

# ANALYSIS OF SINGULARITIES OF AREA-MINIMIZING CURRENTS: PLANAR FREQUENCY, BRANCH POINTS OF RAPID DECAY, AND WEAK LOCALLY UNIFORM APPROXIMATION

BRIAN KRUMMEL AND NESHAN WICKRAMASEKERA

ABSTRACT. Here, in [KrumWic-b] and in [KrumWic-c] we study the nature of an  $n$ -dimensional locally area minimising rectifiable current  $T$  of codimension  $\geq 2$  near its typical (i.e.  $\mathcal{H}^{n-2}$  a.e.) singular points. Our approach relies on an intrinsic frequency function for  $T$ , which we call the *planar frequency function*, which is defined geometrically relative to a given  $n$ -dimensional plane  $P$  and a given base point in the support of  $T$ . In the present article we establish that the planar frequency function satisfies an approximate monotonicity property, and takes values  $\leq 1$  on any cone ( $\neq P$ ) meeting  $P^\perp$  only at the origin, whenever the base point is the vertex of the cone. Using these properties we obtain a *decomposition theorem* for the singular set of  $T$ , which (roughly speaking) asserts the following: for any integer  $q \geq 2$ , the set  $\text{sing}_q T$  of density  $q$  singularities of  $T$  can be written as  $\text{sing}_q T = \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{B}$  for disjoint sets  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$ , where: (I) along  $\mathcal{S}$  the current  $T$  satisfies a weak locally uniform approximation property, namely, each point  $Z \in \mathcal{S}$  has a neighbourhood  $\mathbf{B}_{\rho_Z}(Z)$  such that about any point  $Z' \in \mathbf{B}_{\rho_Z}(Z) \cap \text{spt} T$  with density  $\geq q$  and at any scale  $\rho' < \rho_Z$ ,  $T$  is significantly closer to some non-planar cone  $\mathbf{C}_{Z', \rho'}$  than to any plane, and (II)  $\mathcal{B}$  is relatively closed in  $\text{sing}_q T$  and  $T$  satisfies a locally uniform estimate along  $\mathcal{B}$  implying decay of  $T$ , upon scaling about any point in  $\mathcal{B}$ , to a unique tangent plane faster than a fixed exponential rate in the scale. This result is central to the more refined analysis of  $T$  we perform in [KrumWic-b] and [KrumWic-c].

In [KrumWic-b] we use the approximation property in (I), a new height bound for  $T$  and techniques inspired by the work of Simon ([Sim93]) and by [Wic14], [KW17], to establish: (i) the existence, at  $\mathcal{H}^{n-2}$  a.e. point in  $\mathcal{S}$ , of a unique tangent cone to  $T$  supported on a union of two or more planes meeting along an  $(n-2)$ -dimensional axis, and (ii) countable  $(n-2)$ -rectifiability of  $\mathcal{S}$ . By (II) and (i),  $T$  has a unique tangent cone at  $\mathcal{H}^{n-2}$  a.e. point.

Our approach to the study of singularities of area minimizers relates to, and contrasts with, Almgren's pioneering work [Alm83] (and De Lellis and Spadaro's more recent streamlined version [DS14],[DS16-I],[DS16-II]) in the following way: the work here and in [KrumWic-b] relies on relatively elementary parts of [Alm83] (specifically, the theory of Dirichlet energy minimizing multi-valued functions and the strong Lipschitz approximation for area minimizers near a plane) but avoids the need for other results from [Alm83] including the construction and use of a center manifold and the Hausdorff dimension upper bound on the singular set. In [KrumWic-c] we point out that the dimension bound on the singular set follows in a considerably more efficient manner from the approximate monotonicity of the planar frequency function and the estimates provided by the decomposition theorem (which facilitate a simpler construction of a center manifold), and moreover establish: (iii) the existence of a unique non-zero homogeneous Dirichlet energy minimizing tangent function (blow-up) of  $T$ , together with a corresponding decay estimate, at  $\mathcal{H}^{n-2}$  a.e. point in  $\mathcal{B}$ , and (iv)  $(n-2)$ -rectifiability of  $\mathcal{B}$ , and consequently countable  $(n-2)$ -rectifiability of  $\text{sing} T$ .

## CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	2
2.	Preliminaries	8
2.1.	General notation	8

2.2. Planes	8
2.3. Rectifiable currents	8
2.4. Locally area-minimizing rectifiable currents	9
2.5. Multi-valued functions	11
2.6. Dirichlet energy minimizing multi-valued functions	12
2.7. Some elementary estimates	14
2.8. Lipschitz approximation	17
3. Planar frequency function and its approximate monotonicity	19
3.1. Variational formulas	21
3.2. Bounding error terms in derivative of $H_{T,P,0}$	24
3.3. Bounding error terms in derivative of $D_{T,P,0}$	28
3.4. Proof of Theorem 3.4	33
4. Preliminary consequences of monotonicity of the planar frequency function	34
5. Blow-ups of area-minimizers relative to a plane	38
5.1. Blow-up procedure	39
5.2. Blow-up of optimal planes	40
5.3. Hardt-Simon inequality	41
5.4. Continuity properties of the planar frequency function with respect to blowing up of currents	45
6. Scales with planar frequency pinching, or without flatness, or without decay	48
6.1. Planar frequency pinching near one	48
6.2. Distance to a plane not small	51
6.3. Distance to a plane not decaying	55
7. Proof of the main theorem	59
References	64

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $T$  be an  $n$ -dimensional locally area minimising rectifiable current in an open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ . The monumental work of Almgren in the early 1980's, published posthumously as [Alm83], established that the interior singular set  $\text{sing} T$  of  $T$  has Hausdorff dimension at most  $n - 2$ . This dimension bound is optimal whenever the codimension  $m$  of the current is  $\geq 2$ , as illustrated by multiplicity 1 currents induced by certain holomorphic subvarieties of  $\mathbb{C}^n$  (which are always locally area minimising). For instance, each of  $T_1 = \{(z, w) : z^2 = w^3\} \subset \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C} \approx \mathbb{R}^4$  and  $T_2 = \{(z, w) : zw = 0\} \subset \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}$  is the support of a two (real) dimensional locally area minimising current in  $\mathbb{R}^4$  with an isolated singularity at the origin. On the other hand if the codimension of  $T$  is 1, then  $\text{sing} T$  is empty if  $n \leq 6$ , and has Hausdorff dimension  $\leq n - 7$  if  $n \geq 7$ . This dimension bound, which is again sharp, was the final outcome of a series of works, spanning approximately

the decade 1960–1970, due to De Giorgi ([DeG61]), Fleming ([Fle62]), Almgren ([Alm66]), Simons ([JSim68]) and Federer ([Fed70]). The major difference between the case of codimension  $\geq 2$  and that of codimension 1, as far as singularities are concerned, is that in codimension  $\geq 2$  the current may have *branch points*, i.e. singular points where there is at least one tangent cone supported on an  $n$ -dimensional plane (as in example  $T_1$  above, which has an isolated branch point at  $(0, 0)$ ). In codimension 1, De Giorgi’s work ([DeG61]) implies that points of the current with planar tangent cones are embedded points.

Almgren’s strategy in [Alm83] for bounding the dimension of the singular set was to establish first  $(n-2)$ -dimensionality of the set of non branch point singularities (such as the point  $(0, 0)$  in example  $T_2$  above). It is easily seen that at a non branch point singularity, each tangent cone is a singular cone whose spine—i.e. the maximal dimensional subspace of translation invariance—is of dimension  $\leq n-2$ . Based on this fact, Almgren developed an elementary, very general argument ([Alm83, Corollary 2.27]) to show that the Hausdorff dimension of the set of non branch point singularities is at most  $n-2$ . Once this result was in place, it remained to bound the size of the branch set. This was by far the deepest and most involved part of [Alm83], for which Almgren developed a powerful set of techniques and ideas that have since been highly influential in a wide variety of geometric and PDE theoretic problems. More recently, De Lellis and Spadaro published Almgren’s theory in more modern and concise language ([DS14],[DS16-I],[DS16-II]), providing technical streamlining of certain parts of the original version [Alm83], and generating a renewed interest in this profound work and making it more accessible.

Here and in [KrumWic-b], [KrumWic-c] we develop a new approach to the analysis of interior singularities of locally area minimising rectifiable currents of codimension  $\geq 2$ . In this approach, rather than using a tangent cone criterion to initially classify singularities as branch points or non branch points, the first step (accomplished in the present article) is to establish a more effective way to decompose the singular set into two disjoint pieces. In Almgren’s work, substantial complications arise in the analysis of the branch set from the lack of an estimate at branch points giving decay of the current towards a unique tangent plane. In view of this, it is natural to consider decomposing the singular set (more precisely, singularities with a fixed density) as the disjoint union of a set  $\mathcal{B}$  of branch points  $Z$  where the scaled current  $\eta_{Z,\rho}\#T$  decays rapidly to a unique tangent plane (in the  $L^2$  sense) as  $\rho \rightarrow 0$ , and the complementary set  $\mathcal{S}$ . It turns out that this is in fact a considerably more useful way to proceed, as  $T$  can be shown to satisfy a certain local uniform approximation-by-non-planar-cones property at each point in  $\mathcal{S}$  and each sufficiently small scale; this property, once established, lends itself well not only to the task of bounding the size of  $\mathcal{S}$  with very little effort, but also to performing an asymptotic analysis of the current at generic (i.e.  $\mathcal{H}^{n-2}$  a.e.) points in  $\mathcal{S}$ . For the set  $\mathcal{B}$  on the other hand, the fact that there is a unique tangent plane at each of its points together with a (locally uniform) decay estimate serves as an extremely helpful starting point for bounding its dimension more efficiently; moreover, and perhaps more importantly, this fact provides a crucial basis for further asymptotic analysis of the current at points along  $\mathcal{B}$ .

This decomposition result is our main theorem here (Theorem 1.1 below) and it asserts (roughly speaking) the following: *given an integer  $q \geq 2$ , there is a fixed  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , depending only on  $n$ ,  $m$  and  $q$ , such that if  $\text{sing}_q T$  denotes the set of density  $q$  singularities of  $T$ , and  $\mathcal{B}$  is the set of branch points  $Z \in \text{sing}_q T$  where the scaled current  $\eta_{Z,\rho}\#T$  converges to a multiplicity  $q$  plane at a rate  $o(\rho^\alpha)$ , then  $\mathcal{B}$  is relatively closed in  $\text{sing}_q T$ , and for every point  $Z \in \mathcal{S} = \text{sing}_q T \setminus \mathcal{B}$ , the current  $T$  satisfies the following property: for every point  $Z'$  with density  $\geq q$  and sufficiently close to  $Z$ , and every sufficiently small scale  $\rho'$  (depending on  $Z$ ), the scaled current  $\eta_{Z',\rho'}\#T$  is significantly closer to some non-planar cone  $\mathbf{C}_{Z',\rho'}$  than it is to any plane.*

The set  $\mathcal{B}$  consists of branch points by definition, but note that the theorem allows that  $\mathcal{S}$  may also contain branch points. If a point  $Z \in \mathcal{S}$  is not a branch point, it is not difficult to see that for all sufficiently small  $\rho$  (depending on  $Z$ ), the scaled current  $\eta_{Z,\rho\#}T$  is much closer to a non-planar cone than it is to any plane. The significance of the theorem is that this property holds even if  $Z \in \mathcal{S}$  is a branch point (in which case, by the definition of  $\mathcal{S}$ ,  $Z$  must necessarily be such that the current at  $Z$  must decay slowly, if at all, to a plane), and that there is a locally uniform choice for how small the scale needs to be for the property to hold.

In proving this result, the main difficulty one has to overcome is ruling out the possibility that there may be a point  $Z \in \mathcal{S}$  such that  $\eta_{Z,\sigma\#}T$  continually oscillates, as  $\sigma \rightarrow 0$ , between rapidly decaying to a plane and being much closer to a non-planar cone than to a plane (and decaying slowly, or not at all, to a plane). To rule out this behaviour (and for other key purposes subsequently), we introduce an intrinsic frequency function, which we call the *planar frequency function*. The planar frequency function  $\rho \mapsto N_{T,P,Z}(\rho)$  (for  $\rho \in (0, \rho_0)$  for some  $\rho_0 > 0$ ) is defined relative to a given fixed  $n$ -dimensional plane  $P$  and a given base point  $Z \in \text{spt}T$ , in terms of geometric quantities integrated over the current (see Definition 3.1), whenever the current  $T$  has no boundary in the cylinder  $\mathbf{C}_{\rho_0}(Z, P) = \{X : \pi_P(X - Z) < \rho_0\}$  (where  $\pi_P : \mathbb{R}^{n+m} \rightarrow P$  is the orthogonal projection) and all points of  $T$  in  $\mathbf{C}_{\rho_0}(Z, P)$  are within a bounded distance to the affine plane  $Z + P$ .

Almgren in [Alm83] introduced a frequency function for area minimizing currents (based on his frequency function for Dirichlet energy minimizing multi-valued functions, also introduced in [Alm83]) which was extrinsic in the sense that it required a choice of a Lipschitz multi-valued function whose graph approximates the current. (By a key result established in [Alm83], such an approximation can be chosen whenever the current is sufficiently close to a plane.) In [Alm83], the primary use of this frequency function was to rule out the possibility that at a branch point the “sheets” of the current approach each other, with decreasing scale, infinitely rapidly. In our approach, we are not concerned with ruling out this possibility initially, and our first use of the planar frequency function is to rule out the oscillatory behaviour of the current described above. The key properties of the planar frequency function that enable us to do this are:

- (a)  $N_{T,P,Z}(\rho)$  is approximately monotonically non-decreasing on any interval  $I$  of scales  $\rho$  on which the rescaled current  $\eta_{Z,\rho\#}T$  decays exponentially (at any fixed rate, however slow) towards  $P$  as  $\rho \in I$  decreases (Theorem 3.4 below);
- (b)  $N_{T,P,0}(\cdot)$  takes values  $\leq 1$  whenever  $T$  is any cone (having vertex 0) with  $\text{spt}T \neq P$  and  $\text{spt}T \cap P^\perp = \{0\}$  (Lemma 6.4).

We can now give a precise statement of the decomposition theorem, which is proved employing the planar frequency function together with relatively elementary ingredients of Almgren’s theory (specifically, the theory of Dirichlet energy minimising multi-valued functions, strong Lipschitz approximation theorem and convergence results for blow-up sequences of area minimisers relative to a plane). As mentioned above, this theorem is the first crucial step in our asymptotic analysis of area minimisers near singularities.

**Theorem 1.1.** *For every integer  $q \geq 2$  and  $\varepsilon, \beta \in (0, 1)$  there exist  $R = R(n, m, q, \varepsilon, \beta) > 2$ ,  $\delta = \delta(n, m, q, \varepsilon, \beta) > 0$ ,  $\eta = \eta(n, m, q, \varepsilon, \beta) > 0$  and  $\alpha = \alpha(n, m, q, \varepsilon, \beta) > 0$  such that if  $T$  is an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current of  $\mathbf{B}_R(0)$  with*

$$(1.1) \quad (\partial T) \llcorner \mathbf{B}_R(0) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \|T\|(\mathbf{B}_R(0)) \leq (q + \delta) \omega_n R^n$$

then

$$\text{sing}T \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0) \cap \{X : \Theta(T, X) \geq q\} = \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{B}$$

where  $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_{q,\varepsilon,\beta}(T)$  and  $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_{q,\varepsilon,\beta}(T)$  are disjoint sets for which the following hold:

(I) For each  $Z_0 \in \mathcal{S}$  there exists  $\rho_0 \in (0, 1/16]$  (depending on  $T$  and  $Z_0$ ) such that for every  $Z \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{B}_{\rho_0}(Z_0)$  with  $\Theta(T, Z) \geq q$  and every  $\rho \in (0, \rho_0]$  one of the following assertions (i) or (ii) holds true:

(i) there exists an integral cone  $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{C}_{Z, \rho}$  supported on a union of  $n$ -dimensional planes meeting along a common  $(n - 2)$ -dimensional subspace such that  $T$  is close to  $\mathbf{C}$  in  $\mathbf{B}_{\rho}(Z)$  and  $T$  is significantly closer to  $\mathbf{C}$  than to any plane  $P$  in  $\mathbf{B}_{\rho}(Z)$  in the sense that

$$(1.2) \quad \rho^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_{\rho}(Z)} \text{dist}^2(X, Z + \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|T\|(X) < \varepsilon^2 \text{ and}$$

$$(1.3) \quad \int_{\mathbf{B}_{\rho}(Z)} \text{dist}^2(X, Z + \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|T\|(X) \\ + \int_{\mathbf{B}_{\rho/2}(Z) \cap \{\text{dist}(X, \text{spine } \mathbf{C}) \geq \rho/16\}} \text{dist}^2(Z + X, \text{spt } T) d\|\mathbf{C}\|(X) \\ \leq \beta^2 \inf_P \int_{\mathbf{B}_{\rho}(Z)} \text{dist}^2(X, Z + P) d\|T\|(X);$$

$$(1.4) \quad \{Y \in \mathbf{B}_{\rho}(Z) : \Theta(T, Y) \geq q\} \subset \{Y \in \mathbf{B}_{\rho}(Z) : \text{dist}(Y, Z + \text{spine } \mathbf{C}) < \varepsilon\rho\};$$

(ii) there is an  $(n - 3)$ -dimensional linear subspace  $L$  such that

$$(1.5) \quad \{Y \in \mathbf{B}_{\rho}(Z) : \Theta(T, Y) \geq q\} \subset \{Y \in \mathbf{B}_{\rho}(Z) : \text{dist}(Y, Z + L) < \varepsilon\rho\}.$$

(II)  $\mathcal{B}$  is a relatively closed set in  $\mathbf{B}_1(0)$ , and for each  $Z_0 \in \mathcal{B}$ , we have that  $\Theta(T, Z_0) = q$  and there is a unique  $n$ -dimensional plane  $P_{Z_0}$  such that:

(i)

$$(1.6) \quad \rho^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_{\rho}(Z_0)} \text{dist}^2(X, Z_0 + P_{Z_0}) d\|T\|(X) \leq C\rho^{2\alpha}$$

for all  $\rho \in (0, 1]$ , where  $C = C(n, m, q, \varepsilon, \beta) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant;

(ii)  $P_{Z_0}$  taken with multiplicity  $q$  and orientated appropriately is the unique tangent cone to  $T$  at  $Z_0$ ;

(iii) the planar frequency  $\mathcal{N}_{T, P_{Z_0}}(Z_0) = \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0^+} \mathcal{N}_{T, P_{Z_0}, Z_0}(\rho)$  exists and  $\mathcal{N}_{T, P_{Z_0}}(Z_0) \geq 1 + \alpha$  (where  $\mathcal{N}_{T, P_{Z_0}, Z_0}(\rho)$  is as in Definition 3.1).

Theorem 1.1 is, in part, inspired by arguments in [Wic08],[Wic14] for analysis of stable codimension 1 integral varifolds. As was observed in [Wic08],[Wic14], using blow-up arguments and the Hardt-Simon inequality [HS79] (see Lemma 5.4 below), one can regard density  $q$  singular points as having planar frequency  $\geq 1$  (if the latter exists). In the setting of [Wic08],[Wic14] however, unlike here, the validity of conditions (1.2) and (1.3) (for appropriately chosen, fixed  $\varepsilon$  and  $\beta$ ) at *some* scale and for some cone  $\mathbf{C}$  made up of half-hyperplanes meeting a common  $(n - 1)$ -dimensional boundary automatically implies decay of the varifold to a unique non-planar cone of the same type; see the more recent work [MW22] for a much more definitive result for stable hypersurfaces in this vein. Moreover, anything like a planar frequency function was neither necessary nor used in that setting.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 proceeds by setting  $\mathcal{S}$  to be the density  $q$  singular points  $Z_0$  such that for some  $\sigma > 0$ , the decay (by a fixed factor) of height excess of  $T$  relative to an optimal plane from scale  $\sigma$  to  $\sigma/2$  fails. It follows that the planar frequency function  $\mathcal{N}_{T, P, Z_0}(\rho)$  is close to 1 for

any plane  $P$  and  $\rho \in (\sigma/4, \sigma/2]$  (Lemma 6.7 and Lemma 6.3). Thus by monotonicity of the planar frequency function (Theorem 3.4), if  $T$  again decays towards a plane  $\tilde{P}$  from scale  $\sigma/2$  down to a smaller scale  $\sigma_1 < \sigma/2$ , the planar frequency function of  $T$  relative to  $\tilde{P}$  must remain close to 1 at scales  $\in (\sigma_1, \sigma/2]$ . Hence  $T$  must be closer to a non-planar cone than  $T$  is to a multiplicity  $q$  plane in  $\mathbf{B}_\rho(Z_0)$  for all  $\rho \in (\sigma_1, \sigma]$  (Lemma 6.2). More precisely, either  $T$  is weakly close to an area-minimizing cone but  $T$  is not close to any multiplicity  $q$  plane in  $\mathbf{B}_\rho(Z_0)$  (Lemma 6.8), or  $T$  is close to a multiplicity  $q$  plane in  $\mathbf{B}_\rho(Z_0)$  and  $T$  is significantly closer to the graph of a homogeneous degree one Dirichlet energy minimizing  $q$ -valued function over  $P$  (Lemma 6.2 and Lemma 6.3). Since the non-planar cone in either case is either a union of planes meeting along an  $(n-2)$ -dimensional subspace or has an axis (i.e. spine) of dimension  $\leq n-3$ , the assertion of Theorem 1.1(I) follows. Setting  $\mathcal{B}$  to be the complement of  $\mathcal{S}$  in the set of density  $q$  singular points, it follows (from the definition of  $\mathcal{S}$ ) that at every point of  $\mathcal{B}$  the current decays exponentially to a unique plane.

Once Theorem 1.1 is established, our primary focus is on using it to analyse the asymptotic behaviour of the current on approach to a typical singular point, establishing uniqueness of tangent cones, existence and uniqueness of non-zero tangent functions (blow ups) at branch points as well as structural properties of the singular set itself including its countable  $(n-2)$ -rectifiability. We carry out this asymptotic analysis in [KrumWic-b] and [KrumWic-c]. As a first consequence of the decomposition theorem though we obtain that the Hausdorff dimension of  $\text{sing } T$  is  $\leq n-2$ .

**Corollary 1.2.** *The Hausdorff dimension of  $\text{sing } T$  is at most  $n-2$ .*

This is Almgren's main theorem in [Alm83]. In our approach it is reached by observing first, by conclusions (I)(i) and (I)(ii) of Theorem 1.1, that there is  $\gamma(\epsilon, \beta) > 0$  with  $\gamma(\epsilon, \beta) \rightarrow 0$  as  $(\epsilon, \beta) \rightarrow (0, 0)$  such that  $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_{q, \epsilon, \beta}(T)$  satisfies  $\mathcal{H}^{n-2+\gamma(\epsilon, \beta)}(\mathcal{S}) = 0$ . To make a similar conclusion for  $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_{q, \epsilon, \beta}(T)$ , write  $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}' \cup \mathcal{B}''$ , where  $\mathcal{B}' = \{Z_0 \in \mathcal{B} : \mathcal{N}_{T, P_0}(Z_0) < 2\}$  and  $\mathcal{B}'' = \{Z_0 \in \mathcal{B} : \mathcal{N}_{T, P_0}(Z_0) \geq 2\}$ . A straightforward blow-up argument using the approximate monotonicity of the planar frequency function  $N_{T, P_{Z_0}, Z_0}(\rho)$  and Almgren's theorem that a Dirichlet energy minimizing  $q$ -valued function has a singular set of Hausdorff dimension  $\leq n-2$  shows that  $\mathcal{B}'$  has Hausdorff dimension  $\leq n-2$ . To bound the dimension of  $\mathcal{B}''$ , we proceed as in [Alm83] by utilising a center manifold, following its construction given in [DS16-I], but with added simplifications in the construction arising from the fact that the current at every point in  $\mathcal{B}''$  satisfies a locally uniform estimate giving decay to a unique plane at a rate (at least) quadratic in the scale. (For instance, complications necessitating having to consider "intervals of flattening" and correspondingly a sequence of center manifolds, as in [Alm83], [DS16-I], [DS16-II], are all removed by the uniform decay estimates.) This quadratic decay estimate is an immediate consequence of the fact that the planar frequency at every point in  $\mathcal{B}''$  is  $\geq 2$ , and it allows construction, about a point in  $\mathcal{B}''$ , of a *single* center manifold that contains all nearby points in  $\mathcal{B}''$ . (See [KrumWic-c] for details).

Since every point in  $\mathcal{B}$  has a unique planar tangent cone, it follows that the set  $\mathcal{S}_{q, n-2}$  of all density  $q$  non branch point singularities (where each tangent cone has spine dimension  $\leq n-2$ ) is contained in  $\mathcal{S}$ . As mentioned above, Theorem 1.1 however allows that  $\mathcal{S}$  may also contain branch points, and in fact it allows a priori that  $\mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{q, n-2}$  may be a set (consisting of branch points) of positive  $(n-2)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure. In [KrumWic-b], we rule out this latter possibility. In fact in [KrumWic-b] we shall take the above locally uniform weak approximation property of the current at points in  $\mathcal{S}$  (to be precise, conditions (1.2) and (1.3) in Theorem 1.1) as a starting point and prove that there is a choice of  $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  and  $\beta = \beta(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  such that for  $\mathcal{H}^{n-2}$  a.e. point  $Z \in \mathcal{S}$ , the current  $T$  has a unique tangent cone  $\mathbf{C}_Z$  supported on a union of (at least two) planes intersecting along an  $(n-2)$ -dimensional subspace, and moreover  $T$  satisfies

a decay estimate giving exponential decay to  $\mathbf{C}_Z$  at a fixed rate (depending only on  $n$ ,  $m$  and  $q$ ). From this it follows that  $\mathcal{H}^{n-2}(\mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{q,n-2}) = 0$  and that  $\mathcal{S}$  is  $(n-2)$ -rectifiable. In [KrumWic-c], we prove similar structure and asymptotic results for  $\mathcal{B}$  and  $T$  at  $\mathcal{H}^{n-2}$  a.e. point of  $\mathcal{B}$ .

**Remark 1.3.** The work of Naber–Valtorta [NV15] implies that  $\mathcal{S}_{q,n-2}$  is countably  $(n-2)$ -rectifiable. However, one cannot apply the results of [NV15] to  $\mathcal{S}$  prior to ruling out (as done in [KrumWic-b]) the possibility that  $\mathcal{S}$  contains a set of positive  $(n-2)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure consisting of branch points of  $T$ .

A further immediate corollary of Theorem 1.1 and the results of [KrumWic-b] referred to above is, of course, the uniqueness of tangent cones to a locally area minimising current at  $\mathcal{H}^{n-2}$  a.e. point.

**Corollary 1.4.** *Let  $T$  be any  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current in an open subset  $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ . Then  $T$  has a unique tangent cone at  $\mathcal{H}^{n-2}$ -a.e.  $Z \in \text{spt } T \cap U$ . This tangent cone is either supported on a plane, or on a union of planes meeting along a common  $(n-2)$ -dimensional subspace.*

The asymptotic analysis in our work in [KrumWic-b], [KrumWic-c] is based on the techniques developed in parts of the work [Wic14] for the analysis of stable codimension 1 integral varifolds, and those developed in [KW17], [KW21] for studying branch sets of Dirichlet energy minimising multi-valued functions and two-valued  $C^{1,\alpha}$  minimal graphs. These earlier works were in turn inspired by the fundamental work of Simon ([Sim93]) on the structure of singular sets of minimal submanifolds in a multiplicity 1 class. A key new ingredient needed for adaptation of these ideas for our purposes in [KrumWic-b], [KrumWic-c] is an interior height bound for area minimising currents. This result (proved in [KrumWic-b]) gives a uniform interior upper bound for the height of an area minimising rectifiable current relative to a union  $\mathbf{P}$  of non-intersecting oriented planes in terms of a *linear expression* in the height excess of the current relative to  $\mathbf{P}$ , under appropriate smallness assumptions on the tilt-excess of the current and of  $\mathbf{P}$ . The key implication of this estimate for our purposes is the obvious one: the current must separate into a sum of disjoint pieces whenever its height excess relative to  $\mathbf{P}$  is much smaller than the smallest distance between any pair of the planes making up  $\mathbf{P}$ .

Our overall approach to the analysis of singularities of area minimising currents can thus be thought of as one where the first step is to establish certain regularity properties for  $T$ , by way of estimates giving separation of the current under appropriate small excess criteria, control from below on the order of contact of the current with a planar tangent cone (i.e. planar frequency), and ultimately, convergence of  $T$ , at  $\mathcal{H}^{n-2}$  a.e. singular point, to a unique tangent cone (supported on a single plane or a union of planes) faster than a fixed exponential rate (depending only on  $n$ ,  $m$  and a mass upper bound for  $T$ ). In particular, in the special case  $n = 2$ , uniqueness of tangent cones must hold at every singular point, a result previously established by B. White ([Whi83]) by a method special to two dimensions. When  $n \geq 3$ , whether such uniqueness properties must hold has been a basic question left open by Almgren’s work. Our results imply, of course, that the current has a unique tangent plane at  $\mathcal{H}^{n-2}$  a.e. branch point, but it is worth noting that our method (here and in [KrumWic-b]) yields this conclusion not in isolation but simultaneously with the conclusion that non-planar tangent cones are also unique at  $\mathcal{H}^{n-2}$  a.e. point. As mentioned above, in our approach the Hausdorff dimension bound for the singular set, as well as structural properties of the singular set, are obtained subsequent to such decay estimates for the current. In particular, the construction of a center manifold—arguably the most intricate construction in [Alm83]—which is needed for studying the dimension and structure of the singular set, is considerably more efficient once decay estimates are in place; this is because in our approach a center manifold is only needed to

study singularities  $Z$  that are branch points having a unique tangent plane  $P_Z$  and planar frequency  $\mathcal{N}_{T,P_Z}(Z)$  relative to  $P_Z$  satisfying  $\mathcal{N}_{T,P_Z}(Z) \geq 2$  (at which the scaled current  $\eta_{Z,\rho} \# T$  converges to  $P_Z$  at a rate  $O(\rho^2)$  or faster).

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

**2.1. General notation.** Throughout the paper, we shall use the following notation:

$n \geq 2$  and  $m \geq 1$  are fixed integers.  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  denotes the  $(n+m)$ -dimensional Euclidean space.  $X = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n+m})$  denotes a general point in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ .

$e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{n+m}$  denotes the standard basis of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ .

For each  $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  and  $\rho > 0$ ,  $\mathbf{B}_\rho(Y) = \{X \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m} : |X - Y| < \rho\}$ .

For each  $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  and  $\rho > 0$ ,  $\eta_{Y,\rho} : \mathbb{R}^{n+m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  is defined by  $\eta_{Y,\rho}(X) = (X - Y)/\rho$ .

$\mathcal{H}^k$  denotes the  $k$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure on  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ .

$\mathcal{L}^k$  denotes the  $k$ -dimensional Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}^k$ .

$\omega_k$  denotes the Lebesgue measure of a ball of radius one in  $\mathbb{R}^k$ .

For each point  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  and set  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ ,  $\text{dist}(X, A) = \inf_{Y \in A} |X - Y|$ .

For each pair of sets  $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ ,  $\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(A, B)$  denotes the Hausdorff distance between  $A$  and  $B$ .

For each set  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ ,  $\bar{A}$  denotes the closure of  $A$  and  $\partial A$  denotes the boundary, or frontier, of  $A$ .

**2.2. Planes.** We let  $\mathcal{P}$  denote the set of all  $n$ -dimensional planes (containing the origin) in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ . Given an  $n$ -dimensional plane  $P$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  we let:

$P^\perp$  denote the orthogonal complement of  $P$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ .

$\pi_P : \mathbb{R}^{n+m} \rightarrow P$  denote the orthogonal projection onto  $P$ .

$\pi_{P^\perp} : \mathbb{R}^{n+m} \rightarrow P^\perp$  denote the orthogonal projection onto  $P^\perp$ .

for each  $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  and  $\rho > 0$ ,  $B_\rho(Z, P) = \{X \in Z + P : |X - Z| < \rho\}$  and  $\mathbf{C}_\rho(Z, P) = \{X \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m} : |\pi_P(X - Z)| < \rho\}$ .

We say that  $P$  is an oriented  $n$ -dimensional plane if we equip  $P$  with a simple  $n$ -vector  $\vec{P} = \tau_1 \wedge \tau_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \tau_n$ , called the *orientation* of  $P$ , where  $\{\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_n\}$  is an orthonormal basis for  $P$ . We let  $[[P]]$  denote integral current with support  $P$ , multiplicity one, and orientation  $\vec{P}$ .

We will often let  $P_0 = \mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\}$ , and take  $[[P_0]]$  with orientation  $\vec{P}_0 = e_1 \wedge e_2 \wedge \dots \wedge e_n$ . In this case we will identify  $P_0 \cong \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $P_0^\perp \cong \mathbb{R}^m$ . For each  $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\rho > 0$  we will let  $B_\rho(z) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x - z| < \rho\}$  and  $\mathbf{C}_\rho(z) = B_\rho(z) \times \mathbb{R}^m$ .

**2.3. Rectifiable currents.** Let  $U$  be an open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ . An  $n$ -dimensional current  $T$  of  $U$  is a continuous linear functional on the Fréchet space of smooth differential  $n$ -forms with compact support in  $U$ . An  $n$ -dimensional integer multiplicity rectifiable current  $T$  of  $U$  (abbreviated as



$n$ -dimensional rectifiable current or just *rectifiable current* henceforth) is a current of the form

$$(2.1) \quad T(\omega) = \int_M \langle \omega, \vec{T} \rangle \theta d\mathcal{H}^n$$

for all smooth differential  $n$ -forms  $\omega$  with compact support in  $U$ , where

- (i)  $M$  is an  $\mathcal{H}^n$  measurable, countably  $n$ -rectifiable subset of  $U$ ;
- (ii)  $\theta : M \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$  is a locally  $\mathcal{H}^n$ -integrable positive integer-valued function on  $M$ . The function  $\theta$  is called the *multiplicity* of  $T$ ;
- (iii)  $\vec{T} : M \rightarrow \Lambda^n(\mathbb{R}^{n+m})$  is an  $\mathcal{H}^n$ -measurable function on  $M$  such that for  $\mathcal{H}^n$ -a.e.  $X \in M$ ,  $\vec{T}(X) = \tau_1 \wedge \tau_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge \tau_n$  for some orthonormal basis  $\{\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_n\}$  for the approximate tangent plane to  $M$  at  $X$ . The function  $\vec{T}$  is called the *orientation* of  $T$ .

We say that an  $n$ -dimensional current  $T$  is an *integral current* if both  $T$  and  $\partial T$  are integer multiplicity rectifiable. The general theory of integral currents can be found in [Fed69] and [Sim83]. We shall use the following notation associated with integral currents:

$\|T\| = \theta d\mathcal{H}^n$  is the *total variation measure* associated with  $T$  (as in 2.1).

$\mathbf{M}_W(T) = \|T\|(W)$  is the *mass*  $T$  in an open set  $W \subseteq U$ .  $\mathbf{M}(T) = \|T\|(U)$  is the *mass*  $T$ .

$\Theta(T, X) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \omega_n^{-1} r^{-n} \|T\|(\mathbf{B}_r(X))$  is the *density* of  $T$  at  $X$ , whenever it exists.

$\text{spt } T$  is the support of  $T$ .

$T \llcorner A$  is the restriction of  $T$  to a  $\|T\|$ -measurable set  $A \subset U$ .

$\partial T$  is the *boundary* of  $T$ .

$f_{\#}T$  is the *image* or the *push-forward* of  $T$  under a Lipschitz map  $f : U \rightarrow V$  between two open sets  $U, V$  such that  $f|_{\text{spt } T}$  is proper, i.e.  $f^{-1}(K) \cap \text{spt } T$  is a compact set whenever  $K \subset V$  is a compact set.

$S \times T$  is the cartesian product of a pair of integral currents  $S$  and  $T$ .

$\llbracket M \rrbracket$  is the multiplicity one  $k$ -dimensional current associated with an oriented  $C^1$  submanifold  $M$ , or an oriented  $C^1$ -submanifold-with-boundary  $M$ , of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ .

$G_n(U)$  denotes the *Grassmannian*, which is the fiber bundle consisting of all pairs  $(X, S)$  where  $X \in U$  and  $S$  is an  $n$ -dimensional plane in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ . An  *$n$ -dimensional varifold* is a Radon measure on  $G_n(U)$ . Varifold convergence is the usual convergence of Radon measures on  $G_n(U)$ . To each pair consisting of an  $\mathcal{H}^n$  measurable, countably  $n$ -rectifiable  $M \subset U$  and a locally  $\mathcal{H}^n$ -integrable positive integer-valued function  $\theta : M \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$  we associate the  *$n$ -dimensional integral varifold*  $V = \mathbf{v}(M, \theta)$  such that

$$\int_{G_n(U)} \varphi(X, S) dV(X, S) = \int_M \varphi(X, \text{Tan}(M, X)) \theta(X) d\mathcal{H}^n(X)$$

for each  $\varphi \in C_c(G_n(U))$ , where  $\text{Tan}(M, X)$  is the approximate tangent plane to  $M$  at  $X$ . In other words, for  $V$ -a.e.  $(X, S) \in G_n(U)$ ,  $S$  is the approximate tangent plane to  $M$  at  $X$ . To each  $n$ -dimensional rectifiable current  $T$  we can associate an  $n$ -dimensional integral varifold  $|T| = \mathbf{v}(M, \theta)$ , where  $M$  and  $\theta$  are as in (2.1). For a further discussion of the theory of integral varifolds and general varifolds, we refer the reader to [Sim83, Chapters 4 and 8].

**2.4. Locally area-minimizing rectifiable currents.** Let  $U$  be an open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ .

**Definition 2.1.** We say that an  $n$ -dimensional rectifiable current  $T$  in  $U$  is *locally area-minimizing* in  $U$  if

$$\mathbf{M}_W(T) \leq \mathbf{M}_W(S)$$

for every open set  $W \subset\subset U$  and every  $n$ -dimensional rectifiable current  $S$  in  $U$  such that  $\partial S = \partial T$  in  $U$  and  $\text{spt}(S - T) \subset W$ . (Here  $W \subset\subset U$  means the closure of  $W$  is a compact subset of  $U$ .)

Given an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current  $T$  of  $U$ , the *regular set*  $\text{reg } T$  is the set of all points  $Y \in \text{spt } T \cap U \setminus \text{spt } \partial T$  such that for some  $\rho > 0$ ,  $\text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{B}_\rho(Y)$  is a smooth embedded  $n$ -dimensional submanifold of  $\mathbf{B}_\rho(Y)$ . The *singular set*  $\text{sing } T = \text{spt } T \cap U \setminus (\text{spt } \partial T \cup \text{reg } T)$ .

Whenever  $T$  is an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current of  $U$  with  $(\partial T)_\perp U = 0$ , the integral varifold  $|T|$  associated with  $T$  is *area-stationary* in the sense that

$$(2.2) \quad \int_{G_n(U)} \text{div}_S \zeta(X) d|T|(X, S) = 0$$

for all  $\zeta \in C_c^1(U, \mathbb{R}^{n+m})$ , where  $\text{div}_S$  denotes the divergence with respect to the plane  $S$  [Sim83, Definition 16.3 and Lemma 33.2].

Let  $T$  be an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current of  $U$  with  $(\partial T)_\perp U = 0$  and let  $Z \in \text{spt } T \cap U$ . Since  $T$  is area-stationary,  $T$  satisfies a well-known *monotonicity formula for area*, which implies

$$(2.3) \quad \frac{\|T\|(\mathbf{B}_\sigma(Z))}{\omega_n \sigma^n} \leq \frac{\|T\|(\mathbf{B}_\rho(Z))}{\omega_n \rho^n}$$

for all  $0 < \sigma \leq \rho \leq \text{dist}(Z, \mathbb{R}^{n+m} \setminus U)$  [Sim83, Theorem 17.6]. If  $U = \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ ,  $Z = 0$  and equality holds true in (2.3) for all  $0 < \sigma \leq \rho < \infty$ , then  $T$  is a *cone*, i.e.  $\eta_{0, \lambda \#} T = T$  for all  $\lambda > 0$  (see [Sim83, Theorem 19.3] and the footnote at the bottom of [Sim83, p. 203]). As a consequence of the monotonicity formula and the compactness theorem for locally area-minimizing rectifiable currents, for each sequence  $\rho_k \rightarrow 0^+$  there exists a subsequence  $\{k'\} \subset \{k\}$  and  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current  $\mathbf{C}$  which is a cone in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  such that  $\eta_{Z, \rho_{k'} \#} T \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$  weakly in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  and  $\Theta(\mathbf{C}, 0) = \Theta(T, Z)$  [Sim83, Theorem 35.1]. We say that  $\mathbf{C}$  is a *tangent cone* of  $T$  at  $Z$ .

Let  $\mathbf{C}$  be any  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable cone in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ . Since  $\mathbf{C}$  is a cone,  $\Theta(\mathbf{C}, Z) = \Theta(\mathbf{C}, tZ)$  for all  $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  and  $t > 0$ . Letting  $t \rightarrow 0^+$  using the semi-continuity of density [Sim83, Corollary 17.8],  $\Theta(\mathbf{C}, Z) \leq \Theta(\mathbf{C}, 0)$  for all  $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ . We define the *spine* of  $\mathbf{C}$  to be the set

$$\text{spine } \mathbf{C} = \{Z \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m} : \Theta(\mathbf{C}, Z) = \Theta(\mathbf{C}, 0)\}.$$

By [Alm83, Theorem 2.26],  $\text{spine } \mathbf{C}$  is a subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  and  $\eta_{Z, 1 \#} \mathbf{C} = \mathbf{C}$  for all  $Z \in \text{spine } \mathbf{C}$ . After an orthogonal change of coordinates, we can assume that  $\text{spine } \mathbf{C} = \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$ , in which case  $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{C}_0 \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$  for some  $k$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable cone  $\mathbf{C}_0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{k+m}$ . If  $\dim \text{spine } \mathbf{C} = n$ , then  $\mathbf{C} = q[[P]]$  for some integer  $q \geq 1$  and some  $n$ -dimensional oriented plane  $P$ . There is no  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable cone  $\mathbf{C}$  such that  $\dim \text{spine } \mathbf{C} = n - 1$ . If  $\dim \text{spine } \mathbf{C} = n - 2$ , then

$$\mathbf{C} = \sum_{i=1}^p q_i [[P_i]]$$

for some integers  $p \geq 2$  and  $q_i \geq 1$  and some  $n$ -dimensional oriented planes  $P_i$  such that  $P_i \cap P_j = \text{spine } \mathbf{C}$  whenever  $i \neq j$ .

Let  $T$  be an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current in  $U$  with  $(\partial T)\llcorner U = 0$ . For each  $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots, n$ , define  $j$ -th stratum  $S_j$  of the singular set of  $T$  to be the set of all points  $Z \in \text{sing } T$  such that  $\dim \text{spine } \mathbf{C} \leq j$  for every tangent cone  $\mathbf{C}$  to  $T$  at  $Z$ . Observe that

$$S_0 \subseteq S_1 \subseteq \dots \subseteq S_{n-3} \subseteq S_{n-2} = S_{n-1} \subseteq S_n = \text{sing } T.$$

$S_n \setminus S_{n-2}$  is the set of all branch point singularities, at which  $T$  has at least one tangent one which is an integer multiplicity plane.

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $T$  be an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current of  $U$  with  $(\partial T)\llcorner U = 0$ . For each  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n-2, n$ ,  $S_j$  has Hausdorff dimension at most  $j$ . For  $\alpha > 0$ ,  $\{Z \in S_0 : \Theta(T, Z) = \alpha\}$  is discrete.*

*Proof.* See [Alm83, Theorem 2.26 and Corollary 2.27].  $\square$

**2.5. Multi-valued functions.** For each integer  $q \geq 1$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$  denotes the space of all sums

$$\sum_{i=1}^q \llbracket a_i \rrbracket$$

of Dirac point masses  $\llbracket a_i \rrbracket$  at points  $a_i \in \mathbb{R}^m$  (possibly repeating). We equip  $\mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$  with the metric defined by

$$\mathcal{G}(a, b) = \inf_{\sigma} \left( \sum_{i=1}^q |a_i - b_{\sigma(i)}|^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

for each  $a = \sum_{i=1}^q \llbracket a_i \rrbracket, b = \sum_{i=1}^q \llbracket b_i \rrbracket \in \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$ , where the infimum is taken over all permutations  $\sigma$  of  $\{1, 2, \dots, q\}$ . We write

$$|a| = \mathcal{G}(a, q\llbracket 0 \rrbracket) = \left( \sum_{i=1}^q |a_i|^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

for each  $a = \sum_{i=1}^q \llbracket a_i \rrbracket \in \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$ .

Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ . A  $q$ -valued function is a map  $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$ . For each  $x \in \Omega$ , we shall express  $u(x) = \sum_{i=1}^q \llbracket u_i(x) \rrbracket$  where  $u_i(x) \in \mathbb{R}^m$  are the “ $q$  values of  $u(x)$ ”. We define the *average*  $u_a : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  of  $u$  to be the single-valued function defined by  $u_a(x) = \frac{1}{q} \sum_{i=1}^q u_i(x)$  for each  $x \in \Omega$ . We say that  $u$  is *average-free* if  $u_a(x) = 0$  for all  $x \in \Omega$ . The *average-free part* of  $u$  is the  $q$ -valued function  $u_f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$  defined by  $u_f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^q \llbracket u_i(x) - u_a(x) \rrbracket$  for each  $x \in \Omega$ . Thus for each  $x \in \Omega$ , we can write  $u_f$  and  $u$  as

$$u_f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^q \llbracket (u_f)_i(x) \rrbracket, \quad u(x) = \sum_{i=1}^q \llbracket u_a(x) + (u_f)_i(x) \rrbracket$$

where  $(u_f)_i(x) = u_i(x) - u_a(x)$ . Observe that for each pair of  $q$ -valued functions  $u, v : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$ ,

$$(2.4) \quad \mathcal{G}(u(x), v(x))^2 = q|u_a(x) - v_a(x)|^2 + \mathcal{G}(u_f(x), v_f(x))^2$$

for all  $x \in \Omega$ .

Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be open. Since  $\mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$  is a metric space, we can define the space  $C^0(\Omega, \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m))$  of continuous  $q$ -valued functions  $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$  in the usual way. For each  $\mu \in (0, 1]$ , we define the space  $C^{0, \mu}(\Omega, \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m))$  of Hölder continuous  $q$ -valued functions to be the set of all  $q$ -valued functions  $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$  such that

$$[u]_{\mu, \Omega'} = \sup_{x, y \in \Omega', x \neq y} \frac{\mathcal{G}(u(x), u(y))}{|x - y|^\mu} < \infty$$

for all  $\Omega' \subset\subset \Omega$ . We say that a  $q$ -valued function  $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$  is *Lipschitz* if

$$\text{Lip } u = \sup_{x, y \in \Omega, x \neq y} \frac{\mathcal{G}(u(x), u(y))}{|x - y|} < \infty.$$

We say a  $q$ -valued function  $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$  is *differentiable* at  $y \in \Omega$  if there exists a  $q$ -valued function  $\ell_y : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$  of the form  $\ell_y(x) = \sum_{i=1}^q [b_i^y + A_i^y x]$  for some  $m \times n$  matrices  $A_i^y$  and points  $b_i^y \in \mathbb{R}^m$  ( $1 \leq i \leq q$ ) such that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow y} \frac{\mathcal{G}(u(x), \ell_y(x))}{|x - y|} = 0.$$

If additionally  $A_i^y \neq A_j^y$  whenever  $b_i^y \neq b_j^y$ , then we say that  $u$  is *strongly differentiable* at  $y$ . Whenever  $u$  is differentiable at  $y$ , the *derivative* of  $u$  at  $y$  is  $Du(y) = \sum_{i=1}^q [A_i^y]$ . We shall use the convention that we write  $u(y) = \sum_{i=1}^q [u_i(y)]$  and  $Du(y) = \sum_{i=1}^q [Du_i(y)]$  when  $u$  is strongly differentiable at  $y$  with  $\ell_y(x) = \sum_{i=1}^q [u_i(y) + Du_i(y) \cdot (x - y)]$ . By Rademacher's theorem for  $q$ -valued functions [DS11, Theorem 1.13], every Lipschitz  $q$ -valued function is strongly differentiable at  $\mathcal{L}^n$ -a.e.  $y \in \Omega$ .

Given a Lipschitz  $q$ -valued function  $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$ ,  $T = \text{graph } u$  is an  $n$ -rectifiable current of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  given by (2.1) with

$$\begin{aligned} M &= \{(x, u_i(x)) : x \in \Omega, i \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}\}, \\ \theta(x, y) &= \#\{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\} : y = u_i(x)\} \text{ for each } (x, y) \in M, \\ \vec{T}(x, u_i(x)) &= \frac{\bigwedge_{j=1}^n (e_j, D_j u_i(x))}{\left| \bigwedge_{j=1}^n (e_j, D_j u_i(x)) \right|} \text{ for } \mathcal{L}^n\text{-a.e. } x \in \Omega \text{ and each } i \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $u(x) = \sum_{i=1}^q [u_i(x)]$  for each  $x \in \Omega$  and  $Du(x) = \sum_{i=1}^q [Du_i(x)]$  for  $\mathcal{L}^n$ -a.e.  $x \in \Omega$  following the above convention. See [Alm83, Section 1.5], in which  $\text{graph } u$  is defined via affine approximation, or [DS15, Section 1], in which  $\text{graph } u$  is equivalently defined as the image of the  $q$ -valued map  $F(x) = \sum_{i=1}^q [(x, u_i(x))]$  of  $x \in \Omega$  using a measurable partition of  $\Omega$  and a corresponding measurable selection of  $F$ .

For each  $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ , we define the Lebesgue space  $L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m))$  to be the set of all Lebesgue measurable  $q$ -valued functions  $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$  such that  $\|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} = \|\mathcal{G}(u, q[0])\|_{L^p(\Omega)} < \infty$ .

The Sobolev space  $W^{1,2}(\Omega, \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m))$  of  $q$ -valued functions is defined in [Alm83, Definitions and terminology 2.1] as follows: Let  $N(q, m) \geq 1$  be an integer and  $\xi : \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$  be a bi-Lipschitz embedding such that  $\text{Lip } \xi \leq 1$  and  $\text{Lip } \xi|_{\mathcal{Q}} \leq C(m, q)$ , where  $\mathcal{Q} = \xi(\mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m))$ . Then  $W^{1,2}(\Omega, \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m))$  is the set of all Lebesgue measurable  $q$ -valued functions  $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$  such that  $\xi \circ u \in W^{1,2}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$ .  $W^{1,2}(\Omega, \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m))$  can be equivalently characterized as the space of Sobolev functions into the metric space  $\mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$ , see [DS11, Definition 0.5]. Every  $u \in W^{1,2}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$  is approximately strongly differentiable at  $\mathcal{L}^n$ -a.e.  $y \in \Omega$  in the sense that there exists a set  $\Omega_y \subset \Omega$  with density one at  $y$  such that  $u|_{\Omega_y}$  is strongly differentiable at  $y$  ([Alm83, Theorem 2.2], [DS11, Corollary 2.7]). The derivative of  $u$  at  $y$  is  $Du(y) = D(u|_{\Omega_y})(y)$ . Whenever  $u \in W^{1,2}(\Omega, \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m))$ ,  $u \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m))$  and  $Du \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}))$ .

**2.6. Dirichlet energy minimizing multi-valued functions.** Let  $\Omega$  be an open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

**Definition 2.3.** We say a  $q$ -valued function  $w \in W^{1,2}(\Omega, \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m))$  is *locally Dirichlet energy minimizing* (or *Dirichlet energy minimizing* for simplicity) if

$$\int_{\Omega'} |Dw|^2 \leq \int_{\Omega'} |Dv|^2$$

whenever  $\Omega' \subset\subset \Omega$  is an open set and  $v \in W^{1,2}(\Omega, \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m))$  is a  $q$ -valued function such that  $w(x) = v(x)$  for  $\mathcal{L}^n$ -a.e.  $x \in \Omega \setminus \Omega'$ .

The theory of Dirichlet energy minimizing  $q$ -valued functions was developed by Almgren in [Alm83] where such functions were used to approximate, in a certain precise sense, locally area-minimizing rectifiable currents weakly close to a multiplicity  $q$  plane; this theory serves as the ‘‘linear theory’’ in the study of area-minimizing currents. For a detailed discussion of this theory see [Alm83, Chapter 2] or [DS11]. See also the summary of Almgren’s existence and regularity theory for Dirichlet energy minimizing multi-valued functions in [KW17, Subsection 3.2 and Section 4].

Let  $\phi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a nonincreasing Lipschitz function such that  $\phi = 1$  on  $[0, 1/2]$  and  $\phi = 0$  on  $[1, \infty)$ . Let  $w \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(\Omega, \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m))$  be a non-zero Dirichlet energy minimizing  $q$ -valued function,  $z \in \Omega$ , and  $0 < \rho < \text{dist}(z, \partial\Omega)$ . We define the *frequency function*  $N_{w,z}(\rho)$  associated with  $w$  and  $z$  by

$$N_{w,z}(\rho) = \frac{D_{w,z}(\rho)}{H_{w,z}(\rho)}$$

whenever  $H_{w,z}(\rho) > 0$ , where we let  $r = |x - z|$  and

$$H_{w,z}(\rho) = -\rho^{1-n} \int |w|^2 \frac{1}{r} \phi'(r/\rho), \quad D_{w,z}(\rho) = \rho^{2-n} \int |Dw|^2 \phi(r/\rho).$$

By letting  $\phi$  increase to the characteristic function on the interval  $[0, 1]$ , we obtain the classical frequency function as defined by Almgren in [Alm83, Theorem 2.6]; incorporating a fixed function  $\phi$  into the definition provides the convenience, as observed in [DMSV18], [DS16-II], of avoiding boundary integrals as in Almgren’s original definition. As in [DMSV18], [DS16-II], here we take  $\phi$  to be the Lipschitz function such that  $\phi(s) = 2 - 2s$  for each  $s \in (1/2, 1)$  (as in (3.2) below). One can then show (see [DMSV18, Proposition 3.1]) that if  $\Omega$  is connected and  $w$  is not identically  $q[0]$  on  $\Omega$ , then  $H_{w,z}(\rho) > 0$  for all  $0 < \rho < \text{dist}(z, \partial\Omega)$  and

$$N'_{w,z}(\rho) = \frac{-2\rho^{1-n}}{H_{w,z}(\rho)} \int \left( \sum_{i=1}^q |x \cdot Dw_i(x) - N_{w,z}(\rho) w_i(x)|^2 \right) \frac{1}{r} \phi'(r/\rho) d\mathcal{L}^n(x) \geq 0$$

for all  $0 < \rho < \text{dist}(z, \partial\Omega)$ , where we write  $w(x) = \sum_{i=1}^q \llbracket w_i(x) \rrbracket$  for each  $x \in \Omega$  and  $Dw(x) = \sum_{i=1}^q \llbracket Dw_i(x) \rrbracket$  for  $\mathcal{L}^n$ -a.e.  $x \in \Omega$  (following the convention from Subsection 2.5). In particular,  $N_{w,z}(\rho)$  is a monotone nondecreasing function of  $\rho \in (0, \text{dist}(z, \partial\Omega))$ .  $N'_{w,z}(\tau) = 0$  for each  $\tau \in (\sigma, \rho)$  if and only if  $w(z + \lambda x) = \sum_{i=1}^q \llbracket \lambda^\alpha w_i(z + x) \rrbracket$  whenever  $\lambda > 0$  and  $x, \lambda x \in B_\rho(0) \setminus B_\sigma(0)$ . We define the *frequency*  $\mathcal{N}_w(z)$  of  $w$  at  $z$  by

$$\mathcal{N}_w(z) = N_{w,z}(0^+) = \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0^+} N_{w,z}(\rho).$$

The value of  $N_{w,z}(0^+)$  is in fact equal to the classical frequency as defined by Almgren in [Alm83, Theorem 2.6]. Using the monotonicity formula for frequency function and continuity of Dirichlet energy under uniform limits ([Alm83, Theorem 2.15], [DS11, Proposition 3.20]), one can show that frequency is upper semi-continuous in the sense that if  $w_k, w \in W^{1,2}(\Omega, \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m))$  are Dirichlet energy minimizing  $q$ -valued functions such that  $w_k \rightarrow w$  uniformly on  $\Omega$ , and  $z_k, z \in \Omega$  are such that  $z_k \rightarrow z$ , then

$$\mathcal{N}_w(z) \geq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{N}_{w_k}(z_k).$$

Suppose that  $w \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m))$  is a non-zero Dirichlet energy minimizing  $q$ -valued function and  $w$  is homogeneous of some degree  $\alpha$ , i.e.  $w(\lambda x) = \sum_{i=1}^q \llbracket \lambda^\alpha w_i(x) \rrbracket$  for each  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\lambda > 0$  where we write  $w(x) = \sum_{i=1}^q \llbracket w_i(x) \rrbracket$ . Then  $N_{w,0}(\rho) = \alpha$  for all  $\rho \in (0, \infty)$ . By the homogeneity of

$w$  and semi-continuity of frequency, for each  $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$  we have that  $\mathcal{N}_w(z) = \limsup_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \mathcal{N}_w(tz) \leq \mathcal{N}_w(0) = \alpha$ . We define the *spine* of  $w$  by

$$\text{spine } w = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathcal{N}_w(z) = \alpha\}.$$

It follows from [Alm83, Theorem 2.14] that spine  $w$  is linear subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and that  $w(z+x) = w(x)$  for all  $z \in \text{spine } w$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . If  $\dim \text{spine } w = n$ , then  $w$  is a constant  $q$ -valued function on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . There is no homogeneous Dirichlet energy minimizing  $q$ -valued function  $w \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m))$  with  $\dim \text{spine } w = n - 1$ . If  $\dim \text{spine } w = n - 2$ , then

$$w(x) = \sum_{i=1}^p q_i \llbracket A_i x \rrbracket$$

where  $p$  and  $q_i$  are positive integers such that  $p \geq 2$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^p q_i = q$ , and  $A_i$  are distinct  $m \times n$  matrices such that  $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : A_i x = A_j x\} = \text{spine } w$  if  $i \neq j$ , and if  $w$  is average-free,  $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : A_i x = 0\} = \text{spine } w$ .

**2.7. Some elementary estimates.** We have the following well-known ‘‘energy estimate’’ which bounds the tilt excess of a stationary integral varifold  $V$  relative to a plane  $P$  from above in terms of the height-excess, i.e.  $L^2$ -distance of  $V$  to  $P$ .

**Lemma 2.4.** *If  $P$  is an  $n$ -dimensional plane in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ ,  $V$  is an  $n$ -dimensional stationary integral varifold on  $\mathbf{C}_\rho(Y, P)$  and  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ , then*

$$(2.5) \quad \frac{1}{\rho^n} \int_{G_n(\mathbf{C}_{\gamma\rho}(Y, P))} \|\pi_S - \pi_P\|^2 dV(X, S) \leq \frac{64}{(1-\gamma)^2 \rho^{n+2}} \int_{\mathbf{C}_\rho(Y, P)} \text{dist}^2(X, Y + P) d\|V\|(X)$$

where  $\|\pi_S - \pi_P\|$  denotes the Frobenius norm of  $\pi_S - \pi_P$ .

*Proof.* Assume without loss of generality that  $Y = 0$ ,  $\rho = 1$ , and  $P = \mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\}$ . Express points  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  as  $X = (x, y)$  where  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $y = (x_{n+1}, \dots, x_{n+m}) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ . Inequality (2.5) follows by setting  $\zeta(x, y) = \phi^2(x) (0, y)$  in (2.2), where  $\phi \in C_c^1(B_1(0))$  is a cut-off function such that  $0 \leq \phi \leq 1$ ,  $\phi = 1$  on  $B_\gamma(0)$ , and  $|D\phi| \leq \frac{2}{1-\gamma}$ .  $\square$

The following well-known result due to Allard ([All72]) bounds the  $L^\infty$ -distance of a stationary integral varifold  $T$  to a plane  $P$  linearly in terms of the  $L^2$ -distance of  $T$  to  $P$ . (See [KrumWic-b] for a generalisation of this to a union of planes disjoint in a cylinder in place of  $P$  in the case that  $V$  corresponds to a locally area minimizing rectifiable current).

**Lemma 2.5.** *If  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ ,  $V$  is an  $n$ -dimensional stationary integral varifold on  $\mathbf{B}_\rho(Y)$  such that  $V \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{\gamma\rho}(Y) \neq 0$  and if  $P$  is an  $n$ -dimensional affine plane in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ , then*

$$(2.6) \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{B}_{\gamma\rho}(Y)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) \leq \frac{C}{\rho^n} \int_{\mathbf{B}_\rho(Y)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X)$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ .

*Proof.* Without loss of generality assume that  $P = \mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\}$ . Since the coordinate functions  $x_i$  are a  $|T|$ -harmonic functions in  $\mathbf{B}_\rho(Y)$  for all  $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$  [All72, 7.5(1)(2)], we can apply [All72, Theorem 7.5(6)] to deduce (2.6).  $\square$

If instead we consider a general closed set  $K$  (not necessarily a plane), as a straightforward consequence of the monotonicity formula for area, we have the following more crude bound for the  $L^\infty$ -distance of  $V$  to  $K$  in terms of the  $L^2$ -distance of  $V$  to  $K$ .

**Lemma 2.6.** *Let  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ . Suppose  $V$  is an  $n$ -dimensional stationary integral varifold on  $\mathbf{B}_\rho(Y)$  and  $K$  is a closed subset of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  such that*

$$(2.7) \quad \frac{1}{\omega_n \rho^{n+2}} \int_{\mathbf{B}_\rho(Y)} \text{dist}^2(X, K) d\|V\|(X) < \left(\frac{1-\gamma}{2}\right)^{n+2}$$

then

$$(2.8) \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } \|V\| \cap \mathbf{B}_{\gamma\rho}(Y)} \text{dist}(X, K) \leq 2 \left( \frac{1}{\omega_n} \int_{\mathbf{B}_\rho(Y)} \text{dist}^2(X, K) d\|V\|(X) \right)^{\frac{1}{n+2}}.$$

*Proof.* Assume without loss of generality (by traslating and scaling) that  $Y = 0$  and  $\rho = 1$ . Fix  $Z \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)$  and set  $d = \min\{1 - \gamma, \text{dist}(Z, K)\}$  so that  $\mathbf{B}_d(Z) \subseteq \mathbf{B}_1(0) \setminus K$ . By the monotonicity formula for area and [Sim83, Remark 17.9(1)],  $\|V\|(\mathbf{B}_{d/2}(Z)) \geq \omega_n (d/2)^n$  and thus

$$(2.9) \quad \omega_n (d/2)^{n+2} \leq \int_{\mathbf{B}_{d/2}(Z)} \text{dist}^2(X, K) d\|V\|(X) \leq \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, K) d\|V\|(X).$$

By (2.9) and (2.7), we must have that  $d < 1 - \gamma$  and thus  $d = \text{dist}(Z, K)$ . Hence (2.8) follows immediately from (2.9).  $\square$

Let  $P$  be an  $n$ -dimensional oriented plane in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  and  $T$  be an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current in  $\mathbf{C}_\rho(Y, P)$  with

$$(\partial T) \llcorner \mathbf{C}_\rho(Y, P) = 0, \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T} \text{dist}(X, P) < \infty.$$

By the constancy theorem [Sim83, Theorem 26.27], there exists an integer  $\theta$  such that

$$\pi_{P\#}(T \llcorner \mathbf{C}_\rho(Y, P)) = \theta \llbracket P \rrbracket \llcorner \mathbf{C}_\rho(Y, P).$$

We define the *excess*  $\mathcal{E}(T, P, \mathbf{C}_\rho(Y, P))$  of  $T$  relative to  $P$  in  $\mathbf{C}_\rho(Y, P)$  by

$$(2.10) \quad \mathcal{E}(T, P, \mathbf{C}_\rho(Y, P))^2 = \frac{\|T\|(\mathbf{C}_\rho(Y, P))}{\omega_n \rho^n} - |\theta|,$$

whence,

$$(2.11) \quad \|T\|(\mathbf{C}_\rho(Y, P)) = (|\theta| + \mathcal{E}(T, P, \mathbf{C}_\rho(Y, P)))^2 \omega_n \rho^n.$$

By [Fed69, 5.3.1], if  $\theta \geq 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(T, P, \mathbf{C}_\rho(Y, P))^2 &= \frac{1}{\omega_n \rho^n} \int_{\mathbf{C}_\rho(Y, P)} (1 - \langle \vec{T}, \vec{P} \rangle) d\|T\|(X) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\omega_n \rho^n} \int_{\mathbf{C}_\rho(Y, P)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}|^2 d\|T\|(X). \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 2.7.** *Let  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ . Let  $P$  be an  $n$ -dimensional oriented plane in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  and  $T$  be an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current in  $\mathbf{C}_\rho(Y, P)$  such that*

$$(\partial T) \llcorner \mathbf{C}_\rho(Y, P) = 0, \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T} \text{dist}(X, P) \leq 1.$$

Then

$$(2.12) \quad \mathcal{E}(T, P, \mathbf{C}_{\gamma\rho}(Y, P))^2 \leq \frac{C}{\rho^{n+2}} \int_{\mathbf{C}_\rho(Y, P)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X)$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ .

*Proof.* The proof is based on [HS79, Lemma 3.2] and is included for completion. Without loss of generality assume that  $Y = 0$ ,  $\rho = 1$ , and  $P = \mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\}$ . Express points  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  as  $X = (x, y)$  where  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $y = (x_{n+1}, \dots, x_{n+m}) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ . Let  $\mu \in C^\infty(\mathbf{C}_1)$  be a smooth function such that  $0 \leq \mu \leq 1$ ,  $\mu = 1$  on  $\mathbf{C}_1 \setminus \mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2}$ ,  $\mu = 0$  in  $\mathbf{C}_\gamma$ , and  $|\nabla \mu| \leq \frac{3}{1-\gamma}$ . Define a diffeomorphism  $F : \mathbf{C}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{C}_1$  by  $F(X) = (x, \mu(X)y)$  and consider the competitor  $F_\#T$  for  $T$  (which fixes points in  $\mathbf{C}_1 \setminus \mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2}$  and projects points in  $\mathbf{C}_\gamma$  onto  $P$ ). Since  $T$  is area-minimizing,

$$\|T\|(\mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2}) \leq \|F_\#T\|(\mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2}).$$

Thus

$$(2.13) \quad \begin{aligned} \omega_n \gamma^n \mathcal{E}(T, P, \mathbf{C}_\gamma)^2 &= \|T\|(\mathbf{C}_\gamma) - \|\pi_{P\#}T\|(\mathbf{C}_\gamma) \\ &= \|T\|(\mathbf{C}_\gamma) - \|F_\#T\|(\mathbf{C}_\gamma) \\ &= \|T\|(\mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2}) - \|F_\#T\|(\mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2}) \\ &\quad + \|F_\#T\|(\mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2} \setminus \mathbf{C}_\gamma) - \|T\|(\mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2} \setminus \mathbf{C}_\gamma) \\ &\leq \|F_\#T\|(\mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2} \setminus \mathbf{C}_\gamma) - \|T\|(\mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2} \setminus \mathbf{C}_\gamma) \end{aligned}$$

Let  $X = (x, y) \in \text{spt } T$  be a point at which the approximate tangent plane  $S_X$  to  $T$  exists, and let  $\{\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_n\}$  be an orthonormal basis for  $S_X$  such that  $\vec{T} = \tau_1 \wedge \tau_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \tau_n$ . Noting that  $\sup_{X \in \text{spt } T} |y| \leq 1$  and  $|\pi_{P^\perp} \tau_i| \leq \|\pi_{S_X} - \pi_P\|$  for each  $i$ ,

$$(2.14) \quad \begin{aligned} F_\#\vec{T} &= \bigwedge_{i=1}^n F_\#\tau_i = \bigwedge_{i=1}^n (\pi_P \tau_i + \mu(X) \pi_{P^\perp} \tau_i + \nabla_{\tau_i} \mu(X)(0, y)) \\ &= \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \pi_P \tau_i + \sum_{i=1}^n (-1)^{i-1} (\mu(X) \pi_{P^\perp} \tau_i + \nabla_{\tau_i} \mu(X)(0, y)) \wedge \bigwedge_{j \neq i} \pi_P \tau_j + \mathcal{R} \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathcal{R}$  is an  $n$ -vector such that  $|\mathcal{R}| \leq C(n, m, \gamma)(|y|^2 + \|\pi_{S_X} - \pi_P\|^2)$ . Notice that the first two terms on the second line of (2.14) are mutually orthogonal as  $n$ -vectors. Hence, again using the fact that  $|\pi_{P^\perp} \tau_i| \leq \|\pi_{S_X} - \pi_P\|$ ,

$$|F_\#\vec{T}|^2 \leq \left| \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \pi_P \tau_i \right|^2 + C(|y|^2 + \|\pi_{S_X} - \pi_P\|^2) = |\pi_{P\#}\vec{T}|^2 + C(|y|^2 + \|\pi_{S_X} - \pi_P\|^2)$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ . Since  $\text{Lip } \pi_P \leq 1$ ,  $|\pi_{P\#}\vec{T}| \leq |\vec{T}| = 1$  and thus

$$(2.15) \quad |F_\#\vec{T}|^2 \leq 1 + C(|y|^2 + \|\pi_{S_X} - \pi_P\|^2).$$

Using (2.15) and the fact that  $|y| = \text{dist}(X, P)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|F_\#T\|(\mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2} \setminus \mathbf{C}_\gamma) - \|T\|(\mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2} \setminus \mathbf{C}_\gamma) &= \int_{\mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2} \setminus \mathbf{C}_\gamma} (|F_\#\vec{T}| - 1) d\|T\| \\ &= \int_{\mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2} \setminus \mathbf{C}_\gamma} \frac{|F_\#\vec{T}|^2 - 1}{|F_\#\vec{T}| + 1} d\|T\| \leq \int_{\mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2} \setminus \mathbf{C}_\gamma} (|F_\#\vec{T}|^2 - 1) d\|T\| \\ &\leq C \int_{\mathbf{C}_1} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X) + C \int_{\mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2}} \|\pi_{S_X} - \pi_P\|^2 d\|T\|(X) \end{aligned}$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ . Hence using Lemma 2.4, we conclude that

$$(2.16) \quad \|F_\#T\|(\mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2} \setminus \mathbf{C}_\gamma) - \|T\|(\mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2} \setminus \mathbf{C}_\gamma) \leq C \int_{\mathbf{C}_1} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X)$$



for some constant  $C = C(n, m, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ , which together with (2.13) completes the proof of (2.12).  $\square$

**2.8. Lipschitz approximation.** The Strong Lipschitz Approximation Theorem for area-minimizing currents is a fundamental result proved by Almgren in [Alm83, Corollaries 3.29 and 3.30] (see also [DS14, Theorem 2.4]). Here we adapt this result in a straightforward manner to obtain a Lipschitz approximation lemma that can be applied to general domains  $\Omega$  and blow-up limits with convergence on compact subsets of  $\Omega$ .

**Theorem 2.8.** *Let  $q$  be a positive integer and  $\Omega$  be a bound open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . For each  $\sigma > 0$  let*

$$\Omega_\sigma = \{x \in \Omega : \text{dist}(x, \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega) > \sigma\}.$$

*There exists  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  such that if  $0 < \delta < \infty$  and  $T$  is an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current in  $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^m$  such that*

$$(2.17) \quad \begin{aligned} (\partial T)_\perp(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^m) &= 0, \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T} \text{dist}(X, P_0) < \infty, \quad \pi_{P_0 \#} T = q[\![\Omega]\!] \\ \mathcal{E}^2 &= \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^m} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}_0|^2 d\|T\|(X) < \varepsilon^2 \delta^n, \end{aligned}$$

*then there exists a Lipschitz function  $u : \Omega_\delta \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$  and  $\mathcal{L}^n$ -measurable set  $K \subseteq \Omega_\delta$  such that*

$$(2.18) \quad T_\perp(K \times \mathbb{R}^m) = (\text{graph } u)_\perp(K \times \mathbb{R}^m)$$

*and for each  $\sigma \geq \delta$*

$$(2.19) \quad \sup_{\Omega_\sigma} |\nabla u| \leq C \mathcal{E}^{2\gamma},$$

$$(2.20) \quad \mathcal{L}^n(\Omega_\sigma \setminus K) + \|T\|((\Omega_\sigma \setminus K) \times \mathbb{R}^m) \leq C \mathcal{E}^{2+2\gamma}$$

*for some constants  $\gamma = \gamma(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  and  $C = C(n, m, q, \sigma, \mathcal{L}^n(\Omega)) \in (0, \infty)$  (independent of  $\delta$ ).*

**Remark 2.9.** We shall consider blow-up limits of area-minimizing currents  $T_k$  in  $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^m$  with  $\mathcal{E}_k^2 = \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^m} |\vec{T}_k - \vec{P}_0|^2 d\|T_k\|(X) \rightarrow 0$ , where  $\vec{T}_k$  denotes the orienting  $n$ -vector field of  $T_k$ . (See for instance Section 5.1.) In this case, we will apply Theorem 2.8 with  $\delta = \delta_k$  and  $T = T_k$  where  $\delta_k$  is chosen so that  $\delta_k^{-n/2} \mathcal{E}_k \rightarrow 0$ . Then (2.19) and (2.20) give us estimates for the Lipschitz approximation of  $T = T_k$  on  $\Omega_\sigma$  with constants  $C$  independent of  $k$ , provide  $k$  is large enough that  $\sigma \geq \delta_k$ .

*Proof of Theorem 2.8.* By the Vitali covering lemma, there is a finite collection of points  $x_i \in \Omega$  ( $1 \leq i \leq N$ ) such that, setting  $d_i = \text{dist}(x_i, \partial\Omega)$ , we have that  $d_{i+1} \leq d_i$  for all  $1 \leq i < N$ ,  $\{B_{d_i/16}(x_i)\}$  covers  $\Omega_{\delta/2}$ , and  $\{B_{d_i/80}(x_i)\}$  is pairwise disjoint. Note that if  $B_{d_i/8}(x_i) \cap B_{d_j/8}(x_j) \neq \emptyset$  then  $|d_i - d_j| \leq |x_i - x_j| \leq (d_i + d_j)/8$  and thus  $7d_i/9 \leq d_j \leq 9d_i/7$ . For each  $\sigma \geq \delta/2$ , if  $B_{d_i/8}(x_i) \cap \Omega_\sigma \neq \emptyset$  then  $d_i > 8\sigma/9$ . In particular, setting  $\sigma = \delta/2$ ,  $d_i > 4\delta/9$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq N$ . For each  $\sigma \geq \delta/2$  let  $N(\sigma)$  be the largest integer such that  $d_{N(\sigma)} > 8\sigma/9$ . Obviously  $\{B_{d_i/8}(x_i)\}_{1 \leq i \leq N(\sigma)}$  covers  $\Omega_\sigma$ . Since  $\{B_{d_i/80}(x_i)\}$  is a collection of pairwise disjoint balls in  $\Omega$ , it follows that

$$N(\sigma) \omega_n(\sigma/90)^n \leq \sum_{i=1}^{N(\sigma)} \mathcal{L}^n(B_{\sigma/90}(x_i)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{N(\sigma)} \mathcal{L}^n(B_{d_i/80}(x_i)) \leq \mathcal{L}^n(\Omega)$$

and thus  $N(\sigma) \leq C(n) \sigma^{-n} \mathcal{L}^n(\Omega)$ . Let  $\{\psi_i\}$  smooth partition of unity for  $\Omega_\delta$  subordinate to  $\{B_{d_i/8}(x_i)\}$  such that

$$(2.21) \quad 0 \leq \psi_i \leq 1, \quad \text{spt } \psi_i \subseteq B_{d_i/8}(x_i), \quad |\nabla \psi_i| \leq \frac{C(n)}{d_i}, \quad \sum_{i=1}^N \psi_i = 1$$

(see for instance [Fed69, 3.1.13]). By (2.17) and the fact that  $d_i > 4\delta/9$ , for each  $i$

$$\frac{1}{d_i^n} \int_{B_{d_i}(x_i) \times \mathbb{R}^m} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}_0|^2 d\|T\|(X) \leq d_i^{-n} \mathcal{E}^2 \leq (4\delta/9)^{-n} \cdot \varepsilon^2 \delta^n = (9/4)^n \varepsilon^2.$$

Hence provided  $\varepsilon$  is sufficiently small, by [Alm83, Corollary 3.29] (or [DS14, Theorem 2.4]), for each  $i$  there exists a Lipschitz function  $u_i : B_{d_i/4}(x_i) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$  and  $\mathcal{L}^n$ -measurable set  $K_i \subseteq B_{d_i/4}(x_i)$  such that

$$(2.22) \quad T \llcorner (K_i \times \mathbb{R}^m) = (\text{graph } u_i) \llcorner (K_i \times \mathbb{R}^m),$$

$$(2.23) \quad \sup_{B_{d_i/4}(x_i)} |\nabla u_i| \leq C d_i^{-n\gamma} \mathcal{E}^{2\gamma},$$

$$(2.24) \quad \mathcal{L}^n(B_{d_i/4}(x_i) \setminus K_i) + \|T\|((B_{d_i/4}(x_i) \setminus K_i) \times \mathbb{R}^m) \leq C d_i^{-n\gamma} \mathcal{E}^{2+2\gamma} \leq C(9/4)^{n+n\gamma} \varepsilon^{2+2\gamma} d_i^n$$

for some constants  $\gamma = \gamma(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  and  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$ . Note that if  $B_{d_i/8}(x_i) \cap B_{d_j/8}(x_j) \neq \emptyset$ , then using the fact that  $d_j \geq 7d_i/9$ , there exists a ball of radius  $\min\{d_i/16, d_j/16\} \geq 7d_i/144$  contained in  $B_{d_i/4}(x_i) \cap B_{d_j/4}(x_j)$ . Thus by (2.24),

$$\mathcal{L}^n(B_{d_i/4}(x_i) \cap B_{d_j/4}(x_j)) \geq \omega_n (7d_i/144)^n > 2C(9/4)^{n+n\gamma} \varepsilon^{2+2\gamma} d_i^n \geq \mathcal{L}^n(B_{d_i/4}(x_i) \cap B_{d_j/4}(x_j) \setminus (K_i \cap K_j))$$

provided  $\varepsilon$  is sufficiently small, where  $C$  is as in (2.24). Hence  $\mathcal{L}^n(K_i \cap K_j) > 0$ . By (2.22),  $u_i(x) = \langle T, \pi_{P_0}, x \rangle = u_j(x)$  for  $\mathcal{L}^n$ -a.e.  $x \in K_i \cap K_j$ . Letting  $z \in K_i \cap K_j$  such that  $u_i(z) = u_j(z)$  and using (2.23) and the fact that  $d_j \leq 9d_i/7$ ,

$$(2.25) \quad \sup_{B_{d_i/8}(x_i) \cap B_{d_j/8}(x_j)} \mathcal{G}(u_i, u_j) \leq \sup_{B_{d_i/4}(x_i)} \mathcal{G}(u_i, u_i(z)) + \sup_{B_{d_j/4}(x_j)} \mathcal{G}(u_j, u_j(z)) \\ \leq C d_i^{-\gamma n} \mathcal{E}^{2\gamma} (d_i/2 + d_j/2) \leq \frac{8}{7} C d_i^{1-\gamma n} \mathcal{E}^{2\gamma},$$

where  $C$  is as in (2.23). By [Alm83, Definition 1.1(6) and Theorem 1.3], there exists an integer  $L(q, m) \geq 1$  and bi-Lipschitz embedding  $\xi : \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^L$  and  $\rho : \mathbb{R}^L \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$  such that  $\text{Lip } \xi \leq 1$ ,  $\text{Lip } \xi^{-1}|_{\mathcal{Q}} \leq C(m, q)$ , and  $\text{Lip } \rho \leq C(m, q)$ , where  $\mathcal{Q} = \xi(\mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m))$ . Define

$$(2.26) \quad K = \Omega_\delta \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^N (B_{d_i/8}(x_i) \setminus K_i),$$

$$(2.27) \quad u(x) = (\xi^{-1} \circ \rho) \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \psi_i(x) \xi(u_i(x)) \right) \text{ for each } x \in \Omega_\delta.$$

By (2.26) and (2.22), for each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  we have that  $K \cap B_{d_i/8}(x_i) \subseteq K_i$  and  $u_i(x) = \langle T, \pi_{P_0}, x \rangle$  for  $\mathcal{L}^n$ -a.e.  $x \in K \cap B_{d_i/8}(x_i)$ . Thus by the fact that  $\sum_{i=1}^N \psi_i = 1$  and (2.27),  $u(x) = \langle T, \pi_{P_0}, x \rangle$  for  $\mathcal{L}^n$ -a.e.  $x \in K$ . Hence  $u_i(x) = u(x)$  for all  $x \in K \cap B_{d_i/8}(x_i)$  and all  $1 \leq i \leq N$ . It follows using (2.22) that (2.18) holds true.

Now fix  $\sigma \geq \delta$  and let  $x \in \Omega_\sigma$ . Recalling that  $\{B_{d_i/8}(x_i)\}_{1 \leq i \leq N(\sigma)}$  covers  $\Omega_\sigma$ , suppose that  $x \in B_{d_i/8}(x_i)$  for some  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N(\sigma)\}$ . Then by (2.21) and (2.27)

$$u(x) = (\xi^{-1} \circ \rho) \left( \xi(u_i(x)) + \sum_{j=1}^{N(\sigma)} \psi_j(x) (\xi(u_j(x)) - \xi(u_i(x))) \right)$$

and thus using (2.21), (2.23), and (2.25)

$$|\nabla u(x)| \leq C \sum_{j=1}^{N(\sigma)} (|\nabla_j \psi_j(x)| \mathcal{G}(u_j(x), u_i(x)) + \psi_j(x) |\nabla u_j(x)|) \leq C N(\sigma) \sigma^{-n\gamma} \mathcal{E}^{2\gamma} \leq C_1 \mathcal{E}^{2\gamma}$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$  and  $C_1 = C_1(n, m, q, \sigma, \mathcal{L}^n(\Omega)) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants, thereby proving (2.19). Using (2.26) and (2.24), we obtain (2.20).  $\square$

Let  $T$ ,  $u$ , and  $K$  be as in Theorem 2.8. Given an  $m \times n$  matrix  $p = [p_i^\kappa]_{1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq \kappa \leq m}$ , let

$$G_{ij}(p) = \delta_{ij} + \sum_{\kappa=1}^m p_i^\kappa p_j^\kappa$$

for all  $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . Let  $[G^{ij}(p)]$  denote the inverse matrix of  $[G_{ij}(p)]$  and  $G(p)$  denote the determinant of  $[G_{ij}(p)]$ . By Taylor's theorem,

$$(2.28) \quad G^{ij}(p) = \delta_{ij} - \sum_{\kappa=1}^m p_i^\kappa p_j^\kappa + O(|p|^4), \quad \sqrt{G(p)} = 1 + \frac{1}{2}|p|^2 + O(|p|^4).$$

Let  $u(x) = \sum_{l=1}^q \llbracket u_l(x) \rrbracket$  for each  $x \in \Omega$  and  $Du(x) = \sum_{l=1}^q \llbracket Du_l(x) \rrbracket$  for  $\mathcal{L}^n$ -a.e.  $x \in \Omega$ , following the conventions from Subsection 2.5. Recall from Subsection 2.5 that we can regard graph  $u$  as a rectifiable current in  $\Omega_\delta \times \mathbb{R}^m$ . Using (2.18), (2.19), and (2.20),

$$(2.29) \quad \int_{\Omega_\sigma \times \mathbb{R}^m} \zeta(X) d\|T\|(X) = \int_{\Omega_\sigma} \sum_{l=1}^q \zeta(x, u_l(x)) \sqrt{G(Du_l(x))} d\mathcal{L}^n(x) + \mathcal{R}$$

for each  $\sigma \in (0, \delta)$  and each bounded  $\|\text{graph } u\| + \|T\|$ -measurable function  $\zeta : \Omega_\sigma \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , where assuming  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(n, m, q, \sigma, |\Omega|)$  is sufficiently small

$$|\mathcal{R}| \leq \sup |\zeta| ((1 + C\varepsilon^{2\gamma}) \mathcal{L}^n(\Omega_\sigma \setminus K) + \|T\|((\Omega_\sigma \setminus K) \times \mathbb{R}^m)) \leq C\varepsilon^{2+2\gamma} \sup |\zeta|$$

for some constants  $C = C(n, m, q, \sigma, |\Omega|) \in (0, \infty)$ . Note that at  $\mathcal{H}^n$ -a.e. point  $X = (x, u_l(x)) \in \text{spt graph } u$ ,

$$(2.30) \quad \frac{1}{2} |\vec{S}_X - \vec{P}|^2 = 1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{G(Du_l(x))}},$$

$$(2.31) \quad \|\pi_{S_X} - \pi_P\|^2 = \sum_{i,j=1}^n G^{ij}(Du_l(x)) D_i u_l(x) D_j u_l(x),$$

where  $S_X$  is the approximate tangent plane to  $\text{spt graph } u$  at  $X$  and  $\vec{S}_X$  is the orientation  $n$ -vector graph  $u$  at  $X$ .

### 3. PLANAR FREQUENCY FUNCTION AND ITS APPROXIMATE MONOTONICITY

In this section we introduce a frequency function for an area-minimizing current  $T$  relative to a plane  $P$ .

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  and  $\rho_0 > 0$ . Let  $T$  be an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current of  $\mathbf{C}_{\rho_0}(Z, P)$  such that

$$(3.1) \quad (\partial T) \llcorner \mathbf{C}_{\rho_0}(Z, P) = 0, \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_{\rho_0}(Z, P)} \text{dist}(X, Z + P) < \infty.$$

Let  $\phi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be the Lipschitz function defined by

$$(3.2) \quad \phi(s) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } 0 \leq s < 1/2 \\ 2 - 2s & \text{if } 1/2 \leq s < 1 \\ 0 & \text{if } 1 \leq s < \infty. \end{cases}$$

For  $\rho \in (0, \rho_0]$ , let

$$(3.3) \quad H_{T,P,Z}(\rho) = 2\rho^{1-n} \int_{G_n(\mathbf{C}_\rho(Z,P) \setminus \overline{\mathbf{C}_{\rho/2}(Z,P)})} \text{dist}^2(X, Z + P) |\nabla^S r|^2 \frac{1}{r} d|T|(X, S) \quad \text{and}$$

$$(3.4) \quad D_{T,P,Z}(\rho) = \frac{1}{2} \rho^{2-n} \int \|\pi_S - \pi_P\|^2 \phi(r/\rho) d|T|(X, S),$$

where  $|T|$  denotes the  $n$ -dimensional integral varifold associated with  $T$ ,  $r(X) = |\pi_P(X - Z)|$ ,  $\nabla^S$  is the gradient with respect to the plane  $S$ , and  $\|\pi_S - \pi_P\|$  denotes the Frobenius norm of  $\pi_S - \pi_P$ . We define the *planar frequency function*  $N_{T,P,Z}$  of  $T$  at  $Z$  relative to the plane  $P$  by

$$N_{T,P,Z}(\rho) = \frac{D_{T,P,Z}(\rho)}{H_{T,P,Z}(\rho)}$$

whenever  $H_{T,P,Z}(\rho) > 0$  (see Remark 3.6 below).

**Remark 3.2.** We will often write

$$(3.5) \quad H_{T,P,Z}(\rho) = -\rho^{1-n} \int \text{dist}^2(X, P) |\nabla^S r|^2 \frac{1}{r} \phi'(r/\rho) d|T|(X, S),$$

where we adopt the convention that  $\phi'(1/2) = \phi'(1) = 0$ . Note that for  $|T|$ -a.e.  $(X, S) \in G_n(\partial\mathbf{C}_{\rho/2}(Z, P))$ ,  $S$  is the approximate tangent plane to  $\text{spt } T$  at  $X$  and  $S$  is tangent to  $\partial\mathbf{C}_{\rho/2}(Z, P)$ , thus  $\nabla^S r(X) = 0$ . By similar reasoning,  $\nabla^S r(X) = 0$  for  $|T|$ -a.e.  $(X, S) \in G_n(\partial\mathbf{C}_\rho(Z, P))$ .

**Remark 3.3.** (1) Almgren in [Alm83] first introduced and used a frequency function. The frequency function in [Alm83] is defined “extrinsically,” as a functional associated with a multi-valued function  $f$  (specifically, either for a multivalued locally Dirichlet energy minimizing function  $f$  over a plane, or for a multi-valued Lipschitz function  $f$ —the “normal map”—over a center manifold, whose graph approximates a locally area minimizing rectifiable current lying close to a plane). In either case, the height function  $H(\rho)$  (corresponding to our  $H_{T,P,Z}(\rho)$ ) is defined as the boundary integral  $\int_{\partial B_\rho(Z)} |f|^2$  over the boundary of a (geodesic) ball  $B_\rho(Z)$  in the domain of  $f$ . Defining the planar frequency function in terms of the fixed function  $\phi$  as in (3.2) affords the technical convenience of not having to express the height function as a boundary integral, as was observed in [DS16-II] where the authors similarly modified the Almgren frequency function.

(2) In contrast to the the frequency functions in [Alm83] and [DS16-II], our planar frequency function  $N_{T,P,Z}(\rho)$  is intrinsic, and is defined in terms of geometric quantities involving  $P$  and  $T$  and in terms of integration over  $T$ . That way  $N_{T,P,Z}(\rho)$  is well-defined for *any* area-minimizing integral current  $T$  (provided (3.1) holds true) and  $N_{T,P,Z}(\rho)$  does not depend on  $T$  being close to  $P$  or on a choice of Lipschitz approximation of  $T$ . This is an important feature of the planar frequency function, which we capitalise on in our analysis. (See for instance Lemma 6.4 below.)

The main result of this section is the following approximate monotonicity of the planar frequency function under the assumption that  $T$  is decaying towards the plane  $P$  in  $L^2$  sense.

**Theorem 3.4.** *For each positive integer  $q$  there exists  $\delta = \delta(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  and  $\eta_0 = \eta_0(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  such that the following holds true. Let  $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  and  $\rho_0 > 0$ . Let  $P$  be an  $n$ -dimensional plane*

in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  and  $T$  be  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current in the open cylinder  $\mathbf{C}_{7\rho_0/4}(Z, P)$  such that

$$(3.6) \quad (\partial T) \llcorner \mathbf{C}_{7\rho_0/4}(Z, P) = 0, \quad \Theta(T, Z) \geq q, \quad \|T\|(\mathbf{C}_{7\rho_0/4}(Z, P)) \leq (q + \delta) \omega_n (7\rho_0/4)^n.$$

Suppose that for some  $\eta \in (0, \eta_0]$ ,  $\sigma_0 \in (0, \rho_0)$  and  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$(3.7) \quad \frac{1}{\omega_n (7\rho_0/4)^{n+2}} \int_{\mathbf{C}_{7\rho_0/4}(Z, P)} \text{dist}^2(X, Z + P) d\|T\|(X) \leq \eta^2 \left(\frac{\rho}{\rho_0}\right)^{2\alpha}$$

for all  $\rho \in [\sigma_0, \rho_0]$ . Then:

$$(3.8) \quad \exp\left(\frac{C_1 \eta^{2\gamma}}{2\alpha\gamma} \sigma^{2\alpha\gamma} + \frac{C_2}{\gamma} (D_{T,P,0}(\sigma))^\gamma\right) N_{T,P,0}(\sigma) \leq N_{T,P,0}(\rho) \exp\left(\frac{C_1 \eta^{2\gamma}}{2\alpha\gamma} \rho^{2\alpha\gamma} + \frac{C_2}{\gamma} (D_{T,P,0}(\rho))^\gamma\right),$$

and hence

$$(3.9) \quad N_{T,P,Z}(\sigma) \leq e^{C\eta^\gamma(\rho/\rho_0)^{\alpha\gamma}} N_{T,P,Z}(\rho)$$

for all  $\sigma, \rho$  with  $\sigma_0 \leq \sigma < \rho \leq \rho_0$  provided  $H_{T,P,Z}(\tau) > 0$  for all  $\tau \in [\sigma, \rho]$ . Here  $C_1 = C_1(n, m, q)$ ,  $C_2 = C_2(n, m, q)$ ,  $\gamma = \gamma(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  and  $C = C(n, m, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$  are fixed constants (independent of  $\eta$ ).

Note that by (3.7), Lemma 2.5 and the fact that  $(\partial T) \llcorner \mathbf{C}_{7\rho_0/4}(Z, P) = 0$ , the conditions (3.1) hold true and thus  $N_{T,P,Z}(\rho)$  is defined for all  $\rho \in (0, \rho_0]$ . The remainder of this section will focus on the proofs of Theorem 3.4. Without loss of generality we may let  $Z = 0$ ,  $\rho_0 = 1$ , and  $P = P_0 = \mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\}$ . We will write each point  $X = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n+m}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  as  $X = (x, y)$  where  $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $y = (x_{n+1}, \dots, x_{n+m}) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ . Note that then  $r(X) = |x|$  and  $\text{dist}(X, P) = |y|$ .

**3.1. Variational formulas.** In Lemma 3.5 below we compute the derivatives of  $H_{T,P,0}(\rho)$  and  $D_{T,P,0}(\rho)$  and establish identity (3.11) for  $D_{T,P,0}(\rho)$ . Eventhough we state Lemma 3.5 for area-minimizing currents  $T$ , the only variational property of  $T$  used in its proof is stationarity with respect to area (i.e. the validity of the first variation formula for area (2.2)); thus, the lemma in fact holds true whenever  $|T|$  is an area-stationary integral varifold in  $\mathbf{C}_1(0)$  with  $(\partial T) \llcorner \mathbf{C}_1 = 0$ . Our proof of Theorem 3.4 however uses certain results and estimates which are specific for area minimising  $T$ .

**Lemma 3.5.** *Let  $T$  be an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current in  $\mathbf{C}_1(0)$ . Suppose that (3.1) holds true with  $Z = 0$ ,  $\rho_0 = 1$  and  $P = \mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\}$ . Then  $H_{T,P,0}$  and  $D_{T,P,0}$  are absolutely continuous functions on  $(0, 1]$ , and satisfy:*

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{aligned} H'_{T,P,0}(\rho) &= -2\rho^{-n} \int (0, y) \cdot \pi_{P^\perp}(\nabla^S r) \phi'(r/\rho) d|T|(X, S) \\ &\quad - \rho^{-n} \int |y|^2 \frac{1}{r} \phi'(r/\rho) \left( n |\nabla^{S^\perp} r|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|\pi_S - \pi_P\|^2 \right) d|T|(X, S) \end{aligned}$$

for  $\mathcal{L}^1$ -a.e.  $\rho \in (0, 1]$ ,

$$(3.11) \quad D_{T,P,0}(\rho) = -\rho^{1-n} \int (0, y) \cdot \pi_{P^\perp}(\nabla^S r) \phi'(r/\rho) d|T|(X, S)$$

for all  $\rho \in (0, 1]$ , and

$$(3.12) \quad D'_{T,P,0}(\rho) = -2\rho^{-n} \int |\nabla^{S^\perp} r|^2 r \phi'(r/\rho) d|T|(X, S) \\ + 2\rho^{1-n} \int \left(1 - \frac{1}{4} \|\pi_S - \pi_P\|^2 - J\pi_P\right) \left(n\phi(r/\rho) + \frac{r}{\rho} \phi'(r/\rho)\right) d|T|(X, S)$$

for  $\mathcal{L}^1$ -a.e.  $\rho \in (0, 1]$ . Here,  $\nabla^S$  and  $\nabla^{S^\perp}$  denote the gradient with respect to the linear subspaces  $S$  and  $S^\perp$  respectively.  $J\pi_P$  is the (signed) Jacobian of  $\pi_P$  on  $T$  defined by  $d\pi_{P\#}\vec{T}(X) = J\pi_P(X) \vec{P}$  for  $\|T\|$ -a.e.  $X \in \mathbf{C}_1(0)$ , where  $\vec{P} = e_1 \wedge e_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge e_n$  is the orientation of  $P$ .

**Remark 3.6.** Let  $T$  be as in Lemma 3.5. We have that  $H_{T,P,0}(\rho) = 0$  if and only if  $\text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_\rho \subset P$ . Clearly by the definition of  $H_{T,P,0}(\rho)$  in (3.3), if  $\text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_\rho \subseteq P$  then  $H_{T,P,0}(\rho) = 0$ . To see the converse, suppose  $H_{T,P,0}(\rho) = 0$ . Then by (3.3),  $X \in P$  or  $\nabla^S r(X) = 0$  for  $|T|$ -a.e.  $(X, S) \in G_n(\mathbf{C}_\rho \setminus \overline{\mathbf{C}_{\rho/2}})$ . Hence by (3.11),  $D_{T,P,0}(\rho) = 0$ . Thus by (3.4),  $P$  must be the approximate tangent plane to  $\text{spt } T$  at  $\|T\|$ -a.e.  $X \in \mathbf{C}_\rho$ . This together with  $|T|$  being area-stationary implies that  $\text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_\rho$  is contained in a finite union of  $n$ -dimensional planes parallel to  $P$ . Also,  $|\nabla^S r(X)| = |\nabla r(X)| = 1 \neq 0$  for  $|T|$ -a.e.  $(X, S) \in G_n(\mathbf{C}_\rho \setminus \overline{\mathbf{C}_{\rho/2}})$ , so  $\text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_\rho \setminus \overline{\mathbf{C}_{\rho/2}} \subset P$ . It follows that  $\text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_\rho \subset P$ .

*Proof of Lemma 3.5.* Let us first consider the case where  $H_{T,P,0}$  and  $D_{T,P,0}$  are defined by (3.5) and (3.4) for  $\phi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  a smooth function such that  $\phi(s) = 1$  if  $0 \leq s \leq 1/2$  and  $\phi(s) = 0$  if  $s \geq 1$ . The case where  $\phi$  is given by (3.2) will later follow by approximation. Clearly when  $\phi$  is smooth,  $H_{T,P,0}$  and  $D_{T,P,0}$  are continuously differentiable on  $(0, 1]$ . By direct differentiation,

$$H'_{T,P,0}(\rho) = (n-1)\rho^{-n} \int |y|^2 |\nabla^S r|^2 \frac{1}{r} \phi'(r/\rho) d|T|(X, S) \\ + \rho^{-n-1} \int |y|^2 |\nabla^S r|^2 \phi''(r/\rho) d|T|(X, S).$$

Setting  $\zeta = |y|^2 \phi'(r/\rho) \nabla r$  in (2.2), and noting that  $\nabla r = \frac{(x,0)}{r}$ ,

$$\nabla^S(|y|^2) \cdot \nabla^S r = \nabla(|y|^2) \cdot \nabla^S r = 2(0, y) \cdot \nabla^S r = 2(0, y) \cdot \pi_{P^\perp}(\nabla^S r) \quad \text{and} \\ (3.13) \quad \text{div}_S(x, 0) = \sum_{i,j=1}^n (\tau_i \cdot e_j)^2 = n - \frac{1}{2} \|\pi_S - \pi_P\|^2$$

for each  $X = (x, y) \in \mathbf{C}_1$  and each  $n$ -dimensional plane  $S \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ , where  $\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_n$  is an orthonormal basis for  $S$ , gives us

$$(3.14) \quad 2 \int (0, y) \cdot \pi_{P^\perp}(\nabla^S r) \phi'(r/\rho) d|T|(X, S) + \frac{1}{\rho} \int |y|^2 |\nabla^S r|^2 \phi''(r/\rho) d|T|(X, S) \\ + \int |y|^2 \left(n - \frac{1}{2} \|\pi_S - \pi_P\|^2 - |\nabla^S r|^2\right) \frac{1}{r} \phi'(r/\rho) d|T|(X, S) = 0$$

for all  $\rho \in (0, 1]$ . Using (3.14) and the above expression for  $H'_{T,P,0}$  gives

$$H'_{T,P,0}(\rho) = -2\rho^{-n} \int (0, y) \cdot \pi_{P^\perp}(\nabla^S r) \phi'(r/\rho) d|T|(X, S) \\ - \rho^{-n} \int |y|^2 \left(n |\nabla^{S^\perp} r|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|\pi_S - \pi_P\|^2\right) \frac{1}{r} \phi'(r/\rho) d|T|(X, S)$$

for all  $\rho \in (0, 1]$ , proving (3.10).

To see (3.11), we set  $\zeta = \phi(r/\rho)(0, y)$  in (2.2), noting that  $(0, y) \cdot \nabla^S r = (0, y) \cdot \pi_{P^\perp}(\nabla^S r)$  and

$$\operatorname{div}_S(0, y) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m (\tau_i \cdot e_{n+j})^2 = \frac{1}{2} \|\pi_S - \pi_P\|^2$$

for each  $X = (x, y) \in \mathbf{C}_1$  and each  $n$ -dimensional plane  $S \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ . Thus

$$\int \left( \frac{1}{2} \phi(r/\rho) \|\pi_S - \pi_P\|^2 + \frac{1}{\rho} \phi'(r/\rho) \pi_{P^\perp}(\nabla^S r) \cdot (0, y) \right) d|T|(X, S) = 0$$

for all  $\rho \in (0, 1]$ . Rearranging terms gives us (3.11).

To see (3.12), we set  $\zeta = \phi(r/\rho)(x, 0)$  in (2.2) and use (3.13) to obtain

$$(3.15) \quad \int \left( n \phi(r/\rho) - \frac{1}{2} \|\pi_S - \pi_P\|^2 \phi(r/\rho) + |\nabla^S r|^2 \frac{r}{\rho} \phi'(r/\rho) \right) d|T|(X, S) = 0$$

for all  $\rho \in (0, 1]$ . We can replace  $T$  with the multiplicity 1 current  $\llbracket P \rrbracket$  in (3.15) to obtain

$$\int_P \left( n \phi(r/\rho) + \frac{r}{\rho} \phi'(r/\rho) \right) d\mathcal{H}^n = 0$$

for all  $\rho \in (0, 1]$ . By the constancy theorem [Sim83, Theorem 26.27],  $\pi_{P\#}T$  is an integer multiple of  $\llbracket P \rrbracket \llcorner \mathbf{C}_1$ . Thus by the area-formula (see [Sim83, Remark 27.2(3)])

$$(3.16) \quad \int \left( n \phi(r/\rho) + \frac{r}{\rho} \phi'(r/\rho) \right) J\pi_P d\|T\|(X) = 0$$

for all  $\rho \in (0, 1]$ . By differentiating  $D_{T,P,0}(\rho)$ ,

$$(3.17) \quad \begin{aligned} D'_{T,P,0}(\rho) &= \frac{2-n}{2} \rho^{1-n} \int \|\pi_S - \pi_P\|^2 \phi(r/\rho) d|T|(X, S) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \rho^{-n} \int \|\pi_S - \pi_P\|^2 r \phi'(r/\rho) d|T|(X, S) \end{aligned}$$

for all  $\rho \in (0, 1]$ . Adding  $2\rho^{1-n} \cdot (3.15) - 2\rho^{1-n} \cdot (3.16) + (3.17)$  and using the fact that  $|\nabla^T r|^2 = 1 - |\nabla^\perp r|^2$  gives us (3.12).

Now suppose that  $H_{T,P,0}$  and  $D_{T,P,0}$  are defined by (3.5) and (3.4) where  $\phi$  is given by (3.2). For each  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2)$  let  $\phi_\varepsilon : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a smooth function such that  $\phi_\varepsilon(s) = 1$  if  $0 \leq s \leq 1/2$ ,  $\phi_\varepsilon(s) = 2 + 3\varepsilon - (2 + 4\varepsilon)s$  if  $1/2 + \varepsilon \leq s \leq 1 - \varepsilon$ ,  $\phi_\varepsilon(s) = 0$  if  $s \geq 1$ , and  $-2 - 4\varepsilon \leq \phi'_\varepsilon \leq 0$ . Let  $H_{T,P,0}^\varepsilon$  and  $D_{T,P,0}^\varepsilon$  be given by (3.5) and (3.4) with  $\phi_\varepsilon$  in place of  $\phi$ . Then (3.10) with  $\phi_\varepsilon$  in place of  $\phi$  gives us

$$(3.18) \quad \begin{aligned} H_{T,P,0}^\varepsilon(\rho) - H_{T,P,0}^\varepsilon(\sigma) &= - \int_\sigma^\rho 2\tau^{-n} \int (0, y) \cdot \pi_{P^\perp}(\nabla^S r) \phi'_\varepsilon(r/\tau) d|T|(X, S) d\tau \\ &\quad - \int_\sigma^\rho \tau^{-n} \int |y|^2 \frac{1}{r} \phi'_\varepsilon(r/\tau) \left( n |\nabla^{S^\perp} r|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|\pi_S - \pi_P\|^2 \right) d|T|(X, S) d\tau \end{aligned}$$

for all  $0 < \sigma < \rho \leq 1$ . Notice that  $\phi_\varepsilon \rightarrow \phi$  uniformly on  $[0, \infty)$  and  $\phi'_\varepsilon \rightarrow \phi'$  pointwise on  $[0, \infty)$  (with  $\phi'_\varepsilon(s) = \phi'(s) = 0$  if  $s = 1/2, 1$ ). Hence letting  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$  in (3.18) using the dominated convergence theorem, we deduce that when  $\phi$  is given by (3.2),  $H_{T,P,0}$  is absolutely continuous and (3.10) holds true for  $\mathcal{L}^1$ -a.e.  $\rho \in (0, 1]$ . Similar reasoning shows that (3.12) and (3.11) hold true with  $\phi$  is given by (3.2).  $\square$

**3.2. Bounding error terms in derivative of  $H_{T,P,0}$ .** Next in Lemma 3.9 we will estimate certain error terms in (3.10). We start with a standard consequence of frequency monotonicity of Dirichlet energy minimising functions (Lemma 3.7) and its direct implication to area minimising currents with small excess (Lemma 3.8).

**Lemma 3.7.** *For every  $c > 0$  there exists  $\beta = \beta(n, m, q, c) > 0$  such that if  $w \in W^{1,2}(B_1(0), \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m))$  is a Dirichlet energy minimizing  $q$ -valued function such that  $\|w\|_{L^2(B_{1/2}(0))} \geq c\|w\|_{L^2(B_1(0))}$  then  $\|w\|_{L^2(B_{1/10}(\xi))} \geq \beta\|w\|_{L^2(B_1(0))}$  for each  $\xi \in B_{1/5}(0)$ .*

*Proof.* Fix  $c > 0$  and suppose to the contrary that for  $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$  there exists a Dirichlet energy minimizing  $q$ -valued function  $w_k \in W^{1,2}(B_1(0), \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m))$  and point  $\xi_k \in B_{1/5}(0)$  such that  $\|w_k\|_{L^2(B_1(0))} = 1$ ,  $\|w_k\|_{L^2(B_{1/2}(0))} \geq c$ , and  $\|w_k\|_{L^2(B_{1/10}(\xi_k))} < 1/k$ . After passing to a subsequence let  $\xi_k \rightarrow \xi$  for some  $\xi \in \overline{B_{1/5}(0)}$ . By the compactness theorem for Dirichlet energy minimizing  $q$ -valued functions ([Alm83, Theorem 2.15], [DS11, Proposition 2.11, Theorem 3.20]), after passing to a subsequence there is a Dirichlet energy minimizing  $q$ -valued function  $w \in W^{1,2}(B_1(0), \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m))$  such that  $w_k \rightarrow w$  uniformly on compact subsets of  $B_1(0)$ . Clearly  $\|w\|_{L^2(B_{1/2}(0))} \geq c > 0$  and  $w = q\llbracket 0 \rrbracket$  on  $B_{1/20}(\xi)$ . On the other hand, it is a standard consequence of the monotonicity of the frequency function associated with  $w$  that  $w = q\llbracket 0 \rrbracket$  on  $B_{1/20}(\xi) \implies w = q\llbracket 0 \rrbracket$  on  $B_{1/2}(0)$ . This gives the desired contradiction proving the lemma.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.8.** *For every  $c > 0$  there exists  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(n, m, q, c) \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\delta = \delta(n, m, q, c) \in (0, 1)$  and  $\beta = \beta(n, m, q, c) \in (0, 1)$  such that if  $T$  is an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current of  $\mathbf{C}_8(0)$ ,  $P = \mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\}$  and if*

$$(3.19) \quad (\partial T) \llcorner \mathbf{C}_8(0) = 0, \quad \Theta(T, 0) \geq q, \quad \|T\|(\mathbf{B}_8(0)) \leq (q + \delta) \omega_n 8^n,$$

$$(3.20) \quad \frac{1}{\omega_n 8^{n+2}} \int_{\mathbf{C}_8(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X) < \varepsilon^2,$$

$$(3.21) \quad \int_{\mathbf{C}_{1/2}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X) \geq c^2 \int_{\mathbf{C}_8(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X),$$

then for every  $\xi \in B_{1/5}(0)$

$$(3.22) \quad \int_{\mathbf{C}_{1/10}(\xi)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X) \geq \beta^2 \int_{\mathbf{C}_8(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X).$$

*Proof.* Notice that by (3.20) and Lemma 2.5,

$$\sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_7(0)} \text{dist}(X, P) \leq C\varepsilon$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m) \in (0, \infty)$ . By the constancy theorem [Sim83, Theorem 26.27],

$$\pi_{P\#}(T \llcorner \mathbf{C}_7(0)) = \theta \llbracket B_7(0) \rrbracket$$

for some integer  $\theta$ . By Lemma 2.7,

$$\mathcal{E}(T, P, \mathbf{C}_6(0))^2 \leq C \int_{\mathbf{C}_8(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X)$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m) \in (0, \infty)$ . Thus by the monotonicity formula for area and (2.11)

$$|\theta| \leq \frac{\|T\|(\mathbf{B}_\rho(0))}{\omega_n \rho^n} \leq \frac{\|T\|(\mathbf{C}_6(0))}{\omega_n 6^n} \leq |\theta| + C(n, m) \varepsilon^2,$$



which by (3.19) implies that  $|\theta| = q$ . Up to reversing the orientation of  $T$ , we may assume that  $\theta = q$ , that is

$$(\pi_{P\#}T)\llcorner B_8(0) = q\llcorner [B_8(0)].$$

By [Alm83, Corollaries 3.29 & 3.30] (or [DS14, Theorem 2.4]), there exists a Lipschitz function  $u : B_1(0) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$  and a set  $K \subset B_1(0)$  such that

$$(3.23) \quad \sup_{B_1(0)} |u| \leq 1, \quad \sup_{B_1(0)} |\nabla u| \leq C\varepsilon^\gamma, \\ T\llcorner K \times \mathbb{R}^m = (\text{graph } u)\llcorner K \times \mathbb{R}^m,$$

$$|B_1(0) \setminus K| + \|T\|((B_1(0) \setminus K) \times \mathbb{R}^m) \leq C\varepsilon^\gamma \int_{\mathbf{C}_8(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X),$$

where  $\gamma = \gamma(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  and  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants. Let  $\eta \in (0, 1)$  be a constant to be determined depending only on  $n, m, q, c$ . By [Alm83, Theorem 2.23] (or [DS14, Theorem 2.6]), if  $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, m, q, \eta)$  is sufficiently small, there exists a Dirichlet energy minimizing  $q$ -valued function  $w \in W^{1,2}(B_1(0), \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m))$  such that

$$(3.24) \quad \int_{B_1(0)} \mathcal{G}(u, w)^2 \leq \eta \int_{\mathbf{C}_8(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X).$$

Notice that provided  $\varepsilon$  and  $\eta$  are sufficiently small depending only on  $n, m, q$ , we have by (2.28), (2.29), (3.23), and (3.24),

$$(3.25) \quad \int_{B_1(0)} |w|^2 \leq 2 \int_{B_1(0)} |u|^2 + (2\eta + 2C\varepsilon^{2\gamma}) \int_{\mathbf{C}_8(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X) \\ \leq 2 \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X) + (2\eta + 2C\varepsilon^{2\gamma}) \int_{\mathbf{C}_8(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X) \\ \leq 4 \int_{\mathbf{C}_8(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X).$$

Similarly, by (2.28), (2.29), (3.23), (3.24), and (3.21),

$$(3.26) \quad \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} |w|^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} |u|^2 - \eta \int_{\mathbf{C}_8(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X) \\ \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbf{C}_{1/2}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X) - (\eta + C\varepsilon^{2+\gamma}) \int_{\mathbf{C}_8(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X) \\ \geq \left( \frac{c^2}{2} - \eta - C\varepsilon^{2+\gamma} \right) \int_{\mathbf{C}_8(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X) \\ \geq \frac{c^2}{4} \int_{\mathbf{C}_8(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X),$$

provided  $\epsilon, \eta$  are sufficiently small depending only on  $n, m, q, c$ , where  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant. Hence combining (3.25) and (3.26),

$$\int_{B_{1/2}(0)} |w|^2 \geq \frac{c^2}{16} \int_{B_1(0)} |w|^2.$$

Therefore, by Lemma 3.7 with  $c/4$  in place of  $c$ , there exists  $\beta = \beta(n, m, q, c) > 0$  such that for each  $\xi \in B_{1/5}(0)$

$$(3.27) \quad \int_{B_{1/10}(\xi)} |w|^2 \geq \beta^2 \int_{B_1(0)} |w|^2.$$

Provided  $\varepsilon$  and  $\eta$  are sufficiently small depending only on  $n, m, q, c$ , by (2.28), (2.29), (3.23), (3.24), (3.27), and (3.26),

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbf{C}_{1/10}(\xi)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X) &\geq \int_{B_{1/10}(\xi)} |u|^2 - C\varepsilon^\gamma \int_{\mathbf{C}_8(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_{1/10}(\xi)} |w|^2 - (\eta + C\varepsilon^{2+\gamma}) \int_{\mathbf{C}_8(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X) \\
&\geq \frac{\beta^2}{2} \int_{B_1(0)} |w|^2 - (\eta + C\varepsilon^{2+\gamma}) \int_{\mathbf{C}_8(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X) \\
&\geq \left( \frac{\beta^2 c^2}{8} - \eta - C\varepsilon^{2+\gamma} \right) \int_{\mathbf{C}_8(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X) \\
&\geq \frac{\beta^2 c^2}{16} \int_{\mathbf{C}_8(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X),
\end{aligned}$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant. This proves (3.22) with  $\beta c/4$  in place of  $\beta$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.9.** *For each positive integer  $q$  and  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  there exists  $\delta = \delta(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  and  $\eta_0 = \eta_0(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  such that the following holds true. Let  $P = \mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\}$  and let  $T$  be  $n$ -dimensional area-minimizing integral current of  $\mathbf{C}_{7/4}(0)$  such that (3.6) and (3.7) hold true with  $Z = 0$  and  $\rho_0 = 1$  for some  $\eta \in (0, \eta_0]$  and  $\sigma_0 \in (0, 1)$ . Then*

$$(3.28) \quad -\rho^{1-n} \int \frac{1}{r} \text{dist}^2(X, P) \|\pi_S - \pi_P\|^2 \phi'(r/\rho) d|T|(X, S) \leq C\eta^{2\gamma} \rho^{2\alpha\gamma} H_{T,P,0}(\rho)$$

for all  $\rho \in [\sigma_0, 1]$  and thus

$$(3.29) \quad \left| H'_{T,P,0}(\rho) + 2\rho^{-n} \int (0, y) \cdot \pi_{P^\perp}(\nabla^S r) \phi'(r/\rho) d|T|(X, S) \right| \leq C\eta^{2\gamma} \rho^{2\alpha\gamma-1} H_{T,P,0}(\rho)$$

for  $\mathcal{L}^1$ -a.e.  $\rho \in [\sigma_0, 1]$ , where  $\gamma = \gamma(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  and  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants.

*Proof.* Fix  $\rho \in [\sigma_0, 1]$ . With  $\eta_0 = \eta_0(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  to be chosen, let  $\eta \in (0, \eta_0]$  and suppose that (3.6) and (3.7) hold. Notice that arguing as we did in the proof of Lemma 3.8, by (3.6) and (3.7) we may assume that

$$(3.30) \quad \pi_{P^\#} T \llcorner B_\rho(0) = q \llbracket B_\rho(0) \rrbracket$$

for  $\rho \in (0, 7/4)$ . For each  $\xi \in B_\rho(0) \setminus \overline{B_{\rho/2}(0)}$  let

$$\bar{\sigma}(\xi) = \sup\{0\} \cup \left\{ \sigma \in (0, \rho/2] : \int_{\mathbf{C}_\sigma(\xi)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X) \geq \eta^2 \omega_n (64\sigma)^{n+2+2\alpha} \right\}.$$

Using (3.7), for each  $\xi \in B_\rho(0) \setminus \overline{B_{\rho/2}(0)}$

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbf{C}_\sigma(\xi)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X) &\leq \int_{\mathbf{C}_{3\rho/2}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X) \\
&\leq \eta^2 \omega_n (3\rho/2)^{n+2+2\alpha} < \eta^2 \omega_n (64\sigma)^{n+2+2\alpha}
\end{aligned}$$

for all  $\sigma \in [\rho/32, \rho/2]$  and thus  $\bar{\sigma}(\xi) \leq \rho/32$ . Let

$$\Xi = \{\xi \in B_\rho(0) \setminus \overline{B_{\rho/2}(0)} : \bar{\sigma}(\xi) > 0\}.$$

Notice that by Lemma 2.5,

$$(3.31) \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_{16\sigma}(\xi)} \text{dist}(X, P) \leq C\eta\sigma^{1+\alpha}$$

for all  $\sigma \in (\bar{\sigma}, \rho/16]$  and some constant  $C = C(n, m) \in (0, \infty)$ . In particular, if  $\xi \in (B_\rho(0) \setminus \overline{B_{\rho/2}(0)}) \setminus \Xi$ , we can let  $\sigma \rightarrow 0^+$  to obtain

$$(3.32) \quad \text{spt } T \cap (\{\xi\} \times \mathbb{R}^m) = \{(\xi, 0)\}.$$

By the Vitali covering lemma, there is a countable set of points  $\xi_i \in \Xi$  such that  $\{B_{2\sigma_i/5}(\xi_i)\}$  is a pairwise disjoint collection of balls and  $\{B_{2\sigma_i}(\xi_i)\}$  covers  $\Xi$ , where  $\sigma_i = \bar{\sigma}(\xi_i)$ . By Lemma 2.7,

$$\sigma_i^{-n} \int_{\mathbf{C}_{8\sigma_i}(\xi_i)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}|^2 d\|T\|(X) \leq C\sigma^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{C}_{16\sigma_i}(\xi_i)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X) \leq C\eta^2\sigma_i^{2\alpha},$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$ . Hence if  $\eta_0 = \eta_0(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  is sufficiently small, by [Alm83, Corollaries 3.29 & 3.30] or [DS14, Theorem 2.4], for each  $i$  there exists a Lipschitz function  $u_i : B_{2\sigma_i}(\xi_i) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$  and a set  $K_i \subset B_{2\sigma_i}(\xi_i)$  such that

$$(3.33) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Lip } u_i &\leq C\eta^\gamma\sigma_i^{\gamma\alpha}, \\ T \llcorner K_i \times \mathbb{R}^m &= (\text{graph } u_i) \llcorner K_i \times \mathbb{R}^m, \\ |B_{2\sigma_i}(\xi_i) \setminus K_i| + \|T\|((B_{2\sigma_i}(\xi_i) \setminus K_i) \times \mathbb{R}^m) &\leq C\eta^{2+2\gamma}\sigma_i^{n+2\alpha(1+\gamma)}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\gamma = \gamma(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  and  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants. By (2.28), (2.29), (2.31), (3.31), and (3.33) that

$$(3.34) \quad \begin{aligned} &\int_{G_n(\mathbf{C}_{2\sigma_i}(\xi_i))} \text{dist}^2(X, P) \|\pi_S - \pi_P\|^2 d\|T\|(X, S) \\ &\leq C \int_{K_i \cap B_{2\sigma_i}(\xi_i)} |u_i|^2 |Du_i|^2 + C\eta^{4+2\gamma}\sigma_i^{n+2+2\alpha(2+\gamma)} \\ &\leq C\eta^{2\gamma}\sigma_i^{2\alpha\gamma} \int_{K_i \cap B_{2\sigma_i}(\xi_i)} |u_i|^2 + C\eta^{4+2\gamma}\sigma_i^{n+2+2\alpha(2+\gamma)} \\ &\leq C\eta^{2\gamma}\sigma_i^{2\alpha\gamma} \int_{\mathbf{C}_{2\sigma_i}(\xi_i)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X) + C\eta^{4+2\gamma}\sigma_i^{n+2+2\alpha(2+\gamma)} \\ &\leq C\eta^{2+2\gamma}\sigma_i^{n+2+2\alpha(1+\gamma)}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants. Notice that since  $\xi_i \in B_\rho(0) \setminus \overline{B_{\rho/2}(0)}$  there exists an open ball  $B_{\sigma_i/5}(\zeta_i) \subset B_{2\sigma_i/5}(\xi_i) \cap B_\rho(0) \setminus \overline{B_{\rho/2}(0)}$ . Also, by the definition of  $\sigma_i$  and since  $\alpha < 1$ ,

$$(3.35) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbf{C}_{\sigma_i}(\xi_i)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X) &\geq \eta^2\omega_n(64\sigma_i)^{n+2+2\alpha} \\ &\geq 16^{-n-4} \int_{\mathbf{C}_{16\sigma_i}(\xi_i)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X). \end{aligned}$$

Thus by Lemma 3.8 there exists a constant  $\beta = \beta(n, m, q) > 0$  such that

$$\int_{\mathbf{C}_{\sigma_i/5}(\zeta_i)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X) \geq \beta^2 \int_{\mathbf{C}_{16\sigma_i}(\xi_i)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X).$$

Using the fact that  $\mathbf{C}_{\sigma_i/5}(\zeta_i) \subset \mathbf{C}_{2\sigma_i/5}(\xi_i) \cap \mathbf{C}_\rho(0) \setminus \overline{\mathbf{C}_{\rho/2}(0)}$ ,  $\mathbf{C}_{\sigma_i}(\xi_i) \subset \mathbf{C}_{16\sigma_i}(\xi_i)$ , and (3.35),

$$(3.36) \quad - \int_{\mathbf{C}_{2\sigma_i/5}(\xi_i)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) \frac{1}{r} \phi'(r/\rho) d\|T\|(X) \geq \frac{2}{\rho} \beta^2 \eta^2 \omega_n (64\sigma_i)^{n+2+2\alpha}.$$

Since  $\{B_{2\sigma_i}(\xi_i)\}$  covers  $\Xi$  and  $\{B_{2\sigma_i/5}(\xi_i)\}$  are pairwise disjoint, and by (3.32),  $\text{dist}(X, P) = 0$  on  $((B_\rho(0) \setminus \overline{B_{\rho/2}(0)}) \setminus \Xi) \times \mathbb{R}^m$ , it follows, using also (3.34), and (3.36), that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.37) \quad & - \int \text{dist}^2(X, P) \|\pi_S - \pi_P\|^2 \frac{1}{r} \phi'(r/\rho) d|T|(X, S) \\
& \leq \frac{4}{\rho} \sum_i \int_{G_n(\mathbf{C}_{2\sigma_i}(\xi_i))} \text{dist}^2(X, P) \|\pi_S - \pi_P\|^2 d|T|(X, S) \\
& \leq \frac{C}{\rho} \sum_i \eta^{2+2\gamma} \sigma_i^{n+2+2\alpha(1+\gamma)} \\
& \leq -C\eta^{2\gamma} \rho^{2\alpha\gamma} \sum_i \int_{\mathbf{C}_{2\sigma_i/5}(\xi_i)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) \frac{1}{r} \phi'(r/\rho) d\|T\|(X) \\
& \leq -C\eta^{2\gamma} \rho^{2\alpha\gamma} \int \text{dist}^2(X, P) \frac{1}{r} \phi'(r/\rho) d\|T\|(X),
\end{aligned}$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$ . Notice that for each  $n$ -dimensional plane  $S \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ ,

$$(3.38) \quad |\nabla^{S^\perp} r|^2 = |(\pi_S - \pi_P) \nabla r|^2 \leq \|\pi_S - \pi_P\|^2.$$

Hence  $|\nabla^S r|^2 = 1 - |\nabla^{S^\perp} r|^2 \geq 1 - \|\pi_S - \pi_P\|^2$ , which by (3.37) gives us

$$(3.39) \quad -\rho^{1-n} \int \text{dist}^2(X, P) \frac{1}{r} \phi'(r/\rho) d|T|(X, S) \leq 2H_{T,P,0}(\rho)$$

for all  $\rho \in [\sigma_0, 1]$  provided  $\eta_0 = \eta_0(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  is sufficiently small. It follows from (3.37) and (3.39) that (3.28) holds true. Using (3.38) and (3.28) to bound the second integral in (3.10), we obtain (3.29).  $\square$

**3.3. Bounding error terms in derivative of  $D_{T,P,0}$ .** Using similar arguments, in Lemma 3.11 we will estimate certain error terms in (3.12).

**Lemma 3.10.** *For every  $c > 0$  there exists  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(n, m, q, c) \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\delta = \delta(n, m, q, c) \in (0, 1)$  and  $\beta = \beta(n, m, q, c) \in (0, 1)$  such that if  $T$  is an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current of  $\mathbf{C}_4(0)$ ,  $P = \mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\}$  and if*

$$(3.40) \quad (\partial T) \llcorner \mathbf{C}_4(0) = 0, \quad \Theta(T, 0) \geq q, \quad \|T\|(\mathbf{C}_4(0)) \leq (q + \delta) \omega_n 4^n,$$

$$(3.41) \quad \int_{\mathbf{C}_4(0)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}|^2 d\|T\| < \varepsilon^2 \quad \text{and}$$

$$(3.42) \quad \int_{\mathbf{C}_{1/2}(0)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}|^2 d\|T\| \geq c^2 \int_{\mathbf{C}_4(0)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}|^2 d\|T\|,$$

then for every  $\xi \in B_{1/5}(0)$

$$(3.43) \quad \int_{G_n(\mathbf{C}_{1/20}(\xi))} \|\pi_S - \pi_P\|^2 d|T|(X, S) \geq \beta^2 \int_{\mathbf{C}_4(0)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}|^2 d\|T\|.$$

*Proof.* It follows from (3.40) and (3.41) that  $T$  is weakly close to  $q\llbracket P \rrbracket$  and hence in particular  $T$  has bounded support in  $\mathbf{C}_{7/2}(0)$ . So by [Alm83, Corollaries 3.29 & 3.30] (or [DS14, Theorem 2.4]), if  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(n, m, q, \eta) \in (0, 1)$  is sufficiently small, there is a Lipschitz function  $u : B_1(0) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$

and a set  $K \subset B_1(0)$  such that

$$(3.44) \quad \sup_{B_1(0)} |\nabla u| \leq C\varepsilon^\gamma,$$

$$T \llcorner K \times \mathbb{R}^m = (\text{graph } u) \llcorner K \times \mathbb{R}^m,$$

$$|B_1(0) \setminus K| + \|T\|((B_1(0) \setminus K) \times \mathbb{R}^m) \leq C\varepsilon^\gamma \int_{\mathbf{C}_4(0)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}|^2 d\|T\|(X),$$

where  $\gamma = \gamma(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  and  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants. Let  $\eta \in (0, 1)$  be a constant to be determined depending only on  $n, m, q, c$ . By [Alm83, Theorem 2.23] (or [DS14, Theorem 2.6]) there exists a Dirichlet energy minimizing  $q$ -valued function  $w \in W^{1,2}(B_1(0), \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m))$  such that

$$(3.45) \quad \int_{B_1(0)} (|Du| - |Dw|)^2 \leq \eta \int_{\mathbf{C}_4(0)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}|^2 d\|T\|.$$

Provided  $\varepsilon$  and  $\eta$  are sufficiently small, by (2.28), (2.29), (2.30), (3.44), (3.45), and (3.42)

$$(3.46) \quad \int_{B_1(0)} |Dw|^2 \leq 2 \int_{B_1(0)} |Du|^2 + 2\eta \int_{\mathbf{C}_4(0)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}|^2 d\|T\|(X)$$

$$\leq 2 \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}|^2 d\|T\|(X) + (2\eta + C\varepsilon^\gamma) \int_{\mathbf{C}_4(0)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}|^2 d\|T\|(X)$$

$$\leq 4 \int_{\mathbf{C}_4(0)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}|^2 d\|T\|(X)$$

and

$$(3.47) \quad \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} |Dw|^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} |Du|^2 - \eta \int_{\mathbf{C}_4(0)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}|^2 d\|T\|(X)$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbf{C}_{1/2}(0)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}|^2 d\|T\|(X) - (\eta + C\varepsilon^\gamma) \int_{\mathbf{C}_4(0)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}|^2 d\|T\|(X)$$

$$\geq \left( \frac{c^2}{2} - \eta - C\varepsilon^\gamma \right) \int_{\mathbf{C}_4(0)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}|^2 d\|T\|(X)$$

$$\geq \frac{c^2}{4} \int_{\mathbf{C}_4(0)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}|^2 d\|T\|(X),$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant. Combining (3.46) and (3.47),

$$(3.48) \quad \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} |Dw|^2 \geq \frac{c^2}{16} \int_{B_1(0)} |Dw|^2.$$

Hence arguing as in the proof of Lemma 3.7, there exists  $\beta = \beta(n, m, q, c) > 0$  such that (3.48) implies that for each  $\xi \in B_{1/5}(0)$

$$(3.49) \quad \int_{B_{1/20}(\xi)} |Dw|^2 \geq \beta^2 \int_{B_1(0)} |Dw|^2.$$

By (2.28), (2.29), (2.31), (3.44), (3.45), (3.49), and (3.47),

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbf{C}_{1/20}(\xi)} \|\pi_S - \pi_P\|^2 d|T|(X, S) &\geq \int_{B_{1/20}(\xi)} |Du|^2 - C\varepsilon^\gamma \int_{\mathbf{C}_4(0)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}|^2 d\|T\|(X) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_{1/20}(\xi)} |Dw|^2 - (\eta + C\varepsilon^\gamma) \int_{\mathbf{C}_4(0)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}|^2 d\|T\|(X) \\
&\geq \frac{\beta^2}{2} \int_{B_1(0)} |Dw|^2 - (\eta + C\varepsilon^\gamma) \int_{\mathbf{C}_4(0)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}|^2 d\|T\|(X) \\
&\geq \left( \frac{\beta^2 c^2}{8} - \eta - C\varepsilon^\gamma \right) \int_{\mathbf{C}_4(0)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}|^2 d\|T\|(X) \\
&\geq \frac{\beta^2 c^2}{16} \int_{\mathbf{C}_4(0)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}|^2 d\|T\|(X),
\end{aligned}$$

where  $C \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant. This proves (3.43) with  $\beta c/4$  in place of  $\beta$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.11.** *For each positive integer  $q$  and  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  there exists  $\delta = \delta(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  and  $\eta_0 = \eta_0(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  such that the following holds true. Let  $P = \mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\}$  and let  $T$  be  $n$ -dimensional area-minimizing integral current of  $\mathbf{C}_{7/4}(0)$  such that (3.6) and (3.7) hold true with  $Z = 0$  and  $\rho_0 = 1$  for some  $\eta \in (0, \eta_0]$  and  $\sigma_0 \in (0, 1)$ . Then*

$$(3.50) \quad \rho^{2-n} \int_{\mathbf{C}_\rho(0)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}|^4 d\|T\|(X) \leq CD(\rho)^{\gamma_1} ((n-1)D_{T,P,0}(\rho) + \rho D'_{T,P,0}(\rho)),$$

for all  $\rho \in [\sigma_0, 1]$ , where  $\gamma_1 = \gamma_1(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  and  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants. Thus

$$(3.51) \quad \left| D'_{T,P,0}(\rho) + 2\rho^{-n} \int_{G_n(\mathbf{B}_2(0)) \cap \{\nabla^S r \neq 0\}} \frac{|\pi_{P^\perp}(\nabla^S r)|^2}{|\nabla^S r|^2} r \phi'(r/\rho) d|T|(X, S) \right| \\ \leq C\rho^{-1} D(\rho)^{\gamma_1} ((n-1)D_{T,P,0}(\rho) + \rho D'_{T,P,0}(\rho))$$

for  $\mathcal{L}^1$ -a.e.  $\rho \in [\sigma_0, 1]$ , where  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant.

*Proof.* Fix  $\rho \in [\sigma_0, 1]$ . With  $\eta_0 = \eta_0(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  to be chosen, let  $\eta \in (0, \eta_0]$  and suppose that (3.6) and (3.7) hold. Recall that by (3.6) and (3.7) we may assume that (3.30) holds true. By Lemma 2.7,

$$(3.52) \quad \int_{\mathbf{C}_{3\rho/2}(0)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}|^2 d\|T\|(X) \leq \frac{C_0}{\rho^2} \int_{\mathbf{C}_{7\rho/4}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X)$$

for some constant  $C_0 = C_0(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$ . For each  $\xi \in B_\rho(0)$  let

$$\bar{\sigma}(\xi) = \sup\{0\} \cup \left\{ \sigma \in (0, \rho/2] : \int_{\mathbf{C}_\sigma(\xi)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}|^2 d\|T\| \geq 4C_0\eta^2 (64\sigma)^{n+2\alpha} \right\},$$

where  $C_0$  is as in (3.52). By (3.52) and (3.7), for each  $\xi \in B_\rho(0)$

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbf{C}_\sigma(\xi)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}|^2 d\|T\| &\leq \int_{\mathbf{C}_{3\rho/2}(0)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}|^2 d\|T\| \leq \frac{C_0}{\rho^2} \int_{\mathbf{C}_{7\rho/4}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X) \\
&\leq 4C_0\eta^2 (7\rho/4)^{n+2\alpha} < 4C_0\eta^2 (64\sigma)^{n+2\alpha}
\end{aligned}$$

for all  $\sigma \in [\rho/32, \rho/2]$  and thus  $\bar{\sigma}(\xi) \leq \rho/32$ . Set

$$\Xi = \{\xi \in B_\rho(0) : \bar{\sigma}(\xi) > 0\}.$$

Since for every  $\xi \in B_\rho(0) \setminus \Xi$  we have that

$$\int_{\mathbf{C}_\sigma(\xi)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}|^2 d\|T\| < 4C_0\eta^2(64\sigma)^{n+2\alpha}$$

for all  $\sigma \in (0, \rho/2]$ , we must have that  $\vec{T}(X) = \vec{P}$  for  $\|T\|$ -a.e.  $X \in (B_\rho(0) \setminus \Xi) \times \mathbb{R}^m$ , and hence the approximate tangent plane to  $\text{spt } T$  is  $P$  at  $\|T\|$ -a.e.  $X \in (B_\rho(0) \setminus \Xi) \times \mathbb{R}^m$ . In other words,

$$(3.53) \quad S = P \text{ for } |T|\text{-a.e. } (X, S) \in G_n((B_\rho(0) \setminus \Xi) \times \mathbb{R}^m).$$

By the Vitali covering lemma, there is a countable set of points  $\xi_i \in \Xi$  such that  $\{B_{2\sigma_i/5}(\xi_i)\}$  is a pairwise disjoint collection of balls and  $\{B_{2\sigma_i}(\xi_i)\}$  covers  $\Xi$ , where  $\sigma_i = \bar{\sigma}(\xi_i)$ . By (3.52) and [Alm83, Corollaries 3.29 & 3.30] (or [DS14, Theorem 2.4]), for each  $i$  there exists a Lipschitz function  $u_i : B_{2\sigma_i}(\xi_i) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$  and a set  $K_i \subset B_{2\sigma_i}(\xi_i)$  such that (3.33) holds true. Hence by (2.28), (2.29), (2.30), (2.31), and (3.33),

$$(3.54) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbf{C}_{2\sigma_i}(\xi_i)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}|^4 d\|T\|(X) \\ & \leq C \int_{K_i \cap B_{2\sigma_i}(\xi_i)} |Du_i|^4 + C\eta^{2+2\gamma}\sigma_i^{n+2\alpha(1+\gamma)} \\ & \leq C\eta^{2\gamma}\sigma_i^{2\alpha\gamma} \int_{K_i \cap B_{2\sigma_i}(\xi_i)} |Du_i|^2 + C\eta^{2+2\gamma}\sigma_i^{n+2\alpha(1+\gamma)} \\ & \leq C\eta^{2\gamma}\sigma_i^{2\alpha\gamma} \int_{\mathbf{C}_{2\sigma_i}(\xi_i)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}|^2 d\|T\|(X) + C\eta^{2+2\gamma}\sigma_i^{n+2\alpha(1+\gamma)} \\ & \leq C\eta^{2+2\gamma}\sigma_i^{n+2\alpha(1+\gamma)}, \end{aligned}$$

$C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$ . Since  $\xi_i \in B_\rho(0)$ , there exists a ball  $B_{\sigma_i/5}(\zeta_i) \subset B_{2\sigma_i/5}(\xi_i) \cap B_\rho(0)$ . By the definition of  $\sigma_i$  and  $\alpha < 1$ ,

$$(3.55) \quad \int_{\mathbf{C}_{\sigma_i}(\xi_i)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}|^2 d\|T\| \geq 4C_0\eta^2(64\sigma_i)^{n+2\alpha} \geq 8^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{C}_{8\sigma_i}(\xi_i)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}|^2 d\|T\|.$$

By Lemma 3.10 there exists a constant  $\beta = \beta(n, m, q) > 0$  such that

$$(3.56) \quad \int_{G_n(\mathbf{C}_{\sigma_i/10}(\zeta_i))} \|\pi_S - \pi_P\|^2 d|T|(X, S) \geq \beta \int_{\mathbf{C}_{8\sigma_i}(\xi_i)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}|^2 d\|T\|.$$

Using the fact that  $\mathbf{C}_{\sigma_i/5}(\zeta_i) \subset \mathbf{C}_{2\sigma_i/5}(\xi_i) \cap \mathbf{C}_\rho(0)$ ,  $\overline{\mathbf{C}_{\sigma_i}(\xi_i)} \subset \mathbf{C}_{8\sigma_i}(\xi_i)$ , (3.55), and (3.56),

$$(3.57) \quad \int_{G_n(\mathbf{C}_{2\sigma_i/5}(\xi_i) \cap \mathbf{C}_\rho(0))} \|\pi_S - \pi_P\|^2 d|T|(X, S) \geq 4\beta C_0\eta^2(64\sigma_i)^{n+2\alpha}.$$

Since  $B_{\sigma_i/5}(\zeta_i) \subset B_\rho(0)$ , we have that  $r \leq \rho - \sigma_i/5$  on  $\mathbf{C}_{\sigma_i/10}(\zeta_i)$  and thus  $\phi(r/\rho) \geq \sigma_i/(5\rho)$  on  $\mathbf{C}_{\sigma_i/10}(\zeta_i)$ . Hence by (3.55) and (3.56)

$$(3.58) \quad \begin{aligned} C_0\beta\eta^2(64\sigma_i)^{n+1+2\alpha} & \leq 16\sigma_i \int_{G_n(\mathbf{C}_{\sigma_i/10}(\zeta_i))} \|\pi_S - \pi_P\|^2 d|T|(X, S) \\ & \leq 80\rho \int_{G_n(\mathbf{C}_\rho(0))} \|\pi_S - \pi_P\|^2 \phi(r/\rho) d|T|(X, S) \leq 80D_{T,P,0}(\rho) \end{aligned}$$

Recalling that  $\{B_{2\sigma_i}(\xi_i)\}$  covers  $\Xi$  and  $\{B_{2\sigma_i/5}(\xi_i)\}$  are pairwise disjoint, and using (3.53), (3.54), (3.57), and (3.58),

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.59) \quad & \int_{\mathbf{C}_\rho(0)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}|^4 d\|T\|(X) \\
& \leq \sum_i \int_{\mathbf{C}_{2\sigma_i}(\xi_i)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}|^4 d\|T\|(X) \\
& \leq C \sum_i \eta^{2+2\gamma} \sigma_i^{n+2\alpha(1+\gamma)} \\
& \leq C \sum_i \eta^{2\gamma} \sigma_i^{2\alpha\gamma} \int_{G_n(\mathbf{C}_{2\sigma_i/5}(\xi_i) \cap \mathbf{C}_\rho(0))} \|\pi_S - \pi_P\|^2 d|T|(X, S) \\
& \leq CD(\rho)^{\gamma_1} \sum_i \int_{G_n(\mathbf{C}_{2\sigma_i/5}(\xi_i) \cap \mathbf{C}_\rho(0))} \|\pi_S - \pi_P\|^2 d|T|(X, S) \\
& \leq CD(\rho)^{\gamma_1} \int_{G_n(\mathbf{C}_\rho(0))} \|\pi_S - \pi_P\|^2 d|T|(X, S),
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\gamma_1 = \frac{2\alpha\gamma}{n+1+2\alpha}$  and  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants. Notice that by the definition of  $\phi$  and by (3.17) (noting also that  $\phi(r/\rho) - \frac{r}{\rho}\phi'(r/\rho) = 1$  on  $\mathbf{C}_{\rho/2}$  and  $\phi(r/\rho) - \frac{r}{\rho}\phi'(r/\rho) = 2(1 - \frac{r}{\rho}) + \frac{2r}{\rho} = 2$  on  $\mathbf{C}_\rho \setminus \mathbf{C}_{\rho/2}$ ), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.60) \quad & \frac{1}{2} \int_{G_n(\mathbf{C}_\rho(0))} \|\pi_S - \pi_P\|^2 d|T|(X, S) \leq \frac{1}{2} \int \|\pi_S - \pi_P\|^2 \left( \phi(r/\rho) - \frac{r}{\rho}\phi'(r/\rho) \right) d|T|(X, S) \\
& = (n-1)\rho^{n-2}D_{T,P,0}(\rho) + \rho^{n-1}D'_{T,P,0}(\rho)
\end{aligned}$$

which together with (3.59) gives us (3.50). (Note that (3.17) holds true when  $\phi$  is given by (3.2) by the approximation argument in the proof of Lemma 3.5.)

We claim that

$$(3.61) \quad \left| |\nabla^{S^\perp} r|^2 - \frac{|\pi_{P^\perp} \nabla^S r|^2}{|\nabla^S r|^2} \right| \leq C \|\pi_S - \pi_P\|^4 \text{ if } \nabla^S r \neq 0$$

for each  $(X, S) \in G_n(\mathbf{C}_\rho(0))$  and that

$$(3.62) \quad \left| 1 - \frac{1}{4} \|\pi_S - \pi_P\|^2 - J\pi_P \right| \leq C |\vec{T} - \vec{P}|^4$$

for  $\|T\|$ -a.e.  $X \in \mathbf{C}_\rho(0)$ . Note that by (3.38), if  $\nabla^S r = 0$  then in place of (3.61) we have  $|\nabla^{S^\perp} r|^2 = 1 = |\nabla^{S^\perp} r|^4 \leq \|\pi_S - \pi_P\|^4$ . To see (3.61), if  $|\nabla^S r|^2 \leq 1/2$ , then again using (3.38) we have that  $1/2 \leq |\nabla^{S^\perp} r|^2 \leq \|\pi_S - \pi_P\|^2$  and thus

$$\left| |\nabla^{S^\perp} r|^2 - \frac{|\pi_{P^\perp} \nabla^S r|^2}{|\nabla^S r|^2} \right| \leq |\nabla^{S^\perp} r|^2 + \frac{|\pi_{P^\perp} \nabla^S r|^2}{|\nabla^S r|^2} \leq |\nabla^{S^\perp} r|^2 + 1 \leq 2 \leq 8 \|\pi_S - \pi_P\|^4.$$



If instead  $|\nabla^S r|^2 \geq 1/2$ , then since  $\nabla r(X) \in P$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla^{S^\perp} r|^2 - |\pi_{P^\perp} \nabla^S r|^2 &= |\nabla^{S^\perp} r|^2 - |\pi_{P^\perp} \nabla^{S^\perp} r|^2 = |\pi_P \nabla^{S^\perp} r|^2 \\ &= |\pi_P (\pi_P - \pi_S) \nabla r|^2 = |(\pi_P - \pi_S)^2 \nabla r|^2, \text{ whence} \\ \left| \frac{|\pi_{P^\perp} \nabla^S r|^2}{|\nabla^S r|^2} - |\nabla^{S^\perp} r|^2 \right| &= \frac{||\pi_{P^\perp} \nabla^S r|^2 - |\nabla^{S^\perp} r|^2 + |\nabla^{S^\perp} r|^4|}{|\nabla^S r|^2} \\ &\leq \frac{|(\pi_P - \pi_S)^2 \nabla r|^2 + |(\pi_P - \pi_S) \nabla r|^4}{|\nabla^S r|^2} \leq 4 \|\pi_S - \pi_P\|^4. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (3.61) holds true.

To see (3.62), without loss of generality suppose that  $|\vec{T} - \vec{P}| < 1/4$ . Then  $|\pi_{P\#} \vec{T} - \vec{P}| < 1/4$  and thus

$$\left| \frac{\pi_{P\#} \vec{T}}{|\pi_{P\#} \vec{T}|} - \vec{P} \right| \leq \frac{2|\pi_{P\#} \vec{T} - \vec{P}|}{|\pi_{P\#} \vec{T}|} \leq 4|\pi_{P\#} \vec{T} - \vec{P}| < 1.$$

Hence (since  $\frac{\pi_{P\#} \vec{T}}{|\pi_{P\#} \vec{T}|} = \pm \vec{P}$ ) we must have that  $\pi_{P\#} \vec{T} = |\pi_{P\#} \vec{T}| \vec{P}$ ; that is,  $J\pi_P = |\pi_{P\#} \vec{T}| > 0$ . Thus  $J\pi_P = \sqrt{\det[\pi_P \tau_i \cdot \pi_P \tau_j]}$  as the square root of the determinant of the  $n \times n$  matrix with  $(i, j)$ -entry  $\pi_P \tau_i \cdot \pi_P \tau_j$ , where  $\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_n$  is an orthonormal basis for the approximate tangent plane  $S_X$  of  $\text{spt } T$  at  $X$ . Since  $\pi_P \tau_i \cdot \pi_P \tau_j = \delta_{ij} - \pi_{\vec{P}}^\perp \tau_i \cdot \pi_{\vec{P}}^\perp \tau_j$  for all  $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ ,

$$J\pi_P = 1 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n |\pi_{\vec{P}}^\perp \tau_i|^2 + \mathcal{R} = 1 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m (\tau_i \cdot e_{n+j})^2 + \mathcal{R} = 1 - \frac{1}{4} \|\pi_{S_X} - \pi_P\|^2 + \mathcal{R}$$

where  $|\mathcal{R}| \leq C(n) \|\pi_{S_X} - \pi_P\|^4$ . Noting that  $\|\pi_{S_X} - \pi_P\| \leq C(n, m) |\vec{T}(X) - \vec{P}|$ , this completes the proof of (3.62).

Again noting that  $\|\pi_{S_X} - \pi_P\| \leq C(n, m) |\vec{T}(X) - \vec{P}|$  and combining (3.12), (3.61), (3.62), and (3.50), we conclude that (3.51) holds true.  $\square$

### 3.4. Proof of Theorem 3.4.

*Proof Theorem 3.4.* Assume without loss of generality that  $\rho_0 = 1$ . By differentiating  $N_{T,P,0}(\rho)$  using (3.11), (3.29) and (3.51), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (3.63) \quad \frac{d}{d\rho} \log N_{T,P,0}(\rho) &= \frac{H_{T,P,0}(\rho) D'_{T,P,0}(\rho) - H'_{T,P,0}(\rho) D_{T,P,0}(\rho)}{H_{T,P,0}(\rho) D_{T,P,0}(\rho)} \\ &\geq \frac{2\rho^{1-2n}}{H_{T,P,0}(\rho) D_{T,P,0}(\rho)} \left( \left( \int |y|^2 |\nabla^S r|^2 \frac{1}{r} \phi'(r/\rho) d|T|(X, S) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \cdot \left( \int_{\{\nabla^S r \neq 0\}} \frac{|\pi_{P^\perp}(\nabla^S r)|^2}{|\nabla^S r|^2} r \phi'(r/\rho) d|T|(X, S) \right) \\ &\quad \left. - \left( \int (0, y) \cdot \pi_{P^\perp}(\nabla^S r) \phi'(r/\rho) d|T|(X, S) \right)^2 \right) \\ &\quad - C\eta^{2\gamma} \rho^{2\alpha\gamma-1} - \frac{C}{\rho} D_{T,P,0}(\rho)^{\gamma-1} ((n-1) D_{T,P,0}(\rho) + \rho D'_{T,P,0}(\rho)) \end{aligned}$$

for all  $\sigma_0 \leq \rho \leq 1$  and some constants  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$  and  $\gamma = \gamma(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$ . By Lemma 2.4 and (3.7),

$$(3.64) \quad \begin{aligned} D_{T,P,0}(\rho) &\leq \frac{1}{2} \rho^{2-n} \int_{\mathbf{C}_\rho(0)} \|\pi_S - \pi_P\|^2 d|T|(X, S) \\ &\leq \frac{512}{9} \rho^{-n} \int_{\mathbf{C}_{7\rho/4}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X) \leq C\eta^2 \rho^{2+2\alpha} \end{aligned}$$

for each  $\sigma_0 \leq \rho \leq 1$  and some constant  $C = C(n) \in (0, \infty)$ . By the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and (3.64), (3.63) gives us

$$\frac{d}{d\rho} \log N_{T,P,0}(\rho) \geq -C_1 \eta^{2\gamma} \rho^{2\alpha\gamma-1} - C_2 D_{T,P,0}(\rho)^{\gamma-1} D'_{T,P,0}(\rho)$$

for all  $\sigma_0 \leq \rho \leq 1$  and some constants  $C_1 = C_1(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$ ,  $C_2 = C_2(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$ , and  $\gamma = \gamma(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$ . Integrating (3.65) over  $[\sigma, \rho]$ ,

$$(3.65) \quad N_{T,P,0}(\sigma) \leq N_{T,P,0}(\rho) \exp \left( \frac{C_1 \eta^{2\gamma}}{2\alpha\gamma} (\rho^{2\alpha\gamma} - \sigma^{2\alpha\gamma}) + \frac{C_2}{\gamma} (D_{T,P,0}(\rho)^\gamma - D_{T,P,0}(\sigma)^\gamma) \right).$$

for all  $\sigma_0 \leq \sigma < \rho \leq 1$ . Bounding the right-hand side of (3.65) using (3.64) gives us (3.9).  $\square$

#### 4. PRELIMINARY CONSEQUENCES OF MONOTONICITY OF THE PLANAR FREQUENCY FUNCTION

Here we will draw several preliminary consequences of the monotonicity formula in Theorem 3.4, including the existence of planar frequency at “well-behaved” branch points (Lemma 4.1 and Definition 4.2), growth estimates for  $H_{T,P,Z}$  and for  $L^2$ -distance to a plane (Corollary 4.3), and upper semi-continuity of planar frequency with respect to weak convergence of locally area-minimizing rectifiable currents (Corollary 4.5).

Here and subsequently we shall use the notation

$$E(T, P, \mathbf{C}_\rho(Z, P)) = \left( \frac{1}{\omega_n \rho^{n+2}} \int_{\mathbf{C}_\rho(Z, P)} \text{dist}^2(X, Z + P) d\|T\|(X) \right)^{1/2}.$$

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ ,  $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ ,  $\rho_0 > 0$  and  $P \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  be an  $n$ -dimensional plane. If  $T$  is an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current of  $\mathbf{C}_{7\rho_0/4}(Z, P)$  such that*

$$(4.1) \quad (\partial T)_\perp \mathbf{C}_{2\rho_0}(Z, P) = 0, \quad \Theta(T, Z) \geq q, \quad \|T\|(\mathbf{C}_{7\rho_0/4}(Z, P)) < (q+1)\omega_n(7\rho_0/4)^n \text{ and}$$

$$(4.2) \quad \sup_{\rho \in (0, \rho_0]} \rho^{-\alpha} E(T, P, \mathbf{C}_{7\rho/4}(Z, P)) < \infty$$

then:

- (i)  $P$  can be equipped with an orientation such that  $q\llbracket P \rrbracket$  is the unique tangent cone to  $T$  at  $Z$ ;
- (ii) if additionally  $\text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_\rho(Z, P) \not\subset P$  for all  $\rho \in (0, \rho_0]$ , then  $N_{T,P,Z}(\rho)$  is well-defined for all sufficiently small  $\rho > 0$  and the limit  $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0^+} N_{T,P,Z}(\rho)$  exists.

**Definition 4.2.** Given  $T$ ,  $P$ , and  $Z$  satisfying the hypothesis of Lemma 4.1, we define the *planar frequency*  $\mathcal{N}_{T,P,1}(Z)$  of  $T$  at  $Z$  with respect to  $P$  by

$$\mathcal{N}_{T,P,1}(Z) = \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0^+} N_{T,P,Z}(\rho).$$

*Proof of Lemma 4.1.* Without loss of generality, assume that  $Z = 0$ ,  $\rho_0 = 1$  and  $P = \mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\}$ . For any given  $\delta, \eta \in (0, 1)$ , by (4.2) and the monotonicity formula for area, we can rescale and assume that

$$(4.3) \quad \|T\|(\mathbf{C}_{7/4}(0)) < (\Theta(T, 0) + \delta) \omega_n(7/4)^n,$$

$$(4.4) \quad E(T, P, \mathbf{C}_{2\rho}(0)) \leq \eta \rho^\alpha \text{ for all } \rho \in (0, 1].$$

Assuming  $\eta$  is sufficiently small, by (4.4) and Lemma 2.5

$$(4.5) \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{B}_{3\rho/2}(0)} \text{dist}(X, P) \leq C(n, m) \eta \rho^{1+\alpha} < \rho/2$$

for all  $\rho \in (0, 1]$ , where  $C = C(n, m) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant. Recall that  $P = \mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\}$  is oriented by  $e_1 \wedge e_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge e_n$ . By (4.1) and the constancy theorem (cf. beginning of the proof of Lemma 3.8), after possibly reversing the orientation of  $P$

$$(4.6) \quad (\pi_{P\#}T) \llcorner B_{1/2}(0) = q \llbracket B_{1/2}(0) \rrbracket.$$

Let  $\mathbf{C}$  be any tangent cone to  $T$  at the origin and  $\rho_k \rightarrow 0^+$  such that  $\eta_{0, \rho_k\#}T \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$  weakly in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ . By (4.5),  $\text{spt } \mathbf{C} \subseteq P$ . By continuity of push-forwards of integral currents with respect to weak convergence and (4.6),

$$\mathbf{C} = \pi_{P\#}\mathbf{C} = \pi_{P\#}(\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \eta_{0, \rho_k\#}T) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \pi_{P\#}\eta_{0, \rho_k\#}T = \pi_{\#}(q \llbracket P \rrbracket) = q \llbracket P \rrbracket$$

in  $\mathbf{B}_1(0)$ , where each limit is computed with respect to the weak topology. Therefore,  $\mathbf{C} = q \llbracket P \rrbracket$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ . In light of the arbitrary choice of sequence  $(\rho_k)$ ,  $\eta_{0, \rho\#}T \rightarrow q \llbracket P \rrbracket$  weakly in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  as  $\rho \rightarrow 0^+$ ; that is,  $q \llbracket P \rrbracket$  is the unique tangent cone to  $T$  at  $Z$ . Note that  $\Theta(T, 0) = q$ . By (4.3) and (4.4),  $H_{T, P, 0}(\rho)$  and  $D_{T, P, 0}(\rho)$  are defined for all  $\rho \in (0, \rho_0]$ . By Remark 3.6, if we assume that  $\text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{B}_\rho(Z) \not\subseteq P$  for all  $\rho \in (0, \rho_0]$ , then  $H_{T, P, 0}(\rho) > 0$  and thus  $N_{T, P, 0}(\rho)$  is well-defined for all  $\rho \in (0, 1]$ . By (4.3) and (4.4), we can apply Theorem 3.4 to deduce that  $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0^+} N_{T, P, Z}(\rho)$  exists.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.3.** *For each positive integer  $q$  there exists  $\delta = \delta(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  and  $\eta_0 = \eta_0(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  such that the following holds true. Let  $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  and  $\rho_0 > 0$ . Let  $P$  be an  $n$ -dimensional plane in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  and  $T$  be  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current in  $\mathbf{C}_{7\rho_0/4}(Z, P)$  such that (3.6) holds true.*

(i) *If there exists  $\eta \in (0, \eta_0]$  and  $\sigma_0 \in (0, \rho_0)$  such that (3.7) holds true for some  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  and all  $\rho \in [\sigma_0, \rho_0]$ , and if  $H_{T, P, Z}(\rho) > 0$  for some  $\rho \in [\sigma_0, \rho_0]$ , then  $H_{T, P, Z}(\rho) > 0$  for all  $\rho \in [\sigma_0, \rho_0]$  and*

$$(4.7) \quad e^{-C\eta^{2\gamma}(\rho/\rho_0)^{2\alpha\gamma/(2\alpha\gamma)}} \left(\frac{\sigma}{\rho}\right)^{2e^{C\eta^\gamma(\rho/\rho_0)^{\alpha\gamma}} N_{T, P, Z}(\rho)} H_{T, P, Z}(\rho) \leq H_{T, P, Z}(\sigma) \\ \leq e^{C(N_{T, P, Z}(\sigma_0)+1)\eta^{2\gamma}(\rho/\rho_0)^{2\alpha\gamma/(2\alpha\gamma)}} \left(\frac{\sigma}{\rho}\right)^{2N_{T, P, Z}(\sigma_0)} H_{T, P, Z}(\rho)$$

for all  $\sigma_0 \leq \sigma < \rho \leq \rho_0$ , where  $\gamma = \gamma(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  is as in Theorem 3.4 and  $C = C(n, m, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant (independent of  $\eta$  and  $\alpha$ ).

(ii) If there exists  $\eta \in (0, \eta_0]$  such that (3.7) holds true for all  $\rho \in (0, \rho_0]$  and if  $H_{T,P,Z}(\rho) > 0$  for some  $\rho \in (0, \rho_0]$ , then  $H_{T,P,Z}(\rho) > 0$  for all  $\rho \in (0, \rho_0]$ ,  $\mathcal{N}_{T,\text{PI}}(Z) \geq 1 + \alpha$ , and

$$(4.8) \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} e^{-C\eta^{2\gamma}(\rho/\rho_0)^{2\alpha\gamma}/(4\alpha\gamma)} \left(\frac{\sigma}{\rho}\right)^{e^{C\eta^\gamma(\rho/\rho_0)^{\alpha\gamma}} N_{T,P,Z}(\rho)-1} E(T, P, \mathbf{C}_\rho(Z, P)) \leq E(T, P, \mathbf{C}_\sigma(Z, P)) \\ \leq e^{C(\mathcal{N}_{T,\text{PI}}(Z)+2)\eta^{2\gamma}(\rho/\rho_0)^{2\alpha\gamma}/(4\alpha\gamma)} \left(\frac{\sigma}{\rho}\right)^{\mathcal{N}_{T,\text{PI}}(Z)-1} E(T, P, \mathbf{C}_\rho(Z, P))$$

for all  $0 < \sigma < \rho \leq \rho_0$ , where  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant (independent of  $\eta$  and  $\alpha$ ).

*Proof.* Without loss of generality assume  $Z = 0$  and  $\rho_0 = 1$ . To see (i), suppose that  $\sigma_0 \leq \sigma < \rho \leq 1$  and that  $H_{T,P,0}(\sigma) > 0$ . Then by Remark 3.6,  $H_{T,P,0}(\tau) > 0$  for all  $\tau \in [\sigma, \rho]$ . By (3.29) and (3.11)

$$\left| \frac{H'_{T,P,0}(\tau)}{H_{T,P,0}(\tau)} - \frac{2N_{T,P,0}(\tau)}{\tau} \right| \leq C\eta^{2\gamma}\tau^{2\alpha\gamma-1}$$

for all  $\tau \in [\sigma, \rho]$  and some constant  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$ . Hence using Theorem 3.4 and the fact that  $e^{-C\eta^\gamma\tau^{\alpha\gamma}} \geq 1 - C\eta^\gamma\tau^{\alpha\gamma}$ ,

$$(4.9) \quad \frac{2N_{T,P,0}(\sigma_0)}{\tau} - C(N_{T,P,0}(\sigma_0) + 1)\eta^{2\gamma}\tau^{2\alpha\gamma-1} \\ \leq \frac{H'_{T,P,0}(\tau)}{H_{T,P,0}(\tau)} \leq \frac{2e^{C\eta^\gamma\rho^{\alpha\gamma}} N_{T,P,0}(\rho)}{\tau} + C\eta^{2\gamma}\tau^{2\alpha\gamma-1}$$

for all  $\tau \in [\sigma, \rho]$  where  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$ . Integrating (4.9) over  $\tau \in [\sigma, \rho]$  we obtain (4.7), subject to the assumption that  $H_{T,P,0}(\sigma) > 0$ . Finally, we deduce from this conclusion and Remark 3.6 that if  $H_{T,P,0}(\tau) > 0$  for some  $\tau \in [\sigma_0, 1]$  then  $H_{T,P,0}(\tau) > 0$  for all  $\tau \in [\sigma_0, 1]$  and hence (4.7) holds for any  $\sigma, \rho$  with  $\sigma_0 \leq \sigma \leq \rho \leq 1$ .

To see (ii), fix  $0 < \sigma < \rho \leq 1$ . Assume without loss of generality that  $P = \mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\}$ . For  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  set  $\sigma_k = 2^{-k}\sigma$  and  $\rho_k = 2^{-k}\rho$ . By Lemma 3.9, in particular (3.28) together with (3.38),

$$\frac{1}{4} H_{T,P,0}(\tau) \leq \frac{1}{\tau^n} \int_{\mathbf{C}_\tau(0) \setminus \mathbf{C}_{\tau/2}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X) \leq 4(1 + C\eta^{2\gamma}\tau^{2\alpha\gamma}) H_{T,P,0}(\tau)$$

for all  $\tau \in (0, 1]$ , where  $\gamma = \gamma(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  and  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants. Noting that  $1 + C\eta^{2\gamma}\tau^{2\alpha\gamma} \leq e^{C\eta^{2\gamma}\tau^{2\alpha\gamma}}$  and  $\sigma_k/\rho_k = \sigma/\rho$  for each  $k$ , by (4.7)

$$(4.10) \quad \frac{1}{16} e^{-C\eta^{2\gamma}\rho^{2\alpha\gamma}/(2\alpha\gamma)} \left(\frac{\sigma}{\rho}\right)^{n+2e^{C\eta^\gamma\rho^{\alpha\gamma}} N_{T,P,0}(\rho)} \int_{\mathbf{C}_{\rho_k}(0) \setminus \mathbf{C}_{\rho_k/2}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P_0) d\|T\|(X) \\ \leq \int_{\mathbf{C}_{\sigma_k}(0) \setminus \mathbf{C}_{\sigma_k/2}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P_0) d\|T\|(X) \\ \leq 16e^{C(\mathcal{N}_{T,\text{PI}}(0)+2)\eta^{2\gamma}\rho^{2\alpha\gamma}/(2\alpha\gamma)} \left(\frac{\sigma}{\rho}\right)^{n+2\mathcal{N}_{T,\text{PI}}(0)} \int_{\mathbf{C}_{\rho_k}(0) \setminus \mathbf{C}_{\rho_k/2}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P_0) d\|T\|(X)$$

for all  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ , where  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant. By summing (4.10) over  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  gives us (4.8). By (3.6),  $E(T, P_0, \mathbf{C}_\sigma(0)) \leq \eta(\sigma/2)^\alpha$  for all  $\sigma \in (0, 1]$ , which by in view of (4.8) gives us  $e^{C\eta^\gamma\rho^{\alpha\gamma}} N_{T,P,0}(\rho) \geq 1 + \alpha$  for all  $\rho \in (0, 1]$ . Letting  $\rho \rightarrow 0^+$  gives us  $\mathcal{N}_{T,\text{PI}}(0) \geq 1 + \alpha$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.4.** *Let  $P_k, P$  be  $n$ -dimensional planes in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  such that*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(P_k \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0), P \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)) = 0.$$

*Let  $Z_k, Z \in \mathbf{B}_1(0)$ ,  $0 < \rho_k < \text{dist}(Z_k, \partial \mathbf{C}_1(0, P))$ , and  $0 < \rho < \text{dist}(Z, \partial \mathbf{C}_1(0, P))$  such that  $Z_k \rightarrow Z$  and  $\rho_k \rightarrow \rho$ . Let  $T_k, T$  be  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable currents in  $\mathbf{C}_1(0, P)$  such that*

$$(4.11) \quad \begin{aligned} (\partial T_k) \llcorner \mathbf{C}_1(0, P) &= 0, \quad \sup_{k \geq 1} \|T_k\|(\mathbf{C}_1(0, P)) < \infty, \\ \sup_{k \geq 1} \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T_k \cap \mathbf{C}_1(0, P)} \text{dist}(X, Z_k + P_k) &< \infty, \\ \text{spt } T \not\subset P, \quad T_k &\rightarrow T \text{ weakly in } \mathbf{C}_1(0, P). \end{aligned}$$

*Then*

$$(4.12) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} N_{T_k, P_k, Z_k}(\rho_k) = N_{T, P, Z}(\rho).$$

*Proof.* Note that by letting  $k \rightarrow \infty$  in (4.11),

$$(\partial T) \llcorner \mathbf{C}_1(0, P) = 0, \quad \|T\|(\mathbf{C}_1(0, P)) < \infty, \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_1(0, P)} \text{dist}(X, Z + P) < \infty.$$

Hence  $H_{T, P, Z}(\rho)$  and  $D_{T, P, Z}(\rho)$  are well-defined, and so  $N_{T, P, Z}(\rho)$  is well-defined if  $H_{T, P, Z}(\rho) > 0$ . Next, after rotating and rescaling we may assume that  $Z_k = Z = 0$ ,  $\rho_k = \rho$ , and  $P_k = P = \mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\}$  for all  $k$ . Since  $T_k$  is area-minimizing in  $\mathbf{C}_1(0)$  and  $(\partial T_k) \llcorner \mathbf{C}_1(0) = 0$ ,  $|T_k|$  is area-stationary in  $\mathbf{C}_1(0)$ . Thus since  $\sup_k \|T_k\|(\mathbf{C}_1(0)) < \infty$ , by the Allard compactness theorem [Sim83, Theorem 42.7] after passing to a subsequence  $|T_k|$  converges weakly to some area-stationary integral varifold in  $\mathbf{C}_1(0)$ . By [Sim83, Theorem 34.5],  $\|T_k\| \rightarrow \|T\|$  in the sense of Radon measures locally in  $\mathbf{C}_1(0)$ , and it follows that  $|T_k| \rightarrow |T|$  in the sense of varifolds in  $\mathbf{C}_1(0)$ . By Remark 3.2,  $|\nabla^S r| = 0$  for  $|T|$ -a.e.  $(X, S) \in G_n(\mathbf{C}_1(0) \cap (\partial \mathbf{C}_{\rho/2}(0) \cup \partial \mathbf{C}_{\rho}(0)))$  and thus

$$\int_{G_n(\partial \mathbf{C}_{\rho/2}(0) \cup \partial \mathbf{C}_{\rho}(0))} \text{dist}^2(X, P) |\nabla^S r|^2 \frac{1}{r} d|T|(X, S) = 0.$$

Hence using the fact that  $|T_k| \rightarrow |T|$  in the sense of varifolds in  $\mathbf{C}_1(0)$

$$(4.13) \quad \begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} H_{T_k, P, 0}(\rho) &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} 2\rho^{1-n} \int_{G_n(\mathbf{C}_{\rho}(0) \setminus \mathbf{C}_{\rho/2}(0))} \text{dist}^2(X, P) |\nabla^S r|^2 \frac{1}{r} d|T_k|(X, S) \\ &= 2\rho^{1-n} \int_{G_n(\mathbf{C}_{\rho}(0) \setminus \mathbf{C}_{\rho/2}(0))} \text{dist}^2(X, P) |\nabla^S r|^2 \frac{1}{r} d|T|(X, S) \\ &= H_{T, P, 0}(\rho). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$(4.14) \quad \begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} D_{T_k, P, 0}(\rho) &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \rho^{2-n} \int_{G_n(\mathbf{C}_{\rho}(0))} \|\pi_S - \pi_P\|^2 \phi(r/\rho) d|T_k|(X, S) \\ &= \rho^{2-n} \int_{G_n(\mathbf{C}_{\rho}(0))} \|\pi_S - \pi_P\|^2 \phi(r/\rho) d|T|(X, S) \\ &= D_{T, P, 0}(\rho). \end{aligned}$$

Note that by Remark 3.6, since  $\text{spt } T \not\subset P$ ,  $H_{T, P, 0}(\rho) > 0$ . Hence by dividing (4.14) by (4.13) we obtain (4.12).  $\square$

**Corollary 4.5.** *Let  $P_k, P$  be  $n$ -dimensional planes in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  such that*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(P_k \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0), P \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)) = 0.$$

*Let  $T_k$  and  $T$  be  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable currents of  $\mathbf{C}_3(0, P)$  such that*

$$(4.15) \quad (\partial T_k) \llcorner \mathbf{C}_3(0, P) = 0, \quad T_k \rightarrow T \text{ weakly in } \mathbf{C}_3(0, P).$$

*Let  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  be a constant and for  $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$  let  $Z_k \in \text{spt } T_k \cap \mathbf{C}_1(0)$  such that*

$$(4.16) \quad \Theta(T_k, Z_k) \geq q, \quad \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|T_k\|(\mathbf{C}_{7/4}(Z_k, P_k)) < (q+1)\omega_n(7/4)^n,$$

$$(4.17) \quad \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\rho \in (0, 1]} \rho^{-\alpha} E(T_k, P_k, \mathbf{C}_{7\rho/4}(Z_k, P_k)) < \infty$$

*and let  $Z_k \rightarrow Z$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ . Then*

$$(4.18) \quad \Theta(T_k, Z_k) = q \quad \forall k, \quad \Theta(T, Z) = q, \quad \|T\|(\mathbf{C}_{7/4}(Z, P)) < (q+1)\omega_n(7/4)^n,$$

$$(4.19) \quad \sup_{\rho \in (0, 1]} \rho^{-\alpha} E(T, P, \mathbf{C}_{7\rho/4}(Z, P)) < \infty, \quad \text{and}$$

$$(4.20) \quad \mathcal{N}_{T, \text{Pl}}(Z) \geq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{N}_{T_k, \text{Pl}}(Z_k).$$

*Proof.* The conclusion  $\Theta(T_k, Z_k) = q$  follows from Lemma 4.1(i). It is clear from (4.15) that  $(\partial T) \llcorner \mathbf{C}_3(0, P) = 0$ . By (4.15), (4.16), and semi-continuity of density and mass [Sim83, Corollary 17.8 and 26.13] we have that the rest of the conclusions in (4.18) hold true (with equality in  $\Theta(T, Z) = q$  again following from Lemma 4.1(i)). By [Sim83, Theorem 34.5],  $\|T_k\| \rightarrow \|T\|$  in the sense of Radon measures of  $\mathbf{C}_3(0, P)$ . Hence

$$E(T, P, \mathbf{C}_{7\rho/4}(Z, P)) \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} E(T_k, P_k, \mathbf{C}_{7\rho/4}(Z_k, P_k))$$

for each  $\rho \in (0, 1]$  and thus (4.19) holds true. In light of (4.16), (4.17), (4.18), and (4.19), by rescaling we may assume that for suitably small constant  $\delta = \delta(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  and  $\eta = \eta(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  and for all sufficiently large  $k$

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_k\|(\mathbf{C}_{7/4}(Z_k, P_k)) &< (q + \delta)\omega_n(7/4)^n, \quad \|T\|(\mathbf{C}_{7/4}(Z, P)) < (q + \delta)\omega_n(7/4)^n, \\ E(T_k, P_k, \mathbf{C}_{7/4}(Z_k, P_k)) &\leq \eta\rho^\alpha, \quad E(T, P, \mathbf{C}_{7/4}(Z, P)) \leq \eta\rho^\alpha \quad \text{for all } \rho \in (0, 1]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus by Theorem 3.4 and Lemma 4.4

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{N}_{T_k, \text{Pl}}(Z_k) \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} e^{C\eta^\gamma \rho^{\alpha\gamma}} \mathcal{N}_{T_k, P_k, Z_k}(\rho) = e^{C\eta^\gamma \rho^{\alpha\gamma}} \mathcal{N}_{T, P, Z}(\rho)$$

for each  $\rho \in (0, 1]$ , where  $C = C(n, m, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant. Letting  $\rho \rightarrow 0^+$  gives us (4.20).  $\square$

## 5. BLOW-UPS OF AREA-MINIMIZERS RELATIVE TO A PLANE

Let  $P$  be an  $n$ -dimensional oriented plane in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ . For  $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ , let  $T_k$  be  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable currents in  $\mathbf{C}_{\rho_0}(0)$  which are converging to the multiplicity  $q$  plane  $q[P]$  as in (5.1) and (5.2) below. In Subsection 5.1, we discuss, following Almgren's work ([Alm83]), the procedure for constructing a  $q$ -valued Dirichlet energy minimizing blow-up  $w$  of the sequence  $(T_k)$  relative to  $P$ . In Lemma 5.2, we consider the optimal planes  $\widehat{P}_k$  which minimizes the  $L^2$ -distance of  $T_k$  to a plane in a fixed ball, and show that the blow-up of  $\widehat{P}_k$  relative to  $P$  is  $Dw_a(0) \cdot x$  where  $w_a$  is the (harmonic) pointwise average of the values of  $w$ . In Lemma 5.4 we establish the Hardt-Simon inequality, which was first introduced in [HS79] and which we use here to show that points at which  $T_k$  has density  $\geq q$  blow up to points at which  $w$  has Almgren

frequency  $\geq 1$ . In Lemma 5.5 and Corollary 5.6, we establish continuity of the planar frequency function associated with  $T_k$ , and upper semi-continuity of planar frequency associated with  $T_k$ , with respect to blowing up of  $(T_k)$ , giving in the limit Almgren frequency function and Almgren frequency associated with the blow-up  $w$ .

**5.1. Blow-up procedure.** Let  $P$  be an  $n$ -dimensional oriented plane in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ . After an orthogonal change of coordinates, we may assume that  $P = P_0 = \mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\}$  and  $P_0$  is oriented by  $\vec{P}_0 = e_1 \wedge e_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge e_n$ . We will express points  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  as  $X = (x, y)$  where  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ . Let  $\rho_0 > 0$ . For  $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$  let  $T_k$  be  $n$ -dimensional area-minimizing integral currents of  $\mathbf{C}_{\rho_0}(0)$  such that

$$(5.1) \quad (\partial T_k)_\# \mathbf{C}_{\rho_0}(0) = 0, \quad \Theta(T_k, 0) \geq q, \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|T_k\|(\mathbf{C}_{\rho_0}(0)) = q\omega_n \rho_0^n,$$

$$(5.2) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} E(T_k, P, \mathbf{C}_{\rho_0}(0)) = 0.$$

For each  $k$  we set  $E_k = E(T_k, P, \mathbf{C}_{\rho_0}(0))$ . (More generally, we can take  $E_k > 0$  such that  $E(T_k, P, \mathbf{C}_{\rho_0}(0)) \leq CE_k$  for a suitable constant  $C \in (0, \infty)$ .)

By Lemma 2.5, for each  $\theta \in (0, 1)$  and sufficiently large  $k$

$$(5.3) \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T_k \cap \mathbf{C}_{\theta\rho_0}(0)} \text{dist}(X, P) \leq CE_k \rho_0$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, \theta) \in (0, \infty)$ . Hence arguing as at the beginning of the proof of Lemma 3.8, it follows using (5.1), (5.2), the constancy theorem, and Lemma 2.7 that for each  $\theta \in (0, 1)$  and sufficiently large  $k$ ,

$$\pi_{P\#}(T_k \llcorner \mathbf{C}_{\theta\rho_0}(0)) = \pm q \llbracket P \rrbracket \llcorner \mathbf{C}_{\theta\rho_0}(0).$$

After reversing the orientation of  $T_k$  if necessary, we may assume that for each  $\theta \in (0, 1)$  and sufficiently large  $k$

$$(5.4) \quad \pi_{P\#}(T_k \llcorner \mathbf{C}_{\theta\rho_0}(0)) = q \llbracket P \rrbracket \llcorner \mathbf{C}_{\theta\rho_0}(0).$$

Note that (5.1) and the compactness of area-minimizing integral currents ([Sim83, Theorems 32.2 and 34.5]), after passing to a subsequence there exists an  $n$ -dimensional area-minimizing integral current  $T_\infty$  of  $\mathbf{C}_{\rho_0}(0)$  such that  $T_k \rightarrow T_\infty$  weakly in  $\mathbf{C}_{\rho_0}(0)$ . By (5.3),  $\text{spt } T_\infty \subset P$  and thus by the constancy theorem  $T_\infty \llcorner B_{\rho_0}(0)$  is a constant multiple of  $\llbracket B_{\rho_0}(0) \rrbracket$ . By the continuity of push-forwards of integral currents with respect to weak convergence

$$T_\infty = \pi_{P\#} T_\infty = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \pi_{P\#} T_k = \pi_{P\#} \left( \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} T_k \right) = \pi_{P\#} (q \llbracket P \rrbracket) = q \llbracket P \rrbracket$$

in  $\mathbf{C}_{\rho_0}(0)$ , where each limit is computed with respect to the weak topology. That is,  $T_k \rightarrow q \llbracket P \rrbracket$  weakly in  $\mathbf{C}_{\rho_0}(0)$ .

By Theorem 2.8, Lemma 2.7, and (5.3), for each sufficiently large  $k$  there exists  $\theta_k \in (0, 1)$  with  $\theta_k \rightarrow 1$ , Lipschitz functions  $u_k : B_{\theta_k \rho_0}(0) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$ , and sets  $K_k \subset B_{\theta_k \rho_0}(0)$  such that

$$(5.5) \quad T_k \llcorner (K_k \times \mathbb{R}^m) = (\text{graph } u_k)_\# (K_k \times \mathbb{R}^m),$$

$$(5.6) \quad \mathcal{L}^n(B_{\theta\rho_0}(0) \setminus K_k) + \|T_k\|((B_{\theta\rho_0}(0) \setminus K_k) \times \mathbb{R}^m) \leq C_\theta E_k^{2+2\gamma} \rho_0^n,$$

$$(5.7) \quad \sup_{B_{\theta\rho_0}(0)} |u_k| \leq C_\theta E_k \rho_0, \quad \sup_{B_{\theta\rho_0}(0)} |\nabla u_k| \leq C_\theta E_k^{2\gamma},$$

for each  $\theta \in (0, \theta_k]$ , where  $\gamma = \gamma(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  and  $C_\theta = C(n, m, q, \theta) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants. We will let  $u_k(x) = \sum_{i=1}^q \llbracket u_{k,i}(x) \rrbracket$  and  $u_{k,a}(x) = \frac{1}{q} \sum_{i=1}^q u_{k,i}(x)$  for each  $x \in B_{\theta_k \rho_0}(0)$  and  $Du_k(x) =$

$\sum_{i=1}^q \llbracket Du_{k,i}(x) \rrbracket$  for  $\mathcal{L}^n$ -a.e.  $x \in B_{\theta_k \rho_0}(0)$ , where we follow the conventions from Subsection 2.5. By (5.5)–(5.7), (2.28), (2.29), (2.30), and Lemma 2.7, for each  $\theta \in (0, 1)$  and sufficiently large  $k$

$$(5.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{B_{\theta \rho_0}(0)} |Du_k|^2 &\leq \int_{\mathbf{C}_{\theta \rho_0}(0)} |\vec{T}_k - \vec{P}|^2 d\|T_k\|(X) + CE_k^{2+2\gamma} \rho_0^n \\ &\leq C \int_{\mathbf{C}_{\rho_0}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T_k\|(X) + CE_k^{2+2\gamma} \rho_0^n \leq CE_k^2 \omega_n \rho_0^n, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q, \theta) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants. Hence by [DS11, Proposition 2.11], after passing to a subsequence there is  $q$ -valued function  $w \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(B_{\rho_0}(0), \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m))$  such that

$$(5.9) \quad u_k/E_k \rightarrow w$$

pointwise  $\mathcal{L}^n$ -a.e. on  $B_{\rho_0}(0)$  and strongly in  $L^2(B_{\theta \rho_0}(0), \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m))$  for all  $\theta \in (0, 1)$ . Moreover, arguing as in [DS14, Theorem 4.2] (also see [Alm83, Theorem 2.19]),  $w$  is locally Dirichlet energy minimizing in  $B_{\rho_0}(0)$  and

$$(5.10) \quad |Du_k|/E_k \rightarrow |Dw|$$

in  $L^2(B_{\theta \rho_0}(0))$  for all  $\theta \in (0, 1)$ . We call  $w$  a *blow-up* of  $T_k$  relative to the plane  $P$  in  $\mathbf{C}_{\rho_0}(0)$ . We will let  $w(x) = \sum_{i=1}^q \llbracket w_i(x) \rrbracket$  and  $w_a(x) = \frac{1}{q} \sum_{i=1}^q w_i(x)$  for each  $x \in B_{\rho_0}(0)$  for each  $x \in B_{\theta_k \rho_0}(0)$  and  $Dw(x) = \sum_{i=1}^q \llbracket Dw_i(x) \rrbracket$  for  $\mathcal{L}^n$ -a.e.  $x \in B_{\rho_0}(0)$ , where we follow the conventions from Subsection 2.5.

## 5.2. Blow-up of optimal planes.

**Definition 5.1.** Let  $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ ,  $\rho > 0$ , and  $T$  be an  $n$ -dimensional area-minimizing integral current of  $\mathbf{B}_\rho(Z)$ . We say that an  $n$ -dimensional plane  $\hat{P}$  is an *optimal plane* for  $T$  in  $\mathbf{B}_\rho(Z)$  if

$$(5.11) \quad E(T, \hat{P}, \mathbf{B}_\rho(Z)) = \inf_{P' \in \mathcal{P}} E(T, P', \mathbf{B}_\rho(Z)),$$

where  $\mathcal{P}$  is the set of all  $n$ -dimensional planes in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ .

Notice that since  $\mathcal{P}$  is compact with respect to Hausdorff distance between pairs of planes in  $\mathbf{B}_1(0)$ , at least one optimal plane  $\hat{P}$  as in (5.11) exists. However, we do not claim the optimal plane is unique.

**Lemma 5.2.** *Let  $T_k$  be  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable currents in  $\mathbf{C}_1(0)$  such that (5.1), (5.2), and (5.4) hold true with  $P = P_0 (= \mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\})$  and  $\rho_0 = 1$ . Let  $u_k$  and  $E_k$  be as in Subsection 5.1 with  $\rho_0 = 1$  and assume that  $w \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(B_1(0), \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m))$  is such that (5.9) holds true. Fix  $\rho \in (0, 1)$  and let  $\hat{P}_k$  be an optimal plane for  $T_k$  in  $\mathbf{B}_\rho(0)$ . Then there exists a sequence of  $m \times n$  matrices  $A_k$  such that*

$$(5.12) \quad \hat{P}_k = \{(x, A_k x) : x \in \mathbb{R}^n\}, \quad \|A_k\| \leq C(n, m, q, \rho) E_k,$$

$$(5.13) \quad Dw_a(0) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} A_k/E_k.$$

In particular, in the special case that  $\hat{P}_k = P_0$  for all  $k$ , we have that  $Dw_a(0) = 0$ .



*Proof.* By the triangle inequality, Lemma 2.4, (5.1), and (5.11)

$$\begin{aligned} \|\pi_{\widehat{P}_k} - \pi_{P_0}\|^2 &\leq \frac{2}{q\omega_n(\rho/2)^n} \int_{G_n(\mathbf{B}_{\rho/2}(0))} \|\pi_S - \pi_{\widehat{P}_k}\|^2 d|T_k|(X, S) \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{q\omega_n(\rho/2)^n} \int_{G_n(\mathbf{B}_{\rho/2}(0))} \|\pi_S - \pi_{P_0}\|^2 d|T_k|(X, S) \\ &\leq CE(T_k, \widehat{P}_k, \mathbf{B}_\rho(0))^2 + CE(T_k, P_0, \mathbf{B}_\rho(0))^2 \leq 2CE_k^2, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q, \rho) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant. Hence for each sufficiently large  $k$ , there exists an  $m \times n$  matrix  $A_k$  such that (5.12) holds true.

By (5.12), after passing to a subsequence there is an  $m \times n$  matrix  $\Lambda$  (which a priori depends on  $\rho$  since  $A_k$  depend on  $\rho$ ) such that  $A_k/E_k \rightarrow \Lambda$ . Since this choice of subsequence is arbitrary, it suffices to show that  $\Lambda = Dw_a(0)$ . Let  $M$  be any  $m \times n$  matrix and let  $S_k$  be the  $n$ -dimensional plane defined by  $S_k = \{(x, E_k Mx) : x \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$ . Since  $\widehat{P}_k$  is an optimal plane of  $T_k$  in  $\mathbf{B}_\rho(0)$ ,

$$(5.14) \quad \int_{\mathbf{B}_\rho(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \widehat{P}_k) d|T_k|(X) \leq \int_{\mathbf{B}_\rho(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, S_k) d|T_k|(X)$$

for all  $k$ . Take any point  $X = (x, y) \in \mathbf{B}_1(0)$ . Since  $(x, E_k Mx) \in S_k$ , clearly

$$\text{dist}(X, S_k) \leq |(x, y) - (x, E_k Mx)| = |y - E_k Mx|.$$

On the other hand, if  $x' \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is such that  $|(x, y) - (x', E_k Mx')| = \text{dist}(X, S_k)$ , then clearly  $|x - x'| \leq \text{dist}(X, S_k)$  and  $|y - E_k Mx'| \leq \text{dist}(X, S_k)$  and thus

$$|y - E_k Mx| \leq |y - E_k Mx'| + E_k \|M\| |x - x'| \leq (1 + E_k \|M\|) \text{dist}(X, S_k).$$

By similar reasoning using (5.12),

$$\text{dist}(X, \widehat{P}_k) \leq |y - A_k x| \leq (1 + CE_k) \text{dist}(X, \widehat{P}_k),$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q\rho) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant. Hence dividing both sides of (5.14) by  $E_k^2$  and letting  $k \rightarrow \infty$  using (5.5)–(5.7), (5.9), (2.28), and (2.29),

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_\rho(0)} \mathcal{G}(w, q[\Lambda x])^2 &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{E_k^2} \int_{B_\rho(0)} \mathcal{G}(u_k, q[A_k x])^2 = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{E_k^2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_\rho(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \widehat{P}_k) d|T_k|(X) \\ &\leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{E_k^2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_\rho(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, S_k) d|T_k|(X) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{E_k^2} \int_{B_\rho(0)} \mathcal{G}(u_k, q[E_k Mx])^2 \\ &= \int_{B_\rho(0)} \mathcal{G}(w, q[Mx])^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence by (2.4),

$$\int_{B_\rho(0)} |w_a - \Lambda x|^2 \leq \int_{B_\rho(0)} |w_a - Mx|^2$$

for all  $m \times n$  matrices  $M$ . Since  $w_a$  is harmonic, it follows (using the series expansion for  $w_a$  in terms of  $L^2$  orthogonal spherical harmonics) that  $\Lambda = Dw_a(0)$ . Finally, we note that in the special case  $\widehat{P}_k = P_0$  for all  $k$ , clearly  $A_k = 0$  for all  $k$  and thus  $Dw_a(0) = \Lambda = 0$ .  $\square$

**5.3. Hardt-Simon inequality.** Here for completion we prove the Hardt-Simon inequality, which was introduced in [HS79].

**Lemma 5.3.** *There exists  $\eta = \eta(n) \in (0, 1)$  such that if  $P$  is an  $n$ -dimensional plane in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and  $T$  is an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current in  $\mathbf{B}_1(0)$  such that*

$$(5.15) \quad (\partial T) \llcorner \mathbf{B}_1(0) = 0, \quad \Theta(T, 0) \geq q,$$

$$(5.16) \quad E(T, P, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) < \eta,$$

and  $Z \in \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)$  with  $\Theta(T, Z) \geq q$ , then

$$(5.17) \quad \text{dist}(Z, P) \leq CE(T, P, \mathbf{B}_1(0)), \quad \text{where } C = C(n, m, q), \quad \text{and}$$

$$(5.18) \quad \int_{G_n(\mathbf{B}_{1/4}(Z))} \frac{|\pi_{S^\perp}(X - Z)|^2}{|X - Z|^{n+2}} d|T|(X, S) \leq CE(T, P, \mathbf{B}_1(0))^2$$

where  $C = C(n, m) \in (0, \infty)$ .

*Proof.* Without loss of generality assume  $P = \mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\}$  and let  $Z$  be as in the lemma. By the monotonicity formula for area ([Sim83, 17.5]) and the assumption  $\Theta(T, Z) \geq q$ ,

$$(5.19) \quad \frac{1}{\omega_n} \int_{G_n(\mathbf{B}_{1/4}(Z))} \frac{|\pi_{S^\perp}(X - Z)|^2}{|X - Z|^{n+2}} d|T|(X, S) \leq \frac{\|T\|(\mathbf{B}_{1/4}(Z))}{\omega_n(1/4)^n} - q.$$

Recall that by (5.15), (5.16), and Lemma 2.6, we have that  $\text{dist}(X, P) < 2\eta^{\frac{2}{n+2}}$  for all  $X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{B}_{15/16}(0)$  and we may assume that  $\pi_{P^\#}(T \llcorner \mathbf{C}_{7/8}(0)) = q \llcorner P_0 \llcorner \mathbf{C}_{7/8}(0)$ . By Lemma 2.7 we can bound the right-hand side of (5.19)

$$(5.20) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\|T\|(\mathbf{B}_{1/4}(Z))}{\omega_n(1/4)^n} - q &= \frac{1}{2\omega_n(1/4)^n} \int_{\mathbf{B}_{1/4}(Z)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}|^2 d\|T\| \\ &\leq C \int_{\mathbf{B}_{3/8}(Z)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X) \leq CE(T, P, \mathbf{B}_1(0))^2 \end{aligned}$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m) \in (0, \infty)$ . Combining (5.19) and (5.20) gives us (5.18). On the other hand, writing  $Z = (\xi, \zeta)$  where  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^m$ , for each  $X = (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and each  $n$ -dimensional plane  $S$

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{S^\perp}(X - Z) &= \pi_{S^\perp}(x - \xi, y - \zeta) = \pi_{S^\perp}(x - \xi, 0) + \pi_{S^\perp}(0, y) - \pi_{S^\perp}(0, \zeta) \\ &= (\pi_P - \pi_S)(x - \xi, 0) + \pi_{S^\perp}(0, y) - (0, \zeta) - (\pi_P - \pi_S)(0, \zeta) \end{aligned}$$

and thus by the triangle inequality

$$|\pi_{S^\perp}(X - Z)| \geq |\zeta| - |y| - 2\|\pi_S - \pi_P\|.$$

Hence using Lemma 2.7 and the assumption  $\Theta(T, Z) \geq q$ , we can bound the left-hand side of (5.19) by

$$(5.21) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\omega_n} \int_{G_n(\mathbf{B}_{1/4}(Z))} \frac{|\pi_{S^\perp}(X - Z)|^2}{|X - Z|^{n+2}} d|T|(X, S) &\geq \frac{4^{n+2}}{\omega_n} \int_{\mathbf{B}_{1/4}(Z)} |\pi_{S^\perp}(X - Z)|^2 d\|T\|(X) \\ &\geq \frac{4^{n+1}}{\omega_n} \int_{\mathbf{B}_{1/4}(Z)} |\zeta|^2 d\|T\|(X) - \frac{4^{n+2}}{\omega_n} \int_{\mathbf{B}_{1/4}(Z)} |y|^2 d\|T\|(X) \\ &\quad - \frac{2 \cdot 4^{n+2}}{\omega_n} \int_{G_n(\mathbf{B}_{1/4}(Z))} \|\pi_S - \pi_P\|^2 d|T|(X, S) \\ &\geq |\zeta|^2 \frac{\|T\|(\mathbf{B}_{1/4}(Z))}{\omega_n(1/4)^n} - CE(T, P, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \\ &\geq q|\zeta|^2 - CE(T, P, \mathbf{B}_1(0)), \end{aligned}$$

where  $C = C(n, m) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant. Combining (5.18) and (5.21) gives us (5.17).  $\square$

**Lemma 5.4.** *For  $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$  let  $T_k$  be  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable currents in  $\mathbf{C}_1(0)$  such that (5.1), (5.2), and (5.4) hold true with  $P = P_0$  and  $\rho_0 = 1$ . Let  $E_k = E(T_k, P_0, \mathbf{C}_1(0))$  and  $w$  be a blow-up of  $T_k$  relative to  $P_0$  in  $\mathbf{C}_1(0)$  (as in Subsection 5.1). Let  $Z_k = (\xi_k, \zeta_k) \in \text{spt } T_k \cap \mathbf{C}_{1/2}(0)$  and  $\xi \in \overline{B_{1/2}(0)}$  be such that  $\Theta(T_k, Z_k) \geq q$  and  $\xi_k \rightarrow \xi$ . Then*

- (i)  $\zeta_k/E_k \rightarrow w_a(\xi)$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ ;
- (ii) for each  $\rho \in (0, 1/4]$

$$(5.22) \quad \int_{B_{\rho/4}(\xi)} r^{2-n} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left( \frac{w - w_a(\xi)}{r} \right) \right|^2 \leq C \int_{B_{\rho}(\xi)} |w - w_a(\xi)|^2,$$

where  $r = |x - \xi|$ ,  $w(x) - w_a(\xi) = \sum_{i=1}^q \llbracket w_i(x) - w_a(\xi) \rrbracket$  for each  $x \in B_1(0)$ , and  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant;

- (iii) Assuming  $w \not\equiv q \llbracket w_a(\xi) \rrbracket$  in  $B_1(0)$ ,  $\mathcal{N}_{w-w_a(\xi)}(\xi) \geq 1$ .

*Proof.* Applying (5.18) to  $\eta_{Z_k, \rho/2} \# T_k$  we obtain

$$(5.23) \quad \int_{G_n(\mathbf{B}_{\rho/4}(Z_k))} \frac{|\pi_{S_X^\perp}(X - Z_k)|^2}{|X - Z_k|^{n+2}} d|T_k|(X, S) \leq C \int_{\mathbf{B}_{\rho}(Z_k)} \text{dist}^2(X, Z_k + P) d|T_k|(X)$$

for each  $\rho \in (0, 1/4]$ . Let  $u_k$  be as in Subsection 5.1 with  $\rho_0 = 1$ . Let  $u_k(x) - \zeta_k = \sum_{i=1}^q \llbracket u_{k,i}(x) - \zeta_k \rrbracket$  for each  $x \in B_{\theta_k}(0)$ . By [DS11, Theorem 1.13],  $u_k$  is differentiable in the sense of [DS11, Definition 1.9] at  $\mathcal{L}^n$ -a.e.  $x \in B_{3/4}(0)$ . Hence given  $x \in B_{3/4}(0)$  at which  $u_k$  is differentiable,  $\frac{\partial}{\partial r_k}(x, u_{k,i}(x))$  is tangent to the graph of  $u_k$  at  $X = (x, u_{k,i}(x))$ , where  $r_k = |x - \xi_k|$ . It follows that

$$|\pi_{S_X^\perp}(X - Z_k)| = |\pi_{S_X^\perp}(x - \xi_k, u_{k,i}(x) - \zeta_k)| = r_k^2 \left| \pi_{S_X^\perp} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial r_k} \left( \frac{(x - \xi_k, u_{k,i}(x) - \zeta_k)}{r_k} \right) \right) \right|,$$

where  $S_X$  is the approximate tangent plane to the graph of  $u_k$  at  $X = (x, u_{k,i}(x))$ . Since  $\|\pi_{S_X} - \pi_P\| \leq C(n, m) \text{Lip } u_k \leq C(n, m, q) E_k^{2\gamma}$  is small,

$$(5.24) \quad |\pi_{S_X^\perp}(X - Z_k)| \geq \frac{1}{2} r_k^2 \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial r_k} \left( \frac{(x - \xi_k, u_{k,i}(x) - \zeta_k)}{r_k} \right) \right| = \frac{1}{2} r_k^2 \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial r_k} \left( \frac{u_{k,i}(x) - \zeta_k}{r_k} \right) \right|.$$

Hence using (5.24) to bound the left-hand side of (5.23) and using (5.5)–(5.7),

$$(5.25) \quad \int_{\mathbf{C}_{\rho/4}(\xi_k)} \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{r_k^4}{(r_k^2 + |u_{k,i}(x) - \zeta_k|^2)^{(n+2)/2}} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial r_k} \left( \frac{u_{k,i}(x) - \zeta_k}{r_k} \right) \right|^2 \leq C \int_{\mathbf{B}_{\rho}(\xi_k)} |u_k - \zeta_k|^2 + C E_k^{2+\gamma}$$

for each  $\rho \in (0, 1/4]$ . Since  $\xi_k \rightarrow \xi$ ,  $r_k \rightarrow r$  uniformly in  $B_{3/4}(0)$ . By (5.17), after passing to a subsequence there exists  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^m$  such that  $\zeta_k/E_k \rightarrow \lambda$ . Let  $N(m, q) \geq 1$  be an integer and  $\xi : \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$  be the bi-Lipschitz injection as in [DS11, Corollary 2.2]. By [DS11, Corollary 2.2], (5.7), (5.8), and (5.17), for each  $\delta \in (0, 1/4)$

$$\left\| \xi \circ \left( \frac{u_{k,i} - \zeta_k}{r_k E_k} \right) \right\|_{W^{1,2}(B_{3/4}(0) \setminus B_\delta(\xi))} \leq \frac{\|u_{k,i}\|_{W^{1,2}(B_{3/4}(0))} + \omega_n^{1/2} (3/4)^{n/2} |\zeta_k|}{\delta E_k} \leq \frac{C(n, m, q)}{\delta}.$$

Thus using the Rellich compactness theorem (Lemma 1 in Section 1.3 of [Sim96]) and recalling (5.9) and  $\zeta_k/E_k \rightarrow \lambda$ , after passing to a subsequence

$$\xi \circ \left( \frac{u_{k,i}(x) - \zeta_k}{r_k E_k} \right) \rightarrow \xi \circ \left( \frac{w_i(x) - \lambda}{r} \right)$$

strongly in  $L^2(B_{3/4}(0) \setminus B_\delta(\xi), \mathbb{R}^N)$  and weakly in  $W^{1,2}(B_{3/4}(0) \setminus B_\delta(\xi), \mathbb{R}^N)$  for each  $\delta \in (0, 1/4)$ . It follows that

$$r_k^{(2-n)/2} \frac{\partial}{\partial r_k} \left( \xi \circ \left( \frac{u_{k,i}(x) - \zeta_k}{r_k E_k} \right) \right) \rightarrow r^{(2-n)/2} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left( \xi \circ \left( \frac{w_i(x) - \lambda}{r} \right) \right)$$

weakly in  $L^2(B_{3/4}(0) \setminus B_\delta(\xi), \mathbb{R}^N)$  for each  $\delta \in (0, 1/4)$ . Hence for each  $\rho \in (0, 1]$  and  $\delta \in (0, \rho/16]$

$$\int_{B_{\rho/8}(\xi) \setminus B_\delta(\xi)} r^{2-n} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left( \xi \circ \left( \frac{w - \lambda}{r} \right) \right) \right|^2 \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_{\rho/8}(\xi_k) \setminus B_\delta(\xi)} r^{2-n} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left( \xi \circ \left( \frac{u_k - \zeta_k}{r_k E_k} \right) \right) \right|^2,$$

or equivalently using [DS11, Corollary 2.2]

$$(5.26) \quad \int_{B_{\rho/8}(\xi) \setminus B_\delta(\xi)} r^{2-n} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left( \frac{w - \lambda}{r} \right) \right|^2 \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{E_k^2} \int_{B_{\rho/8}(\xi_k) \setminus B_\delta(\xi)} r_k^{2-n} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial r_k} \left( \frac{u_k - \zeta_k}{r_k} \right) \right|^2.$$

Dividing both sides of (5.25) by  $E_k$  and letting  $k \rightarrow \infty$  using (5.9), (5.26), and  $\zeta_k/E_k \rightarrow \lambda$ ,

$$\int_{B_{\rho/8}(\xi) \setminus B_\delta(\xi)} r^{2-n} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left( \frac{w - \lambda}{r} \right) \right|^2 = C \int_{B_\rho(\xi)} |w - \lambda|^2$$

for each  $\rho \in (0, 1]$  and  $\delta \in (0, \rho/16]$  and for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$ . Letting  $\delta \rightarrow 0^+$ ,

$$(5.27) \quad \int_{B_{\rho/8}(\xi)} r^{2-n} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left( \frac{w - \lambda}{r} \right) \right|^2 \leq C \int_{B_\rho(\xi)} |w - \lambda|^2$$

for each  $\rho \in (0, 1]$  and for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$ . By (2.4),

$$(5.28) \quad \int_{B_{\rho/8}(\xi)} r^{2-n} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left( \frac{w_a - \lambda}{r} \right) \right|^2 \leq C \int_{B_\rho(\xi)} |w - \lambda|^2$$

for each  $\rho \in (0, 1]$  and for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$ . Since  $w_a$  is harmonic, it follows using the series expansion of  $w_a(x - \xi)$  that in order for (5.28) to hold true we must have that  $\lambda = w_a(\xi)$ . This together with (5.27) completes the proof of conclusions (i) and (ii).

To show conclusion (iii), suppose that  $w \not\equiv q[[w_a(\xi)]]$  in  $B_1(0)$ . Let  $\varphi$  be a tangent function of  $w - w_a(\xi)$  at  $\xi$ ; that is, for some sequence of radii  $\rho_j \rightarrow 0$ ,

$$w_j(x) = \frac{w(\xi + \rho_j x) - w_a(\xi)}{\|w - w_a(\xi)\|_{L^2(B_{\rho_j}(\xi))}} \rightarrow \varphi(x)$$

uniformly on compact subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ . By rescaling (5.22) with  $\rho = \rho_j$ ,

$$\int_{B_{1/8}(0)} r^{2-n} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left( \frac{w_j}{r} \right) \right|^2 \leq C$$

for each  $j$ . Hence letting  $j \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$(5.29) \quad \int_{B_{1/8}(0)} r^{2-n} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left( \frac{\varphi}{r} \right) \right|^2 \leq C.$$

Since  $\varphi$  is homogeneous of degree  $\mathcal{N}_{w-w_a(\xi)}(\xi)$ , in order for (5.29) to hold true we must have that  $\mathcal{N}_{w-w_a(\xi)}(\xi) \geq 1$ .  $\square$

#### 5.4. Continuity properties of the planar frequency function with respect to blowing up of currents.

**Lemma 5.5.** *For  $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ , let  $T_k$  be  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable currents in  $\mathbf{C}_1(0)$  such that (5.1), (5.2), and (5.4) hold true with  $P = P_0$  and  $\rho_0 = 1$ . Let  $E_k = E(T_k, P_0, \mathbf{C}_1(0))$  and  $w$  be a blow-up of  $T_k$  relative to  $P_0$  in  $\mathbf{C}_1(0)$  (as in Subsection 5.1). For  $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ , let  $A_k$  be an  $m \times n$  matrix,*

$$(5.30) \quad P_k = \{(x, A_k x) : x \in \mathbb{R}^n\}, \quad \text{and suppose that } A_k/E_k \rightarrow \Lambda$$

for some  $m \times n$  matrix  $\Lambda$ . Let  $Z_k = (\xi_k, \zeta_k) \in \mathbf{C}_1(0)$ ,  $\xi \in B_1(0)$ , and  $\rho_k, \rho \in (0, 1 - |\xi|)$  be such that  $\xi_k \rightarrow \xi$  and  $\rho_k \rightarrow \rho$ . Let  $\ell(x) = w_a(\xi) + \Lambda(x - \xi)$ , and  $(w - \ell)(x) = \sum_{i=1}^q \llbracket w_i(x) - \ell(x) \rrbracket$  for each  $x \in B_1(0)$ . Assume that  $w \not\equiv q \llbracket \ell \rrbracket$  on  $B_1(0)$ . Then  $w - \ell$  is locally Dirichlet energy minimizing and

$$(5.31) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} N_{T_k, P_k, Z_k}(\rho_k) = N_{w-\ell, \xi}(\rho)$$

where  $N_{w-\ell, \xi}$  is the Almgren frequency function (defined in Section 2.6).

*Proof.* The fact that  $w - \ell$  is locally Dirichlet energy minimizing follows from [Alm83, Theorem 2.6(3)]. Let  $u_k, \theta_k$  be as in Subsection 5.1 with  $\rho_0 = 1$ . Let  $\ell_k(x) = \zeta_k + A_k(x - \xi_k)$  and  $(u_k - \ell_k)(x) = \sum_{i=1}^q \llbracket u_{k,i}(x) - \ell_k(x) \rrbracket$  for each  $x \in B_{\theta_k}(0)$ . Let  $r_k = r_k(x) = |x - \xi_k|$  and  $r = r(x) = |x - \xi|$  for each  $x \in B_1(0)$ . Extend  $r_k$  and  $r$  to functions of  $X = (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  which are independent of  $y$ . Notice that  $\xi_k \rightarrow \xi$ ,  $r_k \rightarrow r$  uniformly on  $B_1(0)$ ,  $\phi'(r_k/\rho_k) \rightarrow \phi'(r/\rho)$  pointwise on  $B_1(0) \setminus (\partial B_{\rho/2}(\xi) \cup \partial B_\rho(\xi))$ , and  $\nabla r_k \rightarrow \nabla r$  uniformly in  $B_1(0) \setminus B_{\rho/4}(\xi)$ . By Lemma 5.4,  $\zeta_k/E_k \rightarrow w_a(\xi)$  and thus by (5.30) we have that  $\ell_k/E_k \rightarrow \ell$  uniformly in  $B_1(0)$ . At  $\mathcal{H}^n$ -a.e.  $X = (x, u_{k,l}(x)) \in \text{spt graph } u_k$

$$|\nabla^{S_X} r_k|^2 = \sum_{i,j=1}^n G^{ij}(Du_{k,l}) D_i r_k D_j r_k$$

where  $S_X$  is the approximate tangent plane to  $\text{spt graph } u_k$  at  $X$ . In particular, by (5.7) and (2.28),  $1 - C(n, m, q, \theta) E_k^{2\gamma} \leq |\nabla^{S_X} r_k|^2 \leq 1$ . Hence using (5.5)–(5.7), (5.9), (2.28), and (2.29),

$$(5.32) \quad \begin{aligned} H_{w-\ell, \xi}(\rho) &= -\rho^{1-n} \int |w - \ell|^2 \frac{1}{r} \phi'(r/\rho) \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{\rho_k^{1-n}}{E_k^2} \int |u_k - \ell_k|^2 \frac{1}{r_k} \phi'(r_k/\rho_k) \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{\rho_k^{1-n}}{E_k^2} \int \text{dist}^2(X, Z_k + P_k) |\nabla^S r_k|^2 \frac{1}{r_k} \phi'(r_k/\rho_k) d|T_k|(X, S) \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{H_{T_k, P_k, Z_k}(\rho_k)}{E_k^2}. \end{aligned}$$

By (5.7), (5.8), (5.9), (2.4), and Rellich's compactness theorem, after passing to a subsequence  $u_{k,a}/E_k \rightarrow w_a$  weakly in  $W^{1,2}(B_\theta(0), \mathbb{R}^m)$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  for each  $\theta \in (0, 1)$ . Thus using (5.5)–(5.8),

(5.10), (2.28), (2.29), (2.31), and (5.30),

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.33) \quad D_{w-\ell, \xi}(\rho) &= \rho^{2-n} \int |Dw - \Lambda|^2 \phi(r/\rho) \\
&= \rho^{2-n} \int (|Dw|^2 - 2q Dw_a \cdot \Lambda + q|\Lambda|^2) \phi(r/\rho_k) \\
&= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\rho_k^{2-n}}{E_k^2} \int (|Du_k|^2 - 2q Du_{k,a} \cdot A_k + q|A_k|^2) \phi(r_k/\rho_k) dx d\tau \\
&= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\rho_k^{2-n}}{E_k^2} \int |Du_k - A_k|^2 \phi(r_k/\rho_k) dx d\tau \\
&= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\rho_k^{2-n}}{2E_k^2} \int \|\pi_S - \pi_{P_k}\|^2 \phi(r_k/\rho_k) d|T_k|(X, S) \\
&= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{D_{T_k, P_k, Z_k}(\rho_k)}{E_k^2}
\end{aligned}$$

(where  $Du_k(x) - A_k = \sum_{i=1}^q \llbracket Du_{k,i}(x) - A_k \rrbracket$  and  $Dw(x) - \Lambda = \sum_{i=1}^q \llbracket Dw_i(x) - \Lambda \rrbracket$  for  $\mathcal{L}^n$ -a.e.  $x \in B_\rho(\xi)$ ). By dividing (5.33) by (5.32) and noting that since  $w - \ell$  is non-zero we have  $H_{w-\ell, \xi}(\rho) > 0$ , we obtain (5.31).  $\square$

**Corollary 5.6.** *There exists  $\eta = \eta(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  such that the following holds true. For  $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$  let  $T_k$  be  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable currents in  $\mathbf{C}_3(0)$  such that (5.1), (5.2), and (5.4) hold true with  $P = P_0$  and  $\rho_0 = 3$ . Let  $E_k = E(T_k, P_0, \mathbf{C}_3(0))$  and let  $w$  be a blow-up of  $T_k$  relative to  $P$  in  $\mathbf{C}_3(0)$  (as in Subsection 5.1). Let  $Z_k = (\xi_k, \zeta_k) \in \text{spt } T_k \cap \mathbf{C}_1(0)$  such that  $\Theta(T_k, Z_k) \geq q$  and suppose that for some  $\alpha > 0$  and for some  $n$ -dimensional plane  $P_k$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ ,*

$$(5.34) \quad E(T_k, P_k, \mathbf{C}_{7\rho/4}(Z_k, P_k)) \leq \eta \rho^\alpha \text{ for all } \rho \in (0, 1].$$

Let  $\xi_k \rightarrow \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Let  $\ell_\xi(x) = w_a(\xi) - Dw_a(\xi) \cdot (x - \xi)$  and  $w(x) - \ell_\xi(x) = \sum_{i=1}^q \llbracket w_i(x) - \ell_\xi(x) \rrbracket$  for each  $x \in B_3(0)$ . Assume that  $w \not\equiv q \llbracket \ell_\xi \rrbracket$  on  $B_3(0)$ . Then  $w - \ell_\xi$  is locally Dirichlet energy minimizing and

$$(5.35) \quad \mathcal{N}_{w-\ell_\xi}(\xi) \geq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{N}_{T_k, P_1}(Z_k).$$

*Proof.* The fact that  $w - \ell_\xi$  is locally Dirichlet energy minimizing follows from [Alm83, Theorem 2.6(3)]. First we show that there exists an  $m \times n$  matrix  $A_k$  such that

$$(5.36) \quad P_k = \{(x, A_k x) : x \in \mathbb{R}^n\}, \quad \|A_k\| \leq C(n, m, q, \alpha) E_k, \text{ and}$$

$$(5.37) \quad A_k/E_k \rightarrow Dw_a(\xi).$$

By Lemma 2.7,  $\mathcal{E}(T, P_0, \mathbf{C}_{7/4}(Z_k, P_k)) \leq (14/23)^{n/2} \mathcal{E}(T, P_0, \mathbf{C}_{23/8}(0, P_0)) \leq C(n, m) E_k$  for all sufficiently large  $k$ . Thus by (2.11) and (5.4),  $\|T_k\|(\mathbf{C}_{7/4}(Z_k, P_k)) \leq (q + C(n, m) E_k^2) \omega_n (7/4)^n$ . Hence by Corollary 4.3,  $\mathcal{N}_{T_k, P_1}(Z_k) \geq 1 + \alpha$ . For  $\theta = \theta(n, m, q, \alpha) \in (0, 1]$  sufficiently small, by Corollary 4.3

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.38) \quad E(T_k, P_k, \mathbf{C}_\rho(Z_k, P_k)) &\leq e^{C(\mathcal{N}_{T_k, P_1}(Z_k)+2)\eta^{2\gamma}/(4\alpha\gamma)} \rho^{\mathcal{N}_{T_k, P_1}(Z_k)-1} E(T_k, P_k, \mathbf{C}_1(Z_k, P_k)) \\
&\leq e^{C(3+\alpha)\eta^{2\gamma}/(4\alpha\gamma)} (e^{C\eta^{2\gamma}/(4\alpha\gamma)} \theta)^{\mathcal{N}_{T_k, P_1}(Z_k)-1-\alpha} \rho^\alpha E(T_k, P_k, \mathbf{C}_1(Z_k, P_k)) \\
&\leq C \rho^\alpha E(T_k, P_k, \mathbf{C}_1(Z_k, P_k))
\end{aligned}$$

for all  $\rho \in (0, \theta]$ , where  $C = C(n, m, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants. By the triangle inequality, Lemma 2.4, (5.1), and (5.38)

$$(5.39) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\pi_{P_k} - \pi_{P_0}\|^2 &\leq \frac{2}{q\omega_n\rho^n} \int_{G_n(\mathbf{C}_\rho(Z_k, P_k))} \|\pi_S - \pi_{P_k}\|^2 d|T_k|(X, S) \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{q\omega_n\rho^n} \int_{G_n(\mathbf{C}_\rho(Z_k, P_k))} \|\pi_S - \pi_{P_0}\|^2 d|T_k|(X, S) \\ &\leq CE(T_k, P_k, \mathbf{C}_{2\rho}(Z_k, P_k))^2 + CE(T_k, P_0, \mathbf{C}_{2\rho}(Z_k, P_k))^2 \\ &\leq C\rho^{2\alpha}E(T_k, P_k, \mathbf{C}_1(Z_k, P_k))^2 + C\rho^{-n-2}E(T_k, P_0, \mathbf{B}_3(0))^2 \end{aligned}$$

for all  $\rho \in (0, \theta/2]$ , where  $C = C(n, m, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants. Noting that  $|\text{dist}(X, Z_k + P_k) - \text{dist}(X, Z_k + P_0)| \leq \|\pi_{P_k} - \pi_{P_0}\| \|X - Z_k\|$  for all  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  and using the triangle inequality, the fact that  $\|T_k\|(\mathbf{C}_{7/4}(Z_k, P_k)) \leq (q + \delta)\omega_n(7/4)^n$ , and (5.39)

$$\begin{aligned} E(T_k, P_k, \mathbf{C}_1(Z_k, P_k))^2 &\leq 2E(T_k, P_0, \mathbf{C}_1(Z_k, P_k))^2 + 2(q + 1)\omega_n \|\pi_{P_k} - \pi_{P_0}\|^2 \\ &\leq C\rho^{2\alpha}E(T_k, P_k, \mathbf{C}_1(Z_k, P_k)) + C\rho^{-n-2}E(T_k, P_0, \mathbf{B}_3(0))^2 \end{aligned}$$

for all  $\rho \in (0, \theta]$ , where  $C = C(n, m, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant. Choosing  $\rho = \rho(n, m, q, \alpha) \in (0, \theta]$  sufficiently small,

$$(5.40) \quad E(T_k, P_k, \mathbf{C}_1(Z_k, P_k)) \leq CE_k,$$

where we recall that  $E_k = E(T_k, P_0, \mathbf{B}_3(0))$  and where  $C = C(n, m, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant. Hence by (5.39)

$$(5.41) \quad \|\pi_{P_k} - \pi_{P_0}\| \leq CE_k$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$ . It follows that for each  $k \in \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$  there exists an  $m \times n$  matrix  $A_k$  such that (5.36) holds true. Thus after passing to a subsequence there exists an  $m \times n$  matrix  $\Lambda$  such that  $A_k/E_k \rightarrow \Lambda$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . By (5.38) and (5.40),

$$(5.42) \quad E(T_k, P_k, \mathbf{C}_\rho(Z_k, P_k)) \leq C\rho^\alpha E_k$$

for each  $k$ , where  $C = C(n, m, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant. Dividing both sides of (5.42) by  $E_k$  and letting  $k \rightarrow \infty$  using (5.5)–(5.7), (5.9), (2.28), (2.29), and the fact that  $\zeta_k/E_k \rightarrow w_a(\xi)$  and  $A_k/E_k \rightarrow \Lambda$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{B_\rho(\xi)} \mathcal{G}(w, q\llbracket w_a(\xi) + \Lambda \cdot (x - \xi) \rrbracket)^2 \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{E_k^2} \int_{B_\rho(\xi)} \mathcal{G}(u_k, q\llbracket \zeta_k + A_k(x - \xi_k) \rrbracket)^2 \\ &\leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{E_k^2} \int_{\mathbf{C}_\rho(\xi_k)} \text{dist}^2(X, P_k) d|T_k|(X) \leq C\rho^{n+2+2\alpha} \end{aligned}$$

for all  $\rho \in (0, \theta]$ , where  $C = C(n, m, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant. Hence by (2.4),

$$(5.43) \quad \int_{B_\rho(\xi)} |w_a - w_a(\xi) - \Lambda \cdot (x - \xi)|^2 \leq C\rho^{n+2+2\alpha}$$

for all  $\rho \in (0, \theta]$ , where  $C = C(n, m, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant. Since  $w_a$  is harmonic, it follows using the series expansion of  $w_a(x - \xi)$  that in order for (5.43) to hold true we must have that  $\Lambda = Dw_a(\xi)$ , completing the proof of (5.37). Now by Lemma 5.5 and Theorem 3.4

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{N}_{T_k, \text{Pl}}(Z_k) \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} e^{C\eta^\gamma \rho^{\alpha\gamma}} \mathcal{N}_{T_k, P_k, Z_k}(\rho) = e^{C\eta^\gamma \rho^{\alpha\gamma}} \mathcal{N}_{w-\ell, \xi}(\rho)$$

for each  $\rho \in (0, 1]$ . Letting  $\rho \rightarrow 0^+$  gives us (5.35).  $\square$

## 6. SCALES WITH PLANAR FREQUENCY PINCHING, OR WITHOUT FLATNESS, OR WITHOUT DECAY

In Lemma 6.2 below, we show that if a locally area-minimizing rectifiable current  $T$  in  $\mathbf{B}_8(0)$  with no boundary in  $\mathbf{B}_8(0)$  is sufficiently close to a multiplicity  $q$  plane  $P$  and if the planar frequency function value  $N_{T,P,0}(2) \lesssim 1$ , then  $T$  is well-approximated by the graph of a homogeneous degree one Dirichlet energy minimizing function in  $\mathbf{C}_1(0)$ . As a consequence, we draw the conclusion that

- (i) either  $T$  is significantly closer to a sum of two or more planes intersecting along a common  $(n-2)$ -dimensional axis than to any plane, or
- (ii) the points of  $T$  of density  $\geq q$  concentrate near an  $(n-3)$ -dimensional linear subspace.

In Section 7 we will use this in combination with monotonicity of the planar frequency function (Theorem 3.4) to argue that if  $T$  is decaying to a plane  $P$  in the sense that (3.7) holds true for all  $\rho \in [\sigma_0, \rho_0]$  and if  $N_{T,P,0}(\rho_0) \lesssim 1$ , then  $N_{T,P,0}(\rho) \lesssim 1$  for all  $\rho \in [\sigma_0, \rho_0]$  and thus  $T$  satisfies the above conclusion in  $\mathbf{C}_{\rho/2}(0)$ .

We shall also need to consider scales where (3.7) does not hold true, i.e. where  $T$  is not decaying towards a plane. We look at this in Subsections 6.2 and 6.3. We show in this setting that the frequency of  $T$  relative to a plane, not necessarily optimal, is  $\lesssim 1$ . We also show that  $T$  is close to either an area-minimizing cone or the graph of a homogeneous degree one Dirichlet energy minimizing function in  $\mathbf{B}_1(0)$ , and thus the conclusion of Lemma 6.2 again holds true.

In what follows, we shall use the notation  $\mathcal{P}$  to denote the set of all  $n$ -dimensional planes in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ . We will also use the following:

**Definition 6.1.** Let  $q$  be a positive integer. We denote by  $\mathcal{C}_q$  the set of all  $n$ -dimensional currents  $\mathbf{C}$  of the form  $\mathbf{C} = \sum_{i=1}^p q_i \llbracket P_i \rrbracket$  where:

- (i)  $p \geq 2$ ,  $q_i \geq 1$  are integers such that  $\sum_{i=1}^p q_i = q$ ;
- (ii)  $P_i$  are  $n$ -dimensional oriented planes;
- (iii) there is an  $(n-2)$ -dimensional subspace  $L = \text{spine } \mathbf{C}$  such that  $P_i \cap P_j = L$  for all  $i \neq j$ .

Note that  $\mathcal{C}_q$  contains  $n$ -dimensional area-minimizing integral cones  $\mathbf{C}$  such that  $\Theta(\mathbf{C}, 0) = q$  and  $\dim \text{spine } \mathbf{C} = n-2$ .  $\mathcal{C}_q$  also contains graphs of all homogeneous degree one, locally Dirichlet energy minimizing  $q$ -valued functions  $w \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m))$  with  $\dim \text{spine } w = n-2$ .

Given  $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ ,  $\rho > 0$ , an  $n$ -dimensional current  $T$  of  $\mathbf{B}_\rho(Z)$ , and  $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_q$ , we define

$$E(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_\rho(Z)) = \left( \frac{1}{\rho^{n+2}} \int_{\mathbf{B}_\rho(Z)} \text{dist}^2(X, Z + \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|T\|(X) \right)^{1/2},$$

$$Q(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_\rho(Z)) = \left( \frac{1}{\rho^{n+2}} \int_{\mathbf{B}_\rho(Z)} \text{dist}^2(X, Z + \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|T\|(X) \right. \\ \left. + \frac{1}{\rho^{n+2}} \int_{\mathbf{B}_\rho(0) \cap \{X: \text{dist}(X, \text{spine } \mathbf{C}) \geq \rho/16\}} \text{dist}^2(Z + X, \text{spt } T) d\|\mathbf{C}\|(X) \right)^{1/2}.$$

**6.1. Planar frequency pinching near one.** First we show that if  $T$  has density  $\geq q$  at the origin and  $T$  is sufficiently close to a multiplicity  $q$  plane, and if the planar frequency function value is not much larger than 1 (as in (6.4)), then  $T$  is significantly closer to the graph of a non-zero homogeneous degree one Dirichlet energy minimizing function than it is to any plane.

**Lemma 6.2.** *For every  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$  and  $\beta \in (0, 1)$  there exists  $\delta = \delta(n, m, q, \varepsilon, \beta) \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\eta = \eta(n, m, q, \varepsilon, \beta) \in (0, 1)$ , and  $\nu = \nu(n, m, q, \varepsilon, \beta) \in (0, 1)$  such that if  $T$  is an  $n$ -dimensional locally*



area-minimizing rectifiable current in  $\mathbf{B}_8(0)$ ,  $P \in \mathcal{P}$ ,  $\text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{B}_2(0) \not\subset P$  and if

$$(6.1) \quad (\partial T) \llcorner \mathbf{B}_8(0) = 0, \quad \Theta(T, 0) \geq q, \quad \|T\|(\mathbf{B}_8(0)) \leq (q + \delta) \omega_n 8^n,$$

$$(6.2) \quad E(T, P, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) = \inf_{P' \in \mathcal{P}} E(T, P', \mathbf{B}_1(0)),$$

$$(6.3) \quad E(T, P, \mathbf{B}_4(0)) < \eta, \quad \text{and}$$

$$(6.4) \quad N_{T \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{15/4}(0), P, 0}(2) < 1 + \nu$$

then for each  $\rho \in [1/2, 1]$  one of the following conclusions (i) or (ii) holds true:

(i) there exists  $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_q$  such that

$$(6.5) \quad E(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_\rho(0)) < \varepsilon,$$

$$(6.6) \quad Q(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_\rho(0)) \leq \beta \inf_{P' \in \mathcal{P}} E(T, P', \mathbf{B}_\rho(0)),$$

$$(6.7) \quad \{X \in \mathbf{B}_\rho(0) : \Theta(T, X) \geq q\} \subset \{X \in \mathbf{B}_\rho(0) : \text{dist}(X, \text{spine } \mathbf{C}) < \varepsilon \rho\};$$

(ii) there is an  $(n - 3)$ -dimensional linear subspace  $L$  such that

$$(6.8) \quad \{X \in \mathbf{B}_\rho(0) : \Theta(T, X) \geq q\} \subset \{X \in \mathbf{B}_\rho(0) : \text{dist}(X, L) < \varepsilon \rho\}.$$

*Proof of Lemma 6.2.* Without loss of generality suppose that  $P = \mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\}$ . Fix  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$  and  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ . Suppose that for  $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$  there exist  $\delta_k \rightarrow 0^+$ ,  $\eta_k \rightarrow 0^+$ ,  $\nu_k \rightarrow 0^+$ , and an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current  $T_k$  of  $\mathbf{B}_8(0)$  such that (6.1)–(6.4) hold true with  $\delta_k$ ,  $\eta_k$ ,  $\nu_k$ , and  $T_k$  in place of  $\delta$ ,  $\eta$ ,  $\nu$ , and  $T$ . We want to show that for infinitely many  $k$  either conclusion (i) or conclusion (ii) holds true. Arguing as in Subsection 5.1, by (6.1) and (6.3) after passing to a subsequence we may assume that  $T_k \rightarrow q\llbracket P \rrbracket$  weakly in  $\mathbf{B}_4(0)$ . By Lemma 2.5 and (6.3),

$$(6.9) \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T_k \cap \mathbf{B}_{15/4}(0)} \text{dist}(X, P) \leq C \eta_k$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m) \in (0, \infty)$ . Set  $\tilde{T}_k = T_k \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{15/4}(0)$  so that by (6.1) and the monotonicity formula for area,  $(\partial \tilde{T}_k) \llcorner \mathbf{C}_{7/2}(0) = 0$  and

$$\|\tilde{T}_k\|(\mathbf{C}_{7/2}(0)) \leq \|\tilde{T}_k\|(\mathbf{B}_{7/2+C\eta_k}(0)) \leq (q + \delta_k) \omega_n (7/2 + C\eta_k)^n,$$

where  $C$  is as in (6.9). Let  $\theta_k \in (0, 1)$  with  $\theta_k \rightarrow 1^+$ , and let  $u_k : B_{2\theta_k}(0) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$  and  $K_k \subset B_{2\theta_k}(0)$  be such that (5.5)–(5.7) hold true with  $\rho_0 = 2$  and  $E_k = E(\tilde{T}_k, P, \mathbf{C}_2(0))$ . Let  $w$  be a blow-up of  $\tilde{T}_k$  relative to  $P$  in  $\mathbf{C}_2(0)$  (as in Subsection 5.1).

We argue using (6.4) and Corollary 4.3 that  $w$  is non-zero. Note that by (6.3)

$$(6.10) \quad E(\tilde{T}_k, P, \mathbf{C}_{7\rho/4}(0)) < (32/7)^{(n+2)/2} \eta_k \leq 2(32/7)^{(n+2)/2} \eta_k \left(\frac{\rho}{2}\right)^\alpha$$

for all  $\rho \in [1/4, 2]$  and all sufficiently large  $k$ , where  $\alpha = 1/2$ . By (6.1) and (6.10) we can apply Lemma 3.9, in particular (3.28) together with (3.38), to obtain

$$(6.11) \quad \frac{1}{2} H_{\tilde{T}_k, P, 0}(\rho) \leq -\frac{1}{\rho^n} \int_{\mathbf{C}_\rho(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) \phi'(r/\rho) d\|\tilde{T}_k\|(X) \leq (1 + C\eta_k^{2\gamma}) H_{\tilde{T}_k, P, 0}(\rho)$$

for all  $\rho \in [1/4, 2]$ , where  $\gamma = \gamma(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  and  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants. Again by (6.1) and (6.10) we can apply Theorem 3.4 and (6.4) to see that

$$(6.12) \quad N_{\tilde{T}_k, P, 0}(\rho) \leq e^{C\eta_k^{2\gamma}} N_{\tilde{T}_k, P, 0}(2) < e^{C\eta_k^{2\gamma}} (1 + \nu_k)$$

for all  $\rho \in [1/4, 2]$ , where  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant. Moreover, by Corollary 4.3,

$$(6.13) \quad H_{\tilde{T}_k, P, 0}(2\rho) \leq e^{C\eta_k^{2\gamma}} 2^{2e^{C\eta_k^\gamma(1+\nu_k)}} H_{\tilde{T}_k, P, 0}(\rho) \leq 8 H_{\tilde{T}_k, P, 0}(\rho)$$

for all  $\rho \in [1/4, 1]$  and all sufficiently large  $k$ , where  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant. Thus, by the fact that  $\phi'(r/\rho) = 2$  if  $\rho/2 \leq r \leq \rho$ , (6.11), and (6.13),

$$\frac{1}{2^{n+2}} \int_{\mathbf{C}_{2\rho}(0) \setminus \mathbf{C}_\rho(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|\tilde{T}_k\|(X) \leq 8 \int_{\mathbf{C}_\rho(0) \setminus \mathbf{C}_{\rho/2}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|\tilde{T}_k\|(X)$$

for all  $\rho \in [1/4, 1]$ . Thus

$$\begin{aligned} E_k^2 &= \int_{\mathbf{C}_2(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|\tilde{T}_k\|(X) \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbf{C}_{1/4}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|\tilde{T}_k\|(X) + \int_{\mathbf{C}_{1/2}(0) \setminus \mathbf{C}_{1/4}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|\tilde{T}_k\|(X) \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0) \setminus \mathbf{C}_{1/2}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|\tilde{T}_k\|(X) + \int_{\mathbf{C}_2(0) \setminus \mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|\tilde{T}_k\|(X) \\ &\leq (1 + 2^{n+5} + 2^{2(n+5)} + 2^{3(n+5)}) \int_{\mathbf{C}_{1/4}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|\tilde{T}_k\|(X) \\ &\leq \frac{2^{4(n+5)} - 1}{2^{n+5} - 1} \int_{\mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|\tilde{T}_k\|(X) \end{aligned}$$

Hence using (5.5)–(5.7), (5.9), (2.28) and (2.29)

$$(6.14) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{2^{n+5} - 1}{2^{4(n+5)} - 1} &\leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{E_k^2} \int_{\mathbf{C}_{1/2}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|\tilde{T}_k\|(X) \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{E_k^2} \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} |u_k|^2 = \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} |w|^2. \end{aligned}$$

In particular,  $w$  is non-zero.

Now by Lemma 5.4(i) we have that  $w_a(0) = 0$ , and by (6.2) and Lemma 5.2 we have that  $Dw_a(0) = 0$ . By Lemma 5.5 and (6.12)

$$N_{w,0}(2) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} N_{\tilde{T}_k, P, 0}(2) \leq 1.$$

On the other hand, since  $\Theta(\tilde{T}_k, 0) = \Theta(T_k, 0) \geq q$ , it follows from by Lemma 5.4 that  $N_w(0) \geq 1$ . Therefore, by the monotonicity formula for the Almgren frequency function for Dirichlet energy minimizing multi-valued functions,  $N_{w,0}(\rho) = 1$  for all  $\rho \in (0, 2]$  and thus  $w$  is homogeneous of degree 1. In particular, the average  $w_a$  of  $w$  is a homogeneous degree 1 harmonic function and thus  $w_a(x) = Dw_a(0) \cdot x = 0$  for all  $x \in B_2(0)$ . Therefore, we have shown that  $w$  is a non-zero, average-free, homogeneous degree 1, Dirichlet energy minimizing  $q$ -valued function.

If  $\dim \text{spt } w = n - 2$ , then we set  $\mathbf{C}_k = \text{graph}(E_k w)$  and note that  $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_q$ . For each  $x \in B_2(0)$  let  $u_k(x) = \sum_{i=1}^q \llbracket u_{k,i}(x) \rrbracket$  and  $w(x) = \sum_{i=1}^q \llbracket w_i(x) \rrbracket$ , where  $u_{k,i}(x), w_i(x) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ . Notice that for each  $x \in B_2(0)$ , at  $X = (x, u_{k,i}(x))$

$$\text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}_k) \leq \text{dist}(u_{k,i}(x), \text{spt}(E_k w(x))) \leq \mathcal{G}(u_k(x), E_k w(x)),$$

where  $\text{spt}(E_k w(x))$  denotes the set of all values  $E_k w_i(x)$  in  $\mathbb{R}^m$ . Hence using (5.5)–(5.7), (5.9), (2.28) and (2.29),

$$(6.15) \quad \begin{aligned} & \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{E_k^2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}_k) d\|T_k\|(X) \\ & \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{E_k^2} \int_{B_1(0)} \sum_{i=1}^q \text{dist}^2((x, u_{k,i}(x)), \text{spt } \mathbf{C}_k) dx \\ & \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{q}{E_k^2} \int_{B_1(0)} \mathcal{G}(u_k(x), E_k w(x))^2 dx = 0. \end{aligned}$$

(Note that here and throughout the remainder of the proof we use the fact that  $T_k \llcorner \mathbf{B}_2(0) = \widetilde{T}_k \llcorner \mathbf{B}_2(0)$ .) Similarly, for each  $x \in B_2(0)$ , at  $X = (x, w_i(x))$  we have  $\text{dist}(X, \text{spt } T_k) \leq \mathcal{G}(u_k(x), E_k w(x))$  and thus

$$(6.16) \quad \begin{aligned} & \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{E_k^2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0) \cap \{X: \text{dist}(X, \text{spine } \mathbf{C}_k) \geq 1/32\}} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } T_k) d\|\mathbf{C}_k\|(X) \\ & \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{q}{E_k^2} \int_{B_1(0)} \mathcal{G}(u_k(x), E_k w(x))^2 dx = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\rho \in [1/2, 1]$  and  $\widetilde{P}_k$  be an optimal plane for  $T_k$  in  $\mathbf{B}_\rho(0)$ . By Lemma 5.2,  $\widetilde{P}_k = \{(x, \widetilde{A}_k x) : x \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$  for some  $m \times n$  matrix  $\widetilde{A}_k$  with  $\|\widetilde{A}_k\| \leq C(n, m, q) E_k$  and  $\widetilde{A}_k/E_k \rightarrow Dw_a(0) = 0$ . Recall from the proof of Lemma 5.2 that for each  $X = (x, y) \in \mathbf{B}_2(0)$

$$\text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \widetilde{P}_k) \leq |y - \widetilde{A}_k x| \leq (1 + CE_k) \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \widetilde{P}_k),$$

where  $C = C(n, m) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant. Hence using (5.5)–(5.7), (5.9), (2.28), (2.29), the fact that  $\widetilde{A}_k/E_k \rightarrow 0$ , and (6.14),

$$(6.17) \quad \begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{E_k^2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_\rho(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \widetilde{P}_k) d\|T_k\|(X) & \geq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{q}{E_k^2} \int_{B_\rho(0)} \mathcal{G}(u_k(x), q[\widetilde{A}_k x])^2 dx \\ & = q \int_{B_\rho(0)} |w(x)|^2 dx \geq \frac{2^{n+7} - 1}{2^{4(n+7)} - 1}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, combining (6.15), (6.16), and (6.17) we conclude that (6.5) and (6.6) hold true for all  $\rho \in [1/2, 1]$  and all sufficiently large  $k$ .

To prove (6.7), suppose to the contrary that for infinitely many  $k$  there exists  $Z_k \in \mathbf{B}_1(0)$  such that  $\Theta(T_k, Z_k) \geq q$  and  $\text{dist}(Z_k, \text{spine } \mathbf{C}_k) \geq \varepsilon/2$ . Note that  $\text{spine } \mathbf{C}_k = \overline{(\text{spine } w) \times \{0\}}$ . By Lemma 5.4, after passing to a subsequence  $Z_k \rightarrow (\xi, 0)$  for some point  $\xi \in \overline{B_1(0)}$  with  $\mathcal{N}_w(\xi) \geq 1$  and  $\text{dist}(\xi, \text{spine } w) \geq \varepsilon/2$ . But since  $w$  is homogeneous degree one and  $\mathcal{N}_w(\xi) \geq 1$ ,  $\xi \in \text{spine } w$ , contradicting  $\text{dist}(\xi, \text{spine } w) \geq \varepsilon/2$ . This completes the proof of conclusion (i). By a similar argument, if  $\dim \text{spine } w \leq n - 3$ , then conclusion (ii) must hold true with  $L = \text{spine } w$ .  $\square$

**6.2. Distance to a plane not small.** Let  $\eta > 0$ . Let  $T$  be an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current of  $\mathbf{B}_8(0)$  and  $P$  be an  $n$ -dimensional plane such that

$$(6.18) \quad (\partial T) \llcorner \mathbf{B}_8(0) = 0, \quad \Theta(T, 0) \geq q, \quad \|T\|(\mathbf{B}_8(0)) \leq (q + \delta) \omega_n 8^n,$$

$$(6.19) \quad E(T, P, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) = \inf_{P' \in \mathcal{P}} E(T, P', \mathbf{B}_1(0)).$$

We wish to consider the case where

$$(6.20) \quad E(T, P, \mathbf{B}_4(0)) \geq \eta.$$

First we show that for any plane  $\tilde{P}$  (not necessarily equal to  $P$  nor assumed to be optimal in a ball), the planar frequency function of  $T$  relative to  $\tilde{P}$  and any base point close to 0 with density  $\geq q$  takes values  $\lesssim 1$  at scales  $\in [1/2, 1]$ .

**Lemma 6.3.** *For every  $\eta > 0$  and  $\nu \in (0, 1)$  there exists  $\delta = \delta(n, m, q, \eta, \nu) \in (0, 1)$  such that if  $P, \tilde{P}$  are  $n$ -dimensional planes in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  and  $T$  is an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current in  $\mathbf{B}_\delta(0)$  such that (6.18), (6.19), and (6.20) hold true and*

$$(6.21) \quad \frac{1}{\omega_n 2^{n+2}} \int_{\mathbf{B}_2(Z)} \text{dist}^2(X, \tilde{P}) d\|T\|(X) < 64^{-n-2},$$

then for each  $Z \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{B}_\delta(0)$  with  $\Theta(T, Z) \geq q$  we have that  $\text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(Z) \not\subset \tilde{P}$  and that  $N_{T \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{15/8}(0), \tilde{P}, Z}(\rho) < 1 + \nu/2$  for each  $\rho \in [1/2, 1]$ .

Lemma 6.3 follows from Lemma 6.4, which states that the frequency function of an area-minimizing cone  $\mathbf{C}$  takes values  $\leq 1$ . Note that in Lemma 6.4 we do not assume that  $\mathbf{C}$  is close to a plane or is represented by the graph of a multi-valued function, showing a key advantage of our intrinsic definition of planar frequency function (Definition 3.1).

**Lemma 6.4.** *Let  $\mathbf{C}$  be a non-zero  $n$ -dimensional area-minimizing cone  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $P$  be an  $n$ -dimensional plane  $P$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ . Assume that*

$$(6.22) \quad \text{spt } \mathbf{C} \cap P^\perp = \{0\}, \quad \text{and} \quad \text{spt } \mathbf{C} \neq P.$$

Then  $N_{\mathbf{C}, P, 0}(\rho) \leq 1$  for all  $\rho > 0$ .

**Remark 6.5.** (1) For an a cone  $\mathbf{C}$ , the assumption  $\text{spt } \mathbf{C} \cap P^\perp = \{0\}$  is equivalent to

$$(6.23) \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } \mathbf{C} \cap \mathbf{C}_1(0, P)} \text{dist}(X, P) < \infty.$$

To see this, assume that  $P = \mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\}$  and express points  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  as  $X = (x, y)$  where  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ . If (6.23) holds true then  $\text{spt } \mathbf{C} \cap P^\perp = \emptyset$  since if there were  $(0, y) \in \text{spt } \mathbf{C} \cap P^\perp$  for some  $y \neq 0$ , then  $(0, ty) \in \text{spt } \mathbf{C}$  and  $\text{dist}((0, ty), P) = t|y|$  for arbitrarily large  $t > 0$ . On the other hand, if (6.23) did not hold true, there would be a sequence of points  $X_k = (x_k, y_k) \in \text{spt } \mathbf{C} \cap \mathbf{C}_1(0)$  such that  $|y_k| \rightarrow \infty$ . After passing to a subsequence,  $X_k/|X_k| \rightarrow (0, \zeta)$  for some  $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^m$  with  $|\zeta| = 1$ . Since  $\text{spt } \mathbf{C}$  is closed,  $(0, \zeta) \in \text{spt } \mathbf{C} \cap P^\perp$  and thus  $\text{spt } \mathbf{C} \cap P^\perp \neq \emptyset$ .

(2) For an area-minimizing cone  $\mathbf{C}$  with  $\text{spt } \mathbf{C} \cap P^\perp = \emptyset$ , it follows from Remark 3.6 and the constancy theorem [Sim83, Theorem 26.27] that  $\mathbf{C} \neq 0$  and  $\text{spt } \mathbf{C} \neq P$  if and only if  $H_{\mathbf{C}, P, 0}(\rho) > 0$  for all  $\rho > 0$ .

*Proof of Lemma 6.4.* Without loss of generality let  $P = \mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\}$ . Express points  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  as  $X = (x, y)$  where  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ . In light of Remark 6.5,  $H_{\mathbf{C}, P, 0}(\rho) > 0$  for each  $\rho > 0$ , so it suffices to show that  $D_{\mathbf{C}, P, 0}(\rho) \leq H_{\mathbf{C}, P, 0}(\rho)$  for all  $\rho > 0$ . Since  $\mathbf{C}$  is a cone, for  $|\mathbf{C}|$ -a.e.  $(X, S) \in G_n(\mathbb{R}^{n+m})$  the radial vector  $X$  is tangent to  $\text{spt } \mathbf{C}$  at  $X$ , i.e.  $X \in S$ . Thus

$$0 = \pi_{S^\perp}(X) = \pi_{S^\perp}(x, y) = \pi_{S^\perp}(x, 0) + \pi_{S^\perp}(0, y)$$

for  $|\mathbf{C}|$ -a.e.  $(X, S) \in G_n(\mathbb{R}^{n+m})$ . That is,  $\pi_{S^\perp}(x, 0) = -\pi_{S^\perp}(0, y)$ . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} (0, y) \cdot \pi_{P^\perp}(\nabla^S r) &= (0, y) \cdot \nabla^S r = (0, y) \cdot \frac{(x, 0) - \pi_{S^\perp}(x, 0)}{r} \\ &= (0, y) \cdot \frac{(x, 0) + \pi_{S^\perp}(0, y)}{r} = \frac{|\pi_{S^\perp}(0, y)|^2}{r} \end{aligned}$$

for  $|\mathbf{C}|$ -a.e.  $(X, S) \in G_n(\mathbb{R}^{n+m})$ . Thus by (3.11) (with  $T = \mathbf{C}$ )

$$(6.24) \quad D_{\mathbf{C}, P, 0}(\rho) = -\rho^{1-n} \int |\pi_{S^\perp}(0, y)|^2 \frac{1}{r} \phi'(r/\rho) d|\mathbf{C}|(X, S)$$

for all  $\rho > 0$ . For  $|\mathbf{C}|$ -a.e.  $(X, S) \in G_n(\mathbb{R}^{n+m})$ , since  $X \in S$ ,

$$(0, y) = \frac{(0, y) \cdot X}{|X|^2} X + V + \pi_{S^\perp}(0, y),$$

where  $V$  is a vector in  $S$  and orthogonal to  $X$ . Hence

$$(6.25) \quad |\pi_{S^\perp}(0, y)|^2 \leq |y|^2 - \left( (0, y) \cdot \frac{(x, y)}{|X|} \right)^2 = |y|^2 - \frac{|y|^4}{|X|^2} = \frac{|x|^2 |y|^2}{|X|^2}$$

for  $|\mathbf{C}|$ -a.e.  $(X, S) \in G_n(\mathbb{R}^{n+m})$ . By  $\pi_{S^\perp}(x, 0) = -\pi_{S^\perp}(0, y)$  and (6.25),

$$(6.26) \quad \begin{aligned} |y|^2 |\nabla^{S_r}|^2 &= |y|^2 \left( 1 - \frac{|\pi_{S^\perp}(x, 0)|^2}{|x|^2} \right) = |y|^2 \left( 1 - \frac{|\pi_{S^\perp}(0, y)|^2}{|x|^2} \right) \\ &\geq |y|^2 \left( 1 - \frac{|y|^2}{|X|^2} \right) = \frac{|x|^2 |y|^2}{|X|^2} \geq |\pi_{S^\perp}(0, y)|^2 \end{aligned}$$

for  $|\mathbf{C}|$ -a.e.  $(X, S) \in G_n(\mathbb{R}^{n+m})$ . In view of (3.5) (with  $T = \mathbf{C}$ ), we see from (6.24) and (6.26), that  $D_{\mathbf{C}, P, 0}(\rho) \leq H_{\mathbf{C}, P, 0}(\rho)$  for all  $\rho > 0$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 6.3.* Fix  $\eta > 0$  and  $\nu \in (0, 1)$ . Without loss of generality assume that  $\tilde{P} = \mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\}$ . Suppose to the contrary that for  $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ , there exists  $\delta_k \rightarrow 0^+$ , an  $n$ -dimensional plane  $P_k$ , and an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current  $T_k$  of  $\mathbf{B}_8(0)$  such that (6.18), (6.19), (6.20), and (6.21) hold true with  $\delta_k$ ,  $P_k$ , and  $T_k$  in place of  $\delta$ ,  $P$ , and  $T$  but  $N_{T_k \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{15/8}(0), \tilde{P}, Z_k}(\rho_k) \geq 1 + \nu/2$  for some  $Z_k \in \text{spt } T_k \cap \mathbf{B}_{\delta_k}(0)$  with  $\Theta(T_k, Z_k) \geq q$  and some  $\rho_k \in [1/2, 1]$ . There exit  $\rho_\infty \in [1/2, 1]$  and an  $n$ -dimensional plane  $P_\infty$  such that after passing to a subsequence (without relabeling),  $\rho_k \rightarrow \rho_\infty$  and

$$(6.27) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(P_k \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0), P_\infty \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)) = 0.$$

By (6.18) and the compactness of area-minimizing integral currents ([Sim83, Theorems 32.2 and 34.5]), after passing to a further subsequence there exists an  $n$ -dimensional area-minimizing integral current  $\mathbf{C}$  such that  $T_k \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$  weakly in  $\mathbf{B}_8(0)$ . Since  $Z_k \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\Theta(T_k, Z_k) \geq q$ , and  $\|T_k\|(\mathbf{B}_8(0)) \leq (q + \delta_k) \omega_n 8^n$ , by the semi-continuity of density and mass ([Sim83, Corollary 17.8 and 26.13]) we have that  $\Theta(\mathbf{C}, 0) \geq q$  and  $\|\mathbf{C}\|(\mathbf{B}_8(0)) \leq q \omega_n 8^n$ . By applying the equality case of the monotonicity formula for area (see [Sim83, Theorem 19.3]),  $\mathbf{C}$  is an area-minimizing cone. Since  $\|T_k\| \rightarrow \|\mathbf{C}\|$  in the sense of Radon measures locally in  $\mathbf{B}_8(0)$ , by (6.19) if  $\mathbf{C}$  is a multiplicity  $q$  plane then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P_\infty) d\|\mathbf{C}\|(X) &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P_k) d\|T_k\|(X) \\ &\leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|T_k\|(X) \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|\mathbf{C}\|(X) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

and thus after equipping  $P_\infty$  with an appropriate orientation  $\mathbf{C} = q\llbracket P_\infty \rrbracket$ . (Note that since  $\mathbf{C}$  is a cone,  $\|\mathbf{C}\|(\partial \mathbf{B}_\rho(0)) = 0$  for all  $\rho \in (0, 8)$ .) On the other hand, by (6.20)

$$(6.28) \quad \int_{\mathbf{B}_4(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P_\infty) d\|\mathbf{C}\|(X) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbf{B}_4(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P_k) d\|T_k\|(X) \geq \eta^2,$$

so  $\mathbf{C} \neq q\llbracket P_\infty \rrbracket$ . Therefore  $\mathbf{C}$  is not a multiplicity  $q$  plane and in particular  $\text{spt } \mathbf{C} \not\subseteq \tilde{P}$ . By (6.21) and Lemma 2.6 with  $K = \tilde{P}$ ,

$$\sup_{X \in \text{spt } T_k \cap \mathbf{B}_{15/8}(0)} \text{dist}(X, \tilde{P}) \leq 1/16.$$

Hence  $(\partial(T_k \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{15/8}(0))) \llcorner \mathbf{C}_1(0) = 0$ . Moreover,

$$\sup_{X \in \text{spt } \mathbf{C} \cap \mathbf{B}_{15/8}(0)} \text{dist}(X, \tilde{P}) \leq 1/16$$

and thus by Remark 6.5(1),  $\text{spt } \mathbf{C} \cap \tilde{P}^\perp = \emptyset$ . Since  $\text{spt } \mathbf{C} \not\subseteq \tilde{P}$  and  $\text{spt } \mathbf{C} \cap \tilde{P}^\perp = \emptyset$ , we can apply Lemma 6.4 to obtain that  $N_{\mathbf{C}, \tilde{P}, 0}(\rho) \leq 1$  for all  $\rho \in (0, 8)$ . But by Lemma 4.4 and the fact that  $N_{T_k \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{15/8}(0), \tilde{P}, Z_k}(\rho_k) \geq 1 + \nu/2$ , it follows that

$$N_{\mathbf{C}, \tilde{P}, 0}(\rho_\infty) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} N_{T_k \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{15/8}(0), \tilde{P}, Z_k}(\rho_k) \geq 1 + \nu/2,$$

giving us a contradiction.  $\square$

Next we show in Lemma 6.6 that, if  $T$  is not close to the plane  $P$  as in (6.20), then  $T$  must be  $L^2$ -close to a non-planar area-minimizing cone in  $\mathbf{B}_1(0)$ .

**Lemma 6.6.** *For every  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ , and  $\eta > 0$  there exists  $\delta = \delta(n, m, q, \varepsilon, \beta, \eta) \in (0, 1)$  such that if  $P$  is an  $n$ -dimensional plane in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  and  $T$  is an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current of  $\mathbf{B}_8(0)$  such that (6.18), (6.19), and (6.20) hold true and  $\Theta(T, 0) \geq q$ , then for each  $\rho \in [1/2, 1]$  one of the following holds true:*

- (i) *there exists  $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_q$  such that (6.5), (6.6), and (6.7) hold true or*
- (ii) *there is an  $(n - 3)$ -dimensional linear subspace  $L$  such that (6.8) holds true.*

*Proof.* Fix  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ , and  $\eta > 0$ . Without loss of generality assume that  $P = \mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\}$ . For  $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$  let  $\delta_k \rightarrow 0^+$  and  $T_k$  be  $n$ -dimensional area-minimizing integral currents of  $\mathbf{B}_8(0)$  such that (6.18), (6.19), and (6.20) hold true with  $\delta_k$  and  $T_k$  in place of  $\delta$  and  $T$ . We want to show that for infinitely many  $k$  either conclusions (i) or (ii) hold true, which in light of the arbitrary choice of sequence  $(T_k)$  proves the theorem. As in the proof of Lemma 6.3, it follows from (6.18) that after passing to a subsequence  $T_k \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$  weakly in  $\mathbf{B}_8(0)$  for some  $n$ -dimensional area-minimizing cone  $\mathbf{C}$  with  $\Theta(\mathbf{C}, 0) = q$ . Moreover, by (6.19) and (6.20),  $\mathbf{C}$  is not a multiplicity  $q$  plane and

$$(6.29) \quad \int_{\mathbf{B}_4(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|\mathbf{C}\|(X) \geq \eta^2$$

(as in (6.28)). If  $\dim \text{spine } \mathbf{C} = n - 2$ , then using the fact that  $T_k \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$  weakly in  $\mathbf{B}_8(0)$  and the monotonicity formula for area, for any  $\rho \in [1/2, 1]$ ,

$$(6.30) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} Q(T_k, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_\rho(0)) \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left( (q + 1/2)\omega_n \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T_k \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) + q\omega_n \sup_{X \in \text{spt } \mathbf{C} \cap \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } T_k) \right) = 0.$$

Let  $\rho \in [1/2, 1]$  and let  $\hat{P}_k$  be an optimal plane for  $T_k$  in  $\mathbf{B}_\rho(0)$ . After passing to a subsequence, let  $\hat{P}_\infty$  be an  $n$ -dimensional linear plane such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\hat{P}_k \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0), \hat{P}_\infty \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)) = 0.$$

By the fact that  $\|T_k\| \rightarrow \|\mathbf{C}\|$  in the sense of Radon measures locally in  $\mathbf{B}_8(0)$ , the homogeneity of  $\mathbf{C}$ , (6.19), and (6.29),

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.31) \quad & \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbf{B}_\rho(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \widehat{P}_k) d\|T_k\|(X) = \int_{\mathbf{B}_\rho(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \widehat{P}_\infty) d\|\mathbf{C}\|(X) \\
& \geq 2^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \widehat{P}_\infty) d\|\mathbf{C}\|(X) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} 2^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \widehat{P}_\infty) d\|T_k\|(X) \\
& \geq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} 2^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T_k\|(X) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} 2^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|\mathbf{C}\|(X) \\
& = 8^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_4(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|\mathbf{C}\|(X) \geq 8^{-n-2} \eta^2.
\end{aligned}$$

By (6.30) and (6.31), we see that (6.5) and (6.6) hold true. By upper semi-continuity of density ([Sim83, Corollary 17.8]), (6.7) holds true if  $\dim \text{spine } \mathbf{C} = n - 2$  and (6.7) holds true with  $L = \text{spine } \mathbf{C}$  if  $\dim \text{spine } \mathbf{C} \leq n - 3$ .  $\square$

**6.3. Distance to a plane not decaying.** Let  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  and let  $T$  be an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current of  $\mathbf{B}_8(0)$  such that and  $P, \widehat{P}$  are  $n$ -dimensional linear planes such that

$$(6.32) \quad (\partial T) \llcorner \mathbf{B}_8(0) = 0, \quad \Theta(T, 0) \geq q, \quad \|T\|(\mathbf{B}_8(0)) \leq (q + \delta) \omega_n 8^n.$$

$$(6.33)$$

Let  $P, \widehat{P}$  be  $n$ -dimensional planes such that

$$(6.34) \quad E(T, P, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) = \inf_{P' \in \mathcal{P}} E(T, P', \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \quad \text{and}$$

$$(6.35) \quad E(T, \widehat{P}, \mathbf{B}_2(0)) = \inf_{P' \in \mathcal{P}} E(T, P', \mathbf{B}_2(0)).$$

For appropriate  $\eta \in (0, 1)$  and  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , we wish to consider the case where

$$(6.36) \quad E(T, P, \mathbf{B}_4(0)) < \eta,$$

$$(6.37) \quad E(T, P, \mathbf{B}_2(0)) \geq 2^{-\alpha} E(T, \widehat{P}, \mathbf{B}_4(0)).$$

First we show that for any plane  $\widetilde{P}$  (not necessarily equal to  $P$  nor equal to  $\widehat{P}$  nor assumed to be optimal in a ball), the frequency of  $T$  relative to  $\widetilde{P}$  is  $\lesssim 1$ .

**Lemma 6.7.** *For every  $\nu \in (0, 1)$  there exists  $\delta = \delta(n, m, q, \nu) \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\eta = \eta(n, m, q, \nu) \in (0, 1)$ , and  $\alpha = \alpha(n, m, q, \nu) \in (0, 1)$  such that if  $T$  is  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current of  $\mathbf{B}_8(0) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  and  $P, \widehat{P}, \widetilde{P}$  are  $n$ -dimensional planes in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  such that (6.32)–(6.37) and (6.21) hold true and  $\text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{B}_4(0) \not\subset \widehat{P}$ , then for each  $Z \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{B}_\delta(0)$  with  $\Theta(T, Z) \geq q$  we have that  $\text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(Z) \not\subset \widetilde{P}$  and that  $N_{T \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{15/8}(0), \widetilde{P}, Z}(\rho) < 1 + \nu/2$  for each  $\rho \in [1/2, 1]$ .*

*Proof.* Without loss of generality suppose that  $\widetilde{P} = \mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\}$ . Fix  $\nu \in (0, 1)$ . Suppose to the contrary that for  $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$  there exists  $\delta_k \rightarrow 0^+$ ,  $\eta_k \rightarrow 0^+$ ,  $\alpha_k \rightarrow 0^+$ , an  $n$ -dimensional area-minimizing integral current  $T_k$  of  $\mathbf{B}_8(0)$ , and  $n$ -dimensional planes  $\widehat{P}_k, P_k$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  such that (6.32)–(6.37) hold true with  $\delta_k, \eta_k, \alpha_k, T_k, P_k$ , and  $\widehat{P}_k$  in place of  $\delta, \eta, \alpha, T, P$ , and  $\widehat{P}$ , but  $N_{T_k \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{15/8}(0), \widetilde{P}, Z_k}(\rho_k) \geq 1 + \nu/2$  for some  $Z_k \in \text{spt } T_k \cap \mathbf{B}_{\delta_k}(0)$  with  $\Theta(T_k, Z_k) \geq q$  and some

$\rho_k \in [1/2, 1]$ . After passing to a subsequence, let  $\rho_k \rightarrow \rho_\infty$  in  $[1/2, 1]$  and let  $P_\infty$  be an  $n$ -dimensional plane such that

$$(6.38) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(P_k \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0), P_\infty \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)) = 0.$$

Arguing as in Subsection 5.1, by (6.32) and (6.36) after passing to a subsequence and equipping  $P_\infty$  with an appropriate orientation we have that  $T_k \rightarrow \mathbf{C} = q\llbracket P_\infty \rrbracket$  weakly in  $\mathbf{B}_4(0)$ . If  $P_\infty \neq \tilde{P}$ , then we can argue as in the proof of Lemma 6.3 that by (6.21) we have  $\text{spt } \mathbf{C} \cap \tilde{P}^\perp = \emptyset$  and by Lemma 4.4 and Lemma 6.4 we have  $N_{T_k \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{15/8}(0), \tilde{P}, Z_k}(\rho_k) \rightarrow N_{\mathbf{C}, \tilde{P}, 0}(\rho_\infty) \leq 1$ , contradicting the assumption  $N_{T_k \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{15/8}(0), \tilde{P}, Z_k}(\rho_k) \geq 1 + \nu/2$ . Thus we may assume that  $P_\infty = \tilde{P}$  ( $= \mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\}$ ).

Set  $E_k = E(T_k, \tilde{P}, \mathbf{B}_4(0))$ . By (6.36), (6.38) and the fact that  $P_\infty = \tilde{P}$ , we have that  $E_k \rightarrow 0$ . Let  $\theta_k \in (0, 1)$  such that  $\theta_k \rightarrow 1^+$  and  $(1 - \theta_k)^{-n-2} E_k^2 \rightarrow 0$ . By Lemma 2.6 with  $K = \tilde{P}$ ,

$$\sup_{X \in \text{spt } T_k \cap \mathbf{B}_{3+\theta_k}(0)} \text{dist}(X, \tilde{P}) \leq 8E_k^{\frac{1}{n+2}} < 1 - \theta_k.$$

Set  $\tilde{T}_k = T_k \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{3+\theta_k}(0)$  so that by (6.32) and the monotonicity formula for area,  $(\partial \tilde{T}_k) \llcorner \mathbf{C}_{2+2\theta_k}(0) = 0$  and

$$(6.39) \quad \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\tilde{T}_k\|(\mathbf{C}_{2+2\theta_k}(0)) \leq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\tilde{T}_k\|(\mathbf{B}_{3+\theta_k}(0)) \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (q + \delta_k) \omega_n (3 + \theta_k)^n = q\omega_n 4^n.$$

By Theorem 2.8 and Lemma 2.7, there exists  $u_k : B_{4\theta_k}(0) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$ , and  $K_k \subset B_{4\theta_k}(0)$  such that (5.5)–(5.7) hold true with  $\tilde{T}_k$  in place of  $T_k$ ,  $\rho_0 = 4$ , and  $E_k = E(T_k, \tilde{P}, \mathbf{B}_4(0))$ . After passing to a subsequence, let  $w \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(B_4(0), \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m))$  such that (5.9) and (5.10) hold true with  $\rho_0 = 4$  and  $E_k = E(T_k, \tilde{P}, \mathbf{B}_4(0))$ . By (6.34) and Lemma 5.2,  $P_k = \{(x, A_k x) : x \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$  for some  $m \times n$  matrix  $A_k$  such that  $\|A_k\| \leq C(n, m, q) E_k$  and  $A_k/E_k \rightarrow Dw_a(0)$ . Similarly, by (6.35) and Lemma 5.2,  $\hat{P}_k = \{(x, \hat{A}_k x) : x \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$  for some  $m \times n$  matrix  $\hat{A}_k$  such that  $\|\hat{A}_k\| \leq C(n, m, q) E_k$  and  $\hat{A}_k/E_k \rightarrow Dw_a(0)$ . Let  $w(x) = \sum_{i=1}^q \llbracket w_i(x) \rrbracket$  and  $w(x) - Dw_a(0) \cdot x = \sum_{i=1}^q \llbracket w_i(x) - Dw_a(0) \cdot x \rrbracket$  for each  $x \in B_4(0)$ . Note that  $w - Dw_a(0) \cdot x$  is Dirichlet energy minimizing ([Alm83, Theorem 2.6(3)]). Recall from the proof of Lemma 5.2 that for each  $X = (x, y) \in \mathbf{B}_4(0)$

$$\text{dist}(X, P_k) \leq |y - A_k x| \leq (1 + CE_k) \text{dist}(X, P_k),$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant. Thus by (5.5)–(5.7), (5.9), (2.28), (2.29), and the fact that  $A_k/E_k \rightarrow Dw_a(0)$ ,

$$(6.40) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{B_\rho(0)} |w - Dw_a(0) \cdot x|^2 &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{E_k^2} \int_{B_\rho(0)} \mathcal{G}(u_k, q\llbracket A_k \rrbracket)^2 \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{E_k^2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_\rho(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P_k) d\|T_k\|(X) \end{aligned}$$

for all  $\rho \in (0, 4)$ . (Note that here and throughout the proof we use the fact that  $T_k \llcorner \mathbf{B}_\rho(0) = \tilde{T}_k \llcorner \mathbf{B}_\rho(0)$  for each  $\rho \in (0, 2 - 2\theta_k]$ .) Similarly, using  $\hat{A}_k/E_k \rightarrow Dw_a(0)$ ,

$$(6.41) \quad \int_{B_\rho(0)} |w - Dw_a(0) \cdot x|^2 = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{E_k^2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_\rho(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \hat{P}_k) d\|T_k\|(X)$$

for all  $\rho \in (0, 4)$ .



We claim that  $w$  is not identically zero. We may assume that  $Dw_a(0) = 0$  since otherwise  $w$  must be non-zero. By (6.40), (6.37), and  $\widehat{A}_k/E_k \rightarrow Dw_a(0) = 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.42) \quad \int_{B_2(0)} |w|^2 &= \int_{B_2(0)} |w - Dw_a(0) \cdot x|^2 \\
&= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{E_k^2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_2(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P_k) d\|T_k\|(X) \\
&\geq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2^{-n-2-2\alpha_k}}{E_k^2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_4(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \widehat{P}_k) d\|T_k\|(X) \\
&\geq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2^{-n-3-2\alpha_k}}{E_k^2} \left( \int_{\mathbf{B}_4(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \widetilde{P}) d\|T_k\|(X) - 2^{2n+1}(q+1)\omega_n \|\widehat{A}_k\|^2 \right) \\
&= 2^{-n-3}
\end{aligned}$$

and thus  $w$  must be non-zero.

Next we claim that  $w$  is homogeneous degree one. We may assume that  $w - Dw_a(0) \cdot x$  is not identically zero since otherwise  $w(x) = q\|Dw_a(0) \cdot x\|$  is certainly homogeneous degree one. Since  $\Theta(\widetilde{T}_k, 0) = \Theta(T_k, 0) \geq q$ , Lemma 5.4 implies that  $\mathcal{N}_w(0) \geq 1$ . Thus by the homogeneity of  $Dw_a(0) \cdot x$ ,  $\mathcal{N}_{w-Dw_a(0) \cdot x}(0) \geq 1$ . By  $L^2$ -growth estimates for Dirichlet energy minimizing multi-valued functions ([Alm83, Theorem 2.6(8)]),

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.43) \quad \int_{B_2(0)} |w - Dw_a(0) \cdot x|^2 &\leq 2^{-n-2\mathcal{N}_{w-Dw_a(0) \cdot x}(0)} \int_{B_4(0)} |w - Dw_a(0) \cdot x|^2 \\
&\leq 2^{-n-2} \int_{B_4(0)} |w - Dw_a(0) \cdot x|^2
\end{aligned}$$

with equality if and only if  $w$  is homogeneous degree one. On the other hand, by (6.40), (6.41), and (6.37)

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{B_2(0)} |w - Dw_a(0) \cdot x|^2 &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{E_k^2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_2(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P_k) d\|T_k\|(X) \\
&\geq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2^{-n-2-2\alpha_k}}{E_k^2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_\rho(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \widehat{P}_k) d\|T_k\|(X) \\
&= 2^{-n-2} \int_{B_\rho(0)} |w - Dw_a(0) \cdot x|^2
\end{aligned}$$

for all  $\rho \in (0, 4)$ . Letting  $\rho \rightarrow 4^+$ ,

$$(6.44) \quad \int_{B_2(0)} |w - Dw_a(0) \cdot x|^2 \geq 2^{-n-2} \int_{B_4(0)} |w - Dw_a(0) \cdot x|^2.$$

Therefore, equality holds true in (6.43), proving that  $w$  is homogeneous degree one.

Since  $N_{\widetilde{T}_k, \widetilde{P}, Z_k}(\rho_k) \geq 1 + \nu/2$ , by Lemma 5.5 and the homogeneity of  $w$ , we have that

$$1 + \nu/2 \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} N_{\widetilde{T}_k, \widetilde{P}, Z_k}(\rho_k) = N_{w,0}(\rho_\infty) = 1$$

giving us a contradiction.  $\square$

Next we show in Lemma 6.8 that if  $T$  is not decaying to a plane as in (6.37), then  $T$  must be  $L^2$ -close to a non-planar area-minimizing cone in  $\mathbf{B}_1(0)$ .

**Lemma 6.8.** *For every  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$  and  $\beta \in (0, 1)$  there exists  $\delta = \delta(n, m, q, \varepsilon, \beta) \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\eta = \eta(n, m, q, \varepsilon, \beta) \in (0, 1)$ , and  $\alpha = \alpha(n, m, q, \varepsilon, \beta) \in (0, 1)$  such that if  $P, \widehat{P}$  are  $n$ -dimensional planes in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  and  $T$  is  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current in  $\mathbf{B}_8(0)$  such that (6.32)–(6.37) hold true,  $\text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{B}_4(0) \not\subset \widehat{P}$  and  $\Theta(T, 0) \geq q$ , then for each  $\rho \in [1/2, 1]$  one of the following holds true:*

- (i) *there exists  $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_q$  such that (6.5), (6.6), and (6.7) hold true or*
- (ii) *there is an  $(n - 3)$ -dimensional linear subspace  $L$  such that (6.8) holds true.*

*Proof.* Without loss of generality suppose that  $P = \mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\}$ . Fix  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$  and  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ . Suppose that for  $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$  there exists  $\delta_k \rightarrow 0^+$ ,  $\eta_k \rightarrow 0^+$ ,  $\alpha_k \rightarrow 0^+$ , and an  $n$ -dimensional area-minimizing integral current  $T_k$  of  $\mathbf{B}_8(0)$  such that (6.32)–(6.37) hold true with  $\delta_k, \eta_k, \alpha_k$ , and  $T_k$  in place of  $\delta, \eta, \alpha$ , and  $T$ . We want to show that for infinitely many  $k$  either conclusion (i) or conclusion (ii) holds true, which in light of arbitrary choice of sequence  $(T_k)$  will prove the lemma. Arguing as in Subsection 5.1, by (6.32) and (6.36) after passing to a subsequence we may assume that  $T_k \rightarrow q\llbracket P \rrbracket$  weakly in  $\mathbf{B}_8(0)$ . Set  $E_k = E(T_k, \widehat{P}, \mathbf{B}_4(0))$  and let  $\theta_k \in (0, 1)$  such that  $\theta_k \rightarrow 1^+$  and  $(1 - \theta_k)^{-n-2} E_k^2 \rightarrow 0$ . By (6.36) and Lemma 2.6 with  $K = P$ ,

$$\sup_{X \in \text{spt } T_k \cap \mathbf{B}_{3+\theta_k}(0)} \text{dist}(X, P) \leq 8E_k^{\frac{1}{n+2}} < 1 - \theta_k.$$

Set  $\widetilde{T}_k = T_k \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{3+\theta_k}(0)$  so that  $(\partial \widetilde{T}_k) \llcorner \mathbf{C}_{2+2\theta_k}(0) = 0$  and  $\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\widetilde{T}_k\|(\mathbf{C}_{2+2\theta_k}(0)) \leq q\omega_n 4^n$  (as in (6.39)). By Theorem 2.8 and Lemma 2.7, there exists  $u_k : B_{4\theta_k}(0) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$ , and  $K_k \subset B_{4\theta_k}(0)$  such that (5.5)–(5.7) hold true with  $\widetilde{T}_k$  in place of  $T_k$ ,  $\rho_0 = 4$ , and  $E_k = E(T_k, P, \mathbf{B}_4(0))$ . After passing to a subsequence, let  $w \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(B_4(0), \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m))$  such that (5.9) and (5.10) hold true with  $\rho_0 = 4$  and  $E_k = E(T_k, \widetilde{P}, \mathbf{B}_4(0))$ . By (6.34) and Lemma 5.2,  $Dw_a(0) = 0$ . By (6.35) and Lemma 5.2,  $\widehat{P}_k = \{(x, \widehat{A}_k x) : x \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$  for some  $m \times n$  matrix  $\widehat{A}_k$  such that  $\|\widehat{A}_k\| \leq C(n, m, q, \theta) E_k$  and  $\widehat{A}_k/E_k \rightarrow Dw_a(0) = 0$ . Since  $\Theta(T_k, 0) \geq q$ , Lemma 5.4 implies that  $\mathcal{N}_w(0) \geq 1$ . Thus by  $L^2$ -growth estimates for Dirichlet energy minimizing multi-valued functions [Alm83, Theorem 2.6(8)],

$$\int_{B_2(0)} |w|^2 \leq 2^{-n-2\mathcal{N}_w(0)} \int_{B_4(0)} |w|^2 \leq 2^{-n-2} \int_{B_4(0)} |w|^2$$

Arguing as we did to obtain (6.42) and (6.44) with  $P$  in place of  $\widetilde{P}$ ,  $A_k = 0$ , and  $Dw_a(0) = 0$  (since we now blow-up relative to  $P$  instead of  $\widetilde{P}$ ), it follows from (6.37) that

$$(6.45) \quad \int_{B_2(0)} |w|^2 \geq 2^{-n-3}, \quad \int_{B_2(0)} |w|^2 \geq 2^{-n-2} \int_{B_4(0)} |w|^2.$$

Therefore  $w$  is non-zero and homogeneous degree one. Since  $w$  is homogeneous degree one and  $Dw_a(0) = 0$ ,  $w$  is average-free. If  $\dim \text{spine } w = n - 2$ , then set  $\mathbf{C}_k = \text{graph}(E_k w)$ . Arguing as in the proof of Lemma 6.2, (6.15) and (6.16) hold true.

Let  $\rho \in [1/2, 1]$  and  $\widetilde{P}_k$  be an optimal plane for  $T_k$  in  $\mathbf{B}_\rho(0)$ . By Lemma 5.2,  $\widetilde{P}_k = \{(x, \widetilde{A}_k x) : x \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$  for some  $m \times n$  matrix  $\widetilde{A}_k$  with  $\|\widetilde{A}_k\| \leq C(n, m, q) E_k$  and  $\widetilde{A}_k/E_k \rightarrow Dw_a(0) = 0$ . Recall from the proof of Lemma 5.2 that for each  $X = (x, y) \in \mathbf{B}_2(0)$

$$\text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \widetilde{P}_k) \leq |y - \widetilde{A}_k x| \leq (1 + CE_k) \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \widetilde{P}_k).$$

Hence using (5.5)–(5.7), (5.9), (2.28), (2.29), the fact that  $\tilde{A}_k/E_k \rightarrow 0$ , and (6.45),

(6.46)

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{E_k^2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_\rho(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \tilde{P}_k) d\|T_k\|(X) &\geq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{q}{E_k^2} \int_{B_\rho(0)} \mathcal{G}(u_k(x), q[\tilde{A}_k x])^2 dx \\ &= q \int_{B_\rho(0)} |w|^2 \geq 4^{-n-2} q \int_{B_2(0)} |w|^2 dx \geq 2^{-3n-7} q. \end{aligned}$$

(Recall that  $T_k \llcorner \mathbf{B}_\rho(0) = \tilde{T}_k \llcorner \mathbf{B}_\rho(0)$ .) Therefore, combining (6.15), (6.16), and (6.46) we conclude that (6.5) and (6.6) hold true. Arguing as in the proof of Lemma 6.2 using Lemma 5.4 gives us that (6.7) holds true if  $\dim \text{spine } \mathbf{C} = n - 2$  and (6.7) holds true with  $L = \text{spine } \mathbf{C}$  if  $\dim \text{spine } \mathbf{C} \leq n - 3$ .  $\square$

## 7. PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREM

In this section we prove our main result Theorem 1.1. We start with the following:

**Theorem 7.1.** *For every  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$  and  $\beta \in (0, 1)$  there exists  $R = R(n, m, q, \varepsilon, \beta) \in [2, \infty)$ ,  $\delta = \delta(n, m, q, \varepsilon, \beta) \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\eta = \eta(n, m, q, \varepsilon, \beta) \in (0, 1)$ , and  $\alpha = \alpha(n, m, q, \varepsilon, \beta) \in (0, 1)$  such that the following holds true. Let  $T$  is  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current in  $\mathbf{B}_{9R}(0)$  such that*

$$(7.1) \quad (\partial T) \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{9R}(0) = 0, \quad \|T\|(\mathbf{B}_{9R}(0)) \leq (q + \delta) \omega_n (9R)^n.$$

Let  $P$  be an  $n$ -dimensional plane in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  such that

$$(7.2) \quad E(T, P, \mathbf{B}_R(0)) = \inf_{P' \in \mathcal{P}} E(T, P', \mathbf{B}_R(0))$$

and assume that one of the following holds true:

$$(A) \quad E(T, P, \mathbf{B}_{4R}(0)) \geq \eta;$$

$$(B) \quad E(T, P, \mathbf{B}_{4R}(0)) < \eta \text{ and } E(T, P, \mathbf{B}_{2R}(0)) \geq 2^{-\alpha} E(T, \hat{P}, \mathbf{B}_{4R}(0)), \text{ where } \hat{P} \text{ is an } n\text{-dimensional plane in } \mathbb{R}^{n+m} \text{ such that } E(T, \hat{P}, \mathbf{B}_{2R}(0)) = \inf_{P' \in \mathcal{P}} E(T, P', \mathbf{B}_{2R}(0)).$$

Then for each  $Z \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)$  with  $\Theta(T, Z) \geq q$  and each  $\rho \in (0, R/2]$  one of the following statements (i) or (ii) holds true:

(i) there exists  $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_q$  such that

$$(7.3) \quad E(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_\rho(Z)) < \varepsilon,$$

$$(7.4) \quad Q(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_\rho(Z)) \leq \beta \inf_{P' \in \mathcal{P}} E(T, P', \mathbf{B}_\rho(Z)) \text{ and}$$

$$(7.5) \quad \{X \in \mathbf{B}_\rho(Z) : \Theta(T, X) \geq q\} \subset \{X \in \mathbf{B}_\rho(Z) : \text{dist}(X, Z + \text{spine } \mathbf{C}) < \varepsilon \rho\};$$

(ii) there is an  $(n - 3)$ -dimensional linear subspace  $L$  of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  such that

$$(7.6) \quad \{X \in \mathbf{B}_\rho(Z) : \Theta(T, X) \geq q\} \subset \{X \in \mathbf{B}_\rho(Z) : \text{dist}(X, Z + L) < \varepsilon \rho\}.$$

*Proof.* First note that for any  $Z \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)$  with  $\Theta(T, Z) \geq q$ , we have by the monotonicity formula for area and the fact that  $\|T\|(\mathbf{B}_{9R}(0)) \leq (q + \delta) \omega_n (9R)^n$ ,

$$q \leq \frac{\|T\|(\mathbf{B}_\rho(Z))}{\omega_n \rho^n} \leq \frac{\|T\|(\mathbf{B}_{9R-1}(Z))}{\omega_n (9R-1)^n} \leq \left( \frac{9R}{9R-1} \right)^n \frac{\|T\|(\mathbf{B}_{9R}(0))}{\omega_n (9R)^n} \leq \left( \frac{9R}{9R-1} \right)^n (q + \delta)$$

for all  $\rho \in (0, 9R - 1]$ . Thus, provided  $R = R(n, q, \delta) \geq 2$  is large enough that

$$(7.7) \quad \left( \frac{9R}{9R-1} \right)^n (q + \delta) \leq q + 2\delta,$$

we have that

$$(7.8) \quad q \leq \frac{\|T\|(\mathbf{B}_\rho(Z))}{\omega_n \rho^n} \leq q + 2\delta$$

for all  $Z \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)$  with  $\Theta(T, Z) \geq q$  and all  $\rho \in (0, 9R - 1]$ .

Fix  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$  and  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ . Choose  $\nu$  and  $\alpha$  so that

$$(7.9) \quad \nu = \nu_{6.2}(n, m, q, \varepsilon, \beta),$$

$$(7.10) \quad \alpha = \min\{\alpha_{6.7}(n, m, q, \nu), \alpha_{6.8}(n, m, q, \varepsilon, \beta)\},$$

where  $\nu_{6.2}$  is the constant denoted  $\nu$  in Lemma 6.2 and  $\alpha_{6.7}$  and  $\alpha_{6.8}$  are the constants denoted  $\alpha$  in Lemma 6.7 and Lemma 6.8 respectively. Then choose  $\eta$  and  $\delta$  so that

$$(7.11) \quad \eta \leq \min\{64^{-n-2}C_0^{-1}, (7/8)^{(n+2)/2}C_0^{-1}\eta_{3.4}(n, m, q), 4^{-2\alpha}C_0^{-1}\eta_{6.2}(n, m, q, \varepsilon, \beta), \\ \eta_{6.7}(n, m, q, \nu), \eta_{6.8}(n, m, q, \varepsilon, \beta)\};$$

$$(7.12) \quad \delta = \min\left\{\frac{1}{2}, \delta_{6.2}(n, m, q, \varepsilon, \beta), \delta_{6.3}(n, m, q, \eta, \nu), \delta_{6.6}(n, m, q, \eta, \varepsilon, \beta), \\ \delta_{6.7}(n, m, q, \nu), \delta_{6.8}(n, m, q, \varepsilon, \beta)\right\};$$

$$(7.13) \quad (q + 2\delta)(1 + C_1\eta)^n < q + \delta_{3.4}(n, m, q) \quad \text{and}$$

$$(7.14) \quad e^{2^{\alpha\gamma}(CC_0)^\gamma\eta^\gamma} < \frac{1 + \nu}{1 + \nu/2}.$$

Here  $C$  is as in Theorem 3.4;  $C_0$  is as in (7.22);  $C_1$  is as in (7.23);  $\eta_{3.4}$ ,  $\eta_{6.2}$ ,  $\eta_{6.7}$  and  $\eta_{6.8}$  are the constants denoted  $\eta$  in Theorem 3.4, Lemma 6.2, Lemma 6.7 and Lemma 6.8 respectively;  $\delta_{3.4}$ ,  $\delta_{6.2}$ ,  $\delta_{6.3}$ ,  $\delta_{6.6}$ ,  $\delta_{6.7}$  and  $\delta_{6.8}$  are the constants denoted  $\delta$  in Theorem 3.4, Lemma 6.2, Lemma 6.3, Lemma 6.6, Lemma 6.7 and Lemma 6.8 respectively. Finally, choose  $R$  so that

$$(7.15) \quad R \geq 1/\min\{\delta_{6.3}(n, m, q, \nu), \delta_{6.7}(n, m, q, \nu)\} \text{ and with } R \text{ also satisfying (7.7)}.$$

Fix  $Z \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)$  with  $\Theta(T, Z) \geq q$ . For each integer  $i \geq 0$  set  $\rho_i = 2^{-i}R$  and  $I_i = [\rho_{i+1}, \rho_i]$  so that the interval  $(0, R]$  is partitioned into the intervals  $I_i$ . Let  $P_0 = P$  be such that (7.2) holds true. (Note that unlike in our notation in earlier sections,  $P_0$  here is not necessarily  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\}$ ). For each integer  $i \geq 1$  let  $P_i$  be an  $n$ -dimensional plane in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  such that

$$(7.16) \quad E(T, P_i, \mathbf{B}_{\rho_i}(Z)) = \inf_{P' \in \mathcal{P}} E(T, P', \mathbf{B}_{\rho_i}(Z)).$$

For each integer  $i \geq 1$  we classify each interval  $I_i$  into one of the following three cases:

- (a)  $E(T, P_i, \mathbf{B}_{4\rho_i}(Z)) \geq \eta$ ;
- (b)  $E(T, P_i, \mathbf{B}_{4\rho_i}(Z)) < \eta$  and  $E(T, P_i, \mathbf{B}_{2\rho_i}(Z)) \geq 2^{-\alpha}E(T, P_{i-1}, \mathbf{B}_{2\rho_{i-1}}(Z))$ ;
- (c)  $E(T, P_i, \mathbf{B}_{4\rho_i}(Z)) < \eta$  and  $E(T, P_i, \mathbf{B}_{2\rho_i}(Z)) < 2^{-\alpha}E(T, P_{i-1}, \mathbf{B}_{2\rho_{i-1}}(Z))$ .

Recall that  $(\partial T) \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{9R}(0) = 0$ ,  $\Theta(T, Z) \geq q$ , and (7.8) holds true. In case (a) we can apply Lemma 6.6 to deduce that either conclusion (i) or conclusion (ii) holds true for all  $\rho \in I_i$ . In case (b), by Lemma 6.8 either conclusion (i) or conclusion (ii) holds true for all  $\rho \in I_i$ . It remains to consider intervals satisfying case (c).

Let  $I = [\rho_{i_1+1}, \rho_{i_0}]$  where  $1 \leq i_0 \leq i_1$  are integers such that either

- $i_0 = 1$  or
- $i_0 > 1$  and either case (a) or case (b) holds true when  $i = i_0 - 1$

and

- case (c) holds true whenever  $i \in \{i_0, i_0 + 1, \dots, i_1\}$ .

By iteratively applying  $E(T, P_i, \mathbf{B}_{2\rho_i}(Z)) < 2^{-\alpha}E(T, P_{i-1}, \mathbf{B}_{2\rho_{i-1}}(Z))$  and using  $E(T, P_{i_0}, \mathbf{B}_{4\rho_{i_0}}(Z)) < \eta$ , for each  $i \in \{i_0, i_0 + 1, \dots, i_1\}$

$$(7.17) \quad E(T, P_i, \mathbf{B}_{2\rho_i}(Z)) \leq 2^{-\alpha(i-i_0)}E(T, P_{i_0}, \mathbf{B}_{2\rho_{i_0}}(Z)) < C2^{-\alpha(i-i_0)}\eta = C\eta\left(\frac{\rho_i}{\rho_{i_0}}\right)^\alpha,$$

where  $C = C(n) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants. By the triangle inequality, (7.8), Lemma 2.4, and (7.17)

$$(7.18) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\pi_{P_i} - \pi_{P_{i+1}}\|^2 &\leq \frac{2}{q\omega_n(\rho_i/2)^n} \int_{G_n(\mathbf{B}_{\rho_i}(Z))} \|\pi_S - \pi_{P_i}\|^2 d|T|(X, S) \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{q\omega_n\rho_{i+1}^n} \int_{G_n(\mathbf{B}_{\rho_{i+1}}(Z))} \|\pi_S - \pi_{P_{i+1}}\|^2 d|T|(X, S) \\ &\leq CE(T, P_i, \mathbf{B}_{2\rho_i}(Z))^2 + CE(T, P_{i+1}, \mathbf{B}_{2\rho_{i+1}}(Z))^2 \\ &\leq C\eta^2\left(\frac{\rho_i}{\rho_{i_0}}\right)^{2\alpha} \end{aligned}$$

for all  $i \in \{i_0, i_0 + 1, \dots, i_1 - 1\}$ , where  $C = C(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants. Hence by the triangle inequality,

$$(7.19) \quad \|\pi_{P_i} - \pi_{P_j}\| \leq C \sum_{k=i}^{j-1} \eta \left(\frac{\rho_k}{\rho_{i_0}}\right)^\alpha = C \sum_{k=i}^{j-1} 2^{\alpha(i-k)} \eta \left(\frac{\rho_i}{\rho_{i_0}}\right)^\alpha \leq \frac{2^\alpha C \eta}{2^\alpha - 1} \left(\frac{\rho_i}{\rho_{i_0}}\right)^\alpha$$

for all  $i_0 \leq i \leq j \leq i_1$ , where  $C = C(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant. For each  $i_0 \leq j \leq i \leq i_1$ , noting that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(X, Z + P_i) &= |\pi_{P_i^\perp}(X - Z)| \leq |\pi_{P_j^\perp}(X - Z)| + |(\pi_{P_i} - \pi_{P_j})(X - Z)| \\ &\leq \text{dist}(X, Z + P_j) + \|\pi_{P_i} - \pi_{P_j}\| \|X - Z\| \end{aligned}$$

for all  $X \in \text{spt } T$  and using (7.8), (7.17), and (7.19), we obtain

$$(7.20) \quad \begin{aligned} E(T, P_i, \mathbf{B}_{2\rho_j}(Z))^2 &= \frac{1}{\omega_n(2\rho_j)^{n+2}} \int_{\mathbf{B}_{2\rho_j}(Z)} \text{dist}^2(X, Z + P_i) d|T|(X) \\ &\leq \frac{2}{\omega_n(2\rho_j)^{n+2}} \int_{\mathbf{B}_{2\rho_j}(Z)} \text{dist}^2(X, Z + P_j) d|T|(X) + 2(q+1) \|\pi_{P_i} - \pi_{P_j}\|^2 \leq C\eta^2\left(\frac{\rho_j}{\rho_{i_0}}\right)^{2\alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant. Similarly, arguing using (7.8), (7.19), and the fact that  $E(T, P_{i_0}, \mathbf{B}_{4\rho_{i_0}}(Z)) < \eta$ ,

$$(7.21) \quad E(T, P_i, \mathbf{B}_{4\rho_{i_0}}(Z)) \leq C\eta$$

for all  $i$  with  $i_0 \leq i \leq i_1$ , where  $C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant. For each  $i \in \{i_0, i_0 + 1, \dots, i_1\}$  and  $\rho \in [\rho_{i+1}, 2\rho_{i_0}]$  we can find an integer  $j$  with  $i_0 - 1 \leq j \leq i$  such that  $\rho_{j+1} < \rho \leq \rho_j$ . Thus by (7.20) and (7.21)

$$(7.22) \quad E(T, P_i, \mathbf{B}_{2\rho}(Z)) \leq C_0\eta\left(\frac{\rho}{\rho_{i_0}}\right)^\alpha,$$

where  $C_0 = C_0(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant. Note that by Lemma 2.5, (7.22) and (7.11)

$$(7.23) \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{B}_{15\rho/4}(Z)} \text{dist}(X, P_i) \leq C_1 \eta \rho < \rho/4$$

for all  $\rho \in [\rho_{i+1}, 2\rho_{i_0}]$ , where  $C_1 = C_1(n, m, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant.

Now fix any  $i \in \{i_0, i_0+1, \dots, i_1\}$ . Recall that  $(\partial T) \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{9R}(0) = 0$ ,  $\Theta(T, Z) \geq q$  and that (7.8) holds true. Set  $\tilde{T} = T \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{15\rho_{i_0}/4}(Z)$ . Note that since  $Z \in \mathbf{B}_1(0)$ , we have by (7.15) that  $Z \in \mathbf{B}_{\delta R}(0)$ . By (7.22),  $E(T, P_i, \mathbf{B}_{2\rho_{i_0-1}}(Z)) \leq C_0 \eta < 64^{-n-2}$ . When  $i_0 = 1$ , either hypothesis (A) or hypothesis (B) holds true and thus we can apply Lemma 6.3 and Lemma 6.7 to obtain  $N_{\tilde{T}, P_i, Z}(\rho) < 1 + \nu/2$  for all  $\rho \in I_0$ . Similarly, when  $i_0 > 1$ , either case (a) or case (b) holds true, and we can again apply Lemma 6.3 and Lemma 6.7 to obtain  $N_{\tilde{T}, P_i, Z}(\rho) < 1 + \nu/2$  for all  $\rho \in I_{i_0-1} = [\rho_{i_0}, 2\rho_{i_0}]$ . Notice that by (7.23), (7.8) and (7.13),  $(\partial \tilde{T}) \llcorner \mathbf{C}_{7\rho_{i_0}/2}(Z, P_i) = 0$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{T}\|(\mathbf{C}_{7\rho_{i_0}/2}(Z, P_i)) &\leq \|\tilde{T}\|(\mathbf{B}_{(7/2+C_1\eta)\rho_{i_0}}(Z)) \leq (q + 2\delta) \omega_n (7/2 + C_1\eta)^n \rho_{i_0}^n \\ &\leq (q + \delta_{3.4}) \omega_n (7\rho_{i_0}/4)^n. \end{aligned}$$

By (7.22) and (7.23),

$$E(\tilde{T}, P_i, \mathbf{C}_{7\rho/4}(Z, P_i)) \leq (8/7)^{(n+2)/2} E(T, P_i, \mathbf{B}_{2\rho}(Z, P_i)) \leq (8/7)^{(n+2)/2} C_0 \eta \left(\frac{\rho}{\rho_{i_0}}\right)^\alpha$$

for all  $\rho \in [\rho_{i+1}, 2\rho_{i_0}]$ . Thus we can apply Theorem 3.4 together with the fact that  $N_{\tilde{T}, P_i, Z}(\rho_{i_0}) < 1 + \nu/2$  and (7.14) to obtain

$$(7.24) \quad N_{\tilde{T}, P_i, Z}(\rho) \leq e^{C_0^\gamma \eta^\gamma (\rho/\rho_{i_0})^{\alpha\gamma}} N_{\tilde{T}, P_i, Z}(\rho_{i_0}) \leq e^{2\alpha\gamma C_0^\gamma \eta^\gamma} (1 + \nu/2) \leq 1 + \nu$$

for all  $\rho \in [\rho_{i+1}, \rho_{i_0}]$ . Note that by (7.23),  $\tilde{T} = T \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{15\rho_{i_0}/4}(Z)$  in  $\mathbf{C}_{2\rho_i}(Z, P_i)$ . Therefore, by (7.16), the fact that  $E(T, P_i, \mathbf{B}_{4\rho_i}(Z)) < \eta$  and (7.24), we can apply Lemma 6.2 to deduce that either conclusion (i) or conclusion (ii) holds true for all  $\rho \in I_i$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 7.2** (Theorem 1.1 in the introduction). *For every  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$  and  $\beta \in (0, 1)$  there exists  $R = R(n, m, q, \varepsilon, \beta) > 2$ ,  $\delta = \delta(n, m, q, \varepsilon, \beta) \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\eta = \eta(n, m, q, \varepsilon, \beta) \in (0, 1)$ , and  $\alpha = \alpha(n, m, q, \varepsilon, \beta) \in (0, 1)$  such that the following holds true. Suppose that  $T$  is  $n$ -dimensional area-minimizing integral current of  $\mathbf{B}_R(0)$  such that*

$$(7.25) \quad (\partial T) \llcorner \mathbf{B}_R(0) = 0, \quad \|T\|(\mathbf{B}_R(0)) \leq (q + \delta) \omega_n R^n.$$

Then

$$\{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0) : \Theta(T, X) \geq q\} = \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{B}$$

where  $\mathcal{B}$  and  $\mathcal{S}$  are sets such that:

(I) For each  $Z_0 \in \mathcal{S}$  there exists a  $\rho_0 \in (0, 1]$  (depending on  $T$  and  $Z_0$ ) such that for every  $Z \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{B}_{\rho_0}(Z_0)$  with  $\Theta(T, Z) \geq q$  and every  $\rho \in (0, \rho_0]$  one of the following holds true:

(i) there exists  $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_q$  such that

$$(7.26) \quad E(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_\rho(Z)) < \varepsilon,$$

$$(7.27) \quad Q(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_\rho(Z)) \leq \beta \inf_{P' \in \mathcal{P}} E(T, P', \mathbf{B}_\rho(Z)),$$

$$(7.28) \quad \{X \in \mathbf{B}_\rho(Z) : \Theta(T, X) \geq q\} \subset \{X \in \mathbf{B}_\rho(Z) : \text{dist}(X, Z + \text{spine } \mathbf{C}) < \varepsilon\rho\};$$

(ii) there is an  $(n-3)$ -dimensional linear subspace  $L$  of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  such that

$$(7.29) \quad \{X \in \mathbf{B}_\rho(Z) : \Theta(T, X) \geq q\} \subset \{X \in \mathbf{B}_\rho(Z) : \text{dist}(X, Z + L) < \varepsilon\rho\}.$$

(II) For each  $Z_0 \in \mathcal{B}$ ,  $\Theta(T, Z_0) = q$  and there is a unique oriented  $n$ -dimensional plane  $P_{Z_0}$  such that

(i) the  $L^2$ -distance of  $T$  to  $P_{Z_0}$  is decaying in that

$$(7.30) \quad E(T, P_{Z_0}, \mathbf{B}_{2\rho}(Z_0)) \leq C_0 \eta \rho^\alpha$$

for all  $\rho \in (0, 1]$ , where  $C_0 = C_0(n, m, q, \varepsilon, \beta) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant;

(ii)  $q\llbracket P_{Z_0} \rrbracket$  is the unique tangent cone to  $T$  at  $Z_0$ ;

(iii) the planar frequency  $\mathcal{N}_{T, \text{Pl}}(Z_0) = \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0^+} N_{T, P_{Z_0}, Z_0}(\rho)$  exists and  $\mathcal{N}_{T, \text{Pl}}(Z_0)(0^+) \geq 1 + \alpha$ .

*Proof of Theorem 7.2.* Fix  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$  and  $\beta \in (0, 1)$  and let  $\alpha, \eta, \delta$ , and  $R$  be as in (7.9)–(7.15), where  $C_0 \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant such that (7.22) and (7.30) both hold true. Recall that by the monotonicity formula for area that we may assume  $R = R(n, q, \delta)$  is large that

$$(7.31) \quad q \leq \frac{\|T\|(\mathbf{B}_\rho(Z))}{\omega_n \rho^n} \leq q + \delta$$

for all  $Z \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)$  with  $\Theta(T, Z) \geq q$  and all  $\rho \in (0, R - 1]$  (as in (7.8)).

For each  $Z_0 \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)$  with  $\Theta(T, Z_0) \geq q$  and each  $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ , set  $\rho_i = 2^{-i}$  and let  $P_{Z_0, i}$  be an  $n$ -dimensional plane such that

$$(7.32) \quad E(T, P_{Z_0, i}, \mathbf{B}_{\rho_i}(Z_0)) = \inf_{P' \in \mathcal{P}} E(T, P', \mathbf{B}_{\rho_i}(Z_0))$$

Define  $\mathcal{S}$  to be the set of all  $Z_0 \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)$  with  $\Theta(T, Z_0) \geq q$  such that for some  $i \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ , one of the following holds true:

(A)  $E(T, P_{Z_0, i}, \mathbf{B}_{4\rho_i}(Z_0)) \geq \eta$ ;

(B)  $E(T, P_{Z_0, i}, \mathbf{B}_{4\rho_i}(Z_0)) < \eta$  and  $E(T, P_{Z_0, i}, \mathbf{B}_{2\rho_i}(Z_0)) > 2^{-\alpha} E(T, P_{Z_0, i+1}, \mathbf{B}_{4\rho_i}(Z_0))$ .

Thus by Theorem 7.1 we can set  $\rho_0 = \rho_i/R$  to conclude that for each  $Z \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{B}_{\rho_0}(Z_0)$  with  $\Theta(T, Z) \geq q$  and each  $\rho \in (0, \rho_0]$  either there exists  $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_q$  such that (7.26), (7.27) and (7.28) hold true or there is an  $(n - 3)$ -dimensional linear subspace  $L$  such that (7.29) holds true.

Set

$$\mathcal{B} = \{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0) : \Theta(T, X) = q\} \setminus \mathcal{S}$$

so that for each  $Z_0 \in \mathcal{B}$  and each  $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots$

$$(7.33) \quad E(T, P_{Z_0, i}, \mathbf{B}_{4\rho_i}(Z_0)) \leq \eta,$$

$$(7.34) \quad E(T, P_{Z_0, i}, \mathbf{B}_{2\rho_i}(Z_0)) \leq 2^{-\alpha} E(T, P_{Z_0, i+1}, \mathbf{B}_{4\rho_i}(Z_0)).$$

Fix  $Z_0 \in \mathcal{B}$  and to simplify notation let  $P_i = P_{Z_0, i}$ . Iteratively applying (7.34), for each  $i \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$

$$(7.35) \quad E(T, P_i, \mathbf{B}_{2\rho_i}(Z_0)) \leq 2^{-\alpha i} E(T, P_{Z_0, 1}, \mathbf{B}_2(Z_0)) \leq C \eta 2^{-\alpha i},$$

where  $C = C(n) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant.

Arguing as we did to obtain (7.19), it follows from (7.35) that

$$(7.36) \quad \|\pi_{P_i} - \pi_{P_j}\| \leq C \eta 2^{-\alpha i}$$

for all  $0 \leq i \leq j$ , where  $C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant. Hence the sequence  $(P_i)$  is a Cauchy sequence and there must be an  $n$ -dimensional plane  $P_{Z_0}$  such that  $\|\pi_{P_i} - \pi_{P_{Z_0}}\| \rightarrow 0$  as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ .

Equivalently,  $\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(P_i \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0), P_{Z_0} \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \rightarrow 0$  as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ . By letting  $j \rightarrow \infty$  in (7.36),

$$(7.37) \quad \|\pi_{P_i} - \pi_{P_{Z_0}}\| \leq C\eta 2^{-\alpha i}$$

for each  $i \geq 0$ . Noting that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \text{dist}(X, Z_0 + P_i) - \text{dist}(X, Z_0 + P_{Z_0}) \right| &= \left| |\pi_{P_i}^\perp(X - Z_0)| - |\pi_{P_{Z_0}}^\perp(X - Z_0)| \right| \\ &\leq \|\pi_{P_i} - \pi_{P_{Z_0}}\| |X - Z_0| \end{aligned}$$

for all  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  and using the triangle inequality, (7.35), (7.37), and (7.31),

$$(7.38) \quad \begin{aligned} E(T, P_{Z_0}, \mathbf{B}_{2\rho_i}(Z_0))^2 &= \frac{1}{\omega_n(2\rho_i)^{n+2}} \int_{\mathbf{B}_{2\rho_i}(Z_0)} \text{dist}^2(X, Z_0 + P_{Z_0}) d\|T\|(X) \\ &\leq \frac{2}{\omega_n(2\rho_i)^{n+2}} \int_{\mathbf{B}_{2\rho_i}(Z_0)} \text{dist}^2(X, Z_0 + P_i) d\|T\|(X) + 2(q+1)\omega_n \|\pi_{P_i} - \pi_{P_{Z_0}}\|^2 \\ &\leq C\eta^2 2^{-2\alpha i} = C\eta^2 \rho_i^{2\alpha} \end{aligned}$$

for each  $i \geq 0$ , where  $C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants. For each  $\rho \in (0, 1]$  we can find an integer  $i \geq 0$  such that  $\rho_{i+1} < \rho \leq \rho_i$  and thus by (7.38), (7.30) holds true. As was discussed in Lemma 4.1, it follows from (7.30) that we can equip  $P_{Z_0}$  with an orientation such that  $\eta_{Z_0, \rho} \# T \rightarrow q[[P_{Z_0}]]$  weakly in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  as  $\rho \rightarrow 0^+$ ; that is,  $q[[P_{Z_0}]]$  is the unique tangent cone to  $T$  at  $Z_0$ . By Corollary 4.3 and (7.30),  $N_{T, P_{Z_0}, Z_0}(0^+) \geq 1 + \alpha$ .  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [All72] Allard, William K. *On the first variation of a varifold*. Ann. of Math. 95.3 (1972): 417-491.
- [Alm66] Almgren, Jr. F. J. *Some interior regularity theorems for minimal surfaces and an extension of Bernstein's theorem*. Ann. of Math. 84 (1966), 277-292.
- [Alm83] Almgren, Jr. F. J. *Almgren's big regularity paper: Q-valued functions minimizing Dirichlet's integral and the regularity of area minimizing rectifiable currents up to codimension two*. World Scientific Monograph Series in Mathematics. 1 World Scientific Publishing Co. Inc., River Edge, NJ (2000).
- [DeG61] De Giorgi, E. *Frontiere orientate di misura minima* Sem. Mat. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa (1961), 1-56.
- [DS11] De Lellis, C. and Spadaro, E. *Almgren's Q-valued functions revisited*. Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. 211 (2011) no. 991, vi+79 pp.
- [DS14] De Lellis, C. and Spadaro, E. *Regularity of area minimizing currents I: gradient L p estimates*. GAFA 24.6 (2014): 1831-1884.
- [DS15] De Lellis, C. and Spadaro, E. *Multiple valued functions and integral currents*. Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5) 14 (2015),
- [DS16-I] De Lellis, C. and Spadaro, E. *Regularity of area minimizing currents II: center manifold*. Ann. of Math. (2016): 499-575.
- [DS16-II] De Lellis, C. and Spadaro, E. *Regularity of area minimizing currents III: blow-up*. Ann. of Math. (2016): 577-617.
- [DMSV18] De Lellis, C., Marchese, A., Spadaro, E., Valtorta, E. *Rectifiability and upper Minkowski bounds for singularities of harmonic Q-valued maps*. Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici 93.4 (2018):737-779.
- [Fed69] Federer, H. *Geometric measure theory*. Springer, 2014.
- [Fed70] Federer, H. *The singular sets of area minimizing rectifiable currents with codimension one and area minimizing flat chains modulo two with arbitrary codimension* Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 76 (1970), 767-771.
- [Fle62] Fleming W. H. *On the oriented Plateau problem*. Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo (2) 11 (1962), 69-90.
- [HS79] Hardt, R. and Simon, L. *Boundary regularity and embedded solutions for the oriented Plateau problem*. Annals of Math. 110 (1979): 439-486.
- [KrumWic-b] Krummel, B. and Wickramasekera, N. *Analysis of singularities of area minimising currents: a uniform height bound, estimates away from branch points of rapid decay, and uniqueness of tangent cones*. preprint.
- [KrumWic-c] Krummel, B. and Wickramasekera, N. *Analysis of singularities of area minimising currents: higher order decay estimates at branch points and size and rectifiability of the singular set*. manuscript in preparation.
- [KW21] Krummel, B. and Wickramasekera, N. *Fine properties of branch point singularities: stationary graphs and stable minimal hypersurfaces near points of density < 3*. arXiv:2111.12246v1 (2021).



- [KW17] Krummel, B. and Wickramasekera, N. *Fine properties of branch point singularities: Dirichlet energy minimizing multi-valued functions*. arXiv:1711.06222 (2017).
- [MW22] Minter, P. and Wickramasekera, N. *A structure theory for stable codimension 1 integral varifolds with applications to area minimising hypersurfaces mod p*. arXiv:2111.11202 (2022).
- [NV15] Naber, A. and Valtorta, D. *The singular structure and regularity of stationary and minimizing varifolds*. Jour. Euro. Math. Soc. 22(10) (2015), 3305-3382.
- [JSim68] J. Simons *Minimal varieties in Riemannian manifolds* Ann. of Math. 88 (1968), 62-105.
- [Sim83] Simon, L. (1983). *Lecture Notes on Geometric Measure Theory*. Proceedings of the Centre for Mathematical Analysis, Australian National University, 3.
- [Sim93] Simon, L. *Cylindrical Tangent Cones and the singular set of minimal submanifolds*. J. Diff. Geo. (1993) 38:585–652.
- [Sim96] Simon, L. *Theorems on regularity and singularity of energy minimizing map*. Springer Science & Business Media (1996).
- [Whi83] White, B. *Tangent cones to 2-dimensional area-minimizing integral currents are unique*. Duke Math. J. **50** (1983), 143–160.
- [Wic08] Wickramasekera, N. *A regularity and compactness theory for immersed stable minimal hypersurfaces of multiplicity at most 2*. J. Diff. Geo. 80.1 (2008): 79–173.
- [Wic14] Wickramasekera, N. *A general regularity theory for stable codimension 1 integral varifolds*. Ann. of Math. (2014): 843–1007.

Brian Krummel  
School of Mathematics & Statistics  
University of Melbourne  
Parkville, VIC 3010, Australia  
brian.krummel@unimelb.edu.au

Neshan Wickramasekera  
DPMMS  
University of Cambridge  
Cambridge CB3 0WB, United Kingdom  
N.Wickramasekera@dpms.cam.ac.uk