

# AN EPIPERIMETRIC INEQUALITY FOR ODD FREQUENCIES IN THE THIN OBSTACLE PROBLEM

MATTEO CARDUCCI AND BOZHIDAR VELICHKOV

ABSTRACT. We prove an epiperimetric inequality for the thin obstacle Weiss' energy with odd frequencies and we apply it to solutions to the thin obstacle problem with general  $C^{k,\gamma}$  obstacle. In particular, we obtain the rate of convergence of the blow-up sequences at points of odd frequencies and the regularity of the strata of the corresponding contact set. We also recover the frequency gap for odd frequencies obtained by Savin and Yu.

## CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Preliminaries	7
3.	Epiperimetric inequality for $W_{2m+1}$	9
4.	Application to the epiperimetric inequality	14
5.	Rate of convergence and stratification	18
6.	Frequency gap	19
	References	21

## 1. INTRODUCTION

We consider solutions  $u : B_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  to the thin obstacle problem

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u = 0 & \text{in } B_1 \setminus \{u(x', 0) = \varphi(x')\}, \\ \Delta u \leq 0 & \text{in } B_1, \\ u(x', 0) \geq \varphi(x') & \text{on } B'_1 := B_1 \cap \{x_{n+1} = 0\}, \\ u(x', x_{n+1}) = u(x', -x_{n+1}) & \text{in } B_1, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

with obstacle  $\varphi : B'_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfying

$$\varphi \in C^{k,\gamma}(B'_1), \quad \text{with } k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2} \cup \{+\infty\} \quad \text{and } \gamma \in (0, 1). \quad (1.2)$$

This problem is equivalent to the variational problem

$$\min_{w \in H^1(B_1)} \left\{ \int_{B_1} |\nabla w|^2 dx : w \geq \varphi \text{ on } B'_1, w = g \text{ on } \partial B_1, w(x, x_{n+1}) = w(x, -x_{n+1}) \right\},$$

for a given boundary datum  $g : \partial B_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , which is even with respect to  $\{x_{n+1} = 0\}$  in the sense that  $g(x', x_{n+1}) = g(x', -x_{n+1})$  for every  $(x', x_{n+1}) \in B_1$ .

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35R35.

*Key words and phrases.* Regularity, free boundaries, thin obstacle problem, epiperimetric inequality.

The optimal regularity of the solution  $u$  was obtained in [AC04] where it was shown that  $u \in \text{Lip}(B_1) \cap C^{1, \frac{1}{2}}(B_1^+ \cup B_1')$ ,  $B_1^+$  being the open half-ball  $B_1^+ = B_1 \cap \{x_{n+1} > 0\}$ . This regularity is also optimal as there are 3/2-homogeneous global solutions to (1.1) with  $\varphi = 0$ .

In this paper we are interested in the local behavior of  $u$  around points on the hyperplane  $\{x_{n+1} = 0\}$ , which is determined by the structure of the contact set

$$\Lambda(u) := \{x' \in B_1' : u(x', 0) = 0\},$$

and its free boundary  $\Gamma(u)$  defined as the topological boundary of  $\Lambda(u)$  with respect to the relative topology of the hyperplane  $\{x_{n+1} = 0\}$ :

$$\Gamma(u) := \partial\Lambda(u) \subset \Lambda(u).$$

Since  $\varphi$  satisfies (1.2), we can proceed as in [GR19] (similar strategies were used in [GP09, CSS08, BFR18]). Given  $x_0 \in \Lambda(u)$ , let  $q_k^{(x_0)}(x')$  be the  $k$ -th Taylor polynomial of  $\varphi$  at  $x_0 \in \Gamma(u)$  and  $\tilde{q}_k^{(x_0)}(x)$  be the polynomial of degree  $k$  which is the harmonic extension of  $q_k^{(x_0)}(x')$ . Then, the function

$$v(x) = u^{(x_0)}(x) := u(x) - \varphi(x') + q_k^{(x_0)}(x') - \tilde{q}_k^{(x_0)}(x),$$

solves the following problem

$$\begin{cases} \Delta v(x) = h(x) & \text{in } B_1 \setminus \{v(x', 0) = 0\} \\ \Delta v(x) \leq h(x) & \text{in } B_1, \\ v(x', 0) \geq 0 & \text{on } B_1', \\ v(x', x_{n+1}) = v(x', -x_{n+1}) & \text{in } B_1, \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

where  $h(x) := \Delta_{x'}(\varphi(x') - q_k^{(x_0)}(x'))$ . In particular

$$|h(x)| \leq C|x - x_0|^{k+\gamma-2} \quad \text{for every } x \in B_1,$$

for some universal constant  $C > 0$ .

In this case we consider the following truncated Almgren's frequency function introduced in [GR19] (similar truncated frequency functions were used in [GP09, CSS08, BFR18])

$$\Phi^{x_0}(r, v) := (r + C_\Phi r^{1+\theta}) \frac{d}{dr} \log \max\{H^{x_0}(r, v), r^{n+2(k+\gamma-\theta)}\},$$

for  $\theta \in (0, \gamma)$ ,  $C_\Phi > 0$  large enough and

$$H^{x_0}(r, v) := \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} v^2 d\mathcal{H}^n.$$

From [GR19], we know that the function  $r \mapsto \Phi^{x_0}(r, v)$  is monotone increasing for  $r > 0$  small enough (see Proposition 2.1) and, as above, we define the frequency at a point  $x_0 \in \Lambda(u)$  as

$$\Phi^{x_0}(0^+, v) := \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \Phi^{x_0}(r, v).$$

We consider the following subsets of the contact set  $\Lambda(u)$  and its boundary  $\Gamma(u)$ :

$$\Gamma_\mu(u) := \{x_0 \in \Gamma(u) : \Phi^{x_0}(0^+, v) = n + 2\mu\} \quad \text{for every } \mu < k + \gamma,$$

and

$$\Lambda_\mu(u) := \{x_0 \in \Lambda(u) : \Phi^{x_0}(0^+, v) = n + 2\mu\} \quad \text{for every } \mu < k + \gamma.$$

Moreover, if  $x_0 \in \Lambda_\mu(u)$ , with  $\mu < k + \gamma$  and  $v = u^{(x_0)}$  is as in (1.3), then, up to a subsequence,

$$\frac{v(x_0 + r \cdot)}{\|v(x_0 + r \cdot)\|_{L^2(\partial B_1)}} \rightarrow v_0,$$

strongly in  $H^1(B_1)$ , where  $v_0$  is a  $\mu$ -homogeneous solution to (1.1) with zero obstacle, which is

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u = 0 & \text{in } B_1 \setminus \{u(x, 0) = 0\}, \\ \Delta u \leq 0 & \text{in } B_1, \\ u(x', 0) \geq 0 & \text{on } B_1', \\ u(x, x_{n+1}) = u(x, -x_{n+1}) & \text{in } B_1. \end{cases} \quad (1.4)$$

**1.1. Admissible frequencies.** We say that  $\mu$  is an *admissible frequency* in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  if there exists a non-trivial  $\mu$ -homogeneous solution to (1.4) in  $B_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ , and we indicate the set of admissible frequencies by

$$\mathcal{A}_n := \{\mu > 0 : \text{there is a } \mu\text{-homogeneous solution to (1.4) in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}\}. \quad (1.5)$$

In dimension  $n + 1 = 2$ , it is known (see for instance [PSU12]) that the set of admissible frequencies is given by

$$\mathcal{A}_1 = \{2m - 1/2 : m \geq 1\} \cup \{2m : m \geq 1\} \cup \{2m + 1 : m \geq 0\}.$$

The known results about the admissible set  $\mathcal{A}_n$  in dimension  $n > 1$  are the following:

- in [ACS08] (see also [GPS16, FS16, CSV20, Car24b, Car24a] for an approach based on epiperimetric inequalities) it was shown that

$$\mathcal{A}_n \cap ((0, 1) \cup (1, 3/2) \cup (3/2, 2)) = \emptyset;$$

- in [CSV20] it was proved via an epiperimetric inequality that, for every  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , there are constants  $c_{n,m}^\pm > 0$  such that

$$\mathcal{A}_n \cap (2m - c_{n,m}^-, 2m) \cup (2m, 2m + c_{n,m}^+) = \emptyset;$$

we refer also to [SY22b] where this result was obtained via different arguments;

- in [SY22b] it was shown that, for every  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  there are constants  $c_{n,m}^\pm > 0$  such that

$$\mathcal{A}_n \cap (2m + 1 - c_{n,m}^-, 2m + 1) \cup (2m + 1, 2m + 1 + c_{n,m}^+) = \emptyset;$$

- finally, we notice that it is currently an open question whether  $\mathcal{A}_n \setminus \mathcal{A}_1 = \emptyset$ .

**1.2. Regularity of the free boundary.** For what concerns the regularity of the free boundary  $\Gamma(u)$  and the contact set  $\Lambda(u)$  of a solution  $u$  to (1.1), with obstacle  $\varphi$  satisfying (1.2), the known results are the following. In dimension  $n + 1 = 2$ , we have that

$$\bigcup_{0 < \mu < k + \gamma} \Gamma_\mu(u) = \bigcup_{0 < \mu < k + \gamma} \{\Gamma_\mu(u) : \mu \in 2\mathbb{N} \cup (2\mathbb{N} - 1/2)\}$$

is a discrete set, while for the contact set we have

$$\bigcup_{0 < \mu < k + \gamma} \Lambda_\mu(u) \setminus \Gamma_\mu(u) = \bigcup_{0 < \mu < k + \gamma} \{\Gamma_{2m+1}(u) : m \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0}\}.$$

In higher dimension, when the obstacle  $\varphi$  is zero (or analytic), it holds

$$\Gamma(u) = \bigcup_{0 < \mu < +\infty} \Gamma_\mu(u) \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda(u) = \bigcup_{0 < \mu < +\infty} \Lambda_\mu(u).$$

In the general case, we know only

$$\Gamma(u) \supset \bigcup_{0 < \mu < k + \gamma} \Gamma_\mu(u) \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda(u) \supset \bigcup_{0 < \mu < k + \gamma} \Lambda_\mu(u).$$

Here below, we briefly recall some of the known results in the literature, for more detailed introduction to the topic we refer to the book [PSU12] and to the surveys [Fer22, DS18].

- *Points of frequency one.* The points of frequency 1 lie in the interior of the contact set, that is,  $\Lambda_1(u)$  is an open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , while  $\Gamma_1(u) = \emptyset$ .
- *Regular points.* The contact points of frequency  $3/2$ , which are called *regular points*, are contained in the free boundary  $\Gamma(u)$ , that is  $\Lambda_{3/2}(u) = \Gamma_{3/2}(u)$ . Moreover,  $\Gamma_{3/2}(u)$  is an open subset of  $\Gamma(u)$  and a  $C^{1,\alpha}$ -regular  $(n-1)$ -dimensional manifold. This result was proved in [ACS08] in the case  $\varphi \equiv 0$  and in [CSS08] in the case  $\varphi \not\equiv 0$ . See also [GPS16, FS16, GPPS17, CSV20] for proofs based on epiperimetric inequalities. Moreover, in the case of zero obstacle, in [KPS15, DS16] was proved that  $\Gamma_{3/2}(u)$  is  $C^\infty$ . In [FR21] it was shown that generically the non-regular part of the free boundary is at most  $(n-2)$ -dimensional (for  $C^\infty$  obstacle), while in [FT23] it was proved that generically the non-regular set has zero  $\mathcal{H}^{n-3-\alpha}$  measure (for zero obstacle). In particular, for  $n+1 \leq 4$ , the free boundary is generically smooth (for zero obstacle).
- *Singular points.* For every  $m \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$  with  $2m \leq k$ , the contact points of frequency  $2m$  (the so-called *singular points*) are contained in the free boundary  $\Gamma(u)$  (that is  $\Lambda_{2m}(u) = \Gamma_{2m}(u)$ ). Moreover, each of the sets  $\Gamma_{2m}(u)$  are contained in a countable union of  $(n-1)$ -dimensional  $C^1$  manifolds. This result was proved in [GP09] in the case  $\varphi \equiv 0$  and  $\varphi \in C^{k,1}$  and in [GR19] in the case  $\varphi \in C^{k,\gamma}$ . The same result with a logarithmic modulus of continuity was obtained via log-epiperimetric inequality in [CSV20] for zero obstacle and in [Car24a] in the general case  $\varphi \in C^{k,\gamma}$ . Moreover, in [FJ21] it was proved that each stratum of the singular set is locally contained in a single  $C^2$  manifold, up to a lower dimensional subset, in the case  $\varphi \equiv 0$ .
- *Points of odd frequency.* In the case  $\varphi \equiv 0$ , in [SY23] it was shown that, for every  $m \geq 0$ , the set  $\Lambda_{2m+1}(u)$  is contained in a countable union of  $(n-1)$ -dimensional manifolds of class  $C^{1,\alpha}$ . Contrary to what happens for points of frequency  $3/2$  and  $2m$ , the points of odd frequency may also lie in the interior of the contact set. In fact, it was shown in [FRS20] that for all homogeneous solutions with zero obstacle  $\Lambda(u) \equiv \{x_{n+1} = 0\}$ . It is currently not known if one can find a solution  $u$  to (1.4) for which the set  $\Gamma_{2m+1}(u)$  is not empty. We also stress that no epiperimetric inequality for odd frequencies was known until now.
- *Points of frequency  $2m - 1/2$ .* The last class of points with 2D blow-ups (that is, points at which there are blow-ups depending only on two of the  $n+1$  variables) are the points of homogeneity  $2m - 1/2$  with  $m > 1$ . In dimension  $n+1 = 3$ , Savin and Yu [SY22a] proved a regularity result for  $\Gamma_{7/2}(u)$  around points at which  $u$  admits *half-space* blow-ups; precisely, they showed that this set is the union of a locally discrete set and a set which is locally covered by a  $C^{1,\log}$  curve. A general regularity result, up to codimension 3, about the free boundary points of frequency  $2m - 1/2$  was proved by Franceschini and Serra in [FS24].
- *Rectifiability of the free boundary.* Finally, we notice that in [FS18] and [FS22] it was shown that the free boundary  $\Gamma(u)$  is an  $(n-1)$ -rectifiable set for any  $n+1 \geq 2$ . In particular, this implies that at  $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}$ -almost every point  $x_0 \in \Gamma(u)$  the blow-up is

unique (this was shown in [CSV21] in the case  $\varphi \equiv 0$ ). This results was improved in [FS24], where the authors proved that, in the case  $\varphi \equiv 0$ , the free boundary  $\Gamma(u)$  is covered by countably many  $(n-1)$ -dimensional manifolds of class  $C^{1,1}$ , up to a set of Hausdorff dimension  $n-2$ .

**1.3. Main results.** The main result of this paper is an epiperimetric inequality for the (boundary adjusted) Weiss' energy associated to the odd frequencies. Before we state our main theorem, we introduce some notations. For every  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , we define the set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_{2m+1} := \{ & p : \Delta p = 0 \text{ in } \{x_{n+1} \neq 0\}, \Delta p \leq 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}, \\ & \nabla p \cdot x = (2m+1)p, p \equiv 0 \text{ on } B'_1, p(x', x_{n+1}) = p(x', -x_{n+1}) \}, \end{aligned}$$

and we recall that, by [FRS20], the set of admissible blow-ups at any point of frequency  $2m+1$  is precisely given by  $\mathcal{P}_{2m+1}$ . We notice that every  $p \in \mathcal{P}_{2m+1}$  can be written as

$$p(x', x_{n+1}) = -|x_{n+1}|(p_0(x') + x_{n+1}^2 p_1(x', x_{n+1}))$$

for some homogeneous polynomials  $p_0$  and  $p_1$  satisfying the inequality  $p_0 \geq 0$  (which follows from the fact that  $p$  is superharmonic). We define the operator  $T$  as

$$T : \mathcal{P}_{2m+1} \rightarrow L^2(B'_1), \quad p \mapsto T[p] := p_0. \quad (1.6)$$

Finally, we recall the (boundary adjusted) Weiss' energy for frequencies  $\mu$ , defined as

$$W_\mu(u) := \int_{B_1} |\nabla u|^2 dx - \mu \int_{\partial B_1} u^2 d\mathcal{H}^n. \quad (1.7)$$

Our main result is the following epiperimetric inequality for the Weiss' energy  $W_{2m+1}$ .

**Theorem 1.1** (Epiperimetric inequality for  $W_{2m+1}$ ). *There are universal constants  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\delta > 0$  and  $\kappa > 0$  such that the following holds. Let  $c \in H^1(\partial B_1)$ , with  $c \geq 0$  on  $B'_1$  and  $c$  even with respect to  $\{x_{n+1} = 0\}$ . Let  $z(r, \theta) = r^{2m+1}c(\theta)$  be the  $(2m+1)$ -homogeneous extension in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  of  $c$ . We suppose that*

$$\|c - p\|_{L^2(\partial B_1)} \leq \varepsilon \quad \text{for some } p \in \mathcal{P}_{2m+1}, \quad (1.8)$$

and

$$c \equiv 0 \quad \text{on } \mathcal{Z}_\delta := \{T[p] \geq \delta\} \cap \partial B'_1, \quad (1.9)$$

where  $\|p\|_{L^2(\partial B_1)} = 1$  and  $T$  is the operator in (1.6). Then there is a function  $\zeta \in H^1(B_1)$  such that

$$W_{2m+1}(\zeta) \leq (1 - \kappa)W_{2m+1}(z), \quad (1.10)$$

where  $\zeta \geq 0$  on  $B'_1$ ,  $\zeta = c$  on  $\partial B_1$  and  $\zeta$  is even with respect to  $\{x_{n+1} = 0\}$ .

An epiperimetric inequality of the form (1.10) it was introduced for the first time in the setting of minimal surfaces by Reifenberg in [Rei64]. Since then, epiperimetric inequalities were proved for different free boundary problems (see e.g. [Wei99, GPS16, FS16, GPPS17, CSV18, SV19, CSV20, SV21, ESV24, Car24b, Car24a, OV24]) and were used to deduce regularity results in different contexts. We also refer to the forthcoming [CC24] for an extension of Theorem 1.1 in the case of the obstacle problem for the fractional Laplacian  $(-\Delta)^s$ , with  $s \in (0, 1)$ .

The epiperimetric inequality from Theorem 1.1, together with the ones proved in [CSV20, Car24a] for the energy  $W_{2m}$ , provide a unified approach for the study of the integer frequencies in the thin obstacle problem, even for general obstacle  $\varphi \not\equiv 0$ . We stress that, there are two major differences between (1.10) and the epiperimetric inequalities from [CSV20, Car24a].

First, contrary to the log-epiperimetric inequalities from [CSV20, Car24a], (1.10) provides a polynomial decay of the blow-up sequence. Second, in order to apply Theorem 1.1, one needs to verify that the closeness conditions (1.8) and (1.9) remain valid along blow-up sequences; in Proposition 4.1 we show that these conditions are self-propagating, that is, they can be deduced from the epiperimetric inequality itself.

We next apply the epiperimetric inequality to solutions  $u$  to (1.1), with general obstacle  $\varphi$  satisfying (1.2). First, as a consequence of Theorem 1.1, we obtain the uniqueness and non-degeneracy of the blow-up limits with rate of the convergence.

**Theorem 1.2** (Uniqueness and non-degeneracy of blow-up limit with rate of convergence). *Let  $u$  be a solution to the thin obstacle problem (1.1), with obstacle  $\varphi$  satisfying (1.2). Suppose that  $0 \in \Lambda_{2m+1}(u)$  and  $2m + 1 \leq k$ . If  $v = u^{(0)}$  is given by (1.3),  $\|v\|_{L^2(\partial B_1)} \leq 1$  and*

$$v_r(x) := \frac{v(rx)}{r^{2m+1}}, \quad (1.11)$$

then there is a non-zero  $p \in \mathcal{P}_{2m+1}$  and  $\rho > 0$  small enough such that

$$\|v_r - p\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \leq Cr^\alpha \quad \text{for every } r \in (0, \rho),$$

where  $C > 0$  and  $\alpha > 0$  are universal constants.

The proof of Theorem 1.2 follows from Theorem 1.1 and Proposition 4.1 (see Section 5). We notice that Theorem 1.2 can also be obtained by combining Theorem 1.1 with the uniqueness and the non-degeneracy results from [FRS20] for points of frequency  $2m + 1$ , which guarantee that the closeness assumptions (1.8) and (1.9) remain satisfied at every scale.

As a consequence of Theorem 1.2 we obtain that for  $2m+1 \leq k$ , the  $j$ -strata of  $\Lambda_{2m+1}(u)$  are contained in  $C^{1,\alpha}$  manifolds of dimension  $j$ , for every  $j = 1, \dots, n-1$ . In the case  $\varphi \equiv 0$ , this stratification result was already established by Savin and Yu in [SY23] via an improvement of flatness technique.

**Corollary 1.3** (Stratification and rectifiability of the contact set  $\Lambda_{2m+1}(u)$ ). *Let  $u$  be a solution to the thin obstacle problem (1.1), with obstacle  $\varphi$  satisfying (1.2). Then for every  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $2m + 1 \leq k$ , the set  $\Lambda_{2m+1}(u)$  is contained in the union of at most countably many manifolds of class  $C^{1,\alpha}$ . More precisely*

$$\Lambda_{2m+1}(u) = \bigcup_{j=1}^{n-1} \Lambda_{2m+1}^j(u)$$

where  $\Lambda_{2m+1}^j(u)$  is locally contained in a  $j$ -dimensional manifold of class  $C^{1,\alpha}$ , for every  $j = 1, \dots, n-1$ .

We also use the epiperimetric inequality in Theorem 1.1 and an epiperimetric inequality for negative energies  $W_{2m+1}$  (see Proposition 6.1) to give another proof of the frequency gap around the odd frequencies, which was first obtained in [SY22b].

**Theorem 1.4** (Frequency gap). *Let  $\mathcal{A}_n$  as in (1.5), then*

$$\mathcal{A}_n \cap ((2m + 1 - c_{n,m}^-, 2m + 1) \cup (2m + 1, 2m + 1 + c_{n,m}^+)) = \emptyset,$$

for some universal constant  $c_{n,m}^\pm > 0$ .

Even in this case, with the analogous result for even frequencies in [CSV20], we get a unified epiperimetric inequality approach for the frequency gap around integer frequencies.

**1.4. Plan of the paper.** In Section 2 we recall the truncated Almgren’s frequency function, the blow-ups and the Weiss’ energy for solutions with obstacle  $\varphi \neq 0$ .

In Section 3 we prove the epiperimetric inequality for  $W_{2m+1}$ , i.e. Theorem 1.1. The strategy is to decompose the trace using the eigenfunctions of spherical Laplacian  $\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^n}$ . We will use the eigenfunctions of the half sphere for the lower modes and the eigenfunctions which are 0 on  $\mathcal{Z}_\delta$  as in (1.9) for the higher modes, as soon as  $\delta > 0$  is small enough. This is possible by an application of the implicit function theorem (see Lemma 3.2). So we can build the competitor increasing the homogeneity of the higher modes and prove the theorem using Lemma 3.3, Lemma 3.4 and Lemma 3.5.

In Section 4 we consider solutions to (1.4) with rescalings  $(\tilde{v}_\rho)_r \in H^1(\partial B_1)$  as in (4.1). We show that we can apply the epiperimetric inequality to the traces of the rescalings  $(\tilde{v}_\rho)_r|_{\partial B_1}$ , for some  $\rho > 0$  and for every  $r \in (0, 1)$ , i.e. the conditions (1.8) and (1.9) hold. Roughly speaking, the sequence  $v_r|_{\partial B_1}$ , defined in (1.11), satisfies (1.8), (1.9), up to a multiplicative constant, by the convergence in  $C^{1,\alpha}$ . But since we do not know the uniqueness and non-degeneracy of blow-up, we need to use a more rigorous and detailed approach (see Proposition 4.1) to obtain the conditions (1.8), (1.9).

In Section 5 we prove the uniqueness of blow-up limit with rate of convergence in Theorem 1.2 and the stratification of the contact set in Corollary 1.3. We show how to use the epiperimetric inequality to get this results, which are standard once we can apply the epiperimetric inequality to every scale.

In Section 6 we prove an epiperimetric inequality for negative energies  $W_{2m+1}$  (see Proposition 6.1) and we use it together with Theorem 1.1 to prove the frequency gap in Theorem 1.4

**1.5. Notations.** Given  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ , we write  $x = (x', x_{n+1})$ , with  $x' \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $x_{n+1} \in \mathbb{R}$ . For any set  $A \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ , we will use the notation

$$A^+ := A \cap \{x_{n+1} > 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad A' := A \cap \{x_{n+1} = 0\}.$$

We will write  $m \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq j}$  if  $m$  is an integer and  $m \geq j$ . From now, by  $m$  we will denote only integers in  $\mathbb{N}_{\geq 0}$ . Finally, we say that a constant is universal if it depends only on  $n, m, \varphi$  and  $p$ .

**Acknowledgement.** The authors are supported by the European Research Council (ERC), through the European Union’s Horizon 2020 project ERC VAREG - *Variational approach to the regularity of the free boundaries* (grant agreement No. 853404); they also acknowledge the MIUR Excellence Department Project awarded to the Department of Mathematics, University of Pisa, CUP I57G22000700001. B.V. acknowledges also support from the projects PRA 2022 14 GeoDom (PRA 2022 - Università di Pisa) and MUR-PRIN “NO3” (No. 2022R537CS).

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

**2.1. Almgren’s frequency function and blow-ups.** We recall the following two propositions from [GR19].

**Proposition 2.1** (Truncated Almgren’s frequency function). *Let  $u$  be a solution to the thin obstacle problem (1.1), with obstacle  $\varphi$  satisfying (1.2). Let  $v = u^{(x_0)}$  given by (1.3) with  $x_0 \in \Lambda(u)$ . Let  $\theta \in (0, \gamma)$ , we define*

$$\Phi^{x_0}(r, v) := (r + C_\Phi r^{1+\theta}) \frac{d}{dr} \log \max\{H^{x_0}(r, v), r^{n+2(k+\gamma-\theta)}\},$$

and

$$H^{x_0}(r, v) := \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} v^2 d\mathcal{H}^n \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{I}^{x_0}(r, v) := \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} v \partial_\nu v d\mathcal{H}^n.$$

We drop the dependence on  $x_0$  if  $x_0 = 0$ .

If  $C_\Phi > 0$  is large enough, then there is  $r_0 > 0$  such that

$$r \mapsto \Phi^{x_0}(r, v) \quad \text{is non-decreasing for every } r \in (0, r_0).$$

Moreover if  $x_0 \in \Lambda_\mu(u)$ , with  $\mu < k + \gamma$ , then, for every  $\varepsilon > 0$

$$r \mapsto \frac{H^{x_0}(r, v)}{r^{n+2\mu}} \quad \text{is non-decreasing for every } r \in (0, r_0),$$

$$r \mapsto \frac{H^{x_0}(r, v)}{r^{n+2\mu+\varepsilon}} \quad \text{is non-increasing for every } r \in (0, r_\varepsilon)$$

and

$$\phi^{x_0}(r, v) = (1 + C_\Phi r^\theta) \left( n + 2r \frac{\mathcal{I}^{x_0}(r, v)}{H^{x_0}(r, v)} \right) \quad \text{for every } r \in (0, r_0).$$

In particular, the rescalings

$$\tilde{v}_{x_0, r}(x) := \frac{v(x_0 + rx)}{\|v(x_0 + r \cdot)\|_{L^2(\partial B_1)}}$$

converge in  $C^{1,\alpha}(B_1^+)$ , as  $r \rightarrow 0^+$ , up to subsequences, to some function  $v_0$  which is a solution to the thin obstacle problem (1.4) and it is  $\mu$ -homogeneous.

**Proposition 2.2.** *Let  $u$  be a solution to the thin obstacle problem (1.1), with obstacle  $\varphi$  satisfying (1.2). Let  $v = u^{(0)}$  given by (1.3). Suppose that, for some  $\rho_0 > 0$ , we have that*

$$H(2, v_r) \leq H_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \phi(2r, v) \leq \phi_0 \quad \text{for every } r \in (0, \rho_0),$$

where

$$v_r(x) := \frac{v(rx)}{r^\mu}, \quad r \in (0, \rho_0]. \quad (2.1)$$

Then

$$\|v_r\|_{C^{1, \frac{1}{2}}(B_{3/2}^+)} \leq C \quad \text{for every } r \in (0, \rho_0]$$

and for some universal constant  $C > 0$  which depends on  $H_0$  and  $\phi_0$ . The same inequality holds if we replace  $v$  with  $\tilde{v}_\rho$ , the rescalings in Proposition 2.1.

**2.2. Weiss' energy  $\widetilde{W}_\mu$ .** Let  $u$  be a solution to (1.1), with obstacle  $\varphi$  satisfying (1.2). Let  $v = u^{(0)}$  given by (1.3) with  $0 \in \Lambda_\mu(u)$ , we consider the following Weiss' energy for the problem (1.3) with right hand side

$$\widetilde{W}_\mu(v) := W_\mu(v) + \int_{B_1} v h dx,$$

where  $W_\mu$  is the Weiss' energy in (1.7). We recall the following results from [GPPS17, Car24a].

**Proposition 2.3** (Monotonicity of the Weiss' energy  $\widetilde{W}_\mu$ ). *Let  $u$  be a solution to (1.1), with obstacle  $\varphi$  satisfying (1.2). Let  $v = u^{(0)}$  given by (1.3) with  $0 \in \Lambda_\mu(u)$  and  $\mu < k + \gamma$ . Then*

$$\frac{d}{dr} \left( \widetilde{W}_\mu(v_r) + C_{\widetilde{W}} r^{k+\gamma-\mu} \right) \geq \frac{2}{r} \int_{\partial B_1} (\nabla v_r \cdot \nu - \mu v_r)^2 d\mathcal{H}^n, \quad \text{for every } r \in (0, 1)$$



for some universal constant  $C_{\widetilde{W}} = C_{\widetilde{W}}(v) > 0$ , where  $v_r$  is as in (2.1). Moreover  $C_{\widetilde{W}}(\widetilde{v}_\rho) \rightarrow 0^+$  as  $\rho \rightarrow 0^+$ , where  $\widetilde{v}_\rho$  are the rescalings in Proposition 2.1.

**Proposition 2.4.** *Let  $u$  be a solution to (1.1), with obstacle  $\varphi$  satisfying (1.2). Let  $v = u^{(0)}$  given by (1.3) with  $0 \in \Lambda_\mu(u)$  and  $\mu < k + \gamma$ . If  $c_r := v_r|_{\partial B_1} \in H^1(\partial B_1)$  the trace of  $v_r$ , with  $v_r$  as in (2.1), then*

$$\frac{d}{dr} \left( \widetilde{W}_\mu(v_r) + C_{\widetilde{W}} r^{k+\gamma-\mu} \right) \geq \frac{n+2\mu-1}{r} (W_\mu(z_r) - \widetilde{W}_\mu(v_r)) + \frac{1}{r} \int_{\partial B_1} (\nabla v_r \cdot \nu - \mu v_r)^2 d\mathcal{H}^n,$$

for  $r \in (0, 1)$ , where  $z_r$  is the  $\mu$ -homogeneous extension of  $c_r$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ .

**Proposition 2.5.** *Let  $u$  be a solution to the thin obstacle problem (1.1) with  $\varphi$  satisfying (1.2). Suppose that  $0 \in \Lambda_\mu(u)$ , with  $\mu < k + \gamma$ . Let  $v = u^{(0)}$  given by (1.3) and  $v_r$  are the rescalings in (2.1), then*

$$\int_{\partial B_1} |v_r - v_{r'}| d\mathcal{H}^n \leq C \log \left( \frac{r}{r'} \right)^{1/2} \left( \widetilde{W}_\mu(v_r) + C_{\widetilde{W}} r^{k+\gamma-\mu} \right)^{1/2}$$

for every  $0 < r' \leq r \leq 1$  and for some universal constant  $C > 0$ .

*Proof.* It is sufficient to integrate the identity from Proposition 2.3 and to apply the Hölder's inequality.  $\square$

### 3. EPIPERIMETRIC INEQUALITY FOR $W_{2m+1}$

In this section we prove the epiperimetric inequality in Theorem 1.1.

**3.1. Eigenfunctions and eigenvalues of  $\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^n}$ .** Let  $p \in \mathcal{P}_{2m+1}$  and  $T$  the operator as in (1.6). Then  $T[p] : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a non-negative  $2m$ -homogeneous polynomial. We define

$$\mathcal{Z}_\delta := \{T[p] \geq \delta\} \cap \partial B_1' \quad \text{and} \quad S_\delta := \partial B_1 \setminus \mathcal{Z}_\delta,$$

for every  $\delta \geq 0$ . We also define the set

$$H_0^1(S_\delta) := \{\phi \in H^1(\partial B_1) : \phi = 0 \text{ on } \mathcal{Z}_\delta\} \subset H^1(\partial B_1),$$

for every  $\delta \geq 0$ . If  $\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^n}$  is the Laplace Beltrami operator on  $\partial B_1$ , then there are a non-decreasing sequence

$$0 < \lambda_1^\delta \leq \lambda_2^\delta \leq \dots \leq \lambda_j^\delta \leq \dots$$

of eigenvalues (counted with multiplicity) and a sequence of eigenfunctions  $\{\phi_j^\delta\} \subset H_0^1(S_\delta)$ , which is an orthonormal basis in  $H_0^1(S_\delta)$ , such that

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^n} \phi_j^\delta = \lambda_j^\delta \phi_j^\delta & \text{in } S_\delta, \\ \phi_j^\delta = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{Z}_\delta. \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

We define the normalized eigenspace corresponding to the eigenvalue  $\lambda$ , as

$$E_\delta(\lambda) := \{\phi^\delta \in H^1(\partial B_1) : -\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^n} \phi^\delta = \lambda \phi^\delta, \phi^\delta = 0 \text{ on } \mathcal{Z}_\delta, \|\phi^\delta\|_{L^2(\partial B_1, a)} = 1\},$$

for every  $\delta \geq 0$ . Notice that  $H_0^1(S_\delta)$  is the natural Sobolev space where we can expand a trace  $c \in H^1(\partial B_1)$  with eigenfunctions of  $H_0^1(S_\delta)$ .

When  $\delta = 0$ , i.e.  $\mathcal{Z}_0 = \partial B_1'$ , we recover the spectrum on the half-sphere  $\partial B_1^+$  (extended evenly with respect to  $\{x_{n+1} = 0\}$ ). We recall that if  $\phi : \partial B_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is such that  $\phi \equiv 0$  on  $\partial B_1'$ , then  $r^\alpha \phi(\theta)$  is harmonic in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  if and only if  $\phi$  is an eigenfunction of the spherical Laplacian corresponding to the eigenvalue  $\lambda(\alpha) := \alpha(n + \alpha - 1)$ . In this case  $r^\alpha \phi(\theta)$  is a polynomial

multiplied by  $|x_{n+1}|$  and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ . This follows by extending  $\phi$  to the whole ball as an odd function with respect to  $\{x_{n+1} = 0\}$  and using a Liouville-type theorem. In particular, if  $\{\phi_j\} \subset H_0^1(S_0)$  are the eigenfunctions on the half-sphere and  $\lambda_j$  are the corresponding eigenvalues, then the following holds.

- $\lambda_1 = \lambda(1)$  and the corresponding eigenfunction is  $\phi_1$  is a multiple of  $|x_{n+1}|$ .
- $\lambda_2 = \dots = \lambda_{n+1} = \lambda(2)$  and the corresponding eigenspace  $E_0(\lambda(2))$  (of dimension  $n$ ) coincides with the space generated by the restriction to  $\partial B_1$  of two homogeneous harmonic polynomials multiples of  $|x_{n+1}|$ .
- In general, there exists an explicit function  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$\lambda_{f(j-1)+1} = \dots = \lambda_{f(j)} = \lambda(j),$$

and the corresponding eigenspace  $E_0(\lambda(j))$  is generated by the restriction to  $\partial B_1$  of  $j$ -homogeneous harmonic polynomials multiples of  $|x_{n+1}|$ .

In particular, we define

$$\ell := f(2m + 1) \tag{3.2}$$

as the number of eigenvalues with homogeneity less than or equal to  $2m + 1$ . Thus, the eigenvalues  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_\ell$  correspond to the homogeneities  $1, \dots, 2m + 1$ , while  $\lambda_{\ell+1}, \dots, \lambda_j, \dots$  correspond to homogeneities greater to  $2m + 1$ .

In the following proposition, we prove that the eigenfunctions the eigenvalues in  $H_0^1(S_\delta)$  converge to the eigenfunctions and the eigenvalues on the half sphere. This is a consequence of the convergence of the resolvent operators.

**Proposition 3.1.** *Let  $\{\phi_j^\delta\}$  be the eigenfunctions in  $H_0^1(S_\delta)$ , according with (3.1). Let  $\{\lambda_j^\delta\}$  be the eigenvalue corresponding to the eigenfunction  $\{\phi_j^\delta\}$ . Let  $\{\lambda_j\}$  be the eigenvalues corresponding to  $H_0^1(S_0)$ , according with (3.1). Then, up to subsequences,*

$$\phi_j^\delta \rightarrow \phi_j \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(\partial B_1) \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_j^\delta \rightarrow \lambda_j \quad \text{for every } j \in \mathbb{N},$$

as  $\delta \rightarrow 0^+$ , where the sequence  $\{\phi_j\}$  is an orthonormal basis of  $H_0^1(S_0)$  of eigenfunctions corresponding to the eigenvalues  $\{\lambda_j\}$ .

*Proof.* Consider a sequence  $\delta_j \rightarrow 0^+$  and functions  $f_j, f \in L^2(\partial B_1)$  such that  $f_j$  converges to  $f$  weakly in  $L^2(\partial B_1)$ . We define the functionals  $F_j, F_\infty : L^2(\partial B_1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$F_j(\psi) := \begin{cases} \int_{\partial B_1} |\nabla_\theta \psi|^2 d\mathcal{H}^n + \int_{\partial B_1} f_j \psi d\mathcal{H}^n & \text{if } \psi \in H_0^1(S_{\delta_j}), \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and

$$F_\infty(\psi) := \begin{cases} \int_{\partial B_1} |\nabla_\theta \psi|^2 d\mathcal{H}^n + \int_{\partial B_1} f \psi d\mathcal{H}^n & \text{if } \psi \in H_0^1(S_0), \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and we prove that  $F_j$   $\Gamma$ -converges to  $F$ . Indeed, the upper bound inequality follows by the inclusion  $H_0^1(S_0) \subset H_0^1(S_{\delta_j})$ . For the lower bound inequality, we observe that if  $\psi_j$  converges to  $\psi$  in  $L^2(\partial B_1)$  and  $\|\psi_j\|_{H^1(\partial B_1)} \leq C$ , then  $\psi_j$  converges to  $\psi$  in  $L^2(\partial B_1')$ . In particular, if  $\psi_j \in H_0^1(S_{\delta_j})$ , then  $\psi \in H_0^1(S_0)$ .

The  $\Gamma$ -convergence of  $F_j$  to  $F$  implies the convergence of the minimizers. In our case this reads as follows. Let  $f_j, f \in L^2(\partial B_1)$  be such that  $f_j$  converges to  $f$  weakly in  $L^2(\partial B_1)$ .

Suppose that there is  $\phi_j \in H_0^1(S_{\delta_j})$  such that

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^n} \phi_j = f_j & \text{in } S_{\delta_j}, \\ \phi_j = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{Z}_{\delta_j}. \end{cases} \quad (3.3)$$

Then there is  $\phi \in H^1(\partial B_1)$  such that  $\phi_j$  converges to  $\phi$  in  $H^1(\partial B_1)$  and

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^n} \phi = f & \text{in } S_0, \\ \phi = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{Z}_0. \end{cases} \quad (3.4)$$

Therefore, if  $R_j, R : L^2(\partial B_1) \rightarrow L^2(\partial B_1)$  are the resolvent operators to the problems (3.3) and (3.4) respectively, then

$$\|R_j(f_j) - R(f)\|_{L^2(\partial B_1)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{for every } f_j \rightharpoonup f \text{ weakly in } L^2(\partial B_1),$$

as  $j \rightarrow +\infty$ . Then

$$\|R_j(f_j) - R(f_j)\|_{L^2(\partial B_1)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{for every } \|f_j\|_{L^2(\partial B_1)} \leq 1$$

as  $j \rightarrow +\infty$ , i.e.

$$\|R_j - R\| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow +\infty,$$

where  $\|\cdot\|$  is the operator norm. Once the convergence (in the operator norm) of the resolvent operators is proved, the claim follows by standard arguments.  $\square$

**3.2. Decomposition of  $c$ .** Let  $c \in H_0^1(S_\delta)$  be close to  $p$  in  $L^2(\partial B_1)$ , i.e. suppose that (1.8) and (1.9) hold. Since the set of admissible blow-up  $\mathcal{P}_{2m+1}$  is a subset of the set of the eigenfunctions of  $H_0^1(S_0)$ , we can take  $\phi_\ell = p$ , where  $\ell$  is as in (3.2). To decompose the trace  $c$  we use the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.2.** *There is a sequence  $\delta_k \rightarrow 0^+$  such that the following holds. Suppose that  $F : \mathbb{R}^\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\ell$  is such that*

$$F(\nu) := \left( \int_{\partial B_1} p_\nu \phi_1^\delta d\mathcal{H}^n, \dots, \int_{\partial B_1} p_\nu \phi_\ell^\delta d\mathcal{H}^n \right), \quad \text{for some } \delta \in \{\delta_k\},$$

where  $\ell$  is as in (3.2),  $p_\nu$  is defined as

$$p_\nu(\theta) := \sum_{j=1}^d \nu_j \phi_j(\theta),$$

and  $\phi_j^\delta$  and  $\phi_j$  are the eigenfunctions of  $-\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^n}$  for  $H_0^1(S_\delta)$  and for the half sphere  $H_0^1(S_0)$  respectively, according with (3.1). Then, there is a neighborhood of  $e_\ell = (0, \dots, 0, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^\ell$  such that  $F$  is invertible there.

*Proof.* Let  $\{\delta_k\}$  the sequence for which Proposition 3.1 holds. By the implicit function theorem, it is sufficient to prove that  $DF$ , the Jacobian matrix of  $F$ , is invertible. In particular, it is sufficient to show that for  $\delta_k > 0$  small enough,  $DF \approx I$ , where  $I$  is the identity matrix in  $\mathbb{R}^{\ell \times \ell}$ . Using that  $\partial_{\nu_j} p_\nu = \phi_j$  and applying Proposition 3.1, we obtain that

$$\frac{\partial F_i}{\partial \nu_j} = \int_{\partial B_1} \phi_j \phi_i^\delta d\mathcal{H}^n = \delta_{i,j} + o(1)$$

as  $\delta_k \rightarrow 0^+$ . Finally, the conclusion follows by extracting a subsequence for which  $\delta_k$  is small enough.  $\square$

By Lemma 3.2, given  $\delta \in \{\delta_k\}$ , there is a constant  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that if

$$\|c - \phi_\ell\|_{L^2(\partial B_1)} \leq \varepsilon,$$

then we can find there are constants  $c_j \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\int_{\partial B_1} c(\theta) \phi_j^\delta d\mathcal{H}^n = \int_{\partial B_1} p_\nu(\theta) \phi_j^\delta d\mathcal{H}^n \quad \text{for every } j = 1, \dots, \ell,$$

where  $\nu = (c_1, \dots, c_\ell) \in \mathbb{R}^\ell$ . Thus if we expand

$$\phi(\theta) := c(\theta) - \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} c_j \phi_j(\theta) \in H_0^1(S_\delta)$$

using the orthonormal basis in  $H_0^1(S_\delta)$ , then  $\phi$  contains only higher modes. In particular, since (1.8) and (1.9) hold, we can decompose the trace  $c$  as

$$c(\theta) = P(\theta) + \phi(\theta), \quad \text{where } P(\theta) = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} c_j \phi_j \quad \text{and} \quad \phi(\theta) = \sum_{j=\ell+1}^{\infty} c_j \phi_j^\delta. \quad (3.5)$$

We choose the constant  $\delta \in \{\delta_k\}$  such that

$$\lambda_j^\delta \geq \lambda(2m+2) - 1 > \lambda(2m+3/2) \quad \text{for every } j > \ell. \quad (3.6)$$

and we choose the corresponding  $\varepsilon > 0$  so that we can expand  $c$  as above.

**3.3. Killing of lower and higher modes.** We use the following two lemmas from [CSV20] to kill the lower and the higher modes respectively.

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $\{\phi_j\} \subset H_0^1(S_\delta)$  be the normalized eigenfunctions of  $-\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^n}$  which are 0 on  $\mathcal{Z}_\delta$ , according with (3.1), for some  $\delta \geq 0$ . Let  $\psi \in H_0^1(S_\delta)$  such that*

$$\psi(\theta) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} c_j \phi_j^\delta(\theta)$$

and let  $r^\mu \psi(\theta)$  be the  $\mu$ -homogeneous extension of  $\psi$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ . Then

$$W_\mu(r^\mu \psi) = \frac{1}{n+2\mu-1} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (\lambda_j^\delta - \lambda(\mu)) c_j^2.$$

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $\{\phi_j^\delta\} \subset H_0^1(S_\delta)$  be the normalized eigenfunctions of  $-\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^n}$  which are 0 on  $\mathcal{Z}_\delta$ , according with (3.1), for some  $\delta \geq 0$ . Let  $\psi \in H_0^1(S_\delta)$  such that*

$$\psi(\theta) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} c_j \phi_j^\delta(\theta)$$

and let  $r^\mu \psi(\theta)$  be the  $\mu$ -homogeneous extension of  $\psi$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ . Then

$$W_\mu(r^\alpha \psi) - (1 - \kappa_{\alpha,\mu}) W_\mu(r^\mu \psi) = \frac{\kappa_{\alpha,\mu}}{n+2\alpha-1} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (\lambda(\alpha) - \lambda_j^\delta) c_j^2,$$

where we set

$$\kappa_{\alpha,\mu} := \frac{\alpha - \mu}{n + \alpha + \mu - 1}. \quad (3.7)$$

**3.4. Killing of double product.** Since the eigenfunctions  $\phi_j$  and  $\phi_j^\delta$  are not orthogonal in  $H^1(\partial B_1)$  and in  $L^2(\partial B_1)$ , there is a bilinear form that appears in the decomposition of the Weiss' energy. In order to deal with this double product, in the proof of the epiperimetric inequality we will need the following lemma.

Given  $v, w \in H^1(B_1)$  and  $\mu > 0$ , we will use the following notation

$$R_\mu(v, w) := \int_{B_1} \nabla v \cdot \nabla w \, dx - \mu \int_{\partial B_1} v w \, d\mathcal{H}^n. \quad (3.8)$$

**Lemma 3.5.** *Let  $\phi, \psi \in H^1(\partial B_1)$  even with respect to  $\{x_{n+1} = 0\}$ , with*

$$\phi(\theta) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} c_j \phi_j(\theta),$$

where  $\{\phi_j\} \subset H_0^1(S_0)$  are the normalized eigenfunctions of  $-\Delta_{S^n}$  which are 0 on  $\partial B_1'$ , according with (3.1). Then

$$R_\mu(r^\mu \phi(\theta), r^\alpha \psi(\theta)) = \frac{1}{n + \alpha + \mu - 1} \beta_\mu(\phi, \psi),$$

where

$$\beta_\mu(\phi, \psi) := \int_{\partial B_1} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (\lambda_j - \lambda(\mu)) c_j \phi_j(\theta) \psi(\theta) \, d\mathcal{H}^n - 2 \int_{\partial B_1'} (\partial_{\theta_{n+1}} \phi) \psi \, d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}.$$

*Proof.* By an integration by parts, we get

$$\begin{aligned} R_\mu(r^\mu \phi, r^\alpha \psi) &= 2 \left( \int_{B_1^+} \nabla(r^\mu \phi) \cdot \nabla(r^\alpha \psi) \, dx - \mu \int_{(\partial B_1)^+} \phi \psi \, d\mathcal{H}^n \right) \\ &= -2 \int_{B_1^+} \Delta(r^\mu \phi) r^\alpha \psi \, dx - 2 \int_{B_1'} \partial_{x_{n+1}}(r^\mu \phi) r^\alpha \psi \, d\mathcal{H}^n \\ &= -2 \int_{B_1^+} \Delta \left( r^\mu \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} c_j \phi_j \right) r^\alpha \psi \, dx - 2 \int_{B_1'} \partial_{x_{n+1}}(r^\mu \phi) r^\alpha \psi \, d\mathcal{H}^n. \end{aligned}$$

Using the expression of the Laplacian and the gradient in spherical coordinates, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} R_\mu(r^\mu \phi, r^\alpha \psi) &= -2 \int_{B_1^+} \left( \lambda(\mu) \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} c_j \phi_j + \Delta_{S^n} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} c_j \phi_j \right) \right) r^{\mu-2} r^\alpha \psi \, dx \\ &\quad - 2 \int_{B_1'} (\mu \theta_{n+1} \phi + \partial_{\theta_{n+1}} \phi) \psi r^{\mu-1} r^\alpha \, d\mathcal{H}^n \\ &= -\frac{1}{n + \alpha + \mu - 1} \int_{\partial B_1} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (\lambda(\mu) - \lambda_j) c_j \phi_j \psi \, d\mathcal{H}^n \\ &\quad - \frac{2}{n + \alpha + \mu - 1} \int_{\partial B_1'} (\partial_{\theta_{n+1}} \phi) \psi \, d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality we used that  $\phi_j$  are eigenfunctions corresponding to the eigenvalues  $\lambda_j$  and we integrated in  $r$ . We finally notice that the right-hand side in the last equality is precisely  $\beta_\mu(\phi, \psi)$ .  $\square$

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 1.1.

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* Let  $c \in H^1(\partial B_1)$  and  $z$  its  $(2m+1)$ -homogeneous extension. Since (1.8) and (1.9) hold, we can decompose  $c$  as in (3.5). Then

$$z(r, \theta) = r^{2m+1}P(\theta) + r^{2m+1}\phi(\theta)$$

and we define the competitor

$$\zeta(r, \theta) := r^{2m+1}P(\theta) + r^\alpha\phi(\theta),$$

where  $\alpha := 2m + 3/2$ . Notice that  $\zeta \geq 0$  on  $B'_1$  since  $P(\theta) \equiv 0$  on  $B'_1$ . So we only need prove the epiperimetric inequality in (1.10). We also set  $\mu := 2m + 1$  and  $\kappa_{\alpha, \mu}$  as in (3.7). Then, the energy can be decomposed as

$$W_\mu(r^\mu P + r^\alpha \phi) = W_\mu(r^\mu P) + W_\mu(r^\alpha \phi) + 2R_\mu(r^\mu P, r^\alpha \phi),$$

where  $R_\mu$  is defined in (3.8). Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} W_\mu(\zeta) - (1 - \kappa_{\alpha, \mu})W_\mu(z) &= W_\mu(r^\mu P + r^\alpha \phi) - (1 - \kappa_{\alpha, \mu})W_\mu(r^\mu P + r^\mu \phi) \\ &= \kappa_{\alpha, \mu}W_\mu(r^\mu P) + W_\mu(r^\alpha \phi) - (1 - \kappa_{\alpha, \mu})W_\mu(r^\mu \phi) \\ &\quad + 2R_\mu(r^\mu P, r^\alpha \phi) - 2(1 - \kappa_{\alpha, \mu})R_\mu(r^\mu P, r^\alpha \phi). \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

First, by Lemma 3.3, we observe that

$$W_\mu(r^\mu P) \leq 0. \quad (3.10)$$

Moreover, by Lemma 3.4, we have that

$$W_\mu(r^\alpha \phi) - (1 - \kappa_{\alpha, \mu})W_\mu(r^\mu \phi) = \frac{\kappa_{\alpha, \mu}}{n + 2\alpha - 1} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (\lambda(\alpha) - \lambda_j^\delta) c_j^2 \leq 0, \quad (3.11)$$

by (3.6). Finally, notice that by Lemma 3.5 and by definition of  $\kappa_{\alpha, \mu}$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} R_\mu(r^\mu P, r^\alpha \phi) - (1 - \kappa_{\alpha, \mu})R_\mu(r^\mu P, r^\alpha \phi) \\ = - \left( \frac{1}{n + \alpha + \mu - 1} - (1 - \kappa_{\alpha, \mu}) \frac{1}{n + 2\mu - 1} \right) \beta_\mu(P, \phi) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

which concludes the proof by using (3.9) with (3.10), (3.11) and (3.12).  $\square$

#### 4. APPLICATION TO THE EPIPERIMETRIC INEQUALITY

In this section we show that we can apply the epiperimetric inequality in Theorem 1.1 at every trace  $(\tilde{v}_\rho)_r|_{\partial B_1}$ , with

$$(\tilde{v}_\rho)_r := \frac{\tilde{v}_\rho(rx)}{r^{2m+1}} \quad (4.1)$$

where  $\tilde{v}_\rho$  is as in Proposition 2.1. In particular, we prove the following proposition.

**Proposition 4.1.** *Let  $u$  be a solution to the thin obstacle problem (1.1), with obstacle  $\varphi$  satisfying (1.2). Suppose that  $0 \in \Lambda_{2m+1}(u)$ ,  $2m + 1 \leq k$  and  $v = u^{(0)}$  given by (1.3). Then there is  $\rho > 0$  small enough such that the epiperimetric inequality in Theorem 1.1 can be applied to the sequence of the traces  $(\tilde{v}_\rho)_r|_{\partial B_1}$ , defined in (4.1), for every  $r \in (0, 1)$ .*

To prove Proposition 4.1, we use the following fundamental proposition.

**Proposition 4.2.** *For every  $H_0 > 0$  and  $\phi_0 > 0$  there are constants  $\eta_1 > 0$ ,  $\eta_2 > 0$ ,  $\delta_1 > 0$  and  $\rho_0 > 0$  such that the following holds. Let  $u$  be a solution to the thin obstacle problem (1.1), with obstacle  $\varphi$  satisfying (1.2). Suppose that  $0 \in \Lambda_{2m+1}(u)$ ,  $2m + 1 \leq k$  and  $v = u^{(0)}$  given by (1.3) with  $\tilde{v}_\rho$  as in Proposition 2.1. We also suppose that, for some  $p \in \mathcal{P}_{2m+1}$ , with  $\|p\|_{L^2(\partial B_1)} = 1$ , we have*

$$\|\tilde{v}_\rho - p\|_{L^2(\partial B_1)} \leq \eta_1, \quad \|\tilde{v}_\rho - p\|_{L^2(B_2)} \leq \eta_2, \quad \text{for some } \rho \in (0, \rho_0),$$

and

$$H(2, (\tilde{v}_\rho)_r) \leq H_0, \quad \phi(2r, \tilde{v}_\rho) \leq \phi_0, \quad \widetilde{W}_{2m+1}(\tilde{v}_\rho) + C_{\widetilde{W}}(\tilde{v}_\rho) \leq \delta_1 \quad \text{for every } r \in (0, 1)$$

where  $C_{\widetilde{W}}(\tilde{v}_\rho) > 0$  is as in Proposition 2.3. Then the epiperimetric inequality in Theorem 1.1 can be applied to the sequence of the traces  $(\tilde{v}_\rho)_r|_{\partial B_1}$ , defined in (4.1), for every  $r \in (0, 1)$ .

We need some preliminary lemmas.

**Lemma 4.3.** *There is a universal constant  $\sigma \in (0, 1)$  such that the following holds. Let  $u$  be a solution to the thin obstacle problem (1.1), with obstacle  $\varphi$  satisfying (1.2). Let  $v = u^{(0)}$  given by (1.3) with  $(\tilde{v}_\rho)_r$  as in (4.1). We also suppose that*

$$H(2, (\tilde{v}_\rho)_r) \leq H_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \phi(2r, \tilde{v}_\rho) \leq \phi_0 \quad \text{for some } \rho \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right), \quad \text{for every } r \in (0, 1).$$

If  $p \in \mathcal{P}_{2m+1}$ , with  $\|p\|_{L^2(\partial B_1)} = 1$ , then

$$\|(\tilde{v}_\rho)_r - p\|_{L^\infty(B_{3/2} \setminus B_{1/4})} \leq C \|(\tilde{v}_\rho)_r - p\|_{L^2(B_2 \setminus B_{1/8})}^\sigma \quad \text{for every } r \in (0, 1),$$

for some universal constant  $C > 0$  which depends on  $H_0$  and  $\phi_0$ .

*Proof.* Notice that, in general, if  $G : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a non-negative  $L$ -Lipschitz continuous function,  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  and  $M := G(x_0)$ , then

$$\int_{B_R(x_0)} G^2(x) dx \geq C \frac{M^{n+3}}{L^{n+1}},$$

where  $R = M/L$  (see e.g. [SV21, Lemma 3.2]). Thus, if for instance

$$M := \|(\tilde{v}_\rho)_r - p\|_{L^\infty(B_{3/2} \setminus B_{1/4})} = (\tilde{v}_\rho)_r(x_0) - p(x_0) \quad \text{for some } x_0 \in \overline{B_{3/2}} \setminus B_{1/4},$$

we can choose  $G := ((\tilde{v}_\rho)_r - p)_+$ . If  $L$  is the Lipschitz constant of  $((\tilde{v}_\rho)_r - p)_+$  in  $B_{3/2}$ , by Proposition 2.2,  $M$  and  $L$  are bounded by a universal constant which depends on  $H_0$  and  $\phi_0$ . Then, up to enlarge  $L > 0$ , we can take  $R = M/L > 0$  small enough. Finally, the claim follows from the previous estimate, with  $\sigma = \frac{1}{n+3}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.4.** *There are universal constants  $\eta_3 > 0$  and  $\bar{\rho} > 0$  such that the following holds. Let  $u$  be a solution to the thin obstacle problem (1.1), with obstacle  $\varphi$  satisfying (1.2). Suppose that  $0 \in \Lambda_{2m+1}(u)$ ,  $2m + 1 \leq k$  and  $v = u^{(0)}$  given by (1.3) with  $(\tilde{v}_\rho)_r$  as in (4.1). We also suppose that*

$$\|(\tilde{v}_\rho)_r - p\|_{L^\infty(B_{3/2} \setminus B_{1/4})} \leq \eta_3 \quad \text{for some } \rho \in (0, \bar{\rho}), \quad r \in (0, 1).$$

Then

$$(\tilde{v}_\rho)_{r'} \equiv 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{Z}_\delta := \{T[p] \geq \delta\} \cap \partial B'_1 \quad \text{for every } r' \in \left(\frac{1}{3}r, r\right),$$

where  $\delta > 0$  is as in Theorem 1.1 and  $T$  is the operator from (1.6).

*Proof.* The proof is similar to [FRS20, Lemma B.3]. Let  $z = (z', 0) \in B'_1 \setminus B'_{1/3}$  be such that

$$T[p](z') \geq \frac{\delta}{3^{2m}}.$$

Consider the function

$$\phi_C(x) := -(n+1)|x_{n+1}|^2 + |x'|^2 + C,$$

for every  $C > 0$ . Then, we have that

$$\tilde{v}_\rho(rx + rz) \leq \phi_C(x) \quad \text{for every } x \in \partial B_{r_1},$$

for some  $r_1 > 0$  and  $\eta_3 > 0$  small enough, by the hypothesis assumption. Next, suppose that there is  $C_* > 0$  such that the function  $\phi_{C_*}$  touches  $\tilde{v}_\rho(r \cdot + rz)$  from above. Notice that the contact point  $x_0$  cannot lie in  $B_{r_1} \setminus \{x' : \tilde{v}_\rho(rx' + rz', 0) = 0\}$ , since the right hand side of  $\tilde{v}_\rho(r \cdot + rz)$  is small (for  $\bar{\rho}$  small enough), while  $\Delta \phi_{C_*} = -2$ . On the other hand, if  $\phi_{C_*}$  touches  $\tilde{v}_\rho(rx' + rz', 0)$  in  $x_0 \in \{x' : \tilde{v}_\rho(rx' + rz', 0) = 0\}$ , then  $\phi_{C_*} > 0$ , which is a contradiction. Thus,  $\phi_{C_*}$  cannot touch  $\tilde{v}_\rho(r \cdot + rz)$  from above when  $C_* > 0$  and so, we get

$$\tilde{v}_\rho(rx + rz) \leq \phi_0(x) \quad \text{for every } x \in B_{r_1}.$$

Since  $\phi_0(0) = 0$ , this implies that  $\tilde{v}_\rho(rz) = 0$ .

Now, given  $x \in \mathcal{Z}_\delta$  and  $r' \in (\frac{1}{3}r, r)$ , we take  $z = (z', 0) = \frac{r'}{r}x \in B'_1 \setminus B'_{1/3}$ , then

$$T[p](z') = \left(\frac{r'}{r}\right)^{2m} T[p](x') \geq \frac{\delta}{3^{2m}}.$$

Therefore  $\tilde{v}_\rho(r'x) = \tilde{v}_\rho(rz) = 0$ , which concludes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.5.** *For every  $\beta > 0$  there are constants  $\delta_1 > 0$  and  $\delta_2 > 0$  such that the following holds. Let  $u$  be a solution to the thin obstacle problem (1.1), with obstacle  $\varphi$  satisfying (1.2). Suppose that  $0 \in \Lambda_{2m+1}(u)$  with  $2m+1 \leq k$  and  $v = u^{(0)}$  given by (1.3) with  $(\tilde{v}_\rho)_r$  as in (4.1). We also suppose that*

$$\widetilde{W}_{2m+1}(\tilde{v}_\rho) + C_{\widetilde{W}}(\tilde{v}_\rho) \leq \delta_1, \quad \|(\tilde{v}_\rho)_r - p\|_{L^2(\partial B_1)} \leq \delta_2 \quad \text{for some } \rho \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right), \quad r \in (0, 1).$$

where  $C_{\widetilde{W}}(\tilde{v}_\rho) > 0$  is as in Proposition 2.3. Then

$$\|(\tilde{v}_\rho)_{r'} - p\|_{L^2(\partial B_1)} \leq \beta \quad \text{for every } r' \in \left(\frac{1}{8}r, r\right).$$

*Proof.* First notice that by Proposition 2.5, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\tilde{v}_\rho)_r - (\tilde{v}_\rho)_{r'}\|_{L^2(\partial B_1)} &\leq C \log\left(\frac{r}{r'}\right)^{1/2} \left(\widetilde{W}_{2m+1}((\tilde{v}_\rho)_r) + C_{\widetilde{W}}(\tilde{v}_\rho)r^{k+\gamma-2m-1}\right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq C \log(8)^{1/2} \left(\widetilde{W}_{2m+1}(\tilde{v}_\rho) + C_{\widetilde{W}}(\tilde{v}_\rho)\right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq C \log(8)^{1/2} \delta_1^{1/2} \quad \text{for every } r' \in \left(\frac{1}{8}r, r\right). \end{aligned}$$

where in the second last inequality we used Proposition 2.3. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\tilde{v}_\rho)_{r'} - p\|_{L^2(\partial B_1)} &\leq \|(\tilde{v}_\rho)_r - (\tilde{v}_\rho)_{r'}\|_{L^2(\partial B_1)} + \|(\tilde{v}_\rho)_r - p\|_{L^2(\partial B_1)} \\ &\leq C \log(8)^{1/2} \delta_1^{1/2} + \delta_2 \leq \beta \end{aligned}$$

if we choose  $\delta_1 > 0$ ,  $\delta_2 > 0$  and  $\bar{\rho} > 0$  small enough.  $\square$



Now we are ready to prove Proposition 4.2.

*Proof of Proposition 4.2.* Let  $\rho \in (0, \rho_0)$  as in the hypothesis, with  $\rho_0 > 0$  to be chosen and such that we can apply Lemma 4.4. First notice that by Lemma 4.3 and Lemma 4.4, we can find a universal constant  $\eta_2 > 0$ , which depends on  $H_0$  and  $\phi_0$ , such that if

$$\|(\tilde{v}_\rho)_r - p\|_{L^2(B_2 \setminus B_{1/8})} \leq \eta_2 \quad \text{for some } r \in (0, 1),$$

then

$$(\tilde{v}_\rho)_{r'} \equiv 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{Z}_\delta \quad \text{for every } r' \in \left(\frac{1}{3}r, r\right),$$

Let  $\beta \in (0, \varepsilon)$  to be chosen and take the corresponding  $\delta_1, \delta_2$  as in Lemma 4.5. We can suppose that  $\eta_1 \in (0, \delta_2)$  to be chosen. Thus, using Lemma 4.5, if

$$\|(\tilde{v}_\rho)_r - p\|_{L^2(\partial B_1)} \leq \delta_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|(\tilde{v}_\rho)_r - p\|_{L^2(B_2 \setminus B_{1/8})} \leq \eta_2 \quad \text{for some } r \in (0, 1), \quad (4.2)$$

then the hypothesis of Theorem 1.1 are satisfied for the traces  $(\tilde{v}_\rho)_{r'}|_{\partial B_1}$  for every  $r' \in (\frac{1}{3}r, r)$  and we can apply Theorem 1.1 to the traces  $(\tilde{v}_\rho)_{r'}|_{\partial B_1}$ .

We define  $r_0 \in [0, 1]$  as the smallest number such that we can apply the epiperimetric inequality in Theorem 1.1 to the traces  $(\tilde{v}_\rho)_r|_{\partial B_1}$  for  $r \in (r_0, 1]$ . In particular, since (4.2) is satisfied for  $r = 1$ , then we can apply the epiperimetric inequality for  $r \in (\frac{1}{3}, 1]$ , i.e.  $r_0 \leq \frac{1}{3}$ . We suppose by contradiction that  $r_0 > 0$ .

Using the Weiss' formula in Proposition 2.4 together with the epiperimetric inequality in Theorem 1.1 and integrating in  $r$  (see e.g. [Car24a]), we can see that

$$\widetilde{W}_{2m+1}((\tilde{v}_\rho)_r) \leq C(\rho)r^\alpha, \quad \text{for every } r \in (r_0, 1),$$

for some constants  $C(\rho) > 0$  and  $\alpha > 0$ , with  $C(\rho) \rightarrow 0^+$  as  $\rho \rightarrow 0^+$  (we used  $\widetilde{W}_{2m+1}(\tilde{v}_\rho) \rightarrow 0$  and  $C_{\widetilde{W}}(\tilde{v}_\rho) \rightarrow 0^+$  as  $\rho \rightarrow 0^+$ ). Now, using Proposition 2.5 and a dyadic argument, we obtain that

$$\int_{\partial B_1} |(\tilde{v}_\rho) - (\tilde{v}_\rho)_r| d\mathcal{H}^n \leq C(\rho) \quad \text{for every } r \in (r_0, 1),$$

up to multiplying  $\alpha$  and  $C(\rho)$  by a universal constant. Therefore, we get that, up to multiplying  $\alpha$  by a universal constant, for every  $r \in (r_0, 1)$

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\tilde{v}_\rho)_r - p\|_{L^2(\partial B_1)} &\leq \|(\tilde{v}_\rho) - (\tilde{v}_\rho)_r\|_{L^2(\partial B_1)} + \|(\tilde{v}_\rho) - p\|_{L^2(\partial B_1)} \\ &\leq C(\rho) + \eta_1 \leq \frac{\delta_2}{2} + \eta_1 \leq \delta_2, \end{aligned}$$

if we choose  $\rho_0 > 0$  and  $\eta_1 > 0$  small enough. Then, by Lemma 4.5, we have that

$$\|(\tilde{v}_\rho)_r - p\|_{L^2(\partial B_1)} \leq \beta \leq \varepsilon \quad \text{for every } r \in \left(\frac{1}{8}r_0, 1\right). \quad (4.3)$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(\tilde{v}_\rho)_r - p\|_{L^2(B_2 \setminus B_{1/8})} &= \left( \int_{1/8}^2 \|(\tilde{v}_\rho)_r - p\|_{L^2(\partial B_t)}^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= \left( \int_{1/8}^2 t^{n+2m+1} \|(\tilde{v}_\rho)_{rt} - p\|_{L^2(\partial B_1)}^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq \left( \int_{1/8}^2 t^{n+2m+1} \beta^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= C\beta \leq \eta_2 \quad \text{for every } r \in \left( r_0, \frac{1}{2} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

if  $\beta > 0$  is small enough, where we used (4.3). Then, (4.2) is satisfied for every  $\rho \in (r_0, \frac{1}{2})$  and thus we can apply the epiperimetric inequality in Theorem 1.1 in the interval  $(\frac{1}{3}r_0, 1]$ , which is a contradiction with the definition of  $r_0$ .  $\square$

Finally we can use Proposition 4.2 to prove Proposition 4.1.

*Proof of Proposition 4.1.* Let  $H_0 := 2^{n+2(2m+1)+1}$  and  $\phi_0 := n + 2(2m + 1) + 1$ , we take the corresponding  $\eta_1 > 0$ ,  $\eta_2 > 0$ ,  $\delta_1 > 0$  and  $\rho_0 > 0$  as in Proposition 4.2. By Proposition 2.1, for every  $\rho \in (0, \rho_1)$  and for every  $r \in (0, 1)$ , with  $\rho_1 < \rho_0$  small enough to be chosen, we have

$$H(2, (\tilde{v}_\rho)_r) = \frac{H(2r, \tilde{v}_\rho)}{r^{n+2(2m+1)}} = \frac{1}{r^{n+2(2m+1)}} \frac{H(2r\rho, v)}{H(\rho, v)} \leq H_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \phi(2r, \tilde{v}_\rho) = \phi(2\rho r, v) \leq \phi_0,$$

Moreover, by Proposition 2.1 and Proposition 2.3 we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{W}_{2m+1}(\tilde{v}_\rho) + C_{\widetilde{W}}(\tilde{v}_\rho) &= \left( \rho \frac{\mathcal{I}(\rho, v)}{H(\rho, v)} - (2m + 1) \right) + C_{\widetilde{W}}(\tilde{v}_\rho) \\
&\leq \left( \frac{1}{2}(\phi(\rho_1, v) - n) - (2m + 1) \right) + \frac{\delta_1}{2} \\
&\leq \delta_1,
\end{aligned}$$

for every  $\rho \in (0, \rho_1)$ , if  $\rho_1 > 0$  is small enough. Moreover we also have

$$\|\tilde{v}_\rho - p\|_{L^2(\partial B_1)} \leq \eta_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\tilde{v}_\rho - p\|_{L^2(B_2)} \leq \eta_2 \quad \text{for some } \rho \in (0, \rho_1)$$

for some  $p \in \mathcal{P}_{2m+1}$ , with  $\|p\|_{L^2(\partial B_1)} = 1$ , since  $\tilde{v}_\rho$  converge, up to subsequences, to some  $(2m+1)$ -homogeneous global solution (see Proposition 2.1). Then the hypothesis of Proposition 4.2 are satisfied and we conclude.  $\square$

## 5. RATE OF CONVERGENCE AND STRATIFICATION

In this section we prove that the epiperimetric inequality in Theorem 1.1 implies the rate of convergence in Theorem 1.2 and the stratification of the contact set in Corollary 1.3. Once we know that we can apply the epiperimetric inequality in Theorem 1.1, the proofs are standard (see e.g. [GPS16, FS16, GPPS17, CSV20, Car24a]). We briefly sketch the proofs here.

*Proof of Theorem 1.2.* By Proposition 4.1, as in the proof of Proposition 4.2, if  $0 \in \Lambda_{2m+1}(u)$  with  $2m + 1 \leq k$ , we deduce that

$$\widetilde{W}_{2m+1}((\tilde{v}_\rho)_r) \leq Cr^\alpha \quad \text{for every } r \in (0, 1),$$

for some  $\rho > 0$ , where  $(\tilde{v}_\rho)_r$  is as in (4.1). Since

$$\widetilde{W}_{2m+1}(v_{r\rho}) = \frac{H(\rho, v)}{\rho^{n+2(2m+1)}} \widetilde{W}_{2m+1}((\tilde{v}_\rho)_r),$$

then the same decay can be deduced for the sequence  $v_r$  for every  $r \in (0, \rho)$ . This implies that, up to multiplying  $\alpha$  by a universal constant,

$$\int_{\partial B_1} |v_r - p| d\mathcal{H}^n \leq Cr^\alpha \quad \text{for every } r \in (0, \rho),$$

where  $p$  is the blow-up limit of  $v$ , as in the proof of Proposition 4.2.

Up to multiplying  $\alpha$  by a universal constant, the same rate of convergence can be obtained in  $L^2(\partial B_1)$  and (after an integration) in  $L^2(B_1)$ . This implies the rate of convergence in  $L^\infty(B_1)$ , as in the proof of Lemma 4.3.  $\square$

*Proof of Corollary 1.3.* As in the proof of Theorem 1.2, we have that if  $K \subset \Lambda_{2m+1}(u) \cap \mathbb{R}^n$  is a compact set and  $2m+1 \leq k$ , then, up to multiplying  $\alpha$  and  $C(\rho)$  by a universal constant,

$$\int_{\partial B_1} |v_{x_0, r} - p_{x_0}| d\mathcal{H}^n \leq Cr^\alpha \quad \text{for every } x_0 \in \Lambda_{2m+1}(u) \cap K, r \in (0, \rho),$$

where  $\rho > 0$ ,  $v_{x_0, r} = \frac{v(x_0+rx)}{r^{2m+1}}$  and  $p_{x_0}$  is the blow-up limit of  $v$  at  $x_0$ . Once the rate of convergence was proved, the stratification can be deduced by a standard arguments which follow by the implicit function theorem and the Whitney extension theorem (see e.g. [GP09, CSV20]).  $\square$

## 6. FREQUENCY GAP

This section is dedicated to the proof of Theorem 1.4. The key points of the proof are Theorem 1.1 and the following epi-perimetric inequality for negative energies.

**Proposition 6.1** (Epi-perimetric inequality for negative energies  $W_{2m+1}$ ). *There are universal constants  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\delta > 0$ ,  $\kappa > 0$  and  $\eta > 0$  such that the following holds. Let  $c \in H^1(\partial B_1)$ , with  $c \geq 0$  on  $B'_1$  and  $c$  even with respect to  $\{x_{n+1} = 0\}$ . Let  $z(r, \theta) = r^{2m+1}c(\theta)$  be the  $(2m+1)$ -homogeneous extension in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  of  $c$ . We suppose that*

$$\|c - p\|_{L^2(\partial B_1)} \leq \varepsilon \quad \text{for some } p \in \mathcal{P}_{2m+1}, \quad (6.1)$$

and

$$c \equiv 0 \quad \text{on } \mathcal{Z}_\delta := \{T[p] \geq \delta\} \cap \partial B'_1, \quad (6.2)$$

with  $\|p\|_{L^2(\partial B_1)} = 1$  and  $T$  is the operator in (1.6). If

$$|W_{2m+1}(z)| \leq \eta, \quad (6.3)$$

then there is a function  $\zeta \in H^1(B_1)$  such that

$$W_{2m+1}(\zeta) \leq (1 + |W_{2m+1}(z)|)W_{2m+1}(z),$$

where  $\zeta \geq 0$  on  $B'_1$ ,  $\zeta = c$  on  $\partial B_1$  and  $\zeta$  is even with respect to  $\{x_{n+1} = 0\}$ .

*Proof.* The proof is similar to the one in Theorem 1.1. We first observe that we can suppose  $W(z) < 0$ , since otherwise one can simply choose  $\zeta = z$ . As in Lemma 3.2, using (6.1), (6.2) and Proposition 3.1, we can decompose  $c$  as

$$c(\theta) = h(\theta) + \phi(\theta),$$

where

$$h(\theta) = c_\ell \phi_\ell \quad \text{and} \quad \phi(\theta) = \sum_{j \neq \ell} c_j \phi_j^\delta,$$

where  $\ell$  is defined as in (3.2). We set  $\mu := 2m + 1$  and we define the competitor

$$\zeta(r, \theta) = r^\mu h(\theta) + r^\alpha \phi(\theta),$$

where  $\alpha \in (2m, 2m + 1)$  is such that

$$|W_\mu(z)| = \kappa_{\mu, \alpha},$$

where  $\kappa_{\mu, \alpha}$  is given by (3.7). Notice that the lower bound for  $\alpha$  follows by (6.3), if we choose a universal  $\eta > 0$  small enough. Moreover notice that  $\zeta = r^\alpha \phi = r^\alpha c \geq 0$  on  $B'_1$ .

Defining the operator  $R$  as in (3.8) and using that  $W_\mu(r^\mu h) = 0$ , we get

$$R_\mu(r^\mu h, r^\mu \phi) = R_\mu(r^\mu h, r^\mu c) = - \int_{B_1} \Delta(r^\mu h) r^\mu c \, dx = -2 \int_{B'_1} \partial_{x_{n+1}}(r^\mu h) r^\mu c \, d\mathcal{H}^n \geq 0,$$

since  $r^\mu h$  is a solution to (1.4) and  $c \geq 0$  on  $B'_1$ . Then

$$0 > W(z) = W_{2m+1}(r^\mu \phi) + R_\mu(r^\mu h, r^\mu \phi) \geq W_{2m+1}(r^\mu \phi). \quad (6.4)$$

Using again that  $r^\mu h$  has zero Weiss' energy, we obtain

$$W_\mu(r^\mu h + r^\alpha \phi) = W_\mu(r^\alpha \phi) + 2R_\mu(r^\mu h, r^\alpha \phi).$$

Then, by Lemma 3.4 and Lemma 3.5, there is a universal constant  $C > 0$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} W_\mu(\zeta) - (1 + \kappa_{\mu, \alpha})W_\mu(z) &= W_\mu(r^\alpha \phi) - (1 + \kappa_{\mu, \alpha})W_\mu(r^\mu \phi) \\ &= \frac{-\kappa_{\mu, \alpha}}{n + 2\alpha - 1} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (\lambda(\alpha) - \lambda_j^\delta) c_j^2 \\ &= \frac{\kappa_{\mu, \alpha}}{n + 2\alpha - 1} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (\lambda_j^\delta - \lambda(\mu)) c_j^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (\lambda(\mu) - \lambda(\alpha)) c_j^2 \right) \\ &= \frac{n + 2\mu - 1}{n + 2\alpha - 1} \kappa_{\mu, \alpha} W_{2m+1}(r^\mu \phi) + C \kappa_{\mu, \alpha}^2 \|\phi\|_{L^2(\partial B_1)}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality we used Lemma 3.3. By (6.1) and (6.4), we get that

$$\begin{aligned} W_\mu(\zeta) - (1 + \kappa_{\mu, \alpha})W_\mu(z) &\leq \kappa_{\mu, \alpha} W_{2m+1}(r^\mu \phi) + C \kappa_{\mu, \alpha}^2 \varepsilon \\ &\leq \kappa_{\mu, \alpha} W_{2m+1}(z) + C \kappa_{\mu, \alpha}^2 \varepsilon \\ &= -|W(z)|^2 + C|W(z)|^2 \varepsilon \\ &= |W(z)|^2 (-1 + C\varepsilon) \\ &\leq 0 \end{aligned}$$

since  $\varepsilon > 0$  is small enough. □

To show the frequency gap, we will use the following lemma from [CSV20] with the epiperimetric inequalities in Theorem 1.1 and Proposition 6.1.

**Lemma 6.2.** *Let  $c \in H^1(\partial B_1)$  such that  $r^{\mu+t}c$  is a solution to the thin obstacle problem (1.4), then*

$$W_\mu(r^{\mu+t}c) = t\|c\|_{L^2(\partial B_1)}^2 \quad \text{and} \quad W_\mu(r^\mu c) = \left(1 + \frac{t}{n+2\mu-1}\right) W_\mu(r^{\mu+t}c).$$

*Proof of Theorem 1.4.* By contradiction, suppose that there are functions  $u_k$  and a sequence  $t_k \rightarrow 0$ , such that  $u_k$  is global  $(2m+1+t_k)$ -homogeneous solution to the thin obstacle problem (1.4). Without loss of generality we can suppose that the traces  $c_k := u_k|_{\partial B_1}$  are such that  $\|c_k\|_{L^2(\partial B_1)} = 1$ . Notice that as in Proposition 2.2, we have that  $u_k$  converges in  $C^{1,\alpha}(B_1^+)$ , up to subsequences, to some function  $p$  which is a  $(2m+1)$ -homogeneous solution. In particular,  $p \in \mathcal{P}_{2m+1}$  and  $\|p\|_{L^2(\partial B_1)} = 1$ . This means that

$$\|u_k - p\|_{L^\infty(B_{3/2})} \leq \eta_3 \quad \text{for every } k > k_0,$$

for some  $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ , where  $\eta_3 > 0$  is defined in Lemma 4.4. Therefore

$$u_k \equiv 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{Z}_\delta \quad \text{for every } k > k_0,$$

by Lemma 4.4. Moreover we can suppose that

$$|W_{2m+1}(u_k)| \leq \eta \quad \text{for every } k > k_0,$$

which follows by Lemma 6.2 with  $\eta > 0$  as in (6.3). Then the function  $u_k$  satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 1.1 and Proposition 6.1.

Passing to a subsequence, we can suppose that either  $t_k > 0$  for every  $k > k_0$  or  $t_k < 0$  for every  $k > k_0$ . In the first case we use Theorem 1.1, while in the second case we use Proposition 6.1. For simplicity, we suppose that  $t_k < 0$  for every  $k > k_0$ , the other case being analogous. By Lemma 6.2

$$W_{2m+1}(r^{2m+1+t_k}c_k) = t_k\|c_k\|_{L^2(\partial B_1)}^2 = t_k < 0 \tag{6.5}$$

and

$$W_{2m+1}(r^{2m+1}c) = (1 + C_m t_k) t_k, \quad \text{where } C_m = \frac{1}{n+2(2m+1)-1}.$$

Then, by the epiperimetric inequality in Proposition 6.1, we have that for every  $k > k_0$

$$\begin{aligned} W_{2m+1}(r^{2m+1+t_k}c_k) &\leq (1 + |(1 + C_m t_k)t_k|) W_{2m+1}(r^{2m+1}c_k) \\ &= (1 - (1 + C_m t_k)t_k) (1 + C_m t_k) W_{2m+1}(r^{2m+1+t_k}c_k), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality we used Lemma 6.2. Then by (6.5)

$$(1 - (1 + C_m t_k)t_k) (1 + C_m t_k) \leq 1 \quad \text{for every } k > k_0,$$

which implies that

$$-t_k + C_m t_k + O(t_k^2) \leq 0 \quad \text{for every } k > k_0,$$

which is a contradiction by the definition of  $C_m$  and the fact that  $t_k \rightarrow 0^+$ ,  $t_k < 0$ .  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [AC04] I. Athanasopoulos and L. Caffarelli. Optimal regularity of lower dimensional obstacle problems. *Zap. Nauchn. Sem. S.-Peterburg. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov.* 310, 310:49–66, 2004.
- [ACS08] I. Athanasopoulos, L. Caffarelli, and S. Salsa. The structure of the free boundary for lower dimensional obstacle problems. *Amer. J. Math.* 130(2):485–498, 2008.
- [BFR18] B. Barrios, A. Figalli, and X. Ros-Oton. Global regularity for the free boundary in the obstacle problem for the fractional Laplacian. *Amer. J. Math.* 140, 2018.

- [Car24a] M. Carducci. Epiperimetric inequalities in the obstacle problem for the fractional Laplacian. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 63(6):Paper No. 150, 41, 2024.
- [Car24b] M. Carducci. Optimal regularity of the thin obstacle problem by an epiperimetric inequality. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4)*, 203(3):1311–1326, 2024.
- [CC24] M. Carducci and R. Colombo. Generic regularity of free boundaries in the obstacle problem for the fractional Laplacian. *In preparation*, 2024.
- [CSS08] L. Caffarelli, S. Salsa, and L. Silvestre. Regularity estimates for the solution and the free boundary to the obstacle problem for the fractional Laplacian. *Invent. Math.*, 171(2):425–46, 2008.
- [CSV18] M. Colombo, L. Spolaor, and B. Velichkov. A logarithmic epiperimetric inequality for the obstacle problem. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 28:1029–1061, 2018.
- [CSV20] M. Colombo, L. Spolaor, and B. Velichkov. Direct epiperimetric inequalities for the thin obstacle problem and applications. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 73(2):384–420, 2020.
- [CSV21] M. Colombo, L. Spolaor, and B. Velichkov. Almost everywhere uniqueness of blow-up limits for the lower dimensional obstacle problem. *Interfaces Free Bound.*, 23(2):159–167, 2021.
- [DS16] D. De Silva and O. Savin. Boundary Harnack estimates in slit domains and applications to thin free boundary problems. *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.*, 32(3):891–912, 2016.
- [DS18] D. Danielli and S. Salsa. Obstacle problems involving the fractional Laplacian. *Recent Developments in Nonlocal Theory*, 2018.
- [ESV24] N. Edelen, L. Spolaor, and B. Velichkov. The symmetric (log-)epiperimetric inequality and a decay-growth estimate. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 63(1):Paper No. 2, 29, 2024.
- [Fer22] X. Fernández-Real. The thin obstacle problem: a survey. *Publicacions Matemàtiques*, 66(1):3– 55, 2022.
- [FJ21] X. Fernández-Real and Y. Jhaveri. On the singular set in the thin obstacle problem: higher-order blow-ups and the very thin obstacle problem. *Anal. PDE*, 14(5):1599–1669, 2021.
- [FR21] X. Fernández-Real and X. Ros-Oton. Free boundary regularity for almost every solution to the Signorini problem. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 240(1):419–466, 2021.
- [FRS20] A. Figalli, X. Ros-Oton, and J. Serra. Generic regularity of free boundaries for the obstacle problem. *Publ.math.IHES*, 132:181–292, 2020.
- [FS16] M. Focardi and E. Spadaro. An epiperimetric inequality for the thin obstacle problem. *Adv. Differential Equations*, 21(1/2):153–200, 2016.
- [FS18] M. Focardi and E. Spadaro. On the measure and the structure of the free boundary of the lower dimensional obstacle problem. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 230:125–184, 2018.
- [FS22] M. Focardi and E. Spadaro. The local structure of the free boundary in the fractional obstacle problem. *Advances in Calculus of Variations*, 15(3):323–349, 2022.
- [FS24] F. Franceschini and J. Serra. Free boundary partial regularity in the thin obstacle problem. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 77(1):630–669, 2024.
- [FT23] X. Fernández-Real and C. Torres-Latorre. Generic regularity of free boundaries for the thin obstacle problem. *Adv. Math.*, 433:Paper No. 109323, 29, 2023.
- [GP09] N. Garofalo and A. Petrosyan. Some new monotonicity formulas and the singular set in the lower dimensional obstacle problem. *Invent. Math.*, 177:415–461, 2009.
- [GPPS17] N. Garofalo, A. Petrosyan, C. Pop, and M. Smit Vega Garcia. Regularity of the free boundary for the obstacle problem for the fractional Laplacian with drift. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire* 34, 34(3):533–570, 2017.
- [GPS16] N. Garofalo, A. Petrosyan, and M. Smit Vega Garcia. An epiperimetric inequality approach to the regularity of the free boundary in the signorini problem with variable coefficients. *J. Math. Pures Appl. 105*, 105(6):745–787, 2016.
- [GR19] N. Garofalo and X. Ros-Oton. Structure and regularity of the singular set in the obstacle problem for the fractional Laplacian. *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.*, 35(5):1309–1365, 2019.
- [KPS15] H. Koch, A. Petrosyan, and W. Shi. Higher regularity of the free boundary in the elliptic Signorini problem. *Nonlinear Analysis*, 126:3–44, 2015.
- [OV24] R. Ognibene and B. Velichkov. Boundary regularity of the free interface in spectral optimal partition problems. *arXiv:2404.05698*, 2024.
- [PSU12] A. Petrosyan, H. Shahgholian, and N. Uraltseva. Regularity of free boundaries in obstacle-type problems. *volume 136 of Graduate Studies in Mathematics. American Mathematical Society*, 2012.

- [Rei64] E.R. Reifenberg. An epiperimetric inequality related to the analyticity of minimal surfaces. *Ann. of Math.*, 80(1):1–14, 1964.
- [SV19] L. Spolaor and B. Velichkov. An epiperimetric inequality for the regularity of some free boundary problems: the 2-dimensional case. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 72(2):375–421, 2019.
- [SV21] L. Spolaor and B. Velichkov. On the logarithmic epiperimetric inequality for the obstacle problem. *Mathematics in Engineering*, 3(1):1–42, 2021.
- [SY22a] O. Savin and H. Yu. Half-space solutions with  $7/2$  frequency in the thin obstacle problem. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 246(2-3):397–474, 2022.
- [SY22b] O. Savin and H. Yu. On the fine regularity of the singular set in the nonlinear obstacle problem. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 218:Paper No. 112770, 27, 2022.
- [SY23] O. Savin and H. Yu. Contact points with integer frequencies in the thin obstacle problem. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 76(12):4048–4074, 2023.
- [Wei99] G. S. Weiss. A homogeneity improvement approach to the obstacle problem. *Invent. Math.* 138, 1999.

MATTEO CARDUCCI  
CLASSE DI SCIENZE, SCUOLA NORMALE SUPERIORE  
PIAZZA DEI CAVALIERI 7, 56126 PISA - ITALY  
*Email address:* `matteo.carducci@sns.it`

BOZHIDAR VELICHKOV  
DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA, UNIVERSITÀ DI PISA  
LARGO B. PONTECORVO 5, 56127 PISA - ITALY  
*Email address:* `bozhidar.velichkov@unipi.it`