

SMOOTH COMPACTNESS OF ELASTICAE

TATSUYA MIURA

ABSTRACT. We prove a smooth compactness theorem for the space of elasticae, unless the limit curve is a straight segment. As an application, we obtain smooth stability results for minimizers with respect to clamped boundary data.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
1.1. Smooth compactness	1
1.2. Smooth stability for boundary value problems	3
2. Compactness	5
2.1. Smooth convergence	5
2.2. Counterexamples	9
3. Stability	10
3.1. Fixed-length case	10
3.2. Length-penalized case	12
References	14

1. INTRODUCTION

Elastica theory is fairly classical, dating back to early modern times [5, 12], but some of its fundamental properties are still missing in the literature.

In this paper we address a compactness problem for the space of elasticae under natural boundedness assumptions. This problem, despite its fundamental nature, proves to be somewhat subtle. Our main result shows that smooth compactness holds true generically, but may fail in the exceptional case that the limit curve is a straight segment. As an application, we clarify necessary assumptions so that smooth stability results hold for minimizers of clamped boundary value problems. This result is directly pertinent to describing physical stability of elastic rods or surfaces with respect to boundary data.

1.1. Smooth compactness. Let $n \geq 2$ and $I = (0, 1)$. An immersed curve $\gamma \in W^{2,2}(I; \mathbf{R}^n)$ is called an *elastica* if it is a critical point of the *bending energy*

$$\mathcal{B}[\gamma] := \int_I |\kappa|^2 ds$$

Date: September 4, 2024.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 53A04 and 49Q10.

Key words and phrases. Elastica, compactness, boundary value problem, stability.

among curves with fixed length $\mathcal{L}[\gamma] := \int_I ds$. Here ds denotes the arclength measure $ds := |\partial_x \gamma| dx$, and $\kappa := \gamma_{ss}$ denotes the curvature vector, where the arclength derivative is defined by $\partial_s := |\partial_x \gamma|^{-1} \partial_x$. Recall that the curve γ is an elastica if and only if there is a multiplier $\lambda \in \mathbf{R}$ such that $\nabla \mathcal{B}[\gamma] + \lambda \nabla \mathcal{L}[\gamma] = 0$. By standard regularity arguments (see e.g. [6]) any elastica is analytic (up to constant-speed reparametrization) and solves the Euler–Lagrange equation in the classical sense:

$$(1.1) \quad 2\nabla_s^2 \kappa + |\kappa|^2 \kappa - \lambda \kappa = 0,$$

where ∇_s denotes the normal derivative $\nabla_s X := X_s^\perp = X_s - \langle X_s, \gamma_s \rangle \gamma_s$.

Here is our main result on compactness of elasticae.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\{\gamma_j\}_{j=1}^\infty \subset W^{2,2}(I; \mathbf{R}^n)$ be a sequence of elasticae such that*

(A) *there exists $C > 0$ such that $\mathcal{B}[\gamma_j] \leq C$ and $\frac{1}{C} \leq \mathcal{L}[\gamma_j] \leq C$ for all j .*

Let $\bar{\gamma}_j \in C^\omega(\bar{I}; \mathbf{R}^n)$ denote the constant-speed reparametrization of γ_j . Then there are translation vectors $b_j \in \mathbf{R}^n$ such that the sequence $\{\bar{\gamma}_j + b_j\}$ contains a subsequence $\{\bar{\gamma}_{j'} + b_{j'}\}$ converging to some constant-speed elastica $\bar{\gamma}_\infty \in C^\omega(\bar{I}; \mathbf{R}^n)$ in the $W^{2,2}$ -weak topology and the C^1 topology.

In addition, if $\bar{\gamma}_\infty$ is not a straight segment, then the convergence holds in the smooth sense, that is, $\lim_{j' \rightarrow \infty} \|\bar{\gamma}_{j'} + b_{j'} - \bar{\gamma}_\infty\|_{C^m(\bar{I}; \mathbf{R}^n)} = 0$ for any $m \geq 0$.

Remark 1.2. Without the additional assumption for smooth convergence, even $W^{2,2}$ -strong convergence may fail. We will give planar counterexamples of both curvature oscillation type in Example 2.4 (see Figure 1) and of concentration type in Example 2.5 (see Figure 2). In particular, those examples imply that adding an assumption of the form $\inf_j \mathcal{B}[\gamma_j] \geq \frac{1}{C}$ cannot prevent nonsmooth convergence.



FIGURE 1. Counterexample of curvature oscillation type.



FIGURE 2. Counterexample of curvature concentration type.

Remark 1.3. If the original sequence $\{\gamma_j\}$ is also bounded in L^∞ , or more generally $\sup_j \min_{x \in \bar{I}} |\gamma_j(x)| < \infty$, then there is no need to take translation vectors $\{b_j\}$, since in this case $\{b_j\}$ must be bounded and thus have a convergent subsequence.

We briefly discuss the idea of the proof of Theorem 1.1. The first assertion is a simple consequence of standard weak compactness. The main point is when this weak convergence improves smooth convergence. Here we focus on the behavior of the corresponding sequence of multipliers $\{\lambda_j\}$. In fact, we will prove the following dichotomy:

- If $\sup_j |\lambda_j| < \infty$, then the convergence is smooth (Proposition 2.2).
- If $\sup_j |\lambda_j| = \infty$, then the limit is a segment (Proposition 2.3).

The first part is now reduced to standard interpolation arguments, while the latter involves a singular limit and requires more delicate arguments concerning the moduli space of elasticae.

A major benefit of Theorem 1.1 is that, under (A), smooth convergence follows by only checking a purely geometric property, without any information on the multipliers. This point is particularly important when studying fixed-length problems, in which multipliers are not a priori controlled.

1.2. Smooth stability for boundary value problems. Theorem 1.1 can be used to show fundamental stability results for elasticae with respect to parameter-perturbations in various boundary value problems. Here we focus on energy-minimal elasticae subject to the clamped boundary condition, and also on smooth convergence in the full limit (without taking a subsequence).

Let $\mathbf{X} := \mathbf{R}^n \times \mathbf{R}^n \times \mathbf{S}^{n-1} \times \mathbf{S}^{n-1}$, where $\mathbf{S}^{n-1} \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ denotes the unit sphere. Given parameters $\Gamma = (P_0, P_1, V_0, V_1) \in \mathbf{X}$ and $L > 0$, we define the admissible set (of constant-speed curves) by

$$\mathcal{A}_{\Gamma,L} := \left\{ \gamma \in W^{2,2}(I; \mathbf{R}^n) \left| \begin{array}{l} \gamma(0) = P_0, \gamma(1) = P_1, \\ \gamma_s(0) = V_0, \gamma_s(1) = V_1, |\partial_x \gamma| \equiv \mathcal{L}[\gamma] \end{array} \right. \right\}.$$

Let

$$\hat{\mathbf{A}} := \{(\Gamma, L) \in \mathbf{X} \times (0, \infty) \mid \mathcal{A}_{\Gamma,L} \neq \emptyset\}.$$

It is geometrically clear that $\hat{\mathbf{A}} = \hat{\mathbf{A}}' \cup \hat{\mathbf{A}}_s$, where

$$\hat{\mathbf{A}}' := \{|P_1 - P_0| < L\}, \quad \hat{\mathbf{A}}_s := \{|P_1 - P_0| = L, V_0 = V_1 = \frac{P_1 - P_0}{L}\}.$$

These sets are distinguished by whether a straight segment is admissible. Of course, the former set $\hat{\mathbf{A}}'$ is much more important as it contains generic parameters.

In view of Theorem 1.1, we are tempted to focus on parameters within $\hat{\mathbf{A}}'$. This restriction is however not sufficient for ensuring convergence of minimizers. In fact, for each $(\Gamma, L) \in \hat{\mathbf{A}}$ there always exists a minimizer of the bending energy \mathcal{B} in $\mathcal{A}_{\Gamma,L}$ ([6, Theorem 3.1]), and such a minimizer must be a smooth elastica ([6, Theorem 3.6]), but minimizers may not be unique in general (see [7, Figure 5]). The lack of uniqueness directly causes a “jump” discontinuity, which one also needs to avoid.

Based on the above observations, we obtain the following smooth stability result for minimizers under sharp assumptions.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $(\Gamma, L) \in \hat{\mathbf{A}}'$. Suppose that \mathcal{B} has a unique minimizer γ in $\mathcal{A}_{\Gamma,L}$. Then, for any sequence $\{(\Gamma_j, L_j)\}_{j=1}^\infty \subset \hat{\mathbf{A}}$ converging to (Γ, L) , and for any sequence $\{\gamma_j\}$ of minimizers γ_j of \mathcal{B} in $\mathcal{A}_{\Gamma_j, L_j}$,*

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|\gamma_j - \gamma\|_{C^m(\bar{I}; \mathbf{R}^n)} = 0 \quad \text{for all } m \geq 0.$$

Finally, for comparison purposes, we also obtain a similar result to the length-penalized problem. More precisely, given $\Gamma \in \mathbf{X}$ and $\lambda > 0$, we minimize the *modified bending energy*

$$\mathcal{E}_\lambda := \mathcal{B} + \lambda \mathcal{L}$$

among curves in the admissible set

$$\mathcal{A}_\Gamma := \bigcup_{L>0} \mathcal{A}_{\Gamma,L}.$$

Notice that $\mathcal{A}_\Gamma \neq \emptyset$ for every $\Gamma \in \mathbf{X}$. As in the fixed-length case, we distinguish the parameters depending on whether straight segments are admissible:

$$\mathbf{X}' := \mathbf{X} \setminus \mathbf{X}_s, \quad \mathbf{X}_s := \{P_0 \neq P_1, V_0 = V_1 = \frac{P_1 - P_0}{|P_1 - P_0|}\}.$$

In addition, also in this case, minimizers always exist (Theorem 3.7) but may not be unique. (For $\lambda \leq 0$, minimizers may not even exist.)

Theorem 1.5. *Let $(\Gamma, \lambda) \in \mathbf{X}' \times (0, \infty)$. Suppose that \mathcal{E}_λ has a unique minimizer γ in \mathcal{A}_Γ . Then, for any sequence $\{(\Gamma_j, \lambda_j)\}_{j=1}^\infty \subset \mathbf{X} \times (0, \infty)$ converging to (Γ, λ) , and for any sequence $\{\gamma_j\}$ of minimizers γ_j of \mathcal{E}_{λ_j} in \mathcal{A}_{Γ_j} ,*

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|\gamma_j - \gamma\|_{C^m(\bar{I}; \mathbf{R}^n)} = 0 \quad \text{for all } m \geq 0.$$

The proof has a slightly different flavor than the fixed-length case. Here the multipliers are a priori controlled, but instead the length is not. In particular, the assumption of Theorem 1.5 rules out discontinuous transitions as in Figure 3.




FIGURE 3. Discontinuous transition of minimizers of \mathcal{E}_λ .

Remark 1.6. General structures of the subsets of admissible parameters on which uniqueness holds are not known. Some observations on global minimality are given e.g. in [1, 7–10], mainly for $n = 2$. In particular, in [7, 8] it is shown that if $n = 2$ and if Γ satisfies the “generic boundary angle” assumption in the sense that

$$\max_{i=0,1} |\langle P_1 - P_0, V_i \rangle| < |P_1 - P_0|,$$

then for any small $L > |P_1 - P_0|$ (resp. small $\lambda > 0$) there exists a unique minimizer of \mathcal{B} in $\mathcal{A}_{\Gamma, L}$ (resp. of \mathcal{E}_λ in \mathcal{A}_Γ). It is an interesting open problem to deepen the understanding of the structure of those uniqueness sets.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we prove Theorem 1.1 and discuss counterexamples. In Section 3 we prove Theorems 1.4 and 1.5.

Acknowledgements. This work grew out of discussions with Georg Dolzmann and Glen Wheeler, whom the author would like to thank. This work is supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers JP21H00990, JP23H00085, and JP24K00532.

2. COMPACTNESS

We begin with a standard weak compactness for general bounded sequences.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\{\gamma_j\}_{j=1}^\infty \subset W^{2,2}(I; \mathbf{R}^n)$ be a sequence of constant-speed curves satisfying (A) and $\sup_j |\gamma_j(0)| < \infty$. Then $\{\bar{\gamma}_j\}$ contains a subsequence converging to some $\gamma_\infty \in W^{2,2}(I; \mathbf{R}^n)$ in the $W^{2,2}$ -weak topology and the C^1 topology. In particular, γ_∞ is a constant-speed curve of positive length.*

Proof. By the boundedness and constant-speed assumptions, we deduce

$$\sup_j \|\partial_x \gamma_j\|_{L^2} = \sup_j \mathcal{L}[\gamma_j] < \infty$$

and also

$$\sup_j \|\gamma_j\|_{L^2} \leq \sup_j \|\gamma_j\|_{L^\infty} \leq \sup_j (|\gamma_j(0)| + \mathcal{L}[\gamma_j]) < \infty.$$

In addition, since

$$\mathcal{B}[\gamma_j] = \int_I |\partial_s^2 \gamma_j|^2 ds = \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}[\gamma_j]^3} \int_I |\partial_x^2 \gamma_j|^2 dx,$$

we also have

$$\sup_j \|\partial_x^2 \gamma_j\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \sup_j \mathcal{L}[\gamma_j]^3 \mathcal{B}[\gamma_j] < \infty.$$

These imply that $\{\gamma_j\}$ is bounded in $W^{2,2}(I; \mathbf{R}^n)$, thus having a subsequence that $W^{2,2}$ -weakly converges to some $\gamma_\infty \in W^{2,2}(I; \mathbf{R}^n)$. Compact Sobolev embedding $W^{2,2}(I; \mathbf{R}^n) \subset\subset C^1(\bar{I}; \mathbf{R}^n)$ also implies C^1 -convergence (passing to a subsequence). Hence γ_∞ must have constant speed $|\partial_x \gamma_\infty| \equiv \mathcal{L}[\gamma_\infty] \geq \inf_j \mathcal{L}[\gamma_j] > 0$. \square

2.1. Smooth convergence. Now we discuss when the above weak convergence becomes smooth, assuming that the sequence consists of elasticae. As explained in the introduction, we look at the behavior of multipliers. If an elastica solves equation (1.1) with multiplier $\lambda \in \mathbf{R}$, then we also call it λ -*elastica* to specify the value of λ . Note that λ is uniquely determined by a given elastica unless it is a segment (for which any λ is allowable).

We first prove that if the multipliers are uniformly bounded, then smooth convergence follows by Gagliardo–Nirenberg type interpolation estimates. This technique is by now standard in the study of elastic flows since Dziuk–Kuwert–Schätzle’s pioneering work [3]. Here we use results for open elastic flows in [2]. The main advantages are direct applicability to our non-closed elasticae (as stationary solutions) and also their explicit dependence on λ .

Proposition 2.2. *Let $\{\gamma_j\}_{j=1}^\infty \subset C^\omega(\bar{I}; \mathbf{R}^n)$ be a sequence of constant-speed λ_j -elasticae satisfying (A) and converging to some curve γ_∞ in the C^1 topology. Suppose that $\sup_j |\lambda_j| < \infty$. Then $\{\gamma_j\}$ smoothly converges to γ_∞ , and γ_∞ is an elastica.*

Proof. Since each γ_j satisfies the assumption of [2, Lemma 3.1] (as a stationary solution), the proof of [2, Lemma 4.4] together with the boundedness assumptions

$$B := \sup_j \mathcal{B}[\gamma_j] < \infty, \quad L_* := \inf_j \mathcal{L}[\gamma_j] > 0, \quad \Lambda := \sup_j |\lambda_j| < \infty$$

implies that for every $m \geq 0$ there is $C = C(n, m, B, L_*, \Lambda) > 0$ such that

$$\sup_j \|\nabla_s^m \kappa_j\|_{L^2} \leq C.$$

Hence by [2, Lemma 4.6] we also have (up to redefining C)

$$\sup_j \|\partial_s^m \kappa_j\|_{L^2} \leq C.$$

Since $\partial_s^m \kappa_j = \partial_s^{m+2} \gamma_j = \mathcal{L}[\gamma_j]^{-(m+2)} \partial_x^{m+2} \gamma_j$, for every $m \geq 0$ we obtain

$$\sup_j \|\partial_x^{m+2} \gamma_j\|_{L^2} \leq (L^*)^{m+2} C < \infty,$$

where $L^* := \sup_j \mathcal{L}[\gamma_j] < \infty$. Combining this boundedness with C^1 -convergence implies smooth convergence (via standard compact Sobolev embeddings). In addition, passing to a subsequence, the bounded sequence $\{\lambda_j\}_j$ converges, so by taking $j \rightarrow \infty$ in equation (1.1) for γ_j we find that γ_∞ is also an elastica. \square

The remaining case $\sup_j |\lambda_j| = \infty$ requires a more delicate and ad-hoc understanding of elasticae. Our proof will be based on explicit formulae for elasticae due to Langer–Singer [4] (see also [6, 11]) and their integrability arguments. We will thus frequently use Jacobi elliptic integrals and functions. Here we adhere to the notation in [6, Appendix A], where one can find all the necessary definitions in this paper. In particular, we choose the elliptic parameter $m = p^2 \in [0, 1]$ instead of the elliptic modulus p .

Proposition 2.3. *Let $\{\gamma_j\}_{j=1}^\infty \subset C^\omega(\bar{I}; \mathbf{R}^n)$ be a sequence of constant-speed λ_j -elasticae satisfying (A) and converging to some curve γ_∞ in the C^1 topology. Suppose that $\sup_j |\lambda_j| = \infty$. Then γ_∞ is a straight segment.*

Proof. As C^1 -convergence is already assumed, it is sufficient to prove that up to taking isometric transformations and subsequences (we will not relabel) the sequence converges to an axis in a certain sense; we will prove that $\gamma_j - \langle \gamma_j, e_n \rangle e_n \rightarrow 0$ in L^2 , where $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^n$ denotes the canonical basis. We may assume that (for a subsequence) each γ_j is not a straight segment, since otherwise the assertion is trivial.

It is known (see e.g. [6, Corollary 2.5]) that any elastica is contained in a three-dimensional affine subspace, as the equation is of fourth order. Hence, without loss of generality we may assume $n = 3$.

By the known explicit formula for elasticae in \mathbf{R}^3 (see e.g. [6, Theorem 2.12]), for each non-straight λ_j -elastica $\gamma_j : \bar{I} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^3$ there are (unique) parameters $m_j, w_j, A_j, c_j \in \mathbf{R}$ such that

$$0 \leq m_j \leq w_j \leq 1, \quad w_j > 0, \quad A_j > 0,$$

with the following properties: Let $k_j (= |\partial_s^2 \gamma_j|)$ be the scalar curvature. Let t_j be the torsion of γ_j ; if γ_j is planar, then we interpret $t_j \equiv 0$. Then for some $\beta_j \in \mathbf{R}$,

$$(2.1) \quad k_j(s)^2 = A_j^2 \left(1 - \frac{m_j}{w_j} \operatorname{sn}^2 \left(\frac{A_j}{2\sqrt{w_j}} s + \beta_j, m_j \right) \right),$$

where $s \in [0, \mathcal{L}[\gamma_j]]$ denotes the arclength parameter, and also

$$(2.2) \quad k_j(s)^2 t_j(s) = c_j,$$

$$(2.3) \quad \lambda_j = \frac{A_j^2}{2w_j} (3w_j - m_j - 1),$$

and

$$(2.4) \quad 4c_j^2 = \frac{A_j^6}{w_j^2} (1 - w_j)(w_j - m_j).$$

In addition, we recall Langer–Singer’s integrability results via Killing fields. It is known [11, Equation (4)] (and easily verified by directly differentiating) that any elastica γ has an associated constant vector field

$$J := (k^2 - \lambda)T + 2\partial_s k N + 2ktB \equiv \text{const.},$$

where T, N, B denote the unit tangent, normal, and binormal, respectively (we interpret $2ktB = 0$ when γ is planar). Clearly, $|J| \neq 0$ if k is nonconstant (i.e., $\partial_s k \neq 0$). Also, if k is a nonzero constant, then in terms of the above parameters we have $m = 0$, $k^2 = A^2$, $\lambda = \frac{3w-1}{2w}A^2$, so $|J| \neq 0$ unless $w = 1$, i.e., unless γ is a circular arc such that $k^2 \equiv \lambda$. Hence, for our sequence $\{\gamma_j\}$, passing to a subsequence, we have either

$$(2.5) \quad a_j^2 := |J_j|^2 \equiv (k_j(s)^2 - \lambda_j)^2 + 4\partial_s k_j(s)^2 + 4k_j(s)^2 t_j(s)^2 > 0,$$

or each γ_j is a circular arc of radius $|\lambda_j|^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. The latter case is ruled out by (A) and $\sup_j |\lambda_j| = \infty$. Therefore, strict positivity (2.5) must hold. Then, the argument in [11, p.7] implies that (up to isometries) each γ_j can be explicitly parametrized in the standard cylindrical coordinate (r, θ, z) . In particular, the radius function $r_j = |\gamma_j - \langle \gamma_j, e_3 \rangle e_3|$ is given by

$$r_j(s) = \frac{2}{a_j^2} \sqrt{a_j^2 k_j(s)^2 - 4c_j^2}.$$

Now, in order to prove the assertion, it is sufficient to show that, passing to a subsequence, $r_j \rightarrow 0$ in a certain (for example L^2) sense. Since

$$\int_I r_j^2 dx = \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}[\gamma_j]} \int_I r_j^2 ds \leq \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}[\gamma_j]} \frac{4}{a_j^2} \int_I k_j^2 ds \leq \frac{4}{a_j^2} \frac{\sup_j \mathcal{B}[\gamma_j]}{\inf_j \mathcal{L}[\gamma_j]},$$

it is sufficient to show that

$$\sup_j |a_j| = \infty.$$

Since identity (2.5) remains true if we extend the functions k_j and t_j to \mathbf{R} via formulae (2.1) and (2.2), we can particularly pick a point $s_* \in \mathbf{R}$ at which the right-hand side of (2.1) takes the maximum, i.e., $k_j(s_*)^2 = A_j^2$. Inserting this into (2.5) implies $a_j^2 \geq (A_j^2 - \lambda_j)^2$. Hence it is sufficient to show that

$$(2.6) \quad \sup_j |A_j^2 - \lambda_j| = \infty.$$

By the assumption $\sup_j |\lambda_j| = \infty$, passing to a subsequence, we have either $\lambda_j \rightarrow \infty$ or $\lambda_j \rightarrow -\infty$. If $\lambda_j \rightarrow -\infty$, then clearly $|A_j^2 - \lambda_j| \rightarrow \infty$. In what follows we suppose

$$0 \leq \lambda_j \rightarrow \infty.$$

By (2.3) we have $\lambda_j \leq \frac{3}{2}A_j^2$ and hence

$$(2.7) \quad A_j \rightarrow \infty.$$

Also, using positivity $\lambda_j \geq 0$ in (2.3) we deduce $3w_j - m_j - 1 \geq 0$. In particular,

$$(2.8) \quad \frac{1}{3} \leq w_j \leq 1.$$

Then, using $\operatorname{sn}^2 + \operatorname{cn}^2 = 1$, we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}[\gamma_j] &= \int_0^{\mathcal{L}[\gamma_j]} A_j^2 \left(1 - \frac{m_j}{w_j} \operatorname{sn}^2 \left(\frac{A_j}{2\sqrt{w_j}} s + \beta_j, m_j \right) \right) ds \\ &\geq A_j^2 \int_0^{\mathcal{L}[\gamma_j]} \operatorname{cn}^2 \left(\frac{A_j}{2\sqrt{w_j}} s + \beta_j, m_j \right) ds \\ &= 2A_j \sqrt{w_j} \int_{\beta_j}^{A_j \mathcal{L}[\gamma_j]/(2\sqrt{w_j}) + \beta_j} \operatorname{cn}^2(u, m_j) du \\ &\geq \frac{2A_j}{\sqrt{3}} \int_{\beta_j}^{\frac{1}{2}A_j \mathcal{L}[\gamma_j] + \beta_j} \operatorname{cn}^2(u, m_j) du, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we used (2.8). By (A) and (2.7), we need to have

$$(2.9) \quad c_j := \int_{\beta_j}^{\frac{1}{2}A_j \mathcal{L}[\gamma_j] + \beta_j} \operatorname{cn}^2(u, m_j) du \rightarrow 0.$$

Now we prove by contradiction that

$$(2.10) \quad m_j \rightarrow 1.$$

If otherwise, there is a subsequence such that $m_j \rightarrow m_\infty \in [0, 1)$. Then the $2K(m_j)$ -periodic integrand $\operatorname{cn}^2(u, m_j)$ locally uniformly converges to $\operatorname{cn}^2(u, m_\infty)$ with finite period $2K(m_\infty) \in [\frac{\pi}{2}, \infty)$. By periodicity we may assume that $\beta_j \in [-2K(m_j), 0]$ and in particular $\{\beta_j\}$ is bounded. By (A) and (2.7) we have $A_j \mathcal{L}[\gamma_j] \rightarrow \infty$. These properties imply that $[0, 2K(m_\infty)] \subset [\beta_j, \frac{1}{2}A_j \mathcal{L}[\gamma_j] + \beta_j]$ for any large j , so

$$0 \leq \int_0^{2K(m_\infty)} \operatorname{cn}^2(u, m_\infty) du = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^{2K(m_\infty)} \operatorname{cn}^2(u, m_j) du \leq \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} c_j \stackrel{(2.9)}{=} 0$$

but this is a contradiction. Hence (2.10) follows.

By (2.10) and $m_j \leq w_j \leq 1$ we also have

$$w_j \rightarrow 1.$$

From this with (2.10) and (2.3) we deduce that $\frac{\lambda_j}{A_j^2} \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}$ and hence, noting (2.7),

$$|A_j^2 - \lambda_j| = A_j^2 \left| 1 - \frac{\lambda_j}{A_j^2} \right| \rightarrow \infty,$$

which implies (2.6). The proof is now complete. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Letting $b_j := -\gamma_j(0)$, the sequence $\{\tilde{\gamma}_j + b_j\}$ satisfies the assumption of Lemma 2.1, and hence a subsequence $\{\tilde{\gamma}_{j'} + b_{j'}\}$ converges to some curve $\tilde{\gamma}_\infty$ in the C^1 -topology.

Now, suppose that $\tilde{\gamma}_\infty$ is not a straight segment. Then by the contrapositive of Proposition 2.3, we have $\sup_{j'} |\lambda_{j'}| < \infty$, where $\lambda_{j'}$ denotes a multiplier of $\tilde{\gamma}_{j'} + b_{j'}$. Hence by Proposition 2.2, the convergence is smooth and $\tilde{\gamma}_\infty$ is an elastica.

On the other hand, if $\tilde{\gamma}_\infty$ is a straight segment, then (convergence may not be smooth but) $\tilde{\gamma}_\infty$ is a trivial elastica, so in any case the limit curve $\tilde{\gamma}_\infty$ must be an elastica. The proof is complete. \square

2.2. Counterexamples. Finally, we provide counterexamples to smooth convergence in Theorem 1.1. Of course, the limit curve must be a straight segment. To this end it is sufficient to construct sequences of constant-speed elasticae $\{\gamma_j\}$ satisfying (A) and also

$$\inf_j \mathcal{B}[\gamma_j] > 0.$$

Indeed, this is equivalent to $\inf_j \|\partial_x^2 \gamma_j\|_{L^2} > 0$ under (A), so any subsequence cannot converge to the segment smoothly, nor even in the $W^{2,2}$ -strong topology.

In fact, we can construct such examples for both $\lambda_j \rightarrow -\infty$ and $\lambda_j \rightarrow \infty$. These cases correspond to different phenomena, namely of curvature oscillation and concentration, respectively.

Example 2.4 (Curvature oscillation). We construct an example as in Figure 1. Consider a sequence $\{\gamma_j\} \subset C^\omega(\bar{I}; \mathbf{R}^n)$ of arclength parametrized elasticae such that for all $j \geq 1$,

$$\mathcal{L}[\gamma_j] = 1.$$

We will choose appropriate parameters in (2.1)–(2.4). Setting $c_j = 0$, $w_j = m_j \in (0, 1)$, and $\beta_j = 0$, we obtain a planar (wavelike) elastica γ_j such that

$$k_j^2(s) = A_j^2 \operatorname{cn}^2\left(\frac{A_j}{2\sqrt{m_j}}s, m_j\right), \quad \lambda_j = \frac{A_j^2}{2m_j}(2m_j - 1).$$

We then compute

$$\mathcal{B}[\gamma_j] = \int_0^1 k_j^2(s) ds = A_j \sqrt{m_j} \int_0^{A_j/\sqrt{m_j}} \operatorname{cn}^2(u, m_j)^2 du.$$

Now, set $A_j = 2K(m_j)$ and $m_j = 1/j^2$. Since $\operatorname{cn}^2(\cdot, m)$ is $2K(m)$ -periodic, we compute

$$\mathcal{B}[\gamma_j] = \frac{2K(m_j)}{j} \int_0^{2K(m_j)j} \operatorname{cn}^2(u, m_j) du = 2K(m_j) \int_0^{2K(m_j)} \operatorname{cn}^2(u, m_j) du > 0.$$

Since $\lim_{m \rightarrow 0} \operatorname{cn}(u, m) = \cos u$ and $\lim_{m \rightarrow 0} 2K(m) = \pi$ ([6, Appendix A]), the bounded convergence theorem implies

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{B}[\gamma_j] = \pi \int_0^\pi \cos^2 u du = \frac{\pi^2}{2} > 0.$$

This with $\mathcal{L}[\gamma_j] = 1$ implies (A) and $\inf_j \mathcal{B}[\gamma_j] > 0$. Thus we obtain a counterexample. For this example we have

$$\lambda_j \rightarrow -\infty.$$

Also, since each γ_j is planar, the signed curvature is well-defined and given by

$$k_j(s) = 2K(m_j) \operatorname{cn}(jK(m_j)s, m_j).$$

This converges L^2 -weakly to 0 in an oscillatory way.

Example 2.5 (Curvature concentration). We construct an example as in Figure 2. Again consider arclength parametrized elasticae $\{\gamma_j\}$ such that $\mathcal{L}[\gamma_j] = 1$. Set $c_j = 0$ and $w_j = m_j = 1$. Then each γ_j is a planar (borderline) elastica such that

$$k_j^2(s) = A_j^2 \operatorname{sech}^2\left(\frac{A_j}{2}s + \beta_j\right), \quad \lambda_j = \frac{A_j^2}{2}.$$

Now we choose $A_j = 2j$, and compute

$$\mathcal{B}[\gamma_j] = 4j \int_0^j \operatorname{sech}^2(u + \beta_j) du.$$

Define the continuous map $f_j : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ by $f(r) := \int_0^j \operatorname{sech}^2(u + r) du$. For each j we have $f_j(0) \geq f_1(0) =: c > 0$ while $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} f_j(r) = 0$, so there is $r_j \geq 0$ such that $f_j(r_j) = c/j$. Setting $\beta_j = r_j$ yields for all $j \geq 1$,

$$\mathcal{B}[\gamma_j] = 4c > 0.$$

This also implies (A) and $\inf_j \mathcal{B}[\gamma_j] > 0$, giving a counterexample. In this case

$$\lambda_j \rightarrow \infty,$$

and the signed curvature is given by

$$k_j(s) = 2j \operatorname{sech}(js + r_j).$$

Since $0 \leq k_j(s) \leq Cj e^{-js}$, the curvature uniformly converges to 0 on any interval $[\varepsilon, 1]$ with small $\varepsilon > 0$. This example is thus of concentration type.

3. STABILITY

3.1. Fixed-length case. Here we prove Theorem 1.4. This case directly benefits from the multiplier-free statement of Theorem 1.1.

We first check that smooth compactness follows from Theorem 1.1.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $(\Gamma, L) \in \hat{\mathbf{A}}'$ and $\{(\Gamma_j, L_j)\}_{j=1}^\infty \subset \hat{\mathbf{A}}$ be a sequence converging to (Γ, L) . Let $\{\gamma_j\} \subset C^\omega(\bar{I}; \mathbf{R}^n)$ be a sequence of elasticae such that $\gamma_j \in \mathcal{A}_{\Gamma_j, L_j}$ for $j \geq 1$ and $\sup_j \mathcal{B}[\gamma_j] < \infty$. Then there is a subsequence of $\{\gamma_j\}$ smoothly converging to an elastica in $\mathcal{A}_{\Gamma, L}$.*

Proof. Since $\sup_j \mathcal{B}[\gamma_j] < \infty$ and $L_j \rightarrow L$, the sequence $\{\gamma_j\}$ satisfies (A). Then by Theorem 1.1 there is a subsequence of $\{\gamma_j\}$ converging to an elastica γ_∞ at least in the C^1 topology. So in particular $\gamma_\infty \in \mathcal{A}_{\Gamma, L}$, and hence γ_∞ cannot be a segment. By Theorem 1.1 the convergence is smooth. \square

To improve this convergence to the full limit, an important tool is continuity of the minimal energy. In fact, we only need upper semicontinuity for later use, but here we address continuity because of its fundamentality.

Lemma 3.2. *The minimal energy function $m : \hat{\mathbf{A}} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ defined by*

$$m(\Gamma, L) := \min_{\gamma \in \mathcal{A}_{\Gamma, L}} \mathcal{B}[\gamma]$$

is continuous at any $(\Gamma, L) \in \hat{\mathbf{A}}'$.

Proof. Fix any $(\Gamma, L) \in \hat{\mathbf{A}}'$ and any sequence $\{(\Gamma_j, L_j)\}_{j=1}^\infty \subset \hat{\mathbf{A}}$ converging to (Γ, L) . Fix any minimizer $\gamma \in \mathcal{A}_{\Gamma, L}$ of \mathcal{B} . Then $m(\Gamma, L) = \mathcal{B}[\gamma]$.

We first prove upper semicontinuity. Since γ has nonzero curvature, and since $\frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \mathcal{L}[\gamma_\varepsilon] = - \int_I \langle \kappa, \eta \rangle ds$ for $\gamma_\varepsilon := \gamma + \varepsilon \eta$ with $\eta \in C_c^\infty(I; \mathbf{R}^n)$, we can find a suitable η such that $\varepsilon \mapsto \mathcal{L}[\gamma_\varepsilon]$ is strictly increasing on $[-\varepsilon_\eta, \varepsilon_\eta]$ for some small $\varepsilon_\eta > 0$. Since η is supported on a compact set $K \subset I$, by suitably deforming γ_ε around the endpoints, namely on $\bar{I} \setminus K$, we can find $\gamma_{\varepsilon, j} \in \mathcal{A}_{\Gamma_j}$ such that for any $\varepsilon \in [-\varepsilon_\eta, \varepsilon_\eta]$,

$$(3.1) \quad \mathcal{L}[\gamma_{\varepsilon, j}] - \mathcal{L}[\gamma_\varepsilon] = \mathcal{L}[\gamma_{0, j}] - L,$$

and since $\Gamma_j \rightarrow \Gamma$, we can also have $\gamma_{\varepsilon,j} \rightarrow \gamma_\varepsilon$ in C^2 so that

$$(3.2) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}[\gamma_{\varepsilon,j}] = \mathcal{L}[\gamma_\varepsilon],$$

$$(3.3) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{B}[\gamma_{\varepsilon,j}] = \mathcal{B}[\gamma_\varepsilon].$$

(See Remark 3.4 for more details.) Then, by $L_j \rightarrow L$ and (3.2) (for $\varepsilon = 0$), there is a large j_η such that for any $j \geq j_\eta$,

$$a_j := \max\{|L_j - L|, |\mathcal{L}[\gamma_{0,j}] - L|\} \leq \frac{1}{2} \min\{\mathcal{L}[\gamma_{\varepsilon_\eta}] - \mathcal{L}[\gamma], \mathcal{L}[\gamma] - \mathcal{L}[\gamma_{-\varepsilon_\eta}]\}.$$

This with (3.1) and the strict monotonicity of $\mathcal{L}[\gamma_\varepsilon]$ implies that for any $j \geq j_\eta$ there exists $\varepsilon_j \in [-\varepsilon_\eta, \varepsilon_\eta]$ such that $\mathcal{L}[\gamma_{\varepsilon_j,j}] = L_j$. Hence $\gamma_{\varepsilon_j,j} \in \mathcal{A}_{\Gamma_j, L_j}$. Note also that $\varepsilon_j \rightarrow 0$ since $a_j \rightarrow 0$. Therefore, by (3.3) and $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{B}[\gamma_\varepsilon] = \mathcal{B}[\gamma]$,

$$\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} m(\Gamma_j, L_j) \leq \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{B}[\gamma_{\varepsilon_j,j}] = \mathcal{B}[\gamma] = m(\Gamma, L).$$

This is the desired upper semicontinuity.

Next we prove lower semicontinuity. Let $\{\gamma_j\}$ be a sequence of elasticae (minimizers) such that $\mathcal{B}[\gamma_j] = m(\Gamma_j, L_j)$. The upper semicontinuity of m particularly implies $\sup_j \mathcal{B}[\gamma_j] < \infty$. Hence by Proposition 3.1 any subsequence has a subsequence $\{\gamma_{j'}\}$ smoothly converging to an elastica $\gamma_\infty \in \mathcal{A}_{\Gamma, L}$. Therefore,

$$\lim_{j' \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{B}[\gamma_{j'}] = \mathcal{B}[\gamma_\infty] \geq m(\Gamma, L),$$

and hence even for the full sequence,

$$\liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} m(\Gamma_j, L_j) = \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{B}[\gamma_j] \geq m(\Gamma, L).$$

This combined with upper semicontinuity completes the proof. \square

Remark 3.3. The minimal energy function is not upper semicontinuous on $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$. In fact, for any $(\Gamma, L) \in \hat{\mathbf{A}}_s = \hat{\mathbf{A}} \setminus \hat{\mathbf{A}}'$ we have $m(\Gamma, L) = 0$, but there is a sequence $\{(\Gamma_j, L_j)\} \subset \hat{\mathbf{A}}'$ converging to (Γ, L) such that $m(\Gamma_j, L_j) \rightarrow \infty$, since for generic angles (as in Remark 1.6) the minimal energy diverges in the limit $L \rightarrow |P_1 - P_0|$.

Remark 3.4. Here we briefly give a more precise argument for the deformation of a curve near the endpoints. Let $\Gamma_j := (P_0^j, P_1^j, V_0^j, V_1^j)$. Define $\gamma_{\varepsilon,j}$ (in the proof of Lemma 3.2) to be the constant-speed reparametrization of

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\gamma}_{\varepsilon,j} := & (1 - \zeta(\frac{x}{\delta_j}))\gamma_\varepsilon(x) + \zeta(\frac{x}{\delta_j})(P_0^j + xV_0^j + \frac{1}{2}x^2\gamma_\varepsilon''(0)) \\ & + (1 - \zeta(\frac{1-x}{\delta_j}))\gamma_\varepsilon(x) + \zeta(\frac{1-x}{\delta_j})(P_1^j + (x-1)V_1^j + \frac{1}{2}(x-1)^2\gamma_\varepsilon''(1)) \end{aligned}$$

with a smooth cut-off function $\zeta : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ such that $\zeta|_{(-\infty, 0]} \equiv 1$ and $\zeta|_{[1, \infty)} \equiv 0$ and with a slowly decaying sequence $\delta_j \rightarrow +0$ (depending on the rate of $\Gamma_j \rightarrow \Gamma$). Since $\hat{\gamma}_{\varepsilon,j} = \gamma_\varepsilon$ on $[\delta_j, 1 - \delta_j]$, the deformation is done outside the fixed compact set $K \subset I$ for large j . It is sufficient to show that $\hat{\gamma}_{\varepsilon,j}$ converges in C^2 to the constant-speed curve γ_ε . For simplicity we focus on the convergence near the origin, or just assume $P_1^j = P_1$ and $V_1^j = V_1$. Also we only compute the most delicate second-order

derivatives:

$$\begin{aligned}
|\hat{\gamma}_{\varepsilon,j}''(x) - \gamma_{\varepsilon}''(x)| &\leq \frac{1}{\delta_j^2} |\zeta''(\frac{x}{\delta_j})| |\gamma_{\varepsilon}(x) - (P_0^j + xV_0^j + \frac{1}{2}x^2\gamma_{\varepsilon}''(0))| \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\delta_j} |\zeta'(\frac{x}{\delta_j})| |\gamma_{\varepsilon}'(x) - (V_0^j + x\gamma_{\varepsilon}''(0))| \\
&\quad + |\zeta(\frac{x}{\delta_j})| |\gamma_{\varepsilon}''(x) - \gamma_{\varepsilon}''(0)| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\delta_j^2} |\zeta''(\frac{x}{\delta_j})| (o(x^2) + |P_0^j - P_0| + x|V_0^j - V_0|) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\delta_j} |\zeta'(\frac{x}{\delta_j})| (o(x) + |V_0^j - V_0|) + |\zeta(\frac{x}{\delta_j})| o(1),
\end{aligned}$$

where the little-o notation is about the limit $x \rightarrow 0$. Letting $C := \|\zeta\|_{C^2}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{x \in [0,1]} |\hat{\gamma}_{\varepsilon,j}''(x) - \gamma_{\varepsilon}''(x)| \\
&\leq C \left(\frac{o(\delta_j^2) + |P_0^j - P_0| + \delta_j |V_0^j - V_0|}{\delta_j^2} + \frac{o(\delta_j) + |V_0^j - V_0|}{\delta_j} + o(1) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

so the RHS converges to 0 if $\delta_j \rightarrow 0$ while $\delta_j^{-2}|P_0^j - P_0| \rightarrow 0$ and $\delta_j^{-1}|V_0^j - V_0| \rightarrow 0$.

We are now in a position to complete the proof of Theorem 1.4.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Lemma 3.2 implies that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{B}[\gamma_j] = \mathcal{B}[\gamma].$$

On the other hand, by Proposition 3.1, for any subsequence of $\{\gamma_j\}$ there is a further subsequence $\{\gamma_{j'}\}$ that smoothly converges to some elastica $\hat{\gamma} \in \mathcal{A}_{\Gamma,L}$. Since

$$\lim_{j' \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{B}[\gamma_{j'}] = \mathcal{B}[\hat{\gamma}],$$

we have $\mathcal{B}[\hat{\gamma}] = \mathcal{B}[\gamma]$ and hence $\hat{\gamma}$ is also a minimizer of \mathcal{B} in $\mathcal{A}_{\Gamma,L}$. By uniqueness, $\hat{\gamma} = \gamma$. Consequently, the full sequence $\{\gamma_j\}$ smoothly converges to γ . \square

3.2. Length-penalized case. Finally we prove Theorem 1.5. In this part the main subtlety lies in the control of length from below.

As in the fixed-length case, we begin with smooth compactness. Here we need a new assumption in order to avoid length-vanishing sequences.

Proposition 3.5. *Let $(\Gamma, \lambda) \in \mathbf{X}' \times (0, \infty)$ and $\{(\Gamma_j, \lambda_j)\}_{j=1}^{\infty} \subset \mathbf{X} \times (0, \infty)$ be a sequence converging to (Γ, λ) . Let $\{\gamma_j\} \subset C^{\omega}(\bar{I}; \mathbf{R}^n)$ be a sequence of λ_j -elasticae such that $\gamma_j \in \mathcal{A}_{\Gamma_j}$ for $j \geq 1$ and $\sup_j \mathcal{E}_{\lambda_j}[\gamma_j] < \infty$. Suppose that $\Gamma \notin \mathbf{X}_c$, where*

$$\mathbf{X}_c := \{(P_0, P_1, V_0, V_1) \in \mathbf{X} \mid P_0 = P_1, V_0 = V_1\} \subset \mathbf{X}'.$$

Then there is a subsequence of $\{\gamma_j\}$ smoothly converging to a λ -elastica in \mathcal{A}_{Γ} .

Proof. By $\sup_j \mathcal{E}_{\lambda_j}[\gamma_j] < \infty$ and $\lambda_j \rightarrow \lambda$ we deduce that $\sup_j \mathcal{B}[\gamma_j] < \infty$ and $\sup_j \mathcal{L}[\gamma_j] < \infty$. Now we prove $\inf_j \mathcal{L}[\gamma_j] > 0$. On one hand, if $|P_1 - P_0| > 0$, then $\mathcal{L}[\gamma_j] \geq |P_1 - P_0| > 0$. On the other hand, if $|P_1 - P_0| = 0$, then by $\Gamma \notin \mathbf{X}_c$ we have $V_0 \neq V_1$. By the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality,

$$\sqrt{\mathcal{L}[\gamma_j] \mathcal{B}[\gamma_j]} \geq \int_I |\kappa_j| ds \geq \left| \int_I \kappa_j ds \right| = |\partial_s \gamma_j(1) - \partial_s \gamma_j(0)| \rightarrow |V_1 - V_0| > 0.$$

Since $\sup_j \mathcal{B}[\gamma_j] < \infty$, in this case we also have $\inf_j \mathcal{L}[\gamma_j] > 0$.

Hence in any case, $\{\gamma_j\}$ satisfies (A). By Theorem 1.1 there is a subsequence converging to some elastica γ_∞ in the C^1 topology. Then $\gamma_\infty \in \mathcal{A}_\Gamma$, not being a segment, so by Theorem 1.1 the convergence is smooth. Letting $j \rightarrow \infty$ in equation (1.1) for γ_j implies that γ_∞ has the multiplier λ . \square

Remark 3.6. The assumption $\Gamma \notin \mathbf{A}_c$ is necessary. Let $(\Gamma, \lambda) \in \mathbf{X}_c \times (0, \infty)$. If we define $\Gamma_j = (P_0^j, P_1^j, V_0^j, V_1^j) := (P_0, P_0 + \frac{1}{j}e, e, e)$ for some $e \in \mathbf{S}^{n-1}$, then $(\Gamma_j, \lambda) \rightarrow (\Gamma, \lambda)$, but a unique minimizer of \mathcal{E}_λ in \mathcal{A}_{Γ_j} is a segment with vanishing length as $j \rightarrow \infty$. Although now $\Gamma_j \notin \mathbf{X}'$, we can even perturb V_0^j, V_1^j so that $\Gamma_j \in \mathbf{X}'$ and \mathcal{A}_{Γ_j} admits a (small) circular arc of radius $1/\sqrt{\lambda}$, which is also a minimizer with vanishing length, as in Figure 3.

Before discussing continuity of the minimal energy, we need to ensure existence of minimizers. This follows by a standard direct method, but here we give an argument using Proposition 3.5 in order not to repeat compactness procedures.

Theorem 3.7. *Let $(\Gamma, \lambda) \in \mathbf{X} \times (0, \infty)$. Then there is a minimizer of \mathcal{E}_λ in \mathcal{A}_Γ .*

Proof. If $\Gamma \in \mathbf{X}_s$, then \mathcal{A}_Γ admits a segment, which is a trivial minimizer. Hence we may suppose $\Gamma \in \mathbf{X}'$.

Suppose $\Gamma \in \mathbf{X}' \setminus \mathbf{X}_c$. Let $\{\gamma_i\} \subset \mathcal{A}_\Gamma$ be a minimizing sequence. By Proposition 3.5 with $(\Gamma_j, \lambda_j) \equiv (\Gamma, \lambda)$, there is a subsequence $\{\gamma_{i'}\}$ smoothly converging to some $\gamma_\infty \in \mathcal{A}_\Gamma$. Then $\mathcal{E}_\lambda[\gamma_\infty] = \lim_{i' \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_\lambda[\gamma_{i'}] = \inf_{\mathcal{A}_\Gamma} \mathcal{E}_\lambda$, so γ_∞ is a minimizer.

If $\Gamma \in \mathbf{X}_c$, then we can directly show that a circle is a minimizer; indeed, any $\gamma \in \mathcal{A}_\Gamma$ is closed, so by the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and Fenchel’s theorem,

$$\mathcal{E}_\lambda[\gamma] \geq 2\sqrt{\lambda \mathcal{L}[\gamma] \mathcal{B}[\gamma]} \geq 2\sqrt{\lambda} \int_I |\kappa| ds \geq 4\pi\sqrt{\lambda},$$

where equality holds if and only if γ is a circle of radius $1/\sqrt{\lambda}$. \square

Now we proceed with continuity of the minimal energy. Here we again need to do away with \mathbf{X}_c to avoid discontinuity as in Remark 3.6 and Figure 3.

Lemma 3.8. *The minimal energy function $\tilde{m} : \mathbf{X} \times (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ defined by*

$$\tilde{m}(\Gamma, \lambda) := \min_{\gamma \in \mathcal{A}_\Gamma} \mathcal{E}_\lambda[\gamma]$$

is upper semicontinuous at any $(\Gamma, \lambda) \in \mathbf{X}' \times (0, \infty)$. In addition, \tilde{m} is continuous at any $(\Gamma, \lambda) \in (\mathbf{X}' \setminus \mathbf{X}_c) \times (0, \infty)$.

Proof. The proof is almost parallel to that of Lemma 3.2. Using existence of minimizers (Theorem 3.7), we can prove upper semicontinuity at each $(\Gamma, \lambda) \in \mathbf{X}' \times (0, \infty)$ by the same deformation argument. (It is in fact much easier as we need not prescribe the length.) Lower semicontinuity also follows by the same compactness argument, for which we use Proposition 3.5 (instead of Proposition 3.1) and this is why we need to assume $\Gamma \notin \mathbf{X}_c$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.5. We first observe that $\Gamma \notin \mathbf{X}_c$. Indeed, if $\Gamma \in \mathbf{X}_c$, then a circle is a minimizer of \mathcal{E}_λ in \mathcal{A}_Γ (see the proof of Theorem 3.7), so its reflection at the endpoints gives a different admissible minimizer (see Figure 3); this conflicts with our uniqueness assumption.

As we now have $\Gamma \in \mathbf{X}' \setminus \mathbf{X}_c$, the assertion follows by a completely parallel argument to the proof of Theorem 1.4, where we replace Proposition 3.1 with Proposition 3.5 and Lemma 3.2 with Lemma 3.8. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Dall'Acqua and K. Deckelnick, *Elastic graphs with clamped boundary and length constraints*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4) **203** (2024), no. 3, 1137–1158. MR4754274
- [2] A. Dall'Acqua and P. Pozzi, *A Willmore-Helfrich L^2 -flow of curves with natural boundary conditions*, Comm. Anal. Geom. **22** (2014), no. 4, 617–669. MR3263933
- [3] G. Dziuk, E. Kuwert, and R. Schätzle, *Evolution of elastic curves in \mathbb{R}^n : existence and computation*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **33** (2002), no. 5, 1228–1245. MR1897710
- [4] J. Langer and D. A. Singer, *Knotted elastic curves in \mathbf{R}^3* , J. London Math. Soc. (2) **30** (1984), no. 3, 512–520. MR810960
- [5] R. Levien, *The elastica: a mathematical history*, Technical Report No. UCB/EECS-2008-10, University of California, Berkeley (2008).
- [6] T. Miura, *Elastic curves and self-intersections*, arXiv:2408.03020, to appear in 2024 MATRIX Annals.
- [7] T. Miura, *Elastic curves and phase transitions*, Math. Ann. **376** (2020), no. 3-4, 1629–1674. MR4081125
- [8] T. Miura and G. Wheeler, *Uniqueness and minimality of Euler's elastica with monotone curvature*, arXiv:2402.12771.
- [9] T. Miura and K. Yoshizawa, *General rigidity principles for stable and minimal elastic curves*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **810** (2024), 253–281. MR4739246
- [10] Yu. L. Sachkov and E. F. Sachkova, *Exponential mapping in Euler's elastic problem*, J. Dyn. Control Syst. **20** (2014), no. 4, 443–464. MR3255084
- [11] D. A. Singer, *Lectures on elastic curves and rods*, Curvature and variational modeling in physics and biophysics, 2008, pp. 3–32. MR2483890
- [12] C. Truesdell, *The influence of elasticity on analysis: the classic heritage*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.) **9** (1983), no. 3, 293–310. MR714991

(T. Miura) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SCIENCE, KYOTO UNIVERSITY, KITASHIRAKAWA OIWAKE-CHO, SAKYO-KU, KYOTO 606-8502, JAPAN

Email address: tatsuya.miura@math.kyoto-u.ac.jp