_n(t) = \frac{(p+d)}{\delta_n^{p+d}} t^p \mathbf{1}_{(0, \delta_n)}(t). \quad (3.17)$$

We have

Proposition 10. *Let $d \geq 1$ and assume that either*

$$1 < p \leq d/(d-1) \quad \text{and} \quad d \geq 2,$$

or

$$1 < p < +\infty \quad \text{and} \quad d = 1,$$

and let (ρ_n) be defined by (3.17). Then

$$\Phi_n(u) \leq C \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u| \quad \forall n, \forall u \in L^1(\Omega), \quad (3.18)$$

for some positive constant C depending only on d , p , and Ω , and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \Phi_n(u) = J(u) \quad \forall u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega). \quad (3.19)$$

On the other hand, there exists some nontrivial $v \in BV(\Omega)$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \Phi_n(v) = \alpha_p J(v) \quad \text{with } \alpha_p > 1. \quad (3.20)$$

Remark 2. The restriction $p \leq d/(d-1)$ in the case $d \geq 2$ is quite natural if the goal is to prove (3.18) since the Sobolev embedding $W^{1,1}(\Omega) \subset L^{d/(d-1)}$ is sharp. In fact, this requirement is necessary. Let $d \geq 2$, fix $x_0 \in \Omega$, and assume that $\text{diam}(\Omega) < 1/2$ for notational ease. Set $u(x) = |x - x_0|^{1-d} \ln^{-2} |x - x_0|$. One can verify that $u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega)$ and for $x \in \Omega$ with $|x - x_0| < \delta_n/2$

$$\int_{\Omega} |u(x) - u(y)|^p dy = +\infty$$

since $p > d/(d-1)$. It follows that

$$\gamma \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u(x)| dx < +\infty = \Phi_n(u) \quad \forall n.$$

Remark 3. We do not know whether it is possible to construct a sequence (ρ_n) such that (3.19) holds for every $u \in BV(\Omega)$. The problem is open even when $d = 1$.

The proof of Proposition 10 relies on the following inequality which is just a rescaled version of the standard Sobolev one. Let B_R be a ball of radius R , then for any $p \in [1, d/(d-1)]$,

$$\left(\int_{B_R} |u(y) - \oint_{B_R} u|^p dy \right)^{1/p} \leq CR^\alpha \int_{B_R} |\nabla u(z)| dz \quad \forall u \in L^1(B_R), \quad (3.21)$$

for some positive constant C depending only on d and p , where $\alpha := (d/p) + 1 - d \geq 0$.

Proof of Proposition 10. Since $\Phi_n(u) = \Phi_n(u + c)$ for any constant c , without loss of generality, one may assume that $\int_{\Omega} u = 0$. Consider an extension of u to $\mathbb{R}^d$ which is still denoted by u such that

$$\|u\|_{W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C_{\Omega} \|u\|_{W^{1,1}(\Omega)} \leq C_{\Omega} \|\nabla u\|_{L^1(\Omega)}. \quad (3.22)$$

In view of (3.17), we have

$$\Phi_n(u) \leq \frac{(p+d)^{1/p}}{\delta_n^{1+d/p}} \int_{\Omega} \left(\int_{B(x, \delta_n)} |u(x) - u(y)|^p dy \right)^{1/p} dx. \quad (3.23)$$

We have, for $y \in B(x, \delta_n)$,

$$|u(x) - u(y)| \leq \left| u(x) - \fint_{B(x, \delta_n)} u \right| + \left| u(y) - \fint_{B(x, \delta_n)} u \right|. \quad (3.24)$$

It follows from the triangle inequality that

$$\left(\int_{B(x, \delta_n)} |u(x) - u(y)|^p dy \right)^{1/p} \leq C \delta_n^{d/p} \left| u(x) - \fint_{B(x, \delta_n)} u \right| + \left(\int_{B(x, \delta_n)} \left| u(y) - \fint_{B(x, \delta_n)} u \right|^p dy \right)^{1/p}. \quad (3.25)$$

Here and in what follows in this proof, C denotes a positive constant depending only on d , p , and Ω . Inserting (3.21) in (3.25) yields

$$\left(\int_{B(x, \delta_n)} |u(x) - u(y)|^p dy \right)^{1/p} \leq C \delta_n^{d/p} \left| u(x) - \fint_{B(x, \delta_n)} u \right| + C \delta_n^{\alpha} \int_{B(x, \delta_n)} |\nabla u(z)| dz. \quad (3.26)$$

We claim that

$$\int_{\Omega} \left| u(x) - \fint_{B(x, \delta_n)} u \right| dx \leq C \delta_n \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u| \quad (3.27)$$

and

$$\int_{\Omega} dx \int_{B(x, \delta_n)} |\nabla u(z)| dz \leq C \delta_n^d \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|. \quad (3.28)$$

Indeed, we have, for R large enough,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \left| u(x) - \fint_{B(x, \delta_n)} u \right| dx &\leq C \delta_n^{-d} \int_{B_R} \int_{B_R} \int_{|x-y| < \delta_n} |u(x) - u(y)| dx dy \\ &\leq C \delta_n \int_{B_R} |\nabla u| \leq C \delta_n \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|, \end{aligned}$$

by the BBM formula applied to $\rho_n(t) = (d+1)\delta_n^{-(d+1)} t \mathbf{1}_{(0, \delta_n)}$ and by (3.22). On the other hand,

$$\int_{\Omega} \int_{B(x, \delta_n)} |\nabla u(z)| dz dx \leq \int_{B_R} \int_{B_R} \int_{|x-z| < \delta_n} |\nabla u(z)| dz dx \leq C \delta_n^p \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u(x)| dx,$$

by (3.22). Combining (3.26), (3.27), and (3.28) yields

$$\int_{\Omega} \left(\int_{B(x, \delta_n)} |u(x) - u(y)|^p dy \right)^{1/p} dx \leq C \delta_n^{1+d/p} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u(z)| dz \quad (3.29)$$

(recall that $\alpha + d = 1 + d/p$). It follows from (3.23) that

$$\Phi_n(u) \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^1(\Omega)};$$

which is (3.18).

Assertion (3.19) is deduced from (3.18) via a density argument as in the proof of Proposition 9.

It remains to prove (3.20). For simplicity, take $\Omega = (-1/2, 1/2)$ and consider $v(x) = \mathbb{1}_{(0,1/2)}(x)$. Then, for n sufficiently large,

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_n(v) &= 2 \frac{(p+1)^{1/p}}{\delta_n^{1/p}} \int_0^{\delta_n} \left(\int_0^{\delta_n-x} dy \right)^{1/p} dx = \frac{2(p+1)^{1/p}}{\delta_n^{1+1/p}} \int_0^{\delta_n} (\delta_n - x)^{1/p} dx \\ &= \frac{2(p+1)^{1/p}}{\delta_n^{1+1/p}} \frac{\delta_n^{1+1/p}}{1+1/p} = \frac{2p}{(p+1)^{1-1/p}} > 2^{1/p} = J(v).\end{aligned}$$

Indeed, since $p+1 < 2p$, it follows that $(p+1)^{1-1/p} < (2p)^{1-1/p}$ and thus

$$\frac{2p}{(p+1)^{1-1/p}} > (2p)^{1/p} > 2^{1/p}.$$

□

3.2 More about the pointwise convergence of (Φ_n) when $d = 1$

In this section, we assume that $d = 1$ and $\Omega = (-1/2, 1/2)$.

Proposition 11. *Assume that (ρ_n) satisfies (1.1)-(1.3). Then, for every $q > 1$, we have*

$$\Phi_n(u) \leq C_q \|u'\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \quad \forall u \in W^{1,q}(\Omega),$$

for some positive constant C_q depending only on q . Moreover,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \Phi_n(u) = J(u) \quad \forall u \in \bigcup_{q>1} W^{1,q}(\Omega).$$

Proof. Since $\Phi_n(u) = \Phi_n(u+c)$ for any constant c , without loss of generality, one may assume that $\int_{\Omega} u = 0$. Consider an extension of u to $\mathbb{R}$ which is still denoted by u , such that

$$\|u\|_{W^{1,q}(\mathbb{R})} \leq C_q \|u\|_{W^{1,q}(\Omega)} \leq C_q \|u'\|_{L^q(\Omega)}.$$

Let $M(f)$ denote the maximal function of f defined in $\mathbb{R}$, i.e.,

$$M(f)(x) := \sup_{r>0} \int_{x-r}^{x+r} |f(s)| ds.$$

From the definition of Φ_n , we have

$$\Phi_n(u) \leq C \int_{\Omega} \left(\int_{\Omega} |M(u')(x)|^p \rho_n(|x-y|) dy \right)^{1/p} dx \leq C \int_{\Omega} M(u')(x) dx.$$

The first statement now follows from the fact that $\|M(f)\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R})} \leq C_q \|f\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R})}$ since $q > 1$. The second statement is derived from the first statement via a density argument as in the proof of Proposition 9. □

Our next result shows that Proposition 11 is sharp and cannot be extended to $q = 1$ (for a general sequence (ρ_n)).

Proposition 12. *For every $p > 1$, there exist a sequence (ρ_n) satisfying (1.1)-(1.3) and some function $v \in W^{1,1}(\Omega)$ such that*

$$\Phi_n(v) = +\infty \quad \forall n.$$

Proof. Fix $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta > 1$ such that

$$\alpha + \beta/p < 1. \quad (3.30)$$

Since $p > 1$ such α and β exist. Let (δ_n) be a sequence of positive numbers converging to 0 and consider

$$\rho_n(t) := A_n \frac{1}{t |\ln t|^\beta} \mathbb{1}_{(0, \delta_n)}.$$

Here A_n is chosen in such a way that (1.3) holds, i.e., $A_n \int_0^{\delta_n} \frac{dt}{t |\ln t|^\beta} = 1$. Set

$$v(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } -1/2 < x < 0, \\ |\ln x|^{-\alpha} & \text{if } 0 < x < 1/2. \end{cases}$$

Clearly, $v \in W^{1,1}(\Omega)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_n(v) &= \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} \left(\int_{-1/2}^{1/2} \frac{|v(x) - v(y)|^p}{|x - y|^p} \rho_n(|x - y|) dy \right)^{1/p} dx \\ &\geq \int_0^{\delta_n} A_n^{1/p} |v(x)| \left(\int_0^{\delta_n - x} \frac{1}{|x + y|^p} \rho_n(x + y) dy \right)^{1/p} dx. \end{aligned} \quad (3.31)$$

We have, for $0 < x < \delta_n/2$,

$$\int_0^{\delta_n - x} \frac{1}{|x + y|^p} \rho_n(x + y) dy \geq \int_x^{\delta_n} \frac{dt}{t^{p+1} |\ln t|^\beta} \geq \int_x^{2x} \frac{dt}{t^{p+1} |\ln t|^\beta} \geq \frac{C_{p,\beta}}{x^p |\ln x|^\beta},$$

and thus

$$\left(\int_0^{\delta_n - x} \frac{1}{|x + y|^p} \rho_n(x + y) dy \right)^{1/p} \geq \frac{C_{p,\beta}}{x |\ln x|^{\beta/p}}. \quad (3.32)$$

Since, by (3.56),

$$\int_0^{\delta_n/2} \frac{1}{x |\ln x|^{\beta/p + \alpha}} dx = +\infty,$$

it follows from (3.31) and (3.32) that

$$\Phi_n(v) = +\infty \quad \forall n.$$

□

Remark 4. D. Spector [28] has noticed that the sequence (ρ_n) and the function v constructed by A. Ponce (presented in [19]) satisfy (1.1)-(1.3), $v \in W^{1,1}(\Omega)$, $\Phi_n(v) < +\infty$ for all n , and $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \Phi_n(v) = +\infty$. In our construction, the pathology is even more dramatic since $\Phi_n(v) = +\infty$ for all n .

3.3 More about the pointwise convergence of (Φ_n) when $d \geq 2$

In this section, we present two “improvements” of (3.5) concerning the (pointwise) convergence of $\Phi_n(u)$ to $J(u)$. In the first one (Proposition 13) (ρ_n) is a general sequence (satisfying (1.1)-(1.3)), but the assumption on u is quite restrictive: $u \in W^{1,q}(\Omega)$ with $q > q_0$ where q_0 is defined in (3.33). In the second one (Proposition 14) there is an additional assumption on (ρ_n) , but pointwise convergence holds for a large (more natural) class of u 's: $u \in W^{1,q}(\Omega)$ with $q > q_1$ where $q_1 < q_0$ is defined in (3.44).

Proposition 13. *Let $p > 1$ and assume that (ρ_n) satisfies (1.1)-(1.3). Set*

$$q_0 := pd/(d+p-1), \quad (3.33)$$

so that $1 < q_0 < p$. Then

$$\Phi_n(u) \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^q} \quad \forall u \in W^{1,q}(\Omega) \text{ with } q > q_0, \quad (3.34)$$

for some positive constant $C = C_{p,q,\Omega}$ depending only on p, q , and Ω . Moreover,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \Phi_n(u) = J(u) \quad \forall u \in W^{1,q}(\Omega) \text{ with } q > q_0. \quad (3.35)$$

Proof. Since $\Phi_n(u) = \Phi_n(u+c)$ for any constant c , without loss of generality, one may assume that $\int_{\Omega} u = 0$. Consider an extension of u to $\mathbb{R}^d$ which is still denoted by u , such that

$$\|u\|_{W^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C_{q,\Omega} \|u\|_{W^{1,q}(\Omega)} \leq C_{q,\Omega} \|\nabla u\|_{L^q(\Omega)}.$$

For simplicity of notation, we assume that $\text{diam}(\Omega) \leq 1/2$. Then

$$\Phi_n(u) \leq \int_{\Omega} \left[\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_0^1 \frac{|u(x+r\sigma) - u(x)|^p}{r^p} \rho_n(r) r^{d-1} dr d\sigma \right]^{1/p} dx.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} |u(x+r\sigma) - u(x)| &\leq \left| u(x+r\sigma) - \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} u(x+r\sigma') d\sigma' \right| + \left| u(x) - \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} u(x+r\sigma') d\sigma' \right| \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} |u(x+r\sigma) - u(x+r\sigma')| d\sigma' + \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} |u(x) - u(x+r\sigma')| d\sigma'. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\Phi_n(u) \lesssim T_1 + T_2, \quad (3.36)$$

where

$$T_1 = \int_{\Omega} \left[\int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} |u(x+r\sigma) - u(x+r\sigma')|^p d\sigma' d\sigma \rho_n(r) r^{d-1-p} dr \right]^{1/p} dx$$

and

$$T_2 = \int_{\Omega} \left[\int_0^1 \left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} |u(x) - u(x+r\sigma')| d\sigma' \right)^p \rho_n(r) r^{d-1-p} dr \right]^{1/p} dx.$$

In this proof the notation $a \lesssim b$ means that $a \leq Cb$ for some positive constant C depending only on p, q , and Ω .

We first estimate T_1 . Let B_1 denotes the open unit ball of $\mathbb{R}^d$. By (3.33) we know that the trace mapping $u \mapsto u|_{\partial B_1}$ is continuous from $W^{1,q_0}(B_1)$ into $L^q(\partial B_1)$. It follows that

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} |u(x+r\sigma) - u(x+r\sigma')|^p d\sigma' d\sigma \lesssim \|\nabla u(x+r\cdot)\|_{L^{q_0}(B_1)}^p \lesssim r^p M^{p/q_0}(|\nabla u|^{q_0})(x)$$

(recall that $M(f)$ denotes the maximal function of a function f defined in $\mathbb{R}^d$). Using (1.2), we derive that

$$T_1 \lesssim \int_{\Omega} \left[\int_0^1 M^{p/q_0}(|\nabla u|^{q_0})(x) \rho_n(r) r^{d-1} dr \right]^{1/p} dx \lesssim \int_{\Omega} M^{1/q_0}(|\nabla u|^{q_0})(x) dx. \quad (3.37)$$

Since $q > q_0$, it follows from the theory of maximal functions that

$$\int_{\Omega} M^{1/q_0}(|\nabla u|^{q_0})(x) dx \lesssim \|\nabla u\|_{L^q(\Omega)}. \quad (3.38)$$

Combining (3.39) and (3.39) yields

$$T_1 \lesssim \|\nabla u\|_{L^q(\Omega)}. \quad (3.39)$$

We next estimate T_2 . We have

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} |u(x) - u(x+r\sigma')| d\sigma' \leq \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_0^r |\nabla u(x+s\sigma')| ds d\sigma'.$$

Applying Lemma 1 below, we obtain, for $0 < r < 1$ and $x \in \Omega$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_0^r |\nabla u(x+s\sigma')| ds d\sigma' \leq Cr M(|\nabla u|)(x). \quad (3.40)$$

We derive that

$$T_2 \lesssim \int_{\Omega} M(|\nabla u|)(x) dx \lesssim \|\nabla u\|_{L^q} \quad (3.41)$$

by the theory of maximal functions since $q > 1$. Combining (3.36), (3.39), and (3.41) yields (3.34).

Assertion (3.35) follows from (3.34) via a density argument as in the proof of Proposition 9. $\square$

In the proof of Proposition 13, we used the following elementary

Lemma 1. *Let $d \geq 1$, $r > 0$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $f \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. We have*

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_0^r |f(x+s\sigma)| ds d\sigma \leq C_d r M(f)(x), \quad (3.42)$$

for some positive constant C_d depending only on d .

Proof. Set $\varphi(s) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} |f(x+s\sigma)| d\sigma$, so that, by the definition of $M(f)(x)$, we have

$$\int_{B_r(x)} |f(y)| dy \leq M(f)(x) \quad \forall r > 0,$$

and thus

$$H(r) := \int_0^r \varphi(s) s^{d-1} ds \leq |B_1| r^d M(f)(x) \quad \forall r > 0. \quad (3.43)$$

Then $H'(r) = \varphi(r) r^{d-1}$, so that

$$\int_0^r \varphi(s) ds = \int_0^r \frac{H'(s)}{s^{d-1}} ds = \frac{H(r)}{r^{d-1}} + (d-1) \int_0^r \frac{H(s)}{s^d} ds \leq C_d r M(f)(x),$$

by (3.43); which is precisely (3.42). (The integration by parts can be easily justified by approximation). $\square$

Under the assumption that ρ_n is non-increasing for every n , one can replace the condition $q > q_0$ in Proposition 13 by the weaker condition $q > q_1$, where

$$q_1 := \max \{pd/(p+d), 1\}, \quad (3.44)$$

so that $1 \leq q_1 < q_0$. It is worth noting that the embedding $W^{1,q_1}(\Omega) \subset L^p(\Omega)$ is sharp and therefore q_1 is a natural lower bound for q (see Remark 2). In fact, we prove a slightly more general result:

Proposition 14. *Let $p > 1$ and assume that (ρ_n) satisfies (1.1)-(1.3). Suppose in addition that there exist $\Lambda > 0$ and a sequence of **non-increasing** functions $(\hat{\rho}_n) \subset L^1_{loc}(0, +\infty)$ such that*

$$\rho_n \leq \hat{\rho}_n \quad \text{and} \quad \int_0^\infty \hat{\rho}_n(t) t^{d-1} dt \leq \Lambda \quad \forall n. \quad (3.45)$$

Then

$$\Phi_n(u) \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^q} \quad \forall u \in W^{1,q}(\Omega) \text{ with } q > q_1, \quad (3.46)$$

for some positive constant $C = C(p, q, \Lambda, \Omega)$ depending only on p, q, Λ , and Ω . Moreover,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \Phi_n(u) = J(u) \quad \forall u \in W^{1,q}(\Omega) \text{ with } q > q_1. \quad (3.47)$$

Remark 5. We do not know whether the conclusions of Proposition 14 hold without assuming the existence of Λ and $(\hat{\rho}_n)$. Equivalently, we do not know whether the conclusions of Proposition 13 hold under the weaker condition $q > q_1$.

Proof. For simplicity of notation, we assume that ρ_n is non-increasing for all n and work directly with ρ_n instead of $\hat{\rho}_n$. We first prove (3.46). As in the proof of Proposition 13, one may assume that $\int_\Omega u = 0$. Consider an extension of u to $\mathbb{R}^d$ which is still denoted by u such that

$$\|u\|_{W^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C_{q,\Omega} \|u\|_{W^{1,q}(\Omega)} \leq C_{q,\Omega} \|\nabla u\|_{L^q(\Omega)}.$$

For simplicity of notation, we also assume that $\text{diam}(\Omega) \leq 1/2$. Then

$$\Phi_n(u) \leq \int_\Omega \left[\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_0^1 \frac{|u(x+r\sigma) - u(x)|^p}{r^p} \rho_n(r) r^{d-1} dr d\sigma \right]^{1/p} dx.$$

We claim that for a.e. $x \in \Omega$,

$$Z(x) = \left[\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_0^1 \frac{|u(x+r\sigma) - u(x)|^p}{r^p} \rho_n(r) r^{d-1} dr d\sigma \right]^{1/p} \leq C M^{1/q_1}(|\nabla u|^{q_1})(x). \quad (3.48)$$

Here and in what follows, C denotes a positive constant depending only on p , d , and Λ .

From (3.48), we deduce (3.46) via the theory of maximal functions since $q > q_1$. Assertion (3.47) follows from (3.46) by density as in the proof of Proposition 9.

It remains to prove (3.48). Without loss of generality we establish (3.48) for $x = 0$. The proof relies heavily on two inequalities valid for all $R > 0$:

$$\left[\int_{B_R} \left| u(\xi) - \int_{B_R} u \right|^p d\xi \right]^{1/p} \leq CRM^{1/q_1} (|\nabla u|^{q_1})(0) \quad (3.49)$$

and

$$\int_{B_R} |u(\xi) - u(0)| d\xi \leq CRM^{1/q_1} (|\nabla u|^{q_1})(0), \quad (3.50)$$

where $B_R = B_R(0)$.

Inequality (3.49) is simply a rescaled version of the Sobolev inequality

$$\left\| u - \int_{B_1} u \right\|_{L^p(B_1)} \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^{q_1}(B_1)},$$

which implies that

$$\left[\int_{B_R} \left| u(\xi) - \int_{B_R} u \right|^p d\xi \right]^{1/p} \leq CR \left[\int_{B_R} |\nabla u|^{q_1} \right]^{1/q_1} \leq CRM^{1/q_1} (|\nabla u|^{q_1})(0).$$

To prove (3.50), we write

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_R} |u(\xi) - u(0)| d\xi &= \int_0^R \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} |u(r\sigma) - u(0)| r^{d-1} dr d\sigma \\ &\leq C \int_0^R r^{d-1} dr \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_0^r |\nabla u(s\sigma)| ds d\sigma \\ &\leq C \int_0^R r^d M(|\nabla u|)(0) dr \text{ by Lemma 1.} \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\int_{B_R} |u(\xi) - u(0)| d\xi \leq CRM (|\nabla u|)(0) \leq CRM^{1/q_1} (|\nabla u|^{q_1})(0).$$

From (3.48), we obtain

$$Z(0)^p = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{2^{-(i+1)}}^{2^{-i}} |u(r\sigma) - u(0)|^p \rho_n(r) r^{d-1-p} dr d\sigma,$$

so that

$$Z(0)^p \leq C \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \rho_n(2^{-(i+1)}) 2^{ip} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{2^{-(i+1)}}^{2^{-i}} |u(r\sigma) - u(0)|^p r^{d-1} dr d\sigma. \quad (3.51)$$

We have

$$|u(r\sigma) - u(0)| \leq \left| u(r\sigma) - \int_{B_{2^{-i}}} u \right| + \left| \int_{B_{2^{-i}}} u - u(0) \right|. \quad (3.52)$$

Inserting (3.52) into (3.51) yields

$$Z(0)^p \leq C \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (U_i + V_i), \quad (3.53)$$

where

$$U_i = \rho_n(2^{-(i+1)}) 2^{ip} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{2^{-(i+1)}}^{2^{-i}} |u(r\sigma) - \oint_{B_{2^{-i}}} u|^p r^{d-1} dr d\sigma$$

and

$$V_i = \rho_n(2^{-(i+1)}) 2^{ip} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{2^{-(i+1)}}^{2^{-i}} \left| \oint_{B_{2^{-i}}} u - u(0) \right|^p r^{d-1} dr d\sigma.$$

Clearly,

$$U_i \leq \rho_n(2^{-(i+1)}) 2^{ip} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_0^{2^{-i}} |u(r\sigma) - \oint_{B_{2^{-i}}} u|^p r^{d-1} dr d\sigma \leq \rho_n(2^{-(i+1)}) 2^{-id} A, \quad (3.54)$$

by (3.49), where $A = M^{p/q_1}(|\nabla u|^{q_1})(0)$. On the other hand,

$$V_i \leq \rho_n(2^{-(i+1)}) 2^{ip} \left[\oint_{B_{2^{-i}}} |u(\xi) - u(0)| d\xi \right]^p 2^{-id} \leq C \rho_n(2^{-(i+1)}) 2^{-id} A \text{ by (3.50)}. \quad (3.55)$$

Combining (3.53), (3.54), and (3.55), we obtain

$$Z(0)^p \leq C \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \rho_n(2^{-(i+1)}) 2^{-id} A.$$

Finally, we observe that

$$\int_0^1 \rho_n(r) r^{d-1} dr \geq \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \int_{2^{-(i+2)}}^{2^{-(i+1)}} \rho_n(r) r^{d-1} dr \geq C \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \rho_n(2^{-(i+1)}) 2^{-id}$$

and thus

$$Z(0)^p \leq C M^{p/q_1}(|\nabla u|^{q_1})(0) \int_0^1 \rho_n(r) r^{d-1} dr \leq C M^{p/q_1}(|\nabla u|^{q_1})(0).$$

□

Remark 6. Assumption (3.45) holds e.g. for the sequence (ρ_n) defined in (3.17), i.e.,

$$\rho_n(t) = \frac{p+d}{\delta_n^{p+d}} t^p \mathbf{1}_{(0, \delta_n)}(t).$$

Indeed, we may choose

$$\hat{\rho}_n(t) = \frac{p+d}{\delta_n^d} \mathbf{1}_{(0, \delta_n)}(t).$$

Applying Proposition 14 we recover Proposition 10 since $q_1 = 1$ (note that $pd \leq p+d$ when $d = 1$ and also when $d \geq 2$ provided that $p \leq d/(d-1)$). Note, however that in Proposition 14 we must take $q > q_1 = 1$, while $q = 1$ was allowed in Proposition 10. This discrepancy is related to our next remark.

Remark 7. Assume that $d \geq 2$ and $1 < p \leq d/(d-1)$, so that $q_1 = 1$. The conclusion of Proposition 14 fails in the borderline case $q = q_1 = 1$. More precisely, for every $p \in (1, d/(d-1)]$, there exist a sequence (ρ_n) satisfying (1.1)-(1.3) and (3.45), and a function $v \in W^{1,1}(\Omega)$ such that $\Phi_n(v) = +\infty$ for all n . The construction is similar to the one presented in the proof of Proposition 10. Indeed, let $\Omega = B_{1/2}(0)$. Fix $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta > 1$ such that

$$\alpha + \beta/p < 1. \quad (3.56)$$

Since $p > 1$ such α and β exist. Let (δ_n) be a sequence of positive numbers converging to 0 and consider

$$\rho_n(t) := A_n \frac{1}{t^d |\ln t|^\beta} \mathbf{1}_{(0, \delta_n)}.$$

Note that the functions $t \mapsto \rho_n(t)$ are non-increasing. Here A_n is chosen in such a way that (1.3) holds, i.e., $A_n \int_0^{\delta_n} \frac{dt}{t |\ln t|^\beta} = 1$. Set

$$V(x) = v(x_1) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } -1/2 < x_1 < 0, \\ |\ln x_1|^{-\alpha} & \text{if } 0 < x_1 < 1/2. \end{cases}$$

Clearly, $V \in W^{1,1}(\Omega)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_n(V) &= \int_{\Omega} \left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{|V(x) - V(y)|^p}{|x - y|^p} \rho_n(|x - y|) dy \right)^{1/p} dx \\ &\gtrsim \int_{\substack{B_{1/4}(0) \\ 0 < x_1 < \delta_n/4}} A_n^{1/p} \left(\int_{|y-x| \leq \delta_n} \frac{|v(x_1) - v(y_1)|^p}{|x - y|^{p+d} |\ln |x - y||^\beta} dy \right)^{1/p} dx. \end{aligned}$$

Note that, for $0 < x_1 < \delta_n/4$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{|y-x| \leq \delta_n} \frac{|v(x_1) - v(y_1)|^p dy}{|x - y|^{p+d} |\ln |x - y||^\beta} &\gtrsim \int_{\substack{|y_1-x_1| \leq \delta_n/4 \\ |x'-y'| \leq \delta_n/4}} \frac{|v(x_1) - v(y_1)|^p dy' dy_1}{(|x_1 - y_1|^{p+d} + |x' - y'|^{p+d}) |\ln |x_1 - y_1||^\beta} \\ &\gtrsim \int_{|y_1-x_1| \leq \delta_n/4} \frac{|v(x_1) - v(y_1)|^p dy_1}{|x_1 - y_1|^{p+1} |\ln |x_1 - y_1||^\beta}. \end{aligned}$$

We derive as in the proof of Proposition 12 that

$$\int_{|y-x| \leq \delta_n} \frac{|v(x_1) - v(y_1)|^p dy}{|x - y|^{p+d} |\ln |x - y||^\beta} \gtrsim \frac{v(x_1)^p}{x_1^p |\ln x_1|^\beta}.$$

It follows that

$$\Phi_n(V) \gtrsim \int_{\substack{\Omega \\ 0 < x_1 < \delta_n/4}} A_n^{1/p} \frac{v(x_1)}{x_1 |\ln x_1|^{\beta/p}} dx = \int_{\substack{\Omega \\ 0 < x_1 < \delta_n/4}} A_n^{1/p} \frac{1}{x_1 |\ln x_1|^{\alpha+\beta/p}} dx = +\infty,$$

since $\alpha + \beta/p < 1$.

Remark 8. Assume that $d \geq 2$ and $p > d/(d-1)$, so that $q_1 = pd/(p+d) > 1$. It is not known whether the conclusions of Proposition 14 hold in the borderline case $q = q_1$. More precisely, assume that $d \geq 2$, $p > d/(d-1)$, and that (ρ_n) satisfying (1.1)-(1.3) and (3.45). Is it true that $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \Phi_n(u) = J(u)$ for all $u \in W^{1,q_1}(\Omega)$? Take for example $d = 2$ and $p = 3$ so that $q_1 = 6/5$.

Remark 9. The technique we use in the proof of Proposition 14 is somewhat similar to the one used by D. Spector [28] (see e.g. the proof of his Theorem 1.8). However, the results are quite different in nature.

3.4 Γ -convergence

Concerning the Γ -convergence of Φ_n , G. Leoni and D. Spector proved in [18]

Proposition 15. *For every $p > 1$ we have*

$$\Phi_n \xrightarrow{\Gamma} \Phi_0(\cdot) := \gamma \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \cdot| \text{ in } L^1(\Omega),$$

where γ is given in (3.3).

Their proof is quite involved. Here is a simpler proof.

Proof. For D an open subset of Ω such that $\bar{D} \subset \Omega$, set

$$\Phi_n(u, D) = \int_D dx \left[\int_D \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^p}{|x - y|^p} \rho_n(|x - y|) dy \right]^{1/p} \quad \text{for } u \in L^1(D).$$

Let $u \in L^1(\Omega)$ and $(u_n) \subset L^1(\Omega)$ be such that $u_n \rightarrow u$ in $L^1(\Omega)$. We must prove that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_n(u_n) \geq \gamma \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|.$$

Let (μ_k) be a sequence of smooth mollifiers such that $\text{supp } \mu_k \subset B_{1/k}$. Let D be a smooth open subset of Ω such that $\bar{D} \subset \Omega$ and fix k_0 be such that $D + B_{1/k_0} \subset \Omega$. We have as in (2.29), for $k \geq k_0$,

$$\Phi_n(\mu_k * u_n, D) \leq \Phi_n(u_n). \quad (3.57)$$

Using the fact that

$$|\Phi_n(u, D) - \Phi_n(v, D)| \leq C_D \|u - v\|_{W^{1,\infty}(D)} \quad \forall u, v \in W^{1,\infty}(D),$$

we obtain

$$|\Phi_n(\mu_k * u_n, D) - \Phi_n(\mu_k * u, D)| \leq C_{k,D} \|u_n - u\|_{L^1(\Omega)}.$$

Hence

$$\Phi_n(\mu_k * u, D) \leq \Phi_n(\mu_k * u_n, D) + C_{k,D} \|u_n - u\|_{L^1(\Omega)}. \quad (3.58)$$

Combining (3.57) and (3.58) yields

$$\gamma \int_D |\nabla(\mu_k * u)| \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \Phi_n(u_n).$$

Letting $k \rightarrow \infty$, we reach

$$\gamma \int_D |\nabla u| \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \Phi_n(u_n).$$

Since $D \subset\subset \Omega$ is arbitrary, we derive that

$$\gamma \int_\Omega |\nabla u| \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \Phi_n(u_n).$$

We next fix $u \in BV(\Omega)$ and construct a sequence (u_n) converging to u in $L^1(\Omega)$ such that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \Phi_n(u_n) \leq \gamma \int_\Omega |\nabla u|.$$

Let $v_k \in C^1(\bar{\Omega})$ be such that

$$v_k \rightarrow u \text{ in } L^1(\Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad \int_\Omega |\nabla v_k| \rightarrow \int_\Omega |\nabla u|. \quad (3.59)$$

For each k , let n_k be such that

$$\left| \Phi_n(v_k) - \gamma \int_\Omega |\nabla v_k| \right| \leq 1/k \text{ if } n > n_k. \quad (3.60)$$

Without loss of generality, one may assume that (n_k) is an increasing sequence with respect to k . Define

$$u_n = v_k \text{ if } n_k < n \leq n_{k+1}.$$

We derive from (3.59) and (3.60) that

$$u_n \rightarrow u \text{ in } L^1(\Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \Phi_n(u_n) = \gamma \int_\Omega |\nabla u|.$$

The proof is complete. $\square$

3.5 Functionals with roots in Image Processing

Set

$$\hat{E}_n(u) := \int_\Omega |u - f|^q + \Phi_n(u),$$

and

$$\hat{E}_0(u) := \int_\Omega |u - f|^q + \gamma \int_\Omega |\nabla u|,$$

where $q > 1$ and $f \in L^q(\Omega)$ is a given function. Motivated by Image Processing, we study variational problems related to $\hat{E}_n$. More precisely, we establish

Proposition 16. *For every n , there exists a unique $u_n \in L^q(\Omega)$ such that*

$$\hat{E}_n(u_n) = \min_{u \in L^q(\Omega)} \hat{E}_n(u).$$

Let u_0 be the unique minimizer of $\hat{E}_0$. We have, as $n \rightarrow +\infty$,

$$u_n \rightarrow u_0 \text{ in } L^q(\Omega)$$

and

$$\hat{E}_n(u_n) \rightarrow \hat{E}_0(u_0).$$

Proof. The proof is similar to the one of Proposition 6. The details are left to the reader. $\square$

References

- [1] G. Aubert and P. Kornprobst, *Can the nonlocal characterization of Sobolev spaces by Bourgain et al. be useful for solving variational problems?*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **47** (2009), 844–860
- [2] J. Bourgain, H. Brezis and P. Mironescu, *Another look at Sobolev spaces*, in Optimal Control and Partial Differential Equations (J.L. Menaldi, E. Rofman and A. Sulem, eds) a volume in honour of A.Bensoussan’s 60th birthday, IOS Press, 2001, 439-455.
- [3] J. Bourgain and H-M. Nguyen, *A new characterization of Sobolev spaces*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris **343** (2006), 75-80.
- [4] A. Braides, *Γ -convergence for beginners*, Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications, vol **22**. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2002.
- [5] H. Brezis, *Functional Analysis, Sobolev Spaces and Partial Differential Equations*, Universitext, Springer, 2010.
- [6] H. Brezis, *How to recognize constant functions. Connections with Sobolev spaces*, Volume in honor of M. Vishik, Uspekhi Mat. Nauk **57** (2002), 59-74; English translation in Russian Math. Surveys **57** (2002), 693-708.
- [7] H. Brezis, *New approximations of the total variation and filters in Imaging*, Rendiconti Lincei **26** (2015), 223-240.
- [8] H. Brezis and P. Mironescu, *Sobolev maps with values into the circle*, Chapter 7, Birkhäuser (in preparation).
- [9] H. Brezis and H-M. Nguyen, *On a new class of functions related to VMO*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris **349** (2011), 157-160.
- [10] H. Brezis and H-M. Nguyen, *Non-local functionals related to the total variation and applications in Image Processing*, preprint.
- [11] A. Buades, B. Coll and J.M. Morel, *A review of image denoising algorithms, with a new one*, Multiscale Model. Simul. **4** (2005), 490-530, reprinted in SIAM Rev. **52** (2010), 113–147.
- [12] G. Dal Maso, *An introduction to Γ -convergence*, Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications, vol **8**. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1993.
- [13] J. Davila, *On an open question about functions of bounded variation*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **15** (2002), 519 - 527.
- [14] G. Gilboa and S. Osher, *Nonlocal linear image regularization and supervised segmentation*, Multiscale Model. Simul. **6** (2007), 595–630.
- [15] G. Gilboa and S. Osher, *Nonlocal operators with applications to image processing*, Multiscale Model. Simul. **7** (2008), 1005-1028.

- [16] S. Kindermann, S. Osher and P. W. Jones, *Deblurring and Denoising of Images by Nonlocal Functionals*, Multiscale Model. Simul. **4** (2005), 1091-1115.
- [17] G. Leoni and D. Spector, *Characterization of Sobolev and BV Spaces*, J. Funct. Anal. **261** (2011), 2926-2958.
- [18] G. Leoni and D. Spector, *Corrigendum to “Characterization of Sobolev and BV Spaces”*, J. Funct. Anal. **266** (2014), 1106–1114.
- [19] H-M. Nguyen, *Some new characterizations of Sobolev spaces*, J. Funct. Anal. **237** (2006), 689-720.
- [20] H-M. Nguyen, *Γ -convergence and Sobolev norms*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris **345** (2007), 679-684.
- [21] H-M. Nguyen, *Further characterizations of Sobolev spaces*, J. European Math. Soc. (JEMS) **10** (2008), 191-229.
- [22] H-M. Nguyen, *Γ -convergence, Sobolev norms, and BV functions*, Duke Math. J. **157** (2011), 495-533.
- [23] H-M. Nguyen, *Some inequalities related to Sobolev norms*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **41** (2011), 483-509.
- [24] H-M. Nguyen, *Estimates for the topological degree and related topics*, J. Fixed Point Theory **15** (2014), 185-215.
- [25] A. Ponce, *A new approach to Sobolev spaces and connections to Γ -convergence*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **19** (2004), 229-255.
- [26] A. Ponce, *An estimate in the spirit of Poincaré’s inequality* J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **6** (2004), 1–15.
- [27] L. I. Rudin, S. Osher and E. Fatemi, *Nonlinear total variation based noise removal algorithms*, Phys. D **60** (1992), 259-268.
- [28] D. Spector, *On a generalization of L^p -differentiability*, preprint, Oct. 2015.