

LARGE SCALE REGULARITY AND CORRELATION LENGTH FOR ALMOST LENGTH-MINIMIZING RANDOM CURVES IN THE PLANE

TOBIAS RIED AND CHRISTIAN WAGNER

ABSTRACT. We consider a model of random curves in the plane related to the large-scale behavior of the Random Field Ising Model (RFIM) at temperature zero in two space dimensions. Our work is motivated by attempts to quantify the Imry–Ma phenomenon concerning the rounding of the phase transition by quenched disorder, and connects to recent advances regarding the decay of correlations in the RFIM.

We study a continuum model of minimal surfaces in two space dimensions subject to an external, quenched random field, and restrict ourselves to isotropic surface integrands. The random fields we consider behave like white noise on large scales with an ultra-violet regularization reminiscent of the lattice structure of the RFIM.

We give a finer description of the minimizer below the length scale starting from which the influence of boundary conditions is suppressed with a given probability, which has recently been shown to be of order $\exp(\varepsilon^{-\frac{4}{3}})$ in the amplitude $\varepsilon > 0$ of the noise. More precisely, we prove flatness of the phase boundaries on scales up to order $\exp(\varepsilon^{-\frac{4}{13}})$.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Strategy of proof	6
3. Proof of the deterministic ingredients	9
4. Proof of the stochastic ingredients	19
5. Proof of the main result	30
Acknowledgments	34
References	35

1. INTRODUCTION

It is a classical prediction by Imry and Ma [29] that the Random Field Ising Model (RFIM) in the critical case of two space dimensions, where the boundary effects and fluctuations of the random field are of the same order, does not exhibit long-range order. This effect is due to the quenched disorder and it persists even without thermal fluctuations. The absence of a phase transition was rigorously established in [4] for all temperatures, including the case of zero temperature. We will focus on the temperature zero case from now on and take a variational point of view: The (random) Gibbs measures are concentrated on local minimizers of the (random) Hamiltonian, and the results of [4] show that there is an almost surely unique infinite volume minimizer.

The quantification of the Imry–Ma phenomenon has attracted the attention of the probability and statistical mechanics communities in recent years: it needs the collective influence from disorder on a large set to shield off the influence of the boundary data. This raises the question of how fast the boundary influence decays, culminating in the works [3, 20, 2], which establish

Date: December 23, 2024.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 82B44; 49Q05, 60K35.

Key words and phrases. random curves, regularity theory, Random Field Ising Model, chaining method.

©2024 by the authors. Faithful reproduction of this article, in its entirety, by any means is permitted for noncommercial purposes.

exponential decay of correlations for the RFIM with independent Gaussian disorder. Following up on this, [18] addressed the correlation length for small amplitude noise. More precisely, they establish that the length scale starting from which the influence of boundary conditions on the spin at the origin is suppressed with a given probability is of order $\exp(\varepsilon^{-\frac{4}{3}})$ in the amplitude $\varepsilon > 0$ of the noise, see (1.4) for the precise statement.

In this article we aim to give a finer description of the minimizer below this length scale. Since our method is based on regularity theory for minimal surfaces, for the moment we study this problem for an isotropic energy, rather than the RFIM itself; for convenience, we focus on the simplest isotropic surface integrand. More precisely, we are interested in the large-scale behavior of local minimizers, i.e. subject to their own boundary conditions, of the energy functional

$$E(m, U) = \int_U |\nabla m| - \varepsilon \int_U \xi m, \quad (1.1)$$

where $m : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \{-1, +1\}$ is a function of (locally) bounded variation and $U \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. We normalize the noise such that $\mathbb{E} \xi(x)^2 = 1$, so that ε acts as the amplitude or variance of the noise. Furthermore, we assume that the noise ξ is a centered Gaussian field subject to a suitable ultra-violet (UV) cut-off. In view of the underlying unit size lattice in the RFIM, we choose to impose this regularization on scales of order one, c.f. Section 1.1 below for the precise assumptions. In particular, the energy (1.1) is almost surely well defined and admits well-defined local minimizers, see Definition 1.2 for details. Note that due to the UV cut-off, we do not expect a universal behavior of minimizers on scales smaller than the cut-off scale.

Let us stress again that the scaling of the first term (the boundary integral) and the fluctuations of the second term (the random field) are of the same order exactly in dimension two, which is the focus of this work. From a statistical physics point of view, the addition of the random field is a substantial perturbation of the model with $\varepsilon = 0$: while not exactly in the framework of [4], a similar argument¹ shows the almost sure uniqueness of minimizers for arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$. Nonetheless, in the regime we are looking at, the functional (1.1) may also be viewed as a (random) perturbation of the perimeter problem. In fact, for such length scales minimizers of (1.1) are almost minimizers of the perimeter problem, see Definition 2.1 and Proposition 5.1. From an analytic point of view, this suggests that minimizers inherit regularity, i.e. flatness, from the perimeter problem. A convenient way of measuring this flatness, is by introducing a notion of averaged (on scales of order one) normal \bar{v}_1 to the jump set of the minimizer, see Definition 1.4. In this language our main theorem is:

Theorem 1.1. *There exists a (universal) constant $0 < \delta < 1$ such that for any $0 < p_0 < 1$ there exist constants $0 < c < 1$ and $C < \infty$ such that with probability p_0 the following holds:*

Let m be a local minimizer of the energy (1.1). If $R \leq \exp(c\varepsilon^{-\frac{4}{13}})$, and $x, y \in B_{\delta R}$ are contained in the jump set of m , we have

$$|\bar{v}_1(x) - \bar{v}_1(y)| \leq C \left(\varepsilon (\log(|x|_+ + |y|_+))^{\frac{1}{2}} (\log|x-y|_+)^{\frac{11}{4}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where² $|x|_+ := \max\{|x|, 2\}$.

Let us remark that due to the UV regularization the minimizer m in fact has a well defined normal $\nu(x)$ at every point x in its jump set. Classical regularity theory, which is concerned with the small-scale regularity, could be applied to post-process the above result to a statement about the pointwise normal. However, let us emphasize that this does not capture the effective large-scale behavior of the model (1.1), since it relies on the non-universal small-scale behavior. In contrast to that, our above theorem is a robust large-scale regularity result.

¹We decided to not include the detailed proof in this article because our main result here is independent of almost sure uniqueness of the infinite-volume minimizer.

²Of course there some arbitrariness in the following choice of 2. Every number strictly larger than 1 would work.

Our work draws inspiration from classic large-scale regularity in stochastic homogenization, see e.g. [9, 27]. Let us remark that there is an important conceptual difference to these works: In stochastic homogenization regularity emerges down from infinity to some critical length scale, since on large scales the problem is close to the homogenized problem, which admits a good regularity theory.³ In the work at hand, we understand large-scale regularity in the sense that regularity beyond scales of order one persists up to a critical length scale, which is exponentially large in ε .

As alluded to earlier, our work is motivated by recent developments in the RFIM. Its Hamiltonian on a box $Q_L \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$ of size L with boundary conditions $\tau : Q_L^c \rightarrow \{-1, +1\}$ is given by

$$H(\sigma, Q_L) = \sum_{\substack{x, y \in Q_L \\ x \sim y}} |\sigma_x - \sigma_y|^2 + \sum_{\substack{x \in Q_L, y \in Q_L^c \\ x \sim y}} |\sigma_x - \tau_x|^2 - \varepsilon \sum_{x \in Q_L} \xi_x \sigma_x \quad \text{for } \sigma : Q_L \rightarrow \{-1, +1\}. \quad (1.2)$$

To put our work into this context, let us recall the definition of the order parameter

$$m(L) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[\sigma_0^{L,+} - \sigma_0^{L,-}] = \mathbb{P}\{\sigma_0^{L,+} \neq \sigma_0^{L,-}\}, \quad (1.3)$$

where $\sigma^{L,\pm}$ denotes the value of the ground state of (1.2) with boundary conditions $\tau \equiv \pm 1$ and \mathbb{E} the quenched expectation, i.e. w.r.t. to the noise $\{\xi_x\}_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^2}$. Throughout this introduction, we will assume that the $\{\xi_x\}_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^2}$ are i.i.d. Gaussian random variables, i.e. discrete Gaussian white noise.

Uniqueness of the infinite volume ground state is implied by $m(L) \rightarrow 0$ as $L \rightarrow \infty$, see [4]. In fact, precise decay estimates are known: It was shown in [2, 20] that $m(L)$ decays exponentially,

$$m(L) \lesssim \exp(-cL) \quad \text{for some constant } 0 < c < \infty.$$

A more detailed account on the literature is given in Section 1.3. A natural question, which has not been fully understood yet, is at which length scale L one starts to observe the exponential decay. First bounds were proven in [10, see ζ_1 therein]. However, the exact scaling remains to be understood, see [18, Remark 1.5].

A second notion of correlation length, that is better understood, asks for the order parameter $m(L)$ to drop below a given threshold. Let us denote this length scale by L_* . It has the natural interpretation that with overwhelming probability the value at the origin of any ground state configuration of (1.2) for $L \geq L_*$ does not depend on the boundary condition τ .⁴ First bounds on that quantity were obtained in [10, see ζ_2 therein], while the optimal asymptotics was obtained in [18], where they prove that

$$\exp(c^{-1}\varepsilon^{-\frac{4}{3}}) \leq L_* \leq \exp(c\varepsilon^{-\frac{4}{3}}) \quad \text{for some constant } 0 < c < \infty \text{ independent of } \varepsilon. \quad (1.4)$$

Our motivation is to give a finer description of the infinite volume ground state on scales below L_* . More precisely, rather than monitoring the spin at a single point, we are interested in describing the surface that is defined by the boundary between the +1 and -1 phase.

Right now, we can only answer this question for the model (1.1). The crucial difference to the RFIM (1.2) lies in the isotropic surface integrand. Indeed, on length scales $L \leq L_*$, we can view the energy (1.1) as a perturbation of the perimeter. This suggests that minimizers of (1.1) inherit some regularity from perimeter minimizers corresponding to $\varepsilon = 0$ in (1.1). In two dimensions these are known to be line arrangements.⁵ Therefore, it is natural to measure regularity in terms of a modulus of continuity for the normal to the phase boundary. As explained above, the large-scale regularity statement in Theorem 1.1 is phrased in terms of the averaged normal. The treatment of anisotropic surface energies is a much more delicate question from this point of view, see

³For a more in-depth discussion, we refer to [27] and the monograph [8] or [7].

⁴This is a well-known consequence of the classical FKG inequality, which ensures that checking $\sigma_0^{L,+} = \sigma_0^{L,-}$ for the extremal boundary conditions $\tau \equiv \pm 1$ suffices to conclude $\sigma^{L,\tau} = \sigma_0^{L,+} = \sigma_0^{L,-}$ for any boundary condition τ , see e.g. [3, Section 2.2] for a recent account on this.

⁵The crux is to establish this under minimal regularity assumptions, see e.g. [32, Theorem 10.1].

e.g. [16] for recent advances and overview of the current state regarding the regularity theory of anisotropic minimal surfaces.

Apart from the difference in surface integrands, our Theorem 1.1 is phrased in the same spirit as the result of [18]: With overwhelming probability, the behavior of the model is described up to a given length that grows exponentially as the noise strength becomes small. While the result of [18] are valid up to the larger length scale of order $\exp(\varepsilon^{-\frac{4}{3}})$, our Theorem 1.1 provides a finer description of the minimizer on the smaller length scales of order $\exp(\varepsilon^{-\frac{4}{13}})$ as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$.

From a point of view of regularity for minimal surfaces and perturbations thereof, we profit from the fact that for the Imry-Ma phenomenon two dimensions are critical. For curves in two dimensional space, i.e. surfaces of dimension and co-dimension one, the regularity theory is more explicit, which allows us to work with “logarithmic perturbations” of minimal surfaces, see Proposition 5.1 for the precise statement. This turns out to be the right notion in view of the stochastic estimates on the noise (Proposition 2.4). A detailed account on the regularity theory for (1.1) under minimal decay assumptions is given in Section 1.3 below.

1.1. Assumptions on the noise (UV cut-off). Our main Theorem 1.1 covers the following two important model classes of random fields ξ , where for concreteness the correlation length is set to unity.

Regularized white noise. The first type of noise is regularized white noise, which we assume to be a stationary Gaussian noise with covariance $c(x - y) = \mathbb{E} \xi(x)\xi(y)$. The regularization is conveniently imposed in Fourier-space via a UV cut-off, i.e.

$$\widehat{c} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \mathbf{1}_{\{|k| \leq \sqrt{4\pi}\}}.$$

Note that since $\mathbb{E} \xi(x)^2 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int \widehat{c}(dk)$, we have $\mathbb{E} \xi(x)^2 = 1$.

Discretized white noise. The second type of noise that we want to consider is a discretized white noise, which is a centered Gaussian noise that is stationary w.r.t. \mathbb{Z}^2 -shifts; more precisely,

$$\xi = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \xi_x \mathbf{1}_{Q_1(x)},$$

where $\{\xi_x\}_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^2}$ are i.i.d. Gaussians with mean zero and variance one.

In Section 4.1, more precisely in Lemmas 4.1 and 4.5, we will see that the common properties of these two centered Gaussian noises are

$$\sup_{Q_1(x)} |\xi| < \infty \text{ almost surely, and } \int \delta\xi(x) f(x) dx \lesssim |\delta\xi|_H \left(\int f^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (1.5)$$

for every Cameron-Martin shift $\delta\xi$ and Schwartz function f , see Lemma 4.1 for details. Note that the former property guarantees that (1.1) is well-defined in a pathwise sense. The latter is a convenient way to state the UV regularization in both models (encoded in their Cameron-Martin space H).

1.2. Definition of a local minimizer and its averaged normal. Our main result is concerned with the regularity of local minimizers to (1.1).

Definition 1.2 (Local minimizer). For a given realization ξ of the noise, we call a function of locally bounded variation $m : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \{-1, +1\}$ a *local minimizer* of the energy (1.1), if

$$\int_B |\nabla m| - \varepsilon \int_B \xi m \leq \int_B |\nabla m'| - \varepsilon \int_B \xi m'$$

for every competitor $m' : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \{-1, +1\}$ such that $m = m'$ in some ball B .

Remark 1.3. Notice that we may identify a minimizer m with a curve in \mathbb{R}^2 , namely its reduced boundary $\partial^*\{m = +1\}$, see [5, Definition 3.54]. Due the L^∞ -bound on the noise in (1.5), classical small-scale regularity, see e.g. [31, Example 21.2 & Theorem 21.8] implies that the reduced boundary $\partial^*\{m = +1\}$, is a $C^{\frac{3}{2}}$ -curve that is \mathcal{H}^1 -equivalent to $\partial\{m = +1\} = \partial\{m = -1\}$. Moreover, since we are working in dimension $d = 2$, a finer analysis of the singular set $\Sigma = \partial^*\{m = +1\} \setminus \partial\{m = +1\}$, see [31, Theorem 28.1], shows that in fact $\Sigma = \emptyset$. By the same argument⁶, we may further identify $\partial^*\{m = +1\}$ with the jump set J_m of m , see [5, Example 3.68 & Definition 3.67].

With respect to our main result, we still have to specify the notion of average normal (at scale one). Here, we take inspiration from large-scale regularity and use an appropriate excess quantity to define it. More precisely, the average normal is the best approximation of the classical normal on scales of order one:

Definition 1.4. Let $m : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \{-1, +1\}$ be of locally finite variation. For x in the jump set of m we call a minimizer $\bar{v}_1(x) \in \mathbb{S}^1$ of

$$\min_{\bar{v} \in \mathbb{S}^1} \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_1(x)} |v - \bar{v}|^2 |\nabla m|$$

an averaged normal on scale one centered at x .

By slight abuse of notation, we already wrote $\bar{v}_1(x)$ for the averaged normal in Definition 1.4, suggesting it is always uniquely defined. In the generality of the above definition, this is not the case (an example is provided by bubbles on scales less than one). Nonetheless, we will always be in the setting of the following remark.

Remark 1.5 (Uniqueness of $\bar{v}_1(x)$). Note that the variational problem in Definition 1.4 always has a minimizer. Expanding the square shows that

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{B_1(x)} |v - \bar{v}|^2 |\nabla m| = \int_{B_1(x)} |\nabla m| - \bar{v} \cdot \int_{B_1(x)} \nabla m.$$

In particular, $\int_{B_1(x)} \nabla m \neq 0$ is a necessary and sufficient condition for uniqueness of the averaged normal, which then is given by

$$\bar{v}_1(x) = \frac{\int_{B_1(x)} \nabla m}{\left| \int_{B_1(x)} \nabla m \right|}. \quad (1.6)$$

If additionally, m is an η -minimizer of the perimeter in $B_1(x)$, see Definition 2.1, the density bounds in (3.5) and the above expansion show that

$$\int_{B_1(x)} \nabla m = 0 \quad \text{implies} \quad \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_1(x)} |v - \bar{v}|^2 |\nabla m| \gtrsim 1.$$

Hence, for η -minimizers the average normal is unique provided that

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{B_1} |v - v'|^2 |\nabla m| \ll 1 \quad \text{for some} \quad v' \in \mathbb{S}^1.$$

Let us remark that (1.6) gives yet another interpretation of the average normal \bar{v}_1 : it is in fact the average over the classical normal (which exists by the UV cut-off, see Remark 1.3) over a ball of radius one.

1.3. Related literature. In this subsection, we briefly review important results related to our model. We start, with an overview of the literature to the RFIM at zero temperature that motivates our analysis. Afterwards, we review relevant literature from the regularity theory of perimeter minimizers, before we mention some related result on different models.

⁶Indeed, as in [5, Example 3.68 & Definition 3.67], the essential boundary is contained in the jump set, which itself is contained in the set of density- $\frac{1}{2}$ points. Since the boundary is a (sufficiently) smooth curve, every point of density $\frac{1}{2}$ is contained in the boundary.

The Imry-Ma phenomenon in the context of the Random Field Ising Model. As explained in the introduction, the Imry-Ma phenomenon was first discussed in the physics paper [29]. In case of the RFIM, their heuristic discussion was made rigorous in dimensions $d \geq 3$ by [12] and in dimension $d \leq 2$ by [4]. We refer the interested reader to these two references for more links to the physics literature supporting the argument in [29].

The qualitative result [4] was recently revisited with a particular focus on the zero temperature case with weak quenched disorder. First, double logarithmic decay of correlations was obtained in [13], which was then upgraded to algebraic decay with a small exponent in [3] and more recently culminated in the exponential decay of correlations, see [19, 20, 2]. For accounts of earlier results considering high temperature or strong disorder we refer to the literature review in [3]. Moreover, [14] addressed the fluctuations of the free energy in the RFIM by proving a central limit theorem.

Correlation length for the Random Field Ising Model. In the context of the RFIM, multiple notions of correlation length were considered in [10, 18]. Our main focus is on the length scale L_* , cf. (1.4) above, on which suboptimal bounds were obtained in [10] and sharp bounds in [18].

At zero temperature, the authors of [18] provide optimal upper bounds of order $\exp(c\varepsilon^{-\frac{4}{3}})$ for some $c > 0$ in the noise strength $\varepsilon > 0$. An extension to positive temperatures (including the critical temperature⁷) is considered in [17, 21].

Regularity theory. The classical regularity theory of minimal surfaces, see e.g. [31] for an overview, is interested in regularity statements on small scales, which are non-universal in our setting. In the language of Definition 2.1, the work [6] corresponds to the case where $\eta \rightarrow 0$ as $R \rightarrow 0$, while [28] is concerned with the case that η has no decay properties. In the end, both works contain ε -regularity results, meaning that they require initial smallness of some excess or flatness quantity to conclude. To bypass the initial smallness assumption, we rely on the fact that in our two-dimensional setting everything is more explicit, see Section 3.

Related models. Problems related to the Imry-Ma phenomenon on continuum models have already been considered in [22, 23], where (non-)local⁸ Allen-Cahn energies with an external random field are studied. Their quenched random field is essentially what we call a discretized white noise. In this setting, they obtain the same uniqueness result as [4].

The recent work [15] is devoted to the study of harmonic minimal surfaces in a random environment, which roughly speaking amounts to replacing the area functional on graph configurations by its harmonic approximation. They establish scaling relations for height fluctuations and fluctuations of the ground state energy.

2. STRATEGY OF PROOF

In line with the idea of rough paths, we split our analysis into a purely probabilistic and a purely deterministic part. The main ingredient in our stochastic analysis is the *chaining method*, which allows us to give precise bounds on the random field in weak norms. Once the field is controlled stochastically, we can do a path-wise analysis of typical realizations. This reduces the problem to the deterministic question of regularity of almost minimizers of the perimeter problem in two space dimensions.⁹

Simplifying the discussion a bit for the moment, we essentially need to control the norm

$$\sup \left\{ \frac{1}{|\partial M|} \int_M \xi \mid M \subseteq B_R \text{ Caccioppoli set} \right\} \quad (2.1)$$

⁷Critical temperature refers to the critical temperature of the classical (deterministic) Ising model.

⁸In a parameter regime, where comparison principle are available.

⁹This is also reminiscent of the proof of large-scale regularity in stochastic homogenization, see e.g. [27, Theorem 1] or [7, Theorem 6.1]: the argument becomes entirely deterministic once a decomposition of the coefficient field with control of the sub-linearity of the corrector pair is assumed. Quantitative control on the latter requires a stochastic argument ala [27, Theorem 2] or [7, Theorem 4.4].

of the random field ξ . Here we write $|\partial M|$ for $\int |\nabla \mathbf{1}_M|$, which for smooth boundary curves ∂M reduces to their length, see e.g. the comment after [5, Definition 3.5]. It is one of the main insights of [18] that the discrete analogue of this supremum diverges precisely like $(\log R)^{\frac{3}{4}}$ as $R \rightarrow \infty$. This is in sharp contrast to the polynomial divergence of the L^p -norms of ξ , which is why we like to think of the above norm as a weak norm of ξ .

Let us assume for the moment that we can control (2.1) on some scale R . As alluded to earlier, we use this estimate to show that the behavior of the minimizer of (1.1) on that scale R is dominated by the perimeter term. In that sense, the quenched random field is of lower order, which is captured in the following definition (it is instructive to think of η as an upper bound on (2.1)).

Definition 2.1 (η -minimizer). Let $R > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$. If there exists an $\eta > 0$, such that for every open ball $B \subseteq B_R(x)$, and every competitor $m' : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \{-1, +1\}$ with $m = m'$ in $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B$, we have

$$\int_B |\nabla m| \leq (1 + \eta) \int_B |\nabla m'|,$$

we call $m : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \{-1, +1\}$ an η -minimizer on B_R .

The main deterministic ingredient is a regularity theory for η -minimizers, which has to be as precise as possible in its dependence on η . Since Definition 2.1 is translation invariant, we restrict the exposition in the following subsection to balls centered around the origin.

2.1. Deterministic ingredients. Our deterministic regularity theory is based on a Campanato iteration, which we implement as follows: We inductively construct a sequence of averaged normals over dyadic scales by comparing our minimizer to a configuration that has a jump set consisting of a line (the latter having a natural normal associated to it). The key difficulty is to ensure that upon passing from one dyadic scale to a smaller, one retains a quantitative control of the error made.

This is a convenient strategy since we can directly relate the η -minimizer to a minimizer of the perimeter problem. Assuming this closeness to a line configuration it is not difficult to see that on many smaller balls our η -minimizer has exactly two jumps (like the line configuration). With this, it follows from η -minimality that for a suitable choice of one of these balls the line connecting the two intersection points is a better approximation of our η -minimizer on the smaller scale. We formalize this idea in the next proposition.

Proposition 2.2 (One-step improvement). *There exist $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and $\eta_0 > 0$ such that for every $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$ and $\eta \leq \eta_0$ the following holds. Let m be an η -minimizer on B_R such that $0 \in J_m$ and*

$$\frac{1}{R^2} \int_{B_R} |m - m_{\text{line}}| \leq \varepsilon \tag{2.2}$$

for some m_{line} with jump set equal to a line. There exists a radius $\frac{1}{16}R < r < \frac{15}{16}R$ and another configuration m'_{line} with jump set being a line such that

$$\frac{1}{r^2} \int_{B_r} |m - m'_{\text{line}}| \lesssim \sqrt{\eta} \tag{2.3}$$

and

$$|v - v'| \lesssim \frac{1}{R^2} \int_{B_R} |m - m_{\text{line}}| \tag{2.4}$$

where v, v' are normals to $J_{m_{\text{line}}}$, resp. $J_{m'_{\text{line}}}$, with $v \cdot v' > 0$.

Since the statement is conditional on (2.2), iterating Proposition 2.2 leads to ε -regularity of η -minimizers, i.e. regularity conditional on the initial closeness to a line configuration. Since we are interested in an *unconditional* statement, we need to establish this initial closeness to a line configuration.

At this point it is convenient to directly compare the η -minimizer to a minimizer of the perimeter problem. Using a compactness argument, we show that provided $\eta \ll 1$, it cannot be too far from perimeter minimizers in a sufficiently weak norm compared to the natural energy norm:

Proposition 2.3. *There exists a parameter $0 < \theta < 1$ such that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ exists an $\eta_0 = \eta_0(\varepsilon)$ with the following property: if m is an η -minimizer on B_R for some $\eta \leq \eta_0$, then there exists a configuration m_{line} with jump set given by a line such that*

$$\frac{1}{(\theta R)^2} \int_{B_{\theta R}} |m - m_{\text{line}}| \leq \varepsilon.$$

For notational convenience we formulated the above two propositions for η -minimizers in balls centered around the origin. Recall that by translation invariance both results also apply to η -minimizers centered around any point in \mathbb{R}^2 , which will be important in setting up the Campanto iteration in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

It is built into the strategy that, when comparing two neighboring dyadic scales, the closeness to the line configuration needs to improve. Of course, this can only happen if on smaller scales, our problem gets closer to the perimeter problem. In particular, Proposition 2.2 will only be useful when it is applied to a sequence of η -minimizers with $\eta = \eta_R(x)$ depending on the scale and base point in such a way that it improves as R becomes smaller.

2.2. Stochastic ingredients. As motivated in the last paragraph, we will need control over the supremum in (2.1) on dyadic scales R and varying base points x . To this end, we combine moment bounds reminiscent of [18] with concentration properties of Gaussian random variables.

As starting point for our estimates we will need the continuum version of Proposition 2.2 in [18], see also [33, 34]. In our setting the proof needs some technical adjustments.

Proposition 2.4 (Continuum version of Proposition 2.2 in [18]). *Let us write*

$$S_R = \sup \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{|\partial M|} \int_M \xi \right| \mid M \subseteq B_R \text{ Caccioppoli set} \right\}.$$

Then we have

$$\mathbb{E} S_R \lesssim (\log R)^{\frac{3}{4}} \tag{2.5}$$

for $R \geq 2$, and the variable S_R satisfies the Sub-Gaussian tail estimate

$$\mathbb{P}\{|S_R - \mathbb{E} S_R| \geq t\} \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{8\pi}\right) \tag{2.6}$$

for all $R > 0$ and $t > 0$.

Let us remark that for our purposes the upper bound (2.5) is enough to establish Theorem 1.1. In fact, [18] also prove a lower bound of the same order on the expectation for the discrete model, which could be extended to our situation as well.

The proof of the crucial estimate (2.5) in the above proposition relies on Talagrand's generic chaining method, see the textbook [33] for a nice exposition. The main idea, which we elaborate more in Section 4.2, is to capitalize on the equivalence of bounding the supremum of Gaussian random variables and appropriate partitions of their associated metric space. In our setting this may be rephrased as a question on quantifying the compactness of embeddings of certain function spaces.

Starting from Proposition 2.4, we now specify what we mean by controlling (2.1) over dyadic scales. While the expectation in (2.5) blows up in R , (2.6) shows that its variance stays of order one. In particular, upon normalizing (2.1) by its expectation, its variance decays. This leads to good concentration properties as made precise in the next proposition.

Proposition 2.5. *We have*

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{R \geq 2} (\log R)^{-\frac{3}{4}} S_R \lesssim 1 \tag{2.7}$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\left|\sup_{R \geq 2} (\log R)^{-\frac{3}{4}} S_R - \mathbb{E} \sup_{R \geq 2} (\log R)^{-\frac{3}{4}} S_R\right| \geq t\right\} \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{8\pi}\right) \quad (2.8)$$

for every $t > 0$.

Proposition 2.5 only solves one of our problems, namely the estimate of (2.1) over dyadic scales. We still need to resolve the pinning in different space points. Heuristically, we may argue as follows: since ξ is regular, i.e. does not vary much on spatial scales of order one, we may replace its supremum over a box of radius one by its value at the center point. Therefore, controlling (2.1) over points in a box of radius R amounts to bounding the quantity for $\sim R^d$ different center points. Since we are interested in the supremum of these R^d random variables, any correlation structure between them makes their supremum smaller, so that the worst upper bound is obtained in the independent case. Proposition 2.5 tells us that the random variables of our interest essentially behave like Gaussians with mean and variance of order one. It is well known that the supremum of R^d of these random variables scales like $(\log R^d)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sim (\log R)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ in R . Hence, another concentration argument similar to the one we used above yields the following proposition.

Proposition 2.6. *For*

$$X = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^2} (\log |x|_+)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sup_{R \geq 2} (\log R)^{-\frac{3}{4}} S_R(\xi(\cdot - x)),$$

with $|x|_+ := \max\{|x|, 2\}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E} X \lesssim 1 \quad (2.9)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}\{|X - \mathbb{E} X| \geq t\} \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{8\pi}\right) \quad (2.10)$$

for every $t > 0$.

We expect that the concentration properties in the dyadic scales (Proposition 2.5) are essentially sharp. Since the variance of large-scale contributions is close to zero, they essentially behave like order one quantities. In contrast, Proposition 2.6 may not be sharp: since the underlying noise ξ has correlation length one, the short-range contributions to the supremum at two distinct space points are independent, whilst there is a nontrivial correlation structure in the longer-range contributions.

3. PROOF OF THE DETERMINISTIC INGREDIENTS

The goal of this section is to prove the deterministic ingredients in the proof of Theorem 1.1 outlined in Section 2. In particular, we provide proofs of Propositions 2.2 and 2.3. Let us stress again that centering the minimizer around the origin plays no special role; this is done for notational convenience only. Moreover, let us emphasize that due to our two-dimensional setting, we can avoid the full machinery from the regularity theory of minimal surfaces and instead use elementary – and self-contained – geometric arguments.

Before we start, let us remark that as long as our claim is formulated in a scale invariant way – as for example in Propositions 2.2 and 2.3 – we may always assume in the proofs that $R = 1$:

Remark 3.1 (Rescaling). Let m be an η -minimizer on B_R with constant $\eta = \eta_R$, then m is also an η -minimizer on every smaller ball $B \subseteq B_R$ with constant η_R ; furthermore $m(R \cdot)$ is an η -minimizer on B_1 with constant η_R .

After this initial preparation, we start with the proofs of the two Propositions 2.2 and 2.3. We begin with the latter by employing an implicit argument.

Lemma 3.2. *For every $\varepsilon > 0$ exists an η_0 such that every η -minimizer m on B_R with $\eta \leq \eta_0$ there exists a minimizer m_{Per} of the perimeter in B_R such that*

$$\frac{1}{R^2} \int_{B_R} |m - m_{\text{Per}}| \leq \varepsilon.$$

Proof. W.l.o.g. we set $R = 1$. Let us assume there exists a sequence m_k of η_k -minimizers on B_1 such that

$$\int_{B_1} |m_k - m_{\text{Per}}| \geq \varepsilon \quad \text{for every minimizer of the perimeter } m_{\text{Per}} \text{ in } B_1$$

while $\eta_k \searrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. We may compare m_k to the configuration that is equal to 1 in B_1 to get

$$\int_{B_1} |\nabla m_k| \leq (1 + \eta_k) \int_{B_1} |\nabla(1_{B_1} + m_k 1_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B_1})| \leq 2(1 + \eta_k) |\partial B_1|.$$

The factor two on the r.h.s. results from the jump height of two; remember $m \in \{\pm 1\}$. Combining this with the fact that $-1 \leq m_k \leq 1$, we learn that $(m_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is compact in $L^1(B_1)$. Hence, we may assume that $m_k \rightarrow m$ in $L^1(B_1)$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Since $\eta_k \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and the perimeter is lower semicontinuous w.r.t. L^1 -convergence, we know that m is a minimizer of the perimeter in B_1 . This contradicts our assumption. \blacksquare

The next lemma post-processes the implicit argument from above. This is where it matters that we work in two dimensions: the minimizers of the perimeter problem are unions of line segments, see the discussion following the Lemma 3.3. Hence, once we zoom in far enough, the previously constructed competitor is induced by a single line. The main difficulty at this place is to make this argument work under our weak minimal assumptions.

Lemma 3.3. *There exists a $0 < \theta < 1$ such that for every perimeter minimizer m_{Per} in B_R the jump set of m_{Per} in $B_{\theta R}$ is a line.*

It is fairly plausible that replacing every possibly curved part of the jump set by a line segment reduces the perimeter. Hence, every minimizer of the perimeter problem should come from a union of line segments. The problem is to make this rigorous since a priori the jump sets may be the fairly rough boundary of a Caccioppoli set. Below, we exclude this as a consequence of classical small-scale regularity theory. We refer to the introductory textbook [32, Chapter 10] on geometric measure theory for an argument avoiding the use of heavy regularity theory (however, we prefer not to apply these results directly since they are formulated in the context of currents).

Proof of Lemma 3.3. W.l.o.g. we set $R = 1$. Since we are restricted to configurations on \mathbb{R}^2 , we know that the jump set of m_{Per} is the union of line segments. More precisely, we need to identify the jump set with the reduced boundary of $\{m = 1\}$ (or $\{m = -1\}$) in B_1 . The regularity theory for two-dimensional minimal surfaces allows us to conclude, see e.g. Part III of [31, Theorem on p. 275], where it is shown that these sets are piecewise analytical and have mean curvature zero.

By its finite length, the jump set consists of at most countably many line segments. Furthermore, we learn from minimality, that these line segments can only intersect on ∂B_1 . It follows that any open ball $B \subseteq B_1$ intersects only finitely many of these line segments.

Let us assume that two distinct line segments intersect B_θ . They must extend as straight lines to the boundary ∂B_1 . If θ is small enough, the distance between the closest endpoints of these two lines becomes smaller than the distance of the endpoints on every line segment. We use this to compare m_{Per} to the configuration that removes the two lines (which subtracts $2 \times (2 - o(1))$ units of length from the perimeter), connects their former closest endpoint (which adds $2 \times o(1)$ units of length) and extends m in a way that removes the discontinuities along the erased line segments; here $o(1) \rightarrow 0$ as $\theta \rightarrow 0$. By minimality we obtain the estimate

$$\int_{B_1} |\nabla m_{\text{Per}}| \leq \int_{B_1} |\nabla m_{\text{Per}}| - \text{removed length} + \text{added length} \leq \int_{B_1} |\nabla m_{\text{Per}}| - 4 + o(1),$$

a contradiction for small θ . \blacksquare

The proof of Proposition 2.3 now easily follows:

Proof of Proposition 2.3. Combine Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.3. ■

Before we continue towards Proposition 2.2, let us interpret the proposition we just proved. We think of the quantity $\frac{1}{R^2} \int_{B_R} |m - m_{\text{line}}|$ as an excess that measures flatness (in a weak sense). Let us remark, though, that in classical small-scale regularity theory the excess is typically defined in terms of a stronger energy norm. In that setting $\frac{1}{R^2} \int_{B_R} |m - m_{\text{line}}|$ would correspond to what one may call a measure of flatness. Again, it is the two dimensional setting that enables us to conclude Theorem 1.1 from this weaker notion of excess, see also Remark 3.8 at the end of this section.

For the proof of Proposition 2.2, we will need to first prove some auxiliary lemmas. We start by making precise that we can find a “good” radius, meaning that provided the excess is small, we can find at least one radius (which does not degenerate to zero) such that on the sphere of that radius our minimizer is close to a line.

To keep the next statements simple, we are a bit imprecise¹⁰ when it comes to boundary traces. This is justified since for a function of bounded variation the inner trace (which we denote by $m|_{\partial B_r}$) and outer trace (which we denote by $m|_{\partial(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B_r)}$), both w.r.t. ∂B_r , agree for almost every radius r as L^1 -functions on ∂B_r , see e.g. [26, Remark 3.1].¹¹ For these radii we can still identify $J_m \cap \partial B_r$ and $\partial^* \{m = 1\} \cap \partial B_r$, since they have the same \mathcal{H}^1 -measure, see Remark 1.3. In this spirit, we implicitly assume that whenever we write down a boundary term we work with one of these radii.

Lemma 3.4. *There exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and $\eta_0 > 0$ such that for every $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$ and $\eta \leq \eta_0$ the following holds: for every η -minimizer m on B_R such that*

$$\frac{1}{R^2} \int_{B_R} |m - m_{\text{line}}| \leq \varepsilon$$

for some m_{line} with jump set equal to a line, there exists a radius $\frac{1}{16}R \leq r \leq \frac{15}{16}R$ such that

$$\frac{1}{r} \int_{\partial B_r} |m - m_{\text{line}}| \lesssim \frac{1}{R^2} \int_{B_R} |m - m_{\text{line}}|$$

and $m|_{\partial B_r}$ has either zero or two jumps on ∂B_r .

What we will actually prove is that the radii satisfying the condition of the lemma have positive measure. This is important in view of our implicit assumption concerning boundary traces as explained before Lemma 3.4.

Proof. W.l.o.g. set $R = 1$. Note that there exists radius $\frac{7}{8} < r_1 < 1$ such that

$$\int_{\partial B_{r_1}} |m - m_{\text{line}}| \leq 16\varepsilon.$$

Indeed, this follows from Markov’s inequality that shows

$$|\{\frac{7}{8} < r_1 < 1 \mid \int_{\partial B_{r_1}} |m - m_{\text{line}}| > 16\varepsilon\}| \leq \frac{1}{16\varepsilon} \int_{\frac{7}{8}}^1 \int_{\partial B_r} |m - m_{\text{line}}| dr \leq \frac{1}{16},$$

so that the compliment has positive Lebesgue-measure. This justifies that we can pick the radius such that inner and outer trace agree.

We now compare m to m_{line} on B_{r_1} to obtain

$$\int_{\overline{B_{r_1}}} |\nabla m| \leq (1 + \eta) \left(\int_{B_{r_1}} |\nabla m_{\text{line}}| + \int_{\partial B_{r_1}} |m|_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B_{r_1}} - m_{\text{line}} \right) \leq (1 + \eta)(4r_1 + 16\varepsilon).$$

¹⁰This is also justified by the fact that due to the assumptions (1.5) on the noise, we are effectively constrained to a class of Caccioppoli sets with smooth boundaries, see again [31, Example 21.2 & Theorem 21.8].

¹¹This justifies that we do not introduce new notation for the traces of m on spheres.

Since for almost every $0 < r < r_1$, the integral $\int_{\partial B_r} |\nabla^{\tan} m|$ is equal¹² to twice (jump height) the number of jumps (which is an even number) of m on ∂B_r , we have

$$\begin{aligned} 8|\{0 \leq r \leq r_1 \mid \int_{\partial B_r} |\nabla^{\tan} m| \notin \{0, 4\}\}| &\leq \int_0^{r_1} \left(\int_{\partial B_r} |\nabla^{\tan} m| \right) dr \\ &\leq \int_0^{r_1} \left(\int_{\partial B_r} |\nabla m| \right) dr \leq \int_{B_{r_1}} |\nabla m|, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$|\{0 \leq r \leq \frac{7}{8} \mid \int_{\partial B_r} |\nabla_{\partial B_r} m| \notin \{0, 4\}\}| \leq \frac{1}{2}(1 + \eta)(1 + 4\varepsilon).$$

Furthermore, we have

$$|\{0 \leq r \leq \frac{7}{8} \mid \int_{\partial B_r} |m - m_{\text{line}}| \geq 8\varepsilon\}| \leq \frac{1}{8}.$$

Hence, for small enough $\eta, \varepsilon \ll 1$ the union of the above two sets has at most Lebesgue measure $\frac{3}{4}$. Therefore, its complement in $[0, \frac{7}{8}]$, has Lebesgue-measure larger than $\frac{1}{8}$, so that it must intersect with $[\frac{1}{16}, \frac{7}{8}]$. Hence, we can find a radius $\frac{1}{16} \leq r_2 \leq \frac{15}{16}$ in their complement. ■

Next, we will prove an analog of what is known as the height bound in the classical regularity theory of minimal surfaces, see e.g. [31, Section 22]. In our two dimensional setting, this can be done using fairly elementary geometric arguments. In essence, we solve the following optimization problem: given two points in the plane connected by a curve of a given length, how far can this curve deviate from the line connecting the two points?

Lemma 3.5 (Height bound). *Let γ be a curve in B_R that starts and ends at points $A, B \in \partial B_R$ and satisfies*

$$\text{Length}(\gamma) \leq (1 + \eta)|A - B|$$

for some $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$; then

$$\frac{\text{dist}(\gamma, \text{conv}(A, B))}{R} \lesssim \sqrt{\eta} \frac{|A - B|}{R},$$

where $\text{dist}(\gamma, \text{conv}(A, B))$ refers to the Hausdorff distance between the curve γ and line segment connecting A and B .

Proof. W.l.o.g. we set $R = 1$. Let us write $h := \text{dist}(\gamma, \text{conv}(A, B))$, where dist refers to the (two-sided) Hausdorff distance. Since $\text{conv}(A, B)$ is a line segment, h is in fact equal to the one-sided Hausdorff distance, i.e.

$$h = \sup_{y \in \gamma} \text{dist}(y, \text{conv}(A, B)). \quad (3.1)$$

Let us note that the maximum value of h (taken over all admissible curves γ) is bounded above by the maximum of h taken over all curves that consist of two line segments. Indeed, if h is attained at point $C \in \gamma$, we know that the curve γ' joining A, C , and B , i.e. $\gamma' = \text{conv}(A, C) \cup \text{conv}(C, B)$, is also admissible with the same value of h , so that

$$h \leq \sup\{\text{dist}(C, \text{conv}(A, B)) \mid C \in B_R \text{ s.t. } |A - C| + |B - C| \leq (1 + \eta)|A - B|\}.$$

¹²Our notation is justified by the following observation: we note that for any smooth function m we have $\int_{B_1} |\nabla m| = \int_0^1 \int_{\partial B_r} |\nabla m| \geq \int_0^1 \int_{\partial B_r} |\nabla^{\tan} m|$, where the tangential gradient is given by $\nabla^{\tan} m(x) = \nabla m(x) \cdot \frac{x^\perp}{|x|} \frac{x^\perp}{|x|}$. This estimate holds true for any function of bounded variation if we interpret the r.h.s. via $\int_{\partial B_r} |\nabla^{\tan} m| = V_{\text{per}}(t \mapsto m(re^{it}))$, where $V_{\text{per}}(\cdot)$ denotes the (periodic) variation, like in [5, Definition 3.4 & Discussion around (3.99)]. Since the latter expression is lower-semicontinuous w.r.t. convergence in $L^1(\partial B_r)$, an approximation as in [5, Theorem 3.9] applies.

Furthermore, we note that by the one-dimensional characterization of functions of bounded variation, see [5, Proposition 3.52 & Theorem 3.28], $V_{\text{per}}(t \mapsto m(re^{it}))$ may be understood as counting the jumps m on ∂B_r that, for almost every r , see [5, Theorem 3.10], agree with $J_m \cap \partial B_r$.

To bound the latter expression, we distinguish three cases. First, we consider only points C that lie between the lines through A and B which are orthogonal to the line joining A and B , i.e.

$$h_1 = \sup \left\{ \text{dist}(C, \text{conv}(A, B)) : C \text{ s.t. } \begin{array}{l} (C - A) \cdot (B - A) \geq 0, (C - B) \cdot (A - B) \geq 0, \\ |A - C| + |B - C| \leq (1 + \eta)|A - B| \end{array} \right\}.$$

Secondly, we consider points C that do not satisfy the first constraint but lie in the circle of radius $(1 + \eta)|A - B|$ around B , i.e.

$$h_2 = \sup \left\{ \text{dist}(C, \text{conv}(A, B)) : C \text{ s.t. } \begin{array}{l} (C - A) \cdot (B - A) \leq 0, \\ |B - C| \leq (1 + \eta)|A - B| \end{array} \right\}.$$

By symmetry, the remaining third case, where the second constraint in h_1 is not satisfied but C still lies in a circle of radius $(1 + \eta)|A - B|$ around A , leads to the same bound on h as the second case. Overall, we have

$$h \leq \max\{h_1, h_2\} \quad (3.2)$$

so that we can conclude the lemma by bounding h_1 and h_2 .

Bound on h_1 . Our goal is to reformulate the maximization problem in other variables to see that it is equivalent to a one dimensional problem.

Let us fix some admissible point C and write $h = \text{dist}(C, \text{conv}(A, B))$. There exists a unique point $D \in \text{conv}(A, B)$ such that $h = |C - D|$. Now, we introduce $\ell_1 = |A - C|$, $\ell_2 = |C - B|$, $x = |A - D|$, so that we have

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_1 + \ell_2 &\leq (1 + \eta)|A - B|, \\ h^2 + x^2 &= \ell_1^2, \\ h^2 + (|A - B| - x)^2 &= \ell_2^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

Note that (3.3) holds with equality if h_1 is attained by the point C (otherwise C is still admissible after a small perturbation orthogonal to $\text{conv}(A, B)$) leading to the bound

$$h_1 \leq \max\{h \mid 0 \leq x \leq |A - B|, F(x, h) = (1 + \eta)|A - B|\}$$

where $F(x, h) = (h^2 + x^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} + (h^2 + (|A - B| - x)^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. For fixed h , the function $x \mapsto F(x, h)$ is minimal at $x = \frac{1}{2}|A - B|$ with value $F(\frac{1}{2}|A - B|, h) = 2(h^2 + \frac{1}{4}|A - B|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Hence for any admissible pair (x, h) , we have

$$4h^2 + |A - B|^2 = \min_{0 \leq x' \leq |A - B|} F(x', h)^2 \leq F(x, h)^2 \leq (1 + \eta)^2 |A - B|^2$$

for every admissible h . In particular, we can bound h_1 by

$$h_1^2 \leq \frac{1}{4}(\eta^2 + 2\eta)|A - B|^2.$$

In view of (3.1) and (3.2) the bound is of the right order in η .

Bound on h_2 . Again, we denote by C an admissible point such that $h_2 = \text{dist}(C, \text{conv}(A, B))$. We note that any such point lies in the line $\{C \mid (C - A) \cdot (B - A) = 0\}$ and on the circle $\{C \mid |B - C| = (1 + \eta)|A - B|\}$ which leads to the relation

$$h_2^2 + |A - B|^2 = (1 + \eta)^2 |A - B|^2$$

so that also $h_2^2 = (\eta^2 + 2\eta)|A - B|^2$ which inserted into (3.1) and (3.2) yields the right order in η . ■

The next lemma is well-known in the regularity theory of minimal surfaces, and there are many versions of it. In two dimensions, there is a clear picture to have in mind: zooming in far enough, any minimizer of the perimeter looks like a line. Hence it evenly divides any ball centered on a point of the surface into two pieces of equal volume, which is therefore comparable to the volume of the ball. In terms of estimates, this behavior carries over to η -minimizers:

Lemma 3.6 (Density estimates). *Let m be an η -minimizer in B_R such that $0 \in J_m$, then*

$$\frac{1}{(2+\eta)^2} |B_r| \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_r} |m \mp 1| \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{(2+\eta)^2}\right) |B_r| \quad (3.4)$$

for every $0 < r < R$. Furthermore, we have

$$\frac{r}{(2+\eta)} \lesssim \int_{B_r} |\nabla m| \lesssim (1+\eta)r. \quad (3.5)$$

The proof is quite standard, see for example [31, Theorem 21.11] or [6, Proposition 1.5]. We include it for the reader's convenience. We also want to mention the reference [28, Proposition 3.1] for another argument in the anisotropic (but "uniformly elliptic") setting.

Proof. We split the proof in two steps.

Step 1 (Argument for (3.4)). Note that for a.e. $0 < r < R$ we know the inner and outer trace of m on ∂B_r are equal. Let us fix such a radius and compare m to the configuration that is equal to m in B_r^c and 1 in B_r to get

$$\int_{\overline{B_r}} |\nabla m| \leq (1+\eta) \int_{\overline{B_r}} |1_{B_r} + m 1_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B_r}| \leq (1+\eta) \int_{\partial B_r} |1-m|.$$

Adding $\int_{\partial B_r} |1-m|$ to both sides, we get

$$\int |\nabla((1-m)1_{B_r})| \leq (2+\eta) \int_{\partial B_r} |1-m|.$$

so that the isoperimetric inequality, resp. Sobolev's inequality, implies

$$2|B_1|^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{B_r} |1-m|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \int |\nabla((1-m)1_{B_r})| \leq (2+\eta) \int_{\partial B_r} |1-m|.$$

Since m takes only values ± 1 , this is equivalent to

$$2\sqrt{2}|B_1|^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{B_r} |1-m| \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq (2+\eta) \int_{\partial B_r} |1-m|. \quad (3.6)$$

We now rewrite inequality (3.6) in terms of the function

$$I(R) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_R} |1-m| = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^R \left(\int_{\partial B_r} |1-m| \right) dr \quad \text{with} \quad I'(R) = \int_{\partial B_R} |1-m|.$$

Then (3.6) becomes

$$\frac{|B_1|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2+\eta} \leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{I'(R)}{I(R)^{\frac{1}{2}}} = \frac{d}{dR} I(R)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

so that the claimed lower bound follows by integration. The same argument yields the lower bound for $1-m$ replaced by $-1-m$. Using the fact that

$$|1-m| + |-1-m| = 2,$$

we also conclude the upper bounds in (3.4).

Step 2 (Argument for (3.5)). Observe that by Poincaré's inequality

$$\int_{B_r} |m - \fint_{B_r} m|^2 \lesssim \left(\int_{B_r} |\nabla m| \right)^2, \quad (3.7)$$

where the implicit constant is by scaling independent of r . Since m takes only values ± 1 , we may rewrite the left hand side as

$$\int_{B_r} |m - \fint_{B_r} m|^2 = \frac{1}{2} |1 - \fint_{B_r} m|^2 \int_{B_r} |1+m| + \frac{1}{2} |1 + \fint_{B_r} m|^2 \int_{B_r} |1-m| \quad (3.8)$$

Since $-1 \leq \int_{B_r} m \leq 1$, we have

$$\frac{1}{2}|1 - \int_{B_r} m|^2 + \frac{1}{2}|1 + \int_{B_r} m|^2 = (1 + (\int_{B_r} m)^2) \geq 1$$

so that (3.7) and (3.8), which we estimated by (3.4), combine to the lower bound in (3.5).

The upper bound (3.5), follows from comparing m to the configuration that is equal to 1 in B_r . More precisely, we have

$$\int_{B_r} |\nabla m| \leq (1 + \eta) \int_{\bar{B}_r} |\nabla(1_{B_r} + m1_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B_r})| \leq 2(1 + \eta)|\partial B_r|, \quad (3.9)$$

as claimed. \blacksquare

It was convenient in the above argument that our excess is defined in terms of line configurations. Nonetheless, what we really need to control in the end is the tilt of the normal after readjusting the line configuration. The next lemma provides the necessary estimate for this.

Lemma 3.7. *Consider two lines \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{L}' such that*

$$\text{dist}_{\partial B_1}(\mathcal{L} \cap \bar{B}_1, \mathcal{L}' \cap \bar{B}_1) \leq \frac{1}{4}, \quad \mathcal{L} \cap \bar{B}_{\frac{1}{4}} \neq \emptyset;$$

then

$$|v - v'| \lesssim \text{dist}_{\partial B_1}(\mathcal{L} \cap \bar{B}_1, \mathcal{L}' \cap \bar{B}_1),$$

where v, v' are normals to \mathcal{L} , resp. \mathcal{L}' , with $v \cdot v' > 0$.

In the above statement $\text{dist}_{\partial B_1}(A, B)$ refers to the maximal distance on ∂B_1 between any two points A and B .

Proof of Lemma 3.7. Let us write $d := \text{dist}_{\partial B_1}(\mathcal{L} \cap \bar{B}_1, \mathcal{L}' \cap \bar{B}_1)$. W.l.o.g. we may assume that \mathcal{L} is not parallel to \mathcal{L}' . Since $d \leq \frac{1}{4}$, we know that

$$\mathcal{L} \cap \bar{B}_{\frac{1}{2}} \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{L}' \cap \bar{B}_{\frac{1}{2}} \neq \emptyset.$$

Based on that, we distinguish two cases: either \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{L}' intersect in $\bar{B}_{\frac{1}{2}}$ (case 1), or they meet in $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \bar{B}_{\frac{1}{2}}$ (case 2).

Case 1. Let us assume that $\{p\} = \mathcal{L} \cap \mathcal{L}' \subseteq \bar{B}_{\frac{1}{2}}$. Furthermore, we denote by $A \in \mathcal{L} \cap \partial B_1$ and $A' \in \mathcal{L}' \cap \partial B_1$ two points in \mathcal{L} , resp. \mathcal{L}' , lying on the boundary ∂B_1 such that $(A-p) \cdot (A'-p) > 0$. Such points exist since $d < \frac{\pi}{2}$ and they satisfy

$$\angle(v, v') = \angle(A-p, A'-p). \quad (3.10)$$

By an elementary geometric consideration, we have

$$\sin \angle(A-p, A'-p) = \frac{\text{dist}(A', \mathcal{L})}{|p-A'|} = \frac{\text{dist}(A, \mathcal{L}')}{|p-A|},$$

so that

$$\sin \angle(A-p, A'-p) \leq \min \left\{ \frac{\text{dist}_{\partial B_1}(A', \mathcal{L})}{|p-A'|}, \frac{\text{dist}_{\partial B_1}(A, \mathcal{L}')}{|p-A|} \right\} \leq 2d. \quad (3.11)$$

Since

$$|v - v'|^2 = 2 - 2 \cos \angle(v, v') = 4 \sin^2 \frac{\angle(v, v')}{2},$$

we may combine (3.10) and (3.11) to get

$$|v - v'| \leq 2 \sin \angle(A-p, A'-p) \leq 4d,$$

which proves the claim if \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{L}' meet in $\bar{B}_{\frac{1}{2}}$.

Case 2. We now consider the case that \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{L}' intersect in $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \bar{B}_{\frac{1}{2}}$, and both \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{L}' go through $\bar{B}_{\frac{1}{2}}$. As above, we write $\{p\} = \mathcal{L} \cap \mathcal{L}'$. Since \mathcal{L} passes through $B_{\frac{1}{4}}$, there exists points

$A, B \in \mathcal{L} \cap \partial B_{\frac{1}{2}}$ such that B lies between A and p . Observe that (again since \mathcal{L} intersects $B_{\frac{1}{4}}$) we have $|A - B| \gtrsim 1$. Furthermore, let us note that via parallel translation

$$\text{dist}(A, \mathcal{L}') \leq \text{dist}(\mathcal{L} \cap \partial B_1, \mathcal{L}') \leq \text{dist}(\mathcal{L} \cap \partial B_1, \mathcal{L}' \cap \partial B_1) \leq \text{dist}_{\partial B_1}(\mathcal{L} \cap \partial B_1, \mathcal{L}') = d.$$

Using these two facts, we estimate

$$\sin \angle(v, v') = \frac{\text{dist}(A, \mathcal{L}')}{|A - p|} \leq \frac{d}{|A - B|} \lesssim d$$

As in Case 1, this yields

$$|v - v'| \lesssim d,$$

which proves the lemma when \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{L}' intersect in $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \overline{B_{\frac{1}{2}}}$. \blacksquare

After the preparations above, we are finally ready to prove the one step improvement (Proposition 2.2) of the Campanato iteration in the proof of Theorem 1.1. As announced in Section 2, the final goal is to use the small excess to find a “good” radius so that the jump set of the minimizer has two intersection points with the circle of that radius. Afterwards, we connect these points to construct an improved configuration.

Proof of Proposition 2.2. W.l.o.g. we set $R = 1$. We proceed in three steps.

Step 1. Let us fix some radius r_0 (to be chosen later). We claim that there exist $\varepsilon_0, \eta_0 > 0$ such that for every $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0, \eta \leq \eta_0$, and (m, m_{line}) satisfying (2.2), the jump set of m_{line} intersects B_{r_0} .

Indeed, observe that by using the pointwise inequality $||1 - m_{\text{line}}| - |1 - m|| \leq |m - m_{\text{line}}|$, we obtain after integration

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{B_{r_0}} |1 - m| - \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_1} |m - m_{\text{line}}| \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_{r_0}} |1 - m_{\text{line}}| \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_{r_0}} |1 - m| + \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_1} |m - m_{\text{line}}|.$$

By (3.4) this estimate implies

$$\frac{|B_{r_0}|}{(2 + \eta)^2} - \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_{r_0}} |1 - m_{\text{line}}| \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{(2 + \eta)^2}\right) |B_{r_0}| + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon.$$

Whenever $\eta, \varepsilon \ll_{r_0} 1$, we may infer

$$c|B_{r_0}| \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_{r_0}} |1 - m_{\text{line}}| \leq (1 - c)|B_{r_0}| \quad \text{for some} \quad \frac{1}{8} < c < \frac{1}{4}.$$

We conclude with

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{B_{r_0}} |1 - m_{\text{line}}| = |B_{r_0} \cap \{m_{\text{line}} = -1\}|$$

that the jump set of m_{line} must intersect with B_{r_0} .

Step 2. We claim that for some radius $\frac{1}{16} < r < \frac{5}{16}$ the jump set of m has two intersections with ∂B_r and

$$\text{dist}_{\partial B_r}(J_m, J_{m_{\text{line}}}) \lesssim \int_{B_1} |m - m_{\text{line}}|. \quad (3.12)$$

To this end, we choose a radius $\frac{1}{16} < r < 1$ according to Lemma 3.4. Hence, $m|_{\partial B_r}$ has either zero or two jumps on ∂B_r and

$$\int_{\partial B_r} |m - m_{\text{line}}| \lesssim \int_{B_1} |m - m_{\text{line}}| \lesssim \varepsilon. \quad (3.13)$$

We will proceed in two steps: first, we argue that $m|_{\partial B_r}$ has exactly two jumps provided $\varepsilon \ll 1$. Secondly we upgrade (3.13) to (3.12).

We start with the former: m can't have zero jumps on ∂B_r . By the first step, where for now $r_0 = \frac{1}{32}$ would be sufficient, but for later purposes (in view of Lemma 3.7) $r_0 = \frac{1}{64}$ is convenient,

we may assume that the jump set of m_{line} intersects non-trivially with $B_{\frac{1}{64}}$ whenever $\eta < \eta_0$ and $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$. Since the jump set of m_{line} intersects $B_{\frac{1}{32}}$, we can lower bound

$$|\{m_{\text{line}} = -1\} \cap \partial B_{\frac{1}{16}}| \gtrsim 1.$$

Hence, we can bound

$$|\{m_{\text{line}} = -1\} \cap \partial B_r| \geq 16r |\{m_{\text{line}} = -1\} \cap \partial B_{\frac{1}{16}}| \gtrsim r.$$

Similarly, we may argue for the set $\{m_{\text{line}} = 1\}$ to conclude

$$|\{m_{\text{line}} = -1\} \cap \partial B_r| \gtrsim r \quad \text{and} \quad |\{m_{\text{line}} = 1\} \cap \partial B_r| \gtrsim r. \quad (3.14)$$

Furthermore, we may write

$$|\{m = 1, m_{\text{line}} = -1\} \cap \partial B_r| + |\{m = -1, m_{\text{line}} = 1\} \cap \partial B_r| = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial B_r} |m - m_{\text{line}}| \lesssim \varepsilon. \quad (3.15)$$

If $m|_{\partial B_r}$ had zero jumps on ∂B_r , say m is constantly equal to 1, then

$$|\{m_{\text{line}} = -1\} \cap \partial B_r| = |\{m = 1, m_{\text{line}} = -1\} \cap \partial B_r| \lesssim \varepsilon.$$

Since $r > \frac{1}{16}$, this contradicts (3.14) if $\varepsilon \ll 1$. Hence, by our choice of the radius r through Lemma 3.4 $m|_{\partial B_r}$ has exactly two jumps

We now argue, that (3.13) implies (3.12). The jump set of m_{line} has two intersection points with ∂B_r , say $A', B' \in J_{m_{\text{line}}} \cap \partial B_r$. In this notation, we may write

$$\text{dist}_{\partial B_r}(A', B') = \min\{|\{m_{\text{line}} = -1\} \cap \partial B_r|, |\{m_{\text{line}} = 1\} \cap \partial B_r|\},$$

so that (3.14) turns into

$$1 \lesssim r \lesssim \text{dist}_{\partial B_r}(A', B') \lesssim r \lesssim 1. \quad (3.16)$$

Since also the jump set of m has exactly two intersection points A, B with ∂B_r , we can write

$$\text{dist}_{\partial B_r}(A, A') = |\{m = 1, m_{\text{line}} = -1\} \cap \partial B_r|, \quad \text{dist}_{\partial B_r}(B, B') = |\{m = -1, m_{\text{line}} = 1\} \cap \partial B_r|.$$

Hence (3.15) becomes

$$\text{dist}_{\partial B_r}(A, A') + \text{dist}_{\partial B_r}(B, B') \lesssim \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial B_r} |m - m_{\text{line}}|. \quad (3.17)$$

Now recall that $r > \frac{1}{16}$, $\varepsilon \ll 1$, so that (3.17) and (3.16) show

$$\min\{\text{dist}_{\partial B_r}(B, A'), \text{dist}_{\partial B_r}(A, B')\} \gtrsim 1, \quad \max\{\text{dist}_{\partial B_r}(A, A'), \text{dist}_{\partial B_r}(B, B')\} \lesssim \varepsilon,$$

so that (3.17) turns into (3.12).

Step 3. We now construct the competitor m'_{line} . To this end, we denote by \mathcal{L} the line along which m_{line} jumps and by ν the outwards pointing normal ν to the half space $\{m_{\text{line}} = 1\}$. Furthermore, we let \mathcal{L}' denote the line that contains the two intersection points of the jump set of m and ∂B_r where r was chosen in Step 2. We can now define m'_{line} to be the configuration with jump set \mathcal{L}' such that the halfspace $\{m'_{\text{line}} = 1\}$ has outwards pointing normal ν' with $\nu \cdot \nu' \geq 0$.

First, we argue that (2.3) holds true. Since J_m has exactly two intersections with B_r , we may decompose it, up to sets of measure \mathcal{H}^1 , into curves

$$J_m \cap \overline{B_r} = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \gamma_k,$$

where γ_1 intersects ∂B_r in two points, and every γ_k is a simple closed curve in B_r . Recall¹³ that since ξ is bounded on small scales, see (1.5), the small-scale regularity theory, see [31, Example 21.2 & Theorem 21.8], shows that these curves are (sufficiently) smooth. Hence there is no subtlety in the above decomposition.

¹³Strictly speaking, this relies on the small-scale regularity of a minimizer in the sense of Definition 1.2, which is justified by our later application. For genuine η -minimizers, one can proceed via approximation through smooth boundaries, see e.g. [5, Theorem 3.42].

Let us now denote by $\text{int}(\gamma_k)$ the domain enclosed by the curve γ_k . Hence, we can bound

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_r} |m - m'_{\text{line}}| &\leq \int_{B_r \cap J_{m'_{\text{line}}}} \sup_{y \in \gamma_1} |x - y| d\mathcal{H}^1(x) + \sum_{k \geq 2} |\text{int}(\gamma_k)| \\ &\leq r \text{dist}(J_{m'_{\text{line}}}, \gamma_1) + \sum_{k \geq 2} |\text{int}(\gamma_k)| \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

The first term on the r.h.s is controlled via Lemma 3.5, which yields

$$\text{dist}(J_{m'_{\text{line}}}, \gamma_1) \lesssim r\sqrt{\eta}. \quad (3.19)$$

To the latter, we may apply the isoperimetric inequality to obtain

$$\sum_{k \geq 2} |\text{int}(\gamma_k)| \lesssim \sum_{k \geq 2} |\gamma_k|^2 \leq \left(\sum_{k \geq 2} |\gamma_k| \right)^2 = \left(\int_{B_r} |\nabla m| - |\gamma_1| \right)^2 \leq \left(\int_{B_r} |\nabla m| - \int_{B_r} |\nabla m'_{\text{line}}| \right)^2.$$

The η -minimality of m therefore implies upon comparing m to m'_{line} that

$$\sum_{k \geq 2} |\text{int}(\gamma_k)| \leq \eta^2 \left(\int_{B_r} |\nabla m'_{\text{line}}| \right)^2 \leq r^2 \eta^2. \quad (3.20)$$

Together (3.18), (3.19), and (3.20) imply (2.3), as desired.

Finally, we show that also (2.4) holds. By (3.12), we have

$$\text{dist}_{\partial B_r}(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}') = \text{dist}_{\partial B_r}(J_m, \mathcal{L}') \lesssim \int_{B_1} |m - m_{\text{line}}| \lesssim \varepsilon,$$

so that Lemma 3.7 (recall that in Step 2 we intentionally chose to have $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{L} \cap \overline{B_{\frac{1}{64}}} \subseteq \mathcal{L} \cap \overline{B_{\frac{r}{4}}}$ with $\frac{1}{16} < r < 1$) implies

$$|v - v'| \lesssim \int_{B_1} |m - m_{\text{line}}|,$$

proving (2.4). \blacksquare

Although at this point we have proven the main deterministic ingredient, namely the one step improvement in Proposition 2.2, the next remark will be crucial. It relates the normal constructed in the proof above to the averaged normal in Theorem 1.1.

Remark 3.8. Let us remark, that in the situation of Proposition 2.2, we could even bound

$$\frac{1}{r} \int_{B_r} |v - v'|^2 |\nabla m| \lesssim \eta, \quad (3.21)$$

where r is the same radius as above. Indeed, since m'_{line} has a jump set equal to a line, we have

$$v' = \frac{\int_{B_r} \nabla m'_{\text{line}}}{\int_{B_r} |\nabla m'_{\text{line}}|},$$

so that in the situation of Step 3 in the proof of Proposition 2.2, we can compute

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_r} |v - v'|^2 |\nabla m| &= \int_{B_r} |\nabla m| - \int_{B_r} v' \cdot \nabla m \\ &= \int_{B_r} |\nabla m| - \int_{B_r} |\nabla m'_{\text{line}}| - \int_{B_r} v' \cdot \nabla(m - m'_{\text{line}}). \end{aligned}$$

The last integral vanishes, because $m = m'_{\text{line}}$ on ∂B_r . Indeed, let J denote a counterclockwise rotation by $\frac{\pi}{2}$, so that Jv of a normal v is a tangent. Since the jump sets of m and m'_{line} intersect ∂B_r in two common points, we learn from integrating their tangents that

$$\int_{B_r} Jv |\nabla m| = \int_{B_r} Jv' |\nabla m'_{\text{line}}| \quad \text{so that} \quad \int_{B_r} \nabla m = \int_{B_r} v |\nabla m| = \int_{B_r} v' |\nabla m'_{\text{line}}| = \int_{B_r} \nabla m'_{\text{line}}.$$

Taking the inner product with v' yields $\int_{B_r} v' \cdot \nabla(m - m'_{\text{line}}) = 0$. Therefore, by η -minimality, the above identity simplifies to

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{B_r} |v - v'|^2 |\nabla m| = \int_{B_r} |\nabla m| - \int_{B_r} |\nabla m'_{\text{line}}| \leq \eta \int_{B_r} |\nabla m'_{\text{line}}|,$$

which implies (3.21).

4. PROOF OF THE STOCHASTIC INGREDIENTS

In this section, we make the stochastic ingredients needed for the proof of Theorem 1.1 rigorous. In particular, we prove Propositions 2.4, 2.5, and 2.6 that we introduced in Section 2. Since the first one is an adaption of the results in [18] to our continuum setting, we start with the latter two in Section 4.1. The proof of Proposition 2.4 is then given in Section 4.2 together with a short primer on the chaining method. As in Section 3, we try to give (to some reasonable extent) self-contained arguments.

4.1. Concentration arguments. The proofs of this section rely on concentration properties of Gaussian random variables. More precisely, we use that the application of Lipschitz-continuous functions to a Gaussian random variable enjoys good concentration properties. In particular, this implies concentration estimates for the supremum of a Gaussian processes. Indeed, for a finite-dimensional centered Gaussian vector $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^N$, it is known that

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{ \sup_{i=1,\dots,N} \xi_i > \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{i=1,\dots,N} \xi_i \right] + t \right\} \leq \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{2\sigma^2}\right), \quad \text{where } \sigma^2 = \sup_{i=1,\dots,N} \mathbb{E} \xi_i^2 \quad (4.1)$$

see e.g. [1, Theorem 2.1.1 & Lemma 2.1.6] (or [30, Lemma 3.1 & (3.2)] for a closely related statement). This naturally generalizes to infinite-dimensional Gaussian vectors. To treat the two classes of noise we introduced in Section 1.1 in a unified way, it is convenient to instead argue via the abstract concentration argument in [11, Theorem 4.5.6 & Theorem 4.5.7].

To make this precise for our infinite dimensional Gaussian ξ , we need to specify a norm to measure Lipschitz-continuity. In fact, it turns out, see [11], that Lipschitz-continuity w.r.t. Cameron-Martin shifts is the right notion in infinite dimensions. For convenience, we recall the notion of a Cameron-Martin space from [11]: viewing ξ as a $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^2)$ -valued¹⁴ random variable, the definition of the Cameron-Martin space H (of the law of ξ) is

$$H = \{T \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^2) \mid |T|_H < \infty\} \quad \text{with} \quad |T|_H = \sup\{\ell(T) \mid \ell \in (\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^2))', \mathbb{E}[\ell(\xi)^2] \leq 1\}, \quad (4.2)$$

see [11, Definition 2.2.7]. Using this definition we can prove the following lemma.¹⁵

Lemma 4.1. *Let ξ denote either of the two noises in Section 1.1. The map $\xi \mapsto \frac{1}{|\partial M|} \int_M \xi$ is $2\sqrt{\pi}$ -Lipschitz-continuous under Cameron-Martin shifts; that is*

$$\left| \frac{1}{|\partial M|} \int_M (\xi + \delta\xi) - \frac{1}{|\partial M|} \int_M \xi \right| \leq 2\sqrt{\pi} |\delta\xi|_H \quad (4.3)$$

provided $\delta\xi \in H$.

Proof of Lemma 4.1. First, we observe that either of the two noises satisfies

$$\int \delta\xi(x) f(x) dx \leq |\delta\xi|_H \left(\int f^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (4.4)$$

¹⁴ \mathcal{S}' denotes the space of Schwartz distributions.

¹⁵In the statement of Lemma 4.1, we are intentionally a bit vague with notation: we write $\delta\xi$ for an element in the Cameron-Martin space H , which we think of as a distribution, and use the same symbol for its defining function, i.e. $\delta\xi(f) = \int \delta\xi(x) f(x) dx$.

for any Schwartz function $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Indeed, to see this, we recall that the space of Schwartz functions $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ embeds into its bi-dual $(\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^2))'$ via the map $f \mapsto (\xi \mapsto \xi(f))$. Hence, by the definition of the norm $|\cdot|_H$, see (4.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int \delta\xi(x)f(x)dx &\leq \mathbb{E}[\xi(f)^2] \sup \{l(\delta\xi) \mid \ell \in (\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^2))', \mathbb{E}[\ell(\xi)^2] \leq 1\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\xi(f)^2]|\delta\xi|_H. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, (4.4) follows for the regularized white noise upon invoking the estimate

$$\mathbb{E}[\xi(f)^2] = 2\pi \int |\widehat{f}|^2 \widehat{c} \leq 2\pi(\sup \widehat{c}) \int |\widehat{f}|^2 \leq \int f^2$$

For the discretized white noise we observe that Jensen's inequality gives

$$\mathbb{E}[\xi(f)^2] = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{x,y \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \xi_x \xi_y \left(\int_{Q_1(x)} f \right) \left(\int_{Q_1(y)} f \right) \right] = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \left(\int_{Q_1(x)} f \right)^2 \leq \int f^2,$$

so that (4.4) is established in both cases.

Via a density argument, we can apply (4.4) to $f = \mathbf{1}_M$, which yields

$$\int_M \delta\xi(x)dx \leq |\delta\xi|_H |M|^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

By the isoperimetric inequality this implies

$$\frac{1}{|\partial M|} \int_M \delta\xi(x)dx \leq 2\sqrt{\pi} |\delta\xi|_H.$$

By linearity of the map $\xi \mapsto \frac{1}{|\partial M|} \int_M \xi$, this already implies (4.3). \blacksquare

Equipped with the Lipschitz-continuity estimates in Lemma 4.1, we appeal to the concentration estimate [11, Theorem 4.5.7] asserting that

$$\mathbb{P}\{|X - \mathbb{E}X| > \alpha\} \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha^2}{2C}\right),$$

provided $X = X(\xi)$ is Lipschitz-continuous under Cameron-Martin shifts with constant $C < \infty$, see also [11, Theorem 4.5.6] for a one-sided tail estimate with improved constants. Using this, we can prove Proposition 2.5, which is concerned with the pinning over dyadic scales. Note that in case of the discretized white noise, Step 1 is more explicit: the random variables $\pm \frac{1}{|\partial M|} \int_M \xi$ are Gaussian with variance of order one, hence (4.1) also applies directly to their supremum.

Proof of Proposition 2.5. We split the proof in two parts, one for (2.8) and one for (2.7).

Step 1 (Concentration). We start with the argument for (2.8). Let us observe that Lemma 4.1 states that

$$\xi \mapsto \frac{1}{|\partial M|} \left| \int_M \xi \right| \quad \text{is } 2\sqrt{\pi} - \text{Lipschitz under Cameron-Martin shifts.}$$

In particular, the same holds true after taking the two suprema under consideration (recall that the supremum of uniformly Lipschitz-continuous functions is Lipschitz-continuous with the same constant), i.e.

$$\xi \mapsto \sup_{R \geq 1} (\log R)^{-\frac{3}{4}} S_R \quad \text{is } 2\sqrt{\pi} - \text{Lipschitz under Cameron-Martin shifts.}$$

The pre-factor $(\log R)^{-\frac{3}{4}}$ is not harmful since it decays for large R , even improving the continuity estimate for $(\log R)^{-\frac{3}{4}} S_R$. By the Gaussian concentration estimate, we obtain (2.8). For later purposes let us record that same argument as above may be used to deduce

$$\mathbb{P}\{|S_R - \mathbb{E}S_R| \geq \alpha\} \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{1}{8\pi} \alpha^2\right) \tag{4.5}$$

for every $R > 0$.

Step 2 (Moment bound). For the expectation we have

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{R \geq 2} (\log R)^{-\frac{3}{4}} S_R = \mathbb{E} \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sup_{2^k \leq R \leq 2^{k+1}} (\log R)^{-\frac{3}{4}} S_R \sim \mathbb{E} \sup_{R \geq 2 \text{ dyadic}} (\log R)^{-\frac{3}{4}} S_R. \quad (4.6)$$

Furthermore, we may estimate

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{R \geq 2 \text{ dyadic}} (\log R)^{-\frac{3}{4}} S_R \leq \sup_{R \geq 2 \text{ dyadic}} (\log R)^{-\frac{3}{4}} \mathbb{E} S_R + \mathbb{E} \sup_{R \geq 2 \text{ dyadic}} (\log R)^{-\frac{3}{4}} (S_R - \mathbb{E} S_R). \quad (4.7)$$

We estimate the second term on the r.h.s. of (4.7) by using (4.5). More precisely, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \sup_{R \geq 2 \text{ dyadic}} (\log R)^{-\frac{3}{4}} (S_R - \mathbb{E} S_R) &\leq 1 + \sum_{R \geq 2 \text{ dyadic}} \int_1^\infty \mathbb{P}\{S_R - \mathbb{E} S_R > t(\log R)^{\frac{3}{4}}\} dt \\ &\lesssim 1 + \sum_{R \geq 2 \text{ dyadic}} \int_1^\infty \exp\left(-\frac{1}{8\pi} t^2 (\log R)^{\frac{3}{2}}\right) dt \\ &\lesssim 1 + \sum_{R \geq 2 \text{ dyadic}} (\log R)^{-\frac{3}{4}} \int_{(\log R)^{\frac{3}{4}}}^\infty \exp\left(-\frac{1}{8\pi} t^2\right) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Using the tail bound

$$\int_x^\infty \exp\left(-\frac{1}{8\pi} t^2\right) dt \lesssim \frac{1}{x} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{8\pi} x^2\right), \quad (4.8)$$

see e.g. [1, (2.1.1)], we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{R \geq 2 \text{ dyadic}} (\log R)^{-\frac{3}{4}} (S_R - \mathbb{E} S_R) \lesssim 1 + \sum_{R \geq 2 \text{ dyadic}} (\log R)^{-\frac{3}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{8\pi} (\log R)^{\frac{3}{2}}\right) \quad (4.9)$$

and the last sum converges. Hence, (4.6) and (4.7) imply

$$\sup_{R \geq 2 \text{ dyadic}} (\log R)^{-\frac{3}{4}} \mathbb{E} S_R \lesssim \mathbb{E} \sup_{R > 0} (\log R)^{-\frac{3}{4}} S_R \lesssim 1 + \sup_{R \geq 2 \text{ dyadic}} (\log R)^{-\frac{3}{4}} \mathbb{E} S_R$$

and the latter supremum is finite due to Theorem 2.4. This finishes the argument for (2.7). \blacksquare

Equipped with Proposition 2.5, we now use another concentration argument to perform the pinning in space. The proof proceeds analogously to the previous proof, which makes it a bit hard to recognize the heuristic in Section 2. In its core, our argument literally applies to an abstract set of Gaussian random variables; see also the proof of Lemma 4.5 below.

Proof of Proposition 2.6. Let us write

$$\mathcal{S}(x) = \sup_{R \geq 2} (\log R)^{-\frac{3}{4}} S_R(\xi(\cdot - x)) \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}^2.$$

The reader will notice that the argument relies on the sub-Gaussianity of $\mathcal{S}(x)$ proven in Proposition 2.5 and hence follows essentially the same strategy as the proof of the aforementioned Proposition.

Step 1 (Concentration). As in the proof of Proposition 2.5, we learn from (4.3) that

$$\xi \mapsto \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^2} (\log |x|_+)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{S}(x) \quad \text{is } 2\sqrt{\pi} \text{ - Lipschitz under Cameron-Martin shifts,}$$

so that by [11, Theorem 4.5.7] it follows that the concentration property (2.10) holds true.

Step 2 (Estimate for the expectation). We start with the following observation. Given some set $M \subseteq B_R(x)$, we have $M \subseteq B_{R+1}(y)$ whenever $|x - y| \leq 1$. This implies

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^2} (\log |x|_+)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{S}(x) \lesssim \sup_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^2} (\log |y|_+)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{S}(y) \lesssim \sup_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^2, |y| \geq 2} (\log |y|_+)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{S}(y).$$

Hence, by (2.7), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^2} (\log |x|_+)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{S}(x) \\ & \lesssim \sup_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^2, |x| \geq 2} (\log |x|)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{E} \mathcal{S}(x) + \mathbb{E} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^2, |x| \geq 2} (\log |x|)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\mathcal{S}(x) - \mathbb{E} \mathcal{S}(x)) \\ & \lesssim 1 + \mathbb{E} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^2, |x| \geq 2} (\log |x|)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\mathcal{S}(x) - \mathbb{E} \mathcal{S}(x)). \end{aligned}$$

Similar to (4.9), we may show that for an arbitrary cut-off $c > 0$ (that was chosen to be 1 before), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^2, |x| \geq 2} (\log |x|)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\mathcal{S}(x) - \mathbb{E} \mathcal{S}(x)) \\ & \leq c + \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^2, |x| \geq 2} (\log |x|)^{-1} \exp\left(-\frac{c}{8\pi} \log |x|\right). \end{aligned}$$

The exact form of the exponents is not so important here, since we have the freedom to choose c : note that for $|x| \geq 2$ the latter summand simplifies to $|x|^{-\frac{c}{8\pi}} (\log |x|)^{-1}$, which is summable for large $c \gg 1$. Together, the last two estimates imply (2.9). \blacksquare

4.2. Chaining arguments. The goal of this section is to prove Proposition 2.4. Let us stress again that this is the continuum version of [18, Proposition 2.2], which carries over to our continuum setting due to the UV regularization. In the two Lemmas 4.5 and 4.6 below we collect the main adaptations to the continuum setting.

Preliminaries on the Chaining Method. In this paragraph we give an overview of the main ingredient in Proposition 2.4: the *chaining method*. We start with an exposition of the chaining method, where we recall some useful results from [33] that we will need later on. For more details on this technique, we refer the reader to [35] and the books [33] and [34].

The chaining method is based on the insight that the supremum of centered Gaussian random variables $\{X_t \mid t \in T\}$ is related to covering numbers with respect to the metric

$$d(s, t)^2 := \mathbb{E} |X_s - X_t|^2,$$

and provides a far reaching generalization of Dudley's bound [24] or [33, (1.18)]. Due to Gaussianity of the random variables, this metric provides a strong control on their distance, which is encoded in the tail estimate

$$\mathbb{P}\{|X_s - X_t| > \alpha\} \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha^2}{2d(s, t)^2}\right).$$

In a kind of coarse graining procedure, one bounds the supremum of the family $\{X_t \mid t \in T\}$ by grouping the random variables provided they are close in the distance d . In the Dudley bound this is translated in a successive covering of the metric space T by balls. The main insight of Talagrand is to consider general partitions instead; optimizing them leads to sharp estimates, see [33, Section 1.2] for a short exposition of that topic. Using that strategy one can prove that

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in T} |X_t| \sim \inf \left\{ \sup_{t \in T} \sum_{k \geq 0} 2^{\frac{k}{2}} \text{diam}(A_k(t)) \mid \text{admissible partition chain}^{16} \{\mathcal{A}_k\} \right\}, \quad (4.10)$$

see [33, Theorem 1.2.6] and [34, Theorem 2.10.1]¹⁷. Note that the r.h.s. of (4.10) only depends on the geometry of the metric space (T, d) ; due to its crucial role in the chaining method it is usually denoted by $\gamma_2(T, d)$.

¹⁶A sequence of partitions $\{\mathcal{A}_k\}$ of the metric space (T, d) is admissible provided it increases, but its size grows like $|\mathcal{A}_k| \leq 2^{2^k}$. For any such partition \mathcal{A}_k the set $A_k(t)$ denotes the unique element $A \in \mathcal{A}_k$ such that $t \in A$.

¹⁷Note that since X is centered we have $X \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} -X$ so that $\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in T} |X_t| \leq 2 \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in T} X_t$ so we can indeed use the given references.

Since in our case we are only interested in upper bounds on the supremum of the Gaussians on the l.h.s. of (4.10), let us make the useful observation that instead of studying the metric space (T, d) , we can parametrize it through a surjective Lipschitz-continuous map $f : (M, d_M) \rightarrow (T, d)$ provided we understand the metric geometry of (M, d_M) in the sense of the γ_2 -functional. More precisely, in this case we have

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in T} |X_t| \lesssim [f]_{\text{Lip}} \gamma_2(M, d_M), \quad (4.11)$$

see [33, Theorem 1.3.6]. Hence, to prove Proposition 2.4, we need to find a convenient way of parametrizing the Gaussians $\frac{1}{|\partial M|} \int_M \xi$ through a metric space that we understand well.

In [18], a proof of the discrete analog of Proposition 2.4 is suggested that employs the chaining bound in a multi-scale way, in the sense that they study the integrals $\frac{1}{|\partial M|} \int_M \xi$ for $|\partial M| \sim L$ over a range of dyadic scales L . In this way, the metric takes the more customary form

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \frac{1}{L} \int_M \xi - \frac{1}{L} \int_N \xi \right|^2 = \left\{ \frac{2\pi}{L^2} \int |\widehat{\mathbf{1}}_M(k) - \widehat{\mathbf{1}}_N(k)|^2 \widehat{c}(dk) \right\} \leq \frac{1}{L^2} \int |\mathbf{1}_M - \mathbf{1}_N|^2$$

for the two noises under consideration in Section 1.1. Let us note that passing to the upper bound is justified by (4.11) above. In this way, we are led to consider the space $\{M \subseteq B_R \mid \int |\nabla \mathbf{1}_M| \leq L\}$ of Caccioppoli sets w.r.t. the L^2 -metric. Note that the former set is a compact subset of the space $BV(B_R)$ equipped with the L^1 -topology (which in terms of topologies agrees with the L^2 -topology induced on that set).

We can use (4.11) to pull the estimation procedure back into a Hilbert space setting, where the Euclidian geometry allows for explicit computations. In our case, the following parametrization will be useful.

Lemma 4.2 (Proposition 3.4.5 in [33]). *Denote by $L = 2^k$ (for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$) a length scale and let*

$$\Gamma_L := \{M \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2 \text{ simply connected} \mid \partial M \text{ contained in the square lattice, } |\partial M| \leq L, 0 \in \partial M\}$$

There exists a surjective map $M : \text{dom}(T) \subseteq \{f \in H^1(\mathbb{T}) \mid \int_{\mathbb{T}} |f|^2 + \int_{\mathbb{T}} |f'|^2 \leq 1\} \rightarrow \Gamma_L$ such that

$$\int |\mathbf{1}_{M(f)} - \mathbf{1}_{M(g)}| \lesssim L^2 \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}} |f - g|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

For a proof of the lemma, we refer the reader to the proof given in Talagrand's book, see [33, Proof of Proposition 3.4.5 & Lemma 3.4.7 for the Fourier space representation]. The idea originates from the matching community, see again [33, Theorem 3.4.1] for an exposition of this topic. Since the elements of Γ_L are uniquely determined by their boundary curves, one may use a piecewise continuous function to parametrize it. The crux is to prove the above estimate.

Note that since our original metric measures distances on indicator functions, this bound translates to the statement

$$\left(\mathbb{E} \left| \frac{1}{L} \int_{M(f)} \xi - \frac{1}{L} \int_{M(g)} \xi \right|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim \left(\frac{1}{L} \int |\mathbf{1}_{M(f)} - \mathbf{1}_{M(g)}| \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}} |f - g|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \quad (4.12)$$

for the L^2 -metric considered above. Note that the exponent on the r.h.s. is $\frac{1}{4}$, which is from a metric point of view not a problem: the square root of a metric is still a metric.

It is the next lemma from [33] that recovers the correct exponent in the framework of the chaining method. The lemma relates the γ_2 -functional of interest to another γ -functional, see [33, (3.4)], namely

$$\gamma_{1,2}(T, d) := \inf \left\{ \sup_{t \in T} \left(\sum_{k \geq 0} (2^k \text{diam}(A_k(t)))^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mid \text{admissible partition chain } \{\mathcal{A}_k\} \right\}. \quad (4.13)$$

At a first glance, this looks a bit artificial, but it turns out that this is exactly the right notion of measuring the compactness of the embedding $H^1(\mathbb{T}) \hookrightarrow L^2(\mathbb{T})$, more precisely we shall consider $\gamma_{1,2}(H^1(\mathbb{T}) \hookrightarrow L^2(\mathbb{T})) := \gamma_{1,2}(\{\|f\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T})} \leq 1\}, \|\cdot\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})})$; in view of our original metric, corresponding to the square-root of the $L^2(\mathbb{T})$ -norm, the new functional replaces the $\ell^{\frac{1}{2}}$ -summability (which by the naive argument above we expect to diverge) on the r.h.s. of (4.10) by an ℓ^2 -summability condition in the $\gamma_{1,2}$ -functional (which borderline converges). In Lemma 4.4 we will refine the aforementioned strategy and explicitly construct a partition of $H^1(\mathbb{T})$ as a competitor in (4.13). Since we will use L^2 -balls of slightly varying radii this may indeed be seen as a refined statement on the compactness of $H^1(\mathbb{T}) \hookrightarrow L^2(\mathbb{T})$.

The first of the above mentioned lemma is the following.

Lemma 4.3 (Lemma 3.4.6 in [33]). *Let (T, d_T) , (M, d_M) be two metric spaces related through a Lipschitz-continuous surjective map $f : (M, d_M^{\frac{1}{2}}) \rightarrow (T, d_T)$. Assume that T is finite (with $|T| \geq 2$ to exclude pathological cases); then*

$$\gamma_2(T, d_T) \lesssim (\log \log |T|)^{\frac{3}{4}} \gamma_{1,2}(M, d_M)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

The following proof is essentially the same as in [33], we include it for the reader's convenience, since we have changed the formulation of the statement a little bit.

Proof. W.l.o.g. we may assume that $M = f^{-1}(T)$. Otherwise, we restrict M and observe after the proof that $\gamma_{1,2}$ is monotone up to multiplicative constants, see [33, Theorem 1.3.6].

Modulo the Lipschitz parameterization that may be handled as in [33, Theorem 1.3.6], see also the comment above, what we really need to show is

$$\gamma_2(M, d_M^{\frac{1}{2}}) \lesssim (\log \log |M|)^{\frac{3}{4}} \gamma_{1,2}(M, d_M)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Since $|M| = |T| \geq 2$, we can write $2^{2^{n-1}} \leq |M| \leq 2^{2^n}$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that in particular,

$$\log(\log 2) + (n-1) \log 2 \leq \log(\log |M|) \leq \log(\log 2) + n \log 2, \quad \text{so that} \quad \log \log |M| \sim n.$$

For the desired estimate, we start with an admissible partition $\{\mathcal{A}_k\}$ that almost attains the infimum for $\gamma_{1,2}(T, d)$, i.e.

$$\gamma_{1,2}(M, d_M) \leq \sup_{t \in T} \left(\sum_{k \geq 0} (2^k \text{diam}_d(A_k(t)))^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \gamma_{1,2}(M, d_M) + \varepsilon$$

Note that the remaining supremum above becomes smaller – and hence closer to the actual infimum – if we redefine $\mathcal{A}_n = \{\{t\} \mid t \in M\}$ (note that $|\mathcal{A}_n| \leq |M| \leq 2^{2^n}$). This procedure ensures that the sum is finite; it stops at $k = n - 1$. Hence, by Hölder's inequality we have

$$\gamma_2(M, d_M^{\frac{1}{2}}) \leq \sum_{k \geq 0} (2^k \text{diam}_d(A_k(t)))^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq n^{\frac{3}{4}} \left(\sum_{k \geq 0} (2^k \text{diam}_d(A_k(t)))^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \leq n^{\frac{3}{4}} (\gamma_{1,2}(M, d_M) + \varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Using $|M| \sim n$ this concludes the proof upon sending $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. ■

To make use of the last lemma, we of course need control over the quantity $\gamma_{1,2}(H^1(\mathbb{T}) \hookrightarrow L^2(\mathbb{T}))$ appearing therein. This is handled by the next lemma.

Lemma 4.4 (Lemma 3.4.7 in [33]). *We have $\gamma_{1,2}(H^1(\mathbb{T}) \hookrightarrow L^2(\mathbb{T})) < \infty$.*

Again, we refer to the book [33] for a detailed proof utilizing the partition schemes in [33, Corollary 3.1.4 & Theorem 3.1.5]. Another more recent proof is given in [34, Theorem 4.2.1], which simplifies the argument by using the contraction principle developed in [35, Theorem 3.1]; specializing this construction to our setting leads to an explicit construction of the admissible partition in (4.13).

Adaptations to the continuum setting. In our proof of Proposition 2.4, we follow the general strategy by [18] and [33]. Due to our continuum setting, some adaptations of the proof are needed. Briefly summarized, we need some type of continuity of the functional $M \mapsto \frac{1}{|\partial M|} \int_M \xi$ to reduce the maximization in (2.4) to a set parameterized by discretely many curves. The exponent $\frac{3}{4}$ then emerges from Lemma 4.3.

In view of the bound of order $(\log R)^{\frac{3}{4}}$ in (2.4), the following estimate on the supremum of ξ suffices for our purposes. It is this lemma where we need the assumption on the noise ξ in Section 1.1. We will see that, next to the Gaussianity, we rely on the first property in (1.5), which we verify along the lines.

Lemma 4.5. *Let ξ denote either of the two noises in Section 1.1. It holds*

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{Q_R} |\xi| \lesssim (\log R)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (4.14)$$

for every $R \geq 2$.

Before we prove the lemma, let us comment on why it is natural to expect the bound (4.14): we think of the assumptions of Section 1.1 as guaranteeing that the noise ξ is sufficiently regular on small scales. Therefore, the supremum of $|\xi|$ on small balls behaves, at least in terms of estimates, like $|\xi|$ at the center point. In view of the white noise character of ξ on large scales this shows that the supremum of $|\xi|$ behaves like the supremum of R^d independent random variables, for which the logarithmic bound in (4.14) is sharp. To make this rigorous, surprisingly few regularity assumptions on the noise are needed.

Proof of Lemma 4.5. We split the proof in two steps.

Step 1 (Core argument). Let us write

$$\sup_{Q_R} |\xi| = \sup_{p \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \cap Q_R} \sup_{Q_1(p)} |\xi|.$$

Below we will argue that

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{Q_1(p)} |\xi| \lesssim 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}\left\{ \sup_{Q_1(p)} |\xi| \geq \mathbb{E} \sup_{Q_1(p)} |\xi| + \alpha \right\} \lesssim \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \quad (4.15)$$

for some positive constant $\sigma = \sigma(d) > 0$. The claim now follows by standard arguments.

Indeed, applying the Gaussian tail estimate (4.8) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \sup_{p \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \cap Q_R} \left(\sup_{Q_1(p)} |\xi| - \mathbb{E} \sup_{Q_1(p)} |\xi| \right) &\leq \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}\left\{ \sup_{Q_1(p)} |\xi| - \mathbb{E} \sup_{Q_1(p)} |\xi| > t \text{ for some } p \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \cap Q_R \right\} dt \\ &\leq \delta + \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \cap Q_R} \int_\delta^\infty \mathbb{P}\left\{ \sup_{Q_1(p)} |\xi| > t + \mathbb{E} \sup_{Q_1(p)} |\xi| \right\} dt \\ &\lesssim \delta + \sigma R^d \int_{\frac{\delta}{\sigma}}^\infty \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{2}\right) dt \leq \delta + R^d \frac{\sigma^2}{\delta} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \frac{\delta^2}{\sigma^2}\right) \end{aligned}$$

for all $\delta > 0$. In particular, we may choose $\delta = \sigma \sqrt{2 \log R^d} \sim \sqrt{\log R}$ to obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{p \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \cap Q_R} \sup_{Q_1(p)} |\xi| \lesssim \sup_{p \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \cap Q_R} \left(\mathbb{E} \sup_{Q_1(p)} |\xi| \right) + (\log R)^{\frac{1}{2}} + (\log R)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim (\log R)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where the last inequality holds if R is strictly bounded away from 1.

Step 2 (Argument for (4.15)). By \mathbb{Z}^2 -stationarity we restrict ourselves to the case $p = 0$. The estimates in (4.15) are a direct consequence of the Borell-TIS-inequality, see e.g. [1, Theorem 2.1.1], which applies since any of the two noises satisfies

$$\sup_{Q_1} |\xi| < \infty \quad \text{almost surely,} \quad (4.16)$$

see argument below. Therefore, the Borell-TIS-inequality implies

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{Q_1} \xi < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{Q_1} \xi - \mathbb{E} \sup_{Q_1} \xi > t \right\} \leq \exp \left(-\frac{t^2}{2\sigma^2} \right)$$

with constant $\sigma^2 = \sup_{x \in Q_1} \mathbb{E} \xi(x)^2 < \infty$. Since ξ is a centered Gaussian, we have $\xi \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} -\xi$ so that by $\sup_{Q_1} |\xi| = \sup_{Q_1} \max\{\xi, -\xi\}$ we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{Q_1} |\xi| > t \right\} \leq 2 \mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{Q_1} \xi > t \right\},$$

which in particular implies

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{Q_1} |\xi| > \mathbb{E} \sup_{Q_1} |\xi| + t \right\} \leq 2 \mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{Q_1} \xi > \mathbb{E} \sup_{Q_1} |\xi| + t \right\} \leq 2 \mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{Q_1} \xi > \mathbb{E} \sup_{Q_1} \xi + t \right\}.$$

This shows that although in disguise, the above estimate already contains (4.15).

Step 3 (Argument for (4.16)). To conclude the lemma, it is left to establish (4.16) for our two noises. Note that this also implies the first item in (1.5). Furthermore, let us note that the claim is almost immediate for the discretized white noise. Therefore, we focus only on white noise in the presence of the UV cut-off.

By \mathbb{Z}^2 -stationary, we may restrict ourselves to the case $p = 0$. We first observe that

$$\mathbb{E} |\xi(x) - \xi(y)|^2 = 2(c(0) - c(x - y)) \lesssim |x - y|^{2\alpha},$$

where in the last inequality we used the UV regularization in form of

$$|c(0) - c(x - y)| \sim \int |e^0 - \exp(i(x - y) \cdot q)| \hat{c}(q) dq \lesssim |x - y|^{2\alpha} \int |q|^{2\alpha} \hat{c}(q) dq.$$

Therefore, Dudley's bound, see [33, (1.18)] or [24], can be applied, i.e.

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{B_1} |\xi| \lesssim \int_0^\infty (\log N(B_1, C|\cdot|^\alpha; \varepsilon))^{\frac{1}{2}} d\varepsilon \tag{4.17}$$

for some constant $C > 0$. It is well-known that in two space-dimensions

$$\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right)^2 \leq N(B_1, |\cdot|; \varepsilon) \leq \left(\frac{2 + \varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \right)^2,$$

see [34, Exercise 2.5.9 & (2.47)]. Therefore, the last integrand is given by

$$\log N(B_1, C|\cdot|^\alpha; \varepsilon) = \log N(B_1, |\cdot|; (\frac{\varepsilon}{C})^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}) \lesssim \begin{cases} \log \frac{2 + (\frac{\varepsilon}{C})^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}}{(\frac{\varepsilon}{C})^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}} & \text{for } \varepsilon < C \\ 0 & \text{for } \varepsilon \geq C, \end{cases}$$

so that we may estimate (4.17) by

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{B_1} |\xi| \lesssim \int_0^1 \left(\log(1 + 2\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} d\varepsilon \lesssim_\alpha \int_1^\infty (\log(1 + 2x))^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{dx}{x^{1+\alpha}} \lesssim_\alpha 1,$$

which establishes (4.16) after covering Q_1 with finitely many balls. \blacksquare

Equipped with Lemma 4.5, we are ready to prove that in the supremum considered in Proposition 2.4 we can restrict to finitely many curves. To this end, let us recall from Lemma 4.2 the set of curves

$$\Gamma_L := \{M \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2 \text{ simply connected} \mid \partial M \text{ contained in the square lattice, } |\partial M| \leq L, 0 \in \partial M\}$$

of which we have a good parametrization. The key idea of the next lemma is to deform admissible curves to curves contained in Γ_L . In view of the supremum bound in Lemma 4.5 and our claim in Proposition 2.4, we can allow for a deformation of order $L(\log L)^{\frac{1}{4}}$ around the boundary (which is much more space than we actually need).

Lemma 4.6 (Deformation to discrete curves). *Given some length scale $1 \leq L < \infty$, we consider a set Γ of simply connected sets (in \mathbb{R}^2) with smooth boundaries; additionally assume that $|\partial M| \leq L$ and $0 \in B_1(\partial M)$ for $M \in \Gamma$. There exists a universal constant $0 < c < \infty$, such that for every $M \in \Gamma$, there exists an $N \in \Gamma_{cL}$ such that*

$$\int |\mathbf{1}_M - \mathbf{1}_N| \lesssim L.$$

Proof of Lemma 4.6. Given $M \in \Gamma$, let us write

$$B_1(\partial M) := \{p \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid \text{dist}(p, \partial M) \leq 1\}.$$

for the tube of radius one around ∂M . Now let γ the innermost curve fully contained in the square lattice that contains $B_1(\partial M)$. We denote by $\text{int}(\gamma)$ the domain enclosed by this curve. Note that this curve is contained in $B_3(\partial M)$, which contains at most order $|\partial M|$ many points from \mathbb{Z}^2 . This follows by a volume argument. Hence, $\text{Length}(\gamma) \lesssim L$. Furthermore, by construction we have

$$|\mathbf{1}_{\text{int}(\gamma)} - \mathbf{1}_M| \lesssim |B_3(\partial M)| \lesssim L.$$

By redirecting the curve γ over finitely many lattice sides, we may ensure that $0 \in \gamma$. Since $L \geq 1$ the above bound and the estimate $\text{Length}(\gamma) \lesssim L$ remain true upon chaining the implicit constant. \blacksquare

Proof of Proposition 2.4. We are finally ready to prove Proposition 2.4. We closely follow the argument given by [18, Theorem 1.6 & Proposition 2.2] in the discrete situation of the RFIM.

Note that the concentration property (2.6) already appeared in (4.5) in the section collecting the concentration type argument. Hence, our main concern for now is the upper bound (2.5). We proceed in several steps.

Step 1 (Reduction to simple closed boundary curves). As in [18, Proof of Theorem 1.6], we now reduce the maximization problem in (2.5) to simply connected sets with smooth boundaries. Additionally we need to cut-off too short or too boundary curves, which happens automatically in the discrete setting. More precisely, we argue that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \sup \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{|\partial M|} \int_M \xi \right| \mid M \subseteq B_R \text{ Caccioppoli set} \right\} \\ & \lesssim \mathbb{E} \sup \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{|\partial M|} \int_M \xi \right| \mid M \subseteq B_R \text{ simply connected, } \partial M \text{ smooth, } 1 \leq |\partial M| \leq R^2 \right\} + (\log R)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

In view of our claim the term $(\log R)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ on the right is of lower order. Note that this term is not present in the discrete setting of [18] and comes from the reduction from (possibly very rough) Caccioppoli sets to smooth sets, and from the restriction to short boundaries that is automatic on the lattice.

First, we want to argue that we may restrict to sets M with smooth boundary. To this end, let us start with the continuity estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \left| \frac{1}{|\partial M|} \int_M \xi \right| - \left| \frac{1}{|\partial N|} \int_N \xi \right| \right| & \leq \left| \frac{1}{|\partial M|} \int_N \xi - \frac{1}{|\partial N|} \int_N \xi \right| + \frac{1}{|\partial M|} \left| \int_N \xi - \int_M \xi \right| \\ & \lesssim \left| \frac{|\partial N|}{|\partial M|} - 1 \right| \sup \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{|\partial N|} \int_N \xi \right| \mid N \subseteq B_R, \partial N \text{ smooth} \right\} \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{|\partial M|} \int |\mathbf{1}_M - \mathbf{1}_N| \sup_{B_R} |\xi|. \end{aligned}$$

Since for any Caccioppoli set M , we can find a set N with smooth boundary s.t.

$$\int |\mathbf{1}_M - \mathbf{1}_N| \lesssim |\partial M| \quad \text{and} \quad \left| |\partial M| - |\partial N| \right| \lesssim |\partial M|,$$

see e.g. [5, Theorem 3.42 with a compactly supported mollifier in its proof] the above estimate shows

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \sup \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{|\partial M|} \int_M \xi \right| \middle| M \subseteq B_R \text{ Caccioppoli} \right\} \\ & \lesssim \mathbb{E} \sup \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{|\partial M|} \int_M \xi \right| \middle| M \subseteq B_R, \partial M \text{ smooth} \right\} + \mathbb{E} \sup_{B_R} |\xi|. \end{aligned} \quad (4.19)$$

Lemma 4.5 implies that the last term is of lower order in view of our claimed estimate (2.5).

Now we employ the same argument as [18, Proof of Theorem 1.6] to further restrict to connected sets. To this end, we write $M = \cup_i M_i$ where M_i are the connected components of M . By (4.19), we may already assume that ∂M is smooth. Hence, the boundary segments of the M_i 's do not overlap (which is trivial in the discrete setting of [18]) and we have

$$\sum_i |\partial M_i| = |\partial M|.$$

Therefore, we may estimate

$$\left| \frac{1}{|\partial M|} \int_M \xi \right| \leq \sum_i \frac{|\partial M_i|}{|\partial M|} \left| \frac{1}{|\partial M_i|} \int_{M_i} \xi \right| \leq \sup \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{|\partial N|} \int_N \xi \right| \middle| \begin{array}{l} N \subseteq B_R \text{ connected,} \\ \partial N \text{ smooth} \end{array} \right\}.$$

By a similar argument, we may further restrict the supremum to simply connected sets. If M is connected, then we may write $M = S \setminus \cup_i H_i$ where S is simply connected and the H_i 's denote the possible holes of M . Hence, we may again decompose the above integral

$$\left| \frac{1}{|\partial M|} \int_M \xi \right| \leq \frac{|\partial S|}{|\partial M|} \left| \frac{1}{|\partial S|} \int_S \xi \right| + \sum_i \frac{|\partial H_i|}{|\partial M|} \left| \frac{1}{|\partial H_i|} \int_{H_i} \xi \right|.$$

Note that these holes may as well degenerate to points and lines, where the corresponding integrals vanish. Since the holes H_i are simply connected and by the smoothness of ∂M we also have $|\partial M| = |\partial S| + \sum_i |\partial H_i|$, and we may estimate

$$\left| \frac{1}{|\partial M|} \int_M \xi \right| \leq \sup \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{|\partial N|} \int_N \xi \right| \middle| \begin{array}{l} N \subseteq B_R \text{ simply connected,} \\ \partial N \text{ smooth} \end{array} \right\}.$$

Overall, we have shown

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \sup \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{|\partial M|} \int_M \xi \right| \middle| M \subseteq B_R, \partial M \text{ smooth} \right\} \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \sup \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{|\partial N|} \int_N \xi \right| \middle| \begin{array}{l} N \subseteq B_R \text{ simply connected,} \\ \partial N \text{ smooth} \end{array} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.20)$$

which is reminiscent of the discrete case, see [18, (11)].

Lastly, we want to establish that we can restrict the maximization problem on the r.h.s. of (2.5) to short boundary curves in the sense of $|\partial M| \leq R^2$ and long boundary curves in the sense that $|\partial M| \geq 1$. More precisely, we show that

$$\mathbb{E} \sup \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{|\partial M|} \int_M \xi \right| \middle| \begin{array}{l} M \subseteq B_R \text{ simply connected,} \\ \partial M \text{ smooth, } |\partial M| \leq 1 \text{ or } |\partial M| \geq R^2 \end{array} \right\} \lesssim \mathbb{E} \sup_{B_R} |\xi| + \mathbb{E} \int_{B_R} |\xi| \quad (4.21)$$

Let us start with a set M with long boundary curve, i.e. $|\partial M| \geq R^2$. Here, we employ the estimate

$$\left| \frac{1}{|\partial M|} \int_M \xi \right| \leq \frac{1}{R^2} \int_{B_R} |\xi|.$$

If on the contrary, we have $|\partial M| \leq 1$, we know that $\text{diam}(M) \leq |\partial M| \leq 1$, so that M is fully contained in a ball of radius 1. Combining this with the isoperimetric inequality in form of $\frac{|M|}{|\partial M|} \lesssim |\partial M| \lesssim 1$, we obtain

$$\left| \frac{1}{|\partial M|} \int_M \xi \right| \lesssim \frac{|M|}{|\partial M|} \sup_{B_R} |\xi| \lesssim \sup_{B_R} |\xi|.$$

Combining the last two equations we conclude (4.21), which in combination with (4.19), (4.20), and Lemma 4.5 implies (4.18).

Step 2 (Reduction to finitely many boundary curves). In view of the argument for the analogous upper bound (2.5) in [18, Lemma 4.4] and (4.18), we need to show that

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\sup\left\{\left|\frac{1}{L}\int_M\xi\right|\left|\begin{array}{l}M\subseteq B_R\text{ simply connected,} \\ \partial M\text{ smooth, } \frac{L}{2}\leq|\partial M|\leq L, 0\in B_1(\partial M)\end{array}\right.\right\}\geq C(\log L)^{\frac{3}{4}}+t\right\}\leq\exp\left(-\frac{1}{8\pi}t^2\right) \quad (4.22)$$

for any $t > 0$ and some universal constant $C > 0$. Once more, we make use of the continuity estimate in Lemma 4.1 (with $|\partial M|$ on the l.h.s. replaced by L) that by employing the Gaussian concentration estimate from Bogachev's book, see [11, Theorem 4.5.6], reduces the problem to bounding the expectation

$$\mathbb{E}\sup\left\{\left|\frac{1}{L}\int_M\xi\right|\left|\begin{array}{l}M\subseteq B_R\text{ simply connected,} \\ \partial M\text{ smooth, } \frac{L}{2}\leq|\partial M|\leq L, 0\in B_1(\partial M)\end{array}\right.\right\}\lesssim(\log L)^{\frac{3}{4}}. \quad (4.23)$$

By Lemma 4.6, there exists a universal constant $0 < c < \infty$ such that for any of the competing sets above, we find some set $N \in \Gamma_{cL}$ (see the definition before Lemma 4.6) such that

$$\frac{1}{L}\int|\mathbf{1}_N-\mathbf{1}_M|\lesssim 1.$$

Since

$$\left|\left|\frac{1}{L}\int_M\xi\right|-\left|\frac{1}{L}\int_N\xi\right|\right|\lesssim\frac{1}{L}\int|\xi||\mathbf{1}_M-\mathbf{1}_N|\lesssim\sup_{B_{2cL}}|\xi|\frac{1}{L}\int|\mathbf{1}_N-\mathbf{1}_M|\lesssim\sup_{B_{2cL}}|\xi|,$$

Lemma 4.5 on scale $R = 2cL$ implies

$$\mathbb{E}\sup\left\{\left|\frac{1}{L}\int_M\xi\right|\left|\begin{array}{l}M\subseteq B_R\text{ simply connected,} \\ \partial M\text{ smooth, } \frac{L}{2}\leq|\partial M|\leq L, 0\in B_1(\partial M)\end{array}\right.\right\}\lesssim\mathbb{E}\sup_{N\in\Gamma_{cL}}\left|\frac{1}{L}\int_N\xi\right|+(\log L)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Now the same argument¹⁸ as in [18, Lemma 4.4] and [33, Section 3.4] applies: using the chaining bound (4.10) from [34, Theorem 2.7.2], followed by the Lemmas 4.2 (keeping also (4.12) in mind) and 4.3, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\sup\left\{\left|\frac{1}{L}\int_M\xi\right|\left|\begin{array}{l}M\subseteq B_R\text{ simply connected,} \\ \partial M\text{ smooth, } |\partial M|\leq L, 0\in B_1(\partial M)\end{array}\right.\right\} \\ &\lesssim(\log L)^{\frac{1}{2}}+(\log\log|\Gamma_{cL}|)^{\frac{3}{4}}\gamma_{1,2}(H^1(\mathbb{T})\hookrightarrow L^2(\mathbb{T}))^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

Since $|\Gamma_{cL}| \leq 4^{cL}$, and in view of Lemma 4.4, this implies the claim.

Step 3 (Conclusion). The only thing that is left, is to use the estimate provided in Step 2 to conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}\sup\left\{\left|\frac{1}{|\partial M|}\int_M\xi\right|\left|\begin{array}{l}M\subseteq B_R\text{ simply connected,} \\ \partial M\text{ smooth, } 1\leq|\partial M|\leq R^2\end{array}\right.\right\}\lesssim(\log R)^{\frac{3}{4}}.$$

In view of what we proved in Step 1, this completes the argument for Proposition 2.4.

Here, we again rely on the argument by [18, Proposition 2.2]. For notational simplicity, let $\Gamma_{L,0}^*$ denote the set of admissible M 's in the supremum in (4.23). Once the constraint $0 \in B_1(\partial M)$ is replaced by $p \in B_1(\partial M)$, we write $\Gamma_{L,p}^*$ instead. Equipped with this notation, we can bound

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\sup\left\{\left|\frac{1}{|\partial M|}\int_M\xi\right|\left|\begin{array}{l}M\subseteq B_R\text{ simply connected,} \\ \partial M\text{ smooth, } 1\leq|\partial M|\leq R^2\end{array}\right.\right\} \\ &\leq\mathbb{E}\sup_{p\in\mathbb{Z}^2\cap Q_R}\sup_{L\leq R^2}\sup\left\{\left|\frac{1}{|\partial M|}\int_M\xi\right|\left|\begin{array}{l}M\in\Gamma_{L,p}^*, \\ |\partial M|\geq 1\end{array}\right.\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

¹⁸Note that by construction the set Γ_{cL} contains only sets with boundary curves on the lattice. Hence for the discretized white noise as considered in Section 4.2, we are exactly in the situation of [18].

The latter supremum is conveniently bounded by using the \mathbb{Z}^2 -stationarity: if we denote by C twice the constant appearing in (4.22), then

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{p \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \cap Q_R} \sup_{L \leq R^2} \sup \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{|\partial M|} \int_M \xi \right| \middle| M \in \Gamma_{L,p}^*, |\partial M| \geq 1 \right\} \geq C(\log R)^{\frac{3}{4}} + t \right\} \\ & \leq \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \cap Q_R} \sum_{2^k \leq R^2} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{2^k} \int_M \xi \right| \middle| M \in \Gamma_{2^k,p}^* \right\} \geq \frac{C}{2} (\log 2^k)^{\frac{3}{4}} + \frac{t}{2} \right\} \\ & \leq C_1 R^d \log(R) \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{16\pi}\right) = \exp(d \log(R) + \log(C_1 \log(R)) - \frac{t^2}{32\pi}). \end{aligned}$$

Inserting $t = C'(\log R)^{\frac{3}{4}} + t'$ for some large constant $C' > 0$ absorbs the lower order terms and yields the bound

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{p \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \cap Q_R} \sup_{L \leq R^2} \sup \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{|\partial M|} \int_M \xi \right| \middle| M \in \Gamma_{L,p}^*, |\partial M| \geq 1 \right\} \geq C(\log R)^{\frac{3}{4}} + t \right\} \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha^2}{16\pi}\right).$$

The argument to conclude is standard again, we have

$$\sup_{p \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \cap Q_R} \sup_{L \leq R^2} \sup \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{|\partial M|} \int_M \xi \right| \middle| M \in \Gamma_{L,p}^*, |\partial M| \geq 1 \right\} \leq C(\log R)^{\frac{3}{4}} + \int_{C(\log R)^{\frac{3}{4}}}^{\infty} \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{32\pi}\right) dt,$$

which implies the claim. \blacksquare

5. PROOF OF THE MAIN RESULT

In this section, we prove the main result of this paper, namely Theorem 1.1. We begin by showing that any minimizer of (1.1) is an approximate minimizer of the perimeter in the sense of η -minimality, see Definition 2.1.

Lemma 5.1 (η -minimality of local minimizers). *For any $0 < p_0 < 1$ there exists a constant $C < \infty$ such that with probability p_0 the following holds: let m be a local minimizer of the energy (1.1) for some $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. With probability p_0 , m is an $\eta_R(x)$ -minimizer of the perimeter in $B_R(x)$, with*

$$\eta_R(x) \leq \varepsilon C (\log |x|_+)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\log R)^{\frac{3}{4}} \quad (5.1)$$

for $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $R \geq 2$ provided the latter is less than 1.

Proof of Lemma 5.1. By Proposition 2.6, we may assume that with probability p_0 , the estimate

$$S_R(x) = \sup \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{|\partial M|} \int_M \xi \right| \middle| M \subseteq B_R(x) \text{ Caccioppoli set} \right\} \lesssim_{p_0} (\log |x|_+)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\log R)^{\frac{3}{4}} \quad (5.2)$$

holds for every point $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and scale $R \geq 2$. Here we use the notation $|x|_+ := \max\{|x|, 2\}$. We use this, to argue that m is an $\eta_R(x)$ -minimizer of the perimeter in $B_R(x)$, see Definition 2.1 provided the r.h.s. of (5.2) including the implicit constant is small.

Indeed, fix R and x and consider an open ball $B \subseteq B_R(x)$. From the minimality of m we know that

$$\int_{\overline{B}} |\nabla m| \leq \int_{\overline{B}} |\nabla m'| + \varepsilon \int_B \xi(m - m') \quad (5.3)$$

for every competitor $m' : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}$ such that $m = m'$ in $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B$. We can split the field term on the r.h.s. of (5.3) and use that $\{m = 1, m' = -1\} \cup \{m = -1, m' = 1\} \subseteq B$, together with the definition of $S_R(x)$ in (5.2) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_B \xi(m - m') &= 2 \int_B \xi \mathbf{1}_{\{m=1, m'=-1\}} - 2 \int_B \xi \mathbf{1}_{\{m=-1, m'=1\}} \\ &\leq 2S_R(x) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \mathbf{1}_{\{m=1, m'=-1\}}| + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \mathbf{1}_{\{m=-1, m'=1\}}| \right). \end{aligned}$$

Recall that for any smooth functions $0 \leq f, g \leq 1$ we have $\int |\nabla f g| \leq \int |\nabla f| + \int |\nabla g|$, so that by approximation a la [5, Proposition 3.38], we learn that for every strictly larger open ball $\bar{B} \subseteq B'$

$$\int_{B'} |\nabla \mathbf{1}_{\{m=1, m'=-1\}}| \leq \int_{B'} |\nabla \mathbf{1}_{\{m=1\}}| + \int_{B'} |\nabla \mathbf{1}_{\{m'=-1\}}| \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{B'} |\nabla m| + \frac{1}{2} \int_{B'} |\nabla m'|.$$

By continuity of the measures from above (and a symmetric argument for the second term), this implies

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \mathbf{1}_{\{m=1, m'=-1\}}| + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \mathbf{1}_{\{m=-1, m'=1\}}| \leq \int_{\bar{B}} |\nabla m| + \int_{\bar{B}} |\nabla m'|.$$

Hence, the above estimate implies

$$\int_B \xi(m - m') \leq 2S_R(x) \left(\int_{\bar{B}} |\nabla m| + \int_{\bar{B}} |\nabla m'| \right).$$

Inserting this in (5.3) yields

$$\int_{\bar{B}} |\nabla m| \leq \frac{1 + 2\varepsilon S_R(x)}{1 - 2\varepsilon S_R(x)} \int_{\bar{B}} |\nabla m'|.$$

Provided $2\varepsilon S_R(x) \leq \frac{1}{2}$, we may estimate $\frac{1+2\varepsilon S_R(x)}{1-2\varepsilon S_R(x)} \leq 1 + 8\varepsilon S_R(x)$, which in view of (5.2) implies the claim. \blacksquare

We have now collected all ingredients to prove Theorem 1.1. The only thing that is left is to set up the Campanato iteration that we explained in Section 2.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. By Lemma 5.1, there exists a constant $C = C(p_0) \in (1, \infty)$ such that any local minimizer m is an $\eta_R(x)$ -minimizer of the perimeter in $B_R(x)$, with

$$\eta_R(x) \leq \varepsilon C (\log |x|_+)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\log R)^{\frac{3}{4}},$$

for $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $R \geq 2$ provided the latter is less than 1.

Step 1 (Jump set is a single arc). Next, we capitalize on η_R -minimality in the ball B_R (centered around the origin) for $R = \exp(c\varepsilon^{-\frac{4}{3}})$. Provided the constant $0 < c < \infty$ is small enough (so that the r.h.s. of (5.1) is sufficiently small), we claim that there exists a $\frac{1}{16} \leq \theta \leq 1$, such that the jump set of m in $B_{\theta R}$ consists of a single arc.

First, we argue that we can choose θ such that the jump set of m intersects $\partial B_{\theta R}$ in either zero or two points. This follows from Lemma 3.4. Its assumptions are satisfied by Proposition 2.3 for a suitable choice of $0 < c < \infty$.

Next, we show that m can't have bubbles, i.e. connected components of $\{m = 1\}$ or $\{m = -1\}$, fully contained in B_R . Indeed, the presence of a bubble would contradict (5.2): assume that our minimizer m has a bubble supported in a set $M \subseteq B_R$. Now let m' denote the configuration where the bubble is removed. By local minimality, we know that

$$\int_{\bar{B}_R} |\nabla m| - \varepsilon \int_{B_R} \xi m \leq \int_{\bar{B}_R} |\nabla m'| - \varepsilon \int_{B_R} \xi m',$$

which, since $\frac{1}{2}(m - m') = \pm \mathbf{1}_M$, translates into

$$|\partial M| = \int_{\bar{B}_R} |\nabla m| - \int_{\bar{B}_R} |\nabla m'| \leq \varepsilon \int_{B_R} \xi(m - m') \leq 2\varepsilon \left| \int_M \xi \right|.$$

This contradicts (5.2) provided $R = \exp(c\varepsilon^{-\frac{4}{3}})$ for a possibly smaller choice of $0 < c < \infty$.

Summarizing the above, the jump set of m intersects $\partial B_{\theta R}$ in either zero or two points, and contains no bubbles. Hence, the jump set in $B_{\theta R}$ either consists of a single arc with start and endpoint on $\partial B_{\theta R}$, or is empty.

Step 2 (Distance on the jump set). We now argue that for any two points $x, y \in B_{\frac{1}{64}R}$ in the jump set of m we have

$$\text{dist}_{J_m}(x, y) \sim |x - y|, \quad (5.4)$$

provided that $R = \exp(c\varepsilon^{-\frac{4}{3}})$ as in Step 1. Note carefully that the implicit constants in (5.4) improve if c becomes smaller, since they only rely on the fact that $S_R(0)$ is made small enough by the choice of c .

To this end, let us fix two such points x, y . We note that due to Remark 3.1, the same argument that we used in Step 1 also applies on the ball $B_{16|x-y|}(x) \subseteq B_R$: we find a $\frac{1}{16} \leq \theta \leq 1$, such that the jump set of m in $B_{16\theta|x-y|}(x)$ consists of a single arc. Therefore, since $x, y \in B_{16\theta|x-y|}(x)$, we can estimate

$$|x - y| \leq \text{dist}_{J_m}(x, y) \leq \text{dist}_{J_m \cap B_{16\theta|x-y|}(x)}(x, y) \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_{16\theta|x-y|}(x)} |\nabla m|.$$

We now appeal to the $\eta_R(0)$ -minimality of m in B_R (and therefore in $B_{16|x-y|}(x)$, see Remark 3.1), and invoke the density bounds of Lemma 3.6 (in its more precise form of (3.9)) on the last integral to obtain

$$|x - y| \leq \text{dist}_{J_m}(x, y) \leq (1 + \eta_R(0)) |\partial B_1| 16\theta |x - y| \lesssim |x - y|,$$

provided that $\eta_R(0)$ (due to the choice of c) is small enough. This implies the claim.

Step 3 (Iteration). We now come to the core argument. Recall $R = \exp(c\varepsilon^{-\frac{4}{3}})$ and fix $\frac{1}{16} < \theta < 1$ as in Step 2. We may assume that the jump set of m in $B_{\theta R}$ consists of a single arc; otherwise the jump set is empty and the conclusion of Theorem 1.1 holds trivially.

We now fix a universal constant $0 < \delta < 1$ (to be chosen later) and take two points $x, y \in B_{\delta R}$ in the jump set of m .

Step 3.1 (The case $|x - y| \gtrsim 1$). The main work is to be done in the case $|x - y| \geq (16)^2$ that we treat now. The condition is such that the iteration below makes sense.

We may pick a point z in J_m such that

$$\text{dist}_{J_m}(x, z) = \text{dist}_{J_m}(y, z) = \frac{1}{2} \text{dist}_{J_m}(x, y).$$

By Step 2, $\text{dist}_{J_m}(x, y)$ is comparable to $|x - y|$, so that there exists a universal constant $M > 0$ such that $B_{|x-y|}(x), B_{|x-y|}(y) \subseteq B_{M|x-y|}(z)$. We can now appeal to Proposition 2.3 on $B_{16M|x-y|}(z) \subseteq B_R$ (the inclusion is guaranteed by choosing δ sufficiently small at this point), followed by Proposition 2.2 that asserts that

$$\frac{1}{(M|x-y|)^2} \int_{B_{M|x-y|}(z)} |m - m_{\text{line}}| \lesssim (\eta_{|x-y|}(z))^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

for some configuration m_{line} with jump set being a line. To the price of a worse constant, we can pass this smallness to the balls around x and y , that is

$$\max \left\{ \frac{1}{|x-y|^2} \int_{B_{|x-y|}(x)} |m - m_{\text{line}}|, \frac{1}{|x-y|^2} \int_{B_{|x-y|}(y)} |m - m_{\text{line}}| \right\} \lesssim (\eta_{|x-y|}(z))^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (5.5)$$

We now repeatedly apply Proposition 2.2 on balls centered around $p \in \{x, y\}$ to find configurations $m_{\theta^k|x-y|, p}$ with jump sets being a line and corresponding normal $v_{\theta^k|x-y|}(p)$ such that

$$|v_{\theta^{k+1}|x-y|}(p) - v_{\theta^k|x-y|}(p)| \lesssim \begin{cases} (\eta_{\theta^{k-1}|x-y|}(p))^{\frac{1}{2}} & \text{for } k \geq 1 \\ (\eta_{|x-y|}(z))^{\frac{1}{2}} & \text{for } k = 0 \end{cases} \quad (5.6)$$

and $\theta = \frac{1}{16}$. This follows by an induction.

We start with the case $k = 0$, and observe that Proposition 2.2 yields the existence of $m_{\theta|x-y|,p}$ with associated normal $v_{\theta|x-y|}(p)$ such that

$$\frac{1}{(\theta|x-y|)^2} \int_{B_{\theta|x-y|}(p)} |m - m_{\theta|x-y|,p}| \lesssim (\eta_{|x-y|}(p))^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (5.7)$$

and (already inserting (5.5))

$$|v_{\theta|x-y|}(p) - v_{|x-y|}(p)| \lesssim \frac{1}{|x-y|^2} \int_{B_{|x-y|}(p)} |m - m_{\text{line}}| \lesssim (\eta_{|x-y|}(z))^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

which shows (5.6) for $k = 0$.

Next, we claim that there exists $v_{\theta^k|x-y|}(p)$'s with $k \geq 1$ as in (5.6) together with configurations $m_{\theta^k|x-y|,p}$ such that

$$\frac{1}{(\theta^{k+1}|x-y|)^2} \int_{B_{\theta^{k+1}|x-y|}(p)} |m - m_{\theta^{k+1}|x-y|,p}| \lesssim (\eta_{\theta^k|x-y|}(p))^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (5.8)$$

For $k = 1$, (5.8) follows Proposition 2.2 on scale $R = \theta|x-y|$ that we can apply due to (5.7). Furthermore, the proposition shows that

$$|v_{\theta^2|x-y|}(p) - v_{\theta|x-y|}(p)| \lesssim \frac{1}{(\theta|x-y|)^2} \int_{B_{\theta|x-y|}(p)} |m - m_{\theta|x-y|,p}|,$$

which by (5.7) shows that (5.8) holds for $k = 1$.

To pass from scale $\theta^k|x-y|$ to $\theta^{k+1}|x-y|$ we proceed similarly, again Proposition 2.2 can be applied on scale $R = \theta^k|x-y|$ due to the induction hypothesis (5.8). This shows that (5.8) is true for the next scale $\theta^{k+1}|x-y|$. Furthermore, we obtain together with (5.8) that

$$\begin{aligned} |v_{\theta^{k+1}|x-y|}(p) - v_{\theta^k|x-y|}(p)| &\lesssim \frac{1}{(\theta^k|x-y|)^2} \int_{B_{\theta^k|x-y|}(p)} |m - m_{\theta^k|x-y|,p}| \\ &\lesssim (\eta_{\theta^{k-1}|x-y|}(p))^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{aligned}$$

so that also (5.6) is true on the next level.

We now use (5.6) up to $k \leq N$, where $\theta^{N+1}|x-y| < 1 \leq \theta^N|x-y|$, to estimate

$$|v_{\theta^N|x-y|}(p) - v_{|x-y|}(p)| \leq \sum_{k=1}^N |v_{\theta^k|x-y|} - v_{\theta^{k-1}|x-y|}(p)| \lesssim (\eta_{|x-y|}(z))^{\frac{1}{2}} + \sum_{k=2}^N (\eta_{\theta^{k-2}|x-y|}(p))^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (5.9)$$

Since $N \sim \log|x-y|$, we have

$$\sum_{k=2}^N (\log \theta^{k-2}|x-y|)^{\frac{3}{8}} \leq \sum_{j=3}^{N+1} (\log \theta^{-j})^{\frac{3}{8}} \sim \sum_{k=3}^{N+1} k^{\frac{3}{8}} \lesssim N^{1+\frac{3}{8}} \sim (\log|x-y|)^{1+\frac{3}{8}}.$$

Hence, also in view of (5.1), (5.9) turns into

$$\begin{aligned} |v_{\theta^N|x-y|}(p) - v_{|x-y|}(p)| &\lesssim \left(\varepsilon (\log|z|_+)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\log|x-y|)^{\frac{3}{4}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left(\varepsilon (\log|p|_+)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\log|x-y|)^{2+\frac{3}{4}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\lesssim \left(\varepsilon (\log(|x|_+ + |y|_+))^{\frac{1}{2}} (\log|x-y|)^{\frac{11}{4}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

Finally, it is left to observe that since $\theta^{N+1}|x-y| \leq 1 \leq \theta^N|x-y|$ by Remark 3.8 and (3.21) therein, we have

$$\int_{B_1(p)} |v_{\theta^N|x-y|}(p) - v|^2 |\nabla m| \lesssim \eta_{\theta^{N-2}|x-y|}(x) \lesssim \eta_1(x),$$

so that in view of the density estimates (3.5) and the definition of $\bar{v}_1(p)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |v_{\theta^N|x-y|}(p) - \bar{v}_1(p)|^2 &\lesssim \int_{B_1(p)} |v_{\theta^N|x-y|}(p) - v|^2 |\nabla m| + \int_{B_1(p)} |\bar{v}_1(p) - v|^2 |\nabla m| \\ &\lesssim \int_{B_1(p)} |v_{\theta^N|x-y|}(p) - v|^2 |\nabla m| \lesssim \eta_1(x). \end{aligned}$$

Inserting the last equation in (5.10), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\bar{v}_1(p) - v_{|x-y|}(p)| &\leq |\bar{v}_1(p) - v_{\theta^N|x-y|}(p)| + |v_{\theta^N|x-y|}(p) - v_{|x-y|}(p)| \\ &\lesssim \left(\varepsilon (\log(|x|_+ + |y|_+))^{\frac{1}{2}} (\log|x-y|)^{\frac{11}{4}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

Note that by construction $v_{|x-y|}(x) = v_{|x-y|}(y)$, so that (5.11) implies the claim.

Step 3.2 (The case $|x-y| \lesssim 1$). We now handle the degenerate case that x, y are close in the sense that $|x-y| \lesssim 1$ uniformly and Step 3.1 does not apply.

Again, we may pick a point z in J_m such that

$$\text{dist}_{J_m}(x, z) = \text{dist}_{J_m}(y, z) = \frac{1}{2} \text{dist}_{J_m}(x, y).$$

Since by Step 2, $\text{dist}_{J_m}(x, y)$ is comparable to $|x-y|$, which in this step of the proof is assumed to be of order one, we have $B_1(x), B_1(y) \subseteq B_M(z)$ for some universal constant $M > 0$. Again, we can appeal to Proposition 2.3, this time on $B_{16M}(z) \subseteq B_R$ (which is again guaranteed by choosing δ sufficiently small), followed by Proposition 2.2 to conclude

$$\frac{1}{M^2} \int_{B_M(z)} |m - m_{\text{line}}| \lesssim (\eta_M(z))^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

for some configuration m_{line} with jump set being a line. In addition, Remark 3.8 yields the estimate

$$\frac{1}{M} \int_{B_M(z)} |v - v_M(z)|^2 |\nabla m| \lesssim \eta_M(z)$$

for the normal $v_M(z)$ to the jump set of m_{line} . Using $B_1(x), B_1(y) \subseteq B_M(z)$, and the minimality of $\bar{v}_1(x), \bar{v}_1(y)$, we obtain the estimate

$$\int_{B_1(x)} |v - \bar{v}_1(x)|^2 |\nabla m| + \int_{B_1(y)} |v - \bar{v}_1(y)|^2 |\nabla m| \leq \int_{B_M(z)} |v - v_M(z)|^2 |\nabla m| \lesssim M \eta_M(z).$$

Therefore, another application of the density bounds, (5.1), $M \lesssim 1$ and the fact that $|x-y| \lesssim 1$ yield

$$\begin{aligned} |\bar{v}_1(x) - \bar{v}_1(y)|^2 &\lesssim \int_{B_1(x)} |v - \bar{v}_1(x)|^2 |\nabla m| + \int_{B_1(y)} |v - \bar{v}_1(y)|^2 |\nabla m| \\ &\lesssim \eta_M(z) \lesssim \varepsilon (\log|z|_+)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\log|x-y|_+)^{\frac{3}{4}}, \end{aligned}$$

as desired. ■

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank Felix Otto and Jonas Hirsch for many helpful discussions.

A large part of the work was done while TR was affiliated with the Max Planck Institute for Mathematics in the Sciences; TR thanks the MPI for the support and warm hospitality.

REFERENCES

- [1] Robert J. Adler and Jonathan E. Taylor. *Random fields and geometry*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer, New York, 2007. MR 2319516.
- [2] Michael Aizenman, Matan Harel, and Ron Peled. Exponential decay of correlations in the 2D random field Ising model. *J. Stat. Phys.* **180** (2020), no. 1-6, 304–331. MR 4130991.
- [3] Michael Aizenman and Ron Peled. A power-law upper bound on the correlations in the 2D random field Ising model. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **372** (2019), no. 3, 865–892. MR 4034778.
- [4] Michael Aizenman and Jan Wehr. Rounding effects of quenched randomness on first-order phase transitions. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **130** (1990), no. 3, 489–528. MR 1060388.
- [5] Luigi Ambrosio, Nicola Fusco, and Diego Pallara. *Functions of bounded variation and free discontinuity problems*. Oxford Mathematical Monographs. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 2000. MR 1857292.
- [6] Luigi Ambrosio and Emanuele Paolini. Partial regularity for quasi minimizers of perimeter. *Ricerche Mat.* **48** (1999), Suppl., 167–186. MR 1765683. Errata-corrige MR 1941828.
- [7] Scott Armstrong and Tuomo Kuusi. Elliptic homogenization from qualitative to quantitative. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.06488*, 2022.
- [8] Scott Armstrong, Tuomo Kuusi, and Jean-Christophe Mourrat. *Quantitative stochastic homogenization and large-scale regularity*. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften **352**. Springer, Cham, 2019. MR 3932093.
- [9] Scott Armstrong and Charles K. Smart. Quantitative stochastic homogenization of convex integral functionals. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)* **49** (2016), no. 2, 423–481. MR 3481355.
- [10] Yoav Bar-Nir. Upper and lower bounds for the correlation length of the two-dimensional random-field Ising model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.01522*, 2022.
- [11] Vladimir I. Bogachev. *Gaussian measures*. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs **62**. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1998. MR 1642391.
- [12] Jean Bricmont and Antti Kupiainen. Phase transition in the 3d random field Ising model. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **116** (1988), no. 4, 539–572. MR 0943702.
- [13] Sourav Chatterjee. On the decay of correlations in the random field Ising model. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **362** (2018), no. 1, 253–267. MR 3833610.
- [14] Sourav Chatterjee. Central limit theorem for the free energy of the random field Ising model. *J. Stat. Phys.* **175** (2019), no. 1, 185–202. MR 3927223.
- [15] Barbara Dembin, Dor Elboim, Daniel Hadas, and Ron Peled. Minimal surfaces in random environment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.06768*, 2024.
- [16] Antonio De Rosa and Riccardo Tione. Regularity for graphs with bounded anisotropic mean curvature. *Invent. Math.* **230** (2022), no. 2, 463–507. MR 4493323.
- [17] Jian Ding, Fenglin Huang, and Aoteng Xia. A phase transition and critical phenomenon for the two-dimensional random field Ising model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.12141*, 2023.
- [18] Jian Ding and Mateo Wirth. Correlation length of the two-dimensional random field Ising model via greedy lattice animal. *Duke Math. J.* **172** (2023), no. 9, 1781–1811. MR 4608331.
- [19] Jian Ding and Jiaming Xia. Exponential decay of correlations in the two-dimensional random field Ising model at zero temperature. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.03302*, 2019.
- [20] Jian Ding and Jiaming Xia. Exponential decay of correlations in the two-dimensional random field Ising model. *Invent. Math.* **224** (2021), no. 3, 999–1045. MR 4258059.
- [21] Jian Ding and Zijie Zhuang. Long range order for random field Ising and Potts models. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **77** (2024), no. 1, 37–51. MR 4666622.
- [22] Nicolas Dirr and Enza Orlandi. Unique minimizer for a random functional with double-well potential in dimension 1 and 2. *Commun. Math. Sci.* **9** (2011), no. 2, 331–351. MR 2815675.
- [23] Nicolas Dirr and Enza Orlandi. Uniqueness of the minimizer for a random non-local functional with double-well potential in $d \leq 2$. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré C Anal. Non Linéaire* **32** (2015), no. 3, 593–622. MR 3353702.
- [24] Richard M. Dudley. The sizes of compact subsets of Hilbert space and continuity of Gaussian processes. *J. Functional Analysis* **1** (1967), 290–330. MR 0220340.
- [25] Lawrence C. Evans and Ronald F. Gariepy. *Measure theory and fine properties of functions*. Revised Edition. Textbooks in Mathematics. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 2015. MR 3409135.
- [26] Enrico Giusti. *Minimal Surfaces and Functions of Bounded Variation*. Monographs in Mathematics **80**. Birkhäuser Boston, MA, 1984. MR 0775682.
- [27] Antoine Gloria, Stefan Neukamm, and Felix Otto. A regularity theory for random elliptic operators. *Milan J. Math.* **88** (2020), no. 1, 99–170. MR 4103433.
- [28] Michaël Goldman, Matteo Novaga, and Berardo Ruffini. Reifenberg flatness for almost minimizers of the perimeter under minimal assumptions. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **150** (2022), no. 3, 1153–1165. MR 4375710.
- [29] Yoseph Imry and Shang-keng Ma. Random-field instability of the ordered state of continuous symmetry. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **35** (1975), no. 21, 1399–1401.

- [30] Michel Ledoux and Michel Talagrand. *Probability in Banach spaces*. Isoperimetry and processes. Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3) **23** Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1991. [MR 1102015](#).
- [31] Francesco Maggi. *Sets of finite perimeter and geometric variational problems*. An introduction to geometric measure theory. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics **135**. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012. [MR 2976521](#).
- [32] Frank Morgan. *Geometric measure theory*. A beginner's guide. Fifth edition. Elsevier/Academic Press, Amsterdam, 2016. [MR 3497381](#).
- [33] Michel Talagrand. *The generic chaining*. Upper and lower bounds of stochastic processes. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2005. [MR 2133757](#).
- [34] Michel Talagrand. *Upper and lower bounds for stochastic processes*. Modern methods and classical problems. Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3) **60**. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2014. [MR 3184689](#).
- [35] Ramon van Handel. Chaining, interpolation and convexity II: The contraction principle. *Ann. Probab.* **46** (2018), no. 3, 1764–1805. [MR 3785599](#).

(T. Ried) SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, ATLANTA, GA 30332-0160, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Email address: tobias.ried@gatech.edu

(C. Wagner) MAX-PLANCK-INSTITUT FÜR MATHEMATIK IN DEN NATURWISSENSCHAFTEN, INSELSTRASSE 22, 04103 LEIPZIG, GERMANY

Email address: christian.wagner@mis.mpg.de