Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

ScienceDirect

Ann. I. H. Poincaré – AN 26 (2009) 1345–1360

ANNALES DE L'INSTITUT HENRI POINCARÉ
ANALYSE NON LINÉAIRE

www.elsevier.com/locate/anihpc

Moving domain walls in magnetic nanowires

Katharina Kühn *

Max-Planck-Institute for Mathematics in the Science, Inselstr. 22, 04103 Leipzig, Germany

Received 18 March 2008; received in revised form 18 October 2008; accepted 21 November 2008

Available online 24 December 2008

Abstract

This paper investigates the reversal of magnetic nanowires via a perturbation argument from the static case. We consider the gradient flow equation of the micromagnetic energy including the nonlocal stray field energy. For thin wires and weak external magnetic fields we show the existence of travelling wave solutions. These travelling waves are almost constant on the cross section and can thus be seen as moving domain walls of a type called transverse wall.
© 2008 Elsevier Masson SAS. All rights reserved.

Résumé

Cet article présente une étude du renversement des nano-fils magnétiques par une méthode de perturbation du cas statique. On considère l'équation du flot-gradient associé à l'énergie micromagnétique en incluant l'énergie de la perturbation non locale du champ magnétique. Pour des fils fins et des champs magnétiques externes de faible amplitude, on montre que les solutions prennent la forme d'ondes progressives. Ces ondes progressives ont une amplitude pratiquement homogène sur l'ensemble de la section, et peuvent donc être assimilées à des parois de domaines transverses.
© 2008 Elsevier Masson SAS. All rights reserved.

MSC: 82D40; 47J35

Keywords: Micromagnetism; Domain walls; Nonlinear evolution equations

1. Introduction

Because of possible technical applications [1,10] in the recent years there has been a growing interest in magnetic nanowires and especially in their reversal modes. It is known that the reversal of the magnetisation starts at one end of the wire and then a domain wall separating the already reversed part from the not yet reversed part is propagating through the wire.

In the micromagnetic model, the evolution of the magnetisation is described by the Landau–Lifshitz–Gilbert (LLG) equation. We simplify this equation taking the overdamped limit, that is, we consider the gradient flow equation of the micromagnetic energy. Viewing static domain walls as travelling waves with speed 0, we show the existence of travelling wave solutions for thin wires and weak external magnetic fields via a perturbation argument. This argument relies crucially on the fact that the wires are thin, since we need strong regularity of the static domain wall. We have

* Tel.: 089/72301607; fax: 0341/9959 633.
E-mail address: Katharina.Kuehn@gmx.de.

0294-1449/$ – see front matter © 2008 Elsevier Masson SAS. All rights reserved.
doi:10.1016/j.anihpc.2008.11.004

proved strong regularity in the case of thin wires [7], and we cannot expect it for thick wires where the examples of low energy configurations are vortex walls which have a singularity and are not even continuous [6].

For thin wires, static domain walls are almost constant on the cross section [6]. Thus, after perturbing the equation with a weak external field, the moving domain walls are still almost constant on the cross section. Such a reversal mode has been observed in numerical simulations [4,5,11] and is called transverse mode.

Various models for the transverse mode have been analysed previously. Thiaville and Nakatani [10] study a one-dimensional model for the transverse mode and compare it with numerical simulations. Carbou and Labbé [3] consider a similar model. They prove that one-dimensional domain walls are asymptotically stable. Sanchez [9] considers the limit of the Landau–Lifshitz equation when the diameter of the domain and the exchange coefficient in the equation simultaneously tend to zero and performs an asymptotic expansion.

The final goal in understanding the transverse mode is to find solutions to the full Landau–Lifshitz–Gilbert equation, to describe their properties, and to rigorously derive a reduced theory. This paper is a step towards that goal which, contrary to the other approaches, takes into account the full three-dimensional structure of the problem. We expect that the methods developed in this paper can be applied to find solutions for the full Landau–Lifshitz–Gilbert equation.

1.1. Static domain walls

We work in the framework of micromagnetism. This is a mesoscopic continuum theory that assigns a nonlocal nonconvex energy to each magnetisation m from the domain $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ to the sphere $\mathbb{S}^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$. Experimentally observed ground states correspond to minimisers of the micromagnetic energy functional. When appropriately rescaled, for a soft magnetic material with an external field of strength h in direction of $\vec{e}_x$ this energy is

$$E_h(m) = \int_\Sigma \left(|\nabla m|^2 + h\vec{e}_x \cdot m\right) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left|H(m)\right|^2. \tag{1}$$

Here $H(m) : \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}^3$ is the projection of m on gradient fields, i.e.,

$$H(m) = \nabla u \quad \text{with } \Delta u = \operatorname{div} m \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^3. \tag{2}$$

We consider magnetisations where the domain $\Sigma_R = \mathbb{R} \times D_R$ is an infinite cylinder with radius R and set

$$\mathcal{M}(R) := \left\{m : \Sigma_R \to \mathbb{S}^2 \;\middle|\; E_0(m) < \infty\right\}. \tag{3}$$

To specify the conditions at $\pm\infty$ we need to define a smooth function $\chi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^3$ with $\lim_{x\to\pm\infty} \chi(x) = \pm\vec{e}_x$. Our choice is

$$\chi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^3, \quad x \mapsto \tanh(x)\vec{e}_x. \tag{4}$$

In [6] we have shown that for $m : \Sigma_R \to \mathbb{S}^2$ the condition $E_0(m) < \infty$ is equivalent to the statement that one of the four maps $m \pm \vec{e}_x$, $m \pm \chi$ is in $H^1(\Sigma_R)$. Thus, to single out the magnetisations that correspond to a 180 degree domain wall we define

$$\mathcal{M}_l(R) := \left\{m : \Sigma_R \to \mathbb{S}^2 \;\middle|\; m - \chi\vec{e}_x \in H^1(\Sigma_R)\right\}. \tag{5}$$

For every $R > 0$ there exist energy minimising 180 degree domain walls, i.e., minimisers of E_0 in $\mathcal{M}_l(R)$ [6]. For $R \to 0$ the energy minimisation problem Γ-converges to a reduced, one-dimensional problem whose minimiser can be calculated explicitly to be

$$m^{\text{red}} : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{S}^2, \qquad x \mapsto \left(\tanh\left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{2}}\right), \frac{1}{\cosh(x/\sqrt{2})}, 0\right). \tag{6}$$

In [7] we have shown that the minimisers converge to m^{red} not only in a topology implied by the energy estimates but also in stronger norms.

Theorem 1. *Let m^R be a minimiser of E_0 in $\mathcal{M}_l(R)$.*

(i) *For R small enough, $m^R \in H^2(\Sigma_R) + \chi \cap C^1(\Sigma_R)$.*
(ii) *We have*

$$\lim_{R\to 0} \frac{1}{R} \| m^R - m^{\mathrm{red}} \|_{H^1(\Sigma_R)} = 0,$$
$$\lim_{R\to 0} \| m^R - m^{\mathrm{red}} \|_{C^1(\Sigma_R)} = 0.$$

1.2. The dynamic model

We assume that the evolution of the magnetisation can be described by gradient flow of the energy under the condition $|m| \equiv 1$ with Neumann boundary conditions, that is,

$$\partial_t m = -\delta_m E_h(m) + \big(\delta_m E_h(m) \cdot m\big) m \quad \text{in } \Sigma_R, \qquad \partial_\nu m = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Sigma_R, \tag{7}$$

where

$$\delta_m E_h(m) = -2\Delta m + 2H(m) - h\vec{e}_x. \tag{8}$$

This equation is the overdamped limit of the Landau–Lifshitz–Gilbert equation. We are interested in travelling wave solutions. Because of the rotational symmetry of the cylinder we have to take into account that the solutions may rotate around the axis of the cylinder. We set

$$Q_\phi := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cos(\phi) & \sin(\phi) \\ 0 & -\sin(\phi) & \cos(\phi) \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \tilde{Q}_\phi := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cos(\phi) & \sin(\phi) \\ 0 & -\sin(\phi) & \cos(\phi) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{9}$$

and note that $\partial_t Q_{\omega t} = \omega \tilde{Q}_{\omega t + \frac{\pi}{2}}$. Rotating travelling waves with speed c and angular velocity ω satisfy

$$m(t,x,y) = Q_{\omega t} m\big(0, Q_{-\omega t}(x - ct, y)\big).$$

Defining

$$\Phi(m) := \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ -m_{y_2} \\ m_{y_1} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \partial_{y_1} m_{y_1} & \partial_{y_2} m_{y_1} \\ 0 & \partial_{y_1} m_{y_2} & \partial_{y_2} m_{y_2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ y_2 \\ -y_1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{10}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t m(t,x,y) &= \omega \tilde{Q}_{\omega t + \frac{\pi}{2}} m\big(0, Q_{-\omega t}(x - ct, y)\big) - c Q_{\omega t} \partial_x m\big(0, Q_{-\omega t}(x-ct, y)\big) \\ &\quad - Q_{\omega t} \nabla_y m\big(0, Q_{-\omega t}(x - ct, y)\big) \omega \tilde{Q}_{-\omega t + \frac{\pi}{2}} \vec{y} \\ &= -c\partial_x m(t,x,y) + \omega \tilde{Q}_{\frac{\pi}{2}} m(t,x,y) - \omega \nabla_y m(t,x,y) \tilde{Q}_{\frac{\pi}{2}} \vec{y} \\ &= -c\partial_x m(t,x,y) - \omega \Phi\big(m(t,x,y)\big). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, rotating travelling waves that are a solution of (7) satisfy the stationary equation

$$\begin{aligned} &-\delta_m E_h(m) + \big(\delta_m E_h(m) \cdot m\big) m + c\partial_x m + \omega \Phi(m) = 0 \quad \text{in } \Sigma_R, \\ &\partial_\nu m = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Sigma_R. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

To find solutions of (11) we consider first the case $h = 0$ and then use a perturbation argument. For this we have to work in a function space that is large enough to contain the solutions and small enough that the left-hand side of (11) is differentiable in this function space. As we will see, $H^2(\Sigma_R, \mathbb{R}^3) + \chi$ is a good choice. In this space we have to restrict the search to solutions with $|m| \equiv 1$. We have to include further conditions in the set of admissible solutions to break the translation invariance and the rotation invariance of the problem. For $c=0$, $\omega=0$, $h=0$, Eq. (11) simplifies to

$$0=-\delta_m E_0(m)+\big(\delta_m E_0(m)\cdot m\big)m \quad \text{in } \Sigma_R, \quad \partial_\nu m=0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Sigma_R. \tag{12}$$

This is the Euler Lagrange equation for the energy E_0 under the condition $|m|=1$. Thus, Theorem 1 implies that, for $R>0$ small enough, minimisers m^R of the energy E_0 are solutions of (12) in $H^2(\Sigma_R,\mathbb{R}^3)+\chi$.

We proceed a follows.

1. Depending on m^R we define the set of admissible functions $\mathcal{S}$ and show that $\mathcal{S}$ is a Banach submanifold of $H^2(\Sigma_R,\mathbb{R}^3)+\chi$.
2. We find a continuously differentiable function

   $$N:\mathcal{S}\times L^2(\Sigma_R,\mathbb{R})\times\mathbb{R}^3\to L^2\big(\Sigma_R,\mathbb{R}^3\big)\times\mathbb{R}$$

   such that (m,c,ω,h) is a solution of (11) if and only if there exists $\alpha\in L^2(\Sigma_R,\mathbb{R})$ that satisfies $N(m,\alpha,c,\omega,h)=(0,h)$.
3. We show that the derivative DN of N in $(m^R,0,0,0,0)$ is invertible.
4. Then, according to the inverse function theorem [12, Theorem 73.B, p. 552], there exists a neighbourhood U of $(m^R,0,0,0,0)$ and a neighbourhood V of $(0,0)$ such that $N|_U\to V$ is bijective. In particular, there exists $h_0>0$, such that for all $|h|<h_0$ there are $m_h,\alpha_h,c_h,\omega_h$ with $N(m_h,\alpha_h,c_h,\omega_h,h)=0$. In other words, for all $|h|<h_0$ there exists a solution of (11).

In Section 2 we go through the steps 1–4 to show the existence of travelling wave solutions for small radii and small external magnetic field. The arguments of Section 2 use the invertibility of an operator representing the "interesting" part of $DN(m^R,0,0,0,0)$. This invertibility is shown in Section 3 and relies on the fact that m^R is close to m^{red}.

1.3. Definitions and notation

The letter p denotes a point in $\mathbb{R}^3$ and has the components $p=(x,y_1,y_2)=(x,y)$. A map f with values in $\mathbb{R}^3$ has the components $f=(f_x,f_{y_1},f_{y_2})$. We write f_y for $(0,f_{y_1},f_{y_2})$, i.e., we view f_y as a map to $\{0\}\times\mathbb{R}^2$. For a set $A\subset L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we denote the closure of A in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ by A_{L^2} and the characteristic function by $\mathbb{1}_A$. For $a,b\in\mathbb{R}^n$, $n\in\mathbb{N}$ we denote the scalar product by $a\cdot b$. For $\Omega\subset\mathbb{R}^3$ and $f,g:\Omega\to\mathbb{R}^n$, $n\in\mathbb{N}$, we set

$$\langle f,g\rangle_\Omega:=\int_\Omega f(p)\cdot g(p)\,dp,$$

whenever the integral on the right-hand side is defined. Moreover we set

$$D_R(p):=\big\{q\in\mathbb{R}^2\colon |p-q|<R\big\},\quad D_R:=D_R(0),\qquad \Sigma_R:=\mathbb{R}\times D_R.$$

The definitions of χ in (4), of $\mathcal{M}_l$ in (5), and of Φ in (10) remain valid. With m^{red} as in (6) we define

$$m_R^{\text{red}}:\Sigma_R\to\mathbb{S}^2,\quad (x,y)\mapsto m^{\text{red}}(x). \tag{13}$$

For $m:\Omega\subset\mathbb{R}^3\to\mathbb{R}^3$ let $H(m):\mathbb{R}^3\to\mathbb{R}^3$ be the projection of m on gradient fields as in (2). The micromagnetic energy without external magnetic field is denoted by $E(m)$ and the micromagnetic energy including the external magnetic field is denoted by $E_h(m)$.

Finally, let $m^R:\Sigma_R\to\mathbb{S}^2$ always be a minimiser of E in $\mathcal{M}_l(R)$. To break the translation and rotation invariance we additionally require

$$\big\|m^R-m_R^{\text{red}}\big\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}\leqslant\big\|v-m_R^{\text{red}}\big\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}\quad \text{for all other minimisers } v\in\mathcal{M}_l(R).$$

2. The perturbation argument

As described above, the first step in the perturbation argument is to show that we are working on a sufficiently smooth manifold. Set

$$\mathcal{S}^R := \left\{ f \in H^2(\Sigma_R, \mathbb{R}^3) + \chi \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{ll} |f| \equiv 1, & \partial_\nu f = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Sigma_R, \\ \langle \partial_x m^R, f\rangle_{\Sigma_R} = 0, & \langle \Phi(m^R), f\rangle_{\Sigma_R} = 0, \end{array} \right\},$$

$$T\mathcal{S}^R := \left\{ f \in H^2(\Sigma_R, \mathbb{R}^3) \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{ll} f \cdot m^R \equiv 0, & \partial_\nu f = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Sigma_R, \\ \langle \partial_x m^R, f\rangle_{\Sigma_R} = 0, & \langle \Phi(m^R), f\rangle_{\Sigma_R} = 0 \end{array} \right\}.$$

Lemma 2. *There exists $R_0 > 0$ such that for all $R \leqslant R_0$ the set $\mathcal{S}^R$ is a submanifold of $H^2(\Sigma_R, \mathbb{R}^3) + \chi$. The tangent space of $\mathcal{S}^R$ in m^R is $T\mathcal{S}^R$.*

Proof. We show the lemma in two steps. We define

$$\mathcal{W}^R := \left\{ m \in H^2(\Sigma_R, \mathbb{R}^3) \mid \partial_\nu m|_{\partial\Sigma_R} = 0,\ \langle m, \partial_x m^R\rangle_{\Sigma_R} = 0,\ \langle m, \Phi(m^R)\rangle_{\Sigma_R} = 0 \right\}.$$

First, since $\partial_x m^R, \Phi(m^R) \in L^2(\Sigma_R)$ and since the trace of a function in $H^2(\Sigma_R)$ is in $H^1(\partial\Sigma_R)$, the set $\mathcal{W}^R + \chi$ is a closed affine subspace of $H^2(\Sigma_R, \mathbb{R}^3) + \chi$.

Second, we show that $\mathcal{S}^R$ is a submanifold of $\mathcal{W}^R + \chi$. Set

$$\phi : \mathcal{W}^R + \chi \to \left\{ f \in H^2(\Sigma_R, \mathbb{R}) \colon \partial_\nu f|_{\partial\Sigma_R} = 0 \right\}, \quad m \mapsto |m| - 1,$$

then $\mathcal{S}^R = \phi^{-1}(0)$. On $\{m \in \mathcal{W}^R \colon |\phi(m)| < 1\}$ the function ϕ is continuously differentiable and the derivative in m is

$$D\phi(m) : \mathcal{W}^R \to \left\{ f \in H^2(\Sigma_R, \mathbb{R}) \colon \partial_\nu f|_{\partial\Sigma_R} = 0 \right\}, \quad g \mapsto \frac{g \cdot m}{|m|}. \tag{14}$$

If R is small enough, for every $m \in \mathcal{S}^R$ the differential $D\phi(m)$ is surjective: Indeed the equality $\partial_x m_R^{\mathrm{red}} \cdot \Phi(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}) = 0$ implies

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} \langle \partial_x m_R^{\mathrm{red}}, \partial_x m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\rangle_{\Sigma_R} & \langle \partial_x m^R, \Phi(m_R^{\mathrm{red}})\rangle_{\Sigma_R} \\ \langle \partial_x m_R^{\mathrm{red}}, \Phi(m_R^{\mathrm{red}})\rangle_{\Sigma_R} & \langle \Phi(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}), \Phi(m_R^{\mathrm{red}})\rangle_{\Sigma_R} \end{pmatrix} = \pi R^2 \left(\left\| \partial_x m_R^{\mathrm{red}} \right\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} + \left\| \Phi(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}) \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \right),$$

so with Theorem 1(ii) there exists R_0 such that for all $R \leqslant R_0$ we have

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} \langle \partial_x m^R, \partial_x m^R\rangle_{\Sigma_R} & \langle \partial_x m^R, \Phi(m^R)\rangle_{\Sigma_R} \\ \langle \partial_x m^R, \Phi(m^R)\rangle_{\Sigma_R} & \langle \Phi(m^R), \Phi(m^R)\rangle_{\Sigma_R} \end{pmatrix} > 0.$$

Therefore, for every $f \in H^2(\Sigma_R, \mathbb{R})$ with $\partial_\nu f|_{\partial\Sigma_R} = 0$ we can find unique numbers b_1, b_2 such that

$$\langle fm + b_1 \partial_x m^R + b_2 \Phi(m^R), \partial_x m^R\rangle_{\Sigma_R} = 0,$$
$$\langle fm + b_1 \partial_x m^R + b_2 \Phi(m^R), \Phi(m^R)\rangle_{\Sigma_R} = 0,$$

and $fm + b_1 \partial_x m^R + b_2 \Phi(m^R)$ is a pre-image of f in $\mathcal{W}^R$. Moreover, since in a Hilbert space every subspace splits, in particular $D\phi^{-1}(0)$ splits. Thus 0 is a regular value of ϕ and we can apply [12, Thm. 73C, p. 556] to conclude that $\mathcal{S}^R$ is a submanifold of $\mathcal{W}^R + \chi$. Because of (14) the space $T\mathcal{S}^R$ is the tangent space of $\mathcal{S}^R$ in m^R. □

We consider the map

$$s : \mathcal{S}^R \to L^2(\Sigma_R, \mathbb{R}^3), \quad m \mapsto -\delta_m E_h(m) + (\delta_m E_h(m) \cdot m)m,$$

that is, with (8),

$$s(m) = \underbrace{2\big(\Delta m - (\Delta m \cdot m)m - H(m) + (H(m) \cdot m)m\big)}_{s_1} + \underbrace{h\vec{e}_x - (h\vec{e}_x \cdot m)m}_{s_2}.$$

The space $H^2(\Sigma_R, \mathbb{R}) + \chi$ embeds into $C^0(\Sigma_R, \mathbb{R})$, and functions $m \mapsto \Delta m$, and $m \mapsto H(m)$ are continuous linear maps from $\mathcal{S}^R$ to $L^2(\Sigma_R, \mathbb{R}^3)$. For the last statement see [8, Lemma 2.6]. Thus $s_1 : \mathcal{S}^R \to L^2(\Sigma_R, \mathbb{R}^3)$ is well defined and continuously differentiable.

Moreover, we have

$$\left|h\vec{e}_x - (h\vec{e}_x \cdot m)m\right| = h\left|\left(1 - m_x^2\right)\vec{e}_x + m_x m_y\right| \leqslant 2h|m_y|,$$

so $s_2 : \mathcal{S}^R \to L^2(\Sigma_R, \mathbb{R}^3)$ is well defined and continuously differentiable, too.

Thus we can define the continuously differentiable map

$$N^R : \mathcal{S}^R \times L^2(\Sigma_R, \mathbb{R}) \times \mathbb{R}^3 \to L^2\big(\Sigma_R, \mathbb{R}^3\big) \times \mathbb{R},$$
$$(m, \alpha, c, \omega, h) \mapsto \big(-\delta_m E_h(m) + \big(\delta_m E_h(m) \cdot m\big)m + c\partial_x m + \omega\Phi(m) + \alpha m, h\big).$$

Since $(-\delta_m E_h(m) + (\delta_m E_h(m) \cdot m)m + c\partial_x m + \omega\Phi(m)) \perp m$ for all $m \in \mathcal{S}^R$ we have $N^R(m, \alpha, c, \omega, h) = (0, h)$ if and only if m is a solution of (11) and $\alpha = 0$.

The differential of N^R in $(m^R, 0_{L^2(\Sigma_R,\mathbb{R})}, 0_{\mathbb{R}^3})$ is

$$DN^R\big(m^R, 0, 0\big) : T\mathcal{S}^R \times L^2\big(\Sigma_R, R^3\big) \times \mathbb{R}^3 \to L^2\big(\Sigma_R, \mathbb{R}^3\big) \times \mathbb{R},$$
$$(g, \alpha, c, \omega, h) \mapsto \big(-L^R(g) + c\partial_x m^R + \omega\Phi(m_0) + \alpha m^R, h\big),$$

where

$$L^R : H^2\big(\Sigma_R, \mathbb{R}^3\big) \to L^2\big(\Sigma_R, \mathbb{R}^3\big),$$
$$g \mapsto \delta_m E(g) - \big(\delta_m E(g) \cdot m^R\big)m^R - \big(\delta_m E\big(m^R\big) \cdot g\big)m^R - \big(\delta_m E\big(m^R\big) \cdot m^R\big)g. \tag{15}$$

With (8) we have the following explicit formula for $L^R(g)$:

$$\begin{aligned} L^R(g) = {} & -2\Delta g + 2H(g) + 2\big(\Delta g \cdot m^R\big)m^R - 2\big(H(g) \cdot m^R\big)m^R + 2\big(\Delta m^R \cdot g\big)m^R \\ & - 2\big(H\big(m^R\big) \cdot g\big)m^R + 2\big(\Delta m^R \cdot m^R\big)g - 2\big(H\big(m^R\big) \cdot m^R\big)g. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

We will consider the restrictions of L^R to different subspaces of $H^2(\Sigma_R, \mathbb{R}^3)$. We will call these restrictions L^R as well, but name always the domain and the range.

Lemma 3. *For all $R > 0$ and all $g, f \in T\mathcal{S}^R$ we have*

$$L^R(g) = \delta_m E(g) - \big(\delta_m E(g) \cdot m^R\big)m^R - \big(\delta_m E\big(m^R\big) \cdot m^R\big)g, \tag{17}$$
$$L^R(g) \cdot f = \delta_m E(g) \cdot f - \big(\delta_m E\big(m^R\big) \cdot m^R\big)g \cdot f. \tag{18}$$

Moreover $L^R(T\mathcal{S}^R) \subseteq (T\mathcal{S}^R)_{L^2}$ and the operator $L^R : T\mathcal{S}^R \to (T\mathcal{S}^R)_{L^2}$ is symmetric.

Proof. Since m^R is a solution of (12), $\delta_m E(m^R)$ is pointwise parallel to m^R. The elements of $T\mathcal{S}^R$ are pointwise orthogonal to m^R. This implies (17) and (18). By definition the elements of $T\mathcal{S}^R$ satisfy Neumann boundary conditions, so for all $g, f \in T\mathcal{S}^R$ we have $\langle L^R f, g\rangle_{\Sigma_R} = \langle f, L^R g\rangle_{\Sigma_R}$.

It remains to show that $L^R(T\mathcal{S}^R) \subseteq (T\mathcal{S}^R)_{L^2}$. We have

$$\big(T\mathcal{S}^R\big)_{L^2} := \left\{ f \in L^2\big(\Sigma_R, \mathbb{R}^3\big) \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{l} f \cdot m^R \equiv 0, \\ \big\langle \partial_x m^R, f\big\rangle_{\Sigma_R} = 0,\ \big\langle \Phi\big(m^R\big), f\big\rangle_{\Sigma_R} = 0 \end{array} \right\}.$$

Looking at (17), we see that $L^R(g) \perp m^R$. Set $v(t, x, y) := m^R(x + t, y)$. Then $v(t, \cdot)$ satisfies for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ the equation

$$0 = \delta_m E\big(v(t, \cdot)\big) - \big(\delta_m E\big(v(t, \cdot)\big) \cdot v(t, \cdot)\big)v(t, \cdot),$$

therefore we have for all $g \in T\mathcal{S}^R$

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \partial_t\big\langle \delta_m E\big(v(t, \cdot)\big) - \big(\delta_m E\big(v(t, \cdot)\big) \cdot v(t, \cdot)\big)v(t, \cdot), g\big\rangle_{\Sigma_R}\big|_{t=0} \\ &= \big\langle L\big(\partial_x m^R\big), g\big\rangle_{\Sigma_R} = \big\langle L(g), \partial_x m^R\big\rangle_{\Sigma_R}. \end{aligned}$$

Analogously, with Q_ϕ as in (9) we have for $w(\phi, x, y) := Q_\phi(m^R(Q_{-\phi}(x, y)))$ the equation

$$0 = \delta_m E\big(w(\phi, \cdot)\big) - \big(\delta_m E\big(w(\phi, \cdot)\big) \cdot v(\phi, \cdot)\big)w(\phi, \cdot)$$

and thus for all $g \in T\mathcal{S}^R$

$$0 = \partial_\phi \big\langle \delta_m E\big(w(\phi,\cdot)\big) - \big(\delta_m E\big(w(\phi,\cdot)\big)\cdot v(\phi,\cdot)\big) w(\phi,\cdot), g\big\rangle_{\Sigma_R}\big|_{\phi=0}$$
$$= \big\langle L\big(\Phi\big(m^R\big)\big), g\big\rangle_{\Sigma_R} = \big\langle L(g), \Phi\big(m^R\big)\big\rangle_{\Sigma_R}. \qquad \square$$

Note that $DN^R(m^R,0,0)$ is bijective if and only if

(a) $\partial_x m^R$ and $\Phi(m^R)$ are linearly independent,
(b) $L^R : T\mathcal{S}^R \to (T\mathcal{S}^R)_{L^2}$ bijective.

Since $\lim_{R\to 0} \|m^R - m_R^{\text{red}}\|_{C^1(\Sigma_R)} = 0$ and since $\partial_x m_R^{\text{red}}$ and $\Phi(m_R^{\text{red}})$ are linearly independent, (a) is satisfied if R is small enough. In Section 3 we will show that (b) is satisfied for small R, too. Altogether, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 4. (m,c,ω) *is a solution of* (11) *if and only if there exists* $\alpha \in L^2(\Sigma_R,\mathbb{R})$ *such that* $N^R(m,\alpha,c,\omega,h) = (0,h)$.
The function N^R *is continuously differentiable and, if R is small enough,* $DN^R(m^R,0,0)$ *is bijective.*

If N^R is continuously differentiable and $DN^R(m^R)$ is invertible, according to the inverse function theorem [12, Theorem 73.B, p. 552] there exists a neighbourhood U of $(m^R, 0_{L^2(\Sigma_R,\mathbb{R})}, 0_{\mathbb{R}^3})$ and a neighbourhood V of $(0_{L^2(\Sigma_R,\mathbb{R}^3)}, 0_{\mathbb{R}})$ such that $N^R|_U \to V$ is bijective. So for every h small enough, we can find $m_h, \alpha_h, c_h, \omega_h$ such that $N^R(m_h,\alpha_h,c_h,\omega_h,h) = 0$. That is, we have proved our main theorem.

Theorem 5. *For all* $R > 0$ *small enough there exists* $h_R > 0$ *such that for all h with* $h < h_R$ *there is exists a solution* (m_h, c_h, ω_h) *of* (11).

3. Invertibility of L^R

The goal of this section is to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 6. *For R small enough, the operator* $L^R : T\mathcal{S}^R \to (T\mathcal{S}^R)_{L^2}$, *as defined in* (15)*, is invertible, and its inverse is continuous.*

We proceed in two steps. First, we define a map L_*^R and show that for functions m in a certain space $T\mathcal{S}_0^R$ we have $\langle L_*^R(m), m\rangle_{\Sigma_R} \geqslant \frac{1}{4}\|m\|^2_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}$. Then we prove that, for small R, the operator L^R on the space $T\mathcal{S}^R$ is in a certain sense similar to L_*^R on $T\mathcal{S}_0^R$.

In analogy to (1) and (15) we set

$$E_*^R : \mathcal{M}(R) \to \mathbb{R}, \qquad m \mapsto \int_{\Sigma_R} |\partial_x m|^2 + \frac{1}{2}|m_y|^2 + 20R^2|\nabla_y m|^2, \tag{19}$$

$$L_*^R : H^2\big(\Sigma_R,\mathbb{R}^3\big) \to L^2\big(\Sigma_R,\mathbb{R}^3\big),$$
$$g \mapsto \delta_m E_*^R(g) - \big(\delta_m E_*^R(g)\cdot m_R^{\text{red}}\big) m_R^{\text{red}} - \big(\delta_m E_*^R\big(m_R^{\text{red}}\big)\cdot g\big) m_R^{\text{red}} - \big(\delta_m E_*^R\big(m_R^{\text{red}}\big)\cdot m_R^{\text{red}}\big) g, \tag{20}$$

where

$$\delta_m E_*^R(m) = -2\partial_{xx} m + (0, m_{y_1}, m_{y_2}) - 40R^2\Delta_y m.$$

Moreover we define

$$T\mathcal{S}_0^R := \left\{ f \in H^2\big(\Sigma_R,\mathbb{R}^3\big) \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{ll} f\cdot m_R^{\text{red}} \equiv 0, & \partial_\nu f = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Sigma_R, \\ \big\langle \partial_x m_R^{\text{red}}, f\big\rangle = 0, & \big\langle \Phi\big(m_R^{\text{red}}\big), f\big\rangle = 0 \end{array} \right\}.$$

Lemma 7. *The minimiser of E_*^R in $\mathcal{M}_l(R)$ is unique up to translation and rotation. It is given by*

$$m_R^{\mathrm{red}}: \Sigma_R \to \mathbb{S}^2, \quad (x,y) \mapsto \left(\tanh\left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{2}}\right), \frac{1}{\cosh(x/\sqrt{2})}, 0\right),$$

and we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\partial_x m_R^{\mathrm{red}}(x,y)\right| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left|\left(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\right)_y(x,y)\right| \\
&\frac{\partial_x m_R^{\mathrm{red}}(x,y)}{|\partial_x m_R^{\mathrm{red}}(x,y)|} = \left(\frac{1}{\cosh(x/\sqrt{2})}, -\tanh\left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{2}}\right), 0\right), \\
&\Phi\left(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}(x,y)\right) = \left(0, 0, \frac{1}{\cosh(x/\sqrt{2})}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. The function

$$m^{\mathrm{red}}: \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{S}^2, \qquad x \mapsto \left(\tanh\left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{2}}\right), \frac{1}{\cosh(x/\sqrt{2})}, 0\right)$$

is the only minimiser of $\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\partial_x m|^2 + \frac{1}{2}|m_y|^2$, up to translation and rotation [8, Lemma 2.26]. Thus the function m_R^{red} is the only minimiser of E_*^R in $\mathcal{M}_l(R)$, up to translation and rotation.
A direct calculation yields the results for $\partial_x m_R^{\mathrm{red}}$ and $\Phi(m_R^{\mathrm{red}})$. □

Lemma 8. *For all $R > 0$ and all $g, f \in T\mathcal{S}_0^R$ we have*

$$L_*^R(g) = \delta_m E_*^R(g) - \left(\delta_m E_*^R(g) \cdot m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\right) m_R^{\mathrm{red}} - \left(\delta_m E_*^R\left(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\right) \cdot m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\right) g, \tag{21}$$

$$L_*^R(g) \cdot f = \delta_m E_*^R(g) \cdot f - \left(\delta_m E_*^R\left(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\right) \cdot m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\right) g \cdot f. \tag{22}$$

Moreover, $L_*^R(T\mathcal{S}_0^R) \subseteq (T\mathcal{S}_0^R)_{L^2}$, and the operator $L_*^R: T\mathcal{S}_0^R \to (T\mathcal{S}_0^R)_{L^2}$ is symmetric.

Proof. We can argue exactly as in Lemma 3. □

Theorem 9. *For all $R > 0$ and all $m \in T\mathcal{S}_0^R$ we have*

$$\left\langle L_*^R(m), m\right\rangle_{\Sigma_R} \geqslant \frac{1}{4}\|m\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}^2.$$

Proof. The relations $|\partial_x m_R^{\mathrm{red}}| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|(m_R^{\mathrm{red}})_y|$ and

$$\partial_{xx} m_R^{\mathrm{red}} \cdot m_R^{\mathrm{red}} + \left|\partial_x m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\right|^2 = \partial_x\left(\partial_x m_R^{\mathrm{red}} \cdot m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\right) = 0$$

imply

$$\delta_m E_*^R\left(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\right) \cdot m_R^{\mathrm{red}} = -2\partial_{xx} m_R^{\mathrm{red}} \cdot m_R^{\mathrm{red}} + \left|\left(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\right)_y\right|^2 = 2\left|\left(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\right)_y\right|^2.$$

Thus, with Lemma 8, for all $g, h \in T\mathcal{S}_0^R$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
L_*^R(g) \cdot h &= \delta_m E_*^R(g) \cdot h - \left(\delta_m E_*^R\left(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\right) \cdot m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\right) g \cdot h \\
&= \left(\delta_m E_0(g) - 2\left|\left(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\right)_y\right|^2 g\right) \cdot h.
\end{aligned}$$

We define the vector $\vec{e}_s$ to be the unit vector in direction of $\partial_x m_R^{\mathrm{red}}$, i.e.,

$$\vec{e}_s(x) := \frac{\partial_x m_R^{\mathrm{red}}(x)}{|\partial_x m_R^{\mathrm{red}}(x)|} = \left(\left(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\right)_{y_1}(x), -\left(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\right)_x(x), 0\right),$$

and introduce the sets

$$\mathcal{W}_1 := \left\{ m \in T\mathcal{S}_0^R \colon \int_{D_R} m(x,y)\,dy \equiv 0 \right\},$$
$$\mathcal{W}_2 := \left\{ m \in T\mathcal{S}_0^R \colon m(x,y) = \alpha(x)\vec{e}_{y_2} \text{ for some } \alpha \in H^2(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R}) \right\},$$
$$\mathcal{W}_3 := \left\{ m \in T\mathcal{S}_0^R \colon m(x,y) = \alpha(x)\vec{e}_s(x) \text{ for some } \alpha \in H^2(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R}) \right\}.$$

Then $T\mathcal{S}_0^R$ is the direct sum of $\mathcal{W}_1$, $\mathcal{W}_2$ and $\mathcal{W}_3$, and we have $L_*^R(\mathcal{W}_i) \subset (\mathcal{W}_i)_{L^2}$ for $i \in \{1,2,3\}$.

Assume $m \in \mathcal{W}_1$. Using the Poincaré inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle L_*^R m, m\rangle_{\Sigma_R} &= 40R^2 \|\nabla_y m\|^2_{L^2(\Sigma_R)} + 2\|\partial_x m\|^2_{L^2(\Sigma_R)} + \|m_y\|^2_{L^2(\Sigma_R)} - 2\big\| \big|(m_R^{\mathrm{red}})_y\big| m\big\|^2_{L^2(\Sigma_R)} \\ &\geqslant \frac{40}{16}\|m\|^2_{L^2(\Sigma_R)} - 2\|m\|^2_{L^2(\Sigma_R)} = \frac{1}{2}\|m\|^2_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}.\end{aligned}$$

Assume $m \in \mathcal{W}_2$. Then $m(x,y) = \alpha(x)\mathbb{1}_{D_R}(y)\vec{e}_{y_2}$ for some $\alpha \in H^2(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R})$, we have

$$L_*^R(m)\big|_{(x,y)} = \big(-2\partial_{xx}\alpha(x) + \alpha(x) - 2\big(\big|m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\big)_y(x)\big|^2\alpha(x)\big)\mathbb{1}_{D_R}(y)\vec{e}_{y_2}, \tag{23}$$

$$\langle L_*^R(m), m\rangle_{\Sigma_R} = \pi R^2\left(2\|\partial_x\alpha\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \big(1 - 2\big|(m_R^{\mathrm{red}})_y\big|^2\big)\alpha^2\right) \tag{24}$$

and

$$1 - 2\big|(m_R^{\mathrm{red}})_y(x)\big|^2 \geqslant \frac{1}{4} \quad \text{for } |x| \geqslant 1.6. \tag{25}$$

Since $\Phi(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}) \cdot \vec{e}_{y_2}$ is positive (Lemma 7), and since $\langle \Phi(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}), m\rangle = 0$, the function α has to change sign.

First, assume that α changes sign in $[-1.6, 1.6]$. We have

$$\inf_{\{f:[-1.6,1.6]\to\mathbb{R},\, f \text{ changes sign}\}} \left(\frac{2\|\partial_x f\|^2_{L^2([-1.6,1.6])}}{\|f\|^2_{L^2([-1.6,1.6])}}\right) = \frac{2\pi^2}{3.2^2},$$

the infimum is attained and the minimisers are multiples of $x \mapsto \sin(\frac{\pi}{3.2}x)$. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}2\|\partial_x\alpha\|^2_{L^2([-1.6,1.6])} + \int_{-1.6}^{1.6} \big(1 - 2\big|(m_R^{\mathrm{red}})_y\big|^2\big)\alpha^2 &\geqslant 2\|\partial_x\alpha\|^2_{L^2([-1.6,1.6])} - \|\alpha\|^2_{L^2([-1.6,1.6])} \\ &\geqslant \left(\frac{2\pi^2}{3.2^2} - 1\right)\|\alpha\|^2_{L^2([-1.6,1.6])},\end{aligned}$$

and therefore, with (25) and (24),

$$\begin{aligned}\langle L_*^R(m), m\rangle_{\Sigma_R} &\geqslant \pi R^2\left(\left(\frac{2\pi^2}{3.2^2} - 1\right)\|\alpha\|^2_{L^2([-1.6,1.6])} + \frac{1}{4}\|\alpha\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}\setminus[-1.6,1.6])}\right) \\ &\geqslant \frac{1}{4}\|m\|^2_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}.\end{aligned}$$

Now assume that α does not change sign in $[-1.6, 1.6]$ and let $S_- \subset \mathbb{R}$ be the set where α has the opposite sign as in $[-1.6, 1.6]$. With Lemma 7 we see that $\Phi(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}(x,y)) \cdot \vec{e}_{y_2} \geqslant 0.5$ for $|x| < 1.6$, $y \in D_R$, and since $\langle \Phi(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}) \cdot \vec{e}_{y_2}, m\rangle_{\Sigma_R} = 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sqrt{1.6}\|\alpha\|_{L^2([-1.6,1.6])} &\leqslant \frac{1}{\pi R^2}\big|\big\langle \Phi\big(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\big) \cdot \vec{e}_{y_2}, |m|\big\rangle_{[-1.6,1.6]\times D_R}\big| \\ &\leqslant \frac{1}{\pi R^2}\big|\big\langle \Phi\big(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\big) \cdot \vec{e}_{y_2}, |m|\big\rangle_{S_-\times D_R}\big| \\ &\leqslant \int_{S_-} 2e^{-\frac{|x|}{\sqrt{2}}}|\alpha| \leqslant \int_{S_-} \sqrt{8}e^{-\frac{|x|}{\sqrt{2}}}|\partial_x\alpha|\end{aligned}$$

$$\leqslant \left\|\sqrt{8}e^{-\frac{|x|}{\sqrt{2}}}\right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}\setminus[-1.6,1.6])}\|\partial_x\alpha\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}\setminus[-1.6,1.6])}$$
$$\leqslant 1.1\|\partial_x\alpha\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}\setminus[-1.6,1.6])}.$$

Thus (25) implies

$$\begin{aligned}\langle L_*^R(m),m\rangle_{\Sigma_R} &\geqslant \pi R^2\left(\frac{1}{4}\|\alpha\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}\setminus[-1.6,1.6])}+2\|\partial_x\alpha\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}\setminus[-1.6,1.6])}-\|\alpha\|^2_{L^2([-1.6,1.6])}\right)\\ &\geqslant \pi R^2\left(\frac{1}{4}\|\alpha\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}\setminus[-1.6,1.6])}+\left(\frac{2\sqrt{1.6}}{1.1}-1\right)\|\alpha\|^2_{L^2([-1.6,1.6])}\right)\\ &\geqslant \frac{1}{4}\|m\|^2_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}.\end{aligned}$$

Assume $m\in\mathcal{W}_3$. Then $m(x,y)=\alpha(x)\mathbb{1}_{D_R}(y)\vec{e}_s(x)$ for some $\alpha\in H^2(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R})$. The function $L_*^R(m)$ is pointwise parallel to $\vec{e}_s$, we have $\partial_x\vec{e}_s\cdot\vec{e}_s=0$ and

$$0=\partial_x(\partial_x\vec{e}_s\cdot\vec{e}_s)=|\partial_x\vec{e}_s|^2+\partial_{xx}\vec{e}_s\cdot\vec{e}_s=\left|\partial_x m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\right|^2+\partial_{xx}\vec{e}_s\cdot\vec{e}_s=\frac{1}{2}\left|\left(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\right)_y\right|^2+\partial_{xx}\vec{e}_s\cdot\vec{e}_s.$$

So $\partial_{xx}(\alpha\vec{e}_s)\cdot\vec{e}_s=\partial_{xx}\alpha-\frac{1}{2}|(m_R^{\mathrm{red}})_y|^2\alpha$. Moreover, we have $\vec{e}_s\cdot\vec{e}_y=(m_R^{\mathrm{red}})_x$ and therefore

$$\begin{aligned}L_*^R(m)\cdot\vec{e}_s &= -2\partial_{xx}\alpha+\left|\left(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\right)_y\right|^2\alpha+\left|\left(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\right)_x\right|^2\alpha-2\left|\left(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\right)_y\right|^2\alpha\\ &= -2\partial_{xx}\alpha+\left(1-2\left|\left(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\right)_y\right|^2\right)\alpha.\end{aligned}\tag{26}$$

Comparing (26) and (23), we can conclude like in the case $m\in\mathcal{W}_2$ that $\langle L^R(m),m\rangle\geqslant\frac{1}{4}\|m\|^2_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}$. □

The next lemma compares the operators L_*^R and L^R on the space $H^2(\Sigma_R)$. It relies on two lemmas of [8] regarding the stray field. Define

$$\mathcal{A}(R):=\left\{f\in H^1_{\mathrm{loc}}\left(\Sigma_R,\mathbb{R}^3\right):\ f \text{ is constant on each cross section}\right\}.\tag{27}$$

Lemma 2.10 of [8] states that for all $R>0$, $g\in\mathcal{A}(R)$,

$$\left\|H(g)\right\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}=\left\|H(g_x\vec{e}_x)\right\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}+\left\|H(g_y)\right\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}.\tag{28}$$

Lemma 2.24 of [8] states that for all $0<R<\frac{1}{3}$, $g\in\mathcal{A}(R)$ we have

$$\left\|H(g_x\vec{e}_x)\right\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}\leqslant 5\pi R^4\ln(R)E(g_x\vec{e}_x,1),\tag{29}$$

$$\frac{1}{2}\|g_y\|^2_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}-\left\|H(g_y)\right\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}\leqslant 3R^2\ln(R)\|g_y\|^2_{H^1(\Sigma_R)}.\tag{30}$$

Lemma 10. *For each* $\epsilon>0$ *there exists a radius* $R_\epsilon>0$ *such that*

$$\left\langle L_*^R(m),m\right\rangle_{\Sigma_R}-\left\langle L^R(m),m\right\rangle_{\Sigma_R}\leqslant\epsilon\|m\|^2_{H^1(\Sigma_R)}$$

for all $R<R_\epsilon$ *and all* $m\in T\mathcal{S}^R$.

Proof. For $\epsilon\in\,]0,1]$ we can find $\tilde{R}_\epsilon\leqslant\min(\frac{1}{\sqrt{20}},\epsilon)$ such that for all $R<\tilde{R}_\epsilon$ the following inequalities hold (Theorem 1):

$$\left\|m_R^{\mathrm{red}}-m^R\right\|_{C^1(\Sigma_R)}\leqslant\epsilon,\qquad \left\|m_R^{\mathrm{red}}-m^R\right\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}\leqslant\epsilon R,\qquad \left\|\nabla_y m^R\right\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_R)}\leqslant\epsilon.$$

Let $\mathcal{A}(R)$ as in (27). Because of (29) and (30), after reducing $\tilde{R}_\epsilon$ we can assume that

$$\left\|H\left(\left(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\right)_x\vec{e}_x\right)\right\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}<\epsilon^2R^2\quad\text{for all } R\leqslant\tilde{R}_\epsilon,\tag{31}$$

$$\frac{1}{2}\|g_y\|^2_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}-\left\|H(g_y)\right\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}<\epsilon^2\|g_y\|^2_{H^1(\Sigma_R)}\quad\text{for all } R\leqslant\tilde{R}_\epsilon,\ g\in\mathcal{A}(R).\tag{32}$$

For $R < \tilde{R}_\epsilon$ and $m \in T\mathcal{S}^R$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle L_*^R m, m\rangle_{\Sigma_R} - \langle L^R m, m\rangle_{\Sigma_R} \\
&\quad = \underbrace{\langle \delta_m E_*^R(m), m\rangle_{\Sigma_R} - \langle \delta_m E(m), m\rangle_{\Sigma_R}}_{A} \underbrace{-\langle \left|\left(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\right)_y\right|^2, |m|^2\rangle_{\Sigma_R} + 2\langle H\left(m^R\right)\cdot m^R, |m|^2\rangle_{\Sigma_R}}_{B} \\
&\qquad \underbrace{+ \int_{\Sigma_R} \left(-2\left|\partial_x m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\right|^2 + 2\left|\partial_x m^R\right|^2 + 2\left|\nabla_y m^R\right|^2\right) m^2}_{C} \\
&\qquad \underbrace{-2\langle \left(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\right)_y \cdot m_y, m_R^{\mathrm{red}} \cdot m\rangle_{\Sigma_R} - 4\langle \partial_x m_R^{\mathrm{red}} \cdot \partial_x m, m_R^{\mathrm{red}} \cdot m\rangle_{\Sigma_R}}_{D}.
\end{aligned}$$

We decompose m in $\overline{m}$ and $\tilde{m}$

$$\overline{m}(x,y) := \int_{D_R} m(x,\tilde{y})\, d\tilde{y}\, \mathbb{1}_{D_R}(y), \qquad \tilde{m}(x,y) := m(x,y) - \overline{m}(x,y).$$

Since $40R^2 \leqslant 2$ and since $\|f\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)} \geqslant \|H(f)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}$ for every $f \in L^2(\Sigma_R, \mathbb{R}^3)$, we get for the first summand

$$\begin{aligned}
A &= \|m_y\|^2_{L^2(\Sigma_R)} + \left(40R^2 - 2\right)\|\nabla_y m\|^2_{L^2(\Sigma_R)} - 2\left\|H(m)\right\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \\
&\leqslant \|m_y\|^2_{L^2(\Sigma_R)} - 2\left\|H(m)\right\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \\
&= \|\overline{m}_y\|^2_{L^2(\Sigma_R)} - 2\left\|H(\overline{m})\right\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} + \|\tilde{m}_y\|^2_{L^2(\Sigma_R)} - 2\left\|H(\tilde{m})\right\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} - 4\int_{\Sigma_R} H(\overline{m})\tilde{m} \\
&\leqslant \|\overline{m}_y\|^2_{L^2(\Sigma_R)} - 2\left\|H(\overline{m}_y)\right\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} + \|\tilde{m}_y\|^2_{L^2(\Sigma_R)} + 4\|\overline{m}\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}\|\tilde{m}\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}.
\end{aligned}$$

We recall (32) and use the Poincaré inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
A &\leqslant 2\epsilon\|\overline{m}_y\|^2_{H^1(\Sigma_R)} + \|\tilde{m}_y\|^2_{L^2(\Sigma_R)} + 4\|m\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}\|\tilde{m}\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)} \\
&\leqslant 2\epsilon\|\overline{m}_y\|^2_{H^1(\Sigma_R)} + 16R^2\|\nabla\tilde{m}\|^2_{L^2(\Sigma_R)} + 16R\|\nabla\tilde{m}\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}\|\overline{m}\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)} \\
&\leqslant 34\epsilon\|m\|^2_{H^1(\Sigma_R)}.
\end{aligned}$$

For the second summand we calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
B &= \underbrace{\int_{\Sigma_R} \left(\left(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\right)_y - 2H\left(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\right)\right)\cdot m_R^{\mathrm{red}}|m|^2}_{B_1} + \underbrace{2\int_{\Sigma_R} H\left(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\right)\cdot\left(m_R^{\mathrm{red}} - m^R\right)|m|^2}_{B_2} \\
&\quad \underbrace{+ 2\int_{\Sigma_R} H\left(m_R^{\mathrm{red}} - m^R\right)\cdot m^R|m|^2}_{B_3},
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
|B_1| &\leqslant \left\|\left(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\right)_y - 2H\left(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\right)\right\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}\left\|m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\right\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_R)}\|m\|^2_{L^4(\Sigma_R)} \\
&\overset{(28)}{\leqslant} \left(\left\|2H\left(\left(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\right)_x\vec{e}_x\right)\right\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)} + \left\|\left(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\right)_y - 2H\left(\left(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\right)_y\right)\right\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}\right)\|m\|^2_{L^4(\Sigma_R)} \\
&\overset{(31)(32)}{\leqslant} \left(2\epsilon R + 2\epsilon\left\|\left(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\right)_y\right\|_{H^1(\Sigma_R)}\right)\|m\|^2_{L^4(\Sigma_R)} \leqslant 6\epsilon R\|m\|^2_{L^4(\Sigma_R)},
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
|B_2| &\leqslant 2\big\|H\big(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\big)\big\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}\big\|m_R^{\mathrm{red}}-m^R\big\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_R)}\|m\|_{L^4(\Sigma_R)}^2 \\
&\overset{(28)}{\leqslant} 2\big(\big\|H\big(\big(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\big)_y\big)\big\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}+\big\|H\big(\big(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\big)_x\vec{e}_x\big)\big\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}\big)\big\|m_R^{\mathrm{red}}-m^R\big\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_R)}\|m\|_{L^4(\Sigma_R)}^2 \\
&\leqslant 2\big(\big\|\big(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\big)_y\big\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}+\big\|H\big(\big(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\big)_x\vec{e}_x\big)\big\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}\big)\epsilon\|m\|_{L^4(\Sigma_R)}^2 \\
&\leqslant 2(2.2R+\epsilon R)\epsilon\|m\|_{L^4(\Sigma_R)}^2\leqslant 6\epsilon R\|m\|_{L^4(\Sigma_R)}^2, \\
|B_3| &\leqslant 2\big\|m_R^{\mathrm{red}}-m^R\big\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}\big\|m^R\big\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_R)}\|m\|_{L^4(\Sigma_R)}^2\leqslant 2R\epsilon\|m\|_{L^4(\Sigma_R)}^2.
\end{aligned}
$$

Because of the Sobolev embedding $H^1(\Sigma_1)\hookrightarrow L^4(\Sigma_1)$ there exists a constant C_{Sobolev} such that

$$\|u\|_{L^4(\Sigma_1)}\leqslant C_{\mathrm{Sobolev}}\|u\|_{H^1(\Sigma_1)}\quad\text{for all } u:\Sigma_1\to\mathbb{R}^n.$$

Rescaling implies for all $R\leqslant 1$

$$\|u\|_{L^4(\Sigma_R)}\leqslant\frac{1}{\sqrt{R}}C_{\mathrm{Sobolev}}\|u\|_{H^1(\Sigma_R)}\quad\text{for all } u:\Sigma_R\to\mathbb{R}^n.$$

Thus,

$$|B|\leqslant 14C_{\mathrm{Sobolev}}^2\epsilon\|m\|_{H^1(\Sigma_R)}^2.$$

Since $\partial_x m_R^{\mathrm{red}}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|(m_R^{\mathrm{red}})_y|\leqslant\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ (Lemma 7) the third summand C can be estimated by

$$
\begin{aligned}
C &\leqslant 2\big\|\partial_x m_R^{\mathrm{red}}-\partial_x m^R\big\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_R)}\big\|\partial_x m_R^{\mathrm{red}}+\partial_x m^R\big\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_R)}\|m\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}^2+2\epsilon\|m\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}^2 \\
&\leqslant 2\epsilon\left(\frac{2}{\sqrt{2}}+\epsilon\right)\|m\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}^2+2\epsilon\|m\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}^2\leqslant 7\epsilon\|m\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)},
\end{aligned}
$$

and D can be estimated by

$$
\begin{aligned}
D &= -2\big\langle\big(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\big)_y\cdot m_y,\big(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}-m^R\big)\cdot m\big\rangle_{\Sigma_R}-4\big\langle\partial_x m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\cdot\partial_x m,\big(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}-m^R\big)\cdot m\big\rangle_{\Sigma_R} \\
&\leqslant 2\epsilon\|m\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}^2+\frac{4}{\sqrt{2}}\|\partial_x m\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}\epsilon\|m\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}\leqslant 5\epsilon\|m\|_{H^1(\Sigma_R)}^2.
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore we have for all $R\leqslant\tilde{R}_\epsilon$

$$\big\langle L_*^R m,m\big\rangle_{\Sigma_R}-\big\langle L^R m,m\big\rangle_{\Sigma_R}\leqslant\big(46+14C_{\mathrm{Sobolev}}^2\big)\epsilon\|m\|_{H^1(\Sigma_R)}^2.\qquad\square$$

Lemma 11. *There exists a constant C such that $\|H(m)\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_R)}\leqslant C\|m\|_{C^1(\Sigma_R)}$ for all $R\leqslant 1$, $m\in C^1(\Sigma_R)$.*

Proof. For bounded domains Ω and $p\in\,]1,\infty[$, Carbou and Fabrie [2, Lemma 2.3] have shown that there exists a constant C_1 such that for all $m\in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$

$$\big\|H(m)\big\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)}\leqslant C_1\|m\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)}. \tag{33}$$

Let $\eta:\Sigma_1\to[0,1]$ be a smooth function with

$$\eta(p)=1\quad\text{for } p\in[-1,1]\times D_1,\qquad \eta(p)=0\quad\text{for } p\in\Sigma_1\setminus\big([-2,2]\times D_1\big),$$

set $\eta_x:(x',y')\mapsto\eta(x'-x,y)$ and let $m\in C^1(\Sigma_1)$. Then (33) and the Sobolev embedding $W^{1,4}(\Sigma_1)\hookrightarrow L^\infty(\Sigma_1)$ imply that there exist constants C_2, C_3 independent of x such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\big\|H(m\cdot\eta_x)\big\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_1)} &\leqslant C_2\big\|H(m\cdot\eta_x)\big\|_{W^{1,4}(\Sigma_1)} \\
&\leqslant C_3\|m\cdot\eta_x\|_{W^{1,4}(\Sigma_1)}\leqslant(2\pi)^{\frac14}C_3\|m\|_{C^1(\Sigma_1)}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{34}
$$

For $f:=m\cdot(1-\eta_x)$ we use the representation

$$H(f)(p)=\int\limits_{\Sigma_1}\nabla G(p-p')\,\mathrm{div}\,f(p')\,dp'+\int\limits_{\partial\Sigma_1}\nabla G(p-p')f\cdot\nu\,dp'. \tag{35}$$

Here ν is the outer normal and G is the map $p \mapsto \frac{1}{4\pi|p|}$. Eq. (35) is well known for bounded domains, and also holds for infinite wires [8, Lemma 2.6]. For all $p=(x,y)\in\Sigma_1$ we obtain

$$\left|H\big(m\cdot(1-\eta_x)\big)(p)\right| \leqslant \big(\|\nabla G\|_{L^1(\Sigma_1\setminus([-1,1]\times D_1))}+\|\nabla G\|_{L^1(\partial\Sigma_1\setminus([-1,1]\times\partial D_1))}\big)\|m\|_{C^1(\Sigma_1)}. \tag{36}$$

Combining (34) and (36) we find a constant C such that $\|H(m)\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_1)}\leqslant C\|m\|_{C^1(\Sigma_1)}$ for all $m\in C^1(\Sigma_1)$. For $R<1$ set $g(x,y)=m(\frac{x}{R},\frac{y}{R})$. Then $H(g)(x,y)=H(m)(\frac{x}{R},\frac{y}{R})$, so rescaling implies the statement of the lemma. □

Using Lemmas 10 and 11, we transfer the result of Lemma 8 to the operator L^R.

Lemma 12. *For each $0<\epsilon<\frac{1}{4}$ there exists R_ϵ such that*

$$\langle L^R(m),m\rangle_{\Sigma_R}\geqslant\left(\frac{1}{4}-\epsilon\right)\|m\|^2_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}$$

for all $R<R_\epsilon$ and all $m\in T\mathcal{S}^R$.

Proof. Let $P_0: H^2(\Sigma_R)\to T\mathcal{S}^R_0$ be the L^2-orthogonal projection. Since

$$m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\perp\partial_x m_R^{\mathrm{red}},\qquad m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\perp\Phi\big(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\big),\qquad \big\langle\partial_x m_R^{\mathrm{red}},\Phi\big(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\big)\big\rangle_{\Sigma_R}=0,$$

we have for all $m\in T\mathcal{S}^R$

$$\begin{aligned}P_0(m)&=m-\big(m\cdot\big(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}-m^R\big)\big)m_R^{\mathrm{red}}+\big\langle m,\partial_x m^R-\partial_x m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\big\rangle_{\Sigma_R}\frac{\partial_x m_R^{\mathrm{red}}}{\|\partial_x m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\|^2_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}}\\&\quad+\big\langle m,\Phi\big(m^R\big)-\Phi\big(m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\big)\big\rangle_{\Sigma_R}\frac{\Phi(m_R^{\mathrm{red}})}{\|\Phi(m_R^{\mathrm{red}})\|^2_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}},\end{aligned}$$

that is,

$$\begin{aligned}\|m\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}-\big\|P_0(m)\big\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}&\leqslant\|m\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}\big\|m^R-m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\big\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_R)}+\|m\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}\frac{\|\partial_x m^R-\partial_x m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}}{\|\partial_x m_R^{\mathrm{red}}\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}}\\&\quad+\|m\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}\frac{\|\Phi(m^R)-\Phi(m_R^{\mathrm{red}})\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}}{\|\Phi(m_R^{\mathrm{red}})\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, with Theorem 1, we can find R_ϵ such that

$$\|m\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}-\big\|P_0(m)\big\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}\leqslant\epsilon\|m\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}\quad\text{for all } R\leqslant R_\epsilon,\ m\in T\mathcal{S}^R.$$

Since the operator L^R_* is the second variation of the energy E^R_* and since m_R^{red} is a minimiser of the energy, the operator L^R_* is positive semidefinite. Moreover, it is symmetric on the set $\{m\in H^2(\Sigma_R,\mathbb{R}^3)\colon \partial_\nu m|_{\partial\Sigma_R}=0\}$, so the relation $L^R_*(T\mathcal{S}^R_0)\subset(T\mathcal{S}^R_0)_{L^2}$ (Lemma 8) implies

$$\begin{aligned}\big\langle L^R_* m,m\big\rangle_{\Sigma_R}&=\big\langle L^R_*\big(P_0(m)\big),P_0(m)\big\rangle_{\Sigma_R}+\big\langle L^R_*\big(m-P_0(m)\big),m-P_0(m)\big\rangle_{\Sigma_R}\\&\geqslant\big\langle L^R_*\big(P_0(m)\big),P_0(m)\big\rangle_{\Sigma_R}\geqslant\frac{1}{4}\big\|P_0(m)\big\|^2_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}\geqslant\frac{1-\epsilon}{4}\|m\|^2_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}.\end{aligned}$$

We now consider L^R. By Lemma 11 there exists a constant C_1 such that $\|H(m^R)\|_{L^\infty}\leqslant C_1\|m^R\|_{C^1(\Sigma_R)}$. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}\big\langle L^R m,m\big\rangle_{\Sigma_R}&=(1-\epsilon)\big\langle L^R m,m\big\rangle_{\Sigma_R}+\epsilon\big(\|\nabla m\|^2_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}+\big\|H(m)\big\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}\big)-\epsilon\int_{\Sigma_R}\big(2\big|\nabla m^R\big|^2+H\big(m^R\big)^2\big)m^2\\&\geqslant(1-\epsilon)\big\langle L^R m,m\big\rangle_{\Sigma_R}+\epsilon\|\nabla m\|^2_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}-\epsilon\big(2+C_1^2\big)\big\|m^R\big\|^2_{C^1(\Sigma_R)}\|m\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}\end{aligned}$$

After reducing R_ϵ we can assume by Lemma 10

$$\langle L^R m, m\rangle_{\Sigma_R} \geqslant \langle L_*^R m, m\rangle_{\Sigma_R} - \epsilon\|m\|^2_{H^1(\Sigma_R)} \quad \text{for all } R \leqslant R_\epsilon,\ m \in T\mathcal{S}^R.$$

Combining the above inequalities and noting that for R small enough $(2 + C_1^2)\|m^R\|^2_{C^1(\Sigma_R)}$ is bounded by some constant C_2 (Theorem 1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle L^R m, m\rangle_{\Sigma_R} &\geqslant (1-\epsilon)\langle L_*^R m, m\rangle_{\Sigma_R} - \epsilon C_2\|m\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}\\ &\geqslant \left(\frac{1}{4} - (C_2+1)\epsilon\right)\|m\|^2_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}.\end{aligned}$$

Now another reduction of R_ϵ yields the lemma. □

For $g \in H^2(\Sigma_R)$ we define

$$\begin{aligned}L_H^R(g) &:= 2\big(H(g) - \big(H(g)\cdot m^R\big)m^R - \big(H\big(m^R\big)\cdot g\big)m^R - \big(H\big(m^R\big)\cdot m^R\big)g\big),\\ L_\nabla^R(g) &:= -4\big(\nabla m^R \cdot \nabla g\big)m^R - 2\big|\nabla m^R\big|^2 g,\end{aligned}$$

and show that on

$$H_N^2(\Sigma_R) := \big\{g \in H^2(\Sigma_R):\ \partial_\nu g = 0\big\}$$

the operators L_H^R and L_∇^R are lower order with respect to the Laplace operator.

Lemma 13.

(i) *There exist $C, \tilde{R} > 0$ such that for all $R \leqslant \tilde{R}$, $g \in H_N^2(\Sigma_R)$ we have*

$$\big\|L_H^R(g)\big\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)} \leqslant C\|g\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}, \qquad \big\|L_\nabla^R(g)\big\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)} \leqslant C\|g\|_{H^1(\Sigma_R)}.$$

(ii) *On $\{g \in H_N^2(\Sigma_R):\ g \perp m^R\}$ we have $-2\Delta + L_H^R + L_\nabla^R = L^R$.*

Proof. (i) Let $g \in (T\mathcal{S}^R)_{L^2}$. By Lemma 11 and Theorem 1 there exists C_1 such that for R small enough $\|H(m^R)\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_R)} \leqslant C_1$. Moreover we have $\|H(g)\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)} \leqslant \|g\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}$ and $\|m^R\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_R)} = 1$. Thus

$$\big\|L_H^R(g)\big\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)} \leqslant \big(4 + 4C_1\big)\|g\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}.$$

The estimate for L_∇^R follows directly from Theorem 1.

(ii) Since $\partial_i m^R \perp m^R$ ($i \in \{x, y_1, y_2\}$) and since $g \perp m^R$ for all $g \in T\mathcal{S}^R$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}0 &= \Delta\big(m^R\cdot g\big) = \Delta m^R \cdot g + 2\nabla m^R \cdot \nabla g + m^R \cdot \Delta g,\\ 0 &= \sum_{i\in\{x,y_1,y_2\}} \partial_i\big(\partial_i m^R \cdot m^R\big) = \Delta m^R \cdot m^R + \big|\nabla m^R\big|^2,\end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$L_\nabla^R(g) = 2\big(\Delta g \cdot m^R\big)m^R + 2\big(\Delta m^R \cdot g\big)m^R + 2\big(\Delta m^R \cdot m^R\big)g = L^R(g) - L_H^R(g) + 2\Delta g. \qquad \square$$

Lemma 14. *Let $\tilde{R}$ as in Lemma 13. Then for all $R < \tilde{R}$ there exists $\lambda > 0$ such that $\lambda + L^R : TS^R \to (TS^R)_{L^2}$ is bijective.*

Proof. For $R < \tilde{R}$ the operators L_H^R and L_∇^R are lower order perturbations to the Laplace operator $\Delta : H_N^2(\Sigma_R) \to L^2(\Sigma_R)$ (Lemma 13). Thus for all λ large enough the operator $\lambda - 2\Delta + L_H^R + L_\nabla^R : H_N^2(\Sigma_R) \to L^2(\Sigma_R)$ is bijective. Since by Lemma 13, $L^R = -2\Delta + L_\nabla^R + L_H^R$ on TS^R, it remains to show that $(\lambda + L^R)(TS^R) = (TS^R)_{L^2}$.

By Lemma 3 we already have

$$\big(\lambda + L^R\big)\big(TS^R\big) \subseteq \big(TS^R\big)_{L^2}. \tag{37}$$

To show the other inclusion we first prove that, after possibly increasing λ,

$$\big(\lambda - 2\Delta + L^R_\nabla + L^R_H\big)\big(\big\{g \in H^2_N(\Sigma_R), g \perp m^R\big\}\big) \supseteq \big\{g \in L^2, g \perp m^R\big\}. \tag{38}$$

For this we take $g \in H^2_N$ and show that $g \not\perp m^R$ implies $(\lambda - 2\Delta + L^R_\nabla + L^R_H)(g) \not\perp m^R$. As in the proof of Lemma 3, we see that L^R maps $\{f \in H^2_N(\Sigma_R)\colon\ f \perp m^R\}$ to $\{f \in L^2(\Sigma_R)\colon\ f \perp m^R\}$ so we can assume that $g = \alpha m^R$, $\alpha : \Sigma_R \to \mathbb{R}$. Since $|m^R| = 1$ we have for all partial derivatives $(\partial\alpha)m^R \perp (\partial m^R)\alpha$ and in particular

$$\big\langle L^R_\nabla\big(\alpha m^R\big), \alpha m^R\big\rangle = \int_{\Sigma_R} -4\alpha\big(\nabla m^R \cdot \nabla\big(\alpha m^R\big)\big) - 2\alpha^2\big|\nabla m^R\big|^2 = \int_{\Sigma_R} -6\alpha^2\big|\nabla m^R\big|^2.$$

Now by Lemma 13 $\|L^R_H(\alpha m^R)\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)} \leqslant C$, so we have

$$\begin{aligned}\big\langle\big(\lambda + \Delta + L^R_\nabla + L^R_H\big)\alpha m^R, \alpha m^R\big\rangle &\geqslant \lambda\|\alpha\|^2_{L^2(\Sigma_R)} - 6\|m^R\|^2_{C^1(\Sigma_R)}\|\alpha\|^2_{L^2(\Sigma_R)} - \big\|L^R_H\big(\alpha m^R\big)\big\|_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}\\ &\geqslant \big(\lambda - 6\big\|m^R\big\|^2_{C^1(\Sigma_R)} - C\big)\|\alpha\||^2_{L^2(\Sigma_R)},\end{aligned}$$

and for λ large enough $L^R(g) \not\perp m^R$ as claimed.

Eqs. (37) and (38) imply

$$\begin{aligned}2 &= \operatorname{codim}\big(TS^R, \big\{g \in H^2_N(\Sigma_R)\colon\ g \perp m^R\big\}\big)\\ &= \operatorname{codim}\big(\big(\lambda + L^R\big)\big(TS^R\big), \big(\lambda + L^R\big)\big(\big\{g \in H^2_N(\Sigma_R)\colon\ g \perp m^R\big\}\big)\big)\\ &\geqslant \operatorname{codim}\big(\big(TS^R\big)_{L^2}, \big\{g \in L^2(\Sigma_R) : g \perp m^R\big\}\big)\\ &= 2.\end{aligned}$$

Thus we can conclude

$$\begin{aligned}&\big(\lambda + L^R\big)\big(\big\{g \in H^2_N(\Sigma_R)\colon\ g \perp m^R\big\}\big) = \big\{g \in L^2(\Sigma_R)\colon\ g \perp m^R\big\},\\ &\big(\lambda + L^R\big)\big(TS^R\big) = \big(TS^R\big)_{L^2}. \qquad \square\end{aligned}$$

Using the above estimates, we prove Theorem 6, that is, we show that the operator L^R is bijective and has a continuous inverse.

Proof of Theorem 6. Let $\tilde{R}, \lambda$ as in Lemma 14 and $R \leqslant \tilde{R}$. After possibly reducing R, we can assume by Lemma 12 that

$$\big\langle L^R(g), g\big\rangle_{\Sigma_R} \geqslant \frac{1}{8}\|g\|^2_{L^2(\Sigma_R)}. \tag{39}$$

Since $\lambda + L^R : TS^R \to TS^R_{L^2}$ is bijective, its Fredholm index

$$\operatorname{Ind}\big(\lambda + L^R\big) := \dim\big(\operatorname{Ker}\big(\lambda + L^R\big)\big) - \operatorname{codim}\big(\operatorname{Ran}\big(\lambda + L^R\big), TS^R_{L^2}\big)$$

is zero. The Fredholm index is continuous with respect to the operator norm so we have $\operatorname{Ind}(L^R) = \operatorname{Ind}(\lambda + L^R) = 0$. Eq. (39) implies that $L^R : TS^R \to TS^R_{L^2}$ is injective, thus $L^R : TS^R \to TS^R_{L^2}$ surjective.

For every bijective continuous operator between Banach spaces, the inverse is continuous. $\square$

Acknowledgements

The present results are part of my PhD thesis [8]. Many thanks are due to my supervisor Prof. S. Müller for suggesting the topic and for many helpful discussions. I also would like to thank Helmut Abels and Carl-Friedrich Kreiner for their helpful remarks. This work was supported by the DFG Priority Programme SPP 1095.

References

[1] D. Atkinson, G. Xiong, C. Faulkner, D. Allwood, D. Petit, R. Cowburn, Magnetic domain wall logic, Science 309 (2005) 1688–1692.
[2] G. Carbou, P. Fabrie, Regular solutions for Landau–Lifschitz equation in $\mathbb{R}^3$, Comm. Appl. Anal. 5 (1) (2001) 17–30.
[3] G. Carbou, S. Labbé, Stability for static walls in ferromagnetic nanowires, Discrete Contin. Dynam. Systems Ser. B 6 (2) (2006) 273–290 (electronic).
[4] H. Forster, T. Schrefl, D. Suess, W. Scholz, V. Tsiantos, R. Dittrich, J. Fidler, Domain wall motion in nanowires using moving grids, J. Appl. Phys. 91 (2002) 6914–6919.
[5] R. Hertel, J. Kirschner, Magnetization reversal dynamics in nickel nanowires, Physica B 343 (2004) 206–210.
[6] K. Kühn, Energy scaling of domain walls in magnetic nanowires, preprint, http://www.mis.mpg.de/preprints/2006/prepr2006_58.
[7] K. Kühn, Regularity of domain walls in magnetic nanowires, preprint, http://www.mis.mpg.de/preprints/2007/prepr2007_106.
[8] K. Kühn, Reversal modes in magnetic nanowires, PhD thesis, Universität Leipzig, 2007, http://www.mis.mpg.de/preprints/thesis/.
[9] D. Sanchez, Behaviour of the Landau–Lifschitz equation in a ferromagnetic wire, Math. Methods Appl. Sci., in press.
[10] A. Thiaville, Y. Nakatani, Domain-wall dynamics in nanowires and nanostripes, in: Spin Dynamics in Confined Magnetic Structures III, in: Topics in Applied Physics, vol. 101, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006, pp. 161–205.
[11] R. Wieser, U. Nowak, K.D. Usadel, Domain wall mobility in nanowires: Transverse versus vortex walls, Phys. Rev. B 69 (2004) 0604401.
[12] E. Zeidler, Nonlinear Functional Analysis and its Applications. IV, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1988.