

A rigorous approach to pattern formation for isotropic isoperimetric problems with competing nonlocal interactions

Sara Daneri^{*1} and Eris Runa^{†1,2}

¹Gran Sasso Science Institute, L'Aquila, Italy

²Courant Institute, NYU, USA

Dedicated to Pierangelo Marcati on the occasion of his 71st birthday.

Abstract

We introduce a rigorous approach to the study of the symmetry breaking and pattern formation phenomenon for isotropic functionals with local/nonlocal interactions in competition.

We consider a general class of nonlocal variational problems in dimension $d \geq 2$, in which an isotropic surface term favouring pure phases competes with an isotropic nonlocal term with power law kernel favouring alternation between different phases.

Close to the critical regime in which the two terms are of the same order, we give a rigorous proof of the conjectured structure of global minimizers, in the shape of domains with flat boundary (e.g. stripes or lamellae).

The natural framework in which our approach is set and developed is the one of calculus of variations and geometric measure theory.

Among others, we detect a nonlocal curvature-type quantity which is controlled by the energy functional and whose finiteness implies flatness for sufficiently regular boundaries.

The power of decay of the considered kernels at infinity is $p \geq d + 3$ and it is related to pattern formation in synthetic antiferromagnets. The decay $p = d + 3$ is optimal to get the flatness of regular boundaries of finite energy in the critical regime.

Keywords: Nonlocal variational problems, geometric measure theory, pattern formation.

1. Introduction

We consider the following class of functionals, in general dimension $d \geq 1$: for $J > 0$, $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ open and bounded and $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, let

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{J,p,d}(E, \Omega) = \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \left[J \text{Per}(E; \Omega) - \int_{\Omega} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\chi_E(x + \zeta) - \chi_E(x)| K(\zeta) dx d\zeta \right], \quad (1.1)$$

where $\text{Per}(\cdot, \Omega)$ is the classical isotropic perimeter functional relative to Ω (measuring for regular sets the surface measure of their boundary inside Ω) and K is an isotropic integrable kernel with p -power law decay at infinity (for precise assumptions see (2.13)–(2.17)).

It is since long well-established that such a type of energy competition (between short range interactions favouring pure phases and long range interactions favouring alternation between different phases) is at the base of spontaneous pattern formation in nature. In particular,

^{*}sara.daneri@gssi.it

[†]eris.runa@gssi.it

experiments and simulations in different physical systems suggest that in a suitable regime in which the competition is active (modulated in our case by the value of the constant J) the continuous symmetry of the functionals is broken, namely minimizers have less symmetries than the original functionals, and moreover they are organized, far from boundary effects, into periodic or nearly periodic structures (see e.g. [44, 5, 47, 29, 45, 4, 30, 41] and references therein).

A long standing problem in the mathematical community is to understand rigorously the mechanisms that are at the base of energy-driven pattern formation. While in dimension $d = 1$ periodicity of minimizers is now understood under convexity (see e.g. [2, 38, 9, 43, 24]) or reflection positivity assumptions on the kernel (see e.g. [21, 23]), in more than one space dimension the additional phenomenon of symmetry breaking makes the problem significantly more challenging.

In general, suitably tuning the parameters modulating the competition between the short range and the long range term, one expects to observe a variety of different patterns.

A very common pattern is that given by small droplets centered at the vertexes of a periodic lattice. This picture is observed for example in a regime in which the surface term is dominant w.r.t. the nonlocal term and a volume constraint is imposed. The problem of periodic droplets formation, and the related study of the shape of minimizers in the Gamov's liquid drop model, has received a lot of attention and has been widely investigated, giving deep and interesting results in low volume fraction regimes (see e.g. [11, 12, 32, 39, 31, 6, 13, 34, 20, 33, 27, 26, 40, 10] and references therein). However, the exact shape of droplets and their arrangement in periodic structures still remains a major open problem in its full generality.

In this paper we are interested in studying the emergence of another type of pattern ubiquitous in nature, namely the so-called stripes/lamellae. By stripes we mean phases separated by flat and disjoint interfaces orthogonal to a given direction. Such patterns are the first one which are expected to emerge from uniform phases once symmetry is broken and are observed for example in a regime in which the surface term and the nonlocal term are of the same order.

In this regime, in more than one space dimension, symmetry breaking has been recently proved w.r.t. a discrete group of symmetries (i.e. coordinate permutations). The discreteness of the symmetry group was either due to the anisotropy of the domain (in the discrete setting of [25]) or of the interactions (in [16, 28]). In the discrete domain given by a square lattice, for kernels with power $p > 2d$, striped pattern formation was first proved in [25]. On continuous domains but for anisotropic interactions (perimeter and kernel) symmetric w.r.t. the group of coordinate permutations, symmetry breaking was proved in [28], for powers $p > 2d$. For the same class of interactions and domains, in [16] the authors proved exact striped pattern formation for exponents $p \geq d + 2$ (see also [19]). Similar results were then obtained for screened Coulomb kernels [18], for diffuse interface versions of the model [14, 17] (proving exact one-dimensionality of minimizers in general dimension), and including a volume constraint [15].

In the case of isotropic interactions, there are in the literature only partial results: for Coulomb kernels in dimension $d \geq 2$ we mention the seminal paper of Alberti, Choksi and Otto [1] in which they prove that minimizers satisfy a uniform distribution of energy; in dimension $d = 2$ exact pattern formation was proved on thin domains $\Omega = (0, \varepsilon) \times (0, 1)$, with $\varepsilon \ll 1$ [36]. More recently, Muratov and Simon [42] proved that in dimension $d = 2$ and for kernels decaying at infinity with power $p = d + 3$, when considering the Γ -limit as the radius of the regularization of the kernel at the origin tends to 0 in the critical regime, minimizers exist and cannot be disks. Such a decay (in dimension $d = 2$) is physically related to the energy of two identical, but oppositely oriented dipolar patches lying in parallel planes separated by a given positive distance. Such a model is, for example, relevant to synthetic antiferromagnets, in which the antiparallel alignment of spins in adjacent layers is favoured by antiferromagnetic exchange coupling through a spacer layer (see, e.g. [37]). Heuristically, the kernel behaves as in a dipolar layer on scales smaller than the distance between the two planes, while on large scales the kernel

decays faster, thus reducing the long-range repulsion in the far field.

In this paper, we consider kernels with power law decay at infinity $p \geq d + 3$ in general dimension d .

If the kernel decays at infinity like a power $p > d + 1$, it is well known that there is a critical constant $J_c > 0$ such that for $J > J_c$, $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{J,p,d} \geq 0$ and it is minimized by the trivial sets \emptyset, \mathbb{R}^d (see [21]). The constant J_c is given by

$$J_c = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\zeta_1| K(\zeta) d\zeta, \quad (1.2)$$

where $\zeta_1 = \langle \zeta, e_1 \rangle$. Symmetry breaking and striped pattern formation is conjectured for $J < J_c$, $|J - J_c| \ll 1$.

Our main result (see Theorem 1.1 below) consists in proving such a conjecture. To state it precisely, we need to introduce some further notation and to suitably rescale the functional (without changing the structure of the minimizers). Set $\tau := J_c - J > 0$. Minimizing $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{J_c - \tau, p, d}$ in the class of periodic unions of stripes, one can see that for $0 < \tau \ll 1$ the stripes with optimal energy have width and distance of order $\tau^{-1/(p-d-1)}$ and energy of order $\tau^{(p-d)/(p-d-1)}$. Therefore it is natural to rescale the spatial variables and the functional so that the optimal width and distance for unions of stripes is $O(1)$ and the energy is $O(1)$ for $0 < \tau \ll 1$. Assume w.l.o.g. that $0 \in \Omega$. Then, setting $\tau^{-1/(p-d-1)}\zeta' = \zeta$, $\tau^{-1/(p-d-1)}x' = x$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{J_c - \tau, p, d}(E, \Omega) = \tau^{(p-d)/(p-d-1)}\mathcal{F}_{\tau, p, d}(E\tau^{1/(p-d-1)}, \Omega\tau^{1/(p-d-1)})$, and rescaling the kernel K into K_τ satisfying assumptions (2.13)–(2.17), one ends up considering the functional

$$\mathcal{F}_{\tau, p, d}(E, \Omega) = \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \left[J_\tau \text{Per}(E, \Omega) - \int_{\Omega} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\chi_E(x + \zeta) - \chi_E(x)| K_\tau(\zeta) dx d\zeta \right], \quad (1.3)$$

where

$$\frac{1}{C \max\{\tau^{1/(p-d-1)}, \|\zeta\|\}^p} \leq K_\tau(\zeta) \leq \frac{C}{\max\{\tau^{1/(p-d-1)}, \|\zeta\|\}^p} \quad (1.4)$$

and

$$J_\tau = \int_{\{\|\zeta\| \leq 1\}} |\zeta_\theta| K_\tau(\zeta) d\zeta \quad \text{for any } \theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}, \zeta_\theta = \langle \zeta, \theta \rangle, \zeta = \zeta_\theta \theta + \zeta_\theta^\perp. \quad (1.5)$$

To avoid boundary effects, for $L \gg 1$ assume now that $\Omega = [0, L]^d$ and that we consider sets $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ which are $[0, L]^d$ -periodic. Our main result is the following

Theorem 1.1. *Let $d \geq 2$, $p \geq d + 3$, $L > 0$. Then, there exists $\hat{\tau} > 0$ such that for every $0 < \tau < \hat{\tau}$ the $[0, L]^d$ -periodic minimizers E_τ of $\mathcal{F}_{\tau, p, d}(\cdot, [0, L]^d)$ are, up to a rigid motion, of the form*

$$E_\tau = \hat{E}_\tau \times \mathbb{R}^{d-1}, \quad \hat{E}_\tau = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} (2kh_L^*, (2k+1)h_L^*), \quad (1.6)$$

for some $h_L^* > 0$ such that $2kh_L^* = L$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

In [28, 16], a similar rescaling around the critical constant J_c led the authors to consider the rescaled functionals on $\Omega = (0, L)^d$ given by

$$\mathcal{F}_{\tau, p, d}^1(E, (0, L)^d) = \frac{1}{L^d} \left[J_\tau^1 \text{Per}_1(E, (0, L)^d) - \int_{(0, L)^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\chi_E(x + \zeta) - \chi_E(x)| K_\tau^1(\zeta) dx d\zeta \right], \quad (1.7)$$

where $\text{Per}_1(E, (0, L)^d)$ is the anisotropic perimeter functional defined by

$$\text{Per}_1(E, (0, L)^d) = \int_{\partial^* E} \|\nu_E(x)\|_1 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x), \quad \|z\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^d |z_i|, \quad (1.8)$$

the kernel K_τ^1 is symmetric w.r.t. coordinate permutations, converges monotonically increasing for $\tau \rightarrow 0$ to $\frac{1}{\|\zeta\|_1^p}$, satisfies

$$\frac{1}{C(\tau^{1/(p-d-1)} + \|\zeta\|)^p} \leq K_\tau^1(\zeta) \leq \frac{C}{(\tau^{1/(p-d-1)} + \|\zeta\|)^p}, \quad (1.9)$$

and

$$J_\tau^1 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \int_{-1}^1 |\zeta_i| K_\tau^1(\zeta) d\zeta_i d\zeta_i^\perp \quad \text{for any } i = 1, \dots, d, \zeta_i = \langle \zeta, e_i \rangle, \zeta = \zeta_i e_i + \zeta_i^\perp \quad (1.10)$$

with e_i coordinate directions.

In order to show that minimizers for $0 < \tau \ll 1$ are close to stripes (in [28] for $p > 2d$ and in [16] for $p \geq d + 2$) the authors introduced the following strategy:

1. Find a decomposition of the functional into d terms penalizing oscillations of χ_E in each coordinate direction plus a cross interaction term penalizing boundaries which are not orthogonal to the coordinate directions e_1, \dots, e_d ;
2. Show that the Γ -limit of $\mathcal{F}_{\tau,p,d}^1(\cdot, (0, L)^d)$ as $\tau \rightarrow 0$ is finite only on stripes with boundaries orthogonal to one of the coordinate directions (rigidity estimate).

Then, in [16], exact striped pattern formation for $0 < \tau \ll 1$ was proved by a so called stability estimate in which it was shown that for sufficiently small τ and for sets with sufficiently small L^1 distance from stripes, stripes have lower energy.

Understanding which mechanisms are at the base of symmetry breaking and striped pattern formation in the isotropic setting, fundamental for most physical applications, remained an open problem.

To prove continuous symmetry breaking (namely, breaking of rotational symmetry) requires major steps forward with respect to discrete symmetry breaking. In both cases, the goal is to show that the normal to the boundary of the minimizers is locally constant. However, while in the anisotropic setting there is a discrete hence disconnected set of preferred directions $\{e_1, \dots, e_d\}$, in the isotropic setting every direction $\nu \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ is admissible. Moreover, one of the difficulties in the isotropic setting is to control both small curvature deviations on large scales and large curvature deviations on small scales. In order to do so, we first identify an integral geometric formulation (see Proposition 3.1) for the functional (1.3) which in the critical regime $\tau = 0$ allows to control a nonlocal type of curvature of the boundary of sets of finite energy (see Proposition 5.2). Such a control implies flatness of the boundaries of Lipschitz sets of finite energy (see Lemma 5.7). Hence, to show flatness we proceed by showing regularity of the boundary of sets of finite energy in the critical regime (see Theorem 5.3 and for more details on the analysis in the critical regime, see the first part of Section 5). Once the symmetry is broken in the limit $\tau \rightarrow 0$, for $0 < \tau \ll 1$ we proceed via a d -dimensional optimization argument.

1.1 Plan of the paper

In Section 2 we introduce some preliminary notation, classical geometric measure theory facts, and the main assumptions on the nonlocal kernel. The proof of Theorem 1.1 is organized following the above meta-strategy, namely: finding a suitable decomposition of the functional bounding quantities with geometrical meaning; proving a rigidity estimate that shows that minimizers are close to stripes as $\tau \rightarrow 0$; showing stability estimates for $0 < \tau \ll 1$. In Section 3 we introduce an integral geometric formulation for the functional (1.3) which will be crucial in our analysis. Section 4 contains a series of one dimensional energy bounds and one dimensional optimization procedures which will be applied in the following sections to the one dimensional

slices of the minimizing sets. Section 5 contains the main rigidity estimates in the critical regime and Γ -convergence results as $\tau \rightarrow 0$. To guide the reader, at the beginning of Section 5 we give an outline of the main steps of the proof. A part of the regularity estimates needed in Section 5 is reported in the Appendix. Finally, in Section 6 we complete the proof of Theorem 1.1 by showing exact striped pattern formation for $0 < \tau \ll 1$.

Acknowledgements

The second author is supported by the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie Grant Agreement No 101063588. All authors are members of the GNAMPA group in INDAM. The authors thank Guido De Philippis and Camillo De Lellis for the hospitality respectively at Courant Institute and Institute for Advanced Study.

2. Notation and preliminaries

We denote by \mathbb{S}^{d-1} the unit sphere in \mathbb{R}^d and by $B_r(x)$ the Euclidean ball of radius $r > 0$. We let $\langle x, y \rangle$ be the scalar product between $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and by $\|x\|$ the Euclidean norm of $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. We let $\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(E)$ be the $(d-1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure of a set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and by $|E|$ its Lebesgue measure. When restricting to k -dimensional affine subspaces of \mathbb{R}^d and it is clear from the context, we will use the same notation $|\cdot|$ to denote the k -dimensional Hausdorff measure. We denote by ω_d the Lebesgue measure of the unit ball in \mathbb{R}^d . Given a Radon measure μ on \mathbb{R}^d , we denote by $|\mu|$ its total variation and by $\text{spt}\mu$ its support. Given a bounded set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we define $\text{dist}(x, A) = \inf\{\|y - x\| : y \in A\}$. Moreover, given $\rho > 0$, we define $(A)_\rho = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^d : \text{dist}(z, A) < \rho\}$. We denote by $\#A$ the cardinality of the set A and by \bar{A} its closure. For sets $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, we let $A\Delta B = (A \setminus B) \cup (B \setminus A)$ be their symmetric difference. For every $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, we let

$$\theta^\perp := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \langle x, \theta \rangle = 0 \right\} \quad (2.1)$$

and given $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ we denote by $(\Omega)_\theta^\perp$ the projection of Ω on the $(d-1)$ -dimensional plane θ^\perp . Given a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we can decompose it as a sum of orthogonal vectors $x = x_\theta^\perp + x_\theta\theta$, where $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, $x_\theta^\perp \in \theta^\perp$ and $x_\theta \in \mathbb{R}$. We define the one dimensional slice of E in direction θ with reference point $x_\theta^\perp \in \theta^\perp$ as

$$E_{x_\theta^\perp} := \left\{ z \in \mathbb{R}^d : z \in E \cap (x_\theta^\perp + \theta\mathbb{R}) \right\}. \quad (2.2)$$

With a slight abuse of notation we will also identify the points in $E_{x_\theta^\perp}$ with the points $s \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $x_\theta^\perp + s\theta \in E$.

Given $k = 1, \dots, d-1$, we denote the Grassmanian of k -dimensional planes in \mathbb{R}^d , by $G(k, \mathbb{R}^d)$. We denote the elements of $G(k, \mathbb{R}^d)$ by π_k and by π_k^\perp the $d-k$ -dimensional subspace orthogonal to π_k . We also decompose points $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ as $x = x_{\pi_k} + x_{\pi_k}^\perp$, where $x_{\pi_k} \in \pi_k$ and $x_{\pi_k}^\perp \in \pi_k^\perp$ and denote by $E_{x_{\pi_k}^\perp}$ the k -dimensional slice of E with the affine k -dimensional plane parallel to π_k and passing through the point $x_{\pi_k}^\perp$. We let $\mathbb{S}_{\pi_k}^{k-1} = \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \cap \pi_k$ and for $\theta \in \mathbb{S}_{\pi_k}^{k-1}$ we denote the points in $(\pi_k)_\theta^\perp$ by $x_{(\pi_k)_\theta^\perp}$.

We denote by $\mu_{k,d}$ the invariant finite Radon measure on $G(k, \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that for any measurable function $f : \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$

$$\int_{G(k, \mathbb{R}^d)} \int_{\mathbb{S}_{\pi_k}^{k-1}} f(\theta) d\theta d\mu_{k,d}(\pi_k) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} f(\theta) d\theta. \quad (2.3)$$

For a set of locally finite perimeter $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, we denote by $D\chi_E$ the associated Radon measure, by ∂^*E the reduced boundary and by ν_E the measure theoretic exterior normal at points of ∂^*E . We let ∂E be the topological boundary of E , where we consider a representative E such that

$$\text{spt}D\chi_E = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : 0 < |E \cap B_r(x)| < \omega_d r^d, \quad \forall r > 0\} = \partial E. \quad (2.4)$$

In general, $\partial^*E \subset \partial E$ and $\overline{\partial^*E} = \partial E$.

We notice also that, by the blow-up properties of the reduced boundary, for every $z \in \partial^*E$ and for every $r > 0$ it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \{s \in [0, r] : z + s\theta \in E\} \right| &> 0, \quad \text{for a.e. } \theta \text{ s.t. } \langle \nu_E(z), \theta \rangle < 0 \\ \left| \{s \in [0, r] : z + s\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus E\} \right| &> 0, \quad \text{for a.e. } \theta \text{ s.t. } \langle \nu_E(z), \theta \rangle > 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

For $x \in \partial^*E$ we denote by $H_{\nu_E(x)}(x)$ the affine halfspace $H_{\nu_E(x)}(x) := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^d : \langle y - x, \nu_E(x) \rangle < 0\}$.

Given $\eta > 0$, $\nu \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we define the cone with vertex at x , base plane ν^\perp and opening η as

$$K_\eta(x, \nu) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^d : |y_\nu - x_\nu| < \eta\}.$$

Using the slicing properties of sets of finite perimeter, for any set E of locally finite perimeter, for a.e. $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, for a.e. $x_\theta^\perp \in \theta^\perp$, the set $E_{x_\theta^\perp}$ is a one dimensional set of locally finite perimeter. Hence, on any compact interval $[a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}$, $\#(\partial^*E_{x_\theta^\perp} \cap [a, b]) < +\infty$.

Given a point $x_\theta \in \partial^*E_{x_\theta^\perp}$, we denote by x_θ^+ and x_θ^- the points in $\partial^*E_{x_\theta^\perp}$ which are closest to x_θ and for which respectively $x_\theta^+ - x_\theta > 0$, $x_\theta^- - x_\theta < 0$. For later use, we introduce also the following notation

$$\mathbf{r}_\theta(x) := |x_\theta - x_\theta^+|. \quad (2.6)$$

We will denote by $\text{Per}^{1D}(A)$ the one dimensional perimeter of a set $A \subset \mathbb{R}$, and by $\text{Per}^{1D}(A, \Omega)$ the one dimensional perimeter of A relative to $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, with a slight abuse of notation, given $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $B = \{\bar{x} + s\theta : s \in A\}$ for some $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ and $A \subset \mathbb{R}$, we define $\text{Per}^{1D}(B) := \text{Per}^{1D}(A)$. The same applies to the perimeter of a set B as above relative to a set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$.

We recall (see e.g. [3, 35]) the following classical slicing formula: given $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and a measurable function $g : \Omega \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $g(\cdot, \theta)$ is $\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \llcorner (\partial^*E \cap \Omega)$ -summable, one has that

$$\int_{\partial^*E \cap \Omega} |\langle \nu_E(x), \theta \rangle| g(x, \theta) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) = \int_{\theta^\perp} \sum_{s \in \partial^*E_{x_\theta^\perp} \cap \Omega_{x_\theta^\perp}} g(x_\theta^\perp + s\theta, \theta) dx_\theta^\perp. \quad (2.7)$$

Moreover,

$$\int_{\partial^*E \cap \Omega} \langle \nu_E(x), \theta \rangle g(x, \theta) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) = \int_{\theta^\perp} \sum_{s \in \partial^*E_{x_\theta^\perp} \cap \Omega_{x_\theta^\perp}} \text{sign}(\langle \nu_E(x_\theta^\perp + s\theta), \theta \rangle) g(x_\theta^\perp + s\theta, \theta) dx_\theta^\perp. \quad (2.8)$$

Given a set of locally finite perimeter $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, and a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, one defines the (spherical) excess of E in the ball of radius r centered at x as

$$\text{Exc}(E, x, r) = \frac{1}{r^{d-1}} \left[|D\chi_E|(B_r(x)) - |D\chi_E(B_r(x))| \right]. \quad (2.9)$$

One has that for all $x \in \partial^*E$, $\text{Exc}(E, x, r) \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow 0$. The converse does not necessarily hold. However, we will use in the proof the following sufficient condition, guaranteeing that

$\partial E = \partial^* E$ (see [46]). Whenever for $x \in \partial E$ there exist $R, C_1, C_2, \alpha > 0$ such that for all $0 < r < R$, the following holds:

$$\text{Per}(E, B_r(x)) \geq C_1 r^{d-1} \quad (2.10)$$

$$\text{Exc}(E, x, r) \leq C_2 r^\alpha, \quad (2.11)$$

then $x \in \partial^* E$. In particular, if (2.10) and (2.11) hold for every $x \in \partial E$, then $\partial E = \partial^* E$. Given a sequence of sets $\{E_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, we say that $E_n \rightarrow E$ in $L^1(\Omega)$ whenever $|((E_n \Delta E) \cap \Omega)| \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, or equivalently if $\|\chi_{E_n} - \chi_E\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. For simplicity of exposition we fix the kernel K in (1.1) to be

$$K(\zeta) := \frac{1}{\max(1, \|\zeta\|^p)} \quad (2.12)$$

and thus the rescaled kernels (see Section 1) are

$$K_\tau(\zeta) := \frac{1}{\max(\tau^{1/(p-d-1)}, \|\zeta\|)^p}.$$

However, the specific form (2.12) is not necessary for Theorem 1.1 to hold.

More in general, we will need the following properties, which are in particular satisfied by (2.12) (for a proof of the last property see Section 4):

$$\exists C : \frac{1}{C(\|\zeta\| + \tau^{1/(p-d-1)})^p} \leq K_\tau(\zeta) \leq C \frac{1}{(\|\zeta\| + \tau^{1/(p-d-1)})^p}, \quad p \geq d+3, \quad (2.13)$$

$$K_\tau(\zeta) \text{ converges monotonically increasing for } \tau \downarrow 0 \text{ to } \frac{1}{\|\zeta\|^p}, \quad (2.14)$$

$$K_\tau \text{ is symmetric under rotations.} \quad (2.15)$$

Moreover, we need to assume an additional property on K_τ . Define

$$\hat{K}_\tau(t) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} K_1(te_1 + t_1^\perp) dt_1^\perp, \quad t \in \mathbb{R},$$

and the one dimensional functional

$$\mathcal{F}_{\tau,p,d}^{\text{1D}}(E, [0, L]) := \frac{1}{L} \left(J_\tau \text{Per}^{\text{1D}}(E; [0, L]) - \int_{[0,L]} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\chi_E(s+t) - \chi_E(s)| \hat{K}_\tau(t) ds dt \right) \quad (2.16)$$

where $E \subset \mathbb{R}$ is an L -periodic set and J_τ is defined in (1.5). We assume that for every $L > 0$ there exists $\bar{\tau} > 0$ such that for every $0 < \tau < \bar{\tau}$ and for every $E_\tau \in \text{argmin } \mathcal{F}_{\tau,p,d}^{\text{1D}}(\cdot, [0, L])$ there exists h_L^* such that up to translations it holds

$$E_\tau = \bigcup_k (2kh_L^*, (2k+1)h_L^*). \quad (2.17)$$

Thanks to condition (2.15), we will also use the notation $K_\tau(t) := K_\tau(z)$ for $z \in \partial B_{|t|}(0)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$. For simplicity of notation, for $t \in \mathbb{R}$ we will also denote $\bar{K}_\tau(t) := |t|^{d-1} K_\tau(t)$.

Given a bounded open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, we define

$$\mathcal{F}_{\tau,p,d}(E, \Omega) = \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \left(J_\tau \text{Per}(E, \Omega) - \int_{\Omega} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\chi_E(x+\zeta) - \chi_E(x)| K_\tau(\zeta) dx d\zeta \right). \quad (2.18)$$

Notice that for any set which, up to a rigid motion, is of the form $E = \hat{E} \times \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$, $\hat{E} \subset \mathbb{R}$, then

$$\mathcal{F}_{\tau,p,d}(E, [0, L]^d) = \mathcal{F}_{\tau,p,d}^{\text{1D}}(\hat{E}, [0, L]).$$

In the following we will often use this notation: given $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^+$

$$a \lesssim b, \quad a \gtrsim b,$$

to denote that there exists a geometric constant $C > 0$ depending only on p, d such that respectively it holds

$$a \leq Cb, \quad a \geq Cb.$$

3. An integral geometric formulation

In this section we provide an integral geometric formulation for the functional $\mathcal{F}_{\tau,p,d}$ introduced in (1.3), which will be fundamental in our analysis.

We recall the definition of the functional $\mathcal{F}_{\tau,p,d}$ relative to a bounded open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\mathcal{F}_{\tau,p,d}(E, \Omega) = \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \left(J_\tau \text{Per}(E, \Omega) - \int_\Omega \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\chi_E(x + \zeta) - \chi_E(x)| K_\tau(\zeta) dx d\zeta \right) \quad (3.1)$$

Our main result is the following

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\mathcal{F}_{\tau,p,d}$ be the functional defined in (3.1). One has that*

$$\mathcal{F}_{\tau,p,d}(E, \Omega) = \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\theta^\perp} \sum_{s \in \partial^* E_{x_\theta^\perp} \cap \Omega_{x_\theta^\perp}} r_\tau(E_{x_\theta^\perp}, s) dx_\theta^\perp d\theta, \quad (3.2)$$

where we set

$$\begin{aligned} r_\tau(E_{x_\theta^\perp}, s) &:= \int_{-1}^1 |\rho| \overline{K}_\tau(\rho) d\rho - \int_{s^-}^s \int_0^{+\infty} |\chi_{E_{x_\theta^\perp}}(u) - \chi_{E_{x_\theta^\perp}}(u + \rho)| \overline{K}_\tau(\rho) d\rho du \\ &\quad - \int_s^{s^+} \int_{-\infty}^0 |\chi_{E_{x_\theta^\perp}}(u) - \chi_{E_{x_\theta^\perp}}(u + \rho)| \overline{K}_\tau(\rho) d\rho du. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

Moreover,

$$\text{Per}(E; \Omega) = \frac{1}{C_{1,d}} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\pi_\theta^\perp} \text{Per}^{\text{1D}}(E_{x_\theta^\perp}, \Omega_{x_\theta^\perp}) dx_\theta^\perp d\theta, \quad (3.4)$$

where

$$C_{1,d} := \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} |\langle \theta, e_1 \rangle| d\theta. \quad (3.5)$$

Proof. Let us first consider the local term of $\mathcal{F}_{\tau,p,d}$. By the rotational invariance of the kernel, polar change of coordinates and Fubini Theorem, one has that

$$\begin{aligned} J_\tau \text{Per}(E; \Omega) &= \int_{\partial^* E \cap \Omega} \int_{\{\|\zeta\| \leq 1\}} |\zeta_\theta| K_\tau(\zeta) d\zeta d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \\ &= \int_{\partial^* E \cap \Omega} \int_{\{\|\zeta\| \leq 1\}} |\langle \zeta, \nu_E(x) \rangle| K_\tau(\zeta) d\zeta d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial^* E \cap \Omega} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{[-1,1]} |\rho|^d |\langle \theta, \nu_E(x) \rangle| K_\tau(\rho) d\rho d\theta d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\partial^* E \cap \Omega} |\langle \theta, \nu_E(x) \rangle| \int_{[-1,1]} |\rho|^d K_\tau(\rho) d\rho d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) d\theta \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\theta^\perp} \sum_{s \in \partial^* E_{x_\theta^\perp} \cap \Omega_{x_\theta^\perp}} \int_{-1}^1 |\rho| \overline{K}_\tau(\rho) d\rho dx_\theta^\perp d\theta, \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

where in the last equality we used the classical slicing formula for the perimeter in direction θ given in (2.7).

Let us now consider the nonlocal term. By polar change of coordinates, Fubini Theorem and (2.7), one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\chi_E(x + \zeta) - \chi_E(x)| K_{\tau}(\zeta) dx d\zeta = \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \int_{\Omega} |\chi_E(x) - \chi_E(x + \rho\theta)| |\rho|^{d-1} K_{\tau}(\rho) dx d\rho d\theta \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\theta^{\perp}} \int_{\Omega_{x_{\theta}^{\perp}}} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |\chi_{E_{x_{\theta}^{\perp}}}(u) - \chi_{E_{x_{\theta}^{\perp}}}(u + \rho)| \overline{K}_{\tau}(\rho) d\rho du dx_{\theta}^{\perp} d\theta \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\theta^{\perp}} \sum_{s \in \partial^* E_{x_{\theta}^{\perp}} \cap \Omega_{x_{\theta}^{\perp}}} \left[\int_{s^-}^s \int_0^{+\infty} |\chi_{E_{x_{\theta}^{\perp}}}(u) - \chi_{E_{x_{\theta}^{\perp}}}(u + \rho)| \overline{K}_{\tau}(\rho) d\rho du \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \int_s^{s^+} \int_{-\infty}^0 |\chi_{E_{x_{\theta}^{\perp}}}(u) - \chi_{E_{x_{\theta}^{\perp}}}(u + \rho)| \overline{K}_{\tau}(\rho) d\rho du \right] dx_{\theta}^{\perp} d\theta. \tag{3.7}
\end{aligned}$$

Putting together (3.6) and (3.7), one obtains (3.2).

To show (3.4), which is a classical formula, one can use Fubini Theorem and the slicing formula (2.7) as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Per}(E; \Omega) &= \int_{\partial^* E \cap \Omega} \|\nu_E(x)\| d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \\
&= \frac{1}{C_{1,d}} \int_{\partial^* E \cap \Omega} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} |\langle \nu_E(x), \theta \rangle| d\theta d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \\
&= \frac{1}{C_{1,d}} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\partial^* E \cap \Omega} |\langle \nu_E(x), \theta \rangle| d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) d\theta \\
&= \frac{1}{C_{1,d}} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\theta^{\perp}} \text{Per}^{1D}(E_{x_{\theta}^{\perp}}, \Omega_{x_{\theta}^{\perp}}) dx_{\theta}^{\perp} d\theta.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 3.2. Defining also the one-dimensional functionals

$$|\Omega_{x_{\theta}^{\perp}}| \overline{F}_{\tau,p,d}^{1D}(E_{x_{\theta}^{\perp}}, \Omega_{x_{\theta}^{\perp}}) = \sum_{s \in \partial E_{x_{\theta}^{\perp}} \cap \Omega_{x_{\theta}^{\perp}}} r_{\tau}(E_{x_{\theta}^{\perp}}, s), \tag{3.8}$$

formula (3.2) can be rewritten as

$$\mathcal{F}_{\tau,p,d}(E, \Omega) = \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\theta^{\perp}} |\Omega_{x_{\theta}^{\perp}}| \overline{F}_{\tau,p,d}^{1D}(E_{x_{\theta}^{\perp}}, \Omega_{x_{\theta}^{\perp}}) dx_{\theta}^{\perp} d\theta. \tag{3.9}$$

For every $x = x_{\theta}^{\perp} + x_{\theta}\theta \in \partial^* E$, let us also set for later convenience, with a slight abuse of notation,

$$r_{\tau,\theta}(E, x) := r_{\tau}(E_{x_{\theta}^{\perp}}, x_{\theta}).$$

Thus,

$$\mathcal{F}_{\tau,p,d}(E, \Omega) = \frac{1}{2|\Omega|} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\partial^* E \cap \Omega} |\langle \nu_E(x), \theta \rangle| r_{\tau,\theta}(E, x) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) d\theta.$$

Notice that

$$\overline{F}_{\tau,p,d}^{1D}(E, [a, b]) \neq \mathcal{F}_{\tau,p,d}^{1D}(E, [a, b]),$$

where $\mathcal{F}_{\tau,p,d}^{1D}$ was defined in (2.16), since the two kernels are different.

4. One dimensional estimates

In this section we derive one dimensional estimates, namely estimates which depend only on one dimensional slices $E_{x_\theta^\perp}$ of E .

Recall the formula for r_τ given in (3.3)

$$\begin{aligned} r_\tau(E_{x_\theta^\perp}, s) &:= \int_{-1}^1 |\rho| \overline{K}_\tau(\rho) \, d\rho - \int_{s^-}^s \int_0^{+\infty} |\chi_{E_{x_\theta^\perp}}(u) - \chi_{E_{x_\theta^\perp}}(u + \rho)| \overline{K}_\tau(\rho) \, d\rho \, du \\ &\quad - \int_s^{s^+} \int_{-\infty}^0 |\chi_{E_{x_\theta^\perp}}(u) - \chi_{E_{x_\theta^\perp}}(u + \rho)| \overline{K}_\tau(\rho) \, d\rho \, du. \end{aligned}$$

The following proposition contains one dimensional estimates analogous to those proved along the coordinate directions for the anisotropic functionals considered in [28, 16]. Also in this setting the proof is very similar, though we report it here for completeness and consistency of notation.

Proposition 4.1. *There exist $\gamma_0, \gamma_1 > 0$ depending only on p, d such that*

$$r_\tau(E_{x_\theta^\perp}, s) \geq -\gamma_0 + \gamma_1 \min\{|s - s^-|^{-(p-d-1)}, \tau^{-1}\} + \gamma_1 \min\{|s - s^+|^{-(p-d-1)}, \tau^{-1}\}. \quad (4.1)$$

In particular, whenever $p > d + 1$ there exist $\tau_0, \eta_0 > 0$ such that whenever $\min\{|s - s^-|, |s - s^+|\} < \eta_0$ and $\tau < \tau_0$, then $r_\tau(E_{x_\theta^\perp}, s) \geq \frac{\gamma_1}{2} \min\{|s - s^-|^{-(p-d-1)}, |s - s^+|^{-(p-d-1)}, \tau^{-1}\}$.

Proof. By the estimates

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{s^-}^s |\chi_{E_{x_\theta^\perp}}(u + \rho) - \chi_{E_{x_\theta^\perp}}(u)| \, du &\leq \min\{\rho, s - s^-\}, \quad \forall \rho > 0, \\ \int_s^{s^+} |\chi_{E_{x_\theta^\perp}}(u + \rho) - \chi_{E_{x_\theta^\perp}}(u)| \, du &\leq \min\{-\rho, s^+ - s\}, \quad \forall \rho \leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

(see [28, 16]) one finds that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^1 \rho \overline{K}_\tau(\rho) \, d\rho - \int_{s^-}^s \int_0^{+\infty} |\chi_{E_{x_\theta^\perp}}(u + \rho) - \chi_{E_{x_\theta^\perp}}(u)| \overline{K}_\tau(\rho) \, d\rho \, du \\ &\geq \int_0^1 \rho \overline{K}_\tau(\rho) \, d\rho - \int_0^{+\infty} \min\{|s - s^-|, \rho\} \overline{K}_\tau(\rho) \, d\rho \\ &= \int_{|s-s^-|}^1 (\rho - |s - s^-|) \overline{K}_\tau(\rho) \, d\rho - \int_1^{+\infty} |s - s^-| \overline{K}_\tau(\rho) \, d\rho \end{aligned}$$

and analogously

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{-1}^0 |\rho| \overline{K}_\tau(\rho) \, d\rho - \int_s^{s^+} \int_{-\infty}^0 |\chi_{E_{x_\theta^\perp}}(u + \rho) - \chi_{E_{x_\theta^\perp}}(u)| \overline{K}_\tau(\rho) \, d\rho \, du \\ &\geq \int_{|s-s^+|}^1 (\rho - |s - s^+|) \overline{K}_\tau(\rho) \, d\rho - \int_1^{+\infty} |s - s^+| \overline{K}_\tau(\rho) \, d\rho. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, by property (2.13) and $p > d + 1$, implying in particular the uniform integrability of $\rho \overline{K}_\tau(\rho)$ on the interval $[1, +\infty)$, there exist $\gamma_0, \gamma_1 > 0$ depending only on p, d such that

$$\begin{aligned} r_\tau(E_{x_\theta^\perp}, s) &\geq \int_{|s-s^-|}^{+\infty} (\rho - |s - s^-|) \overline{K}_\tau(\rho) \, d\rho \\ &\quad + \int_{|s-s^+|}^{+\infty} (\rho - |s - s^+|) \overline{K}_\tau(\rho) \, d\rho - 2 \int_1^{+\infty} \rho \overline{K}_\tau(\rho) \, d\rho \\ &\geq -\gamma_0 + \gamma_1 \min\{|s - s^-|^{-(p-d-1)}, \tau^{-1}\} + \gamma_1 \min\{|s - s^+|^{-(p-d-1)}, \tau^{-1}\}. \end{aligned}$$

The last statement in the proposition follows immediately from the fact that $p > d + 1$. \square

As an immediate consequence of the above proposition we show as in [28, 16] that the equi-boundedness of the function r_τ on a family of sets of locally finite perimeter in \mathbb{R} and on the set of their boundary points which are contained in a fixed open bounded set implies compactness of the sets in the L^1 topology and convergence to a set of locally finite perimeter. Moreover, a stronger type of convergence holds, namely the sets $\partial^* E_\tau$ converge in the Hausdorff topology. This will be a fundamental ingredient of the proof of the Γ -convergence Theorem 5.13. The lemma below is the analogue of [16, Lemma 7.5] and we report the proof here for completeness. In the proof of Theorem 5.13 it will be applied to the one dimensional slices of E in direction $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$.

Lemma 4.2 (Compactness). *Let $\{E_\tau\}_{\tau>0} \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a family of sets of locally finite perimeter and let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded open interval. If*

$$\limsup_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \sum_{s \in \partial^* E_\tau \cap I} r_\tau(E_\tau, s) < +\infty, \quad (4.2)$$

then there exists $E_0 \subset \mathbb{R}$ of finite perimeter in I such that, up to subsequences, $E_\tau \rightarrow E_0$ in $L^1(I)$. Moreover, if $\{s_1^0, \dots, s_{m(0)}^0\} = \partial^* E_0 \cap I$, then

$$\liminf_{\tau \downarrow 0} \sum_{s \in \partial^* E_\tau \cap I} r_\tau(E_\tau, s) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{m(0)} \left(-\gamma_0 + \gamma_1 |s_i^0 - s_{i+1}^0|^{-(p-d-1)} \right), \quad (4.3)$$

where γ_0, γ_1 are constants as in (4.1).

Proof. Let us denote by $\{s_1^\tau, \dots, s_{m(\tau)}^\tau\} = \partial^* E_\tau \cap I$. We will also denote by

$$s_0^\tau = \sup\{s \in \partial^* E_\tau : s < s_1^\tau\} \quad \text{and} \quad s_{m(\tau)+1}^\tau = \inf\{s \in \partial^* E_\tau : s > s_{m(\tau)}^\tau\}.$$

Denote by A the r.h.s. of (4.2). From (4.1), one has that $r_\tau(E_\tau, s_i^\tau) \geq -\gamma_0 + \gamma_1 \min\{|s_i^\tau - s_{i+1}^\tau|^{-(p-d-1)}, \tau^{-1}\}$. Thus, by the last statement of Proposition 4.1, there exist $\tilde{\eta}$ and $\tilde{\tau} > 0$ such that for every $\tau < \tilde{\tau}$, whenever

$$\min_{i \in \{0, \dots, m(\tau)\}} |s_{i+1}^\tau - s_i^\tau| < \tilde{\eta}$$

then

$$\sum_{s \in \partial^* E_\tau \cap I} r_\tau(E_\tau, s) \geq A.$$

Hence, assume there exists a subsequence τ_k such that $|s_{i+1}^{\tau_k} - s_i^{\tau_k}| > \tilde{\eta}$ for all $i \leq m(\tau_k)$. Up to relabelling, let us assume that it holds true for the whole sequence of E_τ .

Since $\min_i |s_{i+1}^\tau - s_i^\tau| > \tilde{\eta}$, the convergence $E_\tau \rightarrow E_0$ in $L^1(I)$ can be upgraded to the Hausdorff convergence of the reduced boundaries, namely one has that there exists a $\tilde{\tau}$ such that for $\tau < \tilde{\tau}$, it holds $\#(\partial^* E_\tau \cap I) = \#(\partial^* E_0 \cap I) = m(0)$ and $s_i^\tau \rightarrow s_i^0$.

Then because of the convergence of the boundaries, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{\tau \downarrow 0} \sum_{s \in \partial^* E_\tau \cap I} r_\tau(E_\tau, s) &\geq \liminf_{\tau \downarrow 0} \sum_{j=1}^{m(0)} \left(-\gamma_0 + \gamma_1 \min\{|s_j^\tau - s_{j+1}^\tau|^{-(p-d-1)}, \tau^{-1}\} \right) \\ &\geq \sum_{j=1}^{m(0)} \left(-\gamma_0 + \gamma_1 |s_j^0 - s_{j+1}^0|^{-(p-d-1)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

\square

From the above one can indeed show the following quantitative perimeter bounds.

Corollary 4.3. *There exists $0 < \tau_1 \ll 1$ such that the following holds.*

(i) *Let $I = (a, b) \subset \mathbb{R}$ and let $E \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a set of locally finite perimeter such that*

$$\sum_{s \in \partial^* E \cap I} r_\tau(E, s) \leq A < +\infty, \quad \text{for some } 0 < \tau < \tau_1.$$

Then, there exists a constant $\eta_1 > 0$ such that

$$\text{Per}(E, I) \leq (1 + \gamma_0) \frac{b - a}{\eta_1} + A, \quad (4.4)$$

where γ_0 is as in the one-dimensional estimate (4.1).

(ii) *Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a set of locally finite perimeter. Assume that*

$$\mathcal{F}_{\tau,p,d}(E, \Omega) < +\infty, \quad \text{for some } 0 < \tau < \tau_1.$$

Then,

$$\text{Per}(E, \Omega) \lesssim |\Omega| \left(1 + \mathcal{F}_\tau(E, \Omega) \right). \quad (4.5)$$

Proof. (i). From Proposition 4.1, there exist $\eta_1, \tau_1 > 0$ such that, whenever $s \in \partial^* E \cap I$ satisfies $\min\{|s - s^-|, |s - s^+|\} < \eta_1$ and $0 < \tau < \tau_1$, then $r_\tau(E, s) > 1$. This implies that there are at most $\frac{b-a}{\eta_1}$ points $s \in \partial^* E \cap I$ where $r_\tau(E, s) < 1$. Given that, by Proposition 4.1, $r_\tau(E, \cdot) \geq -\gamma_0$ for some universal constant γ_0 independent of τ , it follows immediately that

$$\sum_{s \in \partial^* E \cap I} r_\tau(E, s) \geq -\gamma_0 \frac{b-a}{\eta_1} + \max\left\{ \text{Per}(E, I) - \frac{b-a}{\eta_1}, 0 \right\}.$$

Hence, as claimed, (4.4) holds.

(ii). For the proof of the second statement, we use (3.4), (i) and the integral geometric formulation (3.2). Indeed, one has that for $\tau < \tau_1$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Per}(E, \Omega) &= \frac{1}{C_{1,d}} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\theta^\perp} \text{Per}^{\text{1D}}(E_{x_\theta^\perp}, \Omega_{x_\theta^\perp}) dx_\theta^\perp d\theta \\ &\leq \frac{1}{C_{1,d}} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\theta^\perp} \frac{(1 + \gamma_0)}{\eta_1} \left[|\Omega_{x_\theta^\perp}| + \sum_{s \in \partial^* E_{x_\theta^\perp} \cap \Omega_{x_\theta^\perp}} r_\tau(E_{x_\theta^\perp}, s) \right] dx_\theta^\perp d\theta \\ &\lesssim |\Omega| \left(1 + \mathcal{F}_{\tau,p,d}(E, \Omega) \right). \end{aligned}$$

□

Let us now consider the rescaled kernel

$$K_\tau(\zeta) := \frac{1}{\max(\tau^{p/(p-d-1)}, \|\zeta\|^p)}.$$

In the following we are concerned with the periodicity of optimal stripes for the corresponding functional $\mathcal{F}_{\tau,p,d}$ introduced in (1.3). This is a simple extension of the periodicity of one dimensional minimizers for functionals with reflection positive kernels, given in [21, 23].

Definition 4.4. *Given $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, let us denote by $\mathcal{S}_{\theta,L}$ the family of $[0, L]^d$ -periodic sets E composed of finitely many stripes such that $\nu_E(x) \in \{\pm\theta\}$, for all $x \in \partial E$. We will say that E is a simple periodic set if up to rotations and translations there exists $\widehat{E} \subset \mathbb{R}$, $h > 0$ such that $\widehat{E} = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} [2kh, (2k+1)h)$ and $E = \widehat{E} \times \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$.*

The following periodicity result holds.

Proposition 4.5. *For every $L > 0$ and every $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ such that $\mathcal{S}_{\theta,L} \neq \emptyset$, let us consider $E \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathcal{S}_{\theta,L}} \mathcal{F}_{\tau,p,d}(\cdot, [0, L]^d)$. Then E is a simple periodic set.*

Proof. W.l.o.g., we can assume that $\theta = e_d$. Thus there exists $\widehat{E} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ $(0, L)$ -periodic, such that $E = \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \times \widehat{E}$ and $\widehat{E} \cap [0, L] = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} (x_{2k}, x_{2k+1})$. Denote by

$$\widehat{K}_\tau(t) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} K_\tau(\zeta_d^\perp + te_d) d\zeta_d^\perp.$$

For any $\alpha, \beta > 0$, let

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{J}_{\tau,\alpha} &= \int_{\{|\zeta_d| \leq \alpha\}} |\zeta_d| K_\tau(\zeta) d\zeta = \int_{-\alpha}^\alpha |t| \widehat{K}_\tau(t) dt \\ J_{\tau,\beta} &= \int_{\{\|\zeta\| \leq \beta\}} |\zeta_d| K_\tau(\zeta) d\zeta. \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

In particular, $J_{\tau,1} = J_\tau$, where J_τ was defined in (1.5) and $\widehat{J}_{\tau,\alpha} > J_{\tau,\alpha}$ for every $\alpha > 0$. Moreover, by the integrability of the kernel and the fact that $K_\tau(\zeta) = \|\zeta\|^{-p}$ whenever $\tau^{1/(p-d-1)} < \|\zeta\|$, it is not difficult to see that there exists $\gamma > 0$ such that $J_{\tau,1} = \widehat{J}_{\tau,1-\gamma}$ for all τ sufficiently small. When restricting the functional to $\mathcal{S}_{e_d,L}$, we have that

$$\mathcal{F}_{\tau,p,d}(E, [0, L]^d) = \mathcal{F}_{\tau,p,d}^{\text{1D}}(\widehat{E}, [0, L])$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} L\mathcal{F}_{\tau,p,d}^{\text{1D}}(\widehat{E}, [0, L]) &:= \int_{-1+\gamma}^{1-\gamma} |t| \widehat{K}_\tau(t) \operatorname{Per}^{\text{1D}}(\widehat{E}; [0, L]) - \int_0^L \int_0^{+\infty} |\chi_{\widehat{E}}(s+t) - \chi_{\widehat{E}}(s)| \widehat{K}_\tau(t) dt ds \\ &\quad - \int_0^L \int_{-\infty}^0 |\chi_{\widehat{E}}(s+t) - \chi_{\widehat{E}}(s)| \widehat{K}_\tau(t) dt ds. \end{aligned}$$

It is well-known that if \widehat{K}_τ is reflection positive (i.e. it is the Laplace transform of a nonnegative function), any \widehat{E} as above is simple periodic (see [21, 23]). Given that for $\tau = 0$ the kernel \widehat{K}_τ is not integrable at the origin, it is convenient to write the functional as

$$\begin{aligned} L\mathcal{F}_{\tau,p,d}^{\text{1D}}(\widehat{E}, [0, L]) &:= \int_{-1+\gamma}^{1-\gamma} \left(|t| \operatorname{Per}(\widehat{E}; [0, L]) - \int_0^L |\chi_{\widehat{E}}(s+t) - \chi_{\widehat{E}}(s)| ds \right) \widehat{K}_\tau(t) dt \\ &\quad - \int_0^L \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus (-1+\gamma, 1-\gamma)} |\chi_{\widehat{E}}(s+t) - \chi_{\widehat{E}}(s)| \widehat{K}_\tau(t) dt ds \end{aligned}$$

If $E \in \mathcal{S}_{e_d,L}$ is a minimizer, applying Proposition 4.1 to the analogous functional in which $\pm 1 \mp \gamma$ is substituted by ± 1 , there exist $\tau_0, \eta_0 > 0$ such that whenever $0 < \tau < \tau_0$, we have that

$$\min\{|x_i - x_j| : i \neq j, x_i, x_j \in \partial^* \widehat{E}\} > \eta_0. \quad (4.7)$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^L \int_0^{+\infty} |\chi_{\widehat{E}}(s+t) - \chi_{\widehat{E}}(s)| \widehat{K}_\tau(t) dt ds &= \sum_k \int_{x_k}^{x_{k+1}} \int_{x_{k+1}}^{+\infty} \widehat{K}_\tau(s-t) ds dt \\ &\quad - \sum_k \sum_{l \geq 1} \int_{x_k}^{x_{k+1}} \int_{x_{k+2l}}^{x_{k+2l+1}} \widehat{K}_\tau(s-t) ds dt. \end{aligned}$$

The first term on the r.h.s. of the above formula can be computed explicitly as

$$\int_{x_k}^{x_{k+1}} \int_{x_{k+1}}^{+\infty} \widehat{K}_\tau(s-t) ds dt = \int_0^{+\infty} \min\{|x_k - x_{k+1}|, t\} \widehat{K}_\tau(t) dt.$$

Given that (4.7) holds and for $0 < \tau < \eta_0 < 1$, it holds $\widehat{K}_\tau(t) = \widehat{K}_0(t)$ whenever $t > \eta_0$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{1-\gamma} t \widehat{K}_\tau - \int_{x_k}^{x_{k+1}} \int_{x_{k+1}}^{+\infty} \widehat{K}_\tau(s-t) ds dt &= \int_0^{1-\gamma} (t - \min\{|x_k - x_{k+1}|, t\}) \widehat{K}_\tau(t) dt \\ &= \int_0^{1-\gamma} (t - \min\{|x_k - x_{k+1}|, t\}) \widehat{K}_0(t) dt \end{aligned}$$

and that

$$\int_{x_k}^{x_{k+1}} \int_{x_{k+2l}}^{x_{k+2l+1}} \widehat{K}_\tau(s-t) ds dt = \int_{x_k}^{x_{k+1}} \int_{x_{k+2l}}^{x_{k+2l+1}} \widehat{K}_0(s-t) ds dt.$$

Thus whenever \widehat{E} is such that $\partial^* \widehat{E} = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \{x_k\}$ with $\min\{|x_i - x_j| : i \neq j, x_i, x_j \in \partial^* \widehat{E}\} > \eta_0$ we have that $\mathcal{F}_{\tau,p,d}^{1D}(E, [0, L]) = \mathcal{F}_{0,p,d}^{1D}(E, [0, L])$. To conclude, it is sufficient to notice that for $\tau = 0$ the kernel \widehat{K}_0 is reflection positive, thus the only minimizers \widehat{E} are simple periodic sets. \square

By Proposition 4.5 one can define, for every $L > 0$ and for τ sufficiently small,

$$h_L^* = \min_{E \text{ } L\text{-periodic}} \mathcal{F}_\tau^{1D}(E, [0, L]) \quad (4.8)$$

and

$$h^* = \min_{L > 0} \min_{E \text{ } L\text{-periodic}} \mathcal{F}_\tau^{1D}(E, [0, L]). \quad (4.9)$$

The following one dimensional Lemma will be used in the proof of Theorem 1.1 in Section 6.

Lemma 4.6. *Let η_0, τ_0 be as in Proposition 4.1. There exists $M_0 > 0$ such that for all $0 < \tau < \tau_0$, $h > 0$, $E \subset \mathbb{R}$ set of locally finite perimeter, $A_0 \subset \partial^* E \cap [0, h)$ and $A_1 = \{s \in \partial^* E \cap [0, h) : \min\{|s - s^-|, |s - s^+|\} < \eta_0\}$, whenever F is a set of finite perimeter such that $\partial^* F \cap [0, h) = \partial^* E \cap [0, h) \setminus (A_0 \cup A_1)$, then*

$$\sum_{s \in \partial^* F \cap [0, h)} r_\tau(F, s) \leq \sum_{s \in \partial^* E \cap [0, h)} r_\tau(E, s) + M_0 \#(A_0 \cup A_1). \quad (4.10)$$

Proof. By Proposition 4.1, there exist $\tau_0 > 0$, $\eta_0 > 0$ such that whenever $r_\tau(E, s) < 0$ it holds $\min\{|s - s^+|, |s - s^-|\} > \eta_0$. We say that a set $C \subset \partial^* E$ is connected if there are no points $s \in A_0 \cup A_1$ and $x, y \in C$ such that $x < s < y$. Let C_1, C_2, \dots, C_N be the connected components of $\partial^* F$. It is immediate to notice that $\partial^* F = \bigcup_i C_i$. Consider $C_1 := \{s_1, \dots, s_m\}$ and denote by $s_{m+1} = \inf\{s \in \partial^* E : s > s_m\}$ and by $s_0 := \sup\{s \in \partial^* E : s < s_1\}$. From the above we have that $|s_0 - s_1|, |s_m - s_{m+1}| > \eta_0$. Moreover, for any $x, y \in (s_0, s_{m+1})$ we have that $|\chi_E(x) - \chi_E(y)| = |\chi_F(x) - \chi_F(y)|$. From the definition of r_τ we have that

$$\left| \sum_{s \in C_1} r_\tau(E, s) - r_\tau(F, s) \right| \leq 2 \int_{s_0}^{s_m} \int_{s_{m+1}}^{+\infty} K_\tau(x-y) dx dy + 2 \int_{s_1}^{s_{m+1}} \int_{-\infty}^{s_0} K_\tau(x-y) dx dy.$$

Because of the integrability of K_τ , we have that the r.h.s. of the above is bounded by a constant \bar{C} depending only on η_0 . Thus, by the fact that $r_\tau(E, s) \geq -\gamma_0$ for all $s \in \partial^* E$ (see Proposition 4.1) and since $N \leq \#(A_0 \cup A_1)$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{s \in \partial^* E \cap [0, h)} r_\tau(E, s) - \sum_{s \in \partial^* F \cap [0, h)} r_\tau(F, s) &\geq \sum_i \left(\sum_{s \in C_i} r_\tau(E, s) - \sum_{s \in C_i} r_\tau(F, s) \right) + \sum_{s \in A_0 \cup A_1} r_\tau(E, s) \\ &\geq -\bar{C}N - \gamma_0 \#(A_0 \cup A_1) \\ &\geq -(\bar{C} + \gamma_0) \#(A_0 \cup A_1). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, to obtain the desired claim (4.10), it is sufficient to take $M_0 \geq \bar{C} + \gamma_0$. \square

The next lemma is similar to [16, Lemma 7.7]. It says that given a set of locally finite perimeter $F \subset \mathbb{R}$, and an interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that the minimal distance between points in $\partial^* F \cap I$ is bounded from below, then the contribution to the energy $\sum_{s \in \partial^* F \cap I} r_\tau(F, s)$, for τ sufficiently small, is comparable to the periodic case up to a constant C depending only on the dimension and on the minimal distance between points in $\partial^* F \cap I$. Among periodic sets F , the energy contribution on an interval I is bigger than or equal to the contribution of periodic stripes with the same number of boundary points of F in I .

Lemma 4.7. *Let η_0, τ_0 be as in Proposition 4.1. There exists a constant $C = C(\eta_0)$ such that for all $0 < \tau < \tau_0$ the following holds. Let F of locally finite perimeter, $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ bounded open interval, $\{k_1, \dots, k_m\} = \partial^* F \cap I$. Assume that*

$$\inf_{i, j \in \{1, \dots, m\}} |k_i - k_j| > \eta_0, \quad (4.11)$$

$$\text{dist}(k_1, \partial^* F \setminus I) > \eta_0, \quad (4.12)$$

$$\text{dist}(k_m, \partial^* F \setminus I) > \eta_0, \quad (4.13)$$

$$(4.14)$$

and let $k_0, k_{m+1}, k_{m+2} \in \mathbb{R} \setminus I$ such that $k_0 < k_1 < \dots < k_m < k_{m+1} < k_{m+2}$ and

$$\inf_{i, j \in \{0, \dots, m+2\}} |k_i - k_j| > \eta_0. \quad (4.15)$$

Then, let $\tilde{I} = [k_0, k_{\max})$, with

$$k_{\max} = \begin{cases} k_{m+1} & \text{if } m \text{ is odd} \\ k_{m+2} & \text{if } m \text{ is even} \end{cases} \quad (4.16)$$

and \tilde{F} the $|\tilde{I}|$ -periodic set of locally finite perimeter such that

$$\tilde{F} \cap I = F \cap I \quad (4.17)$$

$$\partial^* \tilde{F} \cap \tilde{I} = \{k_0, k_1, \dots, k_{m-1}, k_{\max}\}. \quad (4.18)$$

Then,

$$\sum_{s \in \partial^* F \cap I} r_\tau(F, s) \geq \sum_{s \in \partial^* \tilde{F} \cap \tilde{I}} r_\tau(\tilde{F}, s) - C. \quad (4.19)$$

Moreover,

$$\sum_{s \in \partial^* \tilde{F} \cap \tilde{I}} r_\tau(\tilde{F}, s) \geq |\tilde{I}| \bar{F}_{\tau, p, d}^{\text{1D}}(\tilde{S}, \tilde{I}), \quad (4.20)$$

where \tilde{S} is the simple periodic set of period $2 \frac{|\tilde{I}|}{\#\partial^* \tilde{F} \cap \tilde{I}}$.

Proof. Let us denote by $k_1 < \dots < k_m$ the points of $\partial^* F \cap I$, and let $k_0, k_{m+1}, k_{m+2}, \tilde{I}, \tilde{F}$ be as in the statement of the lemma.

To prove (4.20), observe that the boundary points of \tilde{F} are, by assumption, at mutual distance larger than $\eta_0 > 2\tau^{1/(p-d-1)}$. Thus, $K_\tau(z) = \|z\|^{-p}$ behaves like a reflection positive functional (similarly to the proof of Proposition 4.5). Therefore, as shown in [22] for reflection positive functionals, (4.20) holds.

To show (4.19), notice that the symmetric difference between F and \tilde{F} satisfies

$$F \Delta \tilde{F} \subset (-\infty, k_1 - \eta_0) \cup (k_m + \eta_0, +\infty).$$

Let us assume w.l.o.g. that $k_{\max} = k_{m+2}$ and denote by

$$\bar{k}_0 = \sup\{s \in \partial^* F \setminus I : s < k_1\}, \quad \bar{k}_{m+1} = \inf\{s \in \partial^* F \setminus I : s > k_m\}.$$

By assumptions (4.12) and (4.13), $|\bar{k}_0 - k_1| > \eta_0$, $|\bar{k}_{m+1} - k_m| > \eta_0$. Using the fact that $r_\tau(E, s) < C/6$ whenever $\min\{|s - s^-|, |s - s^+|\} > \eta_0$ (see Proposition 4.1), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{i=1}^m r_\tau(F, k_i) - \sum_{i=0}^{m+2} r_\tau(\tilde{F}, k_i) \right| &\leq \frac{C}{2} + \left| \sum_{i=1}^m r_\tau(F, k_i) - \sum_{i=1}^m r_\tau(\tilde{F}, k_i) \right| \\ &= \frac{C}{2} + A + B, \end{aligned} \tag{4.21}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \int_{k_i}^{k_{i+1}} \int_0^{+\infty} (s - |\chi_F(s+u) - \chi_F(u)|) \widehat{K}_\tau(s) \, ds \, du \\ &\quad - \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \int_{k_i}^{k_{i+1}} \int_0^{+\infty} (s - |\chi_{\tilde{F}}(s+u) - \chi_{\tilde{F}}(u)|) \widehat{K}_\tau(s) \, ds \, du \\ B &= \sum_{i=1}^m \int_{k_i}^{k_{i+1}} \int_{-\infty}^0 (s - |\chi_F(s+u) - \chi_F(u)|) \widehat{K}_\tau(s) \, ds \, du \\ &\quad - \sum_{i=1}^m \int_{k_i}^{k_{i+1}} \int_{-\infty}^0 (s - |\chi_{\tilde{F}}(s+u) - \chi_{\tilde{F}}(u)|) \widehat{K}_\tau(s) \, ds \, du. \end{aligned}$$

Thus by using the integrability of \widehat{K}_τ , we have that

$$|A| \leq \int_{k_0}^{k_m} \int_0^{+\infty} \chi_{F \Delta \tilde{F}}(u+s) \widehat{K}_\tau(s) \, ds \, du \leq \int_{k_0}^{k_m} \int_{k_{m+\hat{\eta}}}^{+\infty} \widehat{K}_\tau(u-v) \, dv \, du \leq \frac{C}{4},$$

where C is a constant depending only on η_0 . Similarly, $|B| \leq C/4$.

Thus we have that

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^m r_\tau(F, k_i) - \sum_{i=0}^{m+2} r_\tau(\tilde{F}, k_i) \right| \leq C$$

and the lemma is proved. □

5. A rigidity result

Before stating the main theorem, let us define the following functional

$$\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,d}(E, \Omega) := \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\partial^* E \cap \Omega} \frac{|\langle \nu_E(x), \theta \rangle|}{\mathbf{r}_\theta(x)^{p-d-1}} d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) d\theta, \quad (5.1)$$

where

$$\mathbf{r}_\theta(x) = |x_\theta - x_\theta^+|. \quad (5.2)$$

We recall that $x = x_\theta^\perp + \theta x_\theta$, where $x_\theta^\perp \in \theta^\perp$ and $x_\theta \in \mathbb{R}$. The point $x_\theta^+ \in \mathbb{R}$ is such that $x_\theta^\perp + \theta x_\theta^+ \in \partial^* E$ is the closest point to x in $\partial^* E_{x_\theta^\perp}$ with $x_\theta^+ - x_\theta > 0$.

Notice that, as in Proposition 3.1, one can show the following integral geometric formulation for the functional $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,d}$:

$$\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,d}(E, \Omega) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\theta^\perp} \sum_{s \in \partial^* E_{x_\theta^\perp} \cap \Omega_{x_\theta^\perp}} \frac{1}{|s - s^+|^{p-d-1}} dx_\theta^\perp d\theta. \quad (5.3)$$

The main result of this section is the following theorem.

Theorem 5.1. *The following holds:*

1. Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a $[0, L]^d$ -periodic set of locally finite perimeter such that $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,d}(E, [0, L]^d) < +\infty$, $p \geq d + 3$. Then, up to a rigid motion the set E is of the form

$$E = \widehat{E} \times \mathbb{R}^{d-1}, \quad \widehat{E} \subset \mathbb{R}, \quad \widehat{E} \cap [0, L] = \bigcup_{i=1}^{N_0} (s_i, t_i), \quad s_i < t_i < s_{i+1} < t_{i+1}. \quad (5.4)$$

2. Let $\{E_\tau\}_{\tau>0} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a family of $[0, L]^d$ -periodic sets such that $\sup_{\tau>0} \overline{\mathcal{F}}_{\tau,p,d}(E_\tau, [0, L]^d) \leq M < +\infty$.

Then, up to subsequences, the sets E_τ converge in L^1 to a $[0, L]^d$ -periodic set E_0 with $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,d}(E_0, [0, L]^d) < +\infty$.

The proof of Theorem 5.1 will follow from a series of preliminary lemmas and propositions of independent interest.

The core of Theorem 5.1 lies in the first statement of point 1. In order to prove such a rigidity estimate, we develop a strategy which, up to our knowledge, is new in this type of problems.

The second point 2 of Theorem 5.1 can be instead proved basing on point 1., and the results of Sections 3 and 4.

We now focus on point 1. of Theorem 5.1. Given the length and complexity of the proof, we give an outline of the main strategy.

- (i) First, we show that whenever $p \geq 2d$ the functional $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,d}$ controls a nonlocal generalized version of the curvature of the relative boundary of the set E . More precisely, we show the following

Proposition 5.2. *Let $d \geq 2$, $p \geq 2d$, $M > 0$. Then, there exists $R_0 > 0, C(M) > 0$ such that the following holds: for all $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ bounded open sets and for every $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ of locally finite perimeter such that $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,d}(E, \Omega) \leq M$, for all $0 < r < R_0$ and for all $z \in \Omega$ such that $\text{dist}(z, \partial\Omega) > 2r$, it holds*

$$\int_{\partial^* E \cap B_r(z)} \int_{\partial^* E \cap B_r(z)} \frac{\|\nu_E(x) - \nu_E(y)\|^2}{\|x - y\|^{p-2}} d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(y) \lesssim C(M) \overline{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,d}(E, B_r(z)). \quad (5.5)$$

- (ii) We prove the following regularity result.

Theorem 5.3. *Let $d \geq 2$, $p > 2d$, $\ell > 0$, $M > 0$. There exists $\bar{R} > 0$ such that the following holds. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ open and bounded and let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ of locally finite perimeter such that $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,d}(E, \Omega) \leq M$. Then, on $\Omega_{\bar{R}} = \{z \in \Omega : \text{dist}(z, \partial\Omega) > \bar{R}\}$ the set E enjoys the following regularity properties:*

1. $\partial^* E \cap \Omega_{\bar{R}} = \partial E \cap \Omega_{\bar{R}}$;
2. For every $x \in \partial E \cap \Omega_{\bar{R}}$ the set $\partial E \cap B_r(x)$, $\forall 0 < r < \bar{R}$, is given by the graph of an ℓ -Lipschitz function defined on a connected open subset of a $(d-1)$ -dimensional affine subspace of \mathbb{R}^d .

(iii) We show that a uniform bound (w.r.t. $r \ll 1$ and x) such as

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d, r \leq \bar{R}} \int_{\partial^* E \cap B_r(x)} \int_{\partial^* E \cap B_r(x)} \frac{\|\nu_E(x) - \nu_E(y)\|^2}{\|x - y\|^{p-2}} \leq C \quad (5.6)$$

(as in (5.5)) together with regularity conditions on ∂E as properties 1 and 2 in Theorem 5.3 imply when $p \geq d+3$ that ∂E is given by the union of disjoint hyperplanes (the fact that they are parallel follows if the domain is a cube $[0, L]^d$ and we impose $[0, L]^d$ -periodicity). This result is the content of Lemma 5.7. The proof of such Lemma uses a result of Bourgain, Brezis and Mironescu [7, 8] implying that if ∂E can be locally parametrized by a Lipschitz map defined on \mathbb{R}^{d-1} and (5.6) holds, then ν_E is locally constant and then ∂E is flat.

(iv) Given Lemma 5.7, in order to show that the boundary of sets of $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,d}$ -bounded energy is flat we would like then to combine Proposition 5.2, Theorem 5.3 and Lemma 5.7. However, notice that while for the validity of Lemma 5.7 it is sufficient (and indeed necessary, as a simple computation with a C^2 boundary would show) that $p \geq d+3$, for the validity of Propositions 5.2 and 5.3 we need to assume that $p > 2d$, which is a stronger condition as soon as $d \geq 3$.

Thus, the proof of Theorem 5.1 will be given first for $d = 2$ (where $2d < d+3$) and then extended via a slicing argument with affine two dimensional planes to the case of general dimension (see Proposition 5.12 and the proof of Theorem 5.1). More precisely, we will apply a slicing formula of the functional $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,d}$ w.r.t. the Grassmanian of 2-planes in \mathbb{R}^d (see Proposition 5.11), thus showing that a.e. two-dimensional slice of a set of finite energy E is a union of stripes, which in turn will imply that E is a union of stripes in \mathbb{R}^d .

In the next Sections 5.1–5.4, we proceed to the proof of (i)–(iv). In Section 5.5 we will give a proof of point 2. of Theorem 5.1.

5.1 (i) A nonlocal curvature bound

For simplicity of notation, define

$$e(x) := \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \frac{|\langle \nu_E(x), \theta \rangle|}{r_\theta(x)^{p-d-1}} d\theta, \quad x \in \partial^* E. \quad (5.7)$$

In particular,

$$\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,d}(E, \Omega) = \int_{\partial^* E \cap \Omega} e(x) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x).$$

Lemma 5.4. *Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a set of locally finite perimeter. The following holds*

$$e(x) + e(y) \gtrsim \frac{\|\nu_E(x) - \nu_E(y)\|^2}{\|x - y\|^{p-d-1}}, \quad \forall x, y \in \partial^* E. \quad (5.8)$$

Proof. For every $x = x_\theta^\perp + x_\theta \theta \in \partial^* E$, $y \in \partial^* E$, define the sets

$$\Omega(x, \|y - x\|) = \{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} : \mathbf{r}_\theta(x) < 2\|x - y\|\}, \quad \Omega(y, \|y - x\|) = \{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} : \mathbf{r}_\theta(y) < 2\|x - y\|\}.$$

W.l.o.g., we can assume that $\max\{|\Omega(x, \|y - x\|)|, |\Omega(y, \|y - x\|)|\} \leq d\omega_d/4$. Indeed, if $|\Omega(x, \|y - x\|)| > d\omega_d/4$ one has that

$$\begin{aligned} e(x) &\gtrsim \int_{\Omega(x, \|y-x\|) \cap \{\theta: |\langle \nu_E(x), \theta \rangle| \geq 1/10\}} \frac{|\langle \nu_E(x), \theta \rangle|}{\|x - y\|^{p-d-1}} d\theta \\ &\gtrsim \frac{\|\nu_E(x) - \nu\|^2}{\|x - y\|^{p-d-1}}, \quad \forall \nu \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that $\|\nu_E(x) - \nu\| \leq \sqrt{2}$ and $\Omega(x, \|y - x\|) \cap \{\theta : |\langle \nu_E(x), \theta \rangle| \geq 1/10\} \gtrsim 1$ whenever $|\Omega(x, \|y - x\|)| > d\omega_d/4$. In particular, for points x, y such that $\max\{|\Omega(x, \|y - x\|)|, |\Omega(y, \|y - x\|)|\} > d\omega_d/4$, (5.8) is proved.

Assuming $|\Omega(x, \|y - x\|)| \leq d\omega_d/4$, one has that

$$\begin{aligned} e(x) &\gtrsim \int_{\Omega(x, \|y-x\|) \cap \{\theta: |\langle \nu_E(x), \theta \rangle| \geq |\Omega(x, \|y-x\|)|/(2d\omega_d)\}} \frac{|\langle \nu_E(x), \theta \rangle|}{\|x - y\|^{p-d-1}} d\theta \\ &\gtrsim \frac{|\Omega(x, \|y - x\|)|^2}{\|x - y\|^{p-d-1}}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.9}$$

The rest of the proof is thus devoted to show that

$$|\Omega(x, \|y - x\|)| + |\Omega(y, \|y - x\|)| \gtrsim \|\nu_E(x) - \nu_E(y)\|. \tag{5.10}$$

To this aim, define the cones

$$\begin{aligned} C^+(x, 2\|y - x\|) &:= \{x + s\theta : \langle \nu_E(x), \theta \rangle > 0, s \in (0, 2\|y - x\|)\}, \\ C^-(x, 2\|y - x\|) &:= \{x + s\theta : \langle \nu_E(x), \theta \rangle < 0, s \in (0, 2\|y - x\|)\}, \\ C^+(y, 2\|y - x\|) &:= \{y + s\theta : \langle \nu_E(y), \theta \rangle > 0, s \in (0, 2\|y - x\|)\}, \\ C^-(y, 2\|y - x\|) &:= \{y + s\theta : \langle \nu_E(y), \theta \rangle < 0, s \in (0, 2\|y - x\|)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that, by simple geometric considerations (see Figure 1),

$$|C^+(x, \|y-x\|) \cap C^-(y, \|y-x\|)| + |C^-(x, \|y-x\|) \cap C^+(y, \|y-x\|)| \geq \bar{C} \frac{1}{2} d\omega_d \|\nu_E(x) - \nu_E(y)\| \|x - y\|^d, \tag{5.11}$$

for some dimensional constant $\bar{C} > 0$.

We now claim that (5.10) holds in the form (see Figure 2)

$$|\Omega(x, \|y - x\|)| + |\Omega(y, \|y - x\|)| \geq \frac{\bar{C}}{20} d\omega_d \|\nu_E(x) - \nu_E(y)\|. \tag{5.12}$$

Indeed, assume that (5.12) does not hold for some $x, y \in \partial^* E$ and let

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(x, y) &:= \frac{\bar{C}}{20} \|\nu_E(x) - \nu_E(y)\|, \\ A(x, \delta(x, y)) &= \{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} : |\langle \nu_E(x), \theta \rangle| < \delta(x, y)\}, \\ A(y, \delta(x, y)) &= \{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} : |\langle \nu_E(y), \theta \rangle| < \delta(x, y)\}. \end{aligned}$$




Figure 1: The light grey regions correspond to the sets $C^+(x, \|y-x\|) \cap C^-(y, \|y-x\|)$, $C^-(x, \|y-x\|) \cap C^+(y, \|y-x\|)$.

By (2.5) and the fact that $|\Omega(x, \|y-x\|)| + |\Omega(y, \|y-x\|)| \leq \delta(x, y)d\omega_d$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|\{\theta : \langle \nu_E(x), \theta \rangle < 0 \text{ and } x_\theta + [0, 2\|y-x\|]\theta \in E_{x_\theta^\perp}\}| &\geq |\{\theta : \langle \nu_E(x), \theta \rangle < 0\} \setminus (\Omega(x, \|y-x\|) \cup A(x, \delta(x, y)))| \\
&\geq (1/2 - 2\delta(x, y))d\omega_d \\
|\{\theta : \langle \nu_E(y), \theta \rangle < 0 \text{ and } y_\theta + [0, 2\|y-x\|]\theta \in E_{y_\theta^\perp}\}| &\geq |\{\theta : \langle \nu_E(y), \theta \rangle < 0\} \setminus (\Omega(y, \|y-x\|) \cup A(y, \delta(x, y)))| \\
&\geq (1/2 - 2\delta(x, y))d\omega_d \\
|\{\theta : \langle \nu_E(x), \theta \rangle > 0 \text{ and } x_\theta + [0, 2\|y-x\|]\theta \in E_{x_\theta^\perp}^c\}| &\geq |\{\theta : \langle \nu_E(x), \theta \rangle > 0\} \setminus (\Omega(x, \|y-x\|) \cup A(x, \delta(x, y)))| \\
&\geq (1/2 - 2\delta(x, y))d\omega_d \\
|\{\theta : \langle \nu_E(y), \theta \rangle > 0 \text{ and } y_\theta + [0, 2\|y-x\|]\theta \in E_{y_\theta^\perp}^c\}| &\geq |\{\theta : \langle \nu_E(y), \theta \rangle > 0\} \setminus (\Omega(y, \|y-x\|) \cup A(y, \delta(x, y)))| \\
&\geq (1/2 - 2\delta(x, y))d\omega_d
\end{aligned}$$

which respectively imply

$$\begin{aligned}
|C^-(x, 2\|x-y\|) \cap E| &\geq (1/2 - 2\delta(x, y))\omega_d\|x-y\|^d, \\
|C^+(x, 2\|x-y\|) \cap (\mathbb{R}^d \setminus E)| &\geq (1/2 - 2\delta(x, y))\omega_d\|x-y\|^d, \\
|C^-(y, 2\|x-y\|) \cap E| &\geq (1/2 - 2\delta(x, y))\omega_d\|x-y\|^d, \\
|C^+(y, 2\|x-y\|) \cap (\mathbb{R}^d \setminus E)| &\geq (1/2 - 2\delta(x, y))\omega_d\|x-y\|^d.
\end{aligned}$$

By the above, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}
|C^+(x, 2\|y-x\|) \cap C^-(y, 2\|y-x\|)| &\leq |C^+(x, 2\|y-x\|) \cap C^-(y, 2\|y-x\|) \cap E| \\
&\quad + |C^+(x, 2\|y-x\|) \cap C^-(y, 2\|y-x\|) \cap (\mathbb{R}^d \setminus E)| \\
&\leq |C^+(x, 2\|y-x\|) \cap E| \\
&\quad + |C^-(y, 2\|y-x\|) \cap (\mathbb{R}^d \setminus E)| \\
&\leq 4\delta(x, y)\omega_d\|x-y\|^d,
\end{aligned}$$

and analogously

$$|C^-(x, 2\|y-x\|) \cap C^+(y, 2\|y-x\|)| \leq 4\delta(x, y)\omega_d\|x-y\|^d.$$

This, given the definition of $\delta(x, y)$, contradicts (5.11), thus proving (5.12). \square




Figure 2: By the blow-up properties (2.5), a difference between $\nu_E(x)$ and $\nu_E(y)$ controls from below $\Omega(x, \|y - x\|)$ and $\Omega(y, \|y - x\|)$.

Before stating the next lemma, we give the following definitions: for all $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ let

$$\tilde{\Omega}_k(x) := \{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} : \mathbf{r}_\theta(x) \in (2^{-(k+1)}, 2^{-k}]\}, \quad (5.13)$$

$$\Omega_k(x) := \{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} : \mathbf{r}_\theta(x) \leq 2^{-k}\}. \quad (5.14)$$

Notice that

$$\Omega_k = \cup_{j \geq k} \tilde{\Omega}_j, \quad (5.15)$$

where the union is disjoint.

Lemma 5.5. *For all $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ sets of locally finite perimeter and for all $x \in \partial^* E$,*

$$e(x) \gtrsim \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{|\tilde{\Omega}_k(x)|^2}{2^{-k(p-d-1)}}, \quad (5.16)$$

$$e(x) \gtrsim \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{|\Omega_k(x)|^2}{2^{-k(p-d-1)}}. \quad (5.17)$$

Proof. The proof of (5.16) follows from the same argument used to prove (5.9) in Lemma 5.4. Indeed, since the $\tilde{\Omega}_k(x)$ are disjoint,

$$e(x) \gtrsim \sum_{k \geq 0} \int_{\tilde{\Omega}_k(x) \cap \{|\langle \nu_E(x), \theta \rangle| \geq \min\{1/10, |\tilde{\Omega}_k|/2\}\}} \frac{|\langle \nu_E(x), \theta \rangle|}{2^{-k(p-d-1)}} d\theta \gtrsim \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{|\tilde{\Omega}_k(x)|^2}{2^{-k(p-d-1)}}.$$

To prove (5.17), we use (5.16), the disjoint union (5.15) and the following fact: there exists a constant $C = C(p, d) > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{k \geq 0} \left(\sum_{j \geq k} |\tilde{\Omega}_j(x)| \right)^2 2^{k(p-d-1)} \leq C \sum_{k \geq 0} |\tilde{\Omega}_k(x)|^2 2^{k(p-d-1)}. \quad (5.18)$$

To show (5.18), we set for simplicity of notation $a_k := |\tilde{\Omega}_k(x)| 2^{k \frac{(p-d-1)}{2}}$. With this notation, (5.18) reads as

$$\sum_{k \geq 0} \left(\sum_{j \geq k} a_j 2^{(k-j) \frac{(p-d-1)}{2}} \right)^2 \leq C \sum_{k \geq 0} a_k^2. \quad (5.19)$$

Using the fact that $\sum_{j \geq k} 2^{(k-j)\frac{(p-d-1)}{2}} = \frac{1}{1-2^{-\frac{(p-d-1)}{2}}}$ and Jensen's inequality, one has that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k \geq 0} \left(\sum_{j \geq k} a_j 2^{(k-j)\frac{(p-d-1)}{2}} \right)^2 &\leq \frac{1}{1-2^{-\frac{(p-d-1)}{2}}} \sum_{k \geq 0} \sum_{j \geq k} a_j^2 2^{(k-j)\frac{(p-d-1)}{2}} \\ &= \frac{1}{1-2^{-\frac{(p-d-1)}{2}}} \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{k=0}^j a_j^2 2^{(k-j)\frac{(p-d-1)}{2}} \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{1-2^{-\frac{(p-d-1)}{2}}} \right)^2 \sum_{j \geq 0} a_j^2 \left(1 - 2^{-(j+1)\frac{(p-d-1)}{2}} \right) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{1-2^{-\frac{(p-d-1)}{2}}} \right)^2 \sum_{j \geq 0} a_j^2, \end{aligned}$$

corresponding to (5.19). \square

In the next lemma we show an upper bound for the perimeter of sets of finite energy inside a ball, which is uniform w.r.t. the centres of the balls and with respect to the family of sets of equibounded energy.

Lemma 5.6. *Let $d \geq 2$, $p \geq 2d$, $M > 0$. Then, there exist $R_0 > 0$, $C_0(M) > 0$ such that the following holds: for all $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ bounded open sets, $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ of locally finite perimeter such that $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,d}(E, \Omega) \leq M$, for all $0 < r < R_0$ and all $x \in \Omega$ such that $\text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) > r$,*

$$\text{Per}(E, B_r(x)) \leq C_0(M) r^{d-1}. \quad (5.20)$$

Proof. The claim follows immediately from the following bound:

$$\left(\frac{\text{Per}(E, B_r(x))}{\omega_{d-1} r^{d-1}} - 1 \right)^{p-d} \lesssim r^{p-2d} \overline{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,d}(E, B_r(x)),$$

which will be an immediate consequence of the following two estimates:

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{\text{Per}(E, B_r(x))}{\omega_{d-1} r^{d-1}} - 1 \right)^{p-d} &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{(B_r(x))_{\theta}^{\perp}} (\text{Per}^{\text{1D}}(E_{z_{\theta}^{\perp}}, (B_r(x))_{z_{\theta}^{\perp}}) - 1)^{p-d} dz_{\theta}^{\perp} d\theta, \quad (5.21) \\ \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{(B_r(x))_{\theta}^{\perp}} (\text{Per}^{\text{1D}}(E_{z_{\theta}^{\perp}}, (B_r(x))_{z_{\theta}^{\perp}}) - 1)^{p-d} dz_{\theta}^{\perp} d\theta &\lesssim r^{p-2d} \overline{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,d}(E, B_r(x)). \end{aligned}$$

The first estimate (5.21) is a direct consequence of the slicing formula (3.4) and Jensen's inequality applied to the convex function $t \mapsto t^{p-d}$.

The second estimate can be deduced as follows, using the integral geometric formulation (5.3), the convexity of the function $t \mapsto t^{-(p-d-1)}$ and the fact that $(d-1) - (p-d-1) = 2d-p$

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,d}(E, B_r(x)) &= \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\theta^{\perp}} \sum_{s \in \partial^* E_{z_{\theta}^{\perp}} \cap (B_r(x))_{z_{\theta}^{\perp}}} \frac{1}{|s - s^+|^{p-d-1}} dz_{\theta}^{\perp} d\theta \\ &\geq \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\theta^{\perp}} (\text{Per}^{\text{1D}}(E_{z_{\theta}^{\perp}}, (B_r(x))_{z_{\theta}^{\perp}}) - 1) \cdot \\ &\quad \cdot \sum_{s, s^+ \in \partial^* E_{z_{\theta}^{\perp}} \cap (B_r(x))_{z_{\theta}^{\perp}}} \frac{1}{(\text{Per}^{\text{1D}}(E_{z_{\theta}^{\perp}}, (B_r(x))_{z_{\theta}^{\perp}}) - 1) |s - s^+|^{p-d-1}} dz_{\theta}^{\perp} d\theta \\ &\geq \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\theta^{\perp}} (\text{Per}^{\text{1D}}(E_{z_{\theta}^{\perp}}, (B_r(x))_{z_{\theta}^{\perp}}) - 1)^{p-d} r^{-(p-d-1)} dz_{\theta}^{\perp} d\theta \\ &\gtrsim r^{2d-p} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{(B_r(x))_{\theta}^{\perp}} (\text{Per}^{\text{1D}}(E_{z_{\theta}^{\perp}}, (B_r(x))_{z_{\theta}^{\perp}}) - 1)^{p-d} dz_{\theta}^{\perp} d\theta. \quad (5.22) \end{aligned}$$

□

We can now give a proof of Proposition 5.2.

Proof of Proposition 5.2. Let $2\rho < R_0$, where R_0 is chosen as in Lemma 5.6. We will show that, for all $z \in \Omega$ such that $\text{dist}(z, \partial\Omega) > 2\rho$,

$$\int_{\partial^* E \cap B_\rho(z)} \int_{\partial^* E \cap B_\rho(z)} \frac{\|\nu_E(x) - \nu_E(y)\|^2}{\|x - y\|^{p-2}} d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(y) \lesssim C(M) \overline{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,d}(E, B_\rho(z)),$$

thus proving (5.5).

W.l.o.g., we assume that $2\rho = 1$. Define, for all $k \geq 0$, and for all $x \in \partial^* E$

$$\tilde{A}_k(x) = \{y \in \partial^* E : 2^{-k-1} < \|y - x\| \leq 2^{-k}\}.$$

Notice that

$$y \in \tilde{A}_k(x) \Leftrightarrow \frac{y - x}{\|y - x\|} \in \tilde{\Omega}_k(x), \quad (5.23)$$

where $\tilde{\Omega}_k(x)$ was defined in (5.13). Then, using the equality $p - 2 = (p - d - 1) + (d - 1)$, the equivalence (5.23) and the bound (see (5.10))

$$\|\nu_E(x) - \nu_E(y)\| \lesssim |\Omega_{k-1}(x)| + |\Omega_{k-1}(y)|, \quad \text{for } |y - x| \leq 2^{-k},$$

where $\Omega_k(x)$ was defined in (5.14), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\partial^* E \cap B_\rho(z)} \int_{\partial^* E \cap B_\rho(z)} \frac{\|\nu_E(x) - \nu_E(y)\|^2}{\|x - y\|^{p-2}} d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(y) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \leq \\ & \leq \int_{\partial^* E \cap B_\rho(z)} \sum_{k \geq 0} \int_{\partial^* E \cap \tilde{A}_k(x) \cap B_\rho(x)} \frac{\|\nu_E(x) - \nu_E(y)\|^2}{\|x - y\|^{p-2}} d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(y) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \\ & \leq \int_{\partial^* E \cap B_\rho(z)} \sum_{k \geq 0} 2^{(k+1)(p-d-1)} \int_{\partial^* E \cap \tilde{A}_k(x) \cap B_\rho(z)} \frac{\|\nu_E(x) - \nu_E(y)\|^2}{2^{-(k+1)(d-1)}} d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(y) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \\ & \lesssim \int_{\partial^* E \cap B_\rho(z)} \sum_{k \geq 0} 2^{(k+1)(p-d-1)} \int_{\partial^* E \cap \tilde{A}_k(x) \cap B_\rho(z)} \frac{|\Omega_{k-1}(x)|^2 + |\Omega_{k-1}(y)|^2}{2^{-(k+1)(d-1)}} d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(y) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \\ & \lesssim \int_{\partial^* E \cap B_\rho(z)} \sum_{k \geq 0} 2^{(k+1)(p-d-1)} (|\Omega_{k-1}(x)|^2 + |\Omega_{k-1}(y)|^2) \frac{\text{Per}(E, B_{2^{-k}}(x))}{2^{-(k+1)(d-1)}} d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x). \end{aligned}$$

Now we recall Lemma 5.5 and the fact that for $2^{-k} \leq 1 < R_0$ Lemma 5.6 holds, thus getting

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\partial^* E \cap B_\rho(z)} \int_{\partial^* E \cap B_\rho(z)} \frac{\|\nu_E(x) - \nu_E(y)\|^2}{\|x - y\|^{p-2}} d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(y) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \lesssim \\ & \lesssim \int_{\partial^* E \cap B_\rho(z)} \sum_{k \geq 0} 2^{(k+1)(p-d-1)} (|\Omega_{k-1}(x)|^2 + |\Omega_{k-1}(y)|^2) \frac{\text{Per}(E, B_{2^{-k}}(x))}{2^{-(k+1)(d-1)}} d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \\ & \lesssim C_0(M) \int_{\partial^* E \cap B_\rho(z)} (e(x) + e(y)) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \\ & \lesssim C_0(M) \overline{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,d}(E, B_\rho(z)). \end{aligned}$$

□

5.2 (iii) Regularity and nonlocal curvature bounds imply flatness

In the next lemma, we show that the finiteness of the nonlocal curvature quantity

$$\int_{\partial^* E \cap B_\rho(z)} \int_{\partial^* E \cap B_\rho(z)} \frac{\|\nu_E(x) - \nu_E(y)\|^2}{\|x - y\|^{p-2}} d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(y) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x),$$

proved in Proposition 5.2, together with a regularity assumption on the reduced boundary of E , implies when $p \geq d + 3$ flatness of the boundary of E . Together with $[0, L]^d$ -periodicity this implies then that E has boundaries given by affine hyperplanes orthogonal to a fixed direction, namely it is a union of stripes.

Lemma 5.7. *Let $d \geq 2$, $p \geq d + 3$, $\ell > 0$, $\bar{R} > 0$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ open and bounded, $\Omega_{2\bar{R}} = \{x \in \Omega : \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) > 2\bar{R}\}$ and let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ of locally finite perimeter which enjoys in Ω the following regularity properties:*

1. $\partial^* E \cap \Omega = \partial E \cap \Omega$;
2. For every $x \in \partial E \cap \Omega_{2\bar{R}}$ the set $\partial E \cap B_r(x)$, $\forall 0 < r < \bar{R}$, is given by the graph of an ℓ -Lipschitz function defined on a connected open subset of a $(d - 1)$ -dimensional affine subspace of \mathbb{R}^d .

If moreover, for all $0 < r < \bar{R}$ and for all $x \in \partial E \cap \Omega_{2\bar{R}}$, the following holds

$$\int_{\partial E \cap B_r(x)} \int_{\partial E \cap B_r(x)} \frac{\|\nu_E(z) - \nu_E(y)\|^2}{\|z - y\|^{p-2}} d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(z) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(y) < +\infty,$$

then $\partial E \cap \Omega_{2\bar{R}}$ is given by the disjoint union of the intersections of finitely many hyperplanes of \mathbb{R}^d with $\Omega_{2\bar{R}}$.

Moreover, if $\Omega = [0, L]^d$ and in addition E is $[0, L]^d$ -periodic, up to a rigid motion the set E satisfying the above is of the form

$$E = \hat{E} \times \mathbb{R}^{d-1}, \quad \hat{E} \subset \mathbb{R}, \quad \hat{E} \cap [0, L] = \bigcup_{i=1}^{N_0} (s_i, t_i), \quad s_i < t_i < s_{i+1} < t_{i+1}.$$

Proof. The statement of the lemma follows immediately from the following two technical tools. The first is the Area Formula applied to the bi-Lipschitz parametrization of $\partial E \cap B_r(x)$ given by the graph of an ℓ -Lipschitz function. The second is the following result due to Bourgain, Brezis and Mironescu [7, 8]: given $D \subset \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ open and connected, $g \in L^\infty(D)$ such that $g \geq c > 0$ on D and $f : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ measurable such that

$$\int_D \int_D \frac{\|f(x) - f(y)\|^2}{\|x - y\|^{d+1}} g(x)g(y) dx dy < +\infty,$$

there exists a constant $c \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $f = c$ a.e. on D .

Indeed, if $\phi : D \subset \pi_{d-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the ℓ -Lipschitz function such that $\partial E \cap B_r(x) = \{(z', \phi(z')) : z' \in D\}$, by the Area Formula

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\partial E \cap B_r(x)} \int_{\partial E \cap B_r(x)} \frac{\|\nu_E(z) - \nu_E(y)\|^2}{\|z - y\|^{p-2}} d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(z) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(y) \gtrsim \\ & \gtrsim \int_D \int_D \frac{\|\nu_E((z', \phi(z'))) - \nu_E((y', \phi(y')))\|^2}{\|z' - y'\|^{p-2}} J_{\text{graph}\phi}(z') J_{\text{graph}\phi}(y') dz' dy', \end{aligned}$$

where $J_{\text{graph}\phi}$ is the Jacobian associated to the bi-Lipschitz map $\text{graph}\phi$. Notice that $J_{\text{graph}\phi} \geq c > 0$ due to the fact that the graph of ϕ is a bi-Lipschitz map.

Applying then the result of Bourgain, Brezis and Mironescu recalled above to $f(z) = \nu_E((z, \phi(z)))$ and $g(z) = J_{\text{graph}\phi}(z)$, one has that $\nu_E(x) = \nu \mathcal{H}^{d-1} \llcorner \partial^* E$ -a.e. inside $B_r(x)$, $\nu \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$. Then, by the standard characterization of hyperplanes in geometric measure theory and the fact that the radii of the balls on which such result holds are uniform w.r.t. $x \in \partial E \cap \Omega_{2\bar{R}}$, gives the first statement of the Lemma.

The fact that the connected components of the boundary are all orthogonal to a single direction, and thus E is a union of stripes, is a consequence of the $[0, L]^d$ -periodicity of E . \square

5.3 (ii) Regularity of sets of finite energy

The aim of this section is to give a proof of the regularity Theorem 5.3 for sets of finite energy. The proof of Theorem 5.3 goes through a series of preliminary lemmas. As classical in regularity theory, we look for uniform lower and upper density bounds on perimeter and volume of sets of equibounded energy at boundary points and for power law decay of the excess.

In the next lemma, we show uniform lower bounds on perimeter and volume at points of the topological boundary of E .

Lemma 5.8. *Let $d \geq 2$, $p \geq 2d$, $M > 0$. Then, there exist $C_1, \bar{C}_1, R_1 > 0$ such that the following holds. For all $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ open and bounded, for all $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,d}(E, \Omega) \leq M$, for all $0 < r < R_1$ and for all $x \in \partial E \cap \Omega_r$ (where $\Omega_r = \{z \in \Omega : \text{dist}(z, \partial\Omega) > r\}$)*

$$\min\{|E \cap B_r(x)|, |B_r(x) \setminus E|\} \geq \bar{C}_1 r^d, \quad (5.24)$$

$$\text{Per}(E, B_r(x)) \geq C_1 r^{d-1}. \quad (5.25)$$

Proof. By the isoperimetric inequality, the proof of (5.25) follows immediately from (5.24).

In order to prove (5.24), let us consider w.l.o.g. a point $x \in \partial E$ such that $\min\{|E \cap B_r(x)|, |B_r(x) \setminus E|\} = |E \cap B_r(x)|$ and

$$|E \cap B_r(x)| = c_1 \delta^d r^d, \quad (5.26)$$

for some $\delta < 1/2$, $r < R_1$ and R_1, c_1 sufficiently small to be fixed later.

Then define, for $y \in \partial^* E \cap B_r(x)$, the sets

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta(y) &:= \{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} : \langle \nu_E(y), \theta \rangle < 0, |y_\theta - y_\theta^+| < \text{dist}(y, \partial B_r(x))\}, \\ V(y) &:= \{z \in \mathbb{R}^d : z = y + s\theta, \theta \in \Theta(y), s \in (0, |y_\theta - y_\theta^+|)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that

$$V(y) \subset E \cap B_r(x). \quad (5.27)$$

Moreover, if c_1 in (5.26) is sufficiently small, namely

$$c_1 < \frac{\omega_d}{4}, \quad (5.28)$$

then for all $0 < \bar{\omega}_1 \ll 1$

$$|\Theta(y)| \geq \bar{\omega}_1 \text{ for all } y \in \partial^* E \cap B_{r(1-\delta)}(x). \quad (5.29)$$

Indeed, by the properties (2.5) of the reduced boundary, for all $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ such that $\langle \nu_E(y), \theta \rangle < 0$ the segment $[y, y_\theta^\perp + y_\theta^+ \theta]$ is contained in E . Thus, if (5.29) does not hold, there exists $y \in \partial^* E \cap B_{r(1-\delta)}(x)$ and $|y_\theta - y_\theta^+| \geq \text{dist}(y, \partial B_r(x)) \geq \delta r$ for a set of $\theta \in \{\langle \nu_E(y), \theta \rangle < 0\} \setminus \Theta(y)$ of measure greater than $\frac{1}{2} \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1}) - \bar{\omega}_1 \geq \frac{1}{4} \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1}) \geq \omega_d/2$, thus implying by (5.28)

$$\begin{aligned} |\{z \in \mathbb{R}^d : z = y + s\theta, \theta \in \{\langle \nu_E(y), \theta \rangle < 0\} \setminus \Theta(y), s \leq \delta r\}| &\geq |\mathbb{S}^{d-1} \setminus \Theta(y)| (\delta r)^d \\ &\geq \frac{\omega_d}{2} (\delta r)^d \\ &\geq 2c_1 \delta^d r^d, \end{aligned}$$

which, by the fact that for $y \in \partial^* E \cap B_{r(1-\delta)}(x)$

$$\{z \in \mathbb{R}^d : z = y + s\theta, \theta \in \{\langle \nu_E(y), \theta \rangle < 0\} \setminus \Theta(y), s \leq \delta r\} \subset E \cap B_r(x),$$

contradicts (5.26).

In particular, by (5.29), one has that

$$|V(y)| > 0 \quad \forall y \in \partial^* E \cap B_{r(1-\delta)}(x). \quad (5.30)$$

Using (5.29), Jensen's inequality for the convex function $t \mapsto t^{-(p-d-1)/d}$, the inequality $|\langle \nu_E(y), \theta \rangle| \leq 1$ and (5.30), we get for some constant $C(\bar{\omega}_1)$

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,d}(E, B_r(x)) &\geq \int_{\partial^* E \cap B_r(x)} \int_{\Theta(y)} \frac{|\langle \nu_E(y), \theta \rangle|}{(\mathbf{r}_\theta(y))^{p-d-1}} d\theta d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(y) \\ &\geq C(\bar{\omega}_1) \int_{\partial^* E \cap B_{r(1-\delta)}(x) \cap \{y: |V(y)| > 0\}} \left(\int_{\Theta(y)} (\mathbf{r}_\theta(y))^d d\theta \right)^{-\frac{p-d-1}{d}} d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(y) \\ &\geq C(\bar{\omega}_1) \int_{\partial^* E \cap B_{r(1-\delta)}(x)} |V(y)|^{-\frac{p-d-1}{d}} d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(y). \end{aligned}$$

Now we use the following facts: first, since $x \in \partial E$, $\partial^* E \cap B_{r(1-\delta)}(x) \neq \emptyset$ for all $r > 0$, then as noticed in (5.27) $V(y) \subset E \cap B_r(x)$ and finally the isoperimetric inequality holds. Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,d}(E, B_r(x)) &\geq C(\bar{\omega}_1) \frac{\text{Per}(E, B_{r(1-\delta)}(x))}{|E \cap B_r(x)|^{(p-d-1)/d}} \\ &\geq C(\bar{\omega}_1) \frac{(\min\{|E \cap B_{r(1-\delta)}(x)|, |B_{r(1-\delta)}(x) \setminus E|\})^{(d-1)/d}}{|E \cap B_r(x)|^{(p-d-1)/d}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.31)$$

Now we claim that, under the assumptions (5.26), (5.28) and $\delta < 1/2$, it holds

$$\min\{|E \cap B_{r(1-\delta)}(x)|, |B_{r(1-\delta)}(x) \setminus E|\} = |E \cap B_{r(1-\delta)}(x)|. \quad (5.32)$$

Indeed, let us assume that (5.32) does not hold and define

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(r) &:= \frac{|E \cap B_r(x)|}{r^d}, \\ A_{r,\delta} &= B_r(x) \setminus B_{r(1-\delta)}(x). \end{aligned}$$

On the one hand, one has that (since $|E \cap B_{r(1-\delta)}(x)| > |B_{r(1-\delta)}(x) \setminus E|$)

$$\alpha(r(1-\delta)) > \frac{\omega_d}{2}. \quad (5.33)$$

On the other hand, by assumptions (5.26) and (5.28),

$$\alpha(r) = c_1 \delta^d < \frac{\delta^d \omega_d}{4}$$

and thus since $\delta < 1/2$

$$\alpha(r(1-\delta)) = \frac{|E \cap B_{r(1-\delta)}(x)|}{(1-\delta)^d r^d} \leq \frac{|E \cap B_r(x)|}{(1-\delta)^d r^d} = \frac{\alpha(r)}{(1-\delta)^d} \leq \frac{c_1 \delta^d}{(1-\delta)^d} \leq \frac{\omega_d}{16},$$

which contradicts (5.33).

Hence, by (5.32) and the fact that $p \geq 2d$, the lower bound (5.31) becomes

$$\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,d}(E, B_r(x)) \geq C(\overline{\omega}_1) \left(\frac{|E \cap B_{r(1-\delta)}(x)|}{|E \cap B_r(x)|} \right)^{(d-1)/d}. \quad (5.34)$$

Let us now define

$$\mu(A) := \overline{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,d}(E, A), \quad A \subset \Omega \text{ Borel.}$$

Then, (5.34) can be rewritten as

$$\mu(B_r(x)) \geq C(\overline{\omega}_1) \left(\frac{\alpha(r(1-\delta))}{\alpha(r)} \right)^{(d-1)/d} (1-\delta)^{(d-1)}.$$

Since $\mu \ll \mathcal{H}^{d-1} \llcorner (\partial^* E \cap \Omega)$, $\mu(\Omega) \leq M < +\infty$, and by Lemma 5.6 $\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\partial^* E \cap B_\rho(x)) \leq C_0 \rho^{d-1}$ for all $\rho \leq r \leq R_0$ and for all $x \in \partial^* E \cap \Omega_\rho$, one has that for every $0 < \gamma \ll 1$ there exists $0 < \bar{R}(\gamma) < R_0$ such that for all $r < \bar{R}(\gamma)$ and for all $x \in \Omega_r$ it holds

$$\mu(B_r(x)) \leq \gamma C(\overline{\omega}_1). \quad (5.35)$$

In particular, if γ is smaller than a dimensional constant,

$$\alpha(r(1-\delta)) \leq \alpha(r) \left(\frac{\gamma}{(1-\delta)^{d-1}} \right)^{d/(d-1)} \leq \frac{1}{2^d} \alpha(r).$$

Let us choose $R_1 = \bar{R}(\gamma)$ such that (5.35) holds for all $r < \bar{R}(\gamma)$, where γ is such that for all $\delta < 1/2$

$$\left(\frac{\gamma}{(1-\delta)^{d-1}} \right)^{d/(d-1)} \leq \frac{1}{2^d}.$$

Let us then rename $r_0 := r < R_1$, $\delta_0 := \delta$, $\alpha_0 := \alpha(r_0)$, $r_1 := r_0(1-\delta_0)$, $\alpha_1 := \alpha(r_1)$. Observe that, by assumption (5.26)

$$\frac{\alpha_0}{c_1} = \delta_0^d.$$

Using the assumption (5.28) on c_1 and the fact that $\delta_0 < 1/2$, we were just able to show that

$$\alpha_1 \leq \frac{1}{2^d} \alpha_0. \quad (5.36)$$

Now define iteratively, for $i \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_i &= \left(\frac{\alpha_i}{c_1} \right)^{1/d} \\ r_{i+1} &= r_i(1-\delta_i), \\ \alpha_{i+1} &= \alpha(r_{i+1}). \end{aligned} \quad (5.37)$$

Notice that, by (5.36), $\delta_i \leq \frac{1}{2} \delta_{i-1} \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and thus one can reason as before getting the analogue of (5.36) for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, namely

$$\alpha_{i+1} \leq \frac{1}{2^d} \alpha_i.$$

In particular,

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_i = 0, \quad \lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \delta_i = 0. \quad (5.38)$$

We now claim that

$$\exists \bar{r} > 0 : \quad r_i \geq \bar{r} > 0 \quad \text{for all } i \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (5.39)$$

Once (5.39) is proved, we can easily conclude since by (5.38) one would have that $\alpha(\bar{r}) = 0$, thus contradicting the fact that $x \in \partial E$ and thus by (2.4) that $\alpha(r) > 0$ for all r . In order to prove (5.39), observe that by definition of r_i , and by the fact that $\delta_i \leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{1/d} \delta_{i-1} < \frac{1}{2}$, one has that there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\ln r_i = \ln r_0 + \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} \ln(1 - \delta_k) \geq \ln r_0 + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \delta_i - 2 \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \delta_i^2 \geq -C > -\infty.$$

Thus we reached a contradiction to the assumption (5.26) and thus the Lemma is proved by (5.26) and (5.28) choosing any

$$0 < \bar{C}_1 < \frac{\omega_d}{4}(1/2)^d$$

and R_1 as above. □

Before stating the next lemma, we recall the definition of (spherical) excess given in (2.9), namely

$$Exc(E, x, r) = \frac{1}{r^{d-1}} [|D\chi_E|(B_r(x)) - |D\chi_E(B_r(x))|].$$

In order to show regularity, we will need power law decay of the excess, with uniform constants which are independent of the point x . More precisely, we prove the following.

Lemma 5.9. *Let $d \geq 2$, $p > 2d$, $M > 0$. There exist $R_2, C_2(M) > 0$ such that for all $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ bounded and open and E of locally finite perimeter such that $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,d}(E, \Omega) \leq M$, for all $0 < r < R_2$ and for all $x \in \Omega_r$,*

$$Exc(E, x, r) \leq C_2(M) r^{(p-2d)/\max\{p-d, 8d\}}. \quad (5.40)$$

Proof. W.l.o.g. we assume that $x = 0$ and we denote by $B_r = B_r(0)$.

We first claim that in general dimension d the following integral geometric formula holds

$$\begin{aligned} r^{d-1} Exc(E, 0, r) &= \frac{1}{C_{1,d}} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\partial^* E \cap B_r} |\langle \nu_E(y), \theta \rangle| d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(y) d\theta \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{C_{1,d}} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \left\| \int_{\partial^* E \cap B_r} \langle \nu_E(y), \theta \rangle d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(y) \right\| d\theta, \end{aligned}$$

where $C_{1,d}$ is the constant defined in (3.5).

One can deduce the above directly from the definition of the excess, from the identity

$$\|z\| = \frac{1}{C_{1,d}} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} |\langle z, \theta \rangle| d\theta, \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

applied to $z = \int_{\partial^* E \cap B_r} \nu_E(y) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(y)$ and the formula (3.4). In particular, by the classical slicing formulas (2.7) and (2.8) one has that

$$\begin{aligned} r^{d-1} Exc(E, 0, r) &= \frac{1}{C_{1,d}} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\theta^\perp} \sum_{s \in \partial^* E_{z_\theta^\perp} \cap (B_r)_{z_\theta^\perp}} 1 dz_\theta^\perp d\theta \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{C_{1,d}} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \left| \int_{\theta^\perp} \sum_{s \in \partial^* E_{z_\theta^\perp} \cap (B_r)_{z_\theta^\perp}} \text{sign}(\langle \nu_E(z_\theta^\perp + s\theta), \theta \rangle) dz_\theta^\perp \right| d\theta. \quad (5.41) \end{aligned}$$

In order to show (5.40), we define

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega_1(\theta^\perp) &= \{z_\theta^\perp \in \theta^\perp : \text{Per}^{\text{1D}}(E_{z_\theta^\perp}, (B_r)_{z_\theta^\perp}) = 1\}, \\ \Omega_2(\theta^\perp) &= \{z_\theta^\perp \in \theta^\perp : \text{Per}^{\text{1D}}(E_{z_\theta^\perp}, (B_r)_{z_\theta^\perp}) \geq 2\}.\end{aligned}$$

Using the triangle inequality we bound (5.41) in the following way

$$\begin{aligned}r^{d-1} \text{Exc}(E, 0, r) &\leq \frac{1}{C_{1,d}} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \left[\int_{\Omega_1(\theta^\perp)} 1 \, dz_\theta^\perp - \left| \int_{\Omega_1(\theta^\perp)} \text{sign}(\langle \nu_E(z_\theta^\perp + z_\theta \theta), \theta \rangle) \, dz_\theta^\perp \right| \right] \, d\theta \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{C_{1,d}} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\Omega_2(\theta^\perp)} 2 \text{Per}^{\text{1D}}(E_{z_\theta^\perp}, (B_r)_{z_\theta^\perp}) \, dz_\theta^\perp \, d\theta.\end{aligned}\quad (5.42)$$

Now observe that, as in (5.22), using the formula (5.3), Jensen's inequality and the fact that whenever $z_\theta^\perp \in \Omega_2(\theta^\perp)$ then $\exists s, s^+ \in \partial^* E_{z_\theta^\perp} \cap (B_r)_{z_\theta^\perp}$ and thus $|s - s^+| \leq r$, one obtains the lower bound

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,d}(E, B_r) &\gtrsim \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{(B_r)_{\theta^\perp}} \frac{(\text{Per}^{\text{1D}}(E_{z_\theta^\perp}, (B_r)_{z_\theta^\perp}) - 1)^{p-d}}{r^{p-d-1}} \, dz_\theta^\perp \, d\theta \\ &\gtrsim r^{2d-p} r^{(1-d)(p-d)} \left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{(B_r)_{\theta^\perp}} [\text{Per}^{\text{1D}}(E_{z_\theta^\perp}, (B_r)_{z_\theta^\perp}) - 1] \, dz_\theta^\perp \, d\theta \right)^{p-d}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence the part of the excess relative to the second term in (5.42) can be bounded in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{r^{d-1}} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\Omega_2(\theta^\perp)} \text{Per}^{\text{1D}}(E_{z_\theta^\perp}, (B_r)_{z_\theta^\perp}) \, dz_\theta^\perp \, d\theta &\lesssim \frac{1}{r^{d-1}} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\Omega_2(\theta^\perp)} [\text{Per}^{\text{1D}}(E_{z_\theta^\perp}, (B_r)_{z_\theta^\perp}) - 1] \, dz_\theta^\perp \, d\theta \\ &\lesssim r^{(p-2d)/(p-d)} \overline{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,d}(E, B_r)^{1/(p-d)},\end{aligned}\quad (5.43)$$

implying in particular (by the boundedness of the functional on Ω) the decay for the excess given in (5.40).

The estimate of the first term in (5.42) is instead more involved, due to the necessity of more precise estimates in the case of cancellations inside the second integral.

We denote by

$$\begin{aligned}I &= \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \left[\int_{\Omega_1(\theta^\perp)} 1 \, dz_\theta^\perp - \left| \int_{\Omega_1(\theta^\perp)} \text{sign}(\langle \nu_E(z_\theta^\perp + z_\theta \theta), \theta \rangle) \, dz_\theta^\perp \right| \right] \, d\theta, \\ I_\theta &= \int_{\Omega_1(\theta^\perp)} 1 \, dz_\theta^\perp - \left| \int_{\Omega_1(\theta^\perp)} \text{sign}(\langle \nu_E(z_\theta^\perp + z_\theta \theta), \theta \rangle) \, dz_\theta^\perp \right|, \quad \theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}\end{aligned}$$

and choose $\bar{\theta} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ an angle such that $\bar{\theta} \in \arg\max_\theta I_\theta$. Such a maximum point always exists as the map $\theta \rightarrow I_\theta$ is continuous and, by Lemma 5.6,

$$I_\theta \lesssim \text{Per}(E, B_r) \lesssim r^{d-1}.$$

Then, decompose $\Omega_1(\bar{\theta}^\perp)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega_1(\bar{\theta}^\perp) &= \Omega_1^+ \cup \Omega_1^-, \\ \Omega_1^+ &= \{z_\theta^\perp \in \Omega_1(\bar{\theta}^\perp) : \langle \nu_E(z_\theta^\perp + s(z_\theta^\perp)\bar{\theta}), \bar{\theta} \rangle > 0\}, \\ \Omega_1^- &= \{z_\theta^\perp \in \Omega_1(\bar{\theta}^\perp) : \langle \nu_E(z_\theta^\perp + s(z_\theta^\perp)\bar{\theta}), \bar{\theta} \rangle < 0\}.\end{aligned}$$




Figure 3: By the blow-up properties (2.5), if the set $\{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} : \mathbf{r}_\theta(z) < r\}$ has small measure, then the set $E \cap B_r(z)$ is close to $H_{\nu_E(z)}(z) \cap B_r(z)$

where by $s(z_\theta^\perp)$ we denote the point such that $\partial^* E_{z_\theta^\perp} \cap (B_r)_{z_\theta^\perp} = \{z_\theta^\perp + s(z_\theta^\perp)\bar{\theta}\}$.

Assume w.l.o.g. that $|\Omega_1^+| \geq |\Omega_1^-|$ (the other case can be treated analogously). Notice that, under this non restrictive assumption,

$$I_{\bar{\theta}} = 2|\Omega_1^-|. \quad (5.44)$$

The proof of the Lemma reduces to show that $|\Omega_1^-| \lesssim r^{d-1+\alpha}$, where $\alpha = (p-2d)/(8d)$.

Assume on the contrary that

$$|\Omega_1^-| \geq Cr^{d-1+\alpha} \quad (5.45)$$

and denote by $\beta = p - 2d$.

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} e(z) &:= \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \frac{|\langle \nu_E(z), \theta \rangle|}{\mathbf{r}_\theta(z)^{d-1+\beta}} d\theta \\ &\geq \int_{\{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} : \mathbf{r}_\theta(z) < r\}} \frac{|\langle \nu_E(z), \theta \rangle|}{r^{d-1+\beta}} d\theta \\ &\geq \hat{C} \frac{|\{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} : \mathbf{r}_\theta(z) < r\}|^2}{r^{d-1+\beta}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.46)$$

Let now $H_{\nu_E(z)}(z)$ be the affine halfspace given by $\{y : \langle y - z, \nu_E(z) \rangle < 0\}$. By the blow up properties of the reduced boundary (2.5), whenever $\langle \nu_E(z), \theta \rangle > 0$, then $(z, z + \mathbf{r}_\theta(z)\theta) \subset \mathbb{R}^d \setminus E$ and whenever $\langle \nu_E(z), \theta \rangle < 0$, then $(z, z + \mathbf{r}_\theta(z)\theta) \subset E$. By (5.46), we have that whenever $z \in \partial^* E$ is such that $e(z) < \bar{C}_1 \hat{C} r^{-d+1-\beta/2}/4$, then $|\{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} : \mathbf{r}_\theta(z) < r\}| < \bar{C}_1 r^{\beta/4}/4$, where \bar{C}_1 is the constant of Lemma 5.8. In particular, by the above consequences of the blow up properties at points of the reduced boundary, there exists a cone with vertex in z and of angles of total measure $r^{\beta/4}$, that we denote by $\tilde{C} := \tilde{C}(z, \nu_E(z), r^{\beta/4})$ such that (see Figure 3)

$$\|\chi_{H_{\nu_E(z)}(z)} - \chi_E\|_{L^1(B_r)} \leq \|\chi_{\tilde{C}}\|_{L^1(B_r)} \leq \frac{\bar{C}_1}{4} r^{d+\beta/4}. \quad (5.47)$$

On the other hand, setting $\Gamma_r = \{z \in \partial^* E \cap B_r : e(z) \geq \bar{C}_1 \hat{C} r^{-d+1-\beta/2}\}$, it is immediate to notice that

$$M \geq \bar{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,d}(E, B_r) = \int_{\partial^* E \cap B_r} e(z) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(z) \gtrsim |\Gamma_r| r^{-d+1-\beta/2}. \quad (5.48)$$

We then consider the following two cases:

Case 1 Assume $|\Gamma_r| > |\Omega_1^-|/2$. In this case we have, by (5.45) and (5.48) that

$$Cr^{\alpha-\beta/2} \leq |\Omega_1^-|r^{-d+1-\beta/2} \lesssim 2|\Gamma_r|r^{-d+1-\beta/2} \leq 2M.$$

Thus, if $\alpha < \beta/2 = (p-2d)/2$ this leads to a contradiction for r smaller than some uniform $R \ll 1$ depending only on $M, \alpha - \beta/2$.

Case 2 Assume $|\Gamma_r| \leq |\Omega_1^-|/2$. In particular, there exist $x \in \partial^*E \cap P_{\bar{\theta}^\perp}^{-1}(\Omega_1^+) \cap B_r \setminus \Gamma_r$ and $y \in \partial^*E \cap P_{\bar{\theta}^\perp}^{-1}(\Omega_1^-) \cap B_r \setminus \Gamma_r$, where $P_{\bar{\theta}^\perp}^{-1} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \bar{\theta}^\perp$ is the orthogonal projection map on $\bar{\theta}^\perp$.

In general, by Lemma 5.4 and the definition of Γ_r , whenever $x, y \in \partial^*E \cap B_r \setminus \Gamma_r$, then

$$\|\nu_E(x) - \nu_E(y)\| \lesssim r^{\beta/4}. \quad (5.49)$$

Moreover, for x, y as above such that $x_{\bar{\theta}^\perp} \in \Omega_1^+$ and $y_{\bar{\theta}^\perp} \in \Omega_1^-$, it holds $\langle \nu_E(x), \bar{\theta} \rangle > 0$ and $\langle \nu_E(y), \bar{\theta} \rangle < 0$, thus combining with (5.49) one has that $\max\{|\langle \nu_E(x), \bar{\theta} \rangle|, |\langle \nu_E(y), \bar{\theta} \rangle|\} \lesssim r^{\beta/4}$.

For $x \in \partial^*E \cap B_r \setminus \Gamma_r$, assume now that there exists $y \in \partial^*E \cap B_r$ such that $\text{dist}(y - x, \partial H_{\nu_E(x)}(x) - x) > 2r^{1+\beta/(8d)}$. Because of the volume density estimate (5.24) of Lemma 5.8 we have that there exists \bar{C}_1 such that $|B_{r^{1+\beta/(8d)}}(y) \cap E| > \bar{C}_1 r^{d+\beta/8}$ and $|B_{r^{1+\beta/(8d)}}(y) \setminus E| > \bar{C}_1 r^{d+\beta/8}$, and by the fact that $\text{dist}(y - x, \partial H_{\nu_E(x)}(x) - x) > 2r^{1+\beta/(8d)}$ either $B_{r^{1+\beta/(8d)}}(y) \subset \{z : \langle \nu_E(x), z - x \rangle > 0\}$ or $B_{r^{1+\beta/(8d)}}(y) \subset \{z : \langle \nu_E(x), z - x \rangle < 0\}$. This, by the blow up properties of the reduced boundary (2.5), would contradict the cone condition (5.47) for $H_{\nu_E(x)}(x)$ and the cone \tilde{C} centered at x , provided r is sufficiently small (being $\beta/8 < \beta/4$). Thus we have that $\sup_{y \in \partial^*E \cap B_r} \text{dist}(y - x, \partial H_{\nu_E(x)}(x) - x) \leq 2r^{1+\beta/(8d)}$ and then $\partial^*E \cap B_r \subset (\partial H_{\nu_E(x)}(x))_{2r^{1+\beta/(8d)}}$, where $(\partial H_{\nu_E(x)}(x))_{2r^{1+\beta/(8d)}}$ is the $2r^{1+\beta/(8d)}$ -neighbourhood of $\partial H_{\nu_E(x)}(x)$ defined in Section 2.

To conclude it is sufficient to notice that whenever $x \in \partial^*E \cap P_{\bar{\theta}^\perp}^{-1}(\Omega_1^+) \cap B_r \setminus \Gamma_r$, $|\langle \nu_E(x), \bar{\theta} \rangle| \lesssim r^{\beta/4}$ and thus

$$P_{\bar{\theta}^\perp}((\partial H_{\nu_E(x)}(x))_{r^{1+\beta/(8d)}}) \lesssim r^{d-1+\beta/8},$$

and thus

$$r^{d-1+\alpha}|\Omega_1^-| \leq P_{\bar{\theta}^\perp}((\partial H_{\nu_E(x)}(x))_{2r^{1+\beta/(8d)}}) \lesssim r^{d-1+\beta/(8d)},$$

which yields a contradiction for $\alpha < \beta/(8d) = (p-2d)/(8d)$. □

Proof of Theorem 5.3: In the Appendix we give a self-contained proof of the fact that uniform upper and lower bounds on perimeter and volume, together with uniform power law decay of the excess as in Lemmas 5.6, 5.8 and 5.9, imply the Lipschitz regularity of the boundary given in Theorem 5.3. In particular, the boundary of E is of class $C^{1,\alpha}$, with $\alpha = \frac{p-2d}{2 \max\{p-d, 8d\}}$. Though this general strategy is the same used to prove regularity of quasi-minimizers, we could not find in the literature a self-contained proof of this fact not exploiting the quasi-minimality property. Thus we give details for such an argument in the Appendix. □

5.4 (iv) Rigidity: from $d = 2$ to arbitrary dimension

In dimension $d = 2$, whenever $p \geq d + 3$ one has that Proposition 5.2, Theorem 5.3 and Lemma 5.7 hold. Indeed, in this case $2d = 4 < 5 = d + 3$, so $p > 2d$ whenever $p \geq d + 3$. This gives the point 1. of the rigidity Theorem 5.1 in dimension $d = 2$.




Figure 4: A picture for Case 2 of Lemma 5.9, at a point x such that $|\langle \nu_E(x), \bar{\theta} \rangle| \ll 1$.

In general dimension $d \geq 3$, to overcome the fact that $2d \geq d + 3$ and thus $p \geq d + 3$ does not imply $p > 2d$, we exploit another integral geometric formulation for the functional $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,d}$ on two dimensional affine planes and we recover the rigidity result from two dimensional rigidity on such planes.

First of all, we prove an analogue of the integral geometric formulation (3.9), by decomposing the functional $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,d}$ along the Grassmanian of two dimensional linear subspaces in \mathbb{R}^d instead of one dimensional linear subspaces. For the notation, see Section 2.

Let us preliminarily recall some basic facts about slicing of sets of finite perimeter with k -dimensional affine planes.

Remark 5.10. Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a set of locally finite perimeter and π_k be a k -dimensional plane in \mathbb{R}^d . Denote by P_{π_k} the orthogonal projection on π_k . Then for almost any $x_{\pi_k}^\perp$ in π_k^\perp , the set $E_{x_{\pi_k}^\perp}$ is a set of finite perimeter. Moreover, for \mathcal{H}^{d-k} -almost every $x_{\pi_k}^\perp$ and for \mathcal{H}^k -almost every $x_{\pi_k} \in \partial^* E_{x_{\pi_k}^\perp}$ one has that

$$\nu_{E_{x_{\pi_k}^\perp}}(x_{\pi_k}) = \frac{P_{\pi_k}(\nu_E(x_{\pi_k}^\perp, x_{\pi_k}))}{\|P_{\pi_k}(\nu_E(x_{\pi_k}^\perp, x_{\pi_k}))\|}. \quad (5.50)$$

Proposition 5.11. Let $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,d}$ be the functional defined in (5.1), $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ bounded and open. One has that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,d}(E, \Omega) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{G(2, \mathbb{R}^d)} \int_{\pi_2^\perp} \int_{\mathbb{S}_{\pi_2}^1} \int_{\partial^* E_{x_{\pi_2}^\perp} \cap \Omega} \frac{|\langle \nu_{E_{x_{\pi_2}^\perp}}(x_{\pi_2}), \theta \rangle|}{\mathbf{r}_\theta(x_{\pi_2})^{p-d-1}} d\mathcal{H}^1(x_{\pi_2}) d\theta dx_{\pi_2}^\perp d\mu_{2,d}(\pi_2) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{G(2, \mathbb{R}^d)} \int_{\pi_2^\perp} \bar{F}_{0,p,\pi_2}^{2D}(E_{x_{\pi_2}^\perp}, \Omega_{x_{\pi_2}^\perp}) dx_{\pi_2}^\perp d\mu_{2,d}(\pi_2), \end{aligned} \quad (5.51)$$

where

$$\bar{F}_{0,p,\pi_2}^{2D}(E_{x_{\pi_2}^\perp}, \Omega_{x_{\pi_2}^\perp}) = \int_{\mathbb{S}_{\pi_2}^1} \int_{\partial^* E_{x_{\pi_2}^\perp} \cap \Omega_{x_{\pi_2}^\perp}} \frac{|\langle \nu_{E_{x_{\pi_2}^\perp}}(x_{\pi_2}), \theta \rangle|}{\mathbf{r}_\theta(x_{\pi_2})^{p-d-1}} d\mathcal{H}^1(x_{\pi_2}) d\theta. \quad (5.52)$$

Proof. By the classical slicing formulas for the perimeter (2.7), Fubini Theorem and (2.3), one

has that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{G(2, \mathbb{R}^d)} \int_{\pi_2^\perp} \int_{\mathbb{S}_{\pi_2}^1} \int_{\partial^* E_{x_{\pi_2}^\perp} \cap \Omega_{x_{\pi_2}^\perp}} \frac{|\langle \nu_{E_{x_{\pi_2}^\perp}}(x_{\pi_2}), \theta \rangle|}{\mathbf{r}_\theta(x_{\pi_2})^{p-d-1}} d\mathcal{H}^1(x_{\pi_2}) d\theta dx_{\pi_2}^\perp d\mu_{2,d}(\pi_2) \\
&= \int_{G(2, \mathbb{R}^d)} \int_{\pi_2^\perp} \int_{\mathbb{S}_{\pi_2}^1} \int_{(\pi_2)^\perp_\theta} \sum_{x_\theta \in \partial^* E_{x_{(\pi_2)^\perp_\theta}} \cap \Omega_{x_{(\pi_2)^\perp_\theta}}} \frac{1}{\mathbf{r}_\theta(x_\theta)^{p-d-1}} dx_{(\pi_2)^\perp_\theta} d\theta dx_{\pi_2}^\perp d\mu_{2,d}(\pi_2) \\
&= \int_{G(2, \mathbb{R}^d)} \int_{\mathbb{S}_{\pi_2}^1} \int_{\theta^\perp} \sum_{x_\theta \in \partial^* E_{x_\theta^\perp} \cap \Omega_{x_\theta^\perp}} \frac{1}{\mathbf{r}_\theta(x_\theta)^{p-d-1}} dx_\theta^\perp d\theta d\mu_{2,d}(\pi_2) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\theta^\perp} \sum_{x_\theta \in \partial^* E_{x_\theta^\perp} \cap \Omega_{x_\theta^\perp}} \frac{1}{\mathbf{r}_\theta(x_\theta)^{p-d-1}} dx_\theta^\perp d\theta \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\partial^* E \cap \Omega} \frac{|\langle \nu_E(x), \theta \rangle|}{\mathbf{r}_\theta(x)^{p-d-1}} d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) d\theta.
\end{aligned}$$

□

As a consequence of the above two-dimensional slicing formula, one has that $[0, L]^d$ -periodic sets of $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,d}(\cdot, [0, L]^d)$ -finite energy are, on almost all two dimensional affine planes, periodic stripes.

Proposition 5.12. *Let $p \geq d + 3$, $d \geq 2$, $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ $[0, L]^d$ -periodic set of locally finite perimeter such that $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,d}(E, [0, L]^d) \leq M < +\infty$. Then, for $\mu_{2,d}$ -a.e. two dimensional plane $\pi_2 \in G(2, \mathbb{R}^d)$ and for \mathcal{H}^{d-2} -a.e. $x_{\pi_2}^\perp \in \pi_2^\perp$, the boundary of the two dimensional slice of $E \cap [0, L]^d$ given by $E_{x_{\pi_2}^\perp} \cap [0, L]_{x_{\pi_2}^\perp}^d$ is given by the disjoint union of the intersections of finitely many parallel lines in $x_{\pi_2}^\perp + \pi_2$ with $[0, L]_{x_{\pi_2}^\perp}^d$. More precisely, for \mathcal{H}^{d-2} -a.e. $x_{\pi_2}^\perp$ there exists $\nu_{x_{\pi_2}^\perp} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ such that*

$$\nu_{E_{x_{\pi_2}^\perp}}(y) = \pm \nu_{x_{\pi_2}^\perp} \quad \text{for } \mathcal{H}^1\text{-a.e. } y \in \partial^* E_{x_{\pi_2}^\perp}. \quad (5.53)$$

Proof. Thanks to Proposition 5.11, if $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,d}(E, [0, L]^d) < +\infty$, then for $\mu_{2,d}$ -a.e. two dimensional plane $\pi_2 \in G(2, \mathbb{R}^d)$ and for \mathcal{H}^{d-2} -a.e. $x_{\pi_2}^\perp \in \pi_2^\perp$ one has that

$$\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,\pi_2}^{2D}(E_{x_{\pi_2}^\perp}, ([0, L]^d)_{x_{\pi_2}^\perp}) < +\infty. \quad (5.54)$$

Recalling the formula (5.52), this means that if we identify the plane $x_{\pi_2}^\perp + \pi_2$ with \mathbb{R}^2 , then

$$\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,2}(E_{x_{\pi_2}^\perp}, ([0, L]^d)_{x_{\pi_2}^\perp}) < +\infty. \quad (5.55)$$

Now we observe that for $d = 2$ it holds $p \geq d + 3 = 5 > 4 = 2d$. Hence, Proposition 5.2, Theorem 5.3 and Lemma 5.7 can be applied, implying that there exists $R(x_{\pi_2}^\perp) > 0$ such that for all $z \in x_{\pi_2}^\perp + \pi_2$ and for all $0 < r < R(x_{\pi_2}^\perp)$, there exists $\nu_{z,r}$ such that

$$\nu_{E_{x_{\pi_2}^\perp}}(y) = \nu_{z,r} \quad \text{for } \mathcal{H}^1\text{-a.e. } y \in \partial^* E_{x_{\pi_2}^\perp} \cap B_r(z). \quad (5.56)$$

Moreover, since $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is $[0, L]^d$ -periodic,

$$\frac{1}{L^d} \overline{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,d}(E, [0, L]^d) = \frac{1}{(kL)^d} \overline{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,d}(E, [-kL, kL]^d) \quad \text{for } k \gg 1, \quad (5.57)$$

thus for \mathcal{H}^{d-2} -a.e. $x_{\pi_2}^\perp$ there exists $\nu_{x_{\pi_2}^\perp} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ such that

$$\nu_{E_{x_{\pi_2}^\perp}}(y) = \pm \nu_{x_{\pi_2}^\perp} \quad \text{for } \mathcal{H}^1\text{-a.e. } y \in \partial^* E_{x_{\pi_2}^\perp}, \quad (5.58)$$

namely the connected components of the boundary of $E_{x_{\pi_2}^\perp}$ are all flat and parallel (otherwise they would intersect in a sufficiently large cube giving an infinite two dimensional energy). □

We are now ready to complete the proof of the point 1 of the rigidity Theorem 5.1.

Proof of Theorem 5.1, point 1. Our goal is to show that there exists $\nu \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ such that for \mathcal{H}^{d-1} -a.e. $x \in \partial^* E$ one has that $\nu_E(x) = \pm\nu$. Let us instead assume that there exist $x, y \in \partial^* E$ Lebesgue points of ν_E w.r.t. $\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \llcorner \partial^* E$ such that $\nu_E(x) \neq \pm\nu_E(y)$. For simplicity of notation we will denote by $\nu_1 = \nu_E(x)$, by $\nu_2 = \nu_E(y)$ and by $v = \frac{x-y}{\|x-y\|}$. One can consider the following two cases:

1. $|\langle v, \nu_1 \rangle| \neq 0$ and $|\langle v, \nu_2 \rangle| \neq 0$;
2. $|\langle v, \nu_1 \rangle| = 0$ and/or $|\langle v, \nu_2 \rangle| = 0$.

Let us now show that in both cases our assumption leads to a contradiction with Proposition 5.12.

Case 1. For $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, consider the vector

$$\theta_\alpha = \frac{\alpha\nu_1 + (1-\alpha)\nu_2}{\|\alpha\nu_1 + (1-\alpha)\nu_2\|}.$$

Then it is not difficult to see that there exists $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\frac{|\langle \nu_1, v \rangle|}{|\langle \nu_1, \theta_\alpha \rangle|} \neq \frac{|\langle \nu_2, v \rangle|}{|\langle \nu_2, \theta_\alpha \rangle|}. \quad (5.59)$$

Denoting by $\pi_2 := \text{span}\{v, \theta_\alpha\}$, because of (5.59) it is immediate to see that

$$\frac{P_{\pi_2}(\nu_1)}{\|P_{\pi_2}(\nu_1)\|}, \frac{P_{\pi_2}(\nu_2)}{\|P_{\pi_2}(\nu_2)\|}$$

are linearly independent. Moreover, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for all $\bar{\nu}_1, \bar{\nu}_2 \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ with $\|\bar{\nu}_1 - \nu_1\| \leq \varepsilon$ and $\|\bar{\nu}_2 - \nu_2\| \leq \varepsilon$, and for all $\pi'_2 \in G(2, \mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\|\pi_2 - \pi'_2\| < \varepsilon$, then $\frac{P_{\pi'_2}(\bar{\nu}_1)}{\|P_{\pi'_2}(\bar{\nu}_1)\|}, \frac{P_{\pi'_2}(\bar{\nu}_2)}{\|P_{\pi'_2}(\bar{\nu}_2)\|}$ are linearly independent.

Let now

$$\Gamma_1 := \{z \in \partial^* E : \|\nu_E(z) - \nu_1\| < \varepsilon\} \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma_2 := \{z \in \partial^* E : \|\nu_E(z) - \nu_2\| < \varepsilon\}.$$

Our goal will be to show that

$$\mathcal{H}^{d-2}(\{x_{\pi_2}^\perp : \mathcal{H}^1((\Gamma_1)_{x_{\pi_2}^\perp}) > 0, \mathcal{H}^1((\Gamma_2)_{x_{\pi_2}^\perp}) > 0\}) > 0, \quad (5.60)$$

for all π_2 as above. If (5.60) holds, then for every $x_{\pi_2}^\perp$ in the above set of positive measure $\nu_E|_{x_{\pi_2}^\perp}$ takes linearly independent values on sets of \mathcal{H}^1 positive measure, thus contradicting Proposition 5.12.

Let us first show (5.60) for π_2 . Since $v = \frac{x-y}{\|x-y\|} \in \pi_2$, one has that $P_{\pi_2^\perp}(B_r(x)) = P_{\pi_2^\perp}(B_r(y))$ and has measure proportional to r^{d-2} . Let B^2 be the two dimensional unit ball centered at the origin in π_2 and B^{d-2} the $(d-2)$ -dimensional unit ball centered at the origin in π_2^\perp . Using the notation $A_{x,r} = \frac{A-x}{r}$, one has that by De Giorgi's structure theorem (assuming w.l.o.g. that $\pi_2^\perp = \text{span}\{e_1, \dots, e_{d-2}\}$ and $\pi_2 = \text{span}\{e_{d-1}, \dots, e_d\}$)

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_{E_{x,r}} &\rightarrow \chi_{H_{\nu_1}} && \text{in } L^1(B^{d-2} \times B^2), \\ \chi_{(E_{x,r})_{x_{\pi_2}^\perp}} &\rightarrow \chi_{(H_{\nu_1})_{x_{\pi_2}^\perp}} && \text{in } L^1(x_{\pi_2}^\perp \times B^2), \text{ for } \mathcal{H}^{d-2}\text{-a.e. } x_{\pi_2}^\perp \in B^{d-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Analogous estimates hold for the blow up of E at the point y with normal ν_2 . Moreover, for a.e. $x_{\pi_2}^\perp \in B^{d-2}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\liminf_r \operatorname{Per}((E_{x,r})_{x_{\pi_2}^\perp}, B^2) &\geq \operatorname{Per}((H_{\nu_1})_{x_{\pi_2}^\perp}, B^2) \geq C > 0, \\ \liminf_r \operatorname{Per}((E_{y,r})_{x_{\pi_2}^\perp}, B^2) &\geq \operatorname{Per}((H_{\nu_2})_{x_{\pi_2}^\perp}, B^2) \geq C > 0\end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we used the fact that $\langle v, \nu_1 \rangle \neq 0$, $\langle v, \nu_2 \rangle \neq 0$ and $v \in \pi_2$. Letting $f_{x,r}(x_{\pi_2}^\perp) := \operatorname{Per}((E_{x,r})_{x_{\pi_2}^\perp}, B^2)$, one has then that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $r(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that for every $0 < r < r(\varepsilon)$

$$\begin{aligned}\left| \left\{ x_{\pi_2}^\perp \in B^{d-2} : f_{x,r}(x_{\pi_2}^\perp) \geq \frac{C}{2} \right\} \right| &\geq |B^{d-2}|(1 - \varepsilon), \\ \left| \left\{ x_{\pi_2}^\perp \in B^{d-2} : f_{y,r}(x_{\pi_2}^\perp) \geq \frac{C}{2} \right\} \right| &\geq |B^{d-2}|(1 - \varepsilon).\end{aligned}$$

In particular,

$$\left| \left\{ x_{\pi_2}^\perp \in B^{d-2} : f_{x,r}(x_{\pi_2}^\perp) \geq \frac{C}{2}, f_{y,r}(x_{\pi_2}^\perp) \geq \frac{C}{2} \right\} \right| \geq \frac{1}{2}|B^{d-2}| > 0.$$

To obtain (5.60), we would like to substitute in the above the functions $f_{x,r}$ and $f_{y,r}$ respectively with

$$\begin{aligned}g_{x,r}(x_{\pi_2}^\perp) &:= \mathcal{H}^1((\Gamma_{1,x,r})_{x_{\pi_2}^\perp} \cap B^2), \\ g_{y,r}(x_{\pi_2}^\perp) &:= \mathcal{H}^1((\Gamma_{2,y,r})_{x_{\pi_2}^\perp} \cap B^2).\end{aligned}$$

This is indeed possible since one has that

$$\begin{aligned}f_{x,r} - g_{x,r} &\geq 0, \quad f_{y,r} - g_{y,r} \geq 0, \\ \int_{B^{d-2}} (f_{x,r} - g_{x,r}) dx_{\pi_2}^\perp &\rightarrow 0, \quad \int_{B^{d-2}} (f_{y,r} - g_{y,r}) dx_{\pi_2}^\perp \rightarrow 0,\end{aligned}$$

where the last convergence follows from the following fact: since x, y are Lebesgue points for ν_E w.r.t. $\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \llcorner \partial^* E$, one has that for every $\delta > 0$, there exists r_0 (depending on x, y, δ) such that for every $r < r_0$ one has that

$$\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\partial^* E \setminus \Gamma_1 \cap B_r(x)) < \delta r^{d-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\partial^* E \setminus \Gamma_2 \cap B_r(y)) < \delta r^{d-1}.$$

Finally, from

$$\left| \left\{ x_{\pi_2}^\perp \in B^{d-2} : g_{x,r}(x_{\pi_2}^\perp) \geq \frac{C}{2}, g_{y,r}(x_{\pi_2}^\perp) \geq \frac{C}{2} \right\} \right| \geq \frac{1}{2}|B^{d-2}| > 0, \quad 0 < r < \bar{r},$$

and from the fact that $P_{\pi_2}(y - x) = 0$, the lower bound above translates into the lower bound (5.60) for π_2 . From the proof, it is evident that the above conditions are guaranteed also on a sufficiently small neighbourhood of π_2 in $G(2, \mathbb{R}^d)$, thus proving (5.60).

Case 2. Given $\nu_1 \neq \pm \nu_2$, with $\nu_1 = \nu_E(x)$ and $\nu_2 = \nu_E(y)$, then either $y - x \in \partial H_{\nu_1}$ or $x - y \in \partial H_{\nu_2}$, thus contradicting, by the blow-up at the points y and respectively x , the condition $\nu_1 \neq \pm \nu_2$.

□

5.5 Γ -convergence as $\tau \rightarrow 0$

In this section we prove a stronger version of point 2. of Theorem 5.1, identifying the L^1 Γ -limit of $\mathcal{F}_{\tau,p,d}(\cdot, [0, L]^d)$ as $\tau \rightarrow 0$.

In order to state our main result, define $K_0(\zeta) = \|\zeta\|^{-p}$, $\overline{K}_0(\rho) = \rho^{d-1}K_0(\rho)$, and to avoid the problem of nonintegrability of K_0 at the origin,

$$\begin{aligned} r_0(E_{x_\theta^\perp}, s) &:= \int_0^1 \left(|\rho| - \int_{s^-}^s |\chi_{E_{x_\theta^\perp}}(u) - \chi_{E_{x_\theta^\perp}}(u + \rho)| \overline{K}_0(\rho) \, d\rho \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{-1}^0 \left(|\rho| - \int_s^{s^+} |\chi_{E_{x_\theta^\perp}}(u) - \chi_{E_{x_\theta^\perp}}(u + \rho)| \overline{K}_0(\rho) \, d\rho \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - \int_s^{s^+} \int_{-\infty}^{-1} |\chi_{E_{x_\theta^\perp}}(u) - \chi_{E_{x_\theta^\perp}}(u + \rho)| \overline{K}_0(\rho) \, d\rho \, du \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - \int_s^{s^+} \int_{-\infty}^{-1} |\chi_{E_{x_\theta^\perp}}(u) - \chi_{E_{x_\theta^\perp}}(u + \rho)| \overline{K}_0(\rho) \, d\rho \, du. \right. \right. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{0,p,d}(E, [0, L]^d) &:= \frac{1}{L^d} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\theta^\perp} \sum_{s \in \partial^* E_{x_\theta^\perp} \cap \Omega_{x_\theta^\perp}} r_0(E_{x_\theta^\perp}, s) \, dx_\theta^\perp \, d\theta \\ &= \frac{1}{L^d} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\theta^\perp} \overline{F}_{0,p,d}^{\text{1D}}(E_{x_\theta^\perp}, ([0, L]^d)_{x_\theta^\perp}) \, dx_\theta^\perp \, d\theta. \end{aligned} \quad (5.61)$$

One has that

$$\begin{aligned} L^d \mathcal{F}_{0,p,d}(E, [0, L]^d) &\gtrsim \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\theta^\perp} \sum_{s \in \partial^* E_{x_\theta^\perp} \cap ([0, L]^d)_{x_\theta^\perp}} \left[-1 + \frac{1}{|s - s^+|^{p-d-1}} \right] \, dx_\theta^\perp \, d\theta \\ &\gtrsim -\text{Per}(E, [0, L]^d) + L^d \overline{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,d}(E, [0, L]^d), \end{aligned}$$

where $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,d}$ was defined in (5.1).

We can now state the main result of this section.

Theorem 5.13. *The functionals $\mathcal{F}_{\tau,p,d}(\cdot, [0, L]^d)$ Γ -converge as $\tau \rightarrow 0$ with respect to the L^1 -convergence to the functional $\mathcal{F}_{0,p,d}(\cdot, [0, L]^d)$ defined in (5.61).*

Proof. The proof of the above Γ -convergence result consists of two parts: the proof of the Γ -limsup inequality and of the Γ -liminf inequality.

One can immediately see, by Corollary 4.3 and Proposition 4.1, that as the functional $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,d}$ is finite only on stripes (as proved in the previous section), also the functional $\mathcal{F}_{0,p,d}$ is finite only on stripes.

For the Γ -limsup inequality, for any set of finite energy $E = \widehat{E} \times \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ it is then sufficient to take $E_\tau = E$ for all $\tau > 0$ and notice that $r_\tau(E, s) \rightarrow r_0(E, s)$, thus $\mathcal{F}_{\tau,p,d}(E, [0, L]^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{0,p,d}(E, [0, L]^d)$ as $\tau \rightarrow 0$.

Let us now show the Γ -liminf inequality.

Let E_τ be such that $\sup_\tau \mathcal{F}_{\tau,p,d}(E_\tau, [0, L]^d) < +\infty$. Then, by the bound on the perimeter found in Corollary 4.3, we have that $\sup_\tau \text{Per}(E_\tau, [0, L]^d) < +\infty$, so that we may extract a subsequence, that we relabel as E_τ , converging in L^1 to some $[0, L]^d$ -periodic set E of finite perimeter. Let us initially notice that for any θ and for almost every x_θ^\perp , one has that $\chi_{(E_\tau)_{x_\theta^\perp}} \rightarrow \chi_{E_{x_\theta^\perp}}$ in $L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$. Moreover, given that

$$\mathcal{F}_{\tau,p,d}(E_\tau, [0, L]^d) = \frac{1}{L^d} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\theta^\perp} \overline{F}_{\tau,p,d}^{\text{1D}}((E_\tau)_{x_\theta^\perp}, ([0, L]^d)_{x_\theta^\perp}) \, dx_\theta^\perp \, d\theta,$$

and that $\overline{F}_{\tau,p,d}^{\text{1D}}(\cdot, ([0, L]^d)_{x_\theta^\perp})$ is bounded from below, we have that for almost every $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ and almost every $x_\theta^\perp \in \theta^\perp$, it holds $\sup_{\tau > 0} \overline{F}_{\tau,p,d}^{\text{1D}}((E_\tau)_{x_\theta^\perp}, [0, L]_{x_\theta^\perp}^d) < C_{x_\theta^\perp} < +\infty$. This in particular, by Lemma 4.2, implies that $\partial^*(E_\tau \cap [0, L]^d)_{x_\theta^\perp}$ converges in the Hausdorff distance to $\partial^*(E \cap [0, L]^d)_{x_\theta^\perp}$. Finally, given that whenever $\partial^* E_\tau$ to $\partial^* E$ in the Hausdorff distance then $\overline{F}_{\tau,p,d}^{\text{1D}}((E_\tau)_{x_\theta^\perp}, [0, L]_{x_\theta^\perp}^d) \rightarrow \overline{F}_{0,p,d}^{\text{1D}}(E_{x_\theta^\perp}, [0, L]_{x_\theta^\perp}^d)$, and using Fatou's Lemma we have the desired result. \square

6. Proof of Theorem 1.1

The goal of this section is to prove Theorem 1.1, thus showing that for sufficiently small $\tau > 0$ minimizers of $\mathcal{F}_{\tau,p,d}$ are periodic stripes.

By Theorem 5.1 and recalling the definition of h_L^* given in (4.8), we know that the following holds true.

Corollary 6.1. *Let $L > 0$, $p \geq d + 3$. Then, for every $\sigma > 0$ there exists $\tau(\sigma) > 0$ such that for all $0 < \tau < \tau(\sigma)$ any $[0, L]^d$ -periodic global minimizer E_τ of $\mathcal{F}_{\tau,p,d}(\cdot, [0, L]^d)$ satisfies*

$$\|\chi_{E_\tau} - \chi_{S_\theta}\|_{L^1[0,L]^d} \leq \sigma, \quad (6.1)$$

for some $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ and some $[0, L]^d$ -periodic set S_θ made of stripes with boundaries orthogonal to $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, and of constant distance one from the other given by $h_L^* > 0$.

In order to prove Theorem 1.1, we will show that among sets E_τ satisfying (6.1) as above for sufficiently small σ , there are periodic stripes which have lower energy.

We will need a series of preliminary lemmas.

Let us now introduce some preliminary notation.

For any set E of locally finite perimeter, $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ and $\delta > 0$, define

$$e_{\tau,\delta,\theta}(E_{x_\theta^\perp}, x_\theta) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\max\{\tau, |x_\theta^\perp - x_\theta|^{p-d-1}\}}, & \text{if } |x_\theta - x_\theta^+| < \delta, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$$e_{\tau,\delta}(E, x) := \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} |\langle \nu_E(x), \theta \rangle| e_{\tau,\delta,\theta}(E_{x_\theta^\perp}, x_\theta) d\theta.$$

Notice that for sufficiently small τ , by Proposition 4.1, it holds $\max\{0, r_\tau(E_{x_\theta^\perp}, x_\theta)\} \gtrsim e_{\tau,\delta,\theta}(E_{x_\theta^\perp}, x_\theta)$.

Moreover if $\delta_1 < \delta_2$, $e_{\tau,\delta_1,\theta} < e_{\tau,\delta_2,\theta}$.

The proof of the next lemma is very similar to the proof of Lemma 5.4 for $\tau = 0$.

Lemma 6.2. *There exists a dimensional constant $C_3 > 0$ such that the following holds. For every set E of locally finite perimeter, $x \in \partial^* E$, $\alpha, r > 0$, $r < \delta$ and $0 < \tau < r$, whenever $|(E \Delta H_{\nu_E(x)}(x)) \cap B_r(x)| > \alpha r^d$ it holds $e_{\tau,\delta}(E, x) > C_3 \alpha^2 / r^{p-d-1}$.*

Proof. Define the set

$$\Omega(x, r) = \{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} : |x_\theta - x_\theta^+| < r\}.$$

By the blow up properties (2.5) at points of the reduced boundary and the fact that $|(E \Delta H_{\nu_E(x)}(x)) \cap B_r(x)| > \alpha r^d$, one has that $|\Omega(x, r)| \geq \alpha$. In particular, there exist $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that the set $S_\alpha(x) = \{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} : |\langle \nu_E(x), \theta \rangle| \geq c_1 \alpha\}$ satisfies $|\Omega(x, r) \cap S_\alpha(x)| \geq c_2 \alpha$. Hence,

$$e_{\tau,\delta}(E, x) \geq e_{\tau,r}(E, x) \gtrsim \int_{\Omega(x,r) \cap S_\alpha(x)} \frac{\alpha}{r^{p-d-1}} d\theta \gtrsim \frac{\alpha^2}{r^{p-d-1}},$$

thus proving the desired claim. \square




Figure 5: In the above figure x corresponds to (i) in Remark 6.3, and y corresponds to (ii) in Remark 6.3.

Below we consider sets E which are close to an halfspace in a given rectangle and list some geometric/measure theoretic conditions at points $x \in \partial^* E$ implying that the function $e_{\tau,\delta}(E, x)$ is large (see Figure 5).

Given $L, \delta > 0$ we denote by $R_{L,\delta} := [0, L]^{d-1} \times (-\delta, \delta)$, by $H_{L,\delta} := [0, L]^{d-1} \times (-\delta, 0)$.

Remark 6.3. Let $\delta > 0$, $L > 0$, $\sigma > 0$, $\tau < \min\{\delta, \sigma^{1/d}\}$. Denote by $R_{L,\delta} := [0, L]^{d-1} \times (-\delta, \delta)$, by $H_{L,\delta} := [0, L]^{d-1} \times (-\delta, 0)$ and by $\sigma = |(E \Delta H_{L,\delta}) \cap R_{L,\delta}|$. Let $x, y \in \partial^* E \cap R_{L,\delta}$. Then the following hold:

- (i) If $\sigma < |x_d|^d/4$ then $e_{\tau,\delta}(E, x) > c/|x_d|^{p-d-1}$.
- (ii) If $\|\nu_E(x) - e_d\| > \frac{\sigma}{4\delta^d}$, then $e_{\tau,\delta}(E, x) \geq \|\nu_E(x) - e_d\|/\delta^{p-d-1}$.
- (iii) If $\|x - y\| < \delta$, then $e_{\tau,\delta}(x) + e_{\tau,\delta}(y) \gtrsim \frac{\|\nu_E(x) - \nu_E(y)\|^2}{\delta^{p-d-1}}$.

To prove the first two claims it is sufficient to notice that in the ball $B_r(x)$ with $r = |x_d|$ in the first case and $r = \delta$ in the second case we have that, if $x \in \{\chi_{H_{L,\delta}} = 0\}$, $|E \cap H_{\nu_E(x)}(x) \cap B_r(x)| < 1/4r^d$ and if $x \in \{\chi_{H_{L,\delta}} = 1\}$, $|(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus E) \cap (\mathbb{R}^d \setminus H_{\nu_E(x)}(x)) \cap B_r(x)| < 1/4r^d$. Thus, by using Lemma 6.2, we have the desired claim. The last statement follows directly from Lemma 6.2.

The inequality of the following lemma will be used in the proof of Proposition 6.5.

Lemma 6.4. There exists a constant $C_4 > 0$ such that the following holds. Let $\rho > 0$, $L > 0$ and $Q_\rho(x)$ the d -dimensional cube of centre x and side length $\rho > 0$, for all $x \in [0, L]^d$. Let $f \in L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ be an $[0, L]^d$ -periodic function. Assume that $\int_{[0,L]^d} f \, dx = 0$. Then,

$$\frac{C_4}{\rho^2} \int_{[0,L]^d} \int_{Q_\rho(x)} \left\| f(y) - \int_{Q_\rho(x)} f(z) \, dz \right\|^2 \, dy \, dx \geq \int_{[0,L]^d} \|f(x)\|^2 \, dx. \quad (6.2)$$

Proof. Assume that the statement of the lemma is false. Thus, there exist $\rho_n \downarrow 0$ and $f_n \in L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ a sequence of $[0, L]^d$ -periodic functions such that

$$\frac{1}{\rho_n^2} \int_{[0,L]^d} \int_{Q_{\rho_n}(x)} \left\| f_n(y) - \int_{Q_{\rho_n}(x)} f_n(z) \, dz \right\|^2 \, dy \, dx \leq \frac{1}{n} \int_{[0,L]^d} \|f_n(x)\|^2 \, dx. \quad (6.3)$$

W.l.o.g., we can assume that $\int_{[0,L]^d} \|f_n(x)\|^2 dx = 1$. We can also assume that $f_n \rightarrow f_0$ weakly in $L^2([0,L]^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and let φ_ε be a convolution kernel. Then $f_n * \varphi_\varepsilon \rightarrow f_0 * \varphi_\varepsilon$ strongly in $L^2([0,L]^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$. In particular

$$\int_{[0,L]^d} \|f_n * \varphi_\varepsilon(x)\|^2 dx \rightarrow \int_{[0,L]^d} \|f_0 * \varphi_\varepsilon(x)\|^2 dx. \quad (6.4)$$

We claim that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{[0,L]^d} \int_{Q_{\rho_n}(x)} \|f_n * \varphi_\varepsilon(y) - \int_{Q_{\rho_n}(x)} f_n * \varphi_\varepsilon(z) dz\|^2 dy dx &\leq \\ &\leq \int_{[0,L]^d} \int_{Q_{\rho_n}(x)} \|f_n(y) - \int_{Q_{\rho_n}(x)} f_n(z) dz\|^2 dy dx. \end{aligned} \quad (6.5)$$

To prove (6.5), denote first by $\psi_\rho = \frac{1}{\rho^d} \chi_{Q_\rho(0)}$. For every function $h \in L^1_{\text{loc}}$ one has that $\int_{Q_\rho(x)} h(y) dy = h * \psi_\rho(x)$. By Jensen inequality and Fubini Theorem, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{[0,L]^d} \int_{Q_{\rho_n}(x)} \|f_n * \varphi_\varepsilon(y) - \int_{Q_{\rho_n}(x)} f_n * \varphi_\varepsilon(z) dz\|^2 dy dx &= \\ &= \int_{[0,L]^d} \int_{Q_{\rho_n}(x)} \|f_n * \varphi_\varepsilon(y) - f_n * \varphi_\varepsilon * \psi_{\rho_n}(x)\|^2 dy dx \\ &= \int_{[0,L]^d} \int_{Q_{\rho_n}(x)} \left\| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (f_n(y-z) - f_n * \psi_{\rho_n}(x-z)) \varphi_\varepsilon(z) dz \right\|^2 dy dx \\ &\leq \int_{[0,L]^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left[\int_{Q_{\rho_n}(x)} \|f_n(y-z) - f_n * \psi_{\rho_n}(x-z)\|^2 dy \right] \varphi_\varepsilon(z) dz dx \\ &= \int_{[0,L]^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h_n(x-z) \varphi_\varepsilon(z) dz dx, \end{aligned} \quad (6.6)$$

where

$$h_n(x) := \int_{Q_{\rho_n}(0)} \|f_n(x+t) - f_n * \psi_{\rho_n}(x)\|^2 dt = \int_{Q_{\rho_n}(x)} \|f_n(y) - \int_{Q_{\rho_n}(x)} f_n(z) dz\|^2 dy. \quad (6.7)$$

By $[0,L]^d$ -periodicity,

$$\int_{[0,L]^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h_n(x-z) \varphi_\varepsilon(z) dz dx = \int_{[0,L]^d} h_n(x) dx, \quad (6.8)$$

thus the claim (6.5) is proved. Thanks to (6.5) and (6.4), eventually convolving with a kernel φ_ε we can in addition assume that $f_n \rightarrow f_0$ strongly in L^2 and f_n and f_0 are uniformly C^2 . Under these regularity conditions it is not difficult to see

$$\frac{1}{\rho_n^2} \int_{[0,L]^d} \int_{Q_{\rho_n}(x)} \|f_n(y) - \int_{Q_{\rho_n}(x)} f_n(z) dz\|^2 dy \rightarrow \int_{[0,L]^d} \|\nabla f_0(x)\|^2 dx,$$

thus by using Poincaré inequality, (6.3) and the fact that $\|f_0\|_{L^2([0,L]^d; \mathbb{R}^d)} = 1$, we have the desired contradiction. \square

Proposition 6.5. *Let $L, \delta, C, M, M_1 > 0$. Then, there exist $\sigma_0, \tau_2 > 0$ such that for every $0 < \sigma < \sigma_0$, $0 < \tau < \tau_2$, for every $[0,L]^d$ -periodic set E of locally finite perimeter with $\mathcal{F}_{\tau,p,d}(E, [0,L]^d) < M$ and $\sigma = |E \Delta H_{L,\delta}|$ it holds*

$$\int_{\partial^* E \cap R_{L,\delta}} e_{\tau,\delta}(E, x) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \geq M_1 \left(\text{Per}(E; R_{L,\delta}) - \left\| \int_{\partial^* E \cap R_{L,\delta}} \nu_E(x) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \right\| \right). \quad (6.9)$$

Proof. From the uniform bound $\mathcal{F}_{\tau,p,d}(E, [0, L]^d) < M$, by Corollary 4.3 we have that for every $\tilde{\tau} > 0$ there exists a constant \tilde{C} such that $\text{Per}(E; [0, L]^d) < \tilde{C}$ whenever $0 < \tau < \tilde{\tau}$. By $[0, L]^d$ -periodicity,

$$\int_{\partial^* E \cap R_{L,\delta}} \nu_E(x) \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) = e_d \left\| \int_{\partial^* E \cap R_{L,\delta}} \nu_E(x) \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \right\| \quad (6.10)$$

Thus

$$\left\| \int_{\partial^* E \cap R_{L,\delta}} \nu_E(x) \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \right\| = \left| \int_{\partial^* E \cap R_{L,\delta}} \langle \nu_E(x), e_d \rangle \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \right|$$

For simplicity of notation let us denote by $\nu_d(x) := e_d \langle \nu_E(x), e_d \rangle$ and by $\nu_d^\perp(x) = \nu_E(x) - \nu_d(x)$. Let now fix $\varepsilon > 0$. The range of admissible values for ε will be apparent from the proof, but it is helpful know in advance that $\tau_2 < \varepsilon \ll \delta$ and $\sigma_0 \ll \varepsilon^d$. Moreover, denote by

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &:= \{x \in \partial^* E : \|\nu_E(x) - e_d\| > \delta\}, \\ A_2 &:= \{x = (x_d^\perp, x_d) \in \partial^* E : |x_d| > \varepsilon\} \end{aligned}$$

and by

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_0 &:= \left\{x_d^\perp \in [0, L]^{d-1} : \text{Per}^{1D}(E_{x_d^\perp}, (-\delta, \delta)) = 0\right\} & \Omega_0^\delta &:= \Omega_0 \times (-\delta, \delta) \\ \Omega_1 &:= \left\{x_d^\perp \in [0, L]^{d-1} : \text{Per}^{1D}(E_{x_d^\perp}, (-\delta, \delta)) = 1\right\} & \Omega_1^\delta &:= \Omega_1 \times (-\delta, \delta) \\ \Omega_2 &:= \left\{x_d^\perp \in [0, L]^{d-1} : \text{Per}^{1D}(E_{x_d^\perp}, (-\delta, \delta)) \geq 2\right\} & \Omega_2^\delta &:= \Omega_2 \times (-\delta, \delta) \end{aligned}$$

In particular, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \int_{\partial^* E \cap R_{L,\delta}} \|\nu_E(x)\| \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) - \left\| \int_{\partial^* E \cap R_{L,\delta}} \nu_d(x) \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \right\| \right\| \leq \\ & \leq \left\| \int_{(A_1 \cup A_2)^C \cap R_{L,\delta}} \|\nu_E(x)\| \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) - \left\| \int_{(A_1 \cup A_2)^C \cap R_{L,\delta}} \nu_d(x) \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \right\| \right\| \\ & + 2\mathcal{H}^{d-1}((A_1 \cup A_2) \cap R_{L,\delta}) \end{aligned} \quad (6.11)$$

Using Remark 6.3, we have that for every $x \in (A_1 \cup A_2) \cap R_{L,\delta}$, it holds $e_{\tau,\delta}(E, x) \gtrsim 1/\varepsilon^{p-d-1}$. Thus,

$$\int_{\partial^* E \cap R_{L,\delta}} e_{\tau,\delta}(E, x) \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) > \frac{c}{\varepsilon^{p-d-1}} \mathcal{H}^{d-1}((A_1 \cup A_2) \cap R_{L,\delta}) \quad (6.12)$$

for some constant c . In particular from the above if $\mathcal{H}^{d-1}((A_1 \cup A_2) \cap R_{L,\delta}) > \frac{\varepsilon^{p-d-1} M}{c} \text{Per}(E; R_{L,\delta})$, then (6.9) is trivially satisfied. Thus we can assume w.l.o.g. that

$$\mathcal{H}^{d-1}((A_1 \cup A_2) \cap R_{L,\delta}) < \frac{\varepsilon^{p-d-1} M}{c} \text{Per}(E; R_{L,\delta}) \quad (6.13)$$

and given the uniform bound on $\text{Per}(E; R_{L,\delta})$ we can assume w.l.o.g. that $\mathcal{H}^{d-1}((A_1 \cup A_2) \cap R_{L,\delta}) \ll 1$.

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial^* E \cap R_{L,\delta}} \|\nu_d^\perp(x)\| \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) &= \int_{A_1 \cap R_{L,\delta}} \|\nu_d^\perp(x)\| \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) + \int_{A_1^C \cap R_{L,\delta}} \|\nu_d^\perp(x)\| \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \\ &\leq \int_{A_1 \cap R_{L,\delta}} \|\nu_E(x)\| \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) + \delta \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(A_1^C \cap R_{L,\delta}) \\ &\lesssim \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(A_1 \cap R_{L,\delta}) + \delta \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(A_1^C \cap R_{L,\delta}) \end{aligned} \quad (6.14)$$

$$\lesssim (\varepsilon^{p-d-1} M + \delta) \text{Per}(E; R_{L,\delta}) \ll 1 \quad (6.15)$$

for ε, δ sufficiently small.

Using the triangle inequality we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\partial^* E \cap \Omega_1^\delta} \|\nu_E(x)\| d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) + \int_{\partial^* E \cap \Omega_2^\delta} \|\nu_E(x)\| d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \\
& \quad - \left\| \int_{\partial^* E \cap \Omega_1^\delta} \nu_E(x) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) + \int_{\partial^* E \cap \Omega_2^\delta} \nu_E(x) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \right\| \\
& \leq \int_{\partial^* E \cap \Omega_1^\delta} \|\nu_E(x)\| d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) - \left\| \int_{\partial^* E \cap \Omega_1^\delta} \nu_d(x) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \right\| \\
& \quad + 2 \int_{\partial^* E \cap \Omega_2^\delta} \|\nu_E(x)\| d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x). \tag{6.16}
\end{aligned}$$

We now show that

$$\int_{\partial^* E \cap \Omega_2^\delta} e_{\tau, \delta}(E, x) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \gtrsim \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{p-d-1}} \int_{\partial^* E \cap \Omega_2^\delta} \|\nu_E(x)\| d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x). \tag{6.17}$$

Notice that whenever $x_d^\perp \in \Omega_2$ and $s, s^+ \in \partial E_{x_d^\perp}$, then

$$\operatorname{sgn}(\langle \nu_E(x_d^\perp), s \rangle, e_d) \neq \operatorname{sgn}(\langle \nu_E(x_d^\perp), s^+ \rangle, e_d)$$

Thus either $(x_d^\perp, s) \in A_1$ or $(x_d^\perp, s^+) \in A_1$. In particular, we have that either $e_{\tau, \delta, e_d}(E_{x_d^\perp}, s) > c/\varepsilon^{p-d-1}$ or $e_{\tau, \delta, e_d}(E_{x_d^\perp}, s^+) > c/\varepsilon^{p-d-1}$. Hence, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\partial^* E \cap \Omega_2^\delta} e_{\tau, \delta}(E, x) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) & \geq \int_{\partial^* E \cap \Omega_2^\delta} |\langle \nu_E(x), e_d \rangle| e_{\tau, \delta}(E, x) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \\
& \gtrsim \int_{\Omega_2} \sum_{s \in \partial E_{x_d^\perp} \cap (-\delta, \delta)} e_{\tau, \delta, e_d}(E_{x_d^\perp}, s) dx_d^\perp \\
& \gtrsim \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{p-d-1}} \int_{\Omega_2} \frac{\operatorname{Per}^{\text{1D}}(E_{x_d^\perp}, (-\delta, \delta)) - 1}{2} dx_d^\perp \\
& \gtrsim \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{p-d-1}} \int_{\Omega_2} \operatorname{Per}^{\text{1D}}(E_{x_d^\perp}, (-\delta, \delta)) dx_d^\perp. \tag{6.18}
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\int_{\partial^* E \cap \Omega_2^\delta} \|\nu_E(x)\| d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) = \int_{\partial^* E \cap \Omega_2^\delta \cap A_1} \|\nu_E(x)\| d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) + \int_{\partial^* E \cap \Omega_2^\delta \cap A_1^C} \|\nu_E(x)\| d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x). \tag{6.19}$$

Given that in A_1^C we have that $\|\nu_E(x) - e_d\| < \delta$, we have that

$$\int_{\Omega_2^\delta \cap \partial^* E \cap A_1^C} \|\nu_E(x)\| d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \leq 2 \int_{\Omega_2^\delta \cap \partial^* E \cap A_1^C} \|\nu_d(x)\| d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \leq \int_{\Omega_2} \operatorname{Per}^{\text{1D}}(E_{x_d^\perp}, (-\delta, \delta)) dx_d^\perp. \tag{6.20}$$

Thus, combining (6.19) with (6.13), (6.20) and (6.18), we have that (6.17) holds.

Thus, by (6.16) and (6.17), the statement of the lemma is proved provided we show that

$$\left| \int_{\partial^* E \cap \Omega_1^\delta} \|\nu_E(x)\| d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) - \left\| \int_{\partial^* E \cap \Omega_1^\delta} \nu_d(x) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \right\| \right| \lesssim \varepsilon^{p-d-1} \int_{\partial^* E \cap R_{L, \delta}} e_{\tau, \delta}(E, x) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x). \tag{6.21}$$

To this aim, let us define

$$\Omega^- := \left\{ x_d^\perp \in \Omega_1 : \langle \nu_E(x), e_d \rangle \leq 0 \text{ for } x = (x_d^\perp, x_d) \in \partial^* E \cap R_{L,\delta} \right\}$$

and $\tilde{\Omega} := P_{e_d^\perp}(A_1 \cup A_2)$. Given that $\tilde{\Omega} \supset \Omega^-$ and using the triangular inequality we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\partial^* E \cap \Omega_1^s} \|\nu_E(x)\| d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) - \left\| \int_{\partial^* E \cap \Omega_1^s} \nu_d(x) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \right\| \right| \\ & \leq \int_{\Omega_1 \setminus \tilde{\Omega}} \sqrt{1 + \|\nu_d^\perp(x)\|^2 / \|\nu_d(x)\|^2} dx_d^\perp - \left| \int_{\Omega_1 \setminus \tilde{\Omega}} \operatorname{sgn}(\langle \nu_d(x), e_d \rangle) dx_d^\perp \right| + 2|\tilde{\Omega}| \\ & \leq \int_{\Omega_1 \setminus \tilde{\Omega}} \sqrt{1 + \|\nu_d^\perp(x)\|^2 / \|\nu_d(x)\|^2} dx_d^\perp - |\Omega_1 \setminus \tilde{\Omega}| + 2|\tilde{\Omega}| \\ & \leq \int_{\Omega_1 \setminus \tilde{\Omega}} \|\nu_d^\perp(x)\|^2 / \|\nu_d(x)\|^2 dx_d^\perp + 2|\tilde{\Omega}|, \end{aligned} \quad (6.22)$$

where in the last inequality we used the fact that $\sqrt{1+z^2} - 1 \leq z^2$. Putting together estimates (6.16) and (6.22) we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\partial^* E \cap R_{L,\delta}} \|\nu_E(x)\| d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) - \left\| \int_{\partial^* E \cap R_{L,\delta}} \nu_d(x) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \right\| \right| \leq \\ & \leq 2 \int_{(\Omega_1 \setminus \tilde{\Omega}) \times (-\delta, \delta)} \|\nu_d^\perp(x)\|^2 / \|\nu_d(x)\|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) + 2|\tilde{\Omega}| + 2 \int_{\partial^* E \cap \Omega_2^s} \|\nu_E(x)\| d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \\ & \leq 2 \int_{(\Omega_1 \setminus \tilde{\Omega}) \times (-\delta, \delta)} \|\nu_d^\perp(x)\|^2 / \|\nu_d(x)\|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) + \varepsilon^{p-d-1} \int_{\partial^* E \cap R_{L,\delta}} e_{\tau,\delta}(E, x) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x). \end{aligned} \quad (6.23)$$

To estimate the first term in (6.23), define

$$h(x_d^\perp) := \begin{cases} \nu_d^\perp(x_d^\perp, x_d) / \|\nu_d(x_d^\perp, x_d)\|, & \text{if } x_d^\perp \in \Omega_1 \setminus \tilde{\Omega} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Notice that from the slicing formula (2.7) and from the fact that $\Omega_1 \setminus \tilde{\Omega} \subset P_{e_d^\perp}(A_2^C)$, for every Borel set $A \subset \Omega_1 \setminus \tilde{\Omega}$ one has that

$$\int_A h(x_d^\perp) dx_d^\perp = \int_{\partial^* E \cap (A \times (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon))} \nu_d^\perp(x) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x).$$

Indeed, in A_2^C it holds $|x_d| < \varepsilon$.

For $\gamma > \varepsilon$, $z_d^\perp \in [0, L]^{d-1}$, let $Q_\gamma^\perp(z_d^\perp)$ be the $(d-1)$ -dimensional cube of side length γ and center z_d^\perp . Using Lemma 6.4 and the fact that $p-d-1 \geq 2$, one has that for $\varepsilon < \gamma \ll 1$

$$\frac{1}{\gamma^{p-d-1}} \int_{[0, L]^{d-1}} \int_{Q_\gamma^\perp(z_d^\perp)} \left\| h(y_d^\perp) - \int_{Q_\gamma^\perp(z_d^\perp)} h(x_d^\perp) dx_d^\perp \right\|^2 dy_d^\perp \gtrsim \int_{[0, L]^{d-1}} \|h(x_d^\perp) - \tilde{h}\|^2 dx_d^\perp \quad (6.24)$$

with $\tilde{h} = \int_{[0, L]^{d-1}} h(x_d^\perp) dx_d^\perp$.

Notice that

$$\int_{(\Omega_1 \setminus \tilde{\Omega}) \times (-\delta, \delta)} \|\nu_d^\perp(x)\|^2 / \|\nu_d(x)\|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \lesssim \int_{[0, L]^{d-1}} \|h(x_d^\perp) - \tilde{h}\|^2 dx_d^\perp + L^{d-1} \|\tilde{h}\|^2. \quad (6.25)$$

Let us estimate the first term in (6.25). Letting $N = \lfloor \log_2(\delta/\varepsilon) \rfloor - 1$, $\gamma_i = 2^i \varepsilon$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, and recalling (6.24), it holds

$$\begin{aligned} N \int_{[0,L]^{d-1}} \|h(x_d^\perp) - \tilde{h}\|^2 dx_d^\perp &\lesssim \\ &\lesssim \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{\gamma_i^{p-d-1}} \int_{[0,L]^{d-1}} \int_{Q_{\gamma_i}^\perp(z_d^\perp)} \left\| h(x_d^\perp) - \int_{Q_{\gamma_i}^\perp(z_d^\perp)} h(y_d^\perp) dy_d^\perp \right\|^2 dx_d^\perp dz_d^\perp. \end{aligned} \quad (6.26)$$

Let $Q_\gamma(z_d^\perp)$ be the d -dimensional cube given by $Q_\gamma^\perp(z_d^\perp) \times (0, \gamma)$. Using the fact that $\gamma_i > \varepsilon > x_d$ for all $(x_d^\perp, x_d) \in \Omega_1 \setminus \tilde{\Omega}$, the definition of h and Jensen inequality, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{Q_{\gamma_i}^\perp(z_d^\perp)} \left\| h(x_d^\perp) - \int_{Q_{\gamma_i}^\perp(z_d^\perp)} h(y_d^\perp) dy_d^\perp \right\|^2 dx_d^\perp &\lesssim \\ &\lesssim \int_{\partial^* E \cap Q_{\gamma_i}(z_d^\perp)} \left\| \nu_d^\perp(x) - \int_{\partial^* E \cap Q_{\gamma_i}(z_d^\perp)} \nu_d^\perp(y) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(y) \right\|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \\ &\lesssim \int_{\partial^* E \cap Q_{\gamma_i}(z_d^\perp)} \int_{\partial^* E \cap Q_{\gamma_i}(z_d^\perp)} \|\nu_d^\perp(x) - \nu_d^\perp(y)\|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(y) \\ &\lesssim \int_{\partial^* E \cap Q_{\gamma_i}(z_d^\perp)} \int_{\partial^* E \cap Q_{\gamma_i}(z_d^\perp)} \|\nu_E(x) - \nu_E(y)\|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(y). \end{aligned} \quad (6.27)$$

Thus, recalling (6.26), we would like to estimate the following quantity

$$\int_{[0,L]^{d-1}} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{(\gamma_i^{d-1})^2} \iint_{Q_{\gamma_i}(z_d^\perp) \cap \partial^* E} \frac{\|\nu_E(x) - \nu_E(y)\|^2}{\gamma_i^{p-d-1}} d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(y) dz_d^\perp. \quad (6.28)$$

To this aim, we will use the following facts:

1. For any x, y such that $\|x - y\| < \gamma_i$ and $\max\{|x_d|, |y_d|\} < \gamma_i$

$$\gamma_i^{d-1} \lesssim |\{z_d^\perp : x, y \in Q_\gamma(z_d^\perp)\}| \lesssim \gamma_i^{d-1}. \quad (6.29)$$

2. By (iii) in Remark 6.3, and the fact that the largest term in an geometric series bounds the sum,

$$e_{\tau,\delta}(x) + e_{\tau,\delta}(y) \gtrsim \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\|\nu_E(x) - \nu_E(y)\|^2}{\gamma_i^{p-d-1}} \chi_{(\|x-y\|, +\infty)}(\gamma_i) \quad \text{for } \tau < \varepsilon. \quad (6.30)$$

3. There exists $\tilde{\tau} > 0$ such that for every $0 < \tau \leq \tilde{\tau}$ and for almost every $x_d^\perp \in [0, L]^{d-1}$ we have that

$$\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\partial^* E \cap Q_{\gamma_i}(x_d^\perp)) \leq 2\gamma_i^{d-1}. \quad (6.31)$$

Indeed, if (6.31) were false then there would exist $\tau_n \downarrow 0$ and $\sigma_n \downarrow 0$, $C_n \rightarrow +\infty$ and a set of x_d^\perp of positive measure such that $\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\partial^* E_n \cap Q_{\gamma_i}(x_d^\perp)) > 2\gamma_i^{d-1}$, $\chi_{E_n} \rightarrow \chi_{H_{L,\delta}}$ in L^1 and $\sup_n \int_{\partial^* E_n \cap R_{L,\delta}} e_{\tau,\delta}(E_n, x) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) < C < +\infty$. By the rigidity result of Theorem 5.1 we have that $\text{Per}(E_n; R_{L,\delta}) \rightarrow \text{Per}(H_{L,\delta}; R_{L,\delta})$. Moreover, for any γ_i we have that $\text{Per}(E_n; Q_{\gamma_i}(z_d^\perp)) \rightarrow \text{Per}(H_{L,\delta}; Q_{\gamma_i}(z_d^\perp)) = \gamma_i^{d-1}$, thus getting a contradiction.

As a consequence of (6.31),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \iint_{\{x,y \in \partial^* E \cap R_{L,\delta} : \|x-y\| < \gamma_i, \max\{\|x_d\|, \|y_d\|\} < \gamma_i\}} e_{\tau,\delta}(E, x) + e_{\tau,\delta}(E, y) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(y) = \\
& = 2 \iint_{\{x,y \in \partial^* E \cap R_{L,\delta} : \|x-y\| < \gamma_i, \max\{\|x_d\|, \|y_d\|\} < \gamma_i\}} e_{\tau,\delta}(E, x) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(y) \\
& \leq 4\gamma_i^{d-1} \int_{\partial^* E \cap R_{L,\delta}} e_{\tau,\delta}(E, x) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x). \tag{6.32}
\end{aligned}$$

Using Fubini Theorem and the above facts 1., 2. and 3., we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{[0,L]^{d-1}} \sum_i^N \frac{1}{(\gamma_i^{d-1})^2} \iint_{Q_{\gamma_i}(z_d^\perp) \cap \partial^* E} \frac{\|\nu_E(x) - \nu_E(y)\|^2}{\gamma_i^{p-d-1}} d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(y) dz_d^\perp = \\
& = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{(\gamma_i^{d-1})^2} \iint_{\partial^* E} \int_{[0,L]^{d-1}} \chi_{Q_{\gamma_i}(z_d^\perp)}(x) \chi_{Q_{\gamma_i}(z_d^\perp)}(y) \frac{|\nu_E(x) - \nu_E(y)|^2}{\gamma_i^{p-d-1}} dz_d^\perp d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(y) \\
& \lesssim \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{\gamma_i^{d-1}} \iint_{\partial^* E \cap \{x,y \in R_{L,\delta} : \|x-y\| \leq \gamma_i, \max\{\|x_d\|, \|y_d\|\} < \gamma_i\}} \frac{\|\nu_E(x) - \nu_E(y)\|^2}{\gamma_i^{p-d-1}} d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(y) \\
& \lesssim \frac{1}{\gamma_1^{d-1}} \iint_{\partial^* E \cap \{x,y \in R_{L,\delta} : \|x-y\| \leq \gamma_1, \max\{\|x_d\|, \|y_d\|\} < \gamma_1\}} e_{\tau,\delta}(E, x) + e_{\tau,\delta}(E, y) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(y) \\
& \lesssim \int_{\partial^* E \cap R_{L,\delta}} e_{\tau,\delta}(E, x) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x). \tag{6.33}
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (6.26), (6.27) and (6.33), we have that

$$N \int_{[0,L]^{d-1}} \|h(x_d^\perp) - \tilde{h}\|^2 dx_d^\perp \lesssim \int_{\partial^* E \cap R_{L,\delta}} e_{\tau,\delta}(E, x) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x). \tag{6.34}$$

Recalling the second term in (6.25) and the definition of \tilde{h} , Given that, by (6.10), $\int_{\partial^* E \cap R_{L,\delta}} \nu_d^\perp(x) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) = 0$, and that (6.12) holds, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \int_{[0,L]^{d-1}} h(z_d^\perp) dz_d^\perp \right\|^2 &= \left\| \int_{\partial^* E \cap R_{L,\delta} \setminus (A_1 \cup A_2)} \nu_d^\perp(x) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \right\|^2 \\
&= \left\| \int_{\partial^* E \cap R_{L,\delta} \cap (A_1 \cup A_2)} \nu_d^\perp(x) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \right\|^2 \\
&\leq (\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(A_1 \cup A_2))^2 \\
&\lesssim \varepsilon^{p-d-1} \int_{\partial^* E \cap R_{L,\delta}} e_{\tau,\delta}(E, x) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x). \tag{6.35}
\end{aligned}$$

To conclude the proof it is sufficient to take ε such that $N \gtrsim M_1$ and $\varepsilon^{-(p-d-1)} \gtrsim M_1$. \square

Remark 6.6. Notice that the statement and the proof of the above Proposition 6.5 are invariant under rotations of an angle θ such that stripes with boundary orthogonal to θ are $[0, L]^d$ -periodic. Thus, the assumption that the reference rectangle has height parallel to e_d is not a restriction.

We can now give a proof of Theorem 1.1.




Figure 6: In the above example we have that $(x, \theta) \in \mathcal{B}_{2,i}$, $(y, -\theta) \in \mathcal{B}_{2,i}$ and $z \in \mathcal{B}_1$.

Proof of Theorem 1.1: Let $L > 0$, $M_1 \gg 1$ and $\sigma, \delta, \varepsilon, \tau > 0$ sufficiently small to be fixed later. By the rigidity estimate and Γ -convergence result (see Corollary 6.1), we know that if $0 < \tau < \tau(\sigma)$, then minimizers E_τ of $\mathcal{F}_{\tau,p,d}(\cdot, [0, L]^d)$ satisfy

$$\|\chi_{E_\tau} - \chi_{S_\theta}\|_{L^1([0, L]^d)} \leq \sigma, \quad (6.36)$$

where $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ and S_θ is a $[0, L]^d$ periodic set made of stripes with boundaries orthogonal to $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ and of constant distance one from the other given by $h_L^* > 0$. Let $E = E_\tau$ be a minimizer of $\mathcal{F}_{\tau,L}$ and fix $\delta, \varepsilon > 0$. Thanks also to Remark 6.6, we can assume w.l.o.g. that $\theta = e_d$ and denote by $S = S_{e_d}$. In particular, up to a translation in direction e_d ,

$$\partial S \cap [0, L]^d = \bigcup_{i=0}^{L/h_L^*} [0, L]^{d-1} \times \{ih_L^*\},$$

where h_L^* was introduced in Section 4. Let us denote by $R_i = [0, L]^{d-1} \times [ih_L^* - \delta/2, ih_L^* + \delta/2]$ and $\tilde{R}_i = [0, L]^{d-1} \times [ih_L^* - \delta, ih_L^* + \delta]$, for $i = 0, \dots, L/h_L^*$.

Then, define the sets (see Figure 6)

$$\mathcal{B}_1 := \left\{ x \in \partial^* E : x \notin \bigcup_i R_i \right\}$$

$$\mathcal{B}_{2,i} := \left\{ (x, \theta) \in \partial^* E \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1} : x \in R_i \text{ and } x_\theta^\perp + x_\theta^+ \theta \in \tilde{R}_i \right\}$$

and for any $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ and $x_\theta^\perp \in \theta^\perp$ let

$$\mathcal{B}_{1,\theta,x_\theta^\perp} := \{s \in \partial^* E_{x_\theta^\perp} : x_\theta^\perp + s\theta \in \mathcal{B}_1\}$$

$$\mathcal{B}_{2,i,\theta} := \{x \in \partial^* E : (x, \theta) \in \mathcal{B}_{2,i}\}$$

$$\mathcal{B}_{2,i,\theta,x_\theta^\perp} := \left\{ s \in \partial^* E_{x_\theta^\perp} : x_\theta^\perp + s\theta \in \mathcal{B}_{2,i,\theta} \right\}.$$

Using the integral geometric formula (3.2) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
L^d \mathcal{F}_{\tau,p,d}(E, [0, L]^d) &= \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\theta^\perp} \sum_{s \in \partial^* E_{x_\theta^\perp} \cap ([0, L]^d)_{x_\theta^\perp}} r_\tau(E_{x_\theta^\perp}, s) dx_\theta^\perp d\theta \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\theta^\perp} \sum_{s \in \partial^* E_{x_\theta^\perp} \setminus (\mathcal{B}_{1,\theta,x_\theta^\perp} \cup \bigcup_i \mathcal{B}_{2,i,\theta,x_\theta^\perp}) \cap ([0, L]^d)_{x_\theta^\perp}} r_\tau(E_{x_\theta^\perp}, s) dx_\theta^\perp d\theta \\
&\quad + \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\theta^\perp} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{B}_{1,\theta,x_\theta^\perp} \cup \bigcup_i \mathcal{B}_{2,i,\theta,x_\theta^\perp} \cap ([0, L]^d)_{x_\theta^\perp}} r_\tau(E_{x_\theta^\perp}, s) dx_\theta^\perp d\theta. \tag{6.37}
\end{aligned}$$

We claim that, provided, δ, σ and τ are sufficiently small,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\theta^\perp} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{B}_{1,\theta,x_\theta^\perp} \cup \bigcup_i \mathcal{B}_{2,i,\theta,x_\theta^\perp} \cap ([0, L]^d)_{x_\theta^\perp}} r_\tau(E_{x_\theta^\perp}, s) dx_\theta^\perp d\theta \geq \\
&\geq M \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\theta^\perp} \#\left\{s \in (\mathcal{B}_{1,\theta,x_\theta^\perp} \cup \bigcup_i \mathcal{B}_{2,i,\theta,x_\theta^\perp}) \cap ([0, L]^d)_{x_\theta^\perp}\right\} dx_\theta^\perp d\theta. \tag{6.38}
\end{aligned}$$

Indeed, on the one hand, if δ is such that $\delta^{-(p-d-1)} \gtrsim M_1$, $\sigma < \frac{1}{4}(\delta/2)^d$ and $\tau < \tau(\sigma)$ as in Corollary 6.1, one has that whenever $x \in \mathcal{B}_1$, $\sigma < \frac{1}{4}(\text{dist}(x, \partial S))^d$ thus one can apply point (i) of Remark 6.3 to get

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\theta^\perp} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{B}_{1,\theta,x_\theta^\perp} \cap ([0, L]^d)_{x_\theta^\perp}} r_\tau(E_{x_\theta^\perp}, s) dx_\theta^\perp d\theta \geq M_1 \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\theta^\perp} \#\left\{s \in \mathcal{B}_{1,\theta,x_\theta^\perp} \cap ([0, L]^d)_{x_\theta^\perp}\right\} dx_\theta^\perp d\theta. \tag{6.39}$$

Notice that, by Proposition 6.5, whenever $\sigma < \text{sigma}_0$ and $\tau < \tau_2$ are sufficiently small,

$$\int_{\partial^* E \cap R_i} e_{\tau,\delta/2}(E, x) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \geq M_1 \left(\text{Per}(E; R_i) - \left| \int_{\partial^* E \cap R_i} \nu_E(x) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \right| \right). \tag{6.40}$$

Since

$$\left\{x \in \partial^* E \cap R_i : e_{\tau,\delta,\theta}(E_{x_\theta^\perp}, x_\theta) > 0\right\} \subset \mathcal{B}_{2,i,\theta},$$

the bound (6.40) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\mathcal{B}_{2,i,\theta}} |\langle \nu_E(x), \theta \rangle| e_{\tau,\delta,\theta}(E_{x_\theta^\perp}, x_\theta) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) d\theta \geq \\
&\geq \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\partial^* E \cap R_i} |\langle \nu_E(x), \theta \rangle| e_{\tau,\delta,\theta}(E_{x_\theta^\perp}, x_\theta) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) d\theta \\
&= \int_{\partial^* E \cap R_i} e_{\tau,\delta/2}(E, x) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \\
&\geq M_1 \left(\text{Per}(E; R_i) - \left\| \int_{\partial^* E \cap R_i} \nu_E(x) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \right\| \right) \\
&\geq M_1 \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\theta^\perp} \left(\text{Per}^{1D}(E_{x_\theta^\perp}, (R_i)_{x_\theta^\perp}) - \text{mod}_2(\text{Per}^{1D}(E_{x_\theta^\perp}, (R_i)_{x_\theta^\perp})) \right) dx_\theta^\perp d\theta \\
&\geq 2M_1 \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\theta^\perp} \#\mathcal{B}_{2,i,\theta,x_\theta^\perp} dx_\theta^\perp d\theta. \tag{6.41}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, since by Proposition 4.1

$$r_\tau(E_{x_\theta^\perp}, s) \geq -\gamma_0 + \gamma_1 e_{\tau, \delta, \theta}(E_{x_\theta^\perp}, s),$$

and $M_1 \gg 1$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\theta^\perp} \sum_{s \in \bigcup_i \mathcal{B}_{2,i,\theta,x_\theta^\perp} \cap ([0,L]^d)_{x_\theta^\perp}} r_\tau(E_{x_\theta^\perp}, s) dx_\theta^\perp d\theta \geq M_1 \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\theta^\perp} \#\left\{s \in \bigcup_i \mathcal{B}_{2,i,\theta,x_\theta^\perp} \cap ([0,L]^d)_{x_\theta^\perp}\right\} dx_\theta^\perp d\theta, \quad (6.42)$$

and thus (6.38) is proved.

In particular, (6.37) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{\tau,p,d}(E, [0,L]^d) &\geq \frac{1}{L^d} \left[\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\theta^\perp} \sum_{s \in \partial^* E_{x_\theta^\perp} \setminus (\mathcal{B}_{1,\theta,x_\theta^\perp} \cup \bigcup_i \mathcal{B}_{2,i,\theta,x_\theta^\perp}) \cap ([0,L]^d)_{x_\theta^\perp}} r_\tau(E_{x_\theta^\perp}, s) dx_\theta^\perp d\theta \right. \\ &\quad \left. + M_1 \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\theta^\perp} \#\left\{s \in (\mathcal{B}_{1,\theta,x_\theta^\perp} \cup \bigcup_i \mathcal{B}_{2,i,\theta,x_\theta^\perp}) \cap ([0,L]^d)_{x_\theta^\perp}\right\} dx_\theta^\perp d\theta \right]. \quad (6.43) \end{aligned}$$

Now notice that, due to the $[0,L]^d$ -periodicity of E , both the r.h.s. and l.h.s. of (6.43) are invariant if we substitute $[0,L]^d$ with $[-kL, kL]^d$, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let us fix $\ell \gg \eta_0$, $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ and define the set

$$\mathcal{G}_{k,\ell,\varepsilon} := \{(\theta, x_\theta^\perp) \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \times ([-kL, kL]^d)_\theta^\perp : |([-kL, kL]^d)_{x_\theta^\perp}| \geq \ell, |\langle \nu_S, \theta \rangle| \geq \varepsilon\}. \quad (6.44)$$

It is immediate to see that

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{([-kL, kL]^d)_\theta^\perp} [1 - \chi_{\mathcal{G}_{k,\ell,\varepsilon}}(\theta, x_\theta^\perp)] dx_\theta^\perp d\theta \lesssim \ell^{d-1} + (kL)^{d-1} \varepsilon. \quad (6.45)$$

Let now $(\theta, x_\theta^\perp) \in \mathcal{G}_{k,\ell}$. By using Lemma 4.6 with $E = E_{x_\theta^\perp}$, $A_0 \cup A_1 = \mathcal{B}_{1,\theta,x_\theta^\perp} \cup \bigcup_i \mathcal{B}_{2,i,\theta,x_\theta^\perp}$, and $F_{x_\theta^\perp}$ such that $\partial^* F_{x_\theta^\perp} \cap ([0,L]^d)_{x_\theta^\perp} = \partial^* E_{x_\theta^\perp} \setminus (A_0 \cup A_1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{s \in \partial E_{x_\theta^\perp} \cap ([-kL, kL]^d)_{x_\theta^\perp} \setminus (\mathcal{B}_{1,\theta,x_\theta^\perp} \cup \bigcup_i \mathcal{B}_{2,i,\theta,x_\theta^\perp})} r_\tau(E_{x_\theta^\perp}, s) &\geq -M_0 \#\left\{(\mathcal{B}_{1,\theta,x_\theta^\perp} \cup \bigcup_i \mathcal{B}_{2,i,\theta,x_\theta^\perp}) \cap ([-kL, kL]^d)_{x_\theta^\perp}\right\} \\ &\quad + \sum_{s \in \partial F_{x_\theta^\perp} \cap ([-kL, kL]^d)_{x_\theta^\perp}} r_\tau(F_{x_\theta^\perp}, s). \end{aligned}$$

We now want to apply Lemma 4.7 to $F = F_{x_\theta^\perp}$, $I = ((0, L]^d)_{x_\theta^\perp}$. Given $\{k_1, \dots, k_m\} = \partial^* F_{x_\theta^\perp} \cap I$, notice that $\forall i = 1, \dots, m$ there exists $s_i \in \partial S_{x_\theta^\perp}$ such that $|s_i - k_i| < \frac{\delta}{2 \cos \gamma} \ll h_L^*/\cos \gamma$, with $\gamma = \langle \theta, e_d \rangle$ and thus $|k_i - k_j| > \eta_0$. We then choose k_0, k_{m+1}, k_{m+2} in the following way. Let

$$\begin{aligned} k_0 &= \sup \{s \in \partial S_{x_\theta^\perp} \setminus I : s < k_1 - \delta/\cos \gamma\} \\ \tilde{k}_{m+1} &= \inf \{s \in \partial S_{x_\theta^\perp} : s > k_m + \delta/\cos \gamma\} \\ \tilde{k}_{m+2} &= \inf \{s \in \partial S_{x_\theta^\perp} : s > \tilde{k}_{m+1}\} \\ \tilde{k}_{m+3} &= \inf \{s \in \partial S_{x_\theta^\perp} : s > \tilde{k}_{m+2}\}. \end{aligned}$$

We now distinguish four cases:

$$\#\partial^* F_{x_\theta^\perp} \cap I \in 2\mathbb{N} \quad \text{and} \quad \#\partial S_{x_\theta^\perp} \cap [k_0, \tilde{k}_{m+1}] \in 2\mathbb{N} \quad (6.46)$$

$$\#\partial^* F_{x_\theta^\perp} \cap I \in 2\mathbb{N} \quad \text{and} \quad \#\partial S_{x_\theta^\perp} \cap [k_0, \tilde{k}_{m+1}] \in 2\mathbb{N} + 1 \quad (6.47)$$

$$\#\partial^* F_{x_\theta^\perp} \cap I \in 2\mathbb{N} + 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \#\partial S_{x_\theta^\perp} \cap [k_0, \tilde{k}_{m+1}] \in 2\mathbb{N} + 1 \quad (6.48)$$

$$\#\partial^* F_{x_\theta^\perp} \cap I \in 2\mathbb{N} + 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \#\partial S_{x_\theta^\perp} \cap [k_0, \tilde{k}_{m+1}] \in 2\mathbb{N}. \quad (6.49)$$

If (6.46) holds, then choose

$$k_{m+1} = \tilde{k}_{m+1}, \quad k_{m+2} = \tilde{k}_{m+2};$$

if (6.47) holds, set

$$k_{m+1} = \tilde{k}_{m+1}, \quad k_{m+2} = \tilde{k}_{m+3};$$

if (6.48) holds, let

$$k_{m+1} = \tilde{k}_{m+1};$$

and finally if (6.49) holds, then choose

$$k_{m+1} = \tilde{k}_{m+2}.$$

In this way, on $\tilde{I} = [k_0, k_{\max}]$ as in Lemma 4.7, both the extension \tilde{F} of $F = F_{x_\theta^\perp}$ and the simple periodic set $S_{x_\theta^\perp}$ have an odd number of boundary points, thus they are both $|\tilde{I}|$ -periodic.

Define also $\tilde{S}_{x_\theta^\perp}$ as the simple periodic $|\tilde{I}_{x_\theta^\perp}|$ -periodic set on $x_\theta^\perp + \mathbb{R}\theta$ with the same number of boundary points of \tilde{F} on \tilde{I} , as in Lemma 4.7.

By Lemma 4.7,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{s \in \partial F_{x_\theta^\perp} \cap ([-kL, kL]^d)_{x_\theta^\perp}} r_\tau(F_{x_\theta^\perp}, s) &\geq \sum_{s \in \partial^* \tilde{F} \cap \tilde{I}_{x_\theta^\perp}} r_\tau(\tilde{F}, s) - C \\ &\geq \sum_{s \in \partial^* \tilde{S}_{x_\theta^\perp} \cap \tilde{I}_{x_\theta^\perp}} r_\tau(\tilde{S}_{x_\theta^\perp}, s) - C \\ &= |\tilde{I}_{x_\theta^\perp}| \overline{F}_{\tau, p, d}^{1D}(\tilde{S}_{x_\theta^\perp}, \tilde{I}_{x_\theta^\perp}) - C. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, since $\text{Per}(\tilde{S}_{x_\theta^\perp}, \tilde{I}_{x_\theta^\perp}) \leq \text{Per}(S_{x_\theta^\perp}, \tilde{I}_{x_\theta^\perp})$, the distance $\tilde{h}_{x_\theta^\perp}$ between boundary points in $\tilde{S}_{x_\theta^\perp}$ is greater than or equal to the distance $h_{x_\theta^\perp}$ between boundary points in $S_{x_\theta^\perp}$, which is in turn greater than or equal to $h_L^*/\cos\gamma \geq h_L^*$. Then notice that for $h > h_L^*$ the energy of simple periodic sets with boundaries at distance h is a strictly increasing function of h . This can be seen by the classical explicit computation of such an energy for $\tau = 0$ (see e.g. [28, 16]), which is equal to $h^{-1} + ch^{-(p-d)}$, and the fact that, as seen in Proposition 4.5, for boundary points at distance greater than some given constant η_0 and τ sufficiently small, the energies $\mathcal{F}_{\tau, p, d}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{0, p, d}$ coincide on simple periodic sets.

Thus,

$$|\tilde{I}_{x_\theta^\perp}| \overline{F}_{\tau, p, d}^{1D}(\tilde{S}_{x_\theta^\perp}, \tilde{I}_{x_\theta^\perp}) \geq |\tilde{I}_{x_\theta^\perp}| \overline{F}_{\tau, p, d}^{1D}(S_{x_\theta^\perp}, \tilde{I}_{x_\theta^\perp}) \quad (6.50)$$

where equality holds if and only if $\text{Per}^{1D}(\tilde{S}_{x_\theta^\perp}, \tilde{I}_{x_\theta^\perp}) = \text{Per}^{1D}(S_{x_\theta^\perp}, \tilde{I}_{x_\theta^\perp})$ and thus the two stripes coincide.

From the above (denoting by \mathcal{B}_1 and $\mathcal{B}_{2,i}$ the corresponding sets on $[-kL, kL]^{d-1}$ instead of $[0, L]^d$), and recalling that from Proposition 4.1 $r_\tau(E, s) \geq -\gamma_0$, one has that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}_{\tau,p,d}(E, [-kL, kL]^d) &\geq \frac{1}{(kL)^d} \left[\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\theta^\perp} \sum_{s \in \partial^* E_{x_\theta^\perp} \setminus (\mathcal{B}_{1,\theta,x_\theta^\perp} \cup \bigcup_i \mathcal{B}_{2,i,\theta,x_\theta^\perp}) \cap ([-kL, kL]^d)_{x_\theta^\perp}} r_\tau(E_{x_\theta^\perp}, s) dx_\theta^\perp d\theta \right. \\
&\quad \left. + M_1 \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\theta^\perp} \# \left\{ s \in (\mathcal{B}_{1,\theta,x_\theta^\perp} \cup \bigcup_i \mathcal{B}_{2,i,\theta,x_\theta^\perp}) \cap ([-kL, kL]^d)_{x_\theta^\perp} \right\} dx_\theta^\perp d\theta \right] \\
&\geq -\frac{c\gamma_0 \ell^{d-1} + c\gamma_0 \varepsilon (kL)^{d-1}}{(kL)^d} \\
&\quad + \int_{\mathcal{G}_{k,\ell,\varepsilon}} \frac{(M_1 - M_0)}{(kL)^d} \# \left\{ (\mathcal{B}_{1,\theta,x_\theta^\perp} \cup \bigcup_i \mathcal{B}_{2,i,\theta,x_\theta^\perp}) \cap ([-kL, kL]^d)_{x_\theta^\perp} \right\} dx_\theta^\perp d\theta \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{(kL)^d} \int_{\mathcal{G}_{k,\ell,\varepsilon}} |\tilde{I}_{x_\theta^\perp}| \overline{F}_{\tau,p,d}^{\text{LD}}(S_{x_\theta^\perp}, \tilde{I}_{x_\theta^\perp}) dx_\theta^\perp d\theta \\
&\quad - \frac{C}{kL}. \tag{6.51}
\end{aligned}$$

Sending $k \rightarrow +\infty$ and then $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, since $\mathcal{F}_{\tau,p,d}(E, [-kL, kL]^d) = \mathcal{F}_{\tau,p,d}(E, [0, L]^d)$ and $|\mathcal{G}_{k,\ell,\varepsilon}|/(kL)^d \rightarrow \{|\theta : |\nu_S, \theta| \geq \varepsilon\}$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$, one obtains

$$\mathcal{F}_{\tau,p,d}(E, [0, L]^d) \geq \mathcal{F}_{\tau,p,d}(S, [0, L]^d), \tag{6.52}$$

with equality if and only if $\mathcal{B}_{1,\theta,x_\theta^\perp} \cup \bigcup_i \mathcal{B}_{2,i,\theta,x_\theta^\perp} = \emptyset$ and $E_{x_\theta^\perp} = S_{x_\theta^\perp}$ for all θ, x_θ^\perp , namely $E = S$. \square

Appendix

Given Lemmas 5.6, 5.8 and 5.9, the proof of the Lipschitz regularity of the boundary as in Theorem 5.3 follows from uniform upper and lower bounds on perimeter and volume and power law decay of the excess, similarly to the classical De Giorgi's regularity proof for quasi-minimizers. We give here a self-contained proof of this fact, without exploiting further properties of our class of sets.

In the following, the upper and lower bounds for the family of sets we consider are assumed to hold locally with uniform constants in the whole \mathbb{R}^d . Thus, also the regularity results we prove will hold on the whole \mathbb{R}^d . However, since the proofs depend only on the local behaviour of the sets, this extends trivially to sets E whose upper and lower bounds hold on the balls contained inside any given open and bounded set Ω (as is the case for the sets of $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,d}(\cdot, \Omega)$ -equibounded energy). The choice to work on the whole \mathbb{R}^d is done for simplicity of notation and in order to facilitate the reader.

Proposition 6.7. *Let $d \geq 2$, \mathcal{F} a class of subsets of \mathbb{R}^d of locally finite perimeter for which there exist constants $C_0, C_1, C_2, \tilde{C}_1 > 0$ and $\alpha, R_3 > 0$ such that for every $E \in \mathcal{F}$, for every $x \in \partial^* E$ and for every $0 < r < R_3$ the following holds:*

$$\text{Per}(E, B_r(x)) \leq C_0 r^{d-1} \tag{6.53}$$

$$\text{Per}(E, B_r(x)) \geq C_1 r^{d-1} \tag{6.54}$$

$$\min\{|E \cap B_r(x)|, |B_r(x) \setminus E|\} \geq \tilde{C}_1 r^d \tag{6.55}$$

$$\text{Exc}(E, x, r) \leq C_2 r^\alpha \tag{6.56}$$

Then, there exist $0 < R_4 < R_3$, $0 < c_0 < c_1 < 1$ such that the following holds. For every $x \in \partial^* E$, $0 < r < R_4$ let

$$\theta(x, r) = \frac{\nu(x, r)}{|\nu(x, r)|}, \quad \nu(x, r) = \frac{\int_{\partial^* E \cap B_r(x)} \nu_E(y) \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(y)}{\int_{\partial^* E \cap B_r(x)} |\nu_E(y)| \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(y)}, \quad (6.57)$$

and let

$$Cyl(x, cr, \theta(x, r)) := \{z \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|z_{\theta(x, r)}^\perp - x_{\theta(x, r)}^\perp\| \leq cr, |z_{\theta(x, r)} - x_{\theta(x, r)}| \leq cr\}, \quad (6.58)$$

where c is such that $Cyl(x, cr, \theta(x, r)) \subset B_r(x)$, $c_0 < c < c_1$. Then there exists an affine halfspace \tilde{H} with exterior normal $\nu_{\tilde{H}} = \theta(x, r)$ such that

$$\left(\int_{Cyl(x, cr, \theta(x, r))} |\chi_E(z) - \chi_{\tilde{H}}(z)| \, dz \right)^2 \lesssim Exc(E, x, r)^{1/2}. \quad (6.59)$$

Proof. Step 0: Preliminary excess estimates Let $\nu(x, r)$ and $\theta = \theta(x, r) \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ be as in (6.57). We also introduce the orthogonal decomposition

$$\nu_E(y) = \nu_\theta(y)\theta + \nu_\theta^\perp(y), \quad \nu_\theta \in \mathbb{R}$$

and define

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Per}_\theta(E, B_r(x)) &= \int_{\partial^* E \cap B_r(x)} |\nu_\theta(y)| \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(y), \\ \text{Per}_\theta^\perp(E, B_r(x)) &= \int_{\partial^* E \cap B_r(x)} \|\nu_\theta^\perp(y)\| \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(y). \end{aligned}$$

The goal of this step is to show that

$$\text{Per}_\theta^\perp(E, B_r(x)) \lesssim r^{d-1} (Exc(E, x, r))^{1/2} \lesssim r^{d-1+\alpha/2}. \quad (6.60)$$

The excess in the ball $B_r(x)$ can be rewritten as follows

$$r^{d-1} Exc(E, x, r) = \int_{\partial^* E \cap B_r(x)} \sqrt{\nu_\theta^2(y) + \|\nu_\theta^\perp(y)\|^2} \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(y) - \int_{\partial^* E \cap B_r(x)} \nu_\theta(y) \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(y). \quad (6.61)$$

By Jensen's inequality applied to the convex function $[0, +\infty) \times [0, +\infty) \ni (x, y) \mapsto \sqrt{x^2 + y^2}$, (6.61) gives

$$r^{d-1} Exc(E, x, r) \geq \sqrt{\text{Per}_\theta(E, B_r(x))^2 + \text{Per}_\theta^\perp(E, B_r(x))^2} - \text{Per}_\theta(E, B_r(x)).$$

Now notice that, by definition of excess and the estimates (6.54) and (6.56),

$$\|\nu(x, r)\| - 1 \lesssim r^\alpha.$$

This fact, together with the definition of θ , ν_θ , implies that for $0 < r \leq R_4 < R_3$ and $x \in \partial^* E$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Per}_\theta(E, B_r(x)) &\geq \left| \int_{\partial^* E \cap B_r(x)} \nu_\theta(y) \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(y) \right| \\ &\geq \left\| \int_{\partial^* E \cap B_r(x)} \nu_E(y) \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(y) \right\| \\ &\geq \|\nu(x, r)\| \text{Per}(E, B_r(x)) \\ &\gtrsim r^{d-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.62)$$

Hence, expanding the function $y \mapsto \sqrt{1+y^2} - 1$ up to second order and using (6.62) and the fact that $\text{Per}_\theta^\perp(E, B_r(x)) \leq \text{Per}(E, B_r(x)) \leq C_0 r^{d-1}$, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} r^{d-1} \text{Exc}(E, x, r) &\geq \sqrt{\text{Per}_\theta(E, B_r(x))^2 + \text{Per}_\theta^\perp(E, B_r(x))^2} - \text{Per}_\theta(E, B_r(x)) \\ &= \text{Per}_\theta(E, B_r(x)) \left(\sqrt{1 + \frac{\text{Per}_\theta^\perp(E, B_r(x))^2}{\text{Per}_\theta(E, B_r(x))^2}} - 1 \right) \\ &\gtrsim r^{d-1} \frac{\text{Per}_\theta^\perp(E, B_r(x))^2}{\text{Per}_\theta(E, B_r(x))^2}. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, by (6.53) and (6.56), the estimate (6.60) holds.

Step 1: Estimate of the excess for polyhedral sets

Assume from now on that E is polyhedral and that $\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\{z \in \partial^* E \cap B_r(x) : \nu_\theta(z) = 0\}) = 0$. Indeed, if we show that (6.59) holds for polyhedral sets with sides whose normal is not orthogonal to θ , then it holds by approximation for the sets of the given family \mathcal{F} .

Define $\hat{B} := (B_r(x))_\theta^\perp$ and let $N(z_\theta^\perp) := \text{Per}^{\text{1D}}(E_{z_\theta^\perp}, (B_r(x))_{z_\theta^\perp})$, $f(z_\theta^\perp + s\theta) = \frac{|\nu_\theta^\perp(z_\theta^\perp + s\theta)|}{|\nu_\theta(z_\theta^\perp + s\theta)|}$,

$\Omega_0 = \{z_\theta^\perp \in \hat{B} : N(z_\theta^\perp) = 0\}$.

One has that

$$\begin{aligned} r^{d-1} \text{Exc}(E, x, r) &= \int_{\partial^* E \cap B_r(x)} \sqrt{\nu_\theta^2(y) + \|\nu_\theta^\perp(y)\|^2} \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(y) - \int_{\partial^* E \cap B_r(x)} \nu_\theta(y) \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(y) \\ &= \int_{\hat{B}} \left[\sum_{\{s: z_\theta^\perp + s\theta \in \partial^* E_{x_\theta^\perp} \cap (B_r(x))_{z_\theta^\perp}\}} \sqrt{1 + f^2(z_\theta^\perp + s\theta)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sum_{\{s: z_\theta^\perp + s\theta \in \partial^* E_{x_\theta^\perp} \cap (B_r(x))_{z_\theta^\perp}\}} \text{sign}(\nu_\theta(z_\theta^\perp + s\theta)) \right] dz_\theta^\perp \\ &\geq \int_{\hat{B} \setminus \Omega_0} \left[\left(\sum_{\{s: z_\theta^\perp + s\theta \in \partial^* E_{x_\theta^\perp} \cap (B_r(x))_{z_\theta^\perp}\}} \sqrt{1 + f^2(z_\theta^\perp + s\theta)} \right) - 1 \right] dz_\theta^\perp \\ &= \int_{\hat{B} \setminus \Omega_0} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N(z_\theta^\perp)} \sqrt{1 + \|\nabla h_i(z_\theta^\perp)\|^2} \right) - 1 \right] dz_\theta^\perp, \end{aligned}$$

where $h_i : A_i \subset \hat{B} \setminus \Omega_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ parametrizes the leaves of the boundary of E in an open set A_i , and whose gradient is locally constant by the fact that E is polyhedral. Defining $h(z_\theta^\perp) = \sum_{i=1}^{N(z_\theta^\perp)} h_i(z_\theta^\perp)$ and applying Jensen's inequality to the convex function $y \mapsto \sqrt{1 + \|y\|^2}$, one has that

$$r^{d-1} \text{Exc}(E, x, r) \geq \int_{\hat{B} \setminus \Omega_0} \left[\sqrt{N(z_\theta^\perp)^2 + \|\nabla h(z_\theta^\perp)\|^2} - 1 \right] dz_\theta^\perp.$$

Notice that, given a cylinder $\text{Cyl}(x, cr, \theta)$ as in the statement of the lemma, setting $\hat{B}_{cr} = \{z_\theta^\perp : \|z_\theta^\perp - x_\theta^\perp\| \leq cr\}$, $\tilde{N}(z_\theta^\perp) := \text{Per}^{\text{1D}}(E_{z_\theta^\perp}, (x_\theta - cr, x_\theta + cr))$, $\tilde{\Omega}_0 = \{z_\theta^\perp \in \hat{B}_{cr} : \tilde{N}(z_\theta^\perp) = 0\}$, one has that

$$r^{d-1} \text{Exc}(E, x, r) \geq \int_{\hat{B}_{cr} \setminus \tilde{\Omega}_0} \left[\sqrt{\tilde{N}(z_\theta^\perp)^2 + \|\nabla h(z_\theta^\perp)\|^2} - 1 \right] dz_\theta^\perp. \quad (6.63)$$

Step 2: Closeness of ∂E to a single graph inside the cylinder

We first decompose \hat{B}_{cr} as follows: $\hat{B}_{cr} = \tilde{\Omega} \cup \tilde{\Omega}_0 \cup \tilde{\Omega}_1 \cup \tilde{\Omega}_2$, where $\tilde{\Omega}_0 = \text{int}\{z_\theta^\perp \in \hat{B}_{cr} : \tilde{N}(z_\theta^\perp) = 0\}$, $\tilde{\Omega}_1 = \text{int}\{z_\theta^\perp \in \hat{B}_{cr} : \tilde{N}(z_\theta^\perp) = 1\}$, $\tilde{\Omega}_2 = \text{int}\{z_\theta^\perp \in \hat{B}_{cr} : \tilde{N}(z_\theta^\perp) \geq 2\}$. By the fact that E is polyhedral, $\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\tilde{\Omega}) = 0$ and $\tilde{\Omega}_0, \tilde{\Omega}_1, \tilde{\Omega}_2$ are sets of finite perimeter in \hat{B}_{cr} . Moreover, let us decompose $\tilde{\Omega}_1$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\Omega}_1 &= \tilde{\Omega}_1^+ \cup \tilde{\Omega}_1^-, \\ \tilde{\Omega}_1^+ &= \{z_\theta^\perp \in \tilde{\Omega}_1 : |E_{z_\theta^\perp} \cap [x_\theta - cr, h(z_\theta^\perp)]| = |E_{z_\theta^\perp} \cap [x_\theta - cr, x_\theta + cr]|\}, \\ \tilde{\Omega}_1^- &= \{z_\theta^\perp \in \tilde{\Omega}_1 : |E_{z_\theta^\perp} \cap [h(z_\theta^\perp), x_\theta + cr]| = |E_{z_\theta^\perp} \cap [x_\theta - cr, x_\theta + cr]|\}.\end{aligned}\quad (6.64)$$

The goal of this step is to show the following: there exist $\tilde{C} > 0$, $R_4 > 0$ such that for all $E \in \mathcal{F}$, for all $x \in \partial^* E$, either

$$|\hat{B}_{cr} \setminus \tilde{\Omega}_1^+| \leq \tilde{C} r^{d-1} \text{Exc}(E, x, r)^{1/2}, \quad \forall 0 < r < R_4 \quad (6.65)$$

or

$$|\hat{B}_{cr} \setminus \tilde{\Omega}_1^-| \leq \tilde{C} r^{d-1} \text{Exc}(E, x, r)^{1/2}, \quad \forall 0 < r < R_4. \quad (6.66)$$

The estimates (6.65) or (6.66) will be an immediate consequence of the following facts: there exists $\tilde{C} > 0$, $0 < R_4 \ll 1$ s.t. $\forall x \in \partial E$, $0 < r < R_4$

$$|\tilde{\Omega}_2| \lesssim \tilde{C} r^{d-1} \text{Exc}(E, x, r) \quad (6.67)$$

$$|\tilde{\Omega}_0| \lesssim \tilde{C} r^{d-1} \text{Exc}(E, x, r)^{1/2} \quad (6.68)$$

$$\min\{|\tilde{\Omega}_1^+|, |\tilde{\Omega}_1^-|\} \lesssim \tilde{C} r^{d-1} (\text{Exc}(E, x, r))^{1/2}. \quad (6.69)$$

Proof of (6.67):

The upper bound (6.67) holds by (6.63) and the bound (6.56).

Proof of (6.68):

We now aim at proving (6.68).

Let

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\Omega}_0 &= \tilde{\Omega}_0^+ \cup \tilde{\Omega}_0^-, \\ \tilde{\Omega}_0^+ &= \{z_\theta^\perp \in \tilde{\Omega}_0 : |E_{z_\theta^\perp} \cap [x_\theta - cr, x_\theta + cr]| = 2cr\}, \\ \tilde{\Omega}_0^- &= \{z_\theta^\perp \in \tilde{\Omega}_0 : |E_{z_\theta^\perp} \cap [x_\theta - cr, x_\theta + cr]| = 0\},\end{aligned}$$

and assume w.l.o.g. that $|\tilde{\Omega}_0^+| \geq |\tilde{\Omega}_0^-|$.

For every $t \in [x_\theta - cr, x_\theta + cr]$, let $E_t = E \cap \text{Cyl}(x, cr, \theta) \cap \{z_\theta = t\}$. Then, by (6.56), (6.60) and disintegration in direction θ , one has that

$$\begin{aligned}r^{d-1+\alpha/2} &\gtrsim r^{d-1} \text{Exc}(E, x, r)^{1/2} \gtrsim \text{Per}_\theta^\perp(E, \text{Cyl}(x, cr, \theta)) \\ &= \int_{x_\theta - cr}^{x_\theta + cr} \text{Per}(E_t, \hat{B}_{cr} + t\theta) dt.\end{aligned}$$

In particular, letting

$$A := \{t \in [x_\theta - cr, x_\theta + cr] : \text{Per}(E_t, \hat{B}_{cr} + t\theta) \leq Cr^{d-2} \text{Exc}(E, x, r)^{1/2}\},$$

one has that

$$|A| \gtrsim cr \left(1 - \frac{1}{C}\right). \quad (6.70)$$

On the other hand, notice that by definition

$$|\tilde{\Omega}_0^+| \leq |E_t|, \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in [x_\theta - cr, x_\theta + cr]. \quad (6.71)$$

Since, by the isoperimetric inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \min\{|E_t|, |(\hat{B}_{cr} + t\theta) \setminus E_t|\}^{\frac{d-2}{d-1}} &\lesssim \text{Per}(E_t, \hat{B}_{cr} + t\theta), \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in [x_\theta - cr, x_\theta + cr], \quad d \geq 3, \\ \min\{|E_t|, |(\hat{B}_{cr} + t\theta) \setminus E_t|\} &\lesssim r \text{Per}(E_t, \hat{B}_{cr} + t\theta), \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in [x_\theta - cr, x_\theta + cr], \quad d = 2, \end{aligned}$$

in order to show (6.68) it is sufficient to show that

$$\left| \{t \in A : \min\{|E_t|, |(\hat{B}_{cr} + t\theta) \setminus E_t|\} = |E_t|\} \right| > 0. \quad (6.72)$$

Indeed, if (6.72) holds, choosing $t \in A$ one has that

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{\Omega}_0| \leq 2|\tilde{\Omega}_0^+| \leq 2|E_t| &\lesssim \text{Per}(E_t, \hat{B}_{cr} + t\theta)^{\frac{d-1}{d-2}} \lesssim r^{d-1} \text{Exc}(E, x, r)^{1/2} \quad \text{if } d \geq 3, \\ |\tilde{\Omega}_0| \leq 2|\tilde{\Omega}_0^+| \leq 2|E_t| &\lesssim r^{d-1} \text{Per}(E_t, \hat{B}_{cr} + t\theta) \lesssim r^{d-1} \text{Exc}(E, x, r)^{1/2} \quad \text{if } d = 2. \end{aligned}$$

Let us assume then that the converse to (6.72) holds. Then, using also (6.70), one has that if $d \geq 3$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{|A|} \int_A |(\hat{B}_{cr} + t\theta) \setminus E_t|^{\frac{d-2}{d-1}} dt &\leq \frac{1}{|A|} \int_A \text{Per}(E_t, \hat{B}_{cr} + t\theta) dt \\ &\lesssim \frac{r^{d-1} \text{Exc}(E, x, r)^{1/2}}{|A|} \lesssim r^{d-2} \text{Exc}(E, x, r)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence,

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{Cyl}(x, cr, \theta) \setminus E| &\leq (cr)^{d-1} |[x_\theta - cr, x_\theta + cr] \setminus A| + \int_A |(\hat{B}_{cr} + t\theta) \setminus E_t| dt \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{C} r^d + \int_A \text{Per}(E_t, \hat{B}_{cr} + t\theta)^{\frac{d-1}{d-2}} dt \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{C} r^d + \int_A r^{d-1+\bar{\alpha}} \\ &\lesssim \left[\frac{1}{C} + C \text{Exc}(E, x, r)^{1/2} \right] r^d. \end{aligned} \quad (6.73)$$

If $d = 2$, one analogously obtains

$$|\text{Cyl}(x, cr, \theta) \setminus E| \lesssim \frac{1}{C} r^d + C r^{d-1} \text{Exc}(E, x, r)^{1/2}. \quad (6.74)$$

Both (6.73) and (6.74), by choosing C sufficiently large and then r sufficiently small, contradict the density estimate (6.55). Thus, (6.68) is proved.

Proof of (6.69):

Assume by contradiction that for some $x \in \partial^* E$, r sufficiently small,

$$\min\{|\tilde{\Omega}_1^+|, |\tilde{\Omega}_1^-|\} \geq C r^{d-1} \text{Exc}(E, x, r)^{1/2}, \quad (6.75)$$

where C is sufficiently large, to be fixed later. W.l.o.g., we can assume that

$$\min\{|\tilde{\Omega}_1^+|, |\tilde{\Omega}_1^-|\} = |\tilde{\Omega}_1^-|. \quad (6.76)$$

Fix $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ and decompose further $\tilde{\Omega}_1^\pm$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Omega}_1^+ &= \tilde{\Omega}_{1,\varepsilon}^+ \cup \tilde{\Omega}_{1,1-\varepsilon}^+ \cup \tilde{\Omega}_{1,(\varepsilon,1-\varepsilon)}^+, \\ \tilde{\Omega}_1^- &= \tilde{\Omega}_{1,\varepsilon}^- \cup \tilde{\Omega}_{1,1-\varepsilon}^- \cup \tilde{\Omega}_{1,(\varepsilon,1-\varepsilon)}^-, \\ \tilde{\Omega}_{1,\varepsilon}^\pm &:= \{z_\theta^\perp \in \tilde{\Omega}_1^\pm : |h(z_\theta^\perp) - (x_\theta \pm cr)| \leq \varepsilon cr\}, \\ \tilde{\Omega}_{1,1-\varepsilon}^\pm &:= \{z_\theta^\perp \in \tilde{\Omega}_1^\pm : |h(z_\theta^\perp) - (x_\theta \pm cr)| \leq \varepsilon cr\}, \\ \tilde{\Omega}_{1,(\varepsilon,1-\varepsilon)}^\pm &:= \{z_\theta^\perp \in \tilde{\Omega}_1^\pm : \text{dist}(h(z_\theta^\perp), \{x_\theta \pm cr\}) \geq \varepsilon cr\}. \end{aligned}$$

One has that, by (6.75) and (6.76),

$$\max\{|\tilde{\Omega}_{1,\varepsilon}^-|, |\tilde{\Omega}_{1,1-\varepsilon}^-|, |\tilde{\Omega}_{1,(\varepsilon,1-\varepsilon)}^-|\} \geq \frac{C}{3} r^{d-1} Exc(E, x, r)^{1/2}. \quad (6.77)$$

On the other hand, since by (6.67) and (6.68) $|\tilde{\Omega}_1| \gtrsim r^{d-1}$,

$$\max\{|\tilde{\Omega}_{1,\varepsilon}^+|, |\tilde{\Omega}_{1,1-\varepsilon}^+|, |\tilde{\Omega}_{1,(\varepsilon,1-\varepsilon)}^+|\} \geq cr^{d-1} \quad (6.78)$$

for some geometric constant c independent of x, r .

Notice that

$$z_\theta^\perp + [x_\theta - cr + \varepsilon cr, x_\theta + cr]\theta \subset \mathbb{R}^d \setminus E, \quad \text{for } z_\theta^\perp \in \tilde{\Omega}_{1,\varepsilon}^+, \quad (6.79)$$

$$z_\theta^\perp + [x_\theta - cr, x_\theta + cr - \varepsilon cr]\theta \subset \mathbb{R}^d \setminus E, \quad \text{for } z_\theta^\perp \in \tilde{\Omega}_{1,1-\varepsilon}^-, \quad (6.80)$$

$$z_\theta^\perp + [x_\theta - cr, x_\theta + cr - \varepsilon cr]\theta \subset E, \quad \text{for } z_\theta^\perp \in \tilde{\Omega}_{1,1-\varepsilon}^+, \quad (6.81)$$

$$z_\theta^\perp + [x_\theta - cr + \varepsilon cr, x_\theta + cr]\theta \subset E, \quad \text{for } z_\theta^\perp \in \tilde{\Omega}_{1,\varepsilon}^-, \quad (6.82)$$

$$z_\theta^\perp + [x_\theta - cr, x_\theta - cr + \varepsilon cr]\theta \subset E, \quad \text{for } z_\theta^\perp \in \tilde{\Omega}_{1,(\varepsilon,1-\varepsilon)}^+, \quad (6.83)$$

$$z_\theta^\perp + [x_\theta - cr, x_\theta - cr + \varepsilon cr]\theta \subset \mathbb{R}^d \setminus E, \quad \text{for } z_\theta^\perp \in \tilde{\Omega}_{1,(\varepsilon,1-\varepsilon)}^-, \quad (6.84)$$

$$z_\theta^\perp + [x_\theta + cr - \varepsilon cr, x_\theta + cr]\theta \subset \mathbb{R}^d \setminus E, \quad \text{for } z_\theta^\perp \in \tilde{\Omega}_{1,(\varepsilon,1-\varepsilon)}^+, \quad (6.85)$$

$$z_\theta^\perp + [x_\theta + cr - \varepsilon cr, x_\theta + cr]\theta \subset E, \quad \text{for } z_\theta^\perp \in \tilde{\Omega}_{1,(\varepsilon,1-\varepsilon)}^-, \quad (6.86)$$

For simplicity of notation, let

$$\omega^- := \max\{|\tilde{\Omega}_{1,\varepsilon}^-|, |\tilde{\Omega}_{1,1-\varepsilon}^-|, |\tilde{\Omega}_{1,(\varepsilon,1-\varepsilon)}^-|\}, \quad \omega^+ := \max\{|\tilde{\Omega}_{1,\varepsilon}^+|, |\tilde{\Omega}_{1,1-\varepsilon}^+|, |\tilde{\Omega}_{1,(\varepsilon,1-\varepsilon)}^+|\}.$$

Now we want to show that if C is sufficiently large (depending only on the uniform constants appearing in the density, perimeter and excess bounds in the statement of the lemma), we find a contradiction in the following cases:

$$\omega^- = |\tilde{\Omega}_{1,\varepsilon}^-|, \quad \omega^+ = |\tilde{\Omega}_{1,(\varepsilon,1-\varepsilon)}^+|, \quad (6.87)$$

$$\omega^- = |\tilde{\Omega}_{1,\varepsilon}^-|, \quad \omega^+ = |\tilde{\Omega}_{1,\varepsilon}^+|, \quad (6.88)$$

$$\omega^- = |\tilde{\Omega}_{1,(\varepsilon,1-\varepsilon)}^-|, \quad \omega^+ = |\tilde{\Omega}_{1,\varepsilon}^+|, \quad (6.89)$$

$$\omega^- = |\tilde{\Omega}_{1,(\varepsilon,1-\varepsilon)}^-|, \quad \omega^+ = |\tilde{\Omega}_{1,(\varepsilon,1-\varepsilon)}^+|, \quad (6.90)$$

$$\omega^- = |\tilde{\Omega}_{1,(\varepsilon,1-\varepsilon)}^-|, \quad \omega^+ = |\tilde{\Omega}_{1,1-\varepsilon}^+|, \quad (6.91)$$

$$\omega^- = |\tilde{\Omega}_{1,1-\varepsilon}^-|, \quad \omega^+ = |\tilde{\Omega}_{1,(\varepsilon,1-\varepsilon)}^+|, \quad (6.92)$$

$$\omega^- = |\tilde{\Omega}_{1,1-\varepsilon}^-|, \quad \omega^+ = |\tilde{\Omega}_{1,1-\varepsilon}^+|. \quad (6.93)$$

Since the proof is analogous in all the above cases, we consider only one of them, e.g. (6.87).

If (6.87) holds, then recalling (6.82) and (6.86), for $t \in [x_\theta + cr - \varepsilon cr, x_\theta + cr]$ one has that $|E_t| \geq |\tilde{\Omega}_{1,\varepsilon}^-| = \omega^-$ and $|(\hat{B}_{cr} + t\theta) \setminus E_t| \geq |\tilde{\Omega}_{1,(\varepsilon,1-\varepsilon)}^+| = \omega^+$. Thus, by (6.77) and (6.78),

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{C}{3}\right) \varepsilon cr^{d-1} Exc(E, x, r)^{1/2} &\lesssim \int_{[x_\theta + cr - \varepsilon cr, x_\theta + cr]} \min\{|E_t|, |(\hat{B}_{cr} + t\theta) \setminus E_t|\}^{\frac{d-2}{d-1}} dt \lesssim \\ &\lesssim \int_{[x_\theta + cr - \varepsilon cr, x_\theta + cr]} \text{Per}(E_t, \hat{B}_{cr} + t\theta) dt \\ &\lesssim \text{Per}_\theta^\perp(E, \text{Cyl}(x, cr, \theta)) \\ &\lesssim \bar{C} r^{d-1} Exc(E, x, r)^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

that for ε fixed and C sufficiently large leads to a contradiction.

The only two cases which are not included in (6.88)-(6.93) are the following

$$\omega^- = |\tilde{\Omega}_{1,\varepsilon}^-|, \quad \omega^+ = |\tilde{\Omega}_{1,1-\varepsilon}^+|, \quad (6.94)$$

$$\omega^- = |\tilde{\Omega}_{1,1-\varepsilon}^-|, \quad \omega^+ = |\tilde{\Omega}_{1,\varepsilon}^+| \quad (6.95)$$

together with respectively

$$\max\{|\tilde{\Omega}_{1,1-\varepsilon}^-|, |\tilde{\Omega}_{1,(\varepsilon,1-\varepsilon)}^-|, |\tilde{\Omega}_{1,\varepsilon}^+|, |\tilde{\Omega}_{1,(\varepsilon,1-\varepsilon)}^+|\} \leq \frac{C}{3} r^{d-1} Exc(E, x, r)^{1/2} \quad (6.96)$$

$$\max\{|\tilde{\Omega}_{1,\varepsilon}^-|, |\tilde{\Omega}_{1,(\varepsilon,1-\varepsilon)}^-|, |\tilde{\Omega}_{1,1-\varepsilon}^+|, |\tilde{\Omega}_{1,(\varepsilon,1-\varepsilon)}^+|\} \leq \frac{C}{3} r^{d-1} Exc(E, x, r)^{1/2}. \quad (6.97)$$

Notice that, by (6.79)-(6.82) and by the density estimate (6.55),

$$|\tilde{\Omega}_{1,\varepsilon}^-| + |\tilde{\Omega}_{1,1-\varepsilon}^+| \lesssim \frac{|E \cap Cyl(x, cr, \theta)|}{(1-\varepsilon)cr} \leq (cr)^{d-1} \frac{(1-\bar{C}_1)}{1-\varepsilon}, \quad (6.98)$$

$$|\tilde{\Omega}_{1,1-\varepsilon}^-| + |\tilde{\Omega}_{1,\varepsilon}^+| \lesssim \frac{|Cyl(x, cr, \theta) \setminus E|}{(1-\varepsilon)cr} \leq (cr)^{d-1} \frac{(1-\bar{C}_1)}{1-\varepsilon}. \quad (6.99)$$

Choose $\varepsilon > 0$ s.t. $(1-\bar{C}_1)(1-\varepsilon) < 1-2\delta$ for some small $\delta > 0$. Choosing then $r > 0$ sufficiently small, due to (6.96), (6.97), the bounds (6.56), (6.67) and (6.68) it holds

$$|\tilde{\Omega}_{1,\varepsilon}^-| + |\tilde{\Omega}_{1,1-\varepsilon}^+| \geq (cr)^{d-1}(1-\delta) > (cr)^{d-1}(1-2\delta) \quad (6.100)$$

$$|\tilde{\Omega}_{1,1-\varepsilon}^-| + |\tilde{\Omega}_{1,\varepsilon}^+| \geq (cr)^{d-1}(1-\delta) > (cr)^{d-1}(1-2\delta), \quad (6.101)$$

thus contradicting (6.98) and (6.99).

Step 3: Lipschitz extension of u on \hat{B}_{cr} .

By step 1 (assuming that (6.65) holds), one has that

$$r^{d-1} Exc(E, x, r) \geq \int_{\tilde{\Omega}_1^+} \left[\sqrt{1 + \|\nabla h(z_\theta^\perp)\|^2} - 1 \right] dz_\theta^\perp, \quad (6.102)$$

where $\tilde{\Omega}_1^+$ was defined in (6.64).

The aim of this step is to show that there exists a Lipschitz function \tilde{v} on \hat{B}_{cr} with Lipschitz constant independent of x, r such that $|\{z_\theta^\perp \in \tilde{\Omega}_1^+ : \tilde{v}(z_\theta^\perp) \neq h(z_\theta^\perp)\}| \lesssim r^{d-1} Exc(E, x, r)^{1/2}$ and

$$Exc(E, x, r)^{1/2} \gtrsim \int_{\hat{B}_{cr}} \left[\sqrt{1 + |\nabla \tilde{v}(z_\theta^\perp)|^2} - 1 \right] dz_\theta^\perp. \quad (6.103)$$

Define first the BV function

$$v : \hat{B}_{cr} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad v(z_\theta^\perp) = |E_{z_\theta^\perp} \cap [x_\theta - cr, x_\theta + cr]|, \quad (6.104)$$

and notice that

$$h = v \quad \text{a.e. on } \tilde{\Omega}_1^+.$$

Given $\lambda > 1$, define now the set

$$A_\lambda := \left\{ z_\theta^\perp \in \tilde{\Omega}_1^+ : \sup_{\varepsilon > 0, B_\varepsilon(y_\theta^\perp) \ni z_\theta^\perp, B_\varepsilon(y_\theta^\perp) \subset \hat{B}_{cr}} \frac{|Dv|(B_\varepsilon(y_\theta^\perp))}{\varepsilon^{d-1}} \leq \lambda \right\}.$$

By classical estimates on maximal functions, $A_\lambda \subset \tilde{\Omega}_1^+$ is a closed set and

$$|\tilde{\Omega}_1^+ \setminus A_\lambda| \leq \frac{|Dv|(\hat{B}_{cr})}{\lambda} \quad (6.105)$$

Clam 1: It holds

$$|Dv|(\hat{B}_{cr}) \leq \text{Per}_\theta^\perp(E, \text{Cyl}(x, cr, \theta)), \quad (6.106)$$

and thus by (6.105) and (6.60)

$$|\tilde{\Omega}_1^+ \setminus A_\lambda| \leq \frac{r^{d-1}(\text{Exc}(E, x, r))^{1/2}}{\lambda} \lesssim \frac{1}{\lambda} r^{d-1+\alpha/2}. \quad (6.107)$$

Let us now prove Clam 1. Given a monotone increasing sequence of functions $\phi_n \in C^1([x_\theta - cr, x_\theta + cr]; [0, 1])$, $\phi_n \uparrow 1$, one has that

$$\begin{aligned} |Dv|(\hat{B}_{cr}) &= \sup_{\psi \in C_c^1(\hat{B}_{cr}, \mathbb{R}^d), |\psi| \leq 1} \left| \int_{\hat{B}_{cr}} \psi(z_\theta^\perp) \cdot dDv(z_\theta^\perp) \right| \\ &= \sup_{\psi \in C_c^1(\hat{B}_{cr}, \mathbb{R}^d), |\psi| \leq 1} \left| \int_{\hat{B}_{cr}} \text{div}_{z_\theta^\perp} \psi(z_\theta^\perp) v(z_\theta^\perp) dz_\theta^\perp \right| \\ &= \sup_{\psi \in C_c^1(\hat{B}_{cr}, \mathbb{R}^d), |\psi| \leq 1} \left| \int_{\hat{B}_{cr}} \text{div}_{z_\theta^\perp} \psi(z_\theta^\perp) \left(\sup_n \int \phi_n(z_\theta) \chi_{E_{z_\theta^\perp}}(z_\theta) dz_\theta \right) dz_\theta^\perp \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{\psi \in C_c^1(\hat{B}_{cr}, \mathbb{R}^d), |\psi| \leq 1} \lim_n \left| \int_{\hat{B}_{cr}} \int_{[x_\theta - cr, x_\theta + cr]} \text{div}_{z_\theta^\perp} \psi(z_\theta^\perp) \phi_n(z_\theta) \chi_{E_{z_\theta^\perp}}(z_\theta) dz_\theta dz_\theta^\perp \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{\psi \in C_c^1(\hat{B}_{cr}, \mathbb{R}^d), |\psi| \leq 1, \phi \in C^1([x_\theta - cr, x_\theta + cr]), |\phi| \leq 1} \left| \int_{\hat{B}_{cr}} \int_{[x_\theta - cr, x_\theta + cr]} \text{div}_{z_\theta^\perp} \psi(z_\theta^\perp) \phi(z_\theta) \chi_E(z) dz_\theta dz_\theta^\perp \right| \\ &= \sup_{\psi \in C_c^1(\hat{B}_{cr}, \mathbb{R}^d), |\psi| \leq 1, \phi \in C_c^1([x_\theta - cr, x_\theta + cr]), |\phi| \leq 1} \left| \int_{\partial^* E \cap \text{Cyl}(x, cr, \theta)} (\psi \phi)(y) \cdot \nu_\theta^\perp(y) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(y) \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{T \in C_c^1(\text{Cyl}(x, cr, \theta); \mathbb{R}^d), |T| \leq 1} \left| \int_{\partial^* E \cap \text{Cyl}(x, cr, \theta)} T \cdot \nu_\theta^\perp(y) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(y) \right| \\ &= \int_{\partial^* E \cap \text{Cyl}(x, cr, \theta)} |\nu_\theta^\perp(y)| d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(y) \\ &= \text{Per}_\theta^\perp(E, \text{Cyl}(x, cr, \theta)). \end{aligned}$$

Clam 2: The function v has a representative \tilde{v} which is Lipschitz with constant of order λ on A_λ . To this aim, for $r_0 > 0$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we define the sets

$$\hat{B}_{cr, k} := \{z_\theta^\perp \in \hat{B}_{cr} : \text{dist}(z_\theta^\perp, \partial \hat{B}_{cr}) \geq r_0 2^{-k}\}, \quad B_k(z_\theta^\perp) := B_{r_0 2^{-k}}(z_\theta^\perp),$$

and the functions

$$v_k : \hat{B}_{cr, k} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad v_k(z_\theta^\perp) = \int_{B_k(z_\theta^\perp)} v(y_\theta^\perp) dy_\theta^\perp.$$

We first claim that $\{v_k \chi_{A_\lambda}\}$ is a Cauchy sequence w.r.t. uniform convergence on open sets $W \subset \subset \hat{B}_{cr}$. Given $W \subset \subset \hat{B}_{cr}$, and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that v_m is well defined on W for all $m \geq k$, for

all $z_\theta^\perp \in W \cap A_\lambda$, $m \geq k$ one has that

$$\begin{aligned}
|v_m(z_\theta^\perp) - v_{m+1}(z_\theta^\perp)| &= \left| \int_{B_m(z_\theta^\perp)} v(y_\theta^\perp) dy_\theta^\perp - \int_{B_{m+1}(z_\theta^\perp)} v(y_\theta^\perp) dy_\theta^\perp \right| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{r_0 2^{-(m+1)}} \int_{B_{m+1}(z_\theta^\perp)} \left| v(y_\theta^\perp) - \int_{B_m(z_\theta^\perp)} v(w_\theta^\perp) dw_\theta^\perp \right| dy_\theta^\perp \\
&\leq \frac{r_0 2^{-m}}{r_0 2^{-(m+1)}} \int_{B_m(z_\theta^\perp)} \left| v(y_\theta^\perp) - \int_{B_m(z_\theta^\perp)} v(w_\theta^\perp) dw_\theta^\perp \right| dy_\theta^\perp \\
&\leq 2 \frac{|Dv|(B_m(z_\theta^\perp))}{(r_0 2^{-m})^{d-2}}, \tag{6.108}
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality we used Poincaré inequality in BV. Using now the fact that $z_\theta^\perp \in A_\lambda$,

$$|v_m(z_\theta^\perp) - v_{m+1}(z_\theta^\perp)| \leq 2 \frac{|Dv|(B_m(z_\theta^\perp))}{(r_0 2^{-m})^{d-2}} \leq 2\lambda r_0 2^{-m}, \tag{6.109}$$

thus proving that $\{v_m\}$ is Cauchy in $C^0(W \cap A_\lambda)$.

Define then in \hat{B}_{cr} the function (representative of v)

$$\tilde{v}(z_\theta^\perp) = \lim_k v_k.$$

We now show that \tilde{v} is Lipschitz on A_λ with Lipschitz constant of order λ .

Let $y_\theta^\perp, z_\theta^\perp \in A_\lambda$, $|y_\theta^\perp - z_\theta^\perp| \in [r_0 2^{-k-1}, r_0 2^{-k}]$ for some $r_0 > 0$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and such that $B_{k-1}(y_\theta^\perp) \subset \hat{B}_{cr}$. One has that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\tilde{v}(y_\theta^\perp) - \tilde{v}(z_\theta^\perp)| &\leq \left| \tilde{v}(y_\theta^\perp) - \int_{B_{k-1}(y_\theta^\perp)} v(w_\theta^\perp) dw_\theta^\perp \right| \\
&\quad + \left| \tilde{v}(z_\theta^\perp) - \int_{B_k(z_\theta^\perp)} v(w_\theta^\perp) dw_\theta^\perp \right| \\
&\quad + \left| \int_{B_{k-1}(y_\theta^\perp)} v(w_\theta^\perp) dw_\theta^\perp - \int_{B_k(z_\theta^\perp)} v(w_\theta^\perp) dw_\theta^\perp \right|. \tag{6.110}
\end{aligned}$$

By the estimate (6.109), one has that

$$\left| \tilde{v}(y_\theta^\perp) - \int_{B_{k-1}(y_\theta^\perp)} v(w_\theta^\perp) dw_\theta^\perp \right| = \left| \tilde{v}(y_\theta^\perp) - v_{k-1}(y_\theta^\perp) \right| \leq \lambda r_0 2^{-k+1} \leq 4\lambda |y_\theta^\perp - z_\theta^\perp|$$

and an analogous estimate holds for the second term in (6.110). The last term in (6.110) can be estimated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \int_{B_{k-1}(y_\theta^\perp)} v(w_\theta^\perp) dw_\theta^\perp - \int_{B_k(z_\theta^\perp)} v(w_\theta^\perp) dw_\theta^\perp \right| &\leq 2 \int_{B_{k-1}(y_\theta^\perp)} \left| v(w_\theta^\perp) - \int_{B_{k-1}(y_\theta^\perp)} v(t_\theta^\perp) dt_\theta^\perp \right| dw_\theta^\perp \\
&\leq 2 \frac{|Dv|(B_{k-1}(y_\theta^\perp))}{(r_0 2^{-k+1})^{d-2}} \\
&\leq 2\lambda r_0 2^{-k+1} \\
&\leq 8\lambda |y_\theta^\perp - z_\theta^\perp|, \tag{6.111}
\end{aligned}$$

where in the first inequality we reasoned as in (6.108). Thus, putting together (6.108), (6.110) and (6.111), \tilde{v} is Lipschitz on A_λ with Lipschitz constant smaller than 16λ .

By Whitney's Theorem we can now extend \tilde{v} to a 16λ -Lipschitz function \tilde{v} of \hat{B}_{cr} .

Finally, recalling the bounds (6.102), (6.107), (6.67), (6.68), (6.56) and the fact that $h = \tilde{v}$ a.e. on A_λ , the estimate (6.103) holds. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} r^{d-1} \text{Exc}(E, x, r) &\gtrsim \int_{\tilde{\Omega}_1^+} \left[\sqrt{1 + \|\nabla h(z_\theta^\perp)\|^2} - 1 \right] dz_\theta^\perp \\ &\gtrsim \int_{A_\lambda} \left[\sqrt{1 + \|\nabla \tilde{v}(z_\theta^\perp)\|^2} - 1 \right] dz_\theta^\perp \\ &\gtrsim \int_{\hat{B}_{cr}} \left[\sqrt{1 + \|\nabla \tilde{v}(z_\theta^\perp)\|^2} - 1 \right] dz_\theta^\perp - \sqrt{1 + (16\lambda)^2} (|\tilde{\Omega}_0| + |\tilde{\Omega}_2| + |\tilde{\Omega}_1^-| + |\tilde{\Omega}_1^+ \setminus A_\lambda|) \\ &\gtrsim \int_{\hat{B}_{cr}} \left[\sqrt{1 + \|\nabla \tilde{v}(z_\theta^\perp)\|^2} - 1 \right] dz_\theta^\perp - C\lambda r^{d-1} \text{Exc}(E, x, r)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Step 4: Conclusion Applying to (6.103) Jensen's and Poincaré inequality, is r is sufficiently small so that $\text{Exc}(E, x, r) \ll 1$, one has that

$$\begin{aligned} r^{d-1} \text{Exc}(E, x, r)^{1/2} &\gtrsim \int_{\hat{B}_{cr}} \left[\sqrt{1 + \|\nabla \tilde{v}(z_\theta^\perp)\|^2} - 1 \right] dz_\theta^\perp \\ &\gtrsim r^{d-1} \left[\sqrt{1 + \left(\int_{\hat{B}_{cr}} \|\nabla \tilde{v}(w_\theta^\perp)\| dw_\theta^\perp \right)^2} - 1 \right] \\ &\gtrsim r^{d-1} \min \left\{ \int_{\hat{B}_{cr}} \|\nabla \tilde{v}(w_\theta^\perp)\| dw_\theta^\perp, \left(\int_{\hat{B}_{cr}} \|\nabla \tilde{v}(w_\theta^\perp)\| dw_\theta^\perp \right)^2 \right\} \\ &\gtrsim r^{d-1} \min \left\{ \frac{1}{r} \int_{\hat{B}_{cr}} \left| \tilde{v}(y_\theta^\perp) - \int_{\hat{B}_{cr}} \tilde{v}(w_\theta^\perp) dw_\theta^\perp \right| dy_\theta^\perp, \frac{1}{r^2} \left(\int_{\hat{B}_{cr}} \left| \tilde{v}(y_\theta^\perp) - \int_{\hat{B}_{cr}} \tilde{v}(w_\theta^\perp) dw_\theta^\perp \right| dy_\theta^\perp \right)^2 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, by the bound (6.56), if $0 < r < \bar{R} \ll 1$ then

$$\text{Exc}(E, x, r)^{1/2} \gtrsim \frac{1}{r^2} \left(\int_{\hat{B}_{cr}} \left| \tilde{v}(y_\theta^\perp) - \int_{\hat{B}_{cr}} \tilde{v}(w_\theta^\perp) dw_\theta^\perp \right| dy_\theta^\perp \right)^2.$$

Now observe that, since $|\hat{B}_{cr} \setminus A_\lambda| \lesssim r^{d-1} \text{Exc}(E, x, r)^{1/2}$ and since $|\tilde{v}| \lesssim r$, then

$$\frac{1}{r^2 |\hat{B}_{cr}|^2} \left(\int_{\hat{B}_{cr} \setminus A_\lambda} \left| \tilde{v}(y_\theta^\perp) - \int_{\hat{B}_{cr}} \tilde{v}(w_\theta^\perp) dw_\theta^\perp \right| dy_\theta^\perp \right)^2 \lesssim \text{Exc}(E, x, r) \lesssim r^\alpha.$$

On the other hand, for a.e. $y_\theta^\perp \in A_\lambda$, $\tilde{v}(y_\theta^\perp) = v(y_\theta^\perp) = |E_{y_\theta^\perp} \cap [x_\theta - cr, x_\theta + cr]|$. Thus, defining $\tilde{h} = \int_{\hat{B}_{cr}} \tilde{v}(w_\theta^\perp) dw_\theta^\perp$ and \tilde{H} as the halfspace $\tilde{H} = \{z : z_\theta \leq \tilde{h}\}$, it holds

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{r^2 |\hat{B}_{cr}|^2} \left(\int_{A_\lambda} \left| \tilde{v}(y_\theta^\perp) - \int_{\hat{B}_{cr}} \tilde{v}(w_\theta^\perp) dw_\theta^\perp \right| dy_\theta^\perp \right)^2 \sim \\ &\sim \frac{1}{|\hat{B}_{cr}|^2} \left(\int_{A_\lambda} \left| \int_{[x_\theta - cr, x_\theta + cr]} \chi_{E_{y_\theta^\perp}}(y_\theta) - \chi_{\tilde{H}}(y_\theta) dy_\theta \right| dy_\theta^\perp \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Now we use the fact that $A_\lambda \subset \tilde{\Omega}_1^+$ and thus for all $y_\theta^\perp \in A_\lambda$

$$\left| \int_{[x_\theta - cr, x_\theta + cr]} \chi_{E_{y_\theta^\perp}}(y_\theta) - \chi_{\tilde{H}}(y_\theta) \, dy_\theta \right| = \int_{[x_\theta - cr, x_\theta + cr]} \left| \chi_{E_{y_\theta^\perp}}(y_\theta) - \chi_{\tilde{H}}(y_\theta) \right| \, dy_\theta,$$

thus getting

$$Exc(E, x, r)^{1/2} \gtrsim \left(\int_{Cyl(x, cr, \theta)} |\chi_E(z) - \chi_{\tilde{H}}(z)| \, dz \right)^2$$

as desired.

As a consequence of the above proposition, one can control the uniform L^1 distance of E from the halfspace orthogonal to the measure theoretic exterior normal. More precisely, one has the following

Corollary 6.8. *Let \mathcal{F} be a family of sets of locally finite perimeter as in Proposition 6.7.*

For every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $R_5(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that for all $E \in \mathcal{F}$, for all $x \in \partial^ E$ and for all $0 < r < R_5(\varepsilon)$*

$$\int_{Cyl(x, r, \nu_E(x))} |\chi_E(z) - \chi_{H_{\nu_E(x)}}(z)| \, dz \leq \varepsilon, \quad (6.112)$$

where $Cyl(x, r, \nu_E(x)) = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|z_{\nu_E(x)}^\perp - x_{\nu_E(x)}^\perp\| < r, |z_{\nu_E(x)} - x_{\nu_E(x)}| < r\}$.

Proof. First we prove that there exists $\bar{R}_5(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that for all $E \in \mathcal{F}$, for all $x \in \partial^* E$ and for all $0 < r < \bar{R}_5(\varepsilon)$

$$\text{dist}(x, \tilde{H}) \leq \varepsilon r, \quad (6.113)$$

where \tilde{H} is the affine halfspace of Proposition 6.7. Indeed, assume $\text{dist}(x, \tilde{H}) \geq \varepsilon r$. Then, $B_{\varepsilon r}(x) \subset \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \tilde{H}$, hence by Proposition 6.7 and the uniform bound on the excess (5.40),

$$|E \cap B_{\varepsilon r}(x)| \leq \|\chi_E - \chi_{\tilde{H}}\|_{L^1(Cyl(x, cr, \theta))} \lesssim r^d Exc(E, x, r)^{1/4}. \quad (6.114)$$

On the other hand, by the volume density estimate (6.55)

$$|E \cap B_{\varepsilon r}(x)| \geq \bar{C}_1(\varepsilon r)^d, \quad (6.115)$$

hence by (6.114) and (6.115)

$$\bar{C}_1 \varepsilon^d r^d \lesssim r^d Exc(E, x, r)^{1/4},$$

that for $r < \bar{R}_5(\varepsilon) \ll 1$ leads to a contradiction.

Let now $\tilde{H}(x)$ be the affine halfspace with boundary parallel to $\partial \tilde{H}$ (i.e. orthogonal to $\theta(x, r)$) and passing through the point x . By (6.59) and (6.113), one has that for $r < \bar{R}_2(\varepsilon) \ll 1$

$$\int_{Cyl(x, r, \theta(x, r))} |\chi_E(z) - \chi_{\tilde{H}(x)}(z)| \, dz \leq \varepsilon. \quad (6.116)$$

Now recall (see e.g. [46]) that for the uniform lower bound on the perimeter (6.54) and the uniform power law decay of the excess (6.56), for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\tilde{R}_5(\varepsilon)$ such that for every $E \in \mathcal{F}$, for every $x \in \partial^* E$ and for all $0 < r < \tilde{R}_5(\varepsilon)$ it holds

$$\|\theta(x, r) - \nu_E(x)\| \leq \varepsilon.$$

Hence, up to reducing further $\bar{R}_5(\varepsilon), \tilde{R}_5(\varepsilon)$ into $0 < R_5(\varepsilon) \ll 1$, we can substitute $H_{\nu_E(x)}(x)$ to $\tilde{H}(x)$ and $\nu_E(x)$ to $\theta(x, r)$ in (6.116), thus getting (6.112). \square

The above uniform control of the L^1 -distance of the set E to the halfspace determined by the measure theoretic exterior normal gives Lipschitz regularity of ∂^*E . More precisely, let now $0 < \ell < 1$, $x \in \partial^*E$ and define the cone $K_\ell(x, \nu_E(x)) = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^d : \langle z - x, \nu_E(x) \rangle < \ell\}$. One has the following

Lemma 6.9. *Let \mathcal{F} be a family of sets as in Proposition 6.7.*

*For every $0 < \ell \ll 1$, there exists $R_\ell > 0$ s.t. $\forall E \in \mathcal{F}, \forall x \in \partial^*E, \forall 0 < r < R_\ell$ it holds*

$$\partial^*E \cap B_r(x) \subset B_r(x) \cap (x + K_\ell(x, \nu_E(x))). \quad (6.117)$$

Proof. Let $0 < \varepsilon = \varepsilon(\ell) \ll 1$ sufficiently small to be fixed later. Let $R_5(\varepsilon)$ as in Corollary 6.8 and let R_ℓ such that $R_\ell(1 + \ell) < R_5(\varepsilon)$.

Let now $0 < r < R_\ell$ and assume $\exists y \in \partial^*E \cap (B_r(x) \setminus (x + K_\ell(x, \nu_E(x))))$. In particular,

$$B_{\|y-x\|\ell}(y) \subset B_{\|y-x\|(1+\ell)}(x) \cap \mathbb{R}^d \setminus H_{\nu_E(x)}(x). \quad (6.118)$$

Applying Corollary 6.8 on $B_{\|y-x\|\ell}(y)$, since $\|y-x\|\ell \leq R_\ell\ell < R_5(\varepsilon)$,

$$|E \cap B_{\|y-x\|\ell}(y)| \geq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon\right) (\|y-x\|\ell)^d. \quad (6.119)$$

Applying the inclusion (6.118) and Corollary 6.8 on $B_{\|y-x\|(1+\ell)}(x)$, since $\|y-x\|(1+\ell) \leq R_\ell(1+\ell) < R_5(\varepsilon)$,

$$\begin{aligned} |E \cap B_{\|y-x\|\ell}(y)| &\leq |E \cap B_{\|y-x\|(1+\ell)}(x) \cap \mathbb{R}^d \setminus H_{\nu_E(x)}(x)| \\ &\leq \|\chi_E - \chi_{H_{\nu_E(x)}(x)}\|_{L^1(B_{\|y-x\|(1+\ell)}(x))} \\ &\leq \varepsilon \|y-x\|^d (1+\ell)^d \end{aligned} \quad (6.120)$$

Hence, (6.119) and (6.120) lead to a contradiction provided $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(\ell) \ll 1$. \square

Moreover, as a consequence of Proposition 6.7 and Corollary 6.8, the following holds

Corollary 6.10. *Let \mathcal{F} be a family of sets as in Proposition 6.7. Then, there exists $R_6 > 0$, $\tilde{\beta} : (0, R_6) \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$, $\lim_{s \downarrow 0} \tilde{\beta}(s) = 0$ such that for all $E \in \mathcal{F}$ and for all $x, y \in \partial^*E$ with $\|x-y\| < R_6$ it holds*

$$\|\nu_E(x) - \nu_E(y)\| \leq \tilde{\beta}(\|x-y\|).$$

We omit the proof of the corollary since it is a direct consequence of the flatness condition of Corollary 6.8.

If $\partial E = \partial^*E$, Lemma 6.9 and Corollary 6.10 immediately imply that ∂E is locally given by a single Lipschitz graph, on balls of uniform radii w.r.t. $z \in \partial E$, $E \in \mathcal{F}$. Indeed, one has the following

Corollary 6.11. *Let \mathcal{F} be a family of sets as in Lemma 6.7. Then, for all $\ell > 0$ there exists $\hat{R}_\ell > 0$ such that for all $E \in \mathcal{F}$, for all $0 < r < \hat{R}_\ell$, $B_r(z) \subset \mathbb{R}^d$*

$$\partial^*E \cap B_r(z) \subset y + K_\ell(x, \nu_E(x)), \quad \forall x, y \in \partial^*E \cap B_r(z).$$

*In particular, for any $x \in \partial^*E \cap B_r(z)$ there exists a Lipschitz function $\phi_{r,z,x} : \Omega \subset (B_r(z))_{\nu_E(x)}^\perp \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\partial^*E \cap B_r(z)$ is the intersection of $B_r(z)$ with the graph of $\phi_{r,z,x}$.*

*Moreover, if $\partial^*E = \partial E$ and above we choose $x = z \in \partial E$, one has that $\Omega \supset (B_{c_\ell r}(z))_{\nu_E(x)}^\perp$ for some $c_\ell > 0$ depending only on ℓ .*

Let now

$$\mathcal{F} = \{E \subset \mathbb{R}^d : E \text{ is of locally finite perimeter in } \mathbb{R}^d \text{ and } \overline{\mathcal{F}}_{0,p,d}(E, \Omega) \leq M\}.$$

Thanks to Lemmas 5.8 and 5.9, $\partial^*E = \partial E$ for all $E \in \mathcal{F}$ (see e.g. [46]).

Moreover, thanks to Lemmas 5.6, 5.8, 5.9, the class \mathcal{F} satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 6.7 with $R_3 < \min\{R_0, R_1, R_2\}$ and α as in Lemma 5.9. Thus, the regularity results contained in this Appendix can be used to conclude the proof of Theorem 5.3 at the end of Section 5.4. □

References

- [1] Giovanni Alberti, Rustum Choksi and Felix Otto. ‘Uniform Energy Distribution for an Isoperimetric Problem With Long-Range Interactions’. In: *Journal of the American Mathematical Society* 22.2 (2008), pp. 569–605.
- [2] Giovanni Alberti and Stefan Müller. ‘A new approach to variational problems with multiple scales’. In: *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* 54.7 (2001), pp. 761–825.
- [3] Luigi Ambrosio, Nicola Fusco and Diego Pallara. *Functions of bounded variation and free discontinuity problems*. English. Oxford Math. Monogr. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000. ISBN: 0-19-850245-1.
- [4] David Andelman and Ronald E Rosensweig. ‘Modulated phases: Review and recent results’. In: *The Journal of Physical Chemistry B* 113.12 (2009), pp. 3785–3798.
- [5] Frank S Bates and Glenn H Fredrickson. ‘Block copolymers—designer soft materials’. In: *Physics today* 52.2 (1999), pp. 32–38.
- [6] Marco Bonacini and Ricardo Cristoferi. ‘Local and global minimality results for a nonlocal isoperimetric problem on \mathbb{R}^N ’. In: *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis* 46.4 (2014), pp. 2310–2349.
- [7] Jean Bourgain, Haim Brezis and Petru Mironescu. ‘Another look at Sobolev spaces’. English. In: *Optimal control and partial differential equations. In honour of Professor Alain Bensoussan’s 60th birthday. Proceedings of the conference, Paris, France, December 4, 2000*. Amsterdam: IOS Press; Tokyo: Ohmsha, 2001, pp. 439–455. ISBN: 1-58603-096-5; 4-274-90412-1.
- [8] Haiim Brézis. ‘How to recognize constant functions. Connections with Sobolev spaces’. English. In: *Russ. Math. Surv.* 57.4 (2002), pp. 693–708. ISSN: 0036-0279.
- [9] Xinfu Chen and Yoshihito Oshita. ‘Periodicity and uniqueness of global minimizers of an energy functional containing a long-range interaction’. In: *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis* 37.4 (2005), pp. 1299–1332.
- [10] Rustum Choksi, Cyril B Muratov and Ihsan Topaloglu. ‘An old problem resurfaces non-locally: Gamow’s liquid drops inspire today’s research and applications’. In: *Notices of the AMS* 64.11 (2017), pp. 1275–1283.
- [11] Rustum Choksi and Mark A Peletier. ‘Small volume fraction limit of the diblock copolymer problem: I. Sharp-interface functional’. In: *SIAM journal on mathematical analysis* 42.3 (2010), pp. 1334–1370.
- [12] Rustum Choksi and Mark A Peletier. ‘Small volume-fraction limit of the diblock copolymer problem: II. Diffuse-interface functional’. In: *SIAM journal on mathematical analysis* 43.2 (2011), pp. 739–763.

- [13] Marco Cicalese and Emanuele Spadaro. ‘Droplet Minimizers of an Isoperimetric Problem With Long-Range Interactions’. In: *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* 66.8 (2013), pp. 1298–1333.
- [14] Sara Daneri, Alicja Kerschbaum and Eris Runa. ‘One-dimensionality of the minimizers for a diffuse interface generalized antiferromagnetic model in general dimension’. In: *Journal of Functional Analysis* 283.12 (2022), p. 109715. ISSN: 0022-1236.
- [15] Sara Daneri and Eris Runa. ‘Exact periodic stripes for a local/nonlocal minimization problem with volume constraint’. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.08135* (2021).
- [16] Sara Daneri and Eris Runa. ‘Exact periodic stripes for minimizers of a local/nonlocal interaction functional in general dimension’. In: *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis* 231.1 (2019), pp. 519–589.
- [17] Sara Daneri and Eris Runa. ‘One-dimensionality of the minimizers in the large volume limit for a diffuse interface attractive/repulsive model in general dimension’. In: *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations* 61.1 (2022), p. 12.
- [18] Sara Daneri and Eris Runa. ‘Pattern Formation for a Local/nonlocal Interaction Functional Arising in Colloidal Systems’. In: *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis* 52.3 (2020), pp. 2531–2560.
- [19] Sara Daneri and Eris Runa. ‘Periodic striped configurations in the large volume limit’. In: *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa-Classe di Scienze* (to appear).
- [20] Rupert L Frank, Rowan Killip and Phan Thành Nam. ‘Nonexistence of large nuclei in the liquid drop model’. In: *Letters in Mathematical Physics* 106 (2016), pp. 1033–1036.
- [21] Alessandro Giuliani, Joel L Lebowitz and Elliott H Lieb. ‘Ising models with long-range antiferromagnetic and short-range ferromagnetic interactions’. In: *Physical Review B* 74.6 (2006), p. 064420.
- [22] Alessandro Giuliani, Joel L Lebowitz and Elliott H Lieb. ‘Modulated phases of a one-dimensional sharp interface model in a magnetic field’. In: *Physical Review B* 80.13 (2009), p. 134420.
- [23] Alessandro Giuliani, Joel L Lebowitz and Elliott H Lieb. ‘Periodic minimizers in 1D local mean field theory’. In: *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 286.1 (2009), pp. 163–177.
- [24] Alessandro Giuliani and Stefan Müller. ‘Striped periodic minimizers of a two-dimensional model for martensitic phase transitions’. In: *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 309.2 (2012), pp. 313–339.
- [25] Alessandro Giuliani and Robert Seiringer. ‘Periodic Striped Ground States in Ising Models With Competing Interactions’. In: *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 347.3 (2016), pp. 983–1007.
- [26] Dorian Goldman, Cyrill B Muratov and Sylvia Serfaty. ‘The Γ -limit of the two-dimensional Ohta–Kawasaki energy. Droplet arrangement via the renormalized energy’. In: *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis* 212.2 (2014), pp. 445–501.
- [27] Dorian Goldman, Cyrill B Muratov and Sylvia Serfaty. ‘The Γ -limit of the two-dimensional Ohta–Kawasaki energy. I. Droplet density’. In: *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis* 210.2 (2013), pp. 581–613.
- [28] Michael Goldman and Eris Runa. ‘On the Optimality of Stripes in a Variational Model With Non-Local Interactions’. In: *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations* 58.103 (2019).

- [29] A Hubert. ‘Stray-Field-Free Magnetization Configurations’. In: *physica status solidi (b)* 32.2 (1969), pp. 519–534.
- [30] Alex Hubert and Rudolf Schäfer. *Magnetic domains: the analysis of magnetic microstructures*. Springer Science & Business Media, 1998.
- [31] Vesa Julin. ‘Isoperimetric problem with a Coulomb repulsive term’. In: *Indiana University Mathematics Journal* (2014), pp. 77–89.
- [32] Hans Knüpfer and Cyrill B Muratov. ‘On an isoperimetric problem with a competing nonlocal term I: The planar case’. In: *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* 66.7 (2013), pp. 1129–1162.
- [33] Hans Knüpfer, Cyrill B Muratov and Matteo Novaga. ‘Low density phases in a uniformly charged liquid’. In: *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 345.1 (2016), pp. 141–183.
- [34] Jianfeng Lu and Felix Otto. ‘Nonexistence of a minimizer for Thomas-Fermi-Dirac-von Weizsäcker model’. In: *Comm. Pure Appl. Math* 67.10 (2014), pp. 1605–1617.
- [35] Francesco Maggi. *Sets of Finite Perimeter and Geometric Variational Problems: An Introduction to Geometric Measure Theory*. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- [36] Massimiliano Morini and Peter Sternberg. ‘Cascade of Minimizers for a Nonlocal Isoperimetric Problem in Thin Domains’. In: *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis* 46.3 (2014), pp. 2033–2051.
- [37] Andreas Moser et al. ‘Magnetic recording: advancing into the future’. In: *Journal of Physics D: Applied Physics* 35.19 (2002), R157.
- [38] Stefan Müller. ‘Singular perturbations as a selection criterion for periodic minimizing sequences’. In: *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations* 1.2 (1993), pp. 169–204.
- [39] Cyrill Muratov and Hans Knüpfer. ‘On an isoperimetric problem with a competing nonlocal term II: The general case’. In: *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* 67.12 (2014), pp. 1974–1994.
- [40] Cyrill B Muratov. ‘Droplet phases in non-local Ginzburg-Landau models with Coulomb repulsion in two dimensions’. In: *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 299 (2010), pp. 45–87.
- [41] Cyrill B Muratov. ‘Theory of domain patterns in systems with long-range interactions of Coulomb type’. In: *Physical Review E* 66.6 (2002), p. 066108.
- [42] Cyrill B Muratov and Thilo M Simon. ‘A nonlocal isoperimetric problem with dipolar repulsion’. In: *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 372.3 (2019), pp. 1059–1115.
- [43] Xiaofeng Ren and Juncheng Wei. ‘On energy minimizers of the diblock copolymer problem’. In: *Interfaces and Free Boundaries* 5.2 (2003), pp. 193–238.
- [44] M. Seul and D. Andelman. ‘Domain Shapes and Patterns: the Phenomenology of Modulated Phases’. In: *Science* 267.5197 (1995), pp. 476–483.
- [45] Anna Stradner et al. ‘Equilibrium cluster formation in concentrated protein solutions and colloids’. In: *Nature* 432.7016 (2004), pp. 492–495.
- [46] Italo Tamanini. *Regularity results for almost minimal oriented hypersurfaces in \mathbb{R}^n* . English. Lecce: Dipartimento di Matematica dell’Università di Lecce, 1984.
- [47] Edwin L Thomas et al. ‘Periodic area-minimizing surfaces in block copolymers’. In: *Nature* 334.6183 (1988), pp. 598–601.