

CONVERGENCE OF THRESHOLDING ENERGIES FOR ANISOTROPIC MEAN CURVATURE FLOW ON INHOMOGENEOUS OBSTACLE

ANDREA CHIESA AND KAREL SVADLENKA

ABSTRACT. We extend the analysis by Esedoğlu and Otto (2015) of thresholding energies for the celebrated multiphase Bence-Merriman-Osher algorithm for computing mean curvature flow of interfacial networks, to the case of differing space-dependent anisotropies. In particular, we address the special setting of an obstacle problem, where anisotropic particles move on an inhomogeneous substrate. By suitable modification of the surface energies we construct an approximate energy that uses a single convolution kernel and is monotone with respect to the convolution width. This allows us to prove that the approximate energies Γ -converge to their sharp interface counterpart.

1. INTRODUCTION AND SETTING

In this paper, we address the problem of a particle moving on an inhomogeneous substrate according to the L^2 -gradient flow of the anisotropic interfacial energy. The setup of the problem is depicted in Figure 1. We let Ω be a bounded open set of class C^2 , which is compactly contained in the d -dimensional torus $\mathbb{T}^d := (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^d$, $d \geq 1$. We consider the evolution $P(t)$, $t \geq 0$, of an open set P representing a particle with fixed mass $m = |P(t)| > 0$ in the container Ω . Notice that the assumption of boundedness of Ω is not restrictive as long as we investigate the time-local behavior of the solution. We denote by $V(t) := \Omega \setminus \overline{P(t)}$ the complement of P in the container, i.e., the vapor region surrounding the particle, and by $S := \mathbb{T}^d \setminus \overline{\Omega}$ the rigid substrate that constrains the motion of P . Let $\Gamma_{SP} = \partial S \cap \partial P$, $\Gamma_{SV} = \partial S \cap \partial V$, and $\Gamma = \Gamma_{PV} = \partial P \cap \partial V$ be the substrate-particle, substrate-vapor, and particle-vapor interfaces, with surface energy densities or, interchangeably, surface tensions $\gamma_{SP} = \gamma_{SP}(x)$, $\gamma_{SV} = \gamma_{SV}(x)$, and $\psi_{PV}(x, \nu)$, respectively, where ν is the outer unit normal to Γ . The total energy of the system is given by the anisotropic perimeter

$$\int_{\Gamma} \psi_{PV} \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} + \int_{\Gamma_{SP}} \gamma_{SP} \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} + \int_{\Gamma_{SV}} \gamma_{SV} \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}.$$

Omitting a constant term depending solely on the data of the problem, we may equivalently consider the energy

$$\int_{\Gamma} \psi_{PV} \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} + \int_{\partial P \cap \partial S} \sigma \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}, \quad (1)$$

where $\sigma := \gamma_{SP} - \gamma_{SV}$. Here, γ_{SP} and γ_{SV} are taken as functions of $x \in \partial S$. We note that this covers the case when the substrate is anisotropic, i.e., possesses normal-dependent energy, since the substrate S , and hence also its normal, are fixed in time.

The motion of the particle is given by the L^2 -gradient flow of the energy (1), which amounts to a weighted mean curvature flow interacting with an obstacle. Namely, the free interface $\Gamma(t)$ evolves

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35A15, 35K08, 53E10.

Key words and phrases. Mean curvature flow, obstacle, BMO algorithm, Γ -convergence, anisotropy.




FIGURE 1. Setup and notation: a particle on a rigid substrate.

in such a way that it fulfills a generalized Herring contact angle condition at the free boundary $\Gamma_{SP} \cap \Gamma_{SV}$, while moving with normal velocity

$$V = -\mu_\phi(\nu)(H_\phi - \Lambda_\phi), \quad (2)$$

where the surface energy density ϕ , mobility μ_ϕ , anisotropic mean curvature H_ϕ and Lagrange multiplier Λ_ϕ are precisely defined in Section 2 below.

This kind of interfacial evolution problem appears in several fields of applied science and engineering. For example, in cell biology it is used as a model to understand cell crawling or patterning [33, 39], while in materials science it assists the development of techniques for coating [36] or nanopatterning through the process of solid-state dewetting [6, 7, 23, 34]. In the mentioned applications, topology changes play a crucial role: cell patterning often involves intercalation of cells, coating is usually achieved by merging of particles, and nanopatterns are often fabricated by fragmentation of films. To control these processes in terms of scales and interfacial energies, a mathematical approach is required that is able to precisely handle interfacial evolutions across topology changes.

Following the demand in applications, the mathematical and numerical analysis of the moving interface problem is extensive with a rich variety of methods available. It is impossible to provide an exhaustive account of the work done in this field. Therefore, we mention only a few recent results that are closely related to our setting with an obstacle, focusing on the so-called indirect approach that is suitable for dealing with topological singularities. Bao et al. [2] analyzed the stationary shapes of anisotropic particles on substrates. Mercier and Novaga [32] show the existence of a graph solution for the isotropic obstacle problem. Here, the term *isotropic* refers to constant surface energies, independent of the orientation of the interface. Kröner et al. [26] show the existence of a classical solution to an anisotropic tripod problem. Eto and Giga [12, 13] follow Bellettini and Kholmatov [3] and analyze a modification of the Almgren-Taylor-Wang approximation scheme for mean-curvature motion of an isotropic droplet with prescribed contact angle, showing its convergence to the viscosity solution of the corresponding level-set equation and proposing a numerical

scheme based on the split Bregman method. Garcke et al. [18] study a phase-field approximation of surface-diffusion motion of anisotropic particles on substrate via anisotropic Cahn-Hilliard equation, showing its relation to a sharp-interface problem based on formal expansions. They also present accurate finite element calculations. A similar approach is taken by Hensel and Laux [22] who construct BV solutions to isotropic mean curvature flow with constant contact angle via regularization through the Allen-Cahn equation. On the other hand, Feldman et al. [14] address an isotropic problem with linearized surface energy and rate-independent dissipation.

The above results concern operators different from the anisotropic mean curvature operator that we deal with here. The same setting as ours has been analyzed only numerically; see, e.g., [19, 21]. Here we present a first step in a rigorous existence result for the anisotropic obstacle problem using the diffuse-interface approach, also called the thresholding method or the BMO algorithm. This approach is not only powerful analytically, but is also attractive from the viewpoint of numerical solution because it consists of just two fast-computable steps: convolution with an anisotropic kernel and thresholding. For the basic problem of mean curvature flow of the boundary of a set $P(t)$ without obstacle and volume constraint and with constant surface energy density equal to 1, these steps read:

- (1) *convolution*: $\chi^k := G_h * \mathbb{1}_{P^k}$, where $G_h(x) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi h}} e^{-|x|^2/4h}$ is the scaled Gaussian;
- (2) *thresholding*: $P^{k+1} := \{x \in \mathbb{T}^d \mid \chi^k(x) > \frac{1}{2}\}$.

They are repeated for $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ starting with the characteristic function $\mathbb{1}_{P^0}$ of the initial set P^0 . The interesting point that makes this scheme applicable to a wide range of interface evolution problems is that this thresholding scheme is equivalent to a minimizing movement, i.e., a time-discretization of the gradient flow, for the energy

$$E_h(u) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{h}} \int (1-u) G_h * u \, dx, \quad u: \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow [0, 1].$$

It is known that E_h Γ -converges to the perimeter functional as $h \rightarrow 0$ [11].

Using the thresholding approach, several problems closely related to ours have been addressed. Xu et al. [37, 38] investigate isotropic mean curvature flow with obstacle numerically. Esedoğlu, Laux and Otto [11, 28, 29] develop a theory for the motion of interfacial networks that are isotropic, but each interface is allowed to have a different constant surface tension. Since our obstacle problem can be interpreted as a special type of the three phase problem, this theory can be viewed as a generalization of our problem in the case of isotropic energies. The authors show that if the surface tensions satisfy a certain triangle inequality condition, the corresponding approximate energies E_h Γ -converge to the weighted perimeter and the thresholding scheme converges to a weak BV solution. The thresholding scheme for anisotropic problems without obstacle was first studied in [24], and later [8, 9, 10] developed a theory of anisotropic kernels K to replace the Gaussian G in the isotropic case. The analysis focuses on construction of kernels that not only yield the prescribed anisotropy and mobility but also guarantee desirable properties of the resulting thresholding scheme, such as monotonicity and unconditional stability.

When all interfaces in the problem have the same anisotropy, it seems not difficult to extend the results of Laux and Otto [29] to the anisotropic network problem. However, it turns out that the analysis of the multiphase problem with differing anisotropies for each interface is challenging. The reason is that in such a general situation, it is not possible to show the monotonicity of the approximate energy E_h with respect to h , which is then extensively used in the convergence proof. Our problem treated in this paper can be viewed as an intermediate step towards understanding the

general multiphase problem because we allow for different anisotropies for each of the three types of interfaces but one of them, namely the substrate, is fixed during the evolution. The presented analysis contributes not only to a new result for the anisotropic mean curvature flow on obstacle but also may provide hints on how to deal with the general multiphase problem. In particular, in the present paper we construct suitable approximate energies E_h for the anisotropic obstacle problem and prove that their Γ -limit is the desired interfacial energy (1), deferring the proof of convergence of the corresponding thresholding scheme to the following paper. We achieve this goal under the condition that a strengthened version of the triangle inequality for the surface tensions holds. This stronger condition comes from the fact that the energy densities are space- and normal-dependent.

Before closing the introduction, we briefly describe the contents of this paper. First, we provide a derivation of the gradient flow equation in the general setting of Finsler geometry, introduced by Bellettini and Paolini in [4]. Here, for a given anisotropy $\phi(x, \nu)$, one considers the anisotropic distance

$$d_\phi(x, y) := \inf \left\{ \int_0^1 \phi(c(t), \dot{c}(t)) dt \mid c \in W^{1,1}([0, 1]; \mathbb{R}^d), c(0) = x, c(1) = y \right\}.$$

It was shown in [5] that the corresponding anisotropic perimeter of a C^1 class set D with normal ν_D reads $\mathcal{H}_\phi^{d-1}(\partial D, \Omega) = \int_{\Omega \cap \partial D} \phi^o(x, \nu_D) \det_d \phi d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}$, where ϕ^o is the dual of ϕ and $\det_d \phi$ is the volume element of the anisotropic Hausdorff measure \mathcal{H}_ϕ^d . Our energy in this setting then reads

$$E(P) := E_\phi(P; \Omega) + E_\sigma(P; \bar{S}) := \int_\Gamma \phi^o \det_d \phi d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} + \int_{\partial P \cap \partial S} \sigma d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}. \quad (3)$$

In Section 2, under rather weak assumptions on the anisotropic tensions, we calculate the first variation of this energy, revealing the form of the generalized Herring condition that should hold on the free boundary. Subsequently, we derive the corresponding weighted L^2 -gradient flow and define its solution in the framework of BV -functions.

The following Section 3 focuses on the particular class of surface tensions with separated variables of the form $\psi_{PV}(x, \nu) = \gamma_{PV}(x)\gamma(\nu)$ and constructs an approximate energy E_h that can be employed in the thresholding scheme. As mentioned above, an appropriate nonlocal approximation via convolution with anisotropic kernels is well-known but its straightforward application to our problem would require using different kernels for each type of interface, which would preclude any convergence proof. We deal with this situation by suitably modifying and extending the participating surface tensions to obtain $\tilde{\gamma}_{PV}, \tilde{\gamma}_{SP}, \tilde{\gamma}_{SV}$ and define the approximate energy as

$$E_h(u) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{h}} \int_\Omega \tilde{\gamma}_{PV} u K_h * (\mathbb{1}_\Omega - u) + \tilde{\gamma}_{SP} u K_h * \mathbb{1}_S + \tilde{\gamma}_{SV} (\mathbb{1}_\Omega - u) K_h * \mathbb{1}_S dx. \quad (4)$$

Here K_h is a scaled kernel corresponding to the anisotropy $\gamma(\nu)$, and u is a placeholder for the characteristic function of particle region P .

The final Section 4 proves that the energy (4) Γ -converges in the strong L^1 -topology to (1) or equivalently to (3) where $\phi(x, \nu) := \sqrt{d-1} \sqrt{\gamma_{PV}(x)} \gamma^o(\nu)$. Thanks to the modification of E_h ensuring that all terms are of the form of convolution with the same kernel K_h , the proof is allowed to use standard techniques, but there are some difficulties related to the presence of an obstacle and to the fact that we consider x -dependent surface tensions.

2. DERIVATION OF GRADIENT FLOW EQUATIONS

In the following sections, we derive the anisotropic mean curvature flow equation (2) as the L^2 -gradient flow of the energy (3). We do so in the general Finsler setting introduced in [4], where the surface tension between the particle P and the vapor V is anisotropic and inhomogeneous, i.e., it depends on the normal vector ν and the spatial variable x . On the other hand, the density $\sigma = \sigma(x)$ can be assumed without loss of generality to depend only on x since the substrate S is fixed and, hence, so is the normal vector to ∂S at x .

2.1. Finsler-geometric setting and assumptions. We recall the standard Finsler-geometry setting for anisotropic mean curvature flow introduced in [4]. Let $\Omega \subset \subset \mathbb{T}^d$ be an open, connected set of class C^2 . Let $\phi: \overline{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \phi &\in C^2(\overline{\Omega} \times (\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\})), \\ \phi^2(x, \cdot) &\text{ is strictly convex for every } x \in \overline{\Omega}, \\ \phi(x, \lambda\nu) &= |\lambda|\phi(x, \nu) \text{ for every } x \in \overline{\Omega}, \nu \in \mathbb{R}^d, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}, \\ c_\phi|\nu| &\leq \phi(x, \nu) \leq C_\phi|\nu| \text{ for every } x \in \overline{\Omega}, \nu \in \mathbb{R}^d, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

for some $0 < c_\phi \leq C_\phi$.

Let us denote by $\phi^o: \overline{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ the dual function to ϕ , i.e.,

$$\phi^o(x, \nu^*) = \sup \{ \nu^* \cdot \nu \mid \nu \in B_\phi(x) \},$$

where $B_\phi(x) = \{ \nu \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \phi(x, \nu) \leq 1 \}$. Then ϕ^o satisfies the same conditions (5) and $\phi^{oo} = \phi$ (see [4]).

Let us recall some useful results on the anisotropy densities satisfying (5).

Lemma 2.1 ([4, Sec. 2.1]). *Let (5) hold. For any $\lambda \neq 0$, $x \in \overline{\Omega}$, and $\nu, \nu^* \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$ the following identities hold:*

$$\phi(x, \nu) = \nabla_\nu \phi(x, \nu) \cdot \nu, \quad \phi^o(x, \nu^*) = \nabla_\nu \phi^o(x, \nu^*) \cdot \nu^*, \quad (6)$$

$$\phi(x, \nabla_\nu \phi^o(x, \nu^*)) = \phi^o(x, \nabla_\nu \phi(x, \nu)) = 1, \quad (7)$$

$$\phi^o(x, \nu^*) \nabla_\nu \phi(x, \nabla_\nu \phi^o(x, \nu^*)) = \nu^*, \quad \phi(x, \nu) \nabla_\nu \phi^o(x, \nabla_\nu \phi(x, \nu)) = \nu. \quad (8)$$

In particular, we have, for every $i = 1, \dots, d$,

$$\partial_{x_i} \phi(x, \nabla_\nu \phi^o(x, \nu)) + \frac{\nu}{\phi^o(x, \nu)} \cdot \partial_{x_i} (\nabla_\nu \phi^o(x, \nu)) = 0, \quad (9)$$

$$\partial_{x_i} \phi(x, \nabla_\nu \phi^o(x, \nu)) + \partial_{x_i} \phi^o \left(x, \frac{\nu}{\phi^o(x, \nu)} \right) = 0. \quad (10)$$

Proof. Identities (6)–(8) can be found in [4]. Formula (9) follows by differentiating the first equation of (7) and then using the first identity in (8). Formula (10) follows from (9) combined with the second identity in (6) differentiated by x_i . \square

2.2. First variation of the energy. In order to obtain the mean curvature flow equation as the L^2 -flow of (3), we compute the first variation of the energy. In the calculations, we will use the function $\det_d \phi(x)$ and the measure $d\mathcal{P}_\phi^n(x)$, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, which are defined as

$$\det_d \phi(x) := \frac{\omega_d}{|B_\phi(x)|} \quad \text{and} \quad d\mathcal{P}_\phi^n(x) := \det_d \phi(x) d\mathcal{H}^n(x).$$

Here $|U|$, for a Lebesgue measurable set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, denotes its d -dimensional Lebesgue measure, ω_d stands for the volume of the unit ball in \mathbb{R}^d , and \mathcal{H}^n for the n -dimensional Hausdorff measure.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $P \subset \Omega$ be an open and bounded subset of \mathbb{T}^d with Lipschitz and piecewise C^2 boundary and let $\sigma: \partial S \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ be Lipschitz continuous. Assume that there exists a function $u \in C^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ such that $P = \{u < 0\} \cap \Omega$, $\partial P \cap \Omega = \{u = 0\} \cap \Omega$, and $\nabla u \neq 0$ on $\partial^* P$. Let $\xi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ be an admissible vector field, i.e., such that $\xi|_{\partial S} \cdot \nu_S = 0$, where ν_S denotes the outer unit normal to S , and let $\Phi_t: \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be the vector field solving*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \Phi_t(x) = \xi(\Phi_t(x)) & (t, x) \in (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{T}^d, \\ \Phi_0(x) = x & x \in \mathbb{T}^d. \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

Then, under the assumptions (5), letting $P_t := \Phi_t(P)$, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} E(P_t) \Big|_{t=0} = \int_\Gamma H_\phi \xi \cdot \nu d\mathcal{P}_\phi^{d-1}(x) + \int_{\partial\Gamma} \phi^o(x, \nu) \xi_\tau \cdot b_P d\mathcal{P}_\phi^{d-2}(x) + \int_{\partial(\partial P \cap \partial S)} \sigma(x) \xi_\tau \cdot b_S d\mathcal{H}^{d-2}(x),$$

where $\Gamma := \partial P \cap \Omega$ is the free surface of P , ν is its outward unit normal, b_P and b_S denote the conormal to the boundary of Γ and that of $\partial S \cap \partial P$, respectively, H_ϕ is the anisotropic mean curvature

$$H_\phi(x) = \operatorname{div}(\nabla_\nu \phi^o(x, \nu(x))) + \nabla \log(\det_d \phi(x)) \cdot \nabla_\nu \phi^o(x, \nu(x)), \quad (12)$$

and ξ_τ is the tangential component of ξ to ∂P , defined as

$$\xi_\tau(x) = \begin{cases} \xi(x) - \left(\xi(x) \cdot \frac{\nu}{\phi^o(x, \nu(x))} \right) \nabla_\nu \phi^o(x, \nu(x)) & \text{if } x \in \Gamma, \\ \xi(x) - (\xi(x) \cdot \nu_S(x)) \nu_S(x) & \text{if } x \in \operatorname{int}(\partial P \cap \partial S). \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

Remark 2.1 (Admissibility of ξ). Notice that thanks to the admissibility of ξ , i.e., $\xi|_{\partial S} \cdot \nu_S = 0$, and the definition (11) of Φ_t , it follows that Ω is a trapping region for the flow Φ_t . Hence, $P_t \subseteq \Omega$ for all $t \geq 0$, and the perturbation of P is admissible in the sense that it does not penetrate the rigid substrate S .

Remark 2.2 (Volume preservation). If we want to require volume preservation then we have the additional constraint $\int_\Gamma \xi \cdot \nu d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} = 0$. Indeed,

$$0 = \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} \int_{\Phi_t(P)} dx = \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} \int_P |J\Phi_t| dx = \int_P \operatorname{div} \xi dx = \int_\Gamma \xi \cdot \nu d\mathcal{H}^{d-1},$$

where in the last equality we used the divergence theorem and $\xi|_{\partial S} \cdot \nu_S = 0$.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Let us define the mapping $v_t: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by setting $u(x) = v_t(\Phi_t(x))$. Hence, we have

$$P_t = \Phi_t(P) = \{v_t < 0\} \cap \Omega, \quad \partial P_t \cap \Omega = \{v_t = 0\} \cap \Omega, \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla v_t \neq 0 \text{ on } \partial^* P_t, \quad (14)$$

for t small enough. The outer normal to ∂P and ∂P_t are then given a.e. by $\nabla u/|\nabla u|$ and $\nabla v_t/|\nabla v_t|$, respectively. Thus, for the anisotropic part of the energy we have

$$E_\phi(P_t; \Omega) = \int_\Gamma \phi^o \left(\Phi_t(x), \frac{\nabla v_t}{|\nabla v_t|}(\Phi_t(x)) \right) \det_d \phi(\Phi_t(x)) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\Phi_t(x)).$$

In order to compute the t -derivative of the above expression, we first recall that

$$d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\Phi_t(x)) = d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) + t(\operatorname{div} \xi - \nu \nabla \xi \cdot \nu) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) + o(t) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x)$$

by the change of variable formula on surfaces [35, Sections 8–9]. Moreover, we claim that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\Phi_t \frac{\nabla v_t}{|\nabla v_t|} \right) \Big|_{t=0} = -\nu \nabla \xi + (\nu \nabla \xi \cdot \nu) \nu$$

on Γ . Indeed, differentiating $u(x) = v_t(\Phi_t(x))$ and setting $t = 0$, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \nabla v_t(\Phi_t(x)) \Big|_{t=0} = -\nabla u \nabla \xi,$$

noting that for $t = 0$ we have $u(x) = v_0(\Phi_0(x)) = v_0(x)$. Thus, we find

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\Phi_t \frac{\nabla v_t}{|\nabla v_t|} \right) \Big|_{t=0} = -\frac{1}{|\nabla u|} \nabla u \nabla \xi + \frac{1}{|\nabla u|^2} \frac{\nabla u \nabla \xi \cdot \nabla u}{|\nabla u|} \nabla u = -\nu \nabla \xi + (\nu \nabla \xi \cdot \nu) \nu \quad \text{on } \Gamma,$$

where we used that $\nu = \nabla u/|\nabla u|$. Combining the equations above we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} E_\phi(P_t; \Omega) \Big|_{t=0} &= \text{I} + \text{II} + \text{III} + \text{IV} \\ &:= \int_\Gamma \nabla_x \phi^o \cdot \xi \det_d \phi d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} + \int_\Gamma \nabla_\nu \phi^o \cdot (-\nu \nabla \xi + (\nu \nabla \xi \cdot \nu) \nu) \det_d \phi d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \\ &\quad + \int_\Gamma \phi^o (\operatorname{div} \xi - \nu \nabla \xi \cdot \nu) \det_d \phi d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} + \int_\Gamma \phi^o \nabla \det_d \phi \cdot \xi d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Thanks to (6), we have

$$\text{II} + \text{III} = \int_\Gamma -\nu \nabla \xi \cdot \nabla_\nu \phi^o + \phi^o \operatorname{div} \xi d\mathcal{P}_\phi^{d-1}. \quad (16)$$

On the other hand, in order to rewrite I in a more convenient way, we decompose ξ as $\xi = \xi_\tau + \xi \cdot \frac{\nu}{\phi^o} \nabla_\nu \phi^o$, where ξ_τ is defined as in (13), and we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{\nu}{\phi^o(x, \nu)} \nabla \xi \right)_i &\stackrel{(6)}{=} \partial_{x_i} \xi_\tau^j \frac{\nu^j}{\phi^o(x, \nu)} + \partial_{x_i} \left(\xi \cdot \frac{\nu}{\phi^o(x, \nu)} \right) + \left(\xi \cdot \frac{\nu}{\phi^o(x, \nu)} \right) \partial_{x_i} (\partial_{\nu_j} \phi^o(x, \nu)) \frac{\nu^j}{\phi^o(x, \nu)} \\ &\stackrel{(9),(10)}{=} \partial_{x_i} \xi_\tau^j \frac{\nu^j}{\phi^o(x, \nu)} + \partial_{x_i} \left(\xi \cdot \frac{\nu}{\phi^o(x, \nu)} \right) + \left(\xi \cdot \frac{\nu}{\phi^o(x, \nu)} \right) \partial_{x_i} \phi^o \left(x, \frac{\nu}{\phi^o(x, \nu)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we sum over repeated indices. Thus, by the positive homogeneity (5) of ϕ^o in the ν -variable, we have shown that

$$\nu \nabla \xi = \nu \nabla \xi_\tau + \phi^o(x, \nu) \nabla \left(\xi \cdot \frac{\nu}{\phi^o(x, \nu)} \right) + \left(\xi \cdot \frac{\nu}{\phi^o(x, \nu)} \right) \nabla_x \phi^o(x, \nu). \quad (17)$$

Hence, we may rewrite I as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{I} &\stackrel{(13)}{=} \int_{\Gamma} \nabla_x \phi^o(x, \nu) \cdot \xi_{\tau} + \left(\xi \cdot \frac{\nu}{\phi^o(x, \nu)} \right) \nabla_x \phi^o(x, \nu) \cdot \nabla_{\nu} \phi^o(x, \nu) \, d\mathcal{P}_{\phi}^{d-1} \\ &\stackrel{(17)}{=} \int_{\Gamma} \left[\nabla_x \phi^o(x, \nu) \cdot \xi_{\tau} + \nu \nabla \xi \cdot \nabla_{\nu} \phi^o(x, \nu) - \nu \nabla \xi_{\tau} \cdot \nabla_{\nu} \phi^o(x, \nu) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \phi^o(x, \nu) \nabla \left(\xi \cdot \frac{\nu}{\phi^o(x, \nu)} \right) \cdot \nabla_{\nu} \phi^o(x, \nu) \right] \, d\mathcal{P}_{\phi}^{d-1} \end{aligned}$$

and combining the above terms we find

$$\begin{aligned} \text{I} + \text{II} + \text{III} &\stackrel{(13)}{=} \int_{\Gamma} \phi^o(x, \nu) \left(\operatorname{div} \xi_{\tau} + \left(\xi \cdot \frac{\nu}{\phi^o(x, \nu)} \right) \operatorname{div}(\nabla_{\nu} \phi^o(x, \nu)) \right) \, d\mathcal{P}_{\phi}^{d-1} \\ &\quad + \int_{\Gamma} \nabla_x \phi^o(x, \nu) \cdot \xi_{\tau} + \nabla_{\nu} \phi^o(x, \nu) \nabla \nu \cdot \xi_{\tau} \, d\mathcal{P}_{\phi}^{d-1} \\ &\quad - \int_{\Gamma} \nabla_{\nu} \phi^o(x, \nu) \nabla \nu \cdot \xi_{\tau} + \nu \nabla \xi_{\tau} \cdot \nabla_{\nu} \phi^o(x, \nu) \, d\mathcal{P}_{\phi}^{d-1}. \end{aligned}$$

For the last term we have

$$\int_{\Gamma} \nabla_{\nu} \phi^o(x, \nu) \nabla \nu \cdot \xi_{\tau} + \nu \nabla \xi_{\tau} \cdot \nabla_{\nu} \phi^o(x, \nu) \, d\mathcal{P}_{\phi}^{d-1} = \int_{\Gamma} \nabla_{\nu} \phi^o(x, \nu) (\nabla \nu - \nabla^{\top} \nu) \cdot \xi_{\tau} \, d\mathcal{P}_{\phi}^{d-1},$$

where we used that $\nu \nabla \xi_{\tau} + \xi_{\tau} \nabla \nu = 0$, which follows by differentiating $\xi_{\tau} \cdot \nu = 0$. Moreover,

$$\partial_{x_j} \nu^i = \partial_{x_j} \left(\frac{\partial_{x_i} u}{|\nabla u|} \right) = \frac{\partial_{x_i x_j}^2 u}{|\nabla u|} - \frac{\partial_{x_i} u \partial_{x_k} u \partial_{x_j x_k}^2 u}{|\nabla u|^3} = \frac{\partial_{x_i x_j}^2 u}{|\nabla u|} - \nu^i \nu^k \frac{\partial_{x_j x_k}^2 u}{|\nabla u|} =: A_{ij} + B_{ij},$$

where we sum over repeated indices. In view of the symmetry of A , we find

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\nu} \phi^o(x, \nu) (\nabla \nu - \nabla^{\top} \nu) \cdot \xi_{\tau} &= \nabla_{\nu} \phi^o(x, \nu) (B - B^{\top}) \cdot \xi_{\tau} \\ &= \partial_{\nu^i} \phi^o(x, \nu) \left(\nu^j \nu^k \frac{\partial_{x_i x_k}^2 u}{|\nabla u|} - \nu^i \nu^k \frac{\partial_{x_j x_k}^2 u}{|\nabla u|} \right) \xi_{\tau}^j = -\phi^o(x, \nu) \nu^k \frac{\partial_{x_j x_k}^2 u}{|\nabla u|} \xi_{\tau}^j, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where in the last equality we used $\xi_{\tau} \cdot \nu = 0$ and (6). Moreover, notice that

$$\partial_{x_j x_k}^2 u = \partial_{x_k} (\nu^j |\nabla u|) = |\nabla u| \partial_{x_k} \nu^j + \nu^j \partial_{x_k} (|\nabla u|). \quad (19)$$

Substituting (19) into (18) and again using $\xi_{\tau} \cdot \nu = 0$, we get

$$\nabla_{\nu} \phi^o(x, \nu) (\nabla \nu - \nabla^{\top} \nu) \cdot \xi_{\tau} = -\phi^o(x, \nu) \nu^k \partial_{x_k} \nu^j \xi_{\tau}^j = \phi^o(x, \nu) \nu^k \partial_{x_k} \xi_{\tau}^j \nu^j = \phi^o(x, \nu) \nu \nabla \xi_{\tau} \cdot \nu.$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{I} + \text{II} + \text{III} &= \int_{\Gamma} \phi^o(x, \nu) \left(\operatorname{div}_{\Gamma} \xi_{\tau} + \left(\xi \cdot \frac{\nu}{\phi^o(x, \nu)} \right) \operatorname{div}(\nabla_{\nu} \phi^o(x, \nu)) \right) \, d\mathcal{P}_{\phi}^{d-1} \\ &\quad + \int_{\Gamma} \nabla_x \phi^o(x, \nu) \cdot \xi_{\tau} + \nabla_{\nu} \phi^o(x, \nu) \nabla \nu \cdot \xi_{\tau} \, d\mathcal{P}_{\phi}^{d-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\operatorname{div}_\Gamma$ is the surface divergence given by $\operatorname{div}_\Gamma X := \operatorname{div} X - \nu \nabla X \cdot \nu$. By the divergence theorem on manifolds with boundary, we can rewrite the term involving the divergence of ξ_τ as

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Gamma \phi^o(x, \nu) \operatorname{div}_\Gamma \xi_\tau \, d\mathcal{P}_\phi^{d-1} &= \int_\Gamma \phi^o(x, \nu) \det_d \phi(x) \operatorname{div}_\Gamma \xi_\tau \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \\ &= - \int_\Gamma \nabla(\phi^o(x, \nu)) \cdot \xi_\tau \det_d \phi(x) \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} - \int_\Gamma \phi^o(x, \nu) \nabla(\det_d \phi(x)) \cdot \xi_\tau \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \\ &\quad + \int_\Gamma \nu(\xi_\tau \otimes \nabla(\phi^o(x, \nu) \det_d \phi(x))) \cdot \nu \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} + \int_{\partial\Gamma} \phi^o(x, \nu) \xi_\tau \cdot b_P \det_d \phi(x) \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-2} \\ &= - \int_\Gamma \nabla_x \phi^o(x, \nu) \cdot \xi_\tau + \nabla_\nu \phi^o(x, \nu) \nabla \nu \cdot \xi_\tau \, d\mathcal{P}_\phi^{d-1} - \int_\Gamma \phi^o(x, \nu) \nabla \log(\det_d \phi(x)) \cdot \xi_\tau \, d\mathcal{P}_\phi^{d-1} \\ &\quad + \int_{\partial\Gamma} \phi^o(x, \nu) \xi_\tau \cdot b_P \, d\mathcal{P}_\phi^{d-2}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $\nu(\xi_\tau \otimes \nabla(\phi^o(x, \nu) \det_d \phi(x))) \cdot \nu = \nu^i \xi_\tau^j \partial_{x_j}(\phi^o(x, \nu) \det_d \phi(x)) \nu^j = 0$ since $\xi_\tau \cdot \nu = 0$. Thus, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{I} + \text{II} + \text{III} &= \int_\Gamma \operatorname{div}(\nabla_\nu \phi^o(x, \nu)) \xi \cdot \nu - \phi^o(x, \nu) \nabla(\det_d \phi(x)) \cdot \xi_\tau \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \\ &\quad + \int_{\partial\Gamma} \phi^o(x, \nu) \xi_\tau \cdot b_P \, d\mathcal{P}_\phi^{d-2}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, substituting (13) in IV we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{IV} &= \int_\Gamma \phi^o(x, \nu) \nabla(\det_d \phi(x)) \cdot \xi_\tau \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \\ &\quad + \int_\Gamma \phi^o(x, \nu) \left(\xi \cdot \frac{\nu}{\phi^o(x, \nu)} \right) \nabla \log(\det_d \phi(x)) \cdot \nabla_\nu \phi^o(x, \nu) \, d\mathcal{P}_\phi^{d-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the combination of the above equalities and the definition (12) of H_ϕ yields

$$\frac{d}{dt} E_\phi(P_t; \Omega) \Big|_{t=0} = \int_\Gamma H_\phi \xi \cdot \nu \, d\mathcal{P}_\phi^{d-1} + \int_{\partial\Gamma} \phi^o(x, \nu) \xi_\tau \cdot b_P \, d\mathcal{P}_\phi^{d-2}.$$

If $\partial P \cap \partial S \neq \emptyset$, by using $\xi|_{\partial S} \cdot \nu_S = 0$ and the divergence theorem, a simplified version of the above calculation yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} E_\sigma(P_t; \bar{S}) \Big|_{t=0} &= \int_{\partial S \cap \partial P} \nabla \sigma \cdot \xi \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} + \int_{\partial S \cap \partial P} \sigma (\operatorname{div} \xi - \nu \nabla \xi \cdot \nu) \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \\ &= \int_{\partial(\partial P \cap \partial S)} \sigma \xi_\tau \cdot b_S \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-2}, \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

which concludes the proof. \square

2.3. Gradient flow derivation. In this section we show that the direction of maximal slope of E is a negative multiple of $H_\phi \nabla_\nu \phi^o(x, \nu)$. The derivation of the gradient flow also incorporates volume preservation and an arbitrary admissible mobility $\mu_\phi \in C^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}^d; [0, \infty))$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_\phi(\lambda \nu) &= |\lambda| \mu_\phi(\nu), \quad \text{for every } \nu \in \mathbb{R}^d, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}, \\ \mu_\phi(\nu) &= 0 \quad \text{if and only if } \nu = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

Let us first introduce the normed space

$$L_\phi^2(\partial P; \mathbb{R}^d) := \{\xi \in L^2(\partial P; \mathbb{R}^d) \mid \xi|_{\partial P \cap \partial S} \cdot \nu_S = 0\} \cap C(\partial P; \mathbb{R}^d),$$

equipped with the norm

$$\|\xi\|_{L_\phi^2(\partial P)}^2 := \int_\Gamma \frac{\phi^o(x, \nu)^2}{\mu_\phi(\nu)} |\phi(x, \xi(x))|^2 d\mathcal{P}_\phi^{d-1} + \int_{\partial P \cap \partial S} |\xi(x)|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}.$$

We denote by dE the first variation of the energy functional as an element of the dual of the normed space $L_\phi^2(\partial P; \mathbb{R}^d)$ and by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ the duality pairing.

Theorem 2.2. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 2.1 and those in (21), the problem*

$$\min \left\{ \langle dE, \xi \rangle \mid \xi \in L_\phi^2(\partial P; \mathbb{R}^d), \|\xi\|_{L_\phi^2(\partial P)} = 1, \int_\Gamma \xi \cdot \nu d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} = 0 \right\} \quad (22)$$

admits solution provided that

$$\phi^o(x, \nu) \det_d \phi(x) b_{PS} - (\nabla_\nu \phi^o(x, \nu) \cdot b_P) \det_d \phi(x) \nu_{PS} + \sigma(x) b_S = 0 \quad \text{on } \bar{\Gamma} \cap \bar{S}, \quad (23)$$

where

$$b_{PS} := b_P - (b_P \cdot \nu_S) \nu_S, \quad \nu_{PS} := \nu_P - (\nu_P \cdot \nu_S) \nu_S,$$

and ν_P is the normal extended from Γ to $\partial\Gamma$ (see Figure 2). Moreover, if (23) is satisfied, the solution is given by

$$\xi := \begin{cases} \frac{\mu_\phi(\nu)}{2\lambda\phi^o(x, \nu)} \left(H_\phi - \frac{\Lambda}{\det_d \phi} \right) \nabla_\nu \phi^o(x, \nu) & \text{on } \Gamma, \\ 0 & \text{on } \partial P \cap \partial S, \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

where

$$\Lambda = \frac{\int_\Gamma \mu_\phi(\nu) H_\phi d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}}{\int_\Gamma \frac{\mu_\phi(\nu)}{\det_d \phi} d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}} \quad (25)$$

and

$$\lambda = -\frac{1}{2} \left(\int_\Gamma \mu_\phi(\nu) \left(H_\phi - \frac{\Lambda}{\det_d \phi} \right)^2 d\mathcal{P}_\phi^{d-1} \right)^{1/2}. \quad (26)$$

This theorem justifies the gradient flow structure of the anisotropic mean curvature flow equation (2). Indeed, let us consider the velocity $2\lambda\xi$, where ξ is defined in (24). On $\Gamma \setminus \partial S$, the tangential component of the velocity does not contribute to the variation of the energy (3) and its normal component is

$$V := \xi \cdot \nu = -\mu_\phi(\nu) \left(H_\phi - \frac{\Lambda}{\det_d \phi} \right) \quad (27)$$

by (6). Thus, we formally obtain (2). Notice that in the definition (24), $\xi = 0$ on $\partial P \cap \partial S$ encodes the fact that the substrate is fixed throughout the evolution.

Proof of Theorem 2.2. If ξ is a solution to the minimum problem in the statement of the theorem, then there are $\lambda, \Lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\xi \in L_\phi^2(\partial P; \mathbb{R}^d)$ is a stationary point of

$$F(\xi) := \langle dE, \xi \rangle - \lambda(\|\xi\|_{L_\phi^2(\partial P)}^2 - 1) - \Lambda \int_\Gamma \xi \cdot \nu d\mathcal{H}^{d-1},$$

and hence $\frac{d}{dt}F(\xi + t\zeta)|_{t=0} = 0$ for every $\zeta \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\zeta|_{\partial S} \cdot \nu_S = 0$. By the identification of dE thanks to Theorem 2.1, we have

$$0 = \int_{\Gamma} \left(H_\phi \nu - 2\lambda \frac{\phi^\circ(x, \nu)^2}{\mu_\phi(\nu)} \phi(x, \xi) \nabla_\nu \phi(x, \xi) \right) \cdot \zeta \, d\mathcal{P}_\phi^{d-1} - \int_{\partial P \cap \partial S} 2\lambda \xi \cdot \zeta \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \\ + \int_{\partial \Gamma} \phi^\circ(x, \nu) \zeta_\tau \cdot b_P \, d\mathcal{P}_\phi^{d-2} + \int_{\partial(\partial P \cap \partial S)} \sigma(x) \zeta_\tau \cdot b_S \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-2} - \Lambda \int_{\Gamma} \zeta \cdot \nu \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}.$$

Since $\xi|_{\partial S} \cdot \nu_S = 0$ and ζ is arbitrary over Γ , it follows

$$\left(H_\phi - \frac{\Lambda}{\det_d \phi} \right) \nu = 2\lambda \frac{\phi^\circ(x, \nu)^2}{\mu_\phi(\nu)} \phi(x, \xi) \nabla_\nu \phi(x, \xi) \quad \text{on } \Gamma, \quad (28)$$

$$\xi = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial P \cap \partial S. \quad (29)$$

In order to recover the Herring angle condition from the ensuing identity

$$\int_{\partial \Gamma} \phi^\circ(x, \nu) \zeta_\tau \cdot b_P \, d\mathcal{P}_\phi^{d-2} + \int_{\partial(\partial P \cap \partial S)} \sigma(x) \zeta \cdot b_S \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-2} = 0 \quad (30)$$

for every $\zeta \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\zeta|_{\partial S} \cdot \nu_S = 0$, let us decompose ζ in the first integral into its normal and tangential components as in (13) to obtain

$$\int_{\partial \Gamma} \phi^\circ(x, \nu) \left(\zeta - \frac{1}{\phi^\circ(x, \nu)} (\zeta \cdot \nu_P) \nabla_\nu \phi^\circ(x, \nu) \right) \cdot b_P \, d\mathcal{P}_\phi^{d-2} + \int_{\partial(\partial P \cap \partial S)} \sigma(x) \zeta \cdot b_S \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-2} = 0.$$

Since ζ is arbitrary with $\zeta|_S \cdot \nu_S = 0$, we get (23).

Let us now denote by $T_\phi^\circ = T_\phi^\circ(x, \cdot): \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ the map defined by $T_\phi^\circ(x, \xi) = \phi^\circ(x, \xi) \nabla_\nu \phi^\circ(x, \xi)$ if $\xi \neq 0$, and $T_\phi^\circ(x, \xi) = 0$ if $\xi = 0$. We notice that

$$T_\phi^\circ(x, \phi(x, \xi) \nabla_\nu \phi(x, \xi)) = \phi(x, \xi) \phi^\circ(x, \nabla_\nu \phi(x, \xi)) \nabla_\nu \phi^\circ(x, \nabla_\nu \phi(x, \xi)) \stackrel{(7),(8)}{=} \xi,$$

where, in the first equality, we used the 1-homogeneity of ϕ° and the 0-homogeneity of $\nabla_\nu \phi^\circ$ in the second variable. Thus, by applying $T^\circ(x, \cdot)$ to both sides of (28) we have

$$\xi = \frac{\mu_\phi(\nu)}{2\lambda \phi^\circ(x, \nu)} \left(H_\phi - \frac{\Lambda}{\det_d \phi} \right) \nabla_\nu \phi^\circ(x, \nu) \quad \text{on } \Gamma. \quad (31)$$

In order to find a solution to (22), we require $\|\xi\|_{L_\phi^2(\partial P)} = 1$ and $\int_{\Gamma} \xi \cdot \nu \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} = 0$. By (28), (31), and by 1-homogeneity of ϕ , the first condition yields

$$1 = \int_{\Gamma} \frac{\phi^\circ(x, \nu)^2}{\mu_\phi(\nu)} |\phi(x, \xi)|^2 \, d\mathcal{P}_\phi^{d-1} \stackrel{(7)}{=} \frac{1}{4\lambda^2} \int_{\Gamma} \mu_\phi(\nu) \left(H_\phi - \frac{\Lambda}{\det_d \phi} \right)^2 \, d\mathcal{P}_\phi^{d-1},$$

which gives us the value of λ^2 . Moreover, by (31), (30), and (6), we have

$$F(\xi) = \frac{1}{2\lambda} \int_{\Gamma} \left(H_\phi - \frac{\Lambda}{\det_d \phi} \right)^2 \mu_\phi(\nu) \, d\mathcal{P}_\phi^{d-1}.$$

Hence ξ is a solution to (22) if the right-hand side is negative, namely if λ is given by (26). Finally, from

$$0 = \int_{\Gamma} \xi \cdot \nu \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} = \frac{1}{2\lambda} \int_{\Gamma} \mu_\phi(\nu) \left(H_\phi - \frac{\Lambda}{\det_d \phi} \right) \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1},$$

we get (25) and conclude the proof. \square

2.4. Notion of solution. In this section we define the notion of distributional solutions corresponding to the anisotropic mean curvature flow derived in the previous section. There are several notions of weak solutions for the mean curvature flow whose relation is not yet fully understood (see, e.g., the discussion in [15, 27]). Here we introduce a BV-type solution, anticipating the upcoming convergence proof. For that, notice that the energy (3) can be equivalently rewritten for general $u \in BV(\Omega; \{0, 1\})$ as

$$E(u) = \int_{\Omega} \phi^o(x, \nu(x)) \det_d \phi |\nabla u| + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \sigma(x) (|\nabla u| + |\nabla \mathbb{1}_{\Omega}| - |\nabla(\mathbb{1}_{\Omega} - u)|), \quad (32)$$

where $\nu(x)$ is the measure-theoretic unit outer normal to $P = \{x \mid u(x) = 1\}$ defined at points x belonging to the reduced boundary $\partial^* P$.

Definition 2.1 (Motion by volume-preserving anisotropic mean curvature flow with obstacle). *Let $T \in (0, \infty)$, $m > 0$, and Ω be an open set, and set $S = \mathbb{T}^d \setminus \overline{\Omega}$. Let*

$$u \in BV([0, T] \times \Omega; \{0, 1\}) \text{ with } \sup_{t \in [0, T]} E(u(t)) < \infty$$

be trivially extended to zero in $\mathbb{T}^d \setminus \Omega$, and $\nu := -\nabla u / |\nabla u|$ be its measure-theoretic outer normal. Given a bounded and open initial configuration $P^0 \subset \Omega$ with $E(\mathbb{1}_{P^0}) < \infty$ and $\int_{P^0} dx = m$, we say that u moves by (anisotropic) volume preserving curvature flow with obstacle S if

$$\int_{\Omega} u(t, x) dx = m \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in [0, T]$$

and there exist $H_{\phi}, V : [0, T] \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with

$$\int_0^T \int_{\Omega} |H_{\phi}|^2 \det_d \phi |\nabla u| dt < \infty, \quad \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} |V|^2 \det_d \phi |\nabla u| dt < \infty,$$

such that

(1) H_{ϕ} is the mean curvature in the sense that it satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} H_{\phi} \xi \cdot \nu \det_d \phi |\nabla u| dt &= \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} (\phi^o(x, \nu) \operatorname{div} \xi - \nu \nabla \xi \cdot \nabla_{\nu} \phi^o(x, \nu)) \det_d \phi |\nabla u| dt \\ &+ \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} (\nabla_x \phi^o(x, \nu) + \phi^o(x, \nu) \nabla(\log \det_d \phi(x))) \cdot \xi \det_d \phi |\nabla u| dt \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

for all $\xi \in C^{\infty}((0, T) \times \mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$;

(2) V is the normal velocity in the sense that it satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \zeta(s, x) u(s, x) dx - \int_{\Omega} \zeta(0, x) \mathbb{1}_{P^0}(x) dx &= \int_0^s \int_{\Omega} \partial_t \zeta(t, x) u(t, x) dx dt \\ &+ \int_0^s \int_{\Omega} \zeta(t, x) V(t, x) |\nabla u| dt \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

for all $\zeta \in C^{\infty}([0, T] \times \Omega)$ and $s \in (0, T)$;

(3) H_ϕ and V satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_0^T \int_\Omega \left(H_\phi - \frac{\Lambda}{\det_d \phi} + \frac{1}{\mu_\phi} V \right) \xi \cdot \nu \det_d \phi |\nabla u| dt \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (\sigma(x) (\operatorname{div} \xi - \nu \nabla \xi \cdot \nu) + \nabla_x \sigma(x) \cdot \xi) (|\nabla u| + |\nabla \mathbb{1}_\Omega| - |\nabla(\mathbb{1}_\Omega - u)|) dt \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

for every $\xi \in C^\infty((0, T) \times \mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\xi|_{(0, T) \times \partial S} \cdot \nu_S = 0$, where Λ is the weighted average of the generalized mean curvature H_ϕ given by (cf. (25))

$$\Lambda = \frac{\int_\Omega \mu_\phi(\nu) H_\phi |\nabla u|}{\int_\Omega \frac{\mu_\phi(\nu)}{\det_d \phi} |\nabla u|}.$$

Remark 2.3. Papers employing BV-type solutions such as [22, 30] additionally require an optimal energy dissipation inequality. Since we are not concerned here with existence of solution, we ignore this condition for simplicity.

Remark 2.4 (No volume preservation). In the case of mean curvature flow that does not preserve volume, the correct notion of solution is given by Definition 2.1, setting $\Lambda = 0$ in (35).

Remark 2.5 (Spatial independent case without obstacle). We remark that this notion of solution corresponds to [30, Definition 2.8] when the anisotropies have no dependence on the spatial variable, namely, if $\phi^o(x, \nu) = \phi^o(\nu)$, and when, in addition, $\Lambda = 0$ and $\Omega = \mathbb{T}^d$. In this setting (33) and (35) reduce to

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \int_\Omega H_\phi \xi \cdot \nu |\nabla u| dt &= \int_0^T \int_\Omega (\phi^o(\nu) \operatorname{div} \xi - \nu \nabla \xi \cdot \nabla_\nu \phi^o(\nu)) |\nabla u| dt, \\ \int_0^T \int_\Omega \left(H_\phi + \frac{1}{\mu_\phi} V \right) \xi \cdot \nu |\nabla u| dt &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

respectively.

Remark 2.6 (Spatial independent isotropic case with obstacle). On the other hand, Definition 2.1 corresponds to [22, Definition 1] in the spatial-independent isotropic case, i.e., $\phi^o(x, \nu) = c_0 |\nu|$ and $\sigma(x) = \sigma$, and with $\Lambda = 0$, $\mu_\phi = 1$. The combination of (33) and (35) then reads as

$$\begin{aligned} &c_0 \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (\operatorname{div} \xi - \nu \nabla \xi \cdot \nu) (|\nabla u| + |\nabla(\mathbb{1}_\Omega - u)| - |\nabla \mathbb{1}_\Omega|) dt \\ &\quad + \sigma \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (\operatorname{div} \xi - \nu \nabla \xi \cdot \nu) (|\nabla u| + |\nabla \mathbb{1}_\Omega| - |\nabla(\mathbb{1}_\Omega - u)|) dt \\ &= - \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} V \xi \cdot \nu (|\nabla u| + |\nabla(\mathbb{1}_\Omega - u)| - |\nabla \mathbb{1}_\Omega|) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 2.7 (Recovery of classical solution in the smooth case). In the smooth setting, conditions (33) and (35) imply that the normal velocity is proportional to H_ϕ and that the generalized Herring




FIGURE 2. Definition of the vectors $\nu_S, \nu_P, \nu_{PS}, b_S, b_P, b_{PS}$ and the contact angles θ and θ_c .

angle condition holds on the free boundary $\partial\Gamma$. Indeed, doing the same calculations as in the proof of Theorem 2.1, we get

$$0 = \int_0^T \int_{\Gamma} \left(\operatorname{div}(\nabla_{\nu} \phi^o(x, \nu)) + \nabla \log(\det_d \phi(x)) \cdot \nabla_{\nu} \phi^o(x, \nu) - \frac{\Lambda}{\det_d \phi} + \frac{1}{\mu_{\phi}} V \right) \xi \cdot \nu \, d\mathcal{P}_{\phi}^{d-1} \, dt \\ + \int_0^T \int_{\partial\Gamma} \xi_{\tau} \cdot \phi^o(x, \nu) b_P \, d\mathcal{P}_{\phi}^{d-2} \, dt + \int_0^T \int_{\partial(\partial P \cap \partial S)} \xi_{\tau} \cdot \sigma(x) b_S \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-2} \, dt$$

for every $\xi \in C_c^{\infty}((0, T) \times \mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\xi|_{(0, T) \times \partial S} \cdot \nu_S = 0$. Hence, on one hand, by definition (12) of H_{ϕ} in the smooth setting and the fact that ξ is arbitrary in $(0, T) \times \Omega$, we find (27). On the other, reasoning as in the proof of Theorem 2.2 and using $\xi|_{\partial S} \cdot \nu_S = 0$, we recover (23). In particular, in the case of flat substrate in \mathbb{T}^2 , setting θ to be the angle ν_P forms with the positive direction of the vertical axis, measured clockwise, we have that

$$b_{PS} = b_P - (b_P \cdot \nu_S) \nu_S = \pm(\cos \theta, 0), \quad \nu_{PS} = \nu_P - (\nu_P \cdot \nu_S) \nu_S = (\sin \theta, 0)$$

since $\nu_S = (0, 1)$, $\nu_P = (\sin \theta, \cos \theta)$, $b_P = \pm(\cos \theta, -\sin \theta)$, and $b_S = (\pm 1, 0)$. Here $+$ or $-$ depends on whether we are considering the right or left contact point, respectively, see Figure 2. Hence, assuming $\phi(x, \nu) = \phi^o(\nu)$, (23) becomes

$$0 = \pm \phi(\nu) \cos \theta - (\nabla_{\nu} \phi(\nu) \cdot b_P) \sin \theta \pm \sigma = \pm \tilde{\phi} \cos \theta \mp \tilde{\phi}'(\theta) \sin \theta \pm \sigma,$$

where $\tilde{\phi}(\theta) := \tilde{\phi}(\sin \theta, \cos \theta) = \phi(\nu)$. This is the generalized Herring's condition $\tilde{\phi} \cos \theta - \tilde{\phi}'(\theta) \sin \theta + \sigma = 0$ derived in [2, Lemma 2.2]. In particular, in the isotropic case, we have $\tilde{\phi}'(\theta) = 0$ and hence $\tilde{\phi} \cos \theta + \sigma = 0$. The contact angle $\theta_c \in [0, \pi)$ measured within the particle P is equal to θ at the right contact point and to $2\pi - \theta$ at the left contact point (see Figure 2). Thus, this identity rewrites $\tilde{\phi} \cos \theta_c + \sigma = 0$, which is the classical Young's equation.

3. THE THRESHOLDING SCHEME AND APPROXIMATE ENERGIES

In this section, we study an approximation $E_h: BV(\Omega; [0, 1]) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ of the interfacial energy E defined in (4) for given $h > 0$. To justify the interest in this approximating energy and to illustrate how it arises, let us recall the celebrated thresholding scheme [11] for the evolution of hypersurfaces by mean curvature flow. For the sake of simplicity, we consider the case of three phases $(\Sigma_i)_{i=1}^3$, disjoint open sets with $\mathbb{T}^d = \cup_{i=1}^3 \overline{\Sigma_i}$. Their interfaces $\Gamma_{ij} := \overline{\Sigma_i} \cap \overline{\Sigma_j} = \partial \Sigma_i \cap \partial \Sigma_j$, for $i \neq j$, have isotropic and constant surface energy densities $(\gamma_{ij})_{i,j=1}^3 \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$, where we assume

$\gamma_{ii} = 0$ and $\gamma_{ij} = \gamma_{ji}$. The energy associated to the partition $(\Sigma_i)_{i=1}^3$ of \mathbb{T}^d is

$$E(\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2, \Sigma_3) := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \gamma_{ij} \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\Gamma_{ij}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \int_{\Gamma_{ij}} \gamma_{ij} d\mathcal{H}^{d-1},$$

and its L^2 -gradient flow equations (with mobilities $\mu_{ij} = 1/\gamma_{ij}$) read

$$V_{ij} = -H_{ij} \quad \text{on } \Gamma_{ij},$$

where V_{ij} is the normal velocity of Γ_{ij} and H_{ij} is its mean curvature. Additionally, angles at multiple junctions have to satisfy certain conditions. Thanks to the gradient flow structure of these equations, a natural strategy for proving existence of solutions is the minimizing movements scheme: the time interval $[0, T]$ is discretized into $(t_i)_{i=0}^{N_h}$, $t_i = ih$, with time step $h := T/N_h$ for some $N_h \in \mathbb{N}$, and an incremental minimum problem of the form

$$u^i \in \arg \min_{u \in BV(\mathbb{T}^d; [0,1]^3)} \left\{ E_h(u) + \frac{1}{2h} d_h^2(u, u^{i-1}) \right\} \quad (36)$$

is solved at every step $i = 1, \dots, N_h$, where $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3)$ with $u_1 + u_2 + u_3 = 1$ corresponds to $(\mathbb{1}_{\Sigma_1}, \mathbb{1}_{\Sigma_2}, \mathbb{1}_{\Sigma_3})$. The approximate energy E_h takes the form [11]

$$E_h(u) := \frac{1}{2\sqrt{h}} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \gamma_{ij} u_i G_h * u_j dx, \quad (37)$$

where $G(x) = (4\pi)^{-d/2} e^{-|x|^2/4}$ is the Gaussian kernel and the convolution is to be interpreted on \mathbb{R}^d . The subscript h means rescaling by \sqrt{h} : For a function $K : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we set

$$K_h(x) := h^{-d/2} K\left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{h}}\right). \quad (38)$$

The induced distance function d_h is defined as $d_h(u, v) := E_h(u - v)$. Under suitable assumptions including *triangular inequalities*

$$\gamma_{ij} \leq \gamma_{ik} + \gamma_{kj} \quad \text{for every } i, j, k \in \{1, 2, 3\}, \quad (39)$$

the piecewise constant interpolant in time \bar{u}_h , defined as $\bar{u}_h(t, x) := u^i(x)$ for $t \in [t_i, t_{i+1})$, converges in a certain sense to a function $u \in BV(\mathbb{T}^d; \{0, 1\}^3)$, solving the gradient flow equation [29].

One of the main features of the above minimizing movement scheme, making it attractive for numerical solution, is that it can be reinterpreted as a thresholding scheme: For a given initial condition $u^0 = (\mathbb{1}_{\Sigma_1^0}, \mathbb{1}_{\Sigma_2^0}, \mathbb{1}_{\Sigma_3^0})$, the solution $\{u^i\}_{i=1}^{N_h}$ to the minimum problems (36) can be explicitly obtained by repeating the following two steps for $i = 1, \dots, N_h$:

- (1) *convolution*: $\Psi_j^i := G_h * \left(\sum_{k=1}^3 \gamma_{jk} \mathbb{1}_{\Sigma_k^i} \right)$, $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$;

- (2) *thresholding*: $\Sigma_k^{i+1} := \{x \in \mathbb{T}^d \mid \Psi_k^i(x) < \min_{j \neq k} \Psi_j^i(x)\}$.

The definition and analysis of the thresholding scheme for equation (27) are beyond the scope of this paper and will be addressed in future work. In the following, we consider a first important step in this direction by proposing an appropriate approximation of the energy (4) and showing its Γ -convergence as $h \rightarrow 0$.

Motivated by the fact that in the case $\gamma = \gamma(\nu)$ the anisotropy is represented by a suitable kernel K (cf. (53) below), we consider the case where ψ_{PV} can be multiplicatively split into the product

of a space–dependent and a normal–dependent factor as $\psi_{PV}(x, \nu) = \gamma_{PV}(x)\gamma(\nu)$. To guarantee uniqueness of the decomposition, we assume that γ is chosen so that $|B_\gamma| = \omega_d$. The relation to the Finsler setting in Section 2.1 is then given by $\phi(x, \nu) = \sqrt[d-1]{\gamma_{PV}(x)} \gamma^o(\nu)$. The energy (1) or (32) can now, up to a constant, be written as

$$E(u) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \gamma_{PV}(x)\gamma(\nu) (|\nabla u| + |\nabla(\mathbb{1}_\Omega - u)| - |\nabla \mathbb{1}_\Omega|) \\ \quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \gamma_{SP}(x) (|\nabla u| + |\nabla \mathbb{1}_\Omega| - |\nabla(\mathbb{1}_\Omega - u)|) \\ \quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \gamma_{SV}(x) (|\nabla \mathbb{1}_\Omega| + |\nabla(\mathbb{1}_\Omega - u)| - |\nabla u|) & \text{for } u \in BV(\Omega; \{0, 1\}), \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (40)$$

We aim at introducing an associated approximating energy $E_h: BV(\Omega; [0, 1]) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ in the spirit of (37) and we notice that in (37) the kernel used is the Gaussian for all the interfaces. This is an essential ingredient in the proof of a monotonicity formula for the approximating energies (cf. Lemma 4.3), which in turn is crucial for the proof of the lim inf–inequality part in Γ –convergence. In the energy (4), the three interfaces present a different anisotropic behavior, so that the choice of the same kernel K_h , say the one associated to γ , in the approximating energy would result to the wrong energy in the limit. We avoid this issue by modifying the surface tensions γ_{SP} and γ_{SV} in order to accommodate the presence of anisotropy in the approximate energy, exploiting the fact that the substrate S is fixed. The idea is to define $\tilde{\gamma}_{SP}(x) := \gamma_{SP}(x)/\gamma(\nu_S(x))$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_{SV}(x) := \gamma_{SV}(x)/\gamma(\nu_S(x))$ for $x \in \partial S$ and to extend them appropriately to \mathbb{T}^d . In Section 3.2, we provide their construction in detail. As a result, the energy approximate energy

$$E_h(u) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{h}} \int_{\Omega} \tilde{\gamma}_{PV} u K_h * (\mathbb{1}_\Omega - u) + \tilde{\gamma}_{SP} u K_h * \mathbb{1}_S + \tilde{\gamma}_{SV} (\mathbb{1}_\Omega - u) K_h * \mathbb{1}_S \, dx \quad (41)$$

Γ –converges to (40) in the strong L^1 –topology, which we prove in Section 4.

Note that the integral in (41) can be equivalently be taken over \mathbb{T}^d instead of over Ω , if we define u as zero in $\mathbb{T}^d \setminus \Omega$. For technical reasons, in the sequel we will consider the functions $\tilde{\gamma}_{PV}, \tilde{\gamma}_{SP}, \tilde{\gamma}_{SV}$ and $u, \mathbb{1}_\Omega, \mathbb{1}_S$ appearing in the above definition of E_h to be extended periodically in all coordinate directions of the flat torus \mathbb{T}^d , and the convolutions with K_h will be taken over \mathbb{R}^d . From the numerical perspective, this does not pose any complications – in view of the exponential decay of the kernel K (see (54) below) we just need to make sure that Ω is sufficiently far from the boundary of \mathbb{T}^d , relative to the magnitude of the smoothing parameter h .

3.1. Assumptions. Let $\Omega \subset \subset \mathbb{T}^d$ be an open, connected set of class C^2 . Let $\gamma: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be such that

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma &\in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}), \\ \gamma^2 &\text{ is strictly convex,} \\ \gamma(\lambda\nu) &= |\lambda|\gamma(\nu) \text{ for every } \nu \in \mathbb{R}^d, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}, \\ c_\gamma|\nu| &\leq \gamma(\nu) \leq C_\gamma|\nu| \text{ for every } \nu \in \mathbb{R}^d, \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

for some $0 < c_\gamma \leq C_\gamma$. Moreover, let $\gamma_{PV} : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ and $\gamma_{SP}, \gamma_{SV} : \partial S \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ be such that

$$\gamma_{PV} \in C^1(\overline{\Omega}) \text{ and } \gamma_{SP}, \gamma_{SV} \in C^1(\partial S), \quad (43)$$

$$c_s \leq \gamma_{SP}, \gamma_{SV} \leq C_s \text{ on } \partial S, \quad (44)$$

$$C_\gamma \gamma_{PV} < \gamma_{SP} + \gamma_{SV}, \quad \gamma_{SP} < c_\gamma \gamma_{PV} + \gamma_{SV}, \quad \gamma_{SV} < c_\gamma \gamma_{PV} + \gamma_{SP} \text{ on } \partial S \quad (45)$$

for some $0 < c_s \leq C_s$. In view of the decomposition $\psi_{PV}(x, \nu) = \gamma_{PV}(x)\gamma(\nu)$, the condition (45) represents a uniform version of the triangular inequalities (39), and, similarly to (39), is necessary for the lower semicontinuity of the anisotropic energy functional. However, for the extension argument in Section 3.2 below we need to require strict inequalities.

3.2. Modified surface tensions. We construct the space-dependent surface tensions $\tilde{\gamma}_{PV}$, $\tilde{\gamma}_{SP}$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_{SV}$, in such a way that they extend the functions γ_{PV} , γ_{SP} and γ_{SV} from their original domains of definition $\overline{\Omega}$ and ∂S to \mathbb{T}^d , modify them in a suitable way, so that these modified extensions fulfill

$$\tilde{\gamma}_{PV}, \tilde{\gamma}_{SP}, \tilde{\gamma}_{SV} \in C^{0,1}(\mathbb{T}^d), \quad (46)$$

$$\tilde{c} \leq \tilde{\gamma}_{PV}, \tilde{\gamma}_{SP}, \tilde{\gamma}_{SV} \leq \tilde{C} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{T}^d, \quad (47)$$

$$\tilde{\gamma}_{PV} \leq \tilde{\gamma}_{SP} + \tilde{\gamma}_{SV}, \quad \tilde{\gamma}_{SP} \leq \tilde{\gamma}_{PV} + \tilde{\gamma}_{SV}, \quad \tilde{\gamma}_{SV} \leq \tilde{\gamma}_{PV} + \tilde{\gamma}_{SP} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{T}^d, \quad (48)$$

for some $0 < \tilde{c} \leq \tilde{C}$. We remark in particular that the triangular inequalities (48) are meant to hold for every $x \in \mathbb{T}^d$, cf. (39) for constant surface tensions.

To begin with, we define $\tilde{\gamma}_{PV} : \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ as γ_{PV} in Ω , and as the solution to the boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} \Delta \tilde{\gamma}_{PV} = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{T}^d \setminus \Omega, \\ \tilde{\gamma}_{PV} = \gamma_{PV} & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ \tilde{\gamma}_{PV} = \min_{\partial\Omega} \gamma_{PV} & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{T}^d, \end{cases}$$

in $\mathbb{T}^d \setminus \Omega$. By the regularity theory of the Laplace equation [31, Thm. 1.8] and the maximum principle [20, Thm. 2.3], $\tilde{\gamma}_{PV}$ satisfies (46) and

$$\tilde{c}_{PV} \leq \tilde{\gamma}_{PV} \leq \tilde{C}_{PV} \quad \text{for } \tilde{c}_{PV} = \min_{\partial\Omega} \gamma_{PV} > 0, \quad \tilde{C}_{PV} = \max_{\partial\Omega} \gamma_{PV}.$$

Moreover, since $\Omega \in C^2$ and $\Omega \subset\subset \mathbb{T}^d$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that the open sets $\Omega_\delta^+ \subset \Omega$ and $\Omega_\delta^- \subset \mathbb{T}^d \setminus \Omega$, defined as

$$\Omega_\delta^\pm := \{x \in \mathbb{T}^d \mid 0 < \pm d_s(x; \partial\Omega) < \delta\},$$

are of class C^2 [16, Thm. 1] and compactly contained in \mathbb{T}^d . Here we denote by $d_s(\cdot; \partial\Omega) : \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the signed distance function from the boundary of Ω , i.e.,

$$d_s(x; \partial\Omega) := \begin{cases} d(x; \partial\Omega) & \text{for } x \in \overline{\Omega}, \\ -d(x; \partial\Omega) & \text{for } x \in \mathbb{T}^d \setminus \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Let $g_\delta^\pm : \Omega_\delta^\pm \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the solutions to the boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} \Delta g_\delta^\pm = 0 & \text{in } \Omega_\delta^\pm, \\ g_\delta^\pm = \gamma(\nu_{\partial\Omega}) & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ g_\delta^\pm = c_\gamma & \text{on } \partial\Omega_\delta^\pm \setminus \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

By [31, Thm. 1.8], we have

$$g_\delta^\pm \in C^{0,1}(\overline{\Omega_\delta^\pm}). \quad (49)$$

Moreover, by the maximum principle [20, Thm. 2.3] and the last condition in (42), we have that

$$c_\gamma \leq g_\delta^\pm \leq C_\gamma. \quad (50)$$

Let us now extend γ_{SP} and γ_{SV} to \mathbb{T}^d . Let $g_{SP}^\pm, g_{SV}^\pm: \Omega_\delta^\pm \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ be the solutions to

$$\begin{cases} \Delta g_{SP}^\pm = 0 & \text{in } \Omega_\delta^\pm, \\ g_{SP}^\pm = \gamma_{SP} & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ g_{SP}^\pm = \frac{1}{2}C_\gamma \tilde{C}_{PV} & \text{on } \partial\Omega_\delta^\pm \setminus \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad \begin{cases} \Delta g_{SV}^\pm = 0 & \text{in } \Omega_\delta^\pm, \\ g_{SV}^\pm = \gamma_{SV} & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ g_{SV}^\pm = \frac{1}{2}C_\gamma \tilde{C}_{PV} & \text{on } \partial\Omega_\delta^\pm \setminus \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

respectively. By [31, Thm. 1.8] we have

$$g_{SP}^\pm, g_{SV}^\pm \in C^{0,1}(\overline{\Omega_\delta^\pm}). \quad (51)$$

Since the inequalities in (45) are strict, we can assume, up to possibly taking a smaller δ , that

$$C_\gamma \tilde{\gamma}_{PV} < g_{SP}^\pm + g_{SV}^\pm, \quad g_{SP}^\pm < c_\gamma \gamma_{PV} + g_{SV}^\pm, \quad g_{SV}^\pm < c_\gamma \gamma_{PV} + g_{SP}^\pm \quad \text{on } \Omega_\delta^\pm. \quad (52)$$

We hence define $\tilde{\gamma}_{SP}, \tilde{\gamma}_{SV}: \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ as

$$\tilde{\gamma}_{SP}(x) := \begin{cases} \frac{\gamma_{SP}(x)}{\gamma(\nu_{\partial\Omega}(x))} & \text{if } x \in \partial\Omega, \\ \frac{g_{SP}^\pm(x)}{g_\delta^\pm(x)} & \text{if } x \in \Omega_\delta^\pm, \\ \frac{C_\gamma \tilde{C}_{PV}}{2c_\gamma} & \text{else,} \end{cases} \quad \tilde{\gamma}_{SV}(x) := \begin{cases} \frac{\gamma_{SV}(x)}{\gamma(\nu_{\partial\Omega}(x))} & \text{if } x \in \partial\Omega, \\ \frac{g_{SV}^\pm(x)}{g_\delta^\pm(x)} & \text{if } x \in \Omega_\delta^\pm, \\ \frac{C_\gamma \tilde{C}_{PV}}{2c_\gamma} & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

By definition, $\tilde{\gamma}_{PV}, \tilde{\gamma}_{SP}, \tilde{\gamma}_{SV} \in C(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and satisfy the bounds (47) for some $0 < \tilde{c} \leq \tilde{C}$. Moreover, by (51), (49), and by construction, we have (46). In order to show the triangular inequalities (48), let us first consider the case $x \in \overline{\Omega_\delta^+} \cup \overline{\Omega_\delta^-}$. By the triangular inequalities (52) and the bounds (50) on g_δ^\pm , it follows

$$\tilde{\gamma}_{SP}(x) + \tilde{\gamma}_{SV}(x) \geq \frac{C_\gamma \tilde{\gamma}_{PV}(x)}{C_\gamma} = \tilde{\gamma}_{PV}(x), \quad |\tilde{\gamma}_{SP}(x) - \tilde{\gamma}_{SV}(x)| \leq \frac{c_\gamma \tilde{\gamma}_{PV}(x)}{c_\gamma} = \tilde{\gamma}_{PV}(x).$$

On the other hand, if $x \in \mathbb{T}^d \setminus (\overline{\Omega_\delta^+} \cup \overline{\Omega_\delta^-})$, then

$$\tilde{\gamma}_{SP}(x) + \tilde{\gamma}_{SV}(x) = \frac{C_\gamma \tilde{C}_{PV}}{c_\gamma} \geq \tilde{\gamma}_{PV}(x), \quad |\tilde{\gamma}_{SP}(x) - \tilde{\gamma}_{SV}(x)| = 0 \leq \tilde{\gamma}_{PV}(x).$$

4. Γ -CONVERGENCE OF THRESHOLDING ENERGIES

Here we examine the Γ -convergence of the approximate energies (41) toward the original energy functional (40). We begin by stating the main result and presenting an outline of its proof. The arguments make use of several lemmas which are then proved in the following subsection.

In this section, we consecutively assume that the surface energy density of the free surface can be written as $\psi_{PV}(x, \nu) = \gamma_{PV}(x)\gamma(\nu)$, where $\gamma(\nu)$ satisfies (42) and the space-dependent densities $\gamma_{PV}(x), \gamma_{SP}(x), \gamma_{SV}(x)$ satisfy (43)–(45). Then the modified densities $\tilde{\gamma}_{PV}(x), \tilde{\gamma}_{SP}(x), \tilde{\gamma}_{SV}(x)$ constructed in Section 3.2 meet the conditions (46)–(48).

Further, let $K : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be a kernel associated to the anisotropy γ , i.e.,

$$\gamma(\nu) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{+\infty} r^d \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} |\xi \cdot \nu| K(r\xi) \, d\xi \, dr, \quad (53)$$

where \mathbb{S}^{d-1} is the d -dimensional unit sphere. The kernel K is assumed to satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} K(-x) &= K(x), \quad K \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d), \quad K(x) \geq 0, \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K(x) \, dx &= 1, \quad |x|K(x) \leq c_K K(x/2), \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

for some $c_K > 0$, so that $|x|K(x) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Notice that the last condition in (54) implies that the kernel decays at least exponentially at infinity. Moreover, we assume that K is strictly positive in a neighborhood of the origin, namely, there exist positive constants $a, b > 0$ such that

$$K(x) \geq a \quad \text{for every } x \in B_b(0). \quad (55)$$

The condition on the positivity of the kernel $K \geq 0$ can be weakened to sign-changing kernels that possess a positive rearrangement in the sense of [9, Lemmas 5.6, 5.7] since such a rearrangement decreases the energy and does not change the limiting energy.

A question that naturally arises is whether, for a given anisotropy γ , it is possible to construct a kernel K satisfying the above properties. The problem becomes more involved when one wishes to model also the mobility μ_ϕ appearing in Theorem 2.2. We refer to the papers [8, 9, 10, 17, 19] which address these questions and provide specific methods for the construction of such kernels.

4.1. Main theorem. The Γ -convergence result reads as follows.

Theorem 4.1. *Under the assumptions (42)–(45) and (53)–(55), the sequence of functionals $(E_h)_h$, defined as in (41), Γ -converges with respect to the strong L^1 -topology to the functional E , defined in (40).*

The proof of Theorem 4.1 relies on the following lemmas, whose proofs are presented in Section 4.2. Namely, Lemma 4.1 provides compactness in the strong L^1 -topology, Lemma 4.2 shows the pointwise convergence of $E_h(u)$ to $E(u)$, and Lemma 4.3 states that the energy E_h is approximately monotonic with respect to h .

Lemma 4.1. *Consider a sequence of functions $(u_h)_{h \downarrow 0} \subset BV(\Omega, [0, 1])$ such that $E_h(u_h) \leq c$ for every h , where E_h is as in (41), and assume (46)–(48), (54) and (55). Then there exists $u \in BV(\Omega; \{0, 1\})$ and a non-relabeled subsequence $(u_h)_{h \downarrow 0}$ such that $u_h \rightarrow u$ in $L^1(\Omega)$.*

Lemma 4.2. *Let $u \in BV(\Omega; \{0, 1\})$ and assume (46)–(48) and (54). Then we have*

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} E_h(u) = E(u). \quad (56)$$

Lemma 4.3. *Assume (46)–(48) and (54). Then, for every $u \in BV(\Omega; [0, 1])$, every $h > 0$ and every $N \in \mathbb{N}_+$, we have*

$$E_{N^2 h}(u) \leq (1 + cN\sqrt{h})E_h(u) \quad (57)$$

for some $c > 0$ independent of u , h and N .

Proof of Theorem 4.1.

• **lim sup-inequality:** We can assume without loss of generality that $u \in BV(\Omega; \{0, 1\})$, otherwise $E(u) = \infty$ and the inequality is trivially satisfied. Thanks to Lemma 4.2, for $u \in BV(\Omega; \{0, 1\})$, we can choose the constant sequence as a recovery sequence and we are done.

• **lim inf-inequality:** Let $(u_h)_h \subset BV(\Omega; [0, 1])$ with $\liminf_h E_h(u_h) < +\infty$ without loss of generality. By Lemma 4.1 we can assume $u_h \rightarrow u$ strongly in $L^1(\Omega)$ and $u \in BV(\Omega; \{0, 1\})$. Following the strategy of [9, Proposition 5.5], for $L > 0$ let us define

$$K^L(x) := K(x) \mathbb{1}_{B_L}(x),$$

and denote by γ^L the anisotropy induced by K^L through (53). Moreover, we define E^L and E_h^L according to (40) and (41), respectively, with γ replaced by γ^L and with K replaced by K^L . Notice that by positivity of K , we have $K^L \leq K$ and $\gamma^L \leq \gamma$, and thus $E_h^L \leq E_h$. Fix $h_0 \in (0, 1)$ and let $N_h \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $(N_h - 1)^2 h < h_0 \leq N_h^2 h$. Thanks to Lemma 4.3, we have

$$(1 + cN_h\sqrt{h})E_h(u_h) \geq E_{N_h^2 h}^L(u_h) \geq E_{N_h^2 h}^L(u_h) = E_{h_0}^L(u_h) + R_{h,h_0}^L,$$

where $R_{h,h_0}^L := E_{N_h^2 h}^L(u_h) - E_{h_0}^L(u_h)$. Moreover, for fixed $h_0 > 0$, the functional $E_{h_0}^L$ is continuous with respect to the strong topology of $L^1(\Omega)$ on the space of admissible functions $BV(\Omega; [0, 1])$. Hence, we get

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} E_{h_0}^L(u_h) = E_{h_0}^L(u).$$

Let us show that $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} |R_{h,h_0}^L| = 0$, which in turn implies

$$(1 + c\sqrt{h_0}) \liminf_{h \rightarrow 0} E_h(u_h) \geq E_{h_0}^L(u) \quad (58)$$

for every $h_0 \in (0, 1)$. First, notice

$$\begin{aligned} |R_{h,h_0}^L| &\leq 3c \int_{\Omega} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{1}_{B_L}(y) \left| \frac{1}{(N_h^2 h)^{d+1}} K\left(\frac{y}{N_h \sqrt{h}}\right) - \frac{1}{h_0^{d+1}} K\left(\frac{y}{\sqrt{h_0}}\right) \right| dy dx \\ &\leq 3c \int_{\Omega} \int_{B_{L/\sqrt{h_0}}} \frac{1}{h_0} \left| \left(\frac{h_0}{N_h^2 h}\right)^{d+1} K\left(\frac{\sqrt{h_0}}{N_h \sqrt{h}} y\right) - K(y) \right| dy dx. \end{aligned}$$

By density of $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$, for any given $\delta > 0$ there exists $\varphi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{h_0} \left(\left(\frac{h_0}{N_h^2 h}\right)^{d+1} \left| K\left(\frac{\sqrt{h_0}}{N_h \sqrt{h}} y\right) - \varphi\left(\frac{\sqrt{h_0}}{N_h \sqrt{h}} y\right) \right| + |\varphi(y) - K(y)| \right) dy \leq \delta.$$

Moreover, since Ω and $B_{L/\sqrt{h_0}}$ are bounded, and $N_h^2 h \rightarrow h_0$ as $h \rightarrow 0$, by uniform continuity we have

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} \int_{B_{L/\sqrt{h_0}}} \frac{1}{h_0} \left| \left(\frac{h_0}{N_h^2 h}\right)^{d+1} \varphi\left(\frac{\sqrt{h_0}}{N_h \sqrt{h}} y\right) - \varphi(y) \right| dy dx = 0.$$

Thus, since δ is arbitrary, we have $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} |R_{h,h_0}^L| = 0$.

Hence, thanks to the pointwise convergence (56) and (58), passing to the limit $h_0 \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$\liminf_{h \rightarrow 0} E_h(u_h) \geq \lim_{h_0 \rightarrow 0} E_{h_0}^L(u) = E^L(u).$$

Letting $L \rightarrow \infty$, we conclude the proof by monotone convergence. \square

4.2. Auxiliary results and proofs. In this subsection we provide the proofs of Lemmas 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3. First, we state some useful inequalities, which will play a key role in the proofs.

Useful inequalities

Lemma 4.4. *For any function $v \in L^1(\Omega; [0, 1])$ and kernel K satisfying (54), we have*

$$K_h(y) \int_{\Omega} |v(x+y) - v(x)| dx dy \leq 2 \int_{\Omega} (1-v) K_h * v dx + \int_{\Omega} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{1}_S(x+y) K_h(y) v(x) dy dx, \quad (59)$$

$$\int_{\Omega} |K_h * v - v| dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K_h(y) \int_{\Omega} |v(x+y) - v(x)| dx dy, \quad (60)$$

$$\int_{\Omega} v(1-v) dx \leq \int_{\Omega} (1-v) K_h * v dx + \int_{\Omega} |K_h * v - v| dx. \quad (61)$$

Moreover, if J is a kernel satisfying (54) and $|\nabla J(x)| \leq cJ(x/2)$ for some $c > 0$, we have

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla (J_h * v)| dx \leq \frac{c}{\sqrt{h}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} J_{4h}(y) \int_{\Omega} |v(x+y) - v(x)| dx dy. \quad (62)$$

Proof.

- To see (59), we first use $K(y) = K(-y)$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} (1-v) K_h * v dx &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K_h(y) \int_{\Omega} (1-v(x)) v(x+y) dx dy \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K_h(y) ((\mathbb{1}_{\Omega}(x) - v(x)) v(x+y) + (\mathbb{1}_{\Omega}(x+y) - v(x+y)) v(x)) dy dx \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{1}_{\Omega}(x+y) K_h(y) ((1-v(x)) v(x+y) + (1-v(x+y)) v(x)) dy dx. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, (59) follows from the elementary inequality

$$|v' - v| \leq |v' - vv'| + |vv' - v| = v'(1-v) + v(1-v') \quad \text{for every } v, v' \in [0, 1]$$

for $v = v(x)$ and $v' = v(x+y)$, and recalling that $K \geq 0$. Indeed, thanks to the above inequality we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} (1-v) K_h * v dx &\geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{1}_{\Omega}(x+y) K_h(y) |v(x+y) - v(x)| dy dx \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K_h(y) |v(x+y) - v(x)| dy dx - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{1}_S(x+y) K_h(y) |v(x+y) - v(x)| dy dx \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K_h(y) |v(x+y) - v(x)| dy dx - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{1}_S(x+y) K_h(y) |v(x)| dy dx, \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof for (59).

- (60) follows by Jensen's inequality using the fact that $K \geq 0$, $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K_h = 1$, and $K(-x) = K(x)$.

- (61) follows from the elementary inequality

$$v(1-v) \leq v'(1-v) + |v' - v| \quad \text{for every } v, v' \in [0, 1]$$

applied to $v = v(x)$ and $v' = (K_h * v)(x) \in [0, 1]$.

- To prove (62), we first write

$$\nabla(J_h * v)(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla J_h(y) v(x+y) dy = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla J_h(y) (v(x+y) - v(x)) dy,$$

since by $J(x) = J(-x)$ it follows that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla J_h = 0$. Hence, we have

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla(J_h * v)| dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla J_h(y)| \int_{\Omega} |v(x+y) - v(x)| dx dy.$$

Recalling $|\nabla J(x)| \leq cJ(x/2)$, we have

$$|\nabla J_h(y)| = h^{-\frac{d+1}{2}} |\nabla J(y/\sqrt{h})| \leq ch^{-\frac{d+1}{2}} J(y/2\sqrt{h}) \leq ch^{-\frac{1}{2}} J_{4h}(y),$$

which in combination with the previous inequality yields (62). \square

Proofs of auxiliary lemmas

We first prove the approximate monotonicity of the energy E_h defined in (41).

Proof of Lemma 4.3. Fix $u \in BV(\Omega; [0, 1])$ and $h > 0$. In order to get neat formulas, in the following we will use the new symbols $u^1 := u$, $u^2 := \mathbb{1}_{\Omega} - u$, and $u^3 := \mathbb{1}_S$. Moreover, we put $\gamma_{12} := \gamma_{21} := \tilde{\gamma}_{PV}$, $\gamma_{13} := \gamma_{31} := \tilde{\gamma}_{SP}$, $\gamma_{23} := \gamma_{32} := \tilde{\gamma}_{SV}$, and $\gamma_{11} := \gamma_{22} := \gamma_{33} = 0$, and recall that all these functions are periodically extended to \mathbb{R}^d . The energy (41) can be then equivalently rewritten according to this notation as

$$E_h(u) = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{h}} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \gamma_{ij} u^i K_h * u^j,$$

since K is symmetric. As will be seen below, the inequality (57) follows by reiterating the formula

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{h''} E_{h''}(u) &\leq \sqrt{h} E_h(u) + \sqrt{h'} E_{h'}(u) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K(y) \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} u^i(x) u^j(x - \sqrt{h}y) |\gamma_{ij}(x) - \gamma_{ij}(x + \sqrt{h'}y)| dx dy, \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

where $\sqrt{h''} = \sqrt{h} + \sqrt{h'}$. For notational simplicity, let us define, for fixed $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$F(\sqrt{h}) := \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \gamma_{ij}(x) u^i(x) u^j(x - \sqrt{h}y) dx,$$

so that $2\sqrt{h} E_h(u) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K F(\sqrt{h}) dy$. By change of variable $\tilde{x} = x + \sqrt{h'}y$ in the last term of the right-hand side of (63), to show (63) it suffices to prove that for every $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$F(\sqrt{h''}) - F(\sqrt{h}) - F(\sqrt{h'}) \leq \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} u^i(x') u^j(x'') |\gamma_{ij}(x') - \gamma_{ij}(x)| dx, \quad (64)$$

where $x' := x - \sqrt{h'}y$, $x'' := x - \sqrt{h''}y$. First, notice that in view of $u^1 + u^2 + u^3 \equiv 1$ we can write for $i \neq j$

$$\begin{aligned} &u^i(x) u^j(x'') - u^i(x) u^j(x') - u^i(x') u^j(x'') \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^3 (u^i(x) u^k(x') u^j(x'') - u^i(x) u^j(x') u^k(x'') - u^k(x) u^i(x') u^j(x'')). \end{aligned}$$

Regarding the terms where $k \in \{i, j\}$ in the right-hand side, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & u^i(x)u^i(x')u^j(x'') - u^i(x)u^j(x')u^i(x'') - u^i(x)u^i(x')u^j(x'') \\ & \quad + u^i(x)u^j(x')u^j(x'') - u^i(x)u^j(x')u^j(x'') - u^j(x)u^i(x')u^j(x'') \\ & = -u^i(x)u^j(x')u^i(x'') - u^j(x)u^i(x')u^j(x'') \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have found that

$$\begin{aligned} & u^i(x)u^j(x'') - u^i(x)u^j(x') - u^i(x')u^j(x'') \\ & \leq \sum_{k \neq i, j} (u^i(x)u^k(x')u^j(x'') - u^i(x)u^j(x')u^k(x'') - u^k(x)u^i(x')u^j(x'')). \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying both sides by $\gamma_{ij}(x)$, summing over i, j , integrating over \mathbb{T}^d , and adding and subtracting the term $\sum_{i, j} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \gamma_{ij}(x')u^i(x')u^j(x'') dx$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & F(\sqrt{h''}) - F(\sqrt{h}) - F(\sqrt{h'}) \\ & \leq \sum_{\substack{i, j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^3 \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq i, j}}^3 \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \gamma_{ij}(x) (u^i(x)u^k(x')u^j(x'') - u^i(x)u^j(x')u^k(x'') - u^k(x)u^i(x')u^j(x'')) dx \\ & \quad + \sum_{\substack{i, j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^3 \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} u^i(x')u^j(x'') |\gamma_{ij}(x') - \gamma_{ij}(x)| dx. \end{aligned}$$

Using the triangular inequalities (48), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\substack{i, j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^3 \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq i, j}}^3 \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \gamma_{ij}(x) (u^i(x)u^k(x')u^j(x'') - u^i(x)u^j(x')u^k(x'') - u^k(x)u^i(x')u^j(x'')) dx \\ & \leq \sum_{\substack{i, j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^3 \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq i, j}}^3 \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \gamma_{ik}(x)u^i(x)u^k(x')u^j(x'') + \gamma_{kj}(x)u^i(x)u^k(x')u^j(x'') dx \\ & \quad - \sum_{\substack{i, j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^3 \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq i, j}}^3 \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \gamma_{ij}(x)u^i(x)u^j(x')u^k(x'') + \gamma_{ij}(x)u^k(x)u^i(x')u^j(x'') dx \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we have shown (64) and, in turn, (63).

Reiterating (63), we get, for $N \in \mathbb{N}_+$,

$$E_{N^2h}(u) \leq E_h(u) + C_{N,h}^\gamma(u), \quad (65)$$

where

$$C_{N,h}^\gamma(u) := \frac{1}{N\sqrt{h}} \sum_{i, j=1}^3 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K(y) \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} u^i(x)u^j(x - \sqrt{h}y) \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} |\gamma_{ij}(x) - \gamma_{ij}(x + n\sqrt{h}y)| dx dy.$$

Thus, it remains to bound the last term of the right-hand side. Using the lipschitzianity (46) of γ_{ij} and the bound $|x|K(x) \leq c_K K(x/2)$, we find

$$\begin{aligned} C_{N,h}^\gamma(u) &\stackrel{(46)}{\leq} c \frac{N\sqrt{h}}{\sqrt{h}} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |y| K(y) \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} u^i(x) u^j(x - \sqrt{h}y) dx dy \\ &\stackrel{(54)}{\leq} c \frac{N\sqrt{h}}{\sqrt{h}} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K\left(\frac{y}{2}\right) \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} u^i(x) u^j(x - \sqrt{h}y) dx dy \stackrel{(47)}{\leq} cN\sqrt{h}E_{4h}(u). \end{aligned}$$

Applying (65) with $N = 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} C_{N,h}^\gamma(u) &\stackrel{(65)}{\leq} cN\sqrt{h} \left(E_h(u) + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{h}} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K(y) \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} u^i(x) u^j(x - \sqrt{h}y) |\gamma_{ij}(x) - \gamma_{ij}(x - \sqrt{h}y)| dx dy \right) \\ &\stackrel{(47)}{\leq} cN\sqrt{h} \left(E_h(u) + \frac{c}{\sqrt{h}} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K(y) \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} u^i(x) u^j(x - \sqrt{h}y) dx dy \right) \stackrel{(47)}{\leq} cN\sqrt{h}E_h(u), \end{aligned}$$

thus concluding the proof. \square

We now prove the compactness result.

Proof of Lemma 4.1. Let us define the kernel J as

$$J(x) := \begin{cases} ac_J \left(1 - \frac{|x|}{b}\right) & \text{if } x \in B_b(0), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where a, b are defined in (55) and c_J is such that $\int J = 1$. Notice that J satisfies (54) and $|\nabla J(x)| \leq 2J(x/2)$. Moreover, we have that $\frac{1}{c_J}J(x) \leq K(x)$ and $\tilde{c} \leq \tilde{\gamma}_{PV}(x)$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ thanks to (55) and (47), and thus

$$0 \leq \frac{\tilde{c}}{c_J\sqrt{h}} \int_{\Omega} u_h J_h * (\mathbb{1}_{\Omega} - u_h) dx \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{h}} \int_{\Omega} \tilde{\gamma}_{PV} u_h K_h * (\mathbb{1}_{\Omega} - u_h) dx \leq E_h(u_h) \leq c. \quad (66)$$

Hence, since $|\nabla J(x)| \leq cJ(x/2)$, we can apply (62) and we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla(J_h * u_h)| dx &\stackrel{(62)}{\leq} \frac{c}{\sqrt{h}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} J_{4h}(y) \int_{\Omega} |u_h(x+y) - u_h(x)| dx dy \\ &\leq \frac{c}{\sqrt{h}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K_{4h}(y) \int_{\Omega} |u_h(x+y) - u_h(x)| dx dy \\ &\stackrel{(59)}{\leq} \frac{c}{\sqrt{h}} \left(\int_{\Omega} (1-u_h) K_{4h} * u_h dx + \int_{\Omega} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{1}_S(x+y) K_{4h}(y) u_h(x) dy dx \right). \quad (67) \end{aligned}$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\sqrt{h}} \int_{\Omega} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{1}_S(x+y) K_{4h}(y) u_h(x) dy dx &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{h}} \int_{\Omega} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u_h(x) \frac{1}{(4h)^{d/2}} K\left(\frac{y}{2\sqrt{h}}\right) \mathbb{1}_S(x+y) dy dx \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{h}} \int_{\Omega} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{1}_{\Omega}(x) \frac{1}{(4h)^{d/2}} K\left(\frac{y}{2\sqrt{h}}\right) \mathbb{1}_S(x+y) dy dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{1}_{\Omega}(x) K(y) \frac{\mathbb{1}_S(x+2\sqrt{h}y) - \mathbb{1}_S(x)}{\sqrt{h}} dy dx, \quad (68) \end{aligned}$$

which is bounded since Ω has finite perimeter and $|x|K(x) \in L^1$. Indeed, rewriting in polar coordinates, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\Omega} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{1}_S(x+y) K_{4h}(y) \frac{u_h(x)}{\sqrt{h}} dy dx \right| \\ & \leq \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} r^d K(r\xi) \left| \frac{\mathbb{1}_S(x+2r\sqrt{h}\xi) - \mathbb{1}_S(x)}{r\sqrt{h}} \right| dx d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\xi) dr \\ & \leq \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} r^d K(r\xi) \left| \frac{\mathbb{1}_\Omega(x+2r\sqrt{h}\xi) - \mathbb{1}_\Omega(x)}{r\sqrt{h}} \right| dx d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\xi) dr \\ & \leq \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} r^d K(r\xi) dr d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\xi) \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |\nabla \mathbb{1}_\Omega| = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|K(x) dx \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |\nabla \mathbb{1}_\Omega|, \end{aligned}$$

where for the first inequality in the last line we reason as follows. Letting $v \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and denoting $w(t) = v(x + r\sqrt{h}t\xi)$, we have

$$v(x + r\sqrt{h}\xi) - v(x) = \int_0^1 w'(t) dt = r\sqrt{h} \int_0^1 \nabla v(x + r\sqrt{h}t\xi) \cdot \xi dt,$$

and hence, by Fubini's theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{r\sqrt{h}} \int_{\Omega} |v(x+\sqrt{h}\xi) - v(x)| dx & \leq \int_0^1 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v(x+r\sqrt{h}t\xi)| dx dt \\ & = \int_0^1 \int_{\Omega+r\sqrt{h}t\xi} |\nabla v(x)| dx dt \\ & \leq \int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |\nabla v(x)| dx dt = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |\nabla v|. \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

Then the result for $\mathbb{1}_\Omega = v \in BV(\mathbb{T}^d)$ follows by approximation of $v \in BV(\mathbb{T}^d)$ with functions $v_\varepsilon \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$ such that $v_\varepsilon \rightarrow v$ in $L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |\nabla v_\varepsilon| dx = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |\nabla v|$.

Hence, combining (68) with (67), we find

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla(J_h * u_h)| dx & \stackrel{(67),(68)}{\leq} \frac{2c}{\sqrt{h}} \int_{\Omega} (1 - u_h) K_{4h} * u_h dx + c \leq c(1 + E_{4h}(u_h)) \\ & \stackrel{(57)}{\leq} c(1 + (1 + 2\sqrt{h})E_h(u_h)) \leq c, \end{aligned}$$

where we used Lemma 4.3) with $N = 2$. Thus, combining this with $|J_h * u_h| \leq 1$, by compactness in BV we have (up to a non-relabelled subsequence) that $(J_h * u_h)_h$ converges in $L^1(\Omega)$. Moreover, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |J_h * u_h - u_h| dx & \stackrel{(60)}{\leq} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} J_h(y) \int_{\Omega} |u_h(x+y) - u_h(x)| dx dy \\ & \leq c_J \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K_h(y) \int_{\Omega} |u_h(x+y) - u_h(x)| dx dy \\ & \stackrel{(59),(68)}{\leq} 2c \int_{\Omega} (1 - u_h) K_h * u_h dx + c\sqrt{h} \leq c\sqrt{h}, \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

so that also $(u_h)_h$ converges in $L^1(\Omega)$ up to a non-reabeled subsequence. Let now $u_h \rightarrow u$ in $L^1(\Omega)$. As seen above, we also have $J_h * u_h \rightarrow u$ in $L^1(\Omega)$ and $\nabla J_h * u_h$ bounded in $L^1(\Omega)$ uniformly in h , so that $u \in BV(\Omega)$. Finally, by

$$\int_{\Omega} u_h(1-u_h) dx \stackrel{(61)}{\leq} \int_{\Omega} (1-u_h) J_h * u_h dx + \int_{\Omega} |J_h * u_h - u_h| dx \stackrel{(66),(70)}{\leq} c\sqrt{h}, \quad (71)$$

we get that $u \in BV(\Omega; \{0, 1\})$. Indeed, from the above inequality $\int_{\Omega} u_h^2$ converges, so $(u_h)_h$ converges both in L^1 and L^2 and thus the limit must be the same. Hence, $\int_{\Omega} u(1-u) dx = 0$ and since both u and $1-u$ are nonnegative, we have the result. \square

We finally prove the pointwise convergence of the energy.

Proof of Lemma 4.2. We will show

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{h}} \int_{\Omega} \tilde{\gamma}_{PV} \tilde{v} K_h * v dx = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \gamma_{PV} \gamma(v) (|\nabla v| + |\nabla \tilde{v}| - |\nabla \mathbb{1}_{\Omega}|),$$

where $v, \tilde{v} \in BV(\Omega; [0, 1])$, playing the roles of u and $\mathbb{1}_{\Omega} - u$ respectively, are such that $v\tilde{v} = 0$ almost everywhere. The corresponding limits for the $\tilde{\gamma}_{SP}$ - and $\tilde{\gamma}_{SV}$ -terms follow by analogous calculations.

We first rewrite the left hand side in polar coordinates

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\sqrt{h}} \int_{\Omega} \tilde{\gamma}_{PV} \tilde{v} K_h * v dx &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{h}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K_h(y) \int_{\Omega} \tilde{\gamma}_{PV}(x) \tilde{v}(x) v(x+y) dx dy \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{h}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K(z) \int_{\Omega} \tilde{\gamma}_{PV}(x) \tilde{v}(x) v(x + \sqrt{h}z) dx dy \\ &= \int_0^{+\infty} r^d \frac{1}{r\sqrt{h}} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} K(r\xi) \int_{\Omega} \tilde{\gamma}_{PV}(x) \tilde{v}(x) v(x + r\sqrt{h}\xi) dx d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\xi) dr. \end{aligned}$$

In order to apply the dominated convergence theorem, we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| r^d \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} K(r\xi) \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{r\sqrt{h}} \tilde{\gamma}_{PV}(x) \tilde{v}(x) v(x + r\sqrt{h}\xi) dx d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\xi) \right| \\ &\stackrel{(47)}{\leq} \tilde{C} r^d \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} K(r\xi) \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{r\sqrt{h}} \left| \tilde{v}(x) v(x + r\sqrt{h}\xi) \right| dx d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\xi) \\ &= \tilde{C} r^d \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} K(r\xi) \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{r\sqrt{h}} \left| \tilde{v}(x) \left(v(x + r\sqrt{h}\xi) - v(x) \right) \right| dx d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\xi) \\ &\leq \tilde{C} r^d \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} K(r\xi) \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{r\sqrt{h}} \left| v(x + r\sqrt{h}\xi) - v(x) \right| dx d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\xi) \\ &\stackrel{(69)}{\leq} \tilde{C} r^d \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} K(r\xi) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\xi) \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|, \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

where we used that $\tilde{v}v = 0$ and $\tilde{v} \in [0, 1]$ almost everywhere in the second equality and in the third inequality, respectively. The right hand side in (72) is integrable, i.e.,

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v| \int_0^{\infty} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} r^d K(r\xi) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\xi) dr \leq c \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x| K(x) dx < \infty,$$

since $v \in BV(\Omega)$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|K(x) dx \leq c$. For the pointwise limit we want to compute

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} r^d K(r\xi) \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{r\sqrt{h}} \tilde{\gamma}_{PV}(x) \tilde{v}(x) v(x + r\sqrt{h}\xi) dx d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\xi).$$

To this end, we apply again the dominated convergence theorem. To find a dominating function we write as above

$$\left| r^d K(r\xi) \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{r\sqrt{h}} \tilde{\gamma}_{PV}(x) \tilde{v}(x) v(x + r\sqrt{h}\xi) dx \right| \leq \tilde{C} r^d K(r\xi) \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|,$$

where $r^d K(r\xi) \in L^1(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})$. Then, for fixed $r > 0$, let us compute the pointwise limit

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{r\sqrt{h}} \tilde{\gamma}_{PV}(x) \tilde{v}(x) v(x + r\sqrt{h}\xi) dx$$

or, equivalently by the symmetry of K ,

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\sqrt{h}} \tilde{\gamma}_{PV}(x) \tilde{v}(x) \left(v(x + \sqrt{h}\xi) + v(x - \sqrt{h}\xi) \right) dx.$$

In order to prove the theorem, it is enough to show that

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\sqrt{h}} \tilde{\gamma}_{PV}(x) \tilde{v}(x) \left(v(x + \sqrt{h}\xi) + v(x - \sqrt{h}\xi) \right) dx \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \tilde{\gamma}_{PV} (|\xi \cdot \nabla v| + |\xi \cdot \nabla \tilde{v}| - |\xi \cdot \nabla(v + \tilde{v})|) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \tilde{\gamma}_{PV} |\xi \cdot \nu| (|\nabla v| + |\nabla \tilde{v}| - |\nabla(v + \tilde{v})|), \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

where $|\xi \cdot \nabla v| = |\xi \cdot \nu| |\nabla v|$ with $\nu = -\frac{\nabla v}{|\nabla v|}$ denoting the measure-theoretic outer normal, which exists by Besicovitch differentiation theorem for measures. We claim that it is enough to show, for any $w, \tilde{w} \in BV(\mathbb{R}; \{0, 1\})$ with $w\tilde{w} = 0$ almost everywhere and $\hat{\gamma} \in C_b(\mathbb{R})$,

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{h}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \hat{\gamma}(t) \tilde{w}(t) \left(w(t + \sqrt{h}) + w(t - \sqrt{h}) \right) dt = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \hat{\gamma} \left(\left| \frac{dw}{dt} \right| + \left| \frac{d\tilde{w}}{dt} \right| - \left| \frac{d(w + \tilde{w})}{dt} \right| \right). \quad (74)$$

Indeed, first notice that, by symmetry of (73), we can assume without loss of generality $\xi = e_d$. Let $w = v(x', \cdot)$, $\tilde{w} = \tilde{v}(x', \cdot)$, and $\hat{\gamma} = \tilde{\gamma}_{PV}(x', \cdot)$, where $x' = (x_1, \dots, x_{d-1})$. By [1, Thm. 3.103], if $v \in BV(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then $w = v(x', \cdot) \in BV(\mathbb{R})$ for almost every $x' \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \hat{\gamma} \left| \frac{dw}{dt} \right| dx' = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \tilde{\gamma}_{PV} |e_d \cdot \nabla v| dx. \quad (75)$$

Hence, (73) follows by (74), (75), and the dominated convergence theorem.

Let us thus show (74). Since $w, \tilde{w} \in BV(\mathbb{R}; \{0, 1\})$ have a finite number of jumps between 0 and 1, which we denote by $t_1 < \dots < t_n$ and $\tilde{t}_1 < \dots < \tilde{t}_{\tilde{n}}$, respectively. Let us also denote as $\bar{t}_1 < \dots < \bar{t}_N$ the ordered set of non repeated jump points of both w and \tilde{w} , where $N = n + \tilde{n} - \#\{t_1, \dots, t_n\} \cap \{\tilde{t}_1, \dots, \tilde{t}_{\tilde{n}}\}$ and let

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{I} &:= \{i \in \{1, \dots, N-1\} \mid \tilde{w} \neq 0 \text{ in } (\bar{t}_i, \bar{t}_{i+1})\}, \\ I &:= \{i \in \{1, \dots, N\} \mid \bar{t}_i \in \{t_1, \dots, t_n\} \cap \{\tilde{t}_1, \dots, \tilde{t}_{\tilde{n}}\}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that by definition we have $\tilde{w} \equiv 1$ in $\cup_{i \in \tilde{I}} (\bar{t}_i, \bar{t}_{i+1})$ and $\tilde{w} \equiv 0$ in $\mathbb{R} \setminus \cup_{i \in \tilde{I}} (\bar{t}_i, \bar{t}_{i+1})$. Hence,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{h}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \hat{\gamma}(t) \tilde{w}(t) \left(w(t + \sqrt{h}) + w(t - \sqrt{h}) \right) dt = \frac{1}{\sqrt{h}} \sum_{i \in \tilde{I}} \int_{\bar{t}_i}^{\bar{t}_{i+1}} \hat{\gamma}(t) \left(w(t + \sqrt{h}) + w(t - \sqrt{h}) \right) dt,$$

where we used that \tilde{w} is compactly supported. Moreover, we can also assume $\sqrt{h} < \min_{i \neq j} |\bar{t}_i - \bar{t}_j|$. Thus, since $\tilde{w}w = 0$ almost everywhere, we deduce that for $t \in (\bar{t}_i, \bar{t}_{i+1})$, $i \in \tilde{I}$, $w(t + \sqrt{h}) \neq 0$ only if $t \in (\bar{t}_{i+1} - \sqrt{h}, \bar{t}_{i+1})$ and similarly $w(t - \sqrt{h}) \neq 0$ only if $t \in (\bar{t}_i, \bar{t}_i + \sqrt{h})$. Consequently, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\sqrt{h}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \hat{\gamma}(t) \tilde{w}(t) \left(w(t + \sqrt{h}) + w(t - \sqrt{h}) \right) dt &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{h}} \sum_{i \in \tilde{I}} \int_{\bar{t}_{i+1} - \sqrt{h}}^{\bar{t}_{i+1}} \hat{\gamma}(t) w(t + \sqrt{h}) dt \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{h}} \sum_{i \in \tilde{I}} \int_{\bar{t}_i}^{\bar{t}_i + \sqrt{h}} \hat{\gamma}(t) w(t - \sqrt{h}) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Now notice that $w(t + \sqrt{h})$ and $w(t - \sqrt{h})$ are non-zero if and only if t_i or t_{i+1} are joint jumps of w and \tilde{w} . Indeed, looking without loss of generality at the case of $w(t + \sqrt{h})$, we see that, $w \neq 0$ in $(\bar{t}_{i+1}, \bar{t}_{i+1} + \sqrt{h})$ implies $\tilde{w} = 0$ in $(\bar{t}_{i+1}, \bar{t}_{i+1} + \sqrt{h})$, i.e., \bar{t}_{i+1} is a jump point for both w and \tilde{w} . Hence, by Lebesgue differentiation theorem and by the definition of I , we get

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{h}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \hat{\gamma}(t) \tilde{w}(t) \left(w(t + \sqrt{h}) + w(t - \sqrt{h}) \right) dt = \sum_{i \in I} \hat{\gamma}(\bar{t}_i).$$

On the other hand, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \hat{\gamma}(t) \left| \frac{dw}{dt} \right| &= \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\gamma}(t_i), \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} \hat{\gamma}(t) \left| \frac{d\tilde{w}}{dt} \right| = \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{n}} \hat{\gamma}(\tilde{t}_i), \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}} \hat{\gamma}(t) \left| \frac{d(w + \tilde{w})}{dt} \right| &= \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\gamma}(t_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{n}} \hat{\gamma}(\tilde{t}_i) - 2 \sum_{i \in I} \hat{\gamma}(\bar{t}_i), \end{aligned}$$

and we have thus obtained (73). We have shown that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{h}} \int_{\Omega} \tilde{\gamma}_{PV} \tilde{v} K_h * v \, dx &= \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\int_0^{+\infty} r^d \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} |\xi \cdot \nu| K(r\xi) \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\xi) \, dr \right) \tilde{\gamma}_{PV} (|\nabla v| + |\nabla \tilde{v}| - |\nabla(v + \tilde{v})|) \\ &\stackrel{(53)}{=} \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \tilde{\gamma}_{PV} \gamma(\nu) (|\nabla v| + |\nabla \tilde{v}| - |\nabla \mathbb{1}_{\Omega}|), \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof. \square

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

AC is supported by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) projects 10.55776/F65, 10.55776/I5149, 10.55776/P32788, and 10.55776/I4354, as well as by the OeAD-WTZ project CZ 09/2023. Part of this research was funded by the Mobility Fellowship of the University of Vienna and conducted during a visit to Kyoto University, whose warm hospitality is gratefully acknowledged. The work of KS was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 19K03634.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Ambrosio, N. Fusco, D. Pallara, Functions of bounded variation and free discontinuity problems. Oxford Math. Monogr., Oxford University Press, New York, 2000.
- [2] W. Bao, W. Jiang, D.J. Srolovitz, Y. Wang, Stable equilibria of anisotropic particles on substrates: a generalized Winterbottom construction. SIAM J. Appl. Math. 77 no. 6, pp. 2093-2118, 2017.

- [3] G. Bellettini, S.Y. Kholmatov, Minimizing movements for mean curvature flow of droplets with prescribed contact angle. *J. Math. Pures Appl.* 117, pp. 1–58, 2018.
- [4] G. Bellettini, M. Paolini, Anisotropic motion by mean curvature in the context of Finsler geometry. *Hokkaido Math. J.* 25, no. 3, pp. 537–566, 1996.
- [5] G. Bellettini, M. Paolini, S. Venturini, Some results on surface measures in calculus of variations. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl.* (4) 170, pp. 329–357, 1996.
- [6] A. Benkouider et al., Ordered arrays of Au catalysts by FIB assisted heterogeneous dewetting. *Nanotechnology* 26 (50), 505602, 2015.
- [7] M. Bollani et al., Templated dewetting of single-crystal sub-millimeter-long nanowires and on-chip silicon circuits. *Nat. Commun.* 10 (1), pp. 1–10, 2019.
- [8] M. Elsey, S. Esedoğlu, Threshold dynamics for anisotropic surface energies. *Mathematics of Computation* 87, no. 312, pp. 1721–1756, 2018.
- [9] S. Esedoğlu, M. Jacobs, Convolution kernels and stability of threshold dynamics methods. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 55, no.5, pp. 2123–2150, 2017.
- [10] S. Esedoğlu, M. Jacobs, P. Zhang, Kernels with prescribed surface tension & mobility for threshold dynamics schemes. *J. Comput. Phys.* 337, pp. 62–83, 2017.
- [11] S. Esedoğlu, F. Otto, Threshold dynamics for networks with arbitrary surface tensions. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 68, no. 5, pp. 808–864, 2015.
- [12] T. Eto, Y. Giga, On a minimizing movement scheme for mean curvature flow with prescribed contact angle in a curved domain and its computation. *Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata* 203, pp. 1195–1221, 2024.
- [13] T. Eto, Y. Giga, A convergence result for a minimizing movement scheme for mean curvature flow with prescribed contact angle in a curved domain. *Advances in Mathematical Sciences and Applications* 34, pp. 115–147, 2025.
- [14] W.M. Feldman, I.C. Kim, N. Pozar, An obstacle approach to rate independent droplet evolution. [arXiv:2410.06931](https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.06931).
- [15] J. Fischer, S. Hensel, T. Laux, T. Simon, The local structure of the energy landscape in multiphase mean curvature flow: Weak-strong uniqueness and stability of evolutions. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 2023.
- [16] R. Foote, Regularity of the distance function. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 92, no. 1, pp. 153–155, 1984.
- [17] J. Fuchs, T. Laux, Strong convergence of the thresholding scheme for the mean curvature flow of mean convex sets. *Adv. Calc. Var.* 17, no. 2, pp. 59, 2023.
- [18] H. Garcke, P. Knopf, R. Nürnberg, Q. Zhao, A diffuse-interface approach for solid-state dewetting with anisotropic surface energies. *Journal of Nonlinear Science* 33:34, 2023.
- [19] S. Gavhale, K. Svadlenka, Dewetting dynamics of anisotropic particles: a level set numerical approach. *Appl. Math.* 67, no. 5, pp. 543–571, 2022.
- [20] D. Gilbarg, N.S. Trudinger, Elliptic partial differential equations of second order. *Classics Math.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001.
- [21] J. Guo, S. Esedoğlu, Median filters for anisotropic wetting / dewetting problems. [arXiv:2412.12384](https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.12384).
- [22] S. Hensel, T. Laux, BV solutions for mean curvature flow with constant contact angle: Allen-Cahn approximation and weak-strong uniqueness. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* 73(1), pp. 111–148, 2022.
- [23] J. Huang, F. Kim, A.R. Tao, S. Connor, P. Yang, Spontaneous formation of nanoparticle stripe patterns through dewetting. *Nature Materials* 4, pp. 896–900, 2005.
- [24] H. Ishii, G.E. Pires, P.E. Souganidis, Threshold dynamics type approximation schemes for propagating fronts. *J. Math. Soc. Japan* Vol. 51, No. 2, 1999.
- [25] S. Kholmatov, Minimizing movements for forced anisotropic curvature flow of droplets. *Interfaces and Free Boundaries*, online first, 2024
- [26] H. Kröner, M. Novaga, P. Pozzi, Anisotropic curvature flow of immersed networks. *Milan J. Math.* Vol. 89, pp. 147–186, 2021.
- [27] T. Laux, Weak-strong uniqueness for volume-preserving mean curvature flow. *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.* 40, no. 1, pp. 93–110, 2024.
- [28] T. Laux, J. Lelmi, De Giorgi’s inequality for the thresholding scheme with arbitrary mobilities and surface tensions. *Calc. Var.* 61:35, 2022.
- [29] T. Laux, F. Otto, Convergence of the thresholding scheme for multi-phase mean-curvature flow. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 55, no. 5, Art. 129, 2016.

- [30] T. Laux, K. Stinson, C. Ullrich, Diffuse-interface approximation and weak-strong uniqueness of anisotropic mean curvature flow. arXiv:2212.11939, 2022.
- [31] J. Liang, L. Wang, C. Zhou, Boundary Lipschitz regularity of solutions for general semilinear elliptic equations in divergence form. Acta Math. Sin. 39, no. 2, pp. 193–208, 2023.
- [32] G. Mercier, M. Novaga, Mean curvature flow with obstacles: Existence, uniqueness and regularity of solutions. Interfaces and Free Boundaries 17, pp. 399–426, 2015.
- [33] R.Z. Mohammad, H. Murakawa, K. Svadlenka, H. Togashi, A numerical algorithm for modeling cellular rearrangements in tissue morphogenesis. Communications Biology 5, 239, 2022.
- [34] M. Salvalaglio et al., Hyperuniform monocrystalline structures by spinodal solid-state dewetting. Phys. Rev. Lett. 125 (12), 126101, 2020.
- [35] L. Simon, Lectures on geometric measure theory. Proceedings of the Centre for Mathematical Analysis, Australian National University 3, 1983.
- [36] C.V. Thompson, Solid-state dewetting of thin films. Annual Review Materials Research 42, pp. 399–434, 2012.
- [37] X. Xu, D. Wang, X.P. Wang, An efficient threshold dynamics method for wetting on rough surfaces. J. Comput. Phys. 330, pp. 510–528, 2017.
- [38] X. Xu, W. Ying, An adaptive threshold dynamics method for three-dimensional wetting on rough surfaces. Commun. Comput. Phys. 29, no. 1, pp. 57-79, 2021.
- [39] F. Ziebert, I. Aranson, Computational approaches to substrate-based cell motility. npj Comput Mater 2, 16019, 2016.

(Andrea Chiesa) UNIVERSITY OF VIENNA, FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS AND VIENNA SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, OSKAR-MORGENSTERN-PLATZ 1, A-1090 VIENNA, AUSTRIA

Email address: andrea.chiesa@univie.ac.at

URL: <http://www.mat.univie.ac.at/~achiesa>

(Karel Svadlenka) TOKYO METROPOLITAN UNIVERSITY, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SCIENCE, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, MINAMI-OSAWA 1-1, HACHIOJI, TOKYO, 192-0397 JAPAN

Email address: karel@tmu.ac.jp

URL: https://karel.fpark.tmu.ac.jp/index_e.html