

## SOAP FILM SPANNING AN ELASTIC LINK

BY

GIULIA BEVILACQUA (*MOX - Dipartimento di Matematica, Politecnico di Milano, Italy*),

LUCA LUSSARDI (*Dipartimento di Scienze Matematiche “Giuseppe Luigi Lagrange”,  
Politecnico di Torino, Italy*),

AND

ALFREDO MARZOCCHI (*Dipartimento di Matematica e Fisica “Niccolò Tartaglia”,  
Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Italy*)

**Abstract.** We study the equilibrium problem of a system consisting of several Kirchhoff rods linked in an arbitrary way and tied by a soap film, using techniques of the Calculus of Variations. We prove the existence of a solution with minimum energy, which may be quite irregular, and perform experiments confirming the kind of surface predicted by the model.

**1. Introduction.** In this article we find the solution of the Kirchhoff-Plateau problem which is physically motivated by soap films that span flexible loops. This approach is a generalization of the so-called *Plateau problem*, a centuries-old mathematical problem investigated by the Belgian physicist Joseph Plateau [20]. In contrast with the Plateau problem, in which a soap film spans a fixed frame, the Kirchhoff-Plateau problem concerns the equilibrium shapes of a system in which a *flexible* filament has the form of a closed loop spanned by a liquid film. We model our filament as a Kirchhoff rod: it has to be thin enough, unshearable and inextensible, and it can sustain bending of its midline and twisting of its cross sections (see for instance Antman [2, Ch. 8]). In this way the problem becomes “elasto-variational”.

This kind of problem has been investigated in [14] by Giusteri et al. where they consider only a filament, while our aim is to study more complex configurations of the bounding loop, like a finite number of them linked in an arbitrary way. For the sake of simplicity we will consider throughout the paper two thin elastic three-dimensional closed rods, i.e., two loops, linked in a simple but nontrivial way: we impose that the midline of each rod has to have linking number equal to one with the other one: this

---

Received November 22, 2017, and, in revised form, April 28, 2018.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 49Q05, 49Q20, 74K10; Secondary 74B20.

*Email address:* [giulia.bevilacqua@polimi.it](mailto:giulia.bevilacqua@polimi.it)

*Email address:* [luca.lussardi@polito.it](mailto:luca.lussardi@polito.it)

*Email address:* [alfredo.marzocchi@unicatt.it](mailto:alfredo.marzocchi@unicatt.it)




FIG. 1. Geometry of the problem.

implies that they form what is called a link (see Fig. 1), but the case of a number of  $N$  loops possibly nonisotopic to a torus and arbitrarily linked can be easily treated with the same technique and minor changes. In this way, the major difference with respect to [14] is the fact that the second loop doesn't have a fixed position in space, while the first has a prescribed frame at a point. To take into account all of these requests we have to impose some physically motivated constraints, such as local and global non-interpenetration of matter (though allowing for points on the surface of the bounding loop to come into contact), and others already introduced by Schuricht [24], adding the necessary specifications in considering a link and not a single loop.

As for the energy functional of the system, we consider three contributions: the elastic and the potential energy for the link and the surface tension energy of the film. Precisely, we do not take into account the energy associated with the liquid/solid interface since it is less than the one between the liquid/air interface. However, for the future it could be a parameter to add to the problem in order to give a more physical description also for the spanning surface.

The most delicate point in our elasto-variational problem is a good definition of spanning surface, since we do not prescribe a priori the region where the soap film touches the surface of the spanning loop.

To overcome this problem we use the definition of *spanning surface* introduced by Harrison [16] based on the concept of *linking number*, which is a numerical invariant well-known in topology. Even if this approach describes all soap film solutions [15, 16], it needs much stronger regularity. Therefore, like in [14], we use a recent and powerful reformulation by De Lellis et al. [7], who formulate the Plateau problem in a particular notion of *spanning*. We quote that the result [7] has been generalized in every codimension, for general energies and allowing multiplicities, respectively, in [9–11]. In [7] the authors make use of the weak\* topology of measures for the convergence for surfaces. We also mention that in the extension [10] to any codimension and general energies, a convergence in Hausdorff topology is provided in homological classes. In this way the minimum of the problem is defined as the support of a Radon measure, [5, 8, 22]. Hence, this approach has the advantage of considering also nonrectifiable or not fixed boundaries but it is not easy to apply since the minimization of Hausdorff measures on

classes of compact sets could cause lack of lower semicontinuity (it depends on the notion of convergence adopted), which is fundamental for the direct method of the Calculus of Variations. To avoid these difficulties they combine Preiss’ rectifiability theorem [21] for Radon measure in combination with some variational arguments, such as the introduction of cone and cup competitors. However, we point out that, following the proof in [6] we could avoid the use of the deep Preiss’ Theorem, using instead a soft argument with Caccioppoli sets (see [6, Section 3.2]).

Finally, we tried to reproduce the physical counterpart problem in the laboratory in order to “see” experimentally the solution. The results are interesting because, as we expected, there could be a balance between the film energy and the weight in cases when the loops are very light.

**2. Formulation of the problem.** We consider two continuous bodies whose reference, or material, configurations are two right cylinders of lengths  $L_1, L_2$ . The arc-length parameter  $s$  of the axis of each cylinder identifies a material (cross) section  $\mathcal{A}(s)$ , which consists of all points on a plane perpendicular to the axis at  $s$  belonging to a simply connected and compact subset of the plane. Like in [2, Ch. 8] we describe each rod by three vector-valued functions  $[0, L_i] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  given by  $s \mapsto (\mathbf{r}_i(s), \mathbf{u}_i(s), \mathbf{v}_i(s))$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ).

Now we fix a point  $O$  in the euclidean space  $\mathbb{E}^3$  and describe the position in space of each point of the  $i$ th rod. Setting  $G_i(s) - O = \mathbf{r}_i(s)$  (the so-called *midline*), where  $G_i(s)$  is the center of mass of the cross sections and considering  $\mathbf{u}_i$  and  $\mathbf{v}_i$  as applied vectors in  $G_i(s)$ , a generic point  $P_i$  of the rod in space is given by the knowledge of the vector

$$\mathbf{p}_i(s, \zeta_1, \zeta_2) = P_i - O = \mathbf{r}_i(s) + \zeta_1 \mathbf{u}_i(s) + \zeta_2 \mathbf{v}_i(s), \tag{2.1}$$

where  $(s, \zeta_1, \zeta_2) \in \Omega_i := \{(s, \zeta_1, \zeta_2) \mid s \in [0, L_i], (\zeta_1, \zeta_2) \in \mathcal{A}_i(s)\}$ . Hence,  $\Omega_i$  is the closure of an open set in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . Moreover,  $\zeta_1$  and  $\zeta_2$  are not completely free: we require that our body is “longer than broad”, so there exists an  $R > 0$ , the maximum thickness, which has to be small compared to the length  $L_i$ , such that  $|\zeta_1| < R$  and  $|\zeta_2| < R$  for any  $(s, \zeta_1, \zeta_2)$ .

Moreover, we also assume that the rod is *unshearable*, i.e., the cross section at any point of the midline remains in the plane orthogonal to the midline at that point, so that  $\mathbf{u}$  and  $\mathbf{v}$  are orthogonal to the midline, and that this line is *inextensible*. Hence, by these assumptions, we can choose the Kirchhoff rod as a model for the first rod, which is a special case of a Cosserat rod.

Given the function  $\mathcal{A}_i(s)$ , the position of the midline of each rod is then completely determined by three scalar parameters with a physical meaning:  $k'_i$  and  $k''_i$  are the *flexural densities* and  $\omega$  the *twist density*. The vectors  $\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{v}_i$  satisfy the system of Ordinary Differential Equations

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{r}}_i(s) = \mathbf{w}_i(s), \\ \dot{\mathbf{u}}_i(s) = -\omega(s)\mathbf{w}_i(s) - k'_i(s)\mathbf{v}_i, \\ \dot{\mathbf{v}}_i(s) = k'_i(s)\mathbf{u}_i(s) + k''_i(s)\mathbf{w}_i(s); \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

where  $i = 1, 2$  and  $\mathbf{w}_i = \mathbf{u}_i \times \mathbf{v}_i$  is tangent to the midline.

Up to now, the two rods are defined in the same way. We now suppose that the first one is “clamped” by assigning an initial value to its system, i.e.,

$$(\mathbf{r}_1(0), \mathbf{u}_1(0), \mathbf{v}_1(0)) = (\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{v}}_1). \quad (2.3)$$

Since clearly

$$\dot{\mathbf{w}}_1(s) = -\omega_1(s)\mathbf{u}_1(s) - k_1''(s)\mathbf{v}_1(s)$$

the triple  $(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{w}_1)$  satisfies a nonautonomous linear system and therefore, then by classical results [17], if the densities  $k_1', k_1''$ , and  $\omega$  belong to  $L^p([0, L_1]; \mathbb{R})$  for some  $p \in (1, \infty)$ , then the initial-value problem has a unique solution, with  $\mathbf{r}_1 \in W^{2,p}([0, L_1]; \mathbb{R}^3)$  and  $\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}_1 \in W^{1,p}([0, L_1]; \mathbb{R}^3)$ .

It is easy to verify that if  $(\hat{\mathbf{u}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{v}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{w}}_1)$  is orthonormal, so is  $(\mathbf{u}_1(s), \mathbf{v}_1(s), \mathbf{w}_1(s))$  for every  $s \in [0, L_1]$ . For every  $(\hat{\mathbf{u}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{v}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{w}}_1) \in (\mathbb{R}^3)^3$  we then set

$$\mathbf{z}_1 = (k_1', k_1'', \omega_1) \in V_1 := L^p([0, L_1]; \mathbb{R}^3).$$

As for the second rod, since we do not know a priori its position in space, we need some information also on the orientation of one of its orthonormal frames. Therefore we seek a solution of the form

$$\mathbf{z}_2 = (k_2', k_2'', \omega_2, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_2, \hat{\mathbf{v}}_2, \hat{\mathbf{w}}_2) \in V_2 := L^p([0, L_2]; \mathbb{R}^3) \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3,$$

where  $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_2, \hat{\mathbf{v}}_2, \hat{\mathbf{w}}_2$  are orthonormal and  $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_2$  gives their application point.

Now the system (2.2)<sub>2,3</sub> and (2.3), together with the knowledge of  $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_2$ , fully fixes the position in space of the second midline.

Since we want to deal with closed loops, we have to restrict to a suitable subclass of descriptors by imposing topological constraints. Obviously we impose the closure of the midlines, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{r}_i(0) = \mathbf{r}_i(L_i) \quad (i = 1, 2), \quad (2.4)$$

and, since we do not want interpenetration, we need to have also continuity of the tangent vectors, so that for  $i = 1, 2$ ,

$$\mathbf{w}_i(0) = \mathbf{w}_i(L_i). \quad (2.5)$$

The simple determination of the midline, however, does not completely fix the shape of the loops if they are three-dimensional. Indeed, the same midline may correspond to different bodies if the cross sections  $\mathcal{A}_i(s)$  are rotated around the midline before being glued, and the final rotation angle depends on the shape of the cross section. On the other hand, since they are undeformable, the information to be encoded reduces to fixing a point in every section. First of all we recall the notion of *isotopy*, which will be useful also later on.

**DEFINITION 2.1.** Let  $\eta_i : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ , with  $i = 1, 2$ , be two continuous curves with  $\eta_i(a) = \eta_i(b)$ .  $\eta_1$  and  $\eta_2$  are said to be *isotopic*,  $\eta_1 \simeq \eta_2$ , if there are open neighborhoods  $N_1$  of  $\eta_1([a, b])$ ,  $N_2$  of  $\eta_2([a, b])$ , and a continuous mapping  $\Phi : N_1 \times [0, 1] \mapsto \mathbb{R}^3$  such that  $\Phi(N_1, \tau)$  is homeomorphic to  $N_1$  for all  $\tau \in [0, 1]$ ,  $\Phi(\cdot, 0)$  is the identity,  $\Phi(N_1, 1) = N_2$ , and  $\Phi(\eta_1([a, b]), 1) = \eta_2([a, b])$ .

The isotopy class is then stable with respect to diffeomorphism and we define it also as the *knot type*. Another very useful notion is the linking number.

DEFINITION 2.2. Let  $\eta_1, \eta_2$  be two absolutely continuous disjoint closed curves in  $\mathbb{E}^3$ . The number

$$L(\eta_1, \eta_2) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_a^b \int_a^b \frac{\eta_1(s) - \eta_2(t)}{|\eta_1(s) - \eta_2(t)|^3} \cdot (\eta_1'(s) \times \eta_2'(t)) ds dt$$

is called the *linking number* between  $\eta_1$  and  $\eta_2$ .

It is well known [19] that  $L$  is always an integer and that it is invariant in the isotopy class of the two curves.

To encode a possible rotation of the cross sections, we then proceed as follows for each of the two rods. Since the thickness is nonzero, we can consider a curve “near” the midline  $\mathbf{r}_i$ , which could be not a closed one since the endpoints may be different. Joining them without intersecting the midline, we obtain a closed curve which has a certain linking number with the midline. Of course, every possible midline has to preserve this number, so we will impose this constraint on the midline. At this point, once we know the midline, the position of the nearby curve is fixed and so is its every cross section, thus completely defining<sup>1</sup> the shape of the loops, which we will indicate by  $\Lambda[\mathbf{z}]$ ; see Fig. 2.

Finally, we want to impose that the two loops form a link. We then come back to the two midlines, and we suppose that they are linked with a given linking number  $L_{12} \in \mathbb{Z}$ . As they are closed sets, they admit disjoint neighborhoods, which we can suppose to be tubular without loss of generality ([18, pp. 199-223]). By a further shrinking to the diameter of  $\mathcal{A}(s)$  we have that both rods are disjoint and linked one to each other with the given linking number.

At this point, the shape of the two solids is assigned once we know  $\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2$ , but we still have to avoid local and global interpenetration, which is clearly unphysical. To this end, we first introduce the elastic and potential energy stored in the loops.

The elastic energy is supposed to be of the classical form (see for instance [4, Ch. 2])

$$E_{\text{el}_i}[\mathbf{z}_i] := \int_0^{L_i} f_i(\mathbf{z}_i(s), s) ds, \tag{2.6}$$

where  $f_i(\cdot, s)$  are continuous and convex for any  $s \in [0, L_i]$  and  $f_i(a, \cdot)$  is measurable for any  $a \in \mathbb{R}^3$ . Since we are going to apply the Direct Method of the Calculus of Variations, we suppose that there exist positive constants  $C_i, D_i$  such that

$$f_i(a, s) \geq C_i |a|^p + D_i \quad \forall (a, s) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times [0, L_i]. \tag{2.7}$$

In view of this, the total elastic energy

$$E_{\text{el}}[\mathbf{z}] = E_{\text{el}_1}[\mathbf{z}_1] + E_{\text{el}_2}[\mathbf{z}_2] := \int_I f(\mathbf{z}(\xi), \xi) d\xi,$$

where  $I = [0, L_1] \times [0, L_2]$ ,  $\mathbf{z} = (\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2)$  and  $\xi$  is a vector variable, is easily seen to be coercive on  $V := V_1 \times V_2$ .

As for the potential energy of the weight, it is given for each loop by

$$E_{\text{g}_i}[\mathbf{z}_i] = - \int_0^{L_i} \rho_i(s) \mathbf{g} \cdot (G_i(s) - O) ds,$$

where  $\rho_i > 0$  stand for the mass of each section of the rod and  $\mathbf{g}$  denotes the acceleration of gravity.

---

<sup>1</sup>Up to a set of  $\mathcal{L}^1$ -zero measure which is irrelevant.

It is worth insisting on the fact that the weight plays a different role in the two rods: in the first it acts essentially deforming only the midline, while in the second it influences the global positioning of the rod, and could draw it away without appropriate conditions of nonintersection, that we will introduce below.

We also set

$$E_{\text{loop}}[\mathbf{z}] = E_{\text{el}_1}[\mathbf{z}_1] + E_{\text{g}_1}[\mathbf{z}_1] + E_{\text{el}_2}[\mathbf{z}_2] + E_{\text{g}_2}[\mathbf{z}_2].$$

We now need to set sufficient conditions for the local and global noninterpenetration of our configuration.

As for the first, it is well known ([2, Thm. 6.2]) that for Kirchhoff rods the condition is equivalent to the existence of two convex, homogeneous functions  $g_i(\xi_1, \xi_2, s)$  such that  $g(0, 0, s) = 0$  and

$$g_i(k'_i(s), k''_i(s), s) < 1 \quad \text{for a.e. } s \in [0, L_i], \quad (i = 1, 2). \quad (2.8)$$

However, this will not define a weakly closed set in the space of solutions, due to the strict inequality. Therefore, we will require the weaker condition

$$g_i(k'_i(s), k''_i(s), s) \leq 1 \quad \text{for a.e. } s \in [0, L_i], \quad (i = 1, 2), \quad (2.9)$$

even if this could let some point to infinite compression, and to prevent this we impose the natural growth condition on the elastic energy as

$$f_i(\mathbf{z}_i(s), s) \rightarrow +\infty \quad \text{as} \quad g_i(k'_i(s), k''_i(s), s) \rightarrow 1, \quad (i = 1, 2), \quad (2.10)$$

i.e., the elastic energy approaches infinity under complete compression (remember that  $f_i$  may depend on  $g_i$ ). By this assumption we have that the equality in (2.8) can occur only on a set of measure zero for configurations with finite energy.

At this point it is not difficult to prove the next theorem.

**THEOREM 2.3.** Let  $\mathbf{z} = (\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2) \in V = V_1 \times V_2$  satisfy (2.9),  $f_i$  with  $i = 1, 2$  satisfy (2.10), and  $E_{\text{el}}(\mathbf{z}) < +\infty$ .

Then the mapping  $(s, \zeta_1, \zeta_2) \mapsto \mathbf{p}[\mathbf{z}](s, \zeta_1, \zeta_2) = (\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2)[\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2](s, \zeta_1, \zeta_2)$  is locally injective on  $\text{int } \Omega$ . Moreover, this mapping is open on  $\text{int } \Omega$ .

*Proof.* The proof can be made easily by following the proof presented in [14] taking into account the fact that we can study the two rods separately since it is sufficient to reduce the proof in an open neighborhood well-contained in each rod.  $\square$

As for the global injectivity, we must distinguish each loop and their union. First of all, Ciarlet and Nečas [3] proved that if this condition holds

$$\int_{\Omega_i} \det \frac{\partial \mathbf{p}_i(s, \zeta_1, \zeta_2)}{\partial (s, \zeta_1, \zeta_2)} d(s, \zeta_1, \zeta_2) \leq \mathcal{L}^3(\mathbf{p}_i[\mathbf{z}_i](\Omega_i)), \quad (2.11)$$

then the global injectivity is true. Moreover, in our case it can be rewritten as

$$\int_{\Omega_i} (1 - \zeta_1 k'_i(s) - \zeta_2 k''_i(s)) d(s, \zeta_1, \zeta_2) \leq \mathcal{L}^3(\mathbf{p}_i[\mathbf{z}_i](\Omega_i)). \quad (2.12)$$

Hence, assuming (2.12) to be true, one has the global injectivity of the functions  $\mathbf{p}_i$  on each rod. Roughly speaking, this condition guarantees that parts of the rod which are far away from each other in the reference configuration cannot penetrate each other after large deformations.

We will then suppose (2.12) for the noninterpenetration of each rod. At this point, for the union of the two, we notice that the midlines (which are closed sets) have to be disjoint and therefore there exists  $R > 0$  such that the maximum diameter of the sections is less than  $R$ . It holds

$$\forall \mathbf{z} \in V \quad \mathbf{p}_1[\mathbf{z}_1](\Omega_1) \cap \mathbf{p}_2[\mathbf{z}_2](\Omega_2) = \emptyset. \tag{2.13}$$

We will then suppose the sections are so small that (2.13) is verified.

Now we can prove the following result.

**THEOREM 2.4.** Let  $\mathbf{z}$  be an element of  $V = V_1 \times V_2$  such that  $E_{\text{loop}}[\mathbf{w}] < +\infty$  and  $f_i$  with  $i = 1, 2$  satisfy (2.10). Suppose that  $\mathbf{p}_1[\mathbf{z}](\Omega_1) \cap \mathbf{p}_2[\mathbf{z}](\Omega_2) = \emptyset$  and  $\mathbf{z}_i$  satisfies (2.9) and (2.12).

Then the mapping  $(s, \zeta_1, \zeta_2) \mapsto \mathbf{p}[\mathbf{z}](s, \zeta_1, \zeta_2)$  is globally injective on  $\text{int } \Omega$ .

*Proof.* By (2.13) it suffices to show the global injectivity of  $\mathbf{p}_1$  and repeat the arguments for  $\mathbf{p}_2$ . Let us fix a configuration  $\mathbf{z}_1 \in V_1$ . By Theorem 2.3 there is a set  $\mathcal{I}_0$  of measure zero such that

$$\limsup_{(\tilde{s}, \tilde{\zeta}_1, \tilde{\zeta}_2) \rightarrow (s, \zeta_1, \zeta_2)} \frac{\|\mathbf{p}_1(\tilde{s}, \tilde{\zeta}_1, \tilde{\zeta}_2) - \mathbf{p}_1(s, \zeta_1, \zeta_2)\|}{\|(\tilde{s}, \tilde{\zeta}_1, \tilde{\zeta}_2) - (s, \zeta_1, \zeta_2)\|} < \infty \quad \forall (s, \zeta_1, \zeta_2) \in \Omega'_1,$$

where  $\Omega'_1$  is defined as  $\Omega_1 \setminus \Omega_1(\mathcal{I}_0)$  and

$$\Omega_1(\mathcal{I}_0) = \{(s, \zeta_1, \zeta_2) \in \Omega_1 : s \in \mathcal{I}_0\}.$$

Obviously<sup>2</sup>  $\mathcal{L}^3(\mathbf{p}_1[\mathbf{z}_1](\Omega_1(\mathcal{I}_0)))$  is equal to zero. By the coarea formula<sup>3</sup> ([13, pp. 243-244]), we have

$$\int_{\Omega'_1} (1 - \zeta_1 k'_1 - \zeta_2 k''_1) d(s, \zeta_1, \zeta_2) = \int_{\mathbf{p}_1(\Omega'_1)} \text{card}\{\mathbf{p}_1^{-1}(\mathbf{q})\} d\mathbf{q}, \tag{2.14}$$

where  $\mathbf{p}_1^{-1}$  is the inverse of the mapping  $\mathbf{p}_1$ . Therefore, using (2.12) and (2.14), it yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^3(\mathbf{p}_1[\mathbf{z}_1](\Omega_1)) &= \int_{\mathbf{p}_1[\mathbf{z}_1](\Omega_1)} d\mathbf{q} = \int_{\mathbf{p}_1[\mathbf{z}_1](\Omega_1(\mathcal{I}_0))} d\mathbf{q} \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbf{p}_1[\mathbf{z}_1](\Omega_1(\mathcal{I}_0))} \text{card}\{\mathbf{p}_1^{-1}(\mathbf{q})\} d\mathbf{q} = \int_{\Omega'_1} (1 - \zeta_1 k'_1 - \zeta_2 k''_1) d(s, \zeta_1, \zeta_2) \\ &= \int_{\Omega_1} (1 - \zeta_1 k'_1 - \zeta_2 k''_1) d(s, \zeta_1, \zeta_2) \leq \mathcal{L}^3(\mathbf{p}_1[\mathbf{z}_1](\Omega_1)). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\text{card}\{\mathbf{p}_1^{-1}(\mathbf{q})\} = 1 \quad \text{for almost all } \mathbf{q} \in \mathbf{p}_1[\mathbf{z}_1](\Omega_1), \tag{2.15}$$

<sup>2</sup>The complete proof of this statement is in [24]. However, we can give a simple and empirical idea of the proof: since  $\mathcal{I}_0$  has measure zero, the cross sections such that their arc-length parameter  $s$  belongs to  $\mathcal{I}_0$  are the elements of the set  $\Omega_1(\mathcal{I}_0)$ . Hence,  $\mathcal{L}^3(\Omega_1(\mathcal{I}_0)) = 0$ . But now, since  $\mathbf{p}_1$  is a regular function, we can think that *sets of measure zero are mapped into sets of measure zero*.

<sup>3</sup>Let us consider two locally Lipschitz continuous functions  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  with  $m \leq n$ . Then

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x) \sqrt{\det [dg(x)(dg(x))^T]} d\mathcal{L}^n(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \left( \int_{g^{-1}(y)} f(x) d\mathcal{H}^{n-m}(x) \right) d\mathcal{L}^m(y).$$

If  $m = n$ , the quantity  $\mathcal{H}^0 = \text{card}$ , i.e., the function which counts the elements of a set [13].

which combined with Theorem 2.3 will ensure the injectivity of  $\mathbf{p}_1$  on  $\text{int } \Omega_1$  and then the global injectivity of  $\mathbf{p}$  on  $\text{int } \Omega$ .  $\square$

Finally, the energy stored in a film that will deform the link is defined as

$$E_{\text{film}}(S) = 2\sigma \mathcal{H}^2(S), \tag{2.16}$$

where  $\mathcal{H}^d$  represents the  $d$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure. When a soap film is in stable equilibrium, as in equation (2.16), any small change in its area,  $S$ , will produce a corresponding change in its energy  $E$ , providing  $\sigma$  remains constant. As  $E_{\text{film}}$  is minimized when the film is in stable equilibrium,  $S$  will be minimized. Precisely, in (2.16), we do not consider what happens between the film and the bounding loop, i.e., the energy associated with the liquid/solid interface.

Anyway, we still cannot provide the final expression for the energy since we have not yet specified how the film is attached to each loop. Since in our case we have a boundary with nonvanishing thickness, to formulate the idea of a solution we have to give a good definition of the terms *surface*, *area*, and *contact*, which we will call *span*. We need also a precise mathematical formulation of the conditions which explain how the liquid film spans the bounding loop without detaching from it, after which we will end up with the final expression of the functional to be minimized. We begin with some recalls of topology.

DEFINITION 2.5. Let  $H = \cup_{j \in J} H_j$  be a closed compact three-dimensional submanifold of  $\mathbb{E}^3$  consisting of connected components  $H_j$ . We say that a circle  $\gamma$  embedded in  $\mathbb{E}^3 \setminus H$  is a *simple link* of  $H$  if there exists  $i \in J$  such that the linking numbers  $L(\gamma, H_j)$  verify

$$|L(\gamma, H_i)| = 1, \quad L(\gamma, H_j) = 0 \quad j \neq i.$$

Clearly, a simple link “winds around” only one component of  $H$  (see Figure 2). Precisely, the definition of the linking number between a closed subset and a curve is exactly the one given before (Definition 2.2) by considering a compactification of  $\mathbb{E}^3$  (for more details see [23, pp. 132-136]).

DEFINITION 2.6. We say that a compact subset  $K \subseteq \mathbb{E}^3$  *spans*  $H$  if every simple link of  $H$  intersects  $K$ .

This idea is crucial: we need spanning sets (in simple cases, surfaces) crossing every simple link: in this way it is impossible for  $K$  to be “detached” from  $H$ , or having “holes” which are not occupied by other components of  $H$  (see Figure 2). However, in our case we need a still more general definition, because in our problem  $H$  is not given a priori since  $H = \Lambda[\mathbf{z}]$ , i.e., it depends on the considered configuration.

Now let  $H$  be a closed subset of  $\mathbb{E}^3$  and consider the family

$$C_H = \{\gamma : \mathbb{S}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{E}^3 \setminus H : \gamma \text{ is a smooth embedding of } \mathbb{S}^1 \text{ into } \mathbb{E}^3\}.$$

A set  $C \subseteq C_H$  is said to be *closed by homotopy* (with respect to  $H$ ) if it contains all elements belonging to the same homotopy class.

DEFINITION 2.7. Given  $C \subseteq C_H$  closed by homotopy, we say that a relatively closed subset  $K \subset \mathbb{E}^3 \setminus H$  is a *C-spanning* set of  $H$  if

$$K \cap \gamma \neq \emptyset \quad \forall \gamma \in C.$$

We denote by  $F(H, C)$  the family of all  $C$ -spanning sets of  $H$ .



Notice that the set spanned by the surface can be any closed set in  $\mathbb{E}^3$ , so we can consider  $H = \Lambda[\mathbf{z}]$  with finite cross section, as in our case and not only a line as in Plateau's problem. Nevertheless, the spanning surface depends only on the choice of the homotopy class and not to the configuration  $\mathbf{z}$ . Hence, we can give the following definition.

DEFINITION 2.8. We call a set  $D_{\Lambda[\mathbf{z}]} \subseteq C_{\Lambda[\mathbf{z}]}$  a  $D_{\Lambda[\mathbf{z}]}$ -spanning set of  $\Lambda[\mathbf{z}]$  if it contains all the smooth embeddings  $\gamma$  which are not homotopic to a constant and which have linking number one with both rods. For the sake of brevity, we will write  $D$  in place of  $D_{\Lambda[\mathbf{z}]}$ .

Finally, we denote  $F(\Lambda[\mathbf{z}], D)$  the family of  $D$ -spanning sets of  $\Lambda[\mathbf{z}]$  with linking number one with both components (see Figure 2).




FIG. 2.  $\gamma_i$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ) are simple links for  $H_i$  while  $\gamma_3 \in F(\Lambda[\mathbf{w}])$ . Even if  $K$  is not  $D$ -spanning for the whole system, notice how  $\gamma_1 \cap K \neq \emptyset$ .

We are now in position to set the energy functional for our problem. We set

$$E_{\text{KP}}[\mathbf{z}] := E_{\text{loop}}[\mathbf{z}] + \inf\{E_{\text{fil}}(S) : S \text{ is a } D\text{-spanning set of } \Lambda[\mathbf{z}]\}, \tag{2.17}$$

where  $\mathbf{z} \in V$  and verifies all the above-mentioned constraints. Precisely, the inf in the equation (2.17) is necessary since we want to eliminate the dependence on the spanning surface  $S$  and write everything in the terms of the configuration  $\mathbf{z}$  only.

At this point a first important result holds.

THEOREM 2.9. Let two circumferences  $\eta_i : [0, L_i] \rightarrow \mathbb{E}^3$  and  $M \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$  three constants be given. Then, the set

$$U_{M, n_i, \eta_i} := \{\mathbf{z} = (\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_2, \hat{\mathbf{v}}_2) \in V = V_1 \times V_2 : E_{\text{loop}}[\mathbf{z}] < M; \tag{2.4}, (2.5), (2.12), \text{ and } (2.13) \text{ hold}; L(\mathbf{z}_i) = n_i; \tag{2.18} \\ L_{12} = 1 \text{ and } (\mathbf{r}_1[\mathbf{z}_1], \mathbf{r}_2[\mathbf{z}_2]) \simeq (\eta_1, \eta_2)\}$$

is weakly closed in  $V$ .

*Proof.* If  $U_{M, n_i, \eta_i} = \emptyset$  the thesis is obviously true.

If  $U_{M, n_i, \eta_i} \neq \emptyset$ , it is an extension to Schuricht's theorems 3.9, 4.5, and 4.6 in [24], by remembering that

$$\mathbf{p} = (\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2), \quad \mathbf{z} = (\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2).$$

Moreover, since  $\mathbf{p}_i$  are two open maps and  $\Omega_i$  are the closure of two open sets in  $\mathbb{E}^3$ , condition (2.13) yields the intersection of two closed sets, which is obviously a closed set and concludes the proof.  $\square$

**3. Main results.** Now we want to prove the existence of a solution to the Kirchhoff-Plateau problem, i.e., the existence of a minimizer of  $E_{\text{KP}}$  given by (2.17) in the class  $U_{M,n_i,\eta_i}$ . As a first step we find a minimizer of each of its two terms. Obviously, we cannot say that the solution of our problem will be the sum of them, but this will be useful to prove the main result.

3.1. *Energy minimizer for the bounding loop.* For the first term in the right-hand side of (2.17) we use a quite straightforward application of the direct method of the Calculus of Variations. Recall that its expression is

$$E_{\text{loop}}[\mathbf{z}] : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$$

$$\mathbf{z} \mapsto E_{\text{loop}}[\mathbf{z}] = E_{\text{el}}[\mathbf{z}] + E_{\text{g}}[\mathbf{z}] = \int_I f(\mathbf{z}(\xi), \xi) d\xi + E_{\text{g}}[\mathbf{z}].$$

In order to verify if we can apply this method to  $E_{\text{loop}}$ , we follow the following steps.

First, we need to show that  $E_{\text{loop}}$  is bounded from below and proper, i.e.,  $E_{\text{loop}} \neq +\infty$ .  $E_{\text{el}}$  is proper by definition. As for the boundedness, we can focus only on  $E_{\text{el}}$ , because  $E_{\text{g}}$  is always bounded from below, since the midline is bounded. Therefore, by (2.7) we immediately obtain

$$E_{\text{el}_i}[\mathbf{z}] \geq C_i \int_0^{L_i} |\mathbf{z}_i|^p ds + D_i L_i \geq D_i L_i > -\infty. \tag{3.1}$$

Hence,  $E_{\text{loop}}$  is bounded from below and moreover  $E_{\text{loop}}[\mathbf{z}] = +\infty$  only under complete compression.

Next, consider a sequence  $\{\mathbf{z}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that

$$\lim_k E_{\text{loop}}[\mathbf{z}_k] = \inf_{\mathbf{z} \in V} E_{\text{loop}}[\mathbf{z}] = m.$$

Obviously, it exists  $\bar{k}$  such that  $\forall k \geq \bar{k}$

$$E_{\text{loop}}[\mathbf{z}_k] \leq m + 1.$$

Now, we notice that this sequence is bounded: this follows easily from the boundedness of the clamping parameters and by coercivity, since

$$\int_0^{L_i} |\mathbf{z}_{i_k}|^p dx \leq \frac{1}{C_i} \int_0^{L_i} f_i(\mathbf{z}_{i_k}(s), s) ds - \frac{D_i L_i}{C_i} \leq \frac{1}{C_i} (m + 1) - \frac{D_i L_i}{C_i} \leq A,$$

where  $A > 0$  is a constant. Since  $V$  is a reflexive space,  $\mathbf{z}_k$  admits a weakly convergent subsequence, i.e., up to subsequences one has

$$\exists \mathbf{z} \in V : \quad \mathbf{z}_k \rightharpoonup \mathbf{z}.$$

Now we show that  $E_{\text{loop}}[\mathbf{z}]$  is weakly-lower semicontinuous (wlsc) in  $V$ . Remember that  $E_{\text{loop}} = E_{\text{el}} + E_{\text{g}}$  and all linear functionals are wlsc, so we can focus on the total stored energy  $E_{\text{el}}$ . By assumptions made on  $E_{\text{el}_i}$ , i.e., the hypotheses made on  $f_i$ , we obtain first that  $E_{\text{el}}$  is wlsc and then the total energy associated to the bounding loop.

To introduce and to prove the following theorem, we have to remember that we are looking for the solution of our problem not in a generic Banach space but in  $U_{M,n,\eta_i}$ ,

i.e., it has to satisfy the physical and the topological constraints imposed to the problem. Therefore we have the following.

**THEOREM 3.1.** If there is at least one admissible

$$\bar{\mathbf{z}} = (\bar{\mathbf{z}}_1, \bar{\mathbf{z}}_2) \in U_{M, n_i, \eta_i}$$

with  $M \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $n_i \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $\eta_i : [0, L_i] \rightarrow \mathbb{E}^3$ , then the variational problem described above has a minimizer, i.e., there exists a minimizer  $\mathbf{z} \in U_{M, n_i, \eta_i}$  for the loop energy functional.

*Proof.* Since  $\bar{\mathbf{z}} \in U_{M, n_i, \eta_i}$ , i.e., it is a competitor,  $U_{M, n_i, \eta_i} \neq \emptyset$ . So, let  $\{\mathbf{z}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \in U_{M, n_i, \eta_i}$  be a minimizing sequence such that  $E_{\text{loop}}[\mathbf{z}_k] < M$  for some  $M \in \mathbb{R}$  be given.

By the coercivity of  $f_i$  with  $i = 1, 2$ , we obtain that  $U_{M, n_i, \eta_i}$  is a bounded subset in  $V$ . So, we can extract a weakly converging subsequence  $\mathbf{z}_{k_h} \rightharpoonup \mathbf{z}$ . Moreover, as  $U_{M, n_i, \eta_i}$  is weakly closed in  $V$  (Theorem 2.9), so  $\mathbf{z} \in U_{M, n_i, \eta_i}$ .

Finally, the weak lower semicontinuity of  $E_{\text{loop}}[\mathbf{z}]$  yields

$$E_{\text{loop}}[\mathbf{z}] \leq \liminf_h E_{\text{loop}}[\mathbf{z}_{k_h}] = \lim_k E_{\text{loop}}[\mathbf{z}_k] = \inf_{\mathbf{z} \in U_{M, n_i, \eta_i}} E_{\text{loop}}[\mathbf{z}],$$

where  $\mathbf{z}_{k_h}$  is a subsequence of the chosen minimizing sequence  $\mathbf{z}_k$ . Therefore, the weak limit  $\mathbf{z}$  is a global minimizer. □

**3.2. Area-minimizing spanning surface.** Up to now, we only proved the existence of an energy-minimizing configuration for the bounding loop in the absence of the liquid film. Now we want to show the existence of an area-minimizing spanning surface for the link.

If  $\Lambda[\mathbf{z}]$  is rigid, De Lellis et al. [7] proved an important result.

**THEOREM 3.2.** Fix  $\mathbf{z} \in V$ . If

$$m_0 := \inf\{E_{\text{film}}(S) : S \in F(\Lambda[\mathbf{z}], D)\} < +\infty,$$

then

- (1)  $F(\Lambda[\mathbf{z}], D)$  is a *good class*;
- (2) there exists  $K[\mathbf{z}]$  a relatively closed subset of  $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Lambda[\mathbf{z}]$  such that  $K[\mathbf{z}] \in F(\Lambda[\mathbf{z}], D)$  and  $K[\mathbf{z}]$  is a minimizer, i.e.,  $E_{\text{film}}(K[\mathbf{z}]) = m_0$ ;
- (3)  $K[\mathbf{z}]$  is a countably  $\mathcal{H}^2$ -rectifiable set and it is an  $(M, 0, \infty)$ -minimal set in  $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Lambda[\mathbf{z}]$  in the sense of Almgren.

For a precise definition of *good class* and  $(M, 0, \infty)$ -minimal set in the sense of Almgren, see, respectively, [7] and [1]. In our case the first one is just a family of subsets in which we can control their measures. Namely, there exists a selected and well-defined competitor  $L$  with finite two-dimensional Hausdorff measure which controls the measure of each element of the good class. The second one, instead, is a property of regularity on the subset  $K[\mathbf{z}]$ . The theorem is just a combination of Theorems 2 and 3 in [7].

**3.3. Main result.** Now we come to our main result. Since we are dealing with approximating surfaces, we need to specify the notion of convergence of surfaces. We do this following Giusteri et al. [14].

DEFINITION 3.3. Let  $A, B$  be two nonempty subsets of a metric space  $(M, d_M)$ . The Hausdorff distance between  $A$  and  $B$  is defined by

$$d_H(A, B) := \max\{\sup_{a \in A} \inf_{b \in B} d_M(a, b), \sup_{b \in B} \inf_{a \in A} d_M(a, b)\}.$$

If we consider all nonempty subsets of  $M$ , then  $d_H$  is a *pseudo-metric*, i.e., we can always find two subsets  $A, B$  with  $A \neq B$  such that  $d_H(A, B) = 0$ . However, the set  $K(M)$  of nonempty compact subsets of  $M$  is a metric space. Moreover, the topology induced by  $d_H$  on all closed nonempty subsets of  $M$  does not depend on  $d_M$  and it is called *Hausdorff topology*.

The problem we have to solve is connected to the fact that  $\Lambda[\mathbf{z}_k]$ , the closed subset in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  occupied by the whole link, changes along the minimizing sequence. So we have to consider sequences of nonempty closed sets, possibly converging to a closed set, which might be our minimal link.

THEOREM 3.4. Let  $\Lambda_k$  be a sequence of closed nonempty subsets of  $\mathbb{E}^3$  converging in the Hausdorff topology to a closed set  $\Lambda \neq \emptyset$ . Assume that

- i)  $\forall k \in \mathbb{N}, S_k \in F(\Lambda_k[\mathbf{z}], D)$ , where  $F(\Lambda_k[\mathbf{z}], D)$  is a good class;
- ii)  $S_k$  is a countably  $\mathcal{H}^2$ -rectifiable set;
- iii)  $\mathcal{H}^2(S_k) = \inf\{\mathcal{H}^2(S) : S \in F(\Lambda_k[\mathbf{z}], D)\} < +\infty$ .

Then the sequence of measures  $\mu_k := \mathcal{H}^2 \llcorner S_k$  is a bounded sequence,  $\mu_k \xrightarrow{*} \mu$ , up to subsequences, and

$$\mu \geq \mathcal{H}^2 \llcorner S_\infty, \text{ where } S_\infty = (\text{supt } \mu) \setminus \Lambda \text{ and it is an } \mathcal{H}^2\text{-rectifiable set.}$$

*Proof.* Let  $\mu_k = \mathcal{H}^2 \llcorner S_k$  and  $S_k \in F(\Lambda_k[\mathbf{z}], D)$ . Since  $F(\Lambda_k[\mathbf{z}], D)$  is a good class, for all  $J \in F(\Lambda_k[\mathbf{z}], D)$  one has

$$\mu_k(J) = \mathcal{H}^2 \llcorner S_k(J) = \mathcal{H}^2(S_k \cap J) \leq \mathcal{H}^2(J) \leq \mathcal{H}^2(L) < +\infty,$$

where  $L$  is the generic competitor in the *good class*. Hence,  $\mu_k$  is a bounded Radon measure, therefore ([12, pp. 54-59]), up to a subsequence (not relabeled),  $\mu_k \xrightarrow{*} \mu$ .

Now let  $f \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$  with  $0 \leq f \leq \chi_{B(x,r)}$ ; by the weak\* convergence of  $\mu_k$  we have

$$\int_{B(x,r)} f d\mu = \lim_k \int_{B(x,r)} f d\mu_k \leq \liminf_k \mu_k(B(x,r))$$

so that  $\mu(B(x,r)) \leq \liminf_k \mu_k(B(x,r))$ .

Since  $\Lambda_k \xrightarrow{H} \Lambda$ , for any  $x \in S_\infty = (\text{supt } \mu) \setminus \Lambda$  we can find a radius  $r$  such that

$$0 < r < d(x, \Lambda) \iff d(x, \Lambda_k) > \frac{1}{2} d(x, \Lambda).$$

Moreover, if we assume that  $\mu(\mathbb{R}^n) = \lim_k \mu_k(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , combining De Lellis' result with this additional specification, we have that

$$\mu = \theta \mathcal{H}^2 \llcorner S_\infty \text{ with } S_\infty = (\text{supt } \mu) \setminus \Lambda.$$

Indeed

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\mathbb{R}^n) &= \lim_k \mu_k(\mathbb{R}^n) \geq \liminf_k \mu_k(\mathbb{R}^n) \\ &= \liminf_k \mu_k(B(x, r)) + \liminf_k \mu_k(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B(x, r)}) \\ &\geq \mu(B(x, r)) + \mu(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B(x, r)}) = \mu(\mathbb{R}^n), \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

where the last equivalence is true because if a set  $\{r > 0 : \mu(\partial B(x, r)) \neq 0\}$  is countable, then its Lebesgue measure is zero. Finally,  $\mu(\mathbb{R}^n) = \lim_k \mu_k(\mathbb{R}^n)$  is obviously true because of the definition of  $\mu_k$  and the convergence in the Hausdorff topology.

Let's see that  $S_\infty$  is an  $\mathcal{H}^2$ -rectifiable set. If we fix  $x \in S_\infty$ , i.e.,  $d(x, \Lambda) > 0$ , the function  $r \mapsto \mu(B(x, r))/r^n$  is increasing on  $(0, d(x, \Lambda_k))$  (see, for instance, the Step two of the proof of [7, Thm.2]). By using Preiss' results [21], we can find immediately that

$$\mu = \theta \mathcal{H}^2 \llcorner \tilde{K},$$

where  $\tilde{K}$  is an  $\mathcal{H}^2$ -rectifiable set. By the definition of the support of a measure  $\tilde{K} = S_\infty$ . □

However, this is still not enough. Up to now, we proved in a separate way that the two functionals, the one associated with the elastic link and the other with the film, admit global minimizers.

Now, first we have to rewrite the second result in terms of the configurations of our system since we only prove the existence of the minimal surface in the presence of a changing boundary, and then we have to write the solution to our problem, i.e., making a balance of the two contributions.

**THEOREM 3.5.** Let us suppose that

- i)  $\{\mathbf{z}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq U_{M, n_i, \eta_i}$  a sequence such that  $\mathbf{z}_k \rightarrow \mathbf{z}$  with  $\mathbf{z} \in U_{M, n_i, \eta_i}$ ;
- ii)  $S_k \in F(\Lambda[\mathbf{z}_k], D)$ ;
- iii)  $\gamma$  is a smooth embedding like the one defined in Definition 2.8.

Then there exist two constants  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $M = M(\varepsilon) > 0$  such that  $U_{2\varepsilon}(\gamma) \subseteq \mathbb{E}^3 \setminus \Lambda[\mathbf{z}]$  and  $\forall k \geq k_0$

$$\mathcal{H}^2(S_k \cap U_\varepsilon(\gamma)) \geq M,$$

where  $U_r(\gamma)$  denotes the tubular neighborhood of radius  $r > 0$  around  $\gamma$ , namely the union of all balls of radius  $r$  centered at the points of  $\gamma$ .

Moreover, Theorem 3.5 says that the intersection between the sequence of the surface  $\{S_k\}$ , for large  $k$ , and a neighborhood of the smooth embedding  $\gamma$  is not a point but a set with positive measure. Since the tubular neighborhood  $U_\varepsilon(\gamma)$  depends only on the embedding  $\gamma$ , we can state that the surface  $S_\infty$  which realizes the area minimal set (Theorem 3.4) belongs to  $F(\Lambda[\mathbf{z}], D)$ . This theorem is fundamental in order to rewrite everything in terms of the configuration  $\mathbf{z}$  only, i.e., we solve the first gap mentioned before. Indeed, suppose Theorems 3.4 and 3.5 are true; if we assume by contradiction

that  $S_\infty \notin F(\Lambda[\mathbf{z}], D)$ , this would mean that

$$\exists \gamma \in D_{\Lambda[\mathbf{z}]} : \begin{cases} \gamma \cap S_\infty = \emptyset, \\ L(\gamma, \mathbf{r}_1) \neq 1, \\ L(\gamma, \mathbf{r}_2) \neq 1. \end{cases}$$

If  $\gamma \cap S_\infty = \emptyset$ , we have  $\mu(U_\varepsilon(\gamma)) = 0$ , with  $\varepsilon$  defined in Theorem 3.5. Hence

$$0 = \mu(U_\varepsilon(\gamma)) \geq \mathcal{H}^2 \llcorner S_\infty(U_\varepsilon(\gamma)) = \mathcal{H}^2(S_\infty \cap U_\varepsilon(\gamma)) = \lim_k \mathcal{H}^2(S_k \cap U_\varepsilon(\gamma))$$

which implies

$$\lim_k \mathcal{H}^2(S_k \cap U_\varepsilon(\gamma)) = 0,$$

which contradicts the thesis of Theorem 3.5. Precisely, both  $L(\gamma, \mathbf{r}_1) \neq 1$  and  $L(\gamma, \mathbf{r}_2) \neq 1$  cannot be achieved because the sequence of  $\Lambda_k$  converges in the Hausdorff topology, i.e., it implies a uniform convergence. Hence, we can state that  $F(\Lambda[\mathbf{z}], D)$  is a weakly closed subset with respect to the weak\* convergence.

Now, for the proof of Theorem 3.5, we can say that it is similar to the one presented by Giusteri et al. [14] with some modifications. Remember that we are considering a link so, for example, the constant  $\varepsilon$  is the same for the whole system and we have to consider the embedding which has the linking number equal to one with both the filaments.

We are now ready to prove our final and main result.

**THEOREM 3.6.** Let  $M \in \mathbb{R}$ , let  $n_i \in \mathbb{N}$  and let  $\eta_i : [0, L_i] \rightarrow \mathbb{E}^3$  be two circumferences. If there exists  $\tilde{\mathbf{z}} = (\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_1, \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_2) \in U_{M, n_i, \eta_i}$ , then there exists a solution  $\mathbf{z} \in U_{M, n_i, \eta_i}$  to the Kirchhoff-Plateau problem, i.e., there exists a minimizer  $\mathbf{z}$  for the energy functional  $E_{KP}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\{\mathbf{z}_k\}$  be a minimizing sequence for  $E_{KP}$ . First of all, by coercivity, we have

$$E_{\text{loop}}[\mathbf{z}_k] \leq C_1, \quad \mathcal{H}^2(S_k) \leq C_2,$$

where  $C_1, C_2 > 0$  and  $S_k \in F(\Lambda[\mathbf{z}], D)$ . Precisely, if  $\mathbf{z}_k \in U_{M, n_i, \eta_i}$ , by weak closure we can extract a subsequence  $\mathbf{z}_{k_i}$  such that

$$\mathbf{z}_{k_i} \rightharpoonup \mathbf{z},$$

where  $\mathbf{z} \in U_{M, n_i, \eta_i}$ . Now  $E_{KP}$  is wslc on  $V$ . Indeed, by Theorem 3.1,  $E_{\text{loop}}$  is wslc, so we only need to show that the functional

$$\mathbf{z} \mapsto \inf\{\mathcal{H}^2(S) : S \in F(\Lambda[\mathbf{z}], D)\} \text{ is WLSC.} \quad (3.3)$$

To this end, consider  $S_k \in F(\Lambda[\mathbf{z}_k], D)$  such that

$$\mathcal{H}^2(S_k) = \inf\{\mathcal{H}^2(S) : S \in F(\Lambda[\mathbf{z}_k], D)\} < \infty.$$

Notice that since  $\mathbf{z}_k \rightarrow \mathbf{z}$  in  $V$  we can say that the sequence of corresponding midlines converges uniformly. Hence,  $\Lambda[\mathbf{z}_k]$  converges in the Hausdorff topology to  $\Lambda[\mathbf{z}]$ . By Theorem 3.4, we find immediately that

$$\mu \geq \mathcal{H}^2 \llcorner S_\infty,$$

where  $S_\infty = \text{supt } \mu \setminus \Lambda[\mathbf{z}]$  and it belongs to  $F(\Lambda[\mathbf{z}], D)$ , by the previous remarks. Hence, we obtain the chain of inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_k \inf \{ \mathcal{H}^2(S) : S \in F(\Lambda[\mathbf{z}_k], D) \} \\ \geq \liminf_k (\mathcal{H}^2(S_k)) = \liminf_k \mu_k(\mathbb{R}^3) = \mu(\mathbb{R}^3) \\ \geq \mathcal{H}^2(S_\infty) \geq \inf \{ \mathcal{H}^2(S) : S \in F(\Lambda[\mathbf{z}], D) \}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

which establishes the lower semicontinuity of the functional (3.3) and so the existence of the solution. □

**4. Some simple experiments.** Finally, we tried to get some hint and confirmation reproducing our problem in the laboratory. The film was a solution of 81% water, 16% glycerine, 3% of common dish soap, and we added a spoon of baking powder to make it more resistant.

In the first example we took two fixed linked rigid metallic wires in the configuration of Fig. 1, and we observed first a locally minimal configuration consisting of a plane surface and a  $D$ -spanning set in the sense of our definition. Once the extra surface was removed, the remaining surface seemed to be the minimum surface (Fig. 3).

In the second experiment, for practical reasons, we took a fixed rigid metallic wire as the first rod, while the second was a 0.5 mm thick slender fishing line, twisted by 4 turns and then glued together. The pictures (Fig. 4) show the existence of a configuration balancing the weight of the line with the energy coming from the film.




FIG. 3. Results obtained by our configuration with two fixed linked rigid metallic wires.




FIG. 4. Results obtained by our configuration with the mobile component.

**Acknowledgments.** The authors wish to thank Marco Degiovanni and Giulio Giuseppe Giusteri for helpful suggestions and fruitful discussions. The work was partially supported by INdAM–GNFM (Bevilacqua, Marzocchi) and INdAM–GNAMPA (Lussardi).

#### REFERENCES

- [1] F. J. Almgren Jr., *Existence and regularity almost everywhere of solutions to elliptic variational problems among surfaces of varying topological type and singularity structure*, Ann. of Math. (2) **87** (1968), 321–391, DOI 10.2307/1970587. MR0225243
- [2] S. S. Antman, *Nonlinear problems of elasticity*, 2nd ed., Applied Mathematical Sciences, vol. 107, Springer, New York, 2005. MR2132247
- [3] P. G. Ciarlet and J. Nečas, *Injectivity and self-contact in nonlinear elasticity*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **97** (1987), no. 3, 171–188, DOI 10.1007/BF00250807. MR862546
- [4] B. Dacorogna, *Direct methods in the calculus of variations*, 2nd ed., Applied Mathematical Sciences, vol. 78, Springer, New York, 2008. MR2361288
- [5] G. David, *Should we solve Plateau’s problem again?*, Advances in analysis: the legacy of Elias M. Stein, Princeton Math. Ser., vol. 50, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ, 2014, pp. 108–145. MR3329849
- [6] C. De Lellis, A. De Rosa, and F. Ghiraldin, *A direct approach to the anisotropic Plateau’s problem*, Adv. Calc. Var. arXiv:1602.08757, DOI:https://doi.org/10.1515/acv-2016-0057.
- [7] C. De Lellis, F. Ghiraldin, and F. Maggi, *A direct approach to Plateau’s problem*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **19** (2017), no. 8, 2219–2240, DOI 10.4171/JEMS/716. MR3668059
- [8] T. De Pauw, *Size minimizing surfaces* (English, with English and French summaries), Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4) **42** (2009), no. 1, 37–101, DOI 10.24033/asens.2090. MR2518893
- [9] G. De Philippis, A. De Rosa, and F. Ghiraldin, *A direct approach to Plateau’s problem in any codimension*, Adv. Math. **288** (2016), 59–80, DOI 10.1016/j.aim.2015.10.007. MR3436382
- [10] G. De Philippis, A. De Rosa, and F. Ghiraldin, *Existence results for minimizers of parametric elliptic functionals*, arXiv:1704.07801.
- [11] A. De Rosa, *Minimization of anisotropic energies in classes of rectifiable varifolds*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **50** (2018), no. 1, 162–181, DOI 10.1137/17M1112479. MR3742687
- [12] L. C. Evans and R. F. Gariepy, *Measure theory and fine properties of functions*, Studies in Advanced Mathematics, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 1992. MR1158660
- [13] H. Federer, *Geometric measure theory*, Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 153, Springer-Verlag New York Inc., New York, 1969. MR0257325
- [14] G. G. Giusteri, L. Lussardi, and E. Fried, *Solution of the Kirchhoff-Plateau problem*, J. Nonlinear Sci. **27** (2017), no. 3, 1043–1063, DOI 10.1007/s00332-017-9359-4. MR3638328



- [15] J. Harrison and H. Pugh, *Existence and soap film regularity of solutions to Plateau's problem*, arXiv:1310.0508 (2013).
- [16] J. Harrison, *Soap film solutions to Plateau's problem*, J. Geom. Anal. **24** (2014), no. 1, 271–297, DOI 10.1007/s12220-012-9337-x. MR3145925
- [17] P. Hartman, *Ordinary differential equations*, 2nd ed., Birkhäuser, Boston, Mass., 1982. MR658490
- [18] A. Mukherjee, *Differential topology*, 2nd ed., Hindustan Book Agency, New Delhi; Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2015. MR3379695
- [19] J. R. Munkres, *Topology*, Prentice Hall, Inc., Upper Saddle River, NJ, 2000. Second edition of [MR0464128]. MR3728284
- [20] J. Plateau, *Experimental and theoretical statics of liquids subject to molecular forces only*, Gauthier-Villars (1873).
- [21] D. Preiss, *Geometry of measures in  $\mathbf{R}^n$ : distribution, rectifiability, and densities*, Ann. of Math. (2) **125** (1987), no. 3, 537–643, DOI 10.2307/1971410. MR890162
- [22] E. R. Reifenberg, *Solution of the Plateau Problem for  $m$ -dimensional surfaces of varying topological type*, Acta Math. **104** (1960), 1–92, DOI 10.1007/BF02547186. MR0114145
- [23] D. Rolfsen, *Knots and links*, Publish or Perish, Inc., Berkeley, Calif., 1976. Mathematics Lecture Series, No. 7. MR0515288
- [24] F. Schuricht, *Global injectivity and topological constraints for spatial nonlinearly elastic rods*, J. Nonlinear Sci. **12** (2002), no. 5, 423–444, DOI 10.1007/s00332-002-0462-8. MR1923387