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> AbSTRACT. In this work we give some equivalent formulations for the optimization problem max $\left\{\int_{\Omega} \xi d \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} \xi d \nu ; \xi \in W^{1, \infty}(\Omega)\right.$ s.t $\xi_{/ \Gamma_{D}}=0,|\nabla \xi(x)| \leq 1$ a.e. $\left.x \in \Omega\right\}$, where the boundary of $\Omega$ is $\Gamma=\Gamma_{N} \cup \Gamma_{D}$.

## 1. Introduction and main result

Let $\Omega$ be a bounded open Lipschitz domain of $\mathbb{R}^{N}$ with $\mathcal{C}^{1}$ smooth boundary $\Gamma$. We assume that $\Gamma$ is divided into two parts $\Gamma_{N}, \Gamma_{D}$ such that $\Gamma_{D} \cap \Gamma_{N}=\emptyset$ and the measure area of $\Gamma_{D}$ is positive.
We set

$$
W_{D}^{1, \infty}(\Omega)=\left\{z \in W^{1, \infty}(\Omega) ; z=0 \text { on } \Gamma_{D}\right\}
$$

and

$$
K=\left\{z \in W_{D}^{1, \infty}(\Omega) ;|\nabla z(x)| \leq 1 \text { a.e. } x \in \Omega\right\} .
$$

We are interested in the study of the optimization problem

$$
\begin{equation*}
\max \left\{\int_{\Omega} z \mathrm{~d} \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} z \mathrm{~d} \nu ; z \in K\right\} \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mu$ and $\nu$ are a bounded Radon measures concentrated respectively in and $\Omega$ and $\Gamma$. If we put $\widetilde{K}=\left\{\xi \in W_{0}^{1,1}(\Omega) ;|\nabla z(x)| \leq k(x)\right.$ a.e. $\left.x \in \Omega\right\}$ where $k \in \mathcal{C}(\bar{\Omega})$ and $\Gamma_{N}=\emptyset$, we get from (1.1) the following optimization problem

$$
\begin{equation*}
\max \left\{\int_{\Omega} \xi \mathrm{d} \mu ; \xi \in \widetilde{K}\right\} \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

which is the so-called dual equation of Monge-Kantorovich problem. It is of wide interest for Monge optimal mass transport problem (see[1, 11] and the references therein). It was used by Kantorovich for the study of existence of a solution for is relaxed formulation of the original Monge problem.
In [14], the author showed the equivalence between problem (1.2) and the following three formulations in divergence form

$$
\left\{\begin{align*}
-\nabla \cdot \phi & =\mu \operatorname{in} \mathcal{D}^{\prime}(\Omega)  \tag{1.3}\\
k \phi & =|\phi| \nabla_{|\phi|} u,
\end{align*}\right.
$$
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$$
\left\{\begin{align*}
-\nabla \cdot \phi & =\mu \operatorname{in} \mathcal{D}^{\prime}(\Omega)  \tag{1.4}\\
\int_{\Omega} k \mathrm{~d}|\phi| & \leq \int_{\Omega} u \mathrm{~d} \mu
\end{align*}\right.
$$

and

$$
\left\{\begin{align*}
\int_{\Omega} k d|\phi| & =\min \left\{\int_{\Omega} k d|\nu| ;-\nabla \cdot \nu=\mu \text { in } \mathcal{D}^{\prime}(\Omega)\right\}  \tag{1.5}\\
& =\int_{\Omega} u d \mu
\end{align*}\right.
$$

where $|\phi|$ denotes the total variation measure of $\phi$ and $\nabla_{|\phi|}$ denotes the tangential gradient with respect to $|\phi|([3,4,5,6])$.
The main interest in the formulation (1.2)-(1.4) is their connection with the Monge optimal mass transport problem (see [1, 11, 13, 17] and the references therein) as well as mass optimization (see [3, 18]) and sandpile (see [8, 10, 11, 19]). The formulation (1.3) is called in the litterature Monge-Kantorovich equation, it appears in the study of optimal transport problem (see [5]). The relation between the formulation (1.5) (called dual formulation of (1.2)) and (1.3) is given in [5] within the context of mass optimization problem. The formulation (1.5) also appears in the context of optimal transport problem (see [5, 18]). Concerning the formulation (1.4), it appears in [5] and it is used in the study of the evolution problem associated with the Monge-Kantorovich equation and sandpile problem (see $[2,15]$ ).
In this paper, we prove the equivalence between (1.1) and the following formulations :

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{r}
\phi \in\left(\mathcal{M}_{b}(\Omega)\right)^{N}, v \in K \text { such that }  \tag{1.6}\\
\int_{\Omega} \nabla \xi \cdot \frac{\phi}{|\phi|} \mathrm{d}|\phi|=\int_{\Omega} \xi \mathrm{d} \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} \xi \mathrm{~d} \nu \\
|\phi|(\Omega)=\int_{\Omega} v \mathrm{~d} \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} v \mathrm{~d} \nu
\end{array}\right.
$$

and

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{c}
\phi \in\left(\mathcal{M}_{b}(\Omega)\right)^{N}, v \in K \text { such that }  \tag{1.7}\\
\int_{\Omega} \nabla \xi \cdot \frac{\phi}{|\phi|} d|\phi|=\int_{\Omega} \xi \mathrm{d} \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} \xi \mathrm{~d} \nu \\
\phi=|\phi| \nabla_{|\phi|} v
\end{array}\right.
$$

and

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\phi \in\left(\mathcal{M}_{b}(\Omega)\right)^{N}, v \in K \text { such; that }  \tag{1.8}\\
|\phi|(\Omega)=\min \left\{|\Phi|(\Omega): \int_{\Omega} \nabla \xi \cdot \frac{\Phi}{|\Phi|} d|\Phi|=\int_{\Omega} \xi \mathrm{d} \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} \xi \mathrm{~d} \nu\right\} \\
=\int_{\Omega} v \mathrm{~d} \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} v \mathrm{~d} \nu
\end{array}\right.
$$

where $\xi \in \mathcal{C}^{1}(\Omega) \cap W_{D}^{1, \infty}(\Omega)$.
Since $K$ is bounded, the problem (1.1) admits at least one solution for all bounded Radon measures $\mu$ and $\nu$. Let's recall that the question that we treat in this paper has already been landed in other articles in which the authors use non trivial techniques (see [1, 3, 6] ). Here we look at a simple case with less complicated techniques (cf [14]). Our main result is the following.

Theorem 1.1. Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{b}(\Omega), \nu \in \mathcal{M}_{b}(\Gamma)$ and $v \in K$. Then $v$ is solution of (1.1), i.e.

$$
\int_{\Omega}(v-\xi) d \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}}(v-\xi) d \nu \geq 0 \text { for any } \xi \in K
$$

if and only if there exists $\phi \in\left(\mathcal{M}_{b}(\Omega)\right)^{N}$ such that $(v, \phi)$ satisfies (1.6). Moreover, the formulations (1.6) - (1.8) are equivalent.

Notice also that the main interest in the study of (1.1) and the equivalent formulation (1.6) - (1.8) besides their connection with mass transport problem as well as mass optimization is their connection with sand dunes problems. Indeed, in the dynamic of the formulation of sand dunes, we need a nonhomogeneous Neumann boundary condition on the part of the boundary exposed upon the arrival of grains of sand.
The rest of paper is organized as follows : in the next section we give some preliminaries and we recall some technical lemmas. Section 3 is devoted to the proof of the main theorem.

## 2. Preliminary

In this section we introduce some notations and lemmas that will be useful later on. Let $\Omega$ be a bounded open subset of $\mathbb{R}^{N}(N \geq 2)$ equipped with the $N$-dimensional Lebesgue measure. The space of Radon measure and the set of continuous functions with compact support in $\Omega$ will be denoted by $\mathcal{M}(\Omega)$ and $\mathcal{C}_{c}(\Omega)$ respectively. We recall that each Radon measure $\mu$ can be interpreted as an element of the dual of the space $\mathcal{C}_{c}(\Omega)$. This result can be extended to the space $C(\bar{\Omega})$ ie $\mathcal{M}(\Omega)=(\mathcal{C}(\bar{\Omega}))^{*}$ in the sense that, every $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)$ is equal to $\tilde{\mu} \in(\mathcal{C}(\bar{\Omega}))^{*}$ with $\tilde{\mu}(\partial \Omega)=0$. So, for any $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)$ and $\xi \in \mathcal{C}(\bar{\Omega})$, the notation $\int_{\Omega} \xi \mathrm{d} \mu$ is equivalent to $\langle\tilde{\mu}, \xi\rangle$.
$\mathcal{M}^{+}(\Omega)$ denote the space of all nonnegative Radon measure on $\Omega$. The variation measure $|\mu|$ associated with $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)$ is defined by

$$
|\mu|(B):=\sup \left\{\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\left|\mu\left(B_{i}\right)\right| ; B=\cup_{i=1}^{\infty} B_{i}, \quad B_{i} \text { a Borelean set }\right\}
$$

For $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega), \mu^{+}=\frac{1}{2}(|\mu|+\mu)$ and $\mu^{-}=\frac{1}{2}(|\mu|-\mu)$ are positives and bounded measures. We say that $\mu^{+}, \mu^{-}$is the positive, negative variation of $\mu$ respectively.
The space of Radon measures with bounded total variation $|\mu|(\Omega)$ will be denoted by $\mathcal{M}_{b}(\Omega)$. Recall that $\mathcal{M}_{b}(\Omega)$ equipped with the norm $|\mu|(\Omega)$ is a Banach space.
Let $(\mathcal{M}(\Omega))^{N}$ the space of $\mathbb{R}^{N}$-valued Radon measures of $\Omega$. Then $\mu \in(\mathcal{M}(\Omega))^{N}$ if and only if $\mu=\left(\mu_{1}, \cdots, \mu_{n}\right)$ with $\mu_{i} \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)$. We recall that the total variation measure associated with $\mu \in(\mathcal{M}(\Omega))^{N}$ is denoted again by $|\mu|$ and the subspace $\left(\mathcal{M}_{b}(\Omega)\right)^{N}$ equipped with the norm $\|\mu\|=|\mu|(\Omega)$ is a Banach space. The space $(\mathcal{M}(\Omega))^{N}$ endowed with the norm $\|$.$\| is isometric to the dual space of \left(\mathcal{C}_{c}(\Omega)\right)^{N}$.
For any $\mu \in\left(\mathcal{M}_{b}(\Omega)\right)^{N}$ and $\nu \in\left(\mathcal{M}_{b}(\Omega)\right)^{+}$, the density of $\mu$ with respect to $\nu$ is the
unique bounded $\mathbb{R}^{N}$ - valued Radon measure denoted by $D_{\nu} \mu$ such that

$$
\mu(A)=\int_{A} D_{\nu} \mu \mathrm{d} \nu \quad \text { for any } \quad A \subseteq \Omega .
$$

We have $D_{\nu} \mu \in \mathcal{M}_{b}(\Omega)$ and

$$
\nu(A)=0 \Rightarrow|\mu|(A)=0 .
$$

For any $\mu \in\left(\mathcal{M}_{b}(\Omega)\right)^{N}$ and $\nu \in\left(\mathcal{M}_{b}(\Omega)\right)^{+}, \mu$ is absolutely continuous with respect to $\nu$; denoted by $\mu \ll \nu$, provided

$$
\nu(A)=0 \Rightarrow|\mu|(A)=0, \text { for any } \mathrm{A} \in \Omega .
$$

Let's recall that for $\mu \in\left(\mathcal{M}_{b}(\Omega)\right)^{N}$ and $\nu \in\left(\mathcal{M}_{b}(\Omega)\right)^{+}$such that $\mu \ll \nu$, the previous splitting up of $\mu$ according to $\nu$ is always possible by using Radon-Nikodym Decomposition Theorem. Since $|\mu(A)| \leq|\mu|(A)$, for all $\mu \in(\mathcal{M}(\Omega))^{N}$, then we have $\mu \ll|\mu|$, and $\left|D_{|\mu|} \mu\right|=1$, $|\mu|$-a.e. in $\Omega$. In the litterature $D_{|\mu|} \mu$ is denoted by $\frac{\mu}{|\mu|}$. So, for any $\mu \in$ $(\mathcal{M}(\Omega))^{N}$ we have

$$
\mu(A)=\int_{A} \frac{\mu}{|\mu|} \mathrm{d} \mu \quad \text { for any borel set } \quad A \subseteq \Omega
$$

Hence, every $\mu \in(\mathcal{M}(\Omega))^{N}$ can be identified with the linear application

$$
\xi \in\left(\mathcal{C}_{c}(\Omega)\right)^{N} \mapsto \int_{\Omega} \frac{\mu}{|\mu|} \cdot \xi \mathrm{d}|\mu| .
$$

For any $\Phi \in\left(\mathcal{M}_{b}(\Omega)\right)^{N}$ and $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_{b}(\Omega)$, we say that $-\nabla \cdot \Phi=\nu$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\prime}(\Omega)$ provided that

$$
\int_{\Omega} \nabla \xi \cdot \frac{\Phi}{|\Phi|} \mathrm{d} \Phi=\int_{\Omega} \xi \mathrm{d} \nu \quad \text { for any } \quad \xi \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega) .
$$

In particular, this remains true for any $\xi \in \mathcal{C}_{0}^{1}(\Omega)$, where $\mathcal{C}_{0}^{1}(\Omega)$ is the subset of $\mathcal{C}^{1}$ function in $\Omega$, such that $\xi$ and $\nabla \xi$ are null on the boundary of $\Omega$. In other words, $-\nabla \cdot \Phi=\nu$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\prime}(\Omega)$ is equivalent to $-\nabla \cdot\left(\frac{\Phi}{|\Phi|}|\Phi|\right)=\nu$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\prime}(\Omega)$.
We recall the following sets used in the definition of tangential gradient with respect to $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_{b}(\Omega)^{+}$(see [4]).

$$
\mathcal{N}_{\nu}:=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\xi \in\left(L_{\nu}^{\infty}(\Omega)\right)^{N} ; \exists u_{n} \in C^{\infty}(\Omega), u_{n} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text { in } \quad C(\Omega) \quad \text { and } \\
D u_{n} \rightarrow \xi \operatorname{in} \sigma\left(\left(L_{\nu}^{\infty}(\Omega)\right)^{N},\left(L_{\nu}^{1}(\Omega)\right)^{N}\right)
\end{array}\right\}
$$

and

$$
\mathcal{N}_{\nu}^{\perp}:=\left\{\eta \in\left(L_{\nu}^{1}(\Omega)\right)^{N} ; \int_{\Omega} \eta \cdot \xi \mathrm{d} \nu=0, \forall \xi \in \mathcal{N}_{\nu}\right\} .
$$

For $\nu$-a.e. $x \in \Omega$, we define the tangent space $T_{\nu}(x)$ to measure $\nu$, as the subspace of $\mathbb{R}^{N}$ :

$$
T_{\nu}(x)=\left\{A \in \mathbb{R}^{N} ; \exists \xi \in \mathcal{N}_{\nu}^{\perp}, A=\xi(x)\right\} .
$$

Then (cf. Proposition 3.2 of [6]) the operator $\nabla_{\nu}: \operatorname{Lip}(\Omega) \rightarrow\left(L_{\nu}^{\infty}(\Omega)\right)^{N}$ is the continuous operator such that for any $u \in \mathcal{C}^{1}(\Omega)$,

$$
\nabla_{\nu} u(x)=P_{T_{\nu(x)}} \nabla u(x) \quad \nu-p . p . \quad x \in \Omega
$$

where $P_{T_{\nu(x)}}$ is the orthogonal projection on $T_{\nu}(x), \operatorname{Lip}(\Omega)$ is the set of Lipchitz continuous function equipped with the uniform convergence and $L_{\nu}^{\infty}(\Omega)$ is equipped with the weak star topology. A $\mathbb{R}^{N}$-valued Radon measure $\phi$ is said to be tangential measure on $\Omega$ provided there exist $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_{b}(\Omega)^{+}$and $\sigma \in L_{\nu}^{1}(\Omega)^{N}$, such that $\sigma(x) \in T_{\nu}(x)$, $\nu$-a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and $\phi=\sigma \nu$. Thanks to Proposition 3.5 of [6], we know that for any tangential measure $\phi=\sigma \nu$ on $\Omega$, such that $-\nabla \cdot \phi=\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{b}(\Omega)$, we have the following integration by parts

$$
\int_{\Omega} u d \mu=\int_{\Omega} \sigma \cdot \nabla_{\nu} u d \nu
$$

for any $u \in \operatorname{Lip}(\Omega)$ null on the boundary of $\Omega$.
In the sequel, we need the following two lemmas.
Lemma 2.1. For any $z \in K$, there exists $\left(z_{\varepsilon}\right)_{\varepsilon>0}$ a sequence in $C^{1}(\Omega) \cap K$ such that

$$
z_{\varepsilon} \rightarrow z \text { uniformly in } \bar{\Omega}
$$

Proof. Let $z \in K$ and $\left(d_{\varepsilon}\right)_{\varepsilon>0}$ be a subsequence defined in $\Omega$ by

$$
d_{\varepsilon}(x)=\left\{\begin{array}{rcc}
0 & \text { if } & |z(x)| \leq \varepsilon \\
z(x)-\varepsilon & \text { otherwise. } &
\end{array}\right.
$$

We have $d_{\varepsilon} \in K$ and converges uniformly to $z$ in $\Omega$.
For any $\varepsilon>0$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{supp} d_{\varepsilon} \subset \overline{\{x \in \Omega ;|z(x)| \geq \varepsilon\}} \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and we set

$$
\Omega_{\varepsilon}=\overline{\{x \in \Omega ;|z(x)| \geq \varepsilon\}}
$$

Since $\Omega$ is bounded, $d_{\varepsilon}$ is compactly supported in $\Omega_{\varepsilon}$.
Now we introduce the sequences $\left(\tilde{z}_{\varepsilon}\right)_{\varepsilon>0}$ by

$$
\tilde{z}_{\varepsilon}(x)=\left\{\begin{array}{rll}
d_{\varepsilon}(x) & \text { if } & x \in \Omega_{\varepsilon}  \tag{2.2}\\
0 & \text { if } & x \in \mathbb{R}^{N} \backslash \Omega_{\varepsilon}
\end{array}\right.
$$

For any $\varepsilon>0$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\tilde{z}_{\varepsilon}(x)\right| \leq|z(x)| \text { and }\left|\nabla \tilde{z}_{\varepsilon}(x)\right| \leq|\nabla z(x)| \leq 1 \text { for any } x \in \Omega \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus, $\tilde{z}_{\varepsilon} \in K$ and $\tilde{z}_{\varepsilon}$ is compactly supported in $\Omega_{\varepsilon}$.
Moreover,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sup _{x \in \bar{\Omega}}\left|\tilde{z}_{\varepsilon}(x)-z(x)\right| \leq \varepsilon \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

which implies that $\tilde{z}_{\varepsilon}$ converges uniformly to $z$ in $\bar{\Omega}$.
Let $\left(\rho_{n}\right)_{n>0}$ be the standard sequence of mollifiers such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\rho_{n} \in C_{c}^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right), \operatorname{Supp} \rho_{n} \subset B\left(0, \frac{1}{n}\right), \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} \rho_{n}=1, \text { and } \rho_{n} \geq 0 \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thanks to the propositions $I V .20$ and $I V .21$ in [7] we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
z_{\varepsilon}:=\tilde{z}_{\varepsilon} * \rho_{n} \in C^{1}(\Omega) \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tilde{z}_{\varepsilon} * \rho_{n} \rightarrow \tilde{z}_{\varepsilon} \text { uniformly in } \bar{\Omega} \text { as } n \rightarrow+\infty . \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $\tilde{z}_{\varepsilon}$ converges uniformly to $z$ in $\bar{\Omega}$, it follows that $z_{\varepsilon}$ converges uniformly to $z$ in $\bar{\Omega}$. At last, we use Höelder inequality to obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left|\nabla z_{\varepsilon}(x)\right|^{2}=\sum_{k=1}^{N}\left|\frac{\partial z_{\varepsilon}}{\partial x_{k}}(x)\right|^{2} \\
& =\sum_{k=1}^{N}\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} \frac{\partial \tilde{z}_{\varepsilon}}{\partial x_{k}}(x-y) \rho_{n}(y) d y\right|^{2} \\
& \leq \sum_{k=1}^{N}\left|\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}}\left(\frac{\partial \tilde{z}_{\varepsilon}}{\partial x_{k}}(y) \rho_{n}(x-y)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{2} d y\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}}\left(\rho_{n}(x-y)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{2} d y\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right|^{2} \\
& \leq \sum_{k=1}^{N}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}}\left|\frac{\partial \tilde{z}_{\varepsilon}}{\partial x_{k}}(y)\right|^{2} \rho_{n}(x-y) d y\right)\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} \rho_{n}(x-y) d y\right) \\
& \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} \sum_{k=1}^{N}\left|\frac{\partial \tilde{z}_{\varepsilon}}{\partial x_{k}}(y)\right|^{2} \rho_{n}(x-y) d y \\
& \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}}\left|\nabla \tilde{z}_{\varepsilon}(y)\right|^{2} \rho_{n}(x-y) d y \\
& \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} \rho_{n}(x-y) d y \leq 1 \text { a.e. } x \in \Omega \tag{2.8}
\end{align*}
$$

Then, similarly as in [14], the following result can be prouved.
Lemma 2.2. For any $v \in K$ and $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_{b}(\Omega)^{+}$, we have

$$
\left|\nabla_{\nu} v\right| \leq 1 \nu \text {-a.e.in } \Omega .
$$

## 3. Proof of Theorem 1.1

To get the proof of the Theorem 1.1, we introduce a set of lemmas
Lemma 3.1. Let $\phi \in\left(\mathcal{M}_{b}(\Omega)\right)^{N}$ and $v \in K$. If $(v, \phi)$ satisfies (1.6) then, $v$ is solution of (1.1).

Proof. Let $\xi \in K$, thanks to Lemma 2.1, there exists $\xi_{\varepsilon} \in C^{1}(\Omega) \cap K$ such that $\xi_{\varepsilon} \rightarrow \xi$, uniformly in $\Omega$. Taking $\xi_{\varepsilon}$ as a test function in (1.6), we have

$$
\int_{\Omega} \nabla \xi_{\varepsilon} \cdot \frac{\phi}{|\phi|} \mathrm{d}|\phi|=\int_{\Omega} \xi_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} \xi_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} \nu .
$$

Using the fact that $\xi_{\varepsilon} \in K$, we get

$$
\int_{\Omega} \nabla \xi_{\varepsilon} \cdot \frac{\phi}{|\phi|} \mathrm{d}|\phi| \leq|\phi|(\Omega)
$$

Thus,

$$
\begin{align*}
\int_{\Omega} \xi \mathrm{d} \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} \xi \mathrm{~d} \nu & =\lim _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} \xi_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} \xi_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} \nu \\
& =\lim _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} \nabla \xi_{\varepsilon} \cdot \frac{\phi}{|\phi|} \mathrm{d}|\phi| \\
& \leq|\phi|(\Omega) \tag{3.1}
\end{align*}
$$

i.e.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\Omega} \xi \mathrm{d} \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} \xi \mathrm{~d} \nu \leq|\phi|(\Omega) \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since

$$
\begin{equation*}
|\phi|(\Omega)=\int_{\Omega} v \mathrm{~d} \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} v \mathrm{~d} \nu \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

then

$$
\int_{\Omega} v \mathrm{~d} \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} v \mathrm{~d} \nu \geq \int_{\Omega} \xi \mathrm{d} \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} \xi \mathrm{~d} \nu \text { for all } \xi \in K
$$

Lemma 3.2. Let $\phi \in\left(\mathcal{M}_{b}(\Omega)\right)^{N}$ and $v \in K$. Then $(v, \phi)$ satisfies (1.6) if and only if $(v, \phi)$ satisfies the formulations (1.7) and (1.8)
Proof. Assume that $(v, \phi)$ satisfies (1.6) and taking $v_{\varepsilon} \in C^{1}(\Omega) \cap K$ the approximation of $v$ given by Lemma 2.1; we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
|\phi|(\Omega) & =\int_{\Omega} v \mathrm{~d} \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} v \mathrm{~d} \nu \\
& =\lim _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}\left(\int_{\Omega} v_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} v_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} \nu\right) \\
& =\lim _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} \nabla_{|\phi|} v_{\varepsilon} \cdot \frac{\phi}{|\phi|} \mathrm{d}|\phi|=\int_{\Omega} \nabla_{|\phi|} v \cdot \frac{\phi}{|\phi|} \mathrm{d}|\phi| .
\end{aligned}
$$

So

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\Omega}\left(1-\nabla_{|\phi|} v \cdot \frac{\phi}{|\phi|}\right) \mathrm{d}|\phi|=0 . \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since by Lemma 2.2, we have $\left|\nabla_{|\phi|} v \cdot \frac{\phi}{|\phi|}\right| \leq\left|\nabla_{|\phi|} v\right| \leq 1|\phi|$-a.e. in $\Omega$, then by (3.4), we deduce that

$$
\nabla_{|\phi|} v \cdot \frac{\phi}{|\phi|}=1 \quad|\phi| \text {-a.e. in } \Omega \text {. }
$$

This implies that

$$
\nabla_{|\phi|} v=\frac{\phi}{|\phi|}|\phi| \text {-a.e. in } \Omega .
$$

Therefore,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\phi=|\phi| \frac{\phi}{|\phi|}=|\phi| \nabla_{|\phi|} v \quad|\phi| \text {-a.e. in } \Omega \text {. } \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Moreover if $\Phi \in\left(\mathcal{M}_{b}(\Omega)\right)^{N}$ such that $\Phi$ satisfies the first equality of (1.6), we have

$$
\begin{align*}
|\phi|(\Omega) & =\int_{\Omega} v \mathrm{~d} \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} v \mathrm{~d} \nu \\
& =\lim _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} v_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} v_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} \nu \\
& =\lim _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} \nabla v_{\varepsilon} \cdot \frac{\Phi}{|\Phi|} \mathrm{d}|\Phi| \\
& \leq \int_{\Omega} \mathrm{d}|\Phi| \tag{3.6}
\end{align*}
$$

hence (1.6) implies (1.8). It's clear that (1.8) implies (1.6), now suppose that $(v, \phi)$ satisfies (1.7), we have

$$
\begin{align*}
|\phi|(\Omega) & =\int_{\Omega} \nabla_{|\phi|} v \cdot \frac{\phi}{|\phi|} \mathrm{d}|\phi| \\
& =\lim _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} \nabla v_{\varepsilon} \cdot \frac{\phi}{|\phi|} \mathrm{d}|\phi| \\
& =\lim _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} v_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} v_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} \nu \\
& =\int_{\Omega} v \mathrm{~d} \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} v \mathrm{~d} \nu . \tag{3.7}
\end{align*}
$$

Thus,

$$
|\phi|(\Omega)=\int_{\Omega} v \mathrm{~d} \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} v \mathrm{~d} \nu
$$

As a consequence of lemmas 3.1 and 3.2 , we have (1.6) implies (1.1) and (1.6) $\Longleftrightarrow$ $(1.7) \Longleftrightarrow(1.8)$.
To prove that (1.1) implies (1.6), we consider the following system.

$$
\left(S_{\varepsilon}\right)\left\{\begin{array}{rlccc}
-\nabla \cdot \phi_{\varepsilon}\left(\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right) & =\mu & \text { in } & \Omega \\
v_{\varepsilon} & = & 0 & \text { on } & \Gamma_{D} \\
\phi_{\varepsilon}\left(\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right) \cdot \eta & = & \text { on } & \Gamma_{N},
\end{array}\right.
$$

where $\eta$ is the unit outward normal vecteur on $\partial \Omega$, for any $\varepsilon>0$ and $x \in \Omega, \phi_{\varepsilon}: \mathbb{R}^{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N}$ is given by

$$
\phi_{\varepsilon}(r)=\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\left((|r|-1)^{+}\right)^{(p-1)} \frac{r}{|r|} \quad \text { for all } \quad r \in \mathbb{R}^{N} \quad \text { and } \quad x \in \Omega \text {, }
$$

with $p>N$ fixed.
It is not difficult to see that $\phi_{\varepsilon}$ satisfies the following properties.
(i) For any $r_{1}, r_{2} \in \mathbb{R}^{N}$ and $x \in \Omega$, $\left(\phi_{\varepsilon}\left(r_{1}\right)-\phi_{\varepsilon}\left(r_{2}\right)\right) .\left(r_{1}-r_{2}\right) \geq 0$.
(ii) There exist $\varepsilon_{0}>0$ and $C_{0}>1$ such that $\phi_{\varepsilon}(r) \cdot r \geq|r|^{p}$ for any $|r| \geq C_{0}$ and $\varepsilon<\varepsilon_{0}$.
(iii) For any $\varepsilon>0, r \in \mathbb{R}^{N}$ and $x \in \Omega,\left|\phi_{\varepsilon}(r)\right| \leq \phi_{\varepsilon}(r) . r$.

We define the following separable and reflexive Banach space for $W^{1, p}(\Omega)$-norm

$$
W_{\Gamma_{D}}^{1, p}(\Omega)=\left\{z \in W^{1, p}(\Omega) ; z_{/ \Gamma_{D}}=0\right\}
$$

Lemma 3.3. For any $0<\varepsilon<\varepsilon_{0}$, the problem $\left(S_{\varepsilon}\right)$ has a unique solution $v_{\varepsilon}$ in the sense that $v_{\varepsilon} \in W_{\Gamma_{D}}^{1, p}(\Omega)$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\Omega} \phi_{\varepsilon}\left(\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right) \cdot \nabla z d x=\int_{\Omega} z d \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} z d \nu \tag{3.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $z \in W_{\Gamma_{D}}^{1, p}(\Omega)$.
Proof We define the operator $A_{\varepsilon}: W_{\Gamma_{D}}^{1, p}(\Omega) \rightarrow\left(W_{\Gamma_{D}}^{1, p}(\Omega)\right)^{\prime}$ by,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\langle A_{\varepsilon} v, z\right\rangle=\int_{\Omega} \phi_{\varepsilon}(\nabla v) \cdot \nabla z \mathrm{~d} x \tag{3.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

$A_{\varepsilon}$ is monotone, coercive, hemicontinous and bounded. Indeed, the property (i) of $\phi_{\varepsilon}$ gives the monotonicity.
For any $v, z \in W_{\Gamma_{D}}^{1, p}(\Omega)$, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|\left\langle A_{\varepsilon}(v), z\right\rangle\right| & \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega}\left|(|\nabla v|-1)^{+}\right|^{p-1}|\nabla z| \mathrm{d} x \\
& \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega}\left|(|\nabla v|-1)^{+}\right|^{p-1}|\nabla z| \mathrm{d} x \\
& \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega}|\nabla v|^{p-1}|\nabla z| \mathrm{d} x  \tag{3.10}\\
& \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\left(\int_{\Omega}|\nabla v|^{p} \mathrm{~d} x\right)^{\frac{1}{p^{p}}}\left(\int_{\Omega}|\nabla z|^{p} \mathrm{~d} x\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
& \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\|v\|_{W^{1, p}(\Omega)}^{\frac{p}{p}}\|z\|_{W^{1, p}(\Omega)}
\end{align*}
$$

which implies that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|A_{\varepsilon}(v)\right\|_{\left(W_{\Gamma_{D}}^{1, p}(\Omega)\right)^{\prime}} \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\|v\|_{W^{1, p}(\Omega)}^{\frac{p}{p}} . \tag{3.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $B$ be a bounded set of $W_{\Gamma_{D}}^{1, p}(\Omega)$, there exists $M>0$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|A_{\varepsilon}(v)\right\|_{\left(W_{\Gamma_{D}}^{1, p}(\Omega)\right)^{\prime}} \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} M^{\frac{p}{p^{\prime}}}, \forall v \in B . \tag{3.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Hence, $A_{\varepsilon}$ is a bounded operator. Moreover, using the properties (ii) and (iii) of $\phi_{\varepsilon}$, we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
\left\langle A_{\varepsilon}(v), v\right\rangle & =\int_{\Omega} \Phi_{\varepsilon}(\nabla v) . \nabla v \mathrm{~d} x \\
& =\int_{\left[|\nabla v|<C_{0}\right]} \Phi_{\varepsilon}(\nabla v) . \nabla v \mathrm{~d} x+\int_{\left[|\nabla v| \geq C_{0}\right]} \Phi_{\varepsilon}(\nabla v) . \nabla v \mathrm{~d} x \\
& \geq \int_{\left[|\nabla v|<C_{0}\right]}\left|\Phi_{\varepsilon}(\nabla v)\right| \mathrm{d} x+\int_{\left[|\nabla v| \geq C_{0}\right]}|\nabla v|^{p} \mathrm{~d} x \\
& \geq \int_{\left[|\nabla v| \geq C_{0}\right]}|\nabla v|^{p} \mathrm{~d} x . \tag{3.13}
\end{align*}
$$

Consequently,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\langle A_{\varepsilon}(v), v\right\rangle+\int_{\left[|\nabla v|<C_{0}\right]}|\nabla v|^{p} \mathrm{~d} x \geq \int_{\Omega}|\nabla v|^{p} \mathrm{~d} x . \tag{3.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus,

$$
\begin{align*}
\left\langle A_{\varepsilon}(v), v\right\rangle & \geq-\int_{\left[|\nabla v|<C_{0}\right]}|\nabla v|^{p} \mathrm{~d} x+\int_{\Omega}|\nabla v|^{p} \mathrm{~d} x \\
& \geq-\int_{\left[|\nabla v|<C_{0}\right]} C_{0}^{p} \mathrm{~d} x+\int_{\Omega}|\nabla v|^{p} \mathrm{~d} x \\
& \geq-C_{0}^{p} \operatorname{meas}\left(\left[|\nabla v|<C_{0}\right]\right)+\int_{\Omega}|\nabla v|^{p} \mathrm{~d} x \\
& \geq-C_{0}^{p} \text { meas }(\Omega)+\|v\|_{W^{1, p}(\Omega)}^{p} . \tag{3.15}
\end{align*}
$$

Hence,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\left\langle A_{\varepsilon}(v), v\right\rangle}{\|v\|_{W^{1, p}(\Omega)}} \geq-\frac{C_{0}^{p} \operatorname{meas}(\Omega)}{\|v\|_{W^{1, p}(\Omega)}}+\|v\|_{W^{1, p}(\Omega)}^{p-1} . \tag{3.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $p>1$, letting $\|v\|_{W^{1, p}(\Omega)} \rightarrow+\infty$ in (3.16), it follows that $A_{\varepsilon}$ is coercive. Now consider the map $F: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$
\begin{equation*}
F(\lambda)=\langle A(u+\lambda v), w\rangle=\int_{\Omega} \phi_{\varepsilon}(\nabla u+\lambda \nabla v) \cdot \nabla w \mathrm{~d} x \tag{3.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $u, v, w$ in $W_{\Gamma_{D}}^{1, p}(\Omega)$. We will prove that $F$ is continuous. The functions $x \mapsto$ $\phi_{\varepsilon}(\nabla u+\lambda \nabla v) . \nabla w, \lambda \mapsto \phi_{\varepsilon}(\nabla u+\lambda \nabla v) . \nabla w$ are respectively mesurable $a . e$. in $\Omega$ and continuous in $\mathbb{R}$. Let $\left(\lambda_{n}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be such that $\lambda_{n} \rightarrow \lambda$, so that there exists a constant $c>0$ with $\left|\lambda_{n}\right| \leq c$.
Therefore,

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|\phi_{\varepsilon}\left(\nabla u+\lambda_{n} \nabla v\right) . \nabla w\right| & \leq\left|\phi_{\varepsilon}\left(\nabla u+\lambda_{n} \nabla v\right)\right||\nabla w| \\
& \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\left(|\nabla u|+\left|\lambda_{n}\right||\nabla v|+1\right)^{p-1}|\nabla w| \\
& \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon}(|\nabla u|+c|\nabla v|+1)^{p-1}|\nabla w| . \tag{3.18}
\end{align*}
$$

Letting $n \rightarrow+\infty$ in (3.18) and using the fact that the function $\lambda \mapsto\left|\phi_{\varepsilon}(\nabla u+\lambda \nabla v) . \nabla w\right|$ is continuous we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\phi_{\varepsilon}(\nabla u+\lambda \nabla v) . \nabla w\right| \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon}(|\nabla u|+c|\nabla v|+1)^{p-1}|\nabla w| \in L^{1}(\Omega) . \tag{3.19}
\end{equation*}
$$

Therefore thanks to the Lebesgue theorem, we can say that $F$ is continuous, hence the operator $A$ is hemicontinuous.
Since $p>N$, we have $W_{\Gamma_{D}}^{1, p}(\Omega) \subset C(\bar{\Omega})$ and the linear form $G: W_{\Gamma_{D}}^{1, p}(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ define by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\langle G, v\rangle=\int_{\Omega} v d \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} v d \nu \tag{3.20}
\end{equation*}
$$

belongs to the dual space of $W_{\Gamma_{D}}^{1, p}(\Omega)$. So (see for instance [16]), for any $0<\varepsilon<\varepsilon_{0}$, and $p>N$ there exists $v_{\varepsilon} \in W_{\Gamma_{D}}^{1, p}(\Omega)$ such that $A\left(v_{\varepsilon}\right)=G$, i.e

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\Omega} \phi_{\varepsilon}\left(\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right) \cdot \nabla z d x=\int_{\Omega} z d \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} z d \nu \text { for all } z \in W_{\Gamma_{D}}^{1, p}(\Omega) . \tag{3.21}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now, suppose that $v_{\varepsilon}$ and $\tilde{v}_{\varepsilon}$ are two solutions of $\left(S_{\varepsilon}\right)$. For $v_{\varepsilon}$ and $\tilde{v}_{\varepsilon}$, we take $z=v_{\varepsilon}-\tilde{v}_{\varepsilon}$ in (3.21) to get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\Omega}\left(\phi_{\varepsilon}\left(\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right)-\phi_{\varepsilon}\left(\nabla \tilde{v}_{\varepsilon}\right)\right) \cdot\left(\nabla v_{\varepsilon}-\nabla \tilde{v}_{\varepsilon}\right) d x=0 . \tag{3.22}
\end{equation*}
$$

It follows that there exists a constant $\tilde{c}$ such that $v_{\varepsilon}-\tilde{v}_{\varepsilon}=\tilde{c}$ a.e. in $\Omega$. Using the fact that $v_{\varepsilon}=\tilde{v}_{\varepsilon}=0$ on $\Gamma_{D}$, we get $\tilde{c}=0$. Thus $v_{\varepsilon}=\tilde{v}_{\varepsilon}$ a.e. in $\Omega$.

Lemma 3.4. Let $\left(v_{\varepsilon}\right)_{0<\varepsilon<\varepsilon_{0}}$ be the sequence of solutions of $\left(S_{\varepsilon}\right)$. Then
(1) $\left(v_{\varepsilon}\right)_{0<\varepsilon<\varepsilon_{0}}$ is bounded in $W_{\Gamma_{D}}^{1, p}(\Omega)$.
(2) $\left(\phi_{\varepsilon}\left(\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right)\right)_{0<\varepsilon<\varepsilon_{0}}$ is bounded in $\left(L^{1}(\Omega)\right)^{N}$.
(3) For any Borel set $B \subseteq \Omega$,

$$
\liminf _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}\left(\int_{B}\left|\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right|^{p-1} d x\right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \leq|B|^{\frac{1}{p-1}} .
$$

Proof. (1) Taking $v_{\varepsilon}$ as test function in (3.22) and using the fact that $W^{1, p}(\Omega) \subset C(\bar{\Omega})$, we get following estimate.

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega}\left(\left|\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right|-1\right)^{+(p-1)}\left|\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right| \mathrm{d} x & =\int_{\Omega} \phi_{\varepsilon}\left(\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right) \cdot \nabla v_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} x x \\
& =\int_{\Omega} v_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} v_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} \nu \\
& \leq\left(|\mu|(\Omega)+|\nu|\left(\Gamma_{N}\right)\right)\left\|v_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{\infty} \\
& \leq C\left(|\mu|(\Omega)+|\nu|\left(\Gamma_{N}\right)\right)\left\|v_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{W^{1, p}(\Omega)} . \tag{3.23}
\end{align*}
$$

Combining (3.23) and property (ii) of $\phi_{\varepsilon}$, for any $0<\varepsilon<\varepsilon_{0}$, we get

$$
\begin{align*}
\int_{\Omega}\left|\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right|^{p} \mathrm{~d} x \leq & \int_{\left[\left|\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right| \leq C_{0}\right]}\left|\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right|^{p} \mathrm{~d} x+\int_{\left[\left|\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right|>C_{0}\right]}\left|\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right|^{p} \mathrm{~d} x \\
\leq & \int_{\left[\left|\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right| \leq C_{0}\right]}\left|\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right|^{p} \mathrm{~d} x+\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega}\left(\left|\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right|-1\right)^{+(p-1)}\left|\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right| \mathrm{d} x \\
\leq & \int_{\left[\left|\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right| \leq C_{0}\right]}\left|\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right|^{p} \mathrm{~d} x \\
& +C\left(|\mu|(\Omega)+|\nu|\left(\Gamma_{N}\right)\right)\left\|\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{L^{p}(\Omega)} \\
\leq & C_{0}^{p}|\Omega|+C\left(|\mu|(\Omega)+|\nu|\left(\Gamma_{N}\right)\right)\left\|\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{L^{p}(\Omega)} . \tag{3.24}
\end{align*}
$$

Thus, according to Young inequality, we deduce that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{L^{p}(\Omega)}^{p} \leq p^{\prime} C_{0}^{p}|\Omega|+\left[C\left(|\mu|(\Omega)+|\nu|\left(\Gamma_{N}\right)\right)\right]^{p^{\prime}} \tag{3.25}
\end{equation*}
$$

which implies that $\left(\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right)_{0<\varepsilon<\varepsilon_{0}}$ is bounded in $\left(L^{p}(\Omega)\right)^{N}$. Hence $\left(v_{\varepsilon}\right)_{0<\varepsilon<\varepsilon_{0}}$ is bounded in $W_{\Gamma_{D}}^{1, p}(\Omega)$.
(2) Using (3.23) and the property (iii) of $\phi_{\varepsilon}$ we deduce that

$$
\begin{align*}
\int_{\Omega}\left|\phi_{\varepsilon}\left(\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right)\right| \mathrm{d} x & \leq \int_{\Omega} \phi_{\varepsilon}\left(\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right) \cdot \nabla v_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} x \\
& \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega}\left(\left|\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right|-1\right)^{(p-1)}\left|\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right| \mathrm{d} x \\
& \leq C\left(|\mu|(\Omega)+|\nu|\left(\Gamma_{N}\right)\right)\left\|\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{L^{p}(\Omega)} . \tag{3.26}
\end{align*}
$$

So by (3.25) we deduce that $\phi_{\varepsilon}\left(\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right)$ is bounded in $\left(L^{1}(\Omega)\right)^{N}$.
(3) Now, let $B \subseteq \Omega$ be a fixed Borel set. We have

$$
\begin{align*}
\left\|\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{L^{p-1}(B)} & \leq\left\|\left(\nabla v_{\varepsilon}-1\right)^{+}+1\right\|_{L^{p-1}(B)} \\
& \leq\left\|\left(\nabla v_{\varepsilon}-1\right)^{+}\right\|_{L^{p-1}(B)}+|B|^{\frac{1}{p-1}}  \tag{3.27}\\
& \leq\left(\int_{B}\left(\nabla v_{\varepsilon}-1\right)^{+(p-1)}\left|\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right| \mathrm{d} x\right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}+|B|^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \\
& \leq\left[\varepsilon C\left(|\mu|(\Omega)+|\nu|\left(\Gamma_{N}\right)\right)\left\|\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{L^{p}(\Omega)}\right]^{\frac{1}{p-1}}+|B|^{\frac{1}{p-1}} . \tag{3.28}
\end{align*}
$$

Letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ and using the fact that $v_{\varepsilon}$ is bounded in $W^{1, p}(\Omega)$, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\liminf _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}\left(\int_{\Omega}\left|\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right|^{p-1} \mathrm{~d} x\right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \leq|B|^{\frac{1}{p-1}} . \tag{3.29}
\end{equation*}
$$

Lemma 3.5. Under the assumptions of Lemma 3.4, there exists a subsequence that we denote again by $v_{\varepsilon}$, such that, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$,

$$
\begin{gather*}
v_{\varepsilon} \rightarrow \tilde{v} \text { uniformly in } \bar{\Omega} \text { and in } W^{1, \infty}(\Omega)-\text { weak, }  \tag{3.30}\\
\phi_{\varepsilon}\left(\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right) \rightarrow \phi \text { in }\left(\mathcal{M}_{b}(\Omega)\right)^{N}-\text { weak }^{*}, \tag{3.31}
\end{gather*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\Omega}\left|\phi_{\varepsilon}\left(\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right)\right| d x \rightarrow|\phi|(\Omega) . \tag{3.32}
\end{equation*}
$$

Moreover, $\tilde{v} \in K$ and ( $\tilde{v}, \phi$ ) satisfies (1.6).
Proof. Thanks to the Lemma 3.4, there exist $\tilde{v} \in W_{\Gamma_{D}}^{1, p}(\Omega), \phi \in \mathcal{M}_{b}(\Omega)$ and a subsequence denoted again by $v_{\varepsilon}$, such that (3.30) and (3.31) are fulfilled.
For any $\xi \in \mathcal{C}^{1}(\Omega) \cap W_{D}^{1, \infty}(\Omega)$, we have

$$
\int_{\Omega} \phi_{\varepsilon}\left(\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right) \cdot \nabla \xi \mathrm{d} x=\int_{\Omega} \xi \mathrm{d} \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} \xi \mathrm{~d} \nu .
$$

Thus, letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we deduce that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\Omega} \nabla \xi \cdot \frac{\phi}{|\phi|} \mathrm{d}|\phi|=\int_{\Omega} \xi \mathrm{d} \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} \xi \mathrm{~d} \nu . \tag{3.33}
\end{equation*}
$$

To prove that $\tilde{v} \in K$, let us consider $A_{\delta}=[|\nabla \tilde{v}| \geq 1+\delta]$, with arbitrary $\delta>0$. Since as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0, \nabla v_{\varepsilon} \rightarrow \nabla \tilde{v}$ in $\left(L^{1}(\Omega)\right)^{N}$-weak then,

$$
\begin{align*}
(1+\delta)\left|A_{\delta}\right| & \leq \int_{A_{\delta}}|\nabla \tilde{v}| \mathrm{d} x \\
& \leq \liminf _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{A_{\delta}}\left|\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right| \mathrm{d} x \\
& \leq \liminf _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}\left(\int_{A_{\delta}}\left|\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right|^{p-1} \mathrm{~d} x\right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}\left|A_{\delta}\right|^{\frac{p-2}{p-1}} \tag{3.34}
\end{align*}
$$

So that, by using the third part of Lemma 3.4, we deduce that

$$
(1+\delta)\left|A_{\delta}\right| \leq\left|A_{\delta}\right|,
$$

which implies that $\left|A_{\delta}\right|=0$. Since $\delta$ is arbitrary, we deduce that $|\nabla \tilde{v}| \leq 1$ a.e. in $\Omega$. Therefore,

$$
\tilde{v} \in K .
$$

To prove (3.32), we see that according to the property (iii) of $\phi_{\varepsilon}$ and (3.30), we have

$$
\begin{align*}
\limsup _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega}\left|\phi_{\varepsilon}\left(\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right)\right| \mathrm{d} x & \leq \limsup _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} \phi_{\varepsilon}\left(\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right) \cdot \nabla v_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} x \\
& \leq \limsup _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}\left(\int_{\Omega} v_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} v_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} \nu\right) \\
& \leq \int_{\Omega} \tilde{v} \mathrm{~d} \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} \tilde{v} \mathrm{~d} \nu . \tag{3.35}
\end{align*}
$$

In addition, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
\int_{\Omega} \tilde{v} \mathrm{~d} \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} \tilde{v} \mathrm{~d} \nu & =\lim _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} \phi\left(\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right) \cdot \nabla \tilde{v} \mathrm{~d} x \\
& \leq \lim _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega}\left|\phi_{\varepsilon}\left(\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right)\right| \mathrm{d} x \tag{3.36}
\end{align*}
$$

So, (3.35) and (3.36) implies that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega}\left|\phi_{\varepsilon}\left(\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right)\right| \mathrm{d} x=\int_{\Omega} \tilde{v} \mathrm{~d} \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} \tilde{v} \mathrm{~d} \nu \tag{3.37}
\end{equation*}
$$

and by (3.31) we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
|\phi|(\Omega)=\int_{\Omega} \mathrm{d}|\phi| \leq \liminf _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega}\left|\phi_{\varepsilon}\left(\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right)\right| \mathrm{d} x=\int_{\Omega} \tilde{v} \mathrm{~d} \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} \tilde{v} \mathrm{~d} \nu . \tag{3.38}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using $\tilde{v}_{\varepsilon}$, the approximation of $\tilde{v}$ given by Lemma 2.1, we see that

$$
\begin{align*}
\int_{\Omega} \tilde{v} \mathrm{~d} \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} \tilde{v} \mathrm{~d} \nu & =\lim _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} \nabla \tilde{v}_{\varepsilon} \cdot \frac{\phi}{|\phi|} \mathrm{d}|\phi| \\
& \leq \int_{\Omega} \mathrm{d}|\phi|=|\phi|(\Omega) . \tag{3.39}
\end{align*}
$$

Combining the above inequality with (3.38) we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
|\phi|(\Omega)=\int_{\Omega} \tilde{v} \mathrm{~d} \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} \tilde{v} \mathrm{~d} \nu \tag{3.40}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega}\left|\phi\left(\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right)\right| \mathrm{d} x=|\phi|(\Omega) . \tag{3.41}
\end{equation*}
$$

Lemma 3.6. Let $v \in K$, be a solution of (1.1), then there exists $\phi \in\left(\mathcal{M}_{b}(\Omega)\right)^{N}$ such that $(v, \phi)$ satisfies (1.6).

Proof. Let $\tilde{v}=\lim _{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \tilde{v}_{\varepsilon}$, where $\tilde{v}_{\varepsilon}$ is the solution of $\left(S_{\varepsilon}\right)$. According to Lemma 3.5, there exists $\phi$ in $\left(\mathcal{M}_{b}(\Omega)\right)^{N}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\Omega} \nabla \xi \cdot \frac{\phi}{|\phi|} \mathrm{d}|\phi|=\int_{\Omega} \xi \mathrm{d} \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} \xi \mathrm{~d} \nu \text { for all } \xi \in \mathcal{C}^{1}(\Omega) \cap W_{D}^{1, \infty}(\Omega) \tag{3.42}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
|\phi|(\Omega)=\int_{\Omega} \tilde{v} \mathrm{~d} \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} \tilde{v} \mathrm{~d} \nu . \tag{3.43}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $v_{\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{C}^{1}(\Omega) \cap K$ be the approximation of $v$ given by the Lemma 2.1, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
\int_{\Omega} v \mathrm{~d} \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} v \mathrm{~d} \nu & =\lim _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} v_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} v_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} \nu \\
& =\lim _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} \nabla v_{\varepsilon} \cdot \frac{\phi}{|\phi|} \mathrm{d}|\phi| \\
& \leq \int_{\Omega} \mathrm{d}|\phi|=|\phi|(\Omega) \tag{3.44}
\end{align*}
$$

Since $v$ is solution of (1.1), we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\Omega} v \mathrm{~d} \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} v \mathrm{~d} \nu \geq \int_{\Omega} z \mathrm{~d} \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} z \mathrm{~d} \nu \text { for all } z \in K \tag{3.45}
\end{equation*}
$$

In particular, taking $z=\tilde{v}$, we deduce that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\Omega} v \mathrm{~d} \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} v \mathrm{~d} \nu \geq \int_{\Omega} \tilde{v} \mathrm{~d} \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} \tilde{v} \mathrm{~d} \nu=|\phi|(\Omega) . \tag{3.46}
\end{equation*}
$$

Consequently, (3.44) and (3.46) implies that

$$
|\phi|(\Omega)=\int_{\Omega} v \mathrm{~d} \mu+\int_{\Gamma_{N}} v \mathrm{~d} \nu .
$$

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Thanks to lemma 3.1 we have (1.6) implies (1.1). As a consequence of lemmas 3.6, we have that (1.1) implies (1.6). The equivalence between (1.6), (1.7) and (1.8)is given by Lemma 3.2
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