

HALF-SPACE MINIMIZING SOLUTIONS OF A TWO DIMENSIONAL ALLEN-CAHN SYSTEM

ZHIYUAN GENG

ABSTRACT. This paper studies minimizing solutions to a two dimensional Allen-Cahn system on the upper half plane, subject to Dirichlet boundary conditions,

$$\Delta u - \nabla_u W(u) = 0, \quad u : \mathbb{R}_+^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2, \quad u = u_0 \text{ on } \partial \mathbb{R}_+^2,$$

where $W : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is a multi-well potential. We give a complete classification of such half-space minimizing solutions in terms of their blow-down limits at infinity. In addition, we characterize the asymptotic behavior of solutions near the associated sharp interfaces.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Mathematical formulation and main results. In this paper, we investigate minimizing solutions to the system

$$(1.1) \quad \Delta u - \nabla_u W(u) = 0, \quad u : \mathbb{R}_+^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2,$$

where \mathbb{R}_+^2 is the upper half plane $\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : y > 0\}$. Here $W : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{0\}$ is a nonnegative potential function that vanishes at finitely many 2D points. (1.1) is the Euler-Lagrange equation corresponding to the energy functional

$$(1.2) \quad J(u, \Omega) := \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\nabla u|^2 + W(u) \right) dz, \quad \forall \text{ bounded open set } \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}_+^2.$$

We define *minimizing solutions* in the sense of De Giorgi as follows.

Definition 1.1. *A function $u : \mathbb{R}_+^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ is a minimizing solution of (1.1) if*

$$(1.3) \quad J(u, \Omega \cap \mathbb{R}_+^2) \leq J(u + v, \Omega \cap \mathbb{R}_+^2), \quad \forall \text{ bounded open set } \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2, \quad \forall v \in C_0^1(\Omega \cap \mathbb{R}_+^2).$$

We also call u a local minimizer of the functional (1.2).

We give the following hypotheses on the potential function W . For the hypotheses (H₃) and (H'₃), we assume that one of them holds.

(H₁) $W \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^2; [0, +\infty))$, $\{z \in \mathbb{R}^2 : W(z) = 0\} = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_N\}$, $\nabla_u W(u) \cdot u > 0$ if $|u| > M$, and

$$c_1 |\xi|^2 \leq \xi^T \nabla^2 W(a_i) \xi \leq c_2 |\xi|^2, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, N\},$$

where M , c_1 , c_2 are positive constants.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, PURDUE UNIVERSITY, 150 N. UNIVERSITY STREET, WEST LAFAYETTE, IN 47907-2067

E-mail address: geng42@purdue.edu.

Date: January 1, 2026.

Key words and phrases. half-space solution, Allen-Cahn system, blow-down limit, diffuse interface.

(H₂) For $i \neq j$, $i, j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, there exists a *unique* (up to translation) minimizing heteroclinic connection $U_{ij} \in W^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^2)$ that minimizes the following 1D energy:

$$J_1(U) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\frac{1}{2} |U'|^2 + W(U) \right) d\eta, \quad \lim_{\eta \rightarrow -\infty} U(\eta) = a_i, \quad \lim_{\eta \rightarrow +\infty} U(\eta) = a_j.$$

Denote by σ_{ij} the minimal energy $J_1(U_{ij})$.

(H₃) $N = 3$ and the following triangle inequality holds:

$$(1.4) \quad \sigma_{ij} + \sigma_{jk} > \sigma_{ik}, \quad \forall \{i, j, k\} = \{1, 2, 3\},$$

We refer to [4, Proposition 2.6 & Proposition 2.12] for the sufficiency and necessity of (1.4) for the existence of all three U_{ij} .

(H₃') $N > 3$ and $\sigma_{ij} \equiv \sigma$ for any $i \neq j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$.

A Dirichlet boundary condition will be imposed on $\partial\mathbb{R}_+^2$:

$$(1.5) \quad u = u_0 \text{ on } \partial\mathbb{R}_+^2 = \{(x, 0) : x \in \mathbb{R}\},$$

where $u_0 \in C^2(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^2)$. For u_0 we further assume the following:

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} u_0(x) = a_1, \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} u_0(x) = a_2.$$

$$(1.6) \quad \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{2} |u_0'|^2 + W(u_0) \right) dz < \infty.$$

$$(1.7) \quad \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |x| |u_0'| dx < \infty.$$

The energy bound (1.6) together with Hypothesis (H₁) implies that

$$(1.8) \quad \int_0^{\infty} |u_0(x) - a_1|^2 dx + \int_0^{\infty} |u_0(x) - a_2|^2 dx < \infty,$$

which guarantees that u_0 converges to a_1/a_2 fast enough as $|x|$ tends to ∞ . The integral estimate (1.7) is a technical assumption that will be useful in the almost monotonicity formula, see Lemma 3.1. We note that it is easy to find a u_0 satisfying all these conditions. For example, any function converging to a_1, a_2 at the exponential rate $e^{-k|x|}$ suffices.

We also assume that u is uniformly bounded. Specifically, there exists a constant $M > 0$ such that

$$(1.9) \quad \|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^2; \mathbb{R}^2)} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^2; \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2})} \leq M.$$

In fact, uniform boundedness of $|\nabla u|$ follows from uniform boundedness of $|u|$ by standard elliptic regularity theory. We state (1.9) in this form for convenience.

Another important notation is the following degenerate Riemannian metric on \mathbb{R}^2 induced by the Allen-Cahn energy,

(1.10)

$$d(p, q) := \inf \left\{ \sqrt{2} \int_0^1 |\gamma'(t)| \sqrt{W(\gamma(t))} dt : \gamma \in C^1([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^2), \gamma(0) = p, \gamma(1) = q \right\}, \quad \forall p, q \in \mathbb{R}^2.$$

Intuitively, $d(p, q)$ quantifies the minimal energy needed to move from p to q in the phase plane. It is worth mentioning that $d(a_i, a_j) = \sigma_{ij}$.

The minimizing solution u of (1.1) subject to (1.5) is a diffuse analog of a half-space minimizing partition. For $v \in \text{BV}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}_+^2; \{a_1, \dots, a_N\})$ and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}_+^2$, define

$$(1.11) \quad \begin{aligned} J_*(v, \Omega) := & \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} \sigma_{ij} \mathcal{H}^1(\partial\{v^{-1}(a_i)\} \cap \partial\{v^{-1}(a_j)\} \cap \Omega) \\ & + \int_{\partial\Omega \cap \partial\mathbb{R}_+^2 \cap \{x > 0\}} d(\text{tr } v, a_1) d\mathcal{H}^1 + \int_{\partial\Omega \cap \partial\mathbb{R}_+^2 \cap \{x < 0\}} d(\text{tr } v, a_2) d\mathcal{H}^1. \end{aligned}$$

Here $\text{tr } v$ denotes the classical definition of traces of BV functions, see e.g. [28, Chapter 2].

Definition 1.2. $v \in \text{BV}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}_+^2; \{a_1, \dots, a_N\})$ is called a (Dirichlet) minimizing partition map if

$$J_*(v, \Omega \cap \mathbb{R}_+^2) \leq J_*(w, \Omega \cap \mathbb{R}_+^2),$$

for every bounded open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ and every $w \in \text{BV}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}_+^2, \{a_1, \dots, a_N\})$ such that $w = v$ on $\mathbb{R}_+^2 \setminus \Omega$.

Define the blow-down map of u at the scale $r (r \gg 1)$ by

$$u_r(z) := u(rz), \quad z \in \mathbb{R}_+^2.$$

Then u_r automatically is a local minimizer of the functional

$$J_r(u, \Omega) := \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{1}{2r} |\nabla u|^2 + rW(u) \right) dz,$$

subject to the boundary condition

$$u_r(x, 0) = u_0(rx), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Our first result classifies the minimizing solution u in terms of its asymptotic behavior at infinity by studying the limit of u_r , which can be characterized by minimal cones associated with the functional (1.11).

Theorem 1.3. Let $u : \mathbb{R}_+^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ be a minimizing solution of (1.1) satisfying (1.5)–(1.9). There exists a minimizing partition map $\tilde{u} \in \text{BV}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}_+^2; \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_N\})$ in the sense of Definition 1.2 such that $\nabla \tilde{u} \cdot \frac{z}{|z|} = 0$ for any $z \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, and satisfies

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \|u_r - \tilde{u}\|_{L^1(K)} = 0, \quad \forall K \Subset \mathbb{R}_+^2,$$

where $u_r(z) := u(rz)$. Extend the definition of \tilde{u} to the boundary $\partial\mathbb{R}_+^2$ by setting (in the polar coordinate $z = (r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta)$)

$$(1.12) \quad \hat{u}(r, \theta) = \begin{cases} \tilde{u}(r, \theta), & 0 < \theta < \pi, \\ a_1, & \theta = 0, \\ a_2, & \theta = \pi. \end{cases}$$

Then there exist $0 \leq \alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2 \leq \pi$ such that if $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$, then there is an index $i \in \{3, \dots, N\}$ such that

$$\hat{u}(r, \theta) = \begin{cases} a_i, & \alpha_1 < \theta < \alpha_2 \\ a_1, & 0 \leq \theta \leq \alpha_1, \\ a_2, & \alpha_2 \leq \theta \leq \pi. \end{cases}$$

Otherwise if $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$, then

$$\hat{u}(r, \theta) = \begin{cases} a_1, & 0 \leq \theta < \alpha_1, \\ a_2, & \alpha_2 < \theta \leq \pi. \end{cases}$$

Consequently, \tilde{u} must fall into one of the following three categories.

- a) *Constant:* $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 0$, $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \pi$ or $\alpha_1 = 0$, $\alpha_2 = \pi$.
- b) *Two phase solution:* $0 < \alpha_1 < \alpha_2 = \pi$, $0 = \alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \pi$, or $0 < \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 < \pi$.
- c) *Triple junction:* $0 < \alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \pi$.

Moreover, when $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$, it holds that $\alpha_2 - \alpha_1 \geq \frac{2\pi}{3}$ when (H'_3) holds and $\alpha_1 - \alpha_2 \geq \theta_3$ when (H_3) holds ($a_i = a_3$). Here θ_3 is determined by the relation

$$(1.13) \quad \frac{\sin \theta_1}{\sigma_{23}} = \frac{\sin \theta_2}{\sigma_{13}} = \frac{\sin \theta_3}{\sigma_{12}}, \quad \sum_{i=1}^3 \theta_i = 2\pi.$$

Remark 1.1. In cases a) and b), since the blow-down limit may not coincide with a_1 on $\{(x, 0) : x > 0\}$ and with a_2 on $\{(x, 0) : x < 0\}$, a boundary transitional layer is allowed. u may transit from a phase a_i to a_1/a_2 within a thin layer near the boundary $\partial\mathbb{R}_+^2$.

For any $0 \leq \alpha \leq \pi$, let l_α denote the ray emanating from the origin in direction α :

$$l_\alpha := \{(r \cos \alpha, r \sin \alpha) : r > 0\}.$$

Take a constant $\gamma > 0$. We define the diffuse interface as

$$(1.14) \quad \mathcal{D}_\gamma := \{z \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 : \min_i |u(z) - a_i| \geq \gamma\}.$$

Generally speaking, \mathcal{D}_γ contains points that do not belong to any phase a_i , which therefore represents the interfacial region that separates coexisting phases. From Theorem 1.3, we know that u resembles \hat{u} at infinity; therefore, it is natural to expect \mathcal{D}_γ to be close to the discontinuous set of \hat{u} written as $\mathcal{S}(\hat{u}) = l_{\alpha_1} \cup l_{\alpha_2}$. Below we state our second main result confirming this property and refine the profile of u near $\mathcal{S}(\hat{u})$.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $u : \mathbb{R}_+^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ be a minimizing solution of (1.1) satisfying (1.5)–(1.9). Take \hat{u} as the extended blow-down map of u defined in Theorem 1.3 and suppose $\mathcal{S}(\hat{u}) = l_{\alpha_1} \cup l_{\alpha_2}$ for some $0 < \alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2 < \pi$. For any γ small enough, there exists a constant $C = C(u, \gamma, W)$ such that for sufficiently large R ,*

$$(1.15) \quad (\mathcal{D}_\gamma \cap \partial B_R) \subset \{(R \cos \theta, R \sin \theta) : \theta \in (\alpha_1 - CR^{-1}, \alpha_1 + CR^{-1}) \cup (\alpha_2 - CR^{-1}, \alpha_2 + CR^{-1})\}.$$

Furthermore, suppose $l_\alpha \subset \mathcal{S}(\hat{u})$ for some $0 < \alpha < \pi$, and l_α separates the phases a_i and a_j in the sense that $\hat{u}(r, \theta) = a_i$ when $\theta \rightarrow \alpha_-$, $\hat{u}(r, \theta) = a_j$ when $\theta \rightarrow \alpha_+$. Set $\mathbf{e}_\alpha := (\cos \alpha, \sin \alpha)$, $\mathbf{e}_\alpha^\perp := (-\sin \alpha, \cos \alpha)$. Then there exists a constant h such that

$$(1.16) \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \|u(x\mathbf{e}_\alpha + y\mathbf{e}_\alpha^\perp) - U_{ij}(y - h)\|_{C_{loc}^{2,\beta}(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R}^2)} = 0, \quad \forall \beta \in (0, 1).$$

Remark 1.2. (1.15) and (1.16) imply that for an interior sharp interface l_α with $\alpha \in (0, \pi)$, $\mathcal{D}_\gamma \cap B_R$ is contained in an $O(1)$ neighborhood of l_α . However, if the sharp interface coincides with the positive or negative part of $\partial\mathbb{R}_+^2$, i.e. when $\alpha_i = 0$ or π , then such $O(1)$ estimate is not available. Otherwise, suppose $\mathbf{e}_\alpha = (1, 0)$ and $\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \|u(x, y) - U_{1j}(y - h)\|_{C_{loc}^{2,\beta}} = 0$, then $\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \|u_0(x) - a_1\| > 0$, which contradicts (1.8).

1.2. Related results and outline of the paper. For the scalar case where the potential W has only two energy wells ± 1 , the classification of the global solution $u : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for the Allen-Cahn equation is a problem widely studied, leading to the famous conjecture of De Giorgi [11], which proposes that any global solution that is monotonic in one variable only depends on that variable for dimension $n \leq 8$, i.e. all level sets are parallel hyperplanes. Numerous important contributions have been made to prove De Giorgi's conjecture and its variants, as well as to understand the relationship between the solutions of the Allen-Cahn equation and minimal surfaces; see for instance, [27, 6, 38, 17, 12, 44, 36, 33, 45, 29, 46, 47, 19] and the expository papers [39, 10] for a detailed account. For the

half-space scalar Allen-Cahn equation, the solution is naturally related to the half-space Bernstein theorem for graphical minimal hypersurfaces considered in [15, 13]. The analogous rigidity results are obtained in [16, 32, 14].

In the vectorial case, minimizing solutions can be regarded as diffuse analog of minimal partitions. Due to the lack of Modica's estimate and monotonicity formula (see discussions in [4, 8]) and the non-1D nature, the structure of the solutions are far from being clear compared to the scalar case. In general dimension, the L^1 convergence of Allen-Cahn solution to minimal partitions was established by [7, 42, 20, 24] via Γ -convergence techniques. For the 2D case, recent developments have shed light into geometric and analytic description of fine structures of the Allen-Cahn solutions. Bethuel [8] studied the critical points of (1.1) and successfully generalized results on the regularity of interfaces from the scalar case to the 2D vectorial case with the help of a novel asymptotic monotonicity formula. Fusco [23] studied the connectivity of the diffuse interface and showed the existence of a connected optimal network that separates all phases. Alikakos and Fusco [3] investigated two examples with carefully designed Dirichlet boundary data and derived sharp energy lower and upper bounds and pointwise estimates.

As for the global solution to the vector-valued Allen-Cahn system, most of prior solutions satisfy certain type of symmetry hypotheses. First construction of the planar triple junction (three sectors of 120 degrees join at the center) solution is by Bronsard, Gui and Schatzman [9], where a global solution to (1.1) was constructed in the equivariant class of the reflection group \mathcal{G} corresponding to the symmetries of the equilateral triangle. The result was later extended to the 3D case with a quadruple-junction structure by Gui and Schatzman [31]. More recently, Fusco [22] established the result of [9] in the equivariant class of the rotation subgroup of \mathcal{G} only, thus eliminating the two reflections. Here we also mention constructions of non-1D vector-valued solutions in various settings, see [43, 18, 40, 21, 34, 41].

Recently, independently by Alikakos and the author [5], and Sandier and Sternberg [37], established the existence of an entire minimizing solution, characterized by a triple junction structure at infinity without symmetry assumptions. Such solutions were obtained by a blow-up procedure near the triple junction of the minimizing solution of $\varepsilon\Delta u - \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\nabla_u W(u) = 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Using distinct methods, both studies obtained that along some subsequence $R_k \rightarrow \infty$, the rescaled function $u_{R_k}(z) := u(R_k z)$ converges in $L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ to a triple junction map $\tilde{u} = \sum_{i=1}^3 a_i \chi_{D_i}$, where $\{D_1, D_2, D_3\}$ gives a minimal 3-partition of \mathbb{R}^2 . Following these two works, the author further established the uniqueness of the blow-down limit \tilde{u} at infinity and the almost 1D symmetry along the sharp interface in the subsequent works [26, 25], thereby providing a clearer structure of the triple junction solution as well as a complete classification of 2D global minimizing solutions in terms of their tangent maps at infinity.

The half-space solution considered in the present paper (see Definition 1.1) appears naturally as a blow-up map at the boundary phase-transition point of the minimizing solution to $\varepsilon\Delta u - \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\nabla_u W(u) = 0$ on a finite domain Ω , where $u|_{\partial\Omega}$ has a phase segregation structure. Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4 provide a complete classification of half-space minimizing solutions in terms of blow-down limits and characterize more refined behavior along interior interfaces. We managed to combine and generalize the techniques in [5, 37, 26, 25] with efforts to deal with the boundary data (1.6)–(1.8) on $\partial\mathbb{R}_+^2$.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the notation used throughout the paper and recall several basic estimates for minimizing solutions of the Allen-Cahn system, including the variational maximum principle, the vector-valued Caffarelli-C  rdoba estimate, a rough energy upper bound, and a Γ -convergence result. In Section 3 we classify all blow-down limits at infinity, that is, limits of the form $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} u(r_k z)$ for sequences $r_k \rightarrow \infty$. We first show that every blow-down limit must be homogeneous (radially invariant), using the key estimate in Proposition 3.2,

which establishes an almost energy equipartition property. The argument resembles [37, Section 3], although additional care is needed to handle boundary data in the energy lower and upper bounds. In particular, we obtain a structural characterization of the half-disk minimizing partition in Lemma 3.3, where the interface may coincide with the flat boundary, due to a loss of the strict convexity for the boundary. Similar ideas lead to the classification of all homogeneous minimal cones in the half-space with prescribed boundary data, as shown in Proposition 3.7. Section 4 is devoted to proving the uniqueness of the blow-down limit, following the method introduced in [26]. The key idea, originating from [5], is a slicing argument that yields a sharp lower bound on the energy and, consequently, shows that the diffuse interface remains close to the sharp interface. Finally, in Section 5 we show that when the sharp interface does not coincide with the boundary, the minimizer is almost invariant in the direction of the interface; moreover, on each slice orthogonal to the interface, the map u can be well-approximated by the heteroclinic connection between the corresponding two phases. The proof parallels the arguments in [25].

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Notations. We introduce the following notations for use throughout the paper.

- $z = (x, y)$ denotes a 2D point. The origin $(0, 0)$ is denoted by O .
- $B_r(z)$ is the disk centered at z with radius r . $B_r^+(z)$ denotes the upper half disk centered at z with radius r . When z is the origin, we simply write B_r and B_r^+ .
- Denote by $A_{r_1, r_2}^+(z_0)$ the upper half annulus centered at z_0 : $A_{r_1, r_2}^+(z_0) := \{z : r_1 < |z - z_0| < r_2, z - z_0 \in B_{r_2}^+\}$. When z_0 is the origin, we simply write A_{r_1, r_2}^+ .
- In this paper, we use three different notions of distance. For the Euclidean distance of two points z_1, z_2 on the domain Ω , we denote it by $\text{dist}(z_1, z_2)$. The Euclidean distance on the target domain is denoted by $|\cdot|$, for instance $|u_\varepsilon(z_1) - a_i|$. Finally, we denote by $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ the degenerate Riemannian metric on \mathbb{R}^2 defined in (1.10).
- \tilde{u} denotes a minimizing partition map in the sense of Definition 1.2.
- For a fixed minimizing partition map \tilde{u} , set $S_i := \{\tilde{u}^{-1}(a_i)\}$.
- For $\alpha \in [0, \pi]$, let l_α denote the ray emanating from the origin in the direction α , that is, $l_\alpha := \{(r \cos \alpha, r \sin \alpha) : r > 0\}$.
- Without specific explanation, C denotes a constant that depends on the potential W , M in the uniform bound (1.9) and sometimes also on the boundary data u_0 . C may have distinct values in various estimates.

2.2. Basic estimates for vector-valued Allen-Cahn minimizers. First we recall the following 1D energy estimate.

Lemma 2.1 (Lemma 2.3 in [3]). *Take $i \neq j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, $\delta < \delta_W$ and $s_- < s_+$ be two real numbers. Let $v : (s_-, s_+) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ be a smooth map that minimizes the energy functional*

$$J_{(s_-, s_+)}(v) := \int_{s_-}^{s_+} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\nabla v|^2 + W(v) \right) dx$$

subject to the boundary condition

$$\max\{|v(s_-) - a_i|, |v(s_+) - a_j|\} \leq \delta.$$

Then

$$J_{(s_-, s_+)}(v) \geq \sigma_{ij} - C\delta^2,$$

where $C = C(W)$. Moreover, we have

$$d(v(s_-), v(s_+)) \geq \sigma_{ij} - C\delta^2.$$

The following vectorial maximum principle for u will be useful in our analysis.

Lemma 2.2 (Variational maximum principle, [2]). *Assume (H_1) , (H_2) , (H_3) or (H'_3) . Let $u \in W_{loc}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+^2, \mathbb{R}^2)$ be a minimizing solution of (1.1). There exists a positive constant $r_0 = r_0(W)$ such that if u satisfies*

$$|u(z) - a_i| \leq r \text{ on } \partial D, \text{ for some } r < r_0, 1 \leq i \leq N, D \subset \mathbb{R}_+^2,$$

then

$$|u(z) - a_i| \leq r, \quad \forall z \in D.$$

We also recall the following vector version of the Caffarelli–Córdoba density estimate in [1].

Lemma 2.3 ([1]). *Assume (H_1) , (H_2) , (H_3) or (H'_3) . Let $u \in W_{loc}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+^2, \mathbb{R}^2)$ be a minimizing solution of (1.1). If for some $r_0, \lambda, \mu > 0$, $1 \leq i \leq N$, $z \in \Omega$,*

$$\mathcal{L}^2(B_{r_0}(z) \cap \{|u - a_i| > \lambda\}) \geq \mu, \quad B_{r_0}(z) \subset \mathbb{R}_+^2,$$

then there exists a constant $C(r_0, \lambda, \mu) > 0$ such that

$$\mathcal{L}^2(B_r(z) \cap \{|u - a_i| > \lambda\}) \geq Cr^2, \quad \forall r \in [r_0, \text{dist}(z, \partial \mathbb{R}_+^2)].$$

Next we derive a rough energy upper bound for u on any disk $B_r(z)$.

Lemma 2.4. *Assume (H_1) , (H_2) , (H_3) or (H'_3) . Let u be a minimizing solution of (1.1) satisfying (1.9). Then there exists a constant $C = C(W, M)$ such that*

$$(2.17) \quad J(u, B_r(z) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^2) \leq Cr, \quad \forall z \in \overline{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \text{ and } r > 0.$$

Proof. We take z as the origin. The proof is similar for general $z \in \overline{\mathbb{R}_+^2}$. Since $|\nabla u|$ and $W(u)$ is uniformly bounded by (1.9), it suffices to prove (2.17) for r large enough.

Define the following regions

$$(2.18) \quad \begin{aligned} \Omega_1 &:= B_{r-1}^+ \cap \{(x, y) : y > 1\}, \\ \Omega_2 &:= \{(x, y) : -\sqrt{r^2 - 2r} \leq x \leq \sqrt{r^2 - 2r}, 0 \leq y \leq 1\}, \\ \Omega_3 &:= A_{r-1, r}^+ \cap \{(x, y) : \frac{y}{|x|} \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{r^2 - 2r}}\}, \\ \Omega_4 &:= \{(x, y) \in B_r^+ : x > \sqrt{r^2 - 1}, \frac{y}{x} < \frac{1}{\sqrt{r^2 - 2r}}\}, \\ \Omega_5 &:= \{(x, y) \in B_r^+ : x < -\sqrt{r^2 - 1}, \frac{y}{|x|} < \frac{1}{\sqrt{r^2 - 2r}}\}. \end{aligned}$$

By the definition we have


$$\overline{B_r^+} = \bigcup_{i=1}^5 \overline{\Omega_i}.$$

We construct an energy competitor v in B_r^+ . Set

$$v \equiv a_1 \text{ on } \overline{\Omega_1}.$$

On Ω_2 , let v vertically interpolate between a_1 and u_0 :

$$v(x, y) = a_1 y + u_0(x)(1 - y), \quad (x, y) \in \Omega_2.$$

FIGURE 1. Ω_i for $i = 1, \dots, 5$

On Ω_3 , let v interpolate between a_1 and $u|_{\partial B_r}$ in the radial direction:

$$v(s, \theta) = (s - r + 1)u(r, \theta) + (r - s)a_1, \quad r - 1 < s < r, \arcsin \frac{1}{r-1} \leq \theta \leq \pi - \arcsin \frac{1}{r-1}.$$

For the domain Ω_4 , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial\Omega_4 = & \{(x, 0) : \sqrt{r^2 - 2r} \leq x \leq r\} \cup \{(\sqrt{r^2 - 2r}, y) : 0 \leq y \leq 1\} \\ & \cup \{(s \frac{\sqrt{r^2 - 2r}}{r-1}, s \frac{1}{r-1}) : r - 1 \leq s \leq r\} \cup \{(r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta) : 0 \leq \theta \leq \arcsin \frac{1}{r-1}\} \\ =: & \gamma_1 \cup \gamma_2 \cup \gamma_3 \cup \gamma_4. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\gamma_2 \subset \partial\Omega_2$ and $\gamma_3 \subset \partial\Omega_3$, hence v is already defined on $\gamma_2 \cup \gamma_3$. $\gamma_1, \gamma_4 \subset \partial B_r^+$, we set $v = u$ on $\gamma_1 \cup \gamma_4$. It is not hard to check that

$$|v| \leq 2M, \quad |\partial_T v| \leq 2M \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega_4.$$

Since Ω_4 is a Lipschitz domain, we can extend v to Ω_4 such that

$$(2.19) \quad |v| \leq 2M, \quad |\nabla v| \leq C(M) \quad \text{in } \Omega_4.$$

Finally we define v in Ω_5 similarly. By checking the definition of v in Ω_2 and Ω_3 , the estimate (2.19) also holds in $\Omega_2 \cup \Omega_3$. We estimate the energy

$$J(v, B_r^+) = \sum_{i=2}^5 \int_{\Omega_i} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\nabla v|^2 + W(v) \right) dz \leq C(W, M) \sum_{i=2}^5 |\Omega_i| = C(W, M)r.$$

(2.17) follows immediately by the minimality of u . \square

We use the following compactness result from [37], originally stated for local minimizers in \mathbb{R}^2 , but readily adapted to the half-space setting with only minor modifications to the proof. The argument follows the standard Γ -convergence argument of [7, 24], which we omit here.

Proposition 2.5 (Proposition 3.1 in [37]). *Let $u : \mathbb{R}_+^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ be a minimizing solution of (1.1) satisfying (1.5)–(1.9). For any sequence $\{r_j\} \rightarrow \infty$, there exists a subsequence $\{r_{j_k}\}$ and a function $\tilde{u} \in \text{BV}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}_+^2; \{a_1, \dots, a_N\})$ such that*

$$u_{r_{j_k}} \rightarrow \tilde{u}, \quad \text{in } L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}_+^2; \mathbb{R}^2).$$

Here $u_{r_{j_k}}(z) := u(r_{j_k} z)$ and \tilde{u} is a minimizing partition map that locally minimizes $J_*(\cdot, \Omega)$ in the sense of Definition 1.2. Moreover, for any compact set $K \subset \overline{\mathbb{R}_+^2}$, it holds that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} J(u_{r_{j_k}}, K) = J_*(\tilde{u}, K).$$

3. CLASSIFICATION OF BLOW-DOWN LIMITS

In this section, we classify the blow-down limits of local minimizers of J . Let u denote a minimizing solution of (1.1) satisfying (1.5)–(1.9). Proposition 2.5 establishes the existence of a blow-down limit along any sequence $r_j \rightarrow \infty$. Closely following the argument of [37, Section 3], we first show that every blow-down limit is homogeneous, i.e., invariant in the radial direction. While [37] treats only the case of a triple-well potential W , our argument also applies to multiple wells with equal σ_{ij} , requiring no substantial modification of the proof. In addition, we also need adjustments to account for the half-space setting. We start with the following estimate derived from a Pohozaev's identity.

Lemma 3.1. *There exists a constant $C = C(u_0, W, M)$ such that*

$$(3.20) \quad \frac{d}{dr} \left(\frac{1}{r} \int_{B_r^+} W(u) dz \right) \geq \frac{1}{2r} \int_{\partial B_r^+ \cap \mathbb{R}_+^2} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\partial_r u|^2 - \frac{1}{2} |\partial_T u|^2 + W(u) \right) d\mathcal{H}^1 - \frac{C}{r^2}, \quad \forall r > 0.$$

Proof. We write $z = (z_1, z_2)$ and define the stress-energy tensor

$$T_{ij} := \partial_i u \partial_j u - \delta_{ij} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\nabla u|^2 + W(u) \right).$$

Then $\operatorname{div}(T_i) = \partial_j T_{ij} = \partial_i u \cdot (\Delta u - \nabla_u W(u)) = 0$ by (1.1). Therefore,

$$(3.21) \quad \int_{B_r^+} \partial_j (z_i T_{ij}) dz = \int_{B_r^+} \delta_{ij} T_{ij} dz = -2 \int_{B_r^+} W(u) dz.$$

Using the divergence theorem,

$$(3.22) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{B_r^+} \partial_j (z_i T_{ij}) dz &= \int_{\partial B_r^+} (z \cdot T) \cdot \nu d\mathcal{H}^1 \\ &= \int_{\partial B_r \cap \mathbb{R}_+^2} r \left(|\partial_r u|^2 - \frac{1}{2} |\nabla u|^2 - W(u) \right) d\mathcal{H}^1 - \int_{-r}^r z_1 \partial_1 u \partial_2 u dz_1. \end{aligned}$$

Using (3.21) and (3.22) we derive that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dr} \left(\frac{1}{r} \int_{B_r^+} W(u) dz \right) &= \frac{1}{r} \int_{\partial B_r \cap \mathbb{R}_+^2} W(u) d\mathcal{H}^1 - \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{B_r^+} W(u) dz \\ &= \frac{1}{2r} \int_{\partial B_r \cap \mathbb{R}_+^2} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\partial_r u|^2 - \frac{1}{2} |\partial_T u|^2 + W(u) \right) d\mathcal{H}^1 - \frac{1}{2r^2} \int_{-r}^r z_1 \partial_1 u \partial_2 u dz_1 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2r} \int_{\partial B_r \cap \mathbb{R}_+^2} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\partial_r u|^2 - \frac{1}{2} |\partial_T u|^2 + W(u) \right) d\mathcal{H}^1 - \frac{1}{2r^2} \int_{-r}^r |z_1| \cdot |\partial_1 u| \cdot |\partial_2 u| dz_1. \end{aligned}$$

By (1.9) and (1.7), we have

$$|\partial_2 u| \leq M, \quad \int_{-r}^r |z_1| |\partial_1 u| dz_1 = \int_{-r}^r |x| |u'_0| dx \leq \infty.$$

Then (3.20) follows immediately. \square

Next we prove the following almost equipartition property of energy.

Proposition 3.2. *There exists $C = C(u_0, W, M)$, $R_0 > 0$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, such that*

$$(3.23) \quad \int_{B_r^+} \left(\sqrt{W(u)} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |\nabla u| \right)^2 dz \leq Cr^{1-\alpha}, \quad \forall r \geq R_0.$$

Proof. The proof follows closely that of [37, Proposition 3.3]. We therefore sketch the main steps here, omitting minor details and highlighting the adjustment needed to accommodate the half-space boundary condition.

For any r , using the rough energy upper bound (2.17) with $2r$ and Mean Value Theorem, there is $R \in (r, 2r)$ such that

$$(3.24) \quad \int_{\partial B_R \cap \mathbb{R}_+^2} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\nabla_T u|^2 + W(u) \right) d\mathcal{H}^1 \leq C(W, M).$$

The proof of (3.23) is divided into the proof of the following two inequalities:

$$(3.25) \quad \int_{B_R^+} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\nabla u|^2 + W(u) \right) dz \leq \mathcal{J}_R + CR^{1-\alpha}.$$

$$(3.26) \quad \int_{B_R^+} \sqrt{2W(u)} |\nabla u| dz \geq \mathcal{J}_R - CR^{1-\alpha}.$$

Here \mathcal{J}_R is the energy of a minimizing partition map in the sense of Definition 1.2 determined by $u|_{\partial B_R^+}$, which will be defined later. It is obvious that (3.23) follows directly from (3.25) and (3.26) since r is arbitrary and $R \in (r, 2r)$.

First we show that (3.24) implies $u|_{\partial B_R^+}$ is “well-behaved” in the sense that it can be partitioned into finitely many arcs, each of which is associated with an a_i phase.

Let $\delta = \delta(W) \ll 1$ be a small parameter. Define the set

$$A_R := \{z \in \partial B_R \cap \mathbb{R}_+^2 : |u(z) - a_i| > \frac{\delta}{2}, \forall i\}.$$

This set is a finite union of open arcs. Suppose that, for some arc, there exists a point z such that $|u(z) - a_i| \geq \delta$ for all $1 \leq i \leq N$. Since u must be within $\delta/2$ neighborhood of some phase a_i at the endpoints of this arc, the energy along the arc is bounded below by a constant $C(W, \delta)$. Let T_R denote the union of all such arcs. Then the total number of disjoint arcs in T_R is bounded by a constant C depending only on W , δ and M , and the measure of T_R is uniformly bounded, i.e., $\mathcal{H}^1(T_R) \leq C$. Consequently, the complement $(\partial B_R \cap \mathbb{R}_+^2) \setminus T_R$ consists of finitely many disjoint closed arcs I_1, I_2, \dots, I_k , forming an almost-partition of $\partial B_R \cap \mathbb{R}_+^2$. Furthermore, we may assume $\mathcal{H}^1(I_j) \geq C$ for all j and some constant $C(W, M)$; otherwise, we can absorb any arc I_k with small measure into T_R without affecting the subsequent arguments.

For each arc I_j , there exists an associated phase a_{i_j} such that

$$|u(z) - a_{i_j}| \leq \delta, \quad \forall z \in I_j.$$

We then expand each I_j to a slightly larger arc \tilde{I}_j such that $\{\tilde{I}_j\}_{j=1}^k$ forms a partition of $\partial B_R \cap \mathbb{R}_+^2$. Denote by $v_R \in \text{BV}(B_R^+; \{a_1, \dots, a_N\})$ a minimizer of the following minimizing partition problem:

$$(3.27) \quad \begin{aligned} & \min J_*(v, B_R^+), \\ & v_R = \sum_{j=1}^k \chi_{\tilde{I}_j} a_{i_j} \quad \text{on } \partial B_R \cap \mathbb{R}_+^2 \text{ in the sense of trace.} \end{aligned}$$

Denote by

$$\mathcal{J}_R := J_*(v_R, B_R^+).$$

The existence and the structure of v_R is described later in Lemma 3.3. Then we can construct an energy competitor v based on the profile of v_R to obtain the energy upper bound (3.25). To be more specific, take $R_1 := R - R^\alpha$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Define $v|_{\partial B_{R_1}}$ as

$$v(z) = a_{i_j}, \quad \text{for } z \in \frac{R_1}{R} \tilde{I}_j, \text{ dist}(z, \partial(\frac{R_1}{R} \tilde{I}_j)) \geq 1, \quad 1 \leq j \leq k$$

$$v \text{ changes from } a_{i_j} \text{ to } a_{i_{j+1}} \text{ smoothly in an } O(1) \text{ arc connecting } \frac{R_1}{R} \tilde{I}_j, \frac{R_1}{R} \tilde{I}_{j+1}, \quad 1 \leq j \leq k-1,$$

Near $(R_1, 0)/(-R_1, 0)$, v transits from $u_0(R_1)/u_0(-R_1)$ to a_{i_1}/a_{i_k} smoothly in an $O(1)$ arc.

On the half annulus $A_{R_1, R}^+$, let v linearly interpolate between $u|_{\partial B_R \cap \mathbb{R}_+^2}$ and $v|_{\partial B_{R_1} \cap \mathbb{R}_+^2}$. Special care is required near the x -axis to maintain the boundary condition $v = u_0$ on $\{(x, 0) : R_1 < |x| < R\}$. This can be achieved by defining v separately in the two corner regions $A_{R_1, R}^+ \cap \{(x, y) : |y| \leq C\}$ (analogous to Ω_4 and Ω_5 in the proof of Lemma 2.4) and ensuring that the energy contribution from these regions is negligible. A direct computation then gives the energy bound $J(v, A_{R_1, R}^+) \leq CR^{1-\alpha}$. We omit the detailed calculation and refer the reader to [37, (3.33)–(3.37)].

For the construction of v inside $B_{R_1}^+$, define the following rescaled version of the minimizing partition map v_R :

$$v_{R_1}(z) := v_R\left(\frac{R}{R_1}z\right), \quad z \in B_{R_1}^+.$$

Let S_j^1 denote the set $\{v_{R_1}^{-1}(a_i)\}$. From Lemma 3.3, the total number of connected components of S_i^1 is bounded by $k+2$ and the total number of line segments $l \subset (\partial S_i^1 \cap \partial S_j^1)$ is at most $\binom{k+2}{2}$. Near a line segment $l \subset (\partial S_i^1 \cap \partial S_j^1)$, we set $v(z) = U_{ij}(d(z, l))$ within a thin rectangle of width R^α whose long side is parallel to l . Here $d(\cdot, l)$ denote the signed distance function to l . The energy within these thin rectangles is approximately $\sigma_{ij}\mathcal{H}^1(l)$. Then we glue these thin rectangles either by regions of size $O(R^\alpha)$ in group of three (corresponding to interior triple junction points) or connected them to the boundary $\partial B_{R_1}^+$ through a boundary layer (corresponding to boundary jump points). One can assign the value of v carefully so that the energy within these gluing regions is controlled by $R^{1-\alpha}$. See [37, proof of Proposition 3.3] for a similar construction. If there is mismatch on the x -axis, say, there exists some $i \neq 1$ such that $v_{R_1} = a_i$ on $\{(x, 0) : 0 < x < R_1\}$ in the sense of trace, then we construct v in the boundary layer $L := \{(x, y) : R^\alpha < x < R - 2R^\alpha, 0 < y < 4R^\alpha\}$ as follows:

$$v(x, y) = \begin{cases} U_{1i}(y - 2R^\alpha), & R^\alpha \leq y \leq 3R^\alpha, \\ U_{1i}(-R^\alpha) \frac{y}{R^\alpha} + u_0(x) \frac{R^\alpha - y}{R^\alpha}, & 0 < y < R^\alpha, \\ U_{1i}(R^\alpha) \frac{4R^\alpha - y}{R^\alpha} + a_i \frac{y - 3R^\alpha}{R^\alpha}, & 3R^\alpha < y < 4R^\alpha. \end{cases}$$

The energy $J(v, L \cap \{R^\alpha < y < 3R^\alpha\})$ is bounded by $R\sigma_{1i} - O(R^\alpha)$, while the contributions from the other two layers are controlled by $O(R^\alpha)$. For instance,

$$J(v, L \cap \{0 < y < R^\alpha\}) \leq \int_{R^\alpha}^{R-2R^\alpha} \left(\int_0^{R^\alpha} C \frac{|u_0(x) - a_1|^2}{R^{2\alpha}} + C|u_0(x) - a_1|^2 dy \right) dx \leq CR^\alpha,$$

where we have used the fact that $|U_{1i}(-R^\alpha) - a_1| \leq Ce^{-CR^\alpha}$, $W(u_0(x)) \leq C|u_0 - a_1|^2$ for $x > R^\alpha$, and (1.8).

We have now covered all line segments in $\cup_{i,j} \partial S_i^1 \cap \partial S_j^1$, as well as any boundary mismatch along the x -axis, by thin rectangles of size $O(R^\alpha)$. The triple junctions and boundary jump points are also covered by small connecting regions, which glue all the thin rectangles associated with

flat interfaces. In the remaining “interior region” of each S_i^1 , we simply set $v = a_i$. Summing the contributions, the dominant part of $J(v, B_R^+)$ arises from those rectangular neighborhoods of $\partial S_i^1 \cap \partial S_j^1$ and from the boundary mismatch layer L near the x -axis, yielding approximately $\frac{R_1}{R} \mathcal{J}_R \sim \mathcal{J}_R - O(R^\alpha)$. The remaining energy is bounded by $C(W)R^{1-\alpha}$, where α can be chosen even smaller if necessary. The upper bound 3.25 is established.

Next we prove the lower bound (3.26). Set $R_2 := R + R^\alpha$. We define a function w on $\partial B_{R_2}^+$ in the same way as the definition of $v|_{\partial B_{R_1}^+}$:

$$w(x, 0) = u_0(x) \quad \text{for } -R_2 \leq x \leq R_2,$$

$$w(z) = a_{i_j}, \quad \text{for } z \in \frac{R_2}{R} \tilde{I}_j, \text{ dist}(z, \partial(\frac{R_2}{R} \tilde{I}_j)) \geq 1, \quad 1 \leq j \leq k$$

w changes from a_{i_j} to $a_{i_{j+1}}$ smoothly in an $O(1)$ arc connecting $\frac{R_2}{R} \tilde{I}_j$, $\frac{R_2}{R} \tilde{I}_{j+1}$, $1 \leq j \leq k-1$,

Near $(R_2, 0)/(-R_2, 0)$, w transits from $u_0(R_2)/u_0(-R_2)$ to a_{i_1}/a_{i_k} smoothly in an $O(1)$ arc.

Then let w linearly interpolate between $w|_{\partial B_{R_2} \cap \mathbb{R}_+^2}$ and $u|_{\partial B_R \cap \mathbb{R}_+^2}$ in the half annulus A_{R, R_2}^+ . Again for the two corner regions of size R^α near x -axis, we need to make some adjustment to match with u_0 . Similarly one has

$$J(w, A_{R, R_2}^+) \leq CR^{1-\alpha}.$$

Finally set $w = u$ on B_R^+ . If we can prove

$$(3.27) \quad \int_{B_{R_2}^+} \sqrt{2} |\nabla w| \sqrt{W(w)} dz \geq \mathcal{J}_R - cR^{1-\alpha},$$

then (3.26) follows by

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_R^+} \sqrt{2} |\nabla u| \sqrt{W(u)} dz &= \int_{B_{R_2}^+} \sqrt{2} |\nabla w| \sqrt{W(w)} dz - \int_{A_{R, R_2}^+} \sqrt{2} |\nabla w| \sqrt{W(w)} dz \\ &\geq \int_{B_{R_2}^+} \sqrt{2} |\nabla w| \sqrt{W(w)} dz - J(w, A_{R, R_2}^+) \geq \mathcal{J}_R - CR^{1-\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is reduced to the verification of (3.27). Below we present the proof for the case $N > 3$ and $\sigma_{ij} \equiv \sigma$. The case $N = 3$ follows by a similar argument.

For convenience, we rescale the domain $B_{R_2}^+$ to B_R^+ by defining

$$\tilde{w}(z) := w\left(\frac{R_2}{R} z\right), \quad \forall z \in B_R^+.$$

The energy becomes

$$\int_{B_R^+} \sqrt{2} |\nabla \tilde{w}| \sqrt{W(\tilde{w})} dz = \frac{R}{R_2} \int_{B_{R_2}^+} \sqrt{2} |\nabla w| \sqrt{W(w)} dz.$$

Then (3.27) becomes

$$(3.28) \quad \int_{B_R^+} \sqrt{2} |\nabla \tilde{w}| \sqrt{W(\tilde{w})} dz \geq (1 - R^{\alpha-1})(\mathcal{J}_R - CR^{1-\alpha}) \geq \mathcal{J}_R - CR^{1-\alpha},$$

where the second inequality holds because R^α can be absorbed by $R^{1-\alpha}$ when $\alpha < \frac{1}{2}$.

Define the open subsets of B_R^+ by

$$S_i^2 := \{z \in B_R^+ : d(\tilde{w}(z), a_i) < \frac{\sigma}{2}\} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq N.$$

S_i^2 are all disjoint since for any z and $i \neq j$, $d(\tilde{w}(z), a_i) + d(\tilde{w}(z), a_j) \geq \sigma$. We also recall the following property for the metric d , cf. [42],

$$|\nabla_q d(p, q)| = \sqrt{W(q)}, \quad \text{for any } p, q \in \mathbb{R}^2.$$

Using co-area formula we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_R^+} \sqrt{2} |\nabla \tilde{w}| \sqrt{W(\tilde{w})} dz &\geq \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{S_i^2} \sqrt{2} |\nabla \tilde{w}| \sqrt{W(\tilde{w})} dz \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{S_i^2} |\nabla d(\tilde{w}(z), a_i)| dz \\ (3.29) \quad &\geq \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{R^{-1/3}}^{\sigma/2} \mathcal{H}^1(\{z : d(\tilde{w}(z), a_i) = s\}) ds \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{\sigma}{2} - R^{-\frac{1}{3}} \right) \mathcal{H}^1(\{z : d(\tilde{w}(z), a_i) = s_i\}), \end{aligned}$$

where $s_i \in [R^{-\frac{1}{3}}, \frac{\sigma}{2}]$. For sufficiently large R , the inequality above implies

$$\frac{\sigma}{4} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{H}^1(\{z : d(\tilde{w}(z), a_i) = s_i\}) \leq \int_{B_R^+} \sqrt{2} |\nabla \tilde{w}| \sqrt{W(\tilde{w})} dz \leq CR.$$

Substituting this back to (3.29) yields

$$(3.30) \quad \int_{B_R^+} \sqrt{2} |\nabla \tilde{w}| \sqrt{W(\tilde{w})} dz \geq \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\sigma}{2} \mathcal{H}^1(\{z : d(\tilde{w}(z), a_i) = s_i\}) - CR^{\frac{2}{3}}.$$

Hence, inequality (3.28) is further reduced to the following inequality if we take $\alpha < \frac{1}{3}$.

$$(3.31) \quad \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\sigma}{2} \mathcal{H}^1(\{z : d(\tilde{w}(z), a_i) = s_i\}) \geq \mathcal{J}_R - CR^{1-\alpha}.$$

We show that $\{z : d(\tilde{w}(z), a_i) < s_i\}_{i=1}^N$ forms an almost partition of B_R^+ up to a set with negligible measure. Take any $z_1 \in B_R \setminus \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^N \{z : d(\tilde{w}(z), a_i) < s_i\} \right)$, by Hypothesis (H₁) we have

$$W(\tilde{w}(z_1)) \geq C(W)R^{-\frac{2}{3}},$$

which combined with the upper bound $J(\tilde{w}, B_R^+) \leq CR$ yields

$$CR \geq \int_{B_R^+} W(\tilde{w}(z)) dz \geq \frac{C}{R^{\frac{2}{3}}} \left| B_R^+ \setminus \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^N \{z : d(\tilde{w}(z), a_i) < s_i\} \right) \right|.$$

Therefore, we arrive at

$$(3.32) \quad \left| B_R^+ \setminus \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^N \{z : d(\tilde{w}(z), a_i) < s_i\} \right) \right| \leq CR^{\frac{5}{3}}.$$

Set

$$\eta := \frac{\left| B_R^+ \setminus \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^N \{z : d(\tilde{w}(z), a_i) < s_i\} \right) \right|}{R^2}.$$

We define $\Omega_R := B_R^+ \cup \{(x, y) : -R < x < R, -\sqrt{1 - \frac{x^2}{R^2}} < y \leq 0\}$ and let $\{\tilde{S}_1, \tilde{S}_2, \dots, \tilde{S}_N\}$ be a minimizer of the following constraint minimal partition problem with wetting regions.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \min \quad & \frac{\sigma}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{H}^1(\partial \tilde{S}_i \cap \Omega_2), \\
 \text{such that} \quad & \bigcup_{j:i_j=i} \tilde{I}_j \subset \partial \tilde{S}_i, \quad 1 \leq i \leq N, \\
 (\text{Problem 2}) \quad & \{(x, y) : 0 < x < R, y = -\sqrt{1 - \frac{x^2}{R^2}}\} \subset \partial \tilde{S}_1, \\
 & \{(x, y) : -R < x < 0, y = -\sqrt{1 - \frac{x^2}{R^2}}\} \subset \partial \tilde{S}_2, \\
 & \left| \Omega_R \setminus \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^N \tilde{S}_i \right) \right| \leq \eta R^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

We introduce a half-elliptical boundary layer below the x -axis to account for the boundary energy in (1.11) and to render the domain Ω_R strictly convex. The existence of a minimizer for Problem 2 follows from the same arguments as in [35, Theorem 3.1]. The first observation is that each connected component C of \tilde{S}_j , which does not overlap with the lower half boundary $\{(x, y) : -R < x < R, y = -\sqrt{1 - \frac{x^2}{R^2}}\}$, must meet $\partial B_R \cap \mathbb{R}_+^2$ with one or more \tilde{I}_α such that $i_\alpha = j$. To see this, it suffices to notice that any interior island of \tilde{S}_j can be “eaten” by an adjacent phase to lower the total energy. Hence, the total number of connected components of $\tilde{S}_1, \dots, \tilde{S}_N$ is bounded by $k + 2$, which only depends on W . By [35, Theorems 1.4 and 1.8], for sufficiently small η , the configuration of $\tilde{S}_1, \dots, \tilde{S}_N$ satisfies the following properties. Although the original results are stated for the unit disk, they extend to strict convex domains without essential modification.

- Denote by G the wetting region $\Omega_R \setminus \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^N \tilde{S}_i \right)$. $\partial \tilde{S}_i$ is $C^{1,1}$ except at jump points on $\partial \Omega_R$. $\partial \tilde{S}_i \cap \partial \tilde{S}_j \cap B_R^+$ is a finite union of line segments terminating either on $\partial \Omega_R$ at a jump point or at an interior point belonging to ∂G .
- For every connected component \mathcal{G} of G , $\partial \mathcal{G}$ consists of three arcs, each either a circular arc with curvature $\kappa = \kappa(\eta, R)$. Each arc can be written as $\partial \tilde{S}_i \cap \partial \mathcal{G}$ for some i . If two arcs of $\partial \mathcal{G}$ intersect at an interior point of Ω_R , then they meet tangentially.

From the structure above we can easily bound the total number of connected components of G by a constant C depending only on W . Then we construct a map $\tilde{v}_R \in \text{BV}(\Omega_R; \{a_1, \dots, a_N\})$ in the following way: firstly set $\tilde{v}_R \equiv a_i$ on \tilde{S}_i ; then for any connected component $\mathcal{G} \subset G$, suppose

$$\partial \mathcal{G} = (\partial \tilde{S}_i \cap \partial \mathcal{G}) \cap (\partial \tilde{S}_j \cap \partial \mathcal{G}) \cap (\partial \tilde{S}_k \cap \partial \mathcal{G}).$$

Pick $i \in \{i, j, k\}$ such that $\partial \tilde{S}_i \cap \partial \mathcal{G}$ is the largest arc among three, and set $\tilde{v}_R = a_i$ on \mathcal{G} . Repeat this procedure to assign values for all the wetting regions \mathcal{G} and finally obtain a complete partition of Ω_R . Now we invoke [37, Theorem 5.4] to obtain

$$(3.33) \quad \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{H}^1(\partial \tilde{S}_i \cap \Omega_R) \geq \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{H}^1(\partial \{\tilde{v}_R^{-1}(a_i)\} \cap \Omega_R) - C\eta^{\frac{1}{2}}R \geq \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{H}^1(\partial \{\tilde{v}_R^{-1}(a_i)\} \cap \Omega_R) - CR^{\frac{5}{6}},$$

where the constant C only depends on W . The rough idea for this estimate is that the total area of the wetting region G is $O(1/\kappa^2)$, and the boundary measure gain for \tilde{v}_R is $O(1/\kappa)$. For details, see [37].

Now $\tilde{v}_R|_{B_R^+}$ can compete with the minimizer v_R of Problem 1 since the trace condition on $\partial B_R \cap \mathbb{R}_+^2$ is satisfied. Define the set $\mathcal{M}_1 := \{x \in (0, R) : \tilde{v}_R(x, 0) \neq a_1\}$. For almost every $x_0 \in \mathcal{M}_1$, suppose $\tilde{v}_R(x_0) = a_i$ for some $i \neq 1$, then \tilde{v}_R will transit from a_i to a_1 along the small vertical segments $l_{x_0} := \{(x_0, y) : -\sqrt{1 - \frac{x_0^2}{R^2}} < y < 0\}$, and therefore

$$\partial\{\tilde{v}_R^{-1}(a_i)\} \cap l_{x_0} \neq \emptyset, \quad \partial\{\tilde{v}_R^{-1}(a_1)\} \cap l_{x_0} \neq \emptyset.$$

Consequently, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\sigma}{2} \mathcal{H}^1(\partial\{\tilde{v}_R^{-1}(a_i)\} \cap \{0 < x < R, -\sqrt{1 - \frac{x^2}{R^2}} < y < 0\}) \geq \sigma \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M}_1),$$

Similarly, for $\mathcal{M}_2 := \{x \in (-R, 0) : \tilde{v}_R(x, 0) \neq a_2\}$ we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\sigma}{2} \mathcal{H}^1(\partial\{\tilde{v}_R^{-1}(a_i)\} \cap \{-R < x < 0, -\sqrt{1 - \frac{x^2}{R^2}} < y < 0\}) \geq \sigma \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M}_2),$$

Using (3.33) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (3.34) \quad \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\sigma}{2} \mathcal{H}^1(\partial\tilde{S}_i \cap \Omega_R) &\geq \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\sigma}{2} \mathcal{H}^1(\partial\{\tilde{v}_R^{-1}(a_i)\} \cap \Omega_R) - CR^{\frac{5}{6}} \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\sigma}{2} \mathcal{H}^1(\partial\{\tilde{v}_R^{-1}(a_i)\} \cap B_R^+) + \sigma(\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M}_1) + \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M}_2)) - CR^{\frac{5}{6}}, \\ &= J_*(\tilde{v}_R, B_R^+) - CR^{\frac{5}{6}} \\ &\geq \mathcal{J}_R - CR^{\frac{5}{6}}. \end{aligned}$$

Set $V_i := \{z \in B_R^+ : d(\tilde{w}(z), a_i) < s_i\}$ for $1 \leq i \leq N$. We now modify $\{V_i\}_{i=1}^N$ to obtain a competitor $\{\tilde{V}_i\}_{i=1}^N$ for Problem 2. By the definition of \tilde{w} , $\tilde{w}(z) = a_{i_j}$ for $z \in \partial B_R \cap \mathbb{R}_+^2$ such that $\text{dist}(z, \partial\tilde{I}_j) > 1$. Thus $(\partial B_R \cap \mathbb{R}_+^2) \setminus (\cup_i \partial V_i)$ consists of k small arcs of size $O(1)$. For each such arc, we add to V_i the region enclosed by the arc and its secant line, where a_i is one of the two adjacent phases of this arc. The extra cost in perimeter $\sum_i \mathcal{H}^1(\partial V_i)$ is $O(1)$. Then we define

$$\tilde{V}_i = \begin{cases} V_i, & i \geq 3, \\ V_1 \cup \{(x, y) : 0 < x < R, -\sqrt{1 - \frac{x^2}{R^2}} < y \leq 0\} & i = 1, \\ V_2 \cup \{(x, y) : -R < x < 0, -\sqrt{1 - \frac{x^2}{R^2}} < y \leq 0\} & i = 2. \end{cases}$$

By the definition of \tilde{w} on $\{(x, 0) : -R < x < R\}$, we have

$$\mathcal{H}^1(\{(x, 0) : -R < x < R\} \setminus (V_1 \cup V_2)) \leq C(R^{\frac{2}{3}} + R^\alpha),$$

which further implies

$$(3.35) \quad \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\sigma}{2} \mathcal{H}^1(\partial\tilde{V}_i \cap \Omega_R) \leq \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\sigma}{2} \mathcal{H}^1(\partial V_i \cap B_R^+) + CR^{\frac{2}{3}}.$$

This, together with (3.34) and the minimality of $\{\tilde{S}_i\}_{i=1}^N$, leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\sigma}{2} \mathcal{H}^1(\partial V_i \cap B_R^+) &\geq \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\sigma}{2} \mathcal{H}^1(\partial \tilde{V}_i \cap B_R^+) - CR^{\frac{2}{3}} \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\sigma}{2} \mathcal{H}^1(\partial \tilde{S}_i \cap B_R^+) - CR^{\frac{2}{3}} \\ &\geq \mathcal{J}_R - CR^{\frac{2}{3}} - CR^{\frac{5}{6}}, \end{aligned}$$

which yields (3.31) if we choose $\alpha < \frac{1}{6}$. This completes the proof of Proposition 3.2. \square

Lemma 3.3. *Assume $v_0 \in \text{BV}(\partial B_1 \cap \mathbb{R}_+^2; \{a_1, \dots, a_N\})$. There exists a minimizer v of the functional $J_*(v, B_1^+)$ defined in (1.11) subject to the boundary condition*

$$(3.36) \quad v = v_0 \text{ on } \partial B_1 \cap \mathbb{R}_+^2 \text{ in the sense of trace.}$$

Set $S_i := \{v^{-1}(a_i)\}$. Every connected component of $\partial S_i \cap \partial S_j \cap B_1^+$ is a line segment terminating at an interior triple junction $z \in \partial S_i \cap \partial S_j \cap \partial S_k \cap B_1^+$, at $z \in \partial B_1 \cap \mathbb{R}_+^2$ which is a jump point of v_0 , or at $z \in \{(-1, 0), (1, 0), (0, 0)\}$. Moreover, for each triple $\{i, j, k\}$ of distinct indices there exist angles $\theta_i, \theta_j, \theta_k$ satisfying

$$(3.37) \quad \frac{\sin \theta_i}{\sigma_{jk}} = \frac{\sin \theta_j}{\sigma_{ik}} = \frac{\sin \theta_k}{\sigma_{ij}}, \quad \theta_i + \theta_j + \theta_k = 2\pi.$$

such that if $z \in B$ is an interior triple junction between S_i, S_j, S_k , then there exists $r_z > 0$ such that $S_i \cap B_{r_z}(z)$ is a circular sector determined by θ_i , and similarly for j, k . Finally, each connected component of S_i , which is denoted by C_i , is convex. Moreover, $\partial C_i \cap \partial B_1^+$ contains at least one arc of ∂B_1^+ , which is either a connected arc of $v_0^{-1}(a_i)$ or one of the boundary segments on the x -axis, $\{(x, 0) : x \in (0, 1)\}$ or $\{(x, 0) : x \in (-1, 0)\}$.

Proof. The existence of a minimizer is quite standard by compactness and lower-semicontinuity for BV functions. To treat the boundary energy (second and third terms in J_* accounting for boundary mismatch), we consider an equivalent constraint minimization problem. Let $\Omega := B_1^+ \cup \{(x, y) : -1 < x < 1, -1 < y < 0\}$. For $v \in \text{BV}(\Omega, \{a_1, \dots, a_N\})$, define

$$\begin{aligned} \min \tilde{J}_*(v, \Omega) &:= \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} \sigma_{ij} \mathcal{H}^1(\partial S_i \cap \partial S_j \cap \Omega), \\ (\text{Problem 3}) \quad \text{such that} \quad v &= v_0 \text{ on } \partial B_1 \cap \mathbb{R}_+^2 \text{ in the sense of trace,} \\ v &\equiv a_1 \text{ on } \{(x, y) : 0 < x < 1, -1 < y < 0\}, \\ v &\equiv a_2 \text{ on } \{(x, y) : -1 < x < 0, -1 < y < 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

Since v is fixed on $\Omega \setminus B_1^+$, Problem 3 is equivalent to the original minimization problem, and any minimizer v of Problem 3 restricts to a minimizer of $J_*(\cdot, B_1^+)$ on B_1^+ subject to the trace condition (3.36). Existence of a minimizer for Problem 3 follows directly from [35, Theorem 3.1], with the key point being preservation of the trace condition on $\partial B_1 \cap \mathbb{R}_+^2$ when passing to the limit of minimizing sequences.

For the profile of v , most of the results follow from [35, Theorem 1.6], which is originally stated for the unit disk. The configuration near the interior triple junctions and the intersections of interface $\partial S_i \cap \partial S_j$ with $\partial B_1 \cap \mathbb{R}_+^2$ at boundary jump points can be adapted to the half-disk domain without any modification. It suffices to prove the following two facts:

- A segment of $\partial S_i \cap \partial S_j$, can only intersect with the x -axis at $(0, 0), (1, 0)$ or $(-1, 0)$.

- Any connected component of S_i must meet ∂B_1^+ along at least one arc on $\partial B_1 \cap \mathbb{R}_+^2$ or one of the two radii on the x -axis.

For the first fact we assume by contradiction that $O := (s, 0) \subset \overline{\partial S_i \cap \partial S_j}$ for some $s \notin \{-1, 0, 1\}$. Without loss of generality, assume $0 < s < 1$. Then there exists a $r_0 > 0$ such that $B_{r_0}^+(O)$ can be split into several sectors, denoted by

$$C_j := \{(s + r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta) : 0 < r < r_0, \theta_{j-1} < \theta < \theta_j\}, \quad j = 1, \dots, l,$$

where $0 = \theta_0 < \theta_1 < \dots < \theta_l = \pi$. On each sector C_j , there exists an index i_j such that $v = a_{i_j}$ in C_j . We derive a contradiction for each of following situations.

Case 1. $i_j = 1$ for some $1 \leq j \leq l$. We first consider $i_1 = 1$. Moreover we can set $i_{l+1} = 1$. Then it is clear that a small displacement of the junction point O in the direction $\theta = \frac{\theta_1}{2} + \frac{\pi}{2}$ strictly decreases the length of each interface $\partial S_{i_j} \cap \partial S_{i_{j+1}}$ for $j = 1, \dots, l$, contradicting minimality. See Figure 2. Similarly one can derive a contradiction for other j such that $i_j = 1$.




FIGURE 2. Case I: move the junction inside to reduce energy.

Case 2. $N = 3$ and $l > 2$. As shown in Case 1, $i_j \neq 1$ for all $1 \leq j \leq l$, so the phases a_2 and a_3 must alternate on circular sectors C_1, \dots, C_l . Therefore, C_1 and C_3 correspond to the same phase, say a_2 , separated by a sector C_2 occupied by a_3 . Let $A := \partial C_1 \cap \partial C_2 \cap \partial B_{r_0}(O)$, $B := \partial C_2 \cap \partial C_3 \cap \partial B_{r_0}(O)$, and let C' denote the triangle ABO . Redefine v on C_2 by setting $v = a_2$ on C' and $v = a_3$ on $C_2 \setminus C'$. This modification strictly reduces the energy by the triangle inequality, a contradiction.

Case 3. $N = 3$ and $l = 2$. Assume $v = a_2$ on C_1 and a_3 on C_2 . Denoted by $\theta_2 \in (0, \pi)$ the central angle for C_2 . The stability of the location of the junction point O on the x -axis implies

$$\sigma_{13} = \sigma_{12} + \sigma_{23} \cos \theta_2.$$

Similarly, one-sided stability of the junction along the θ_2 direction leads to

$$(\sigma_{13} - \sigma_{12}) \cos \theta_2 \geq \sigma_{23},$$

which, combined with the previous relation, yields a contradiction $\sigma_{23} \cos^2 \theta_2 \geq \sigma_{23}$.

Case 4. $N > 3$ and $\sigma_{ij} \equiv \sigma$. In this case, there must be a C_i with an opening angle less than $\frac{2\pi}{3}$. Suppose without loss of generality that C_1 has an opening angle $\theta_1 < \frac{2\pi}{3}$. As shown in Figure 3, we can reduce the total energy by moving the junction point along the $\frac{\theta_1}{2}$ direction, which again contradicts the minimality.




FIGURE 3. Case 4: move the junction along the angle bisector of C_1

Therefore, we have verified the first fact that $\partial S_i \cap \partial S_j$ can only intersect with the x -axis at $(0,0)$, $(1,0)$ or $(-1,0)$.

For the second fact, we take a connected component C of S_i such that ∂C does not coincide with any arc of $v_0^{-1}(a_i)$ or any of two radii on the x -axis. Assume $i = 1$ without loss of generality. Then modifying v within C does not violate the boundary condition on ∂B_1^+ . When $N = 3$, set $\partial C = \gamma_2 \cup \gamma_3$ where $\gamma_j := \partial C \cap \partial S_j$ for $j = 2, 3$. Without loss of generality, assume $\mathcal{H}^1(\gamma_2) \geq \mathcal{H}^1(\gamma_3)$. If we take $v = a_2$ on C , then the total energy is changed by

$$\sigma_{23}\mathcal{H}^1(\gamma_3) - \sigma_{12}\mathcal{H}^1(\gamma_2) - \sigma_{13}\mathcal{H}^1(\gamma_3) < \sigma_{12}\mathcal{H}^1(\gamma_3) - \sigma_{12}\mathcal{H}^1(\gamma_2) \leq 0,$$

which contradicts the minimality. Similarly, when $N > 3$ with all equal σ_{ij} , we can eliminate the island C by filling C with any of surrounding phases to lower the total energy. We thus conclude that each connected component of S_i must coincide with ∂B_1^+ along an arc of positive measure. The proof of Lemma 3.3 is complete. \square

We define the quantities

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}(r) &:= \frac{1}{r} \int_{B_r^+} W(u) dz, \\ \mathcal{N}(r) &:= \frac{1}{r} \int_{B_r^+} \frac{1}{2} |\nabla u|^2 dz. \end{aligned}$$

Using Proposition 3.2, we obtain the following convergence results of $\mathcal{W}(r)$ and $\mathcal{N}(r)$.

Lemma 3.4. *There exists a constant L such that*

$$(3.38) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{W}(r) = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{N}(r) = L.$$

Proof. Take R_0 as the constant in Proposition 3.2. We first show that for any $R_2 > R_1 > R_0$,

$$(3.39) \quad W(R_2) - W(R_1) \geq -C R_1^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}.$$

We first consider the case when $R_1 < R_2 \leq 2R_1$. Using (3.20), Lemma 2.4 and Proposition 3.2 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{W}(R_2) - \mathcal{W}(R_1) \\
& \geq \int_{R_1}^{R_2} \left(\frac{1}{2r} \int_{\partial B_r \cap \mathbb{R}_+^2} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\partial_\nu u|^2 - \frac{1}{2} |\partial_T u|^2 + W(u) \right) d\mathcal{H}^1 - \frac{C}{r^2} \right) dr \\
& \geq \int_{A_{R_1, R_2}^+} \frac{1}{2|z|} \left(W(u) - \frac{1}{2} |\nabla u|^2 \right) dz - \frac{C}{R_1} \\
& \geq -\frac{1}{2R_1} \int_{A_{R_1, R_2}^+} \left| \sqrt{W(u)} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |\nabla u| \right| \cdot \left| \sqrt{W(u)} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |\nabla u| \right| dz - \frac{C}{R_1} \\
& \geq -\frac{1}{2R_1} \left(2J(u, B_{R_2}^+) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{B_{R_2}^+} \left(\sqrt{W(u)} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |\nabla u| \right)^2 dz \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{C}{R_1} \\
& \geq -\frac{1}{2R_1} (CR_2)^{\frac{1}{2}} (CR_2^{1-\alpha})^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& = -CR_1^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

For $R_2 > 2R_1$, let $k \geq 1$ be the integer such that $2^k R_1 < R_2 \leq 2^{k+1} R_1$, we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{W}(R_2) - \mathcal{W}(R_1) &= \mathcal{W}(R_2) - \mathcal{W}(2^k R_1) + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (\mathcal{W}(2^{j+1} R_1) - \mathcal{W}(2^j R_1)) \\
&\geq -C \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (2^j R_1)^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \geq -CR_1^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}},
\end{aligned}$$

which yields (3.39). The existence of $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{W}(r)$ follows by (3.39) and the rough upper bound $\mathcal{W}(r) \leq C$.

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\mathcal{W}(r) - \mathcal{N}(r)| \\
& \leq \frac{1}{r} \int_{B_r^+} \left| W(u) - \frac{1}{2} |\nabla u|^2 \right| dz \\
(3.40) \quad & \leq \frac{1}{r} (2J(u, B_r^+))^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{B_r^+} \left(\sqrt{W(u)} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |\nabla u| \right)^2 dz \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \leq \frac{1}{r} (Cr)^{\frac{1}{2}} (Cr^{1-\alpha})^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq Cr^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}, \quad \forall r > R_0,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{N}(r)$ exists and equals to $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{W}(r)$. \square

A direct consequence of the above calculation is:

Lemma 3.5. *For every $0 < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2$ it holds*

$$(3.41) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \int_{A_{\lambda_1 r, \lambda_2 r}^+} \frac{1}{|z|} |\partial_\nu u|^2 dz = 0.$$

Proof. By (3.20) we have

$$\mathcal{W}(\lambda_2 r) - \mathcal{W}(\lambda_1 r) \geq \int_{A_{\lambda_1 r, \lambda_2 r}^+} \frac{1}{2|z|} \left(W(u) - \frac{1}{2} |\nabla u|^2 + |\partial_\nu u|^2 \right) dz - \frac{C}{\lambda_1 r},$$

which together with (3.38), (3.40) immediately gives (3.41). \square

Lemma 3.5 implies that every blow-down limit must be a minimal cone.

Proposition 3.6. *Assume u is a minimizing solution of (1.1) satisfying (1.5)–(1.9). For any sequence $\{r_j\} \rightarrow \infty$, let $\tilde{u} \in \text{BV}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}_+^2; \{a_1, \dots, a_N\})$ be the blow-down limit guaranteed in Proposition 2.5. Then for any $i \neq j$ such that the reduced boundary $\Gamma_{ij}^* := \partial\{\tilde{u}^{-1}(a_i)\}^* \cap \partial\{\tilde{u}^{-1}(a_j)\}^* \neq \emptyset$, Γ_{ij}^* is necessarily a ray emanating from the origin. Moreover, there exist indices i_1, i_2 such that $\tilde{u}(x, 0) \equiv a_{i_1}$ for $x > 0$ and $\tilde{u}(x, 0) \equiv a_{i_2}$ for $x < 0$ in the sense of traces. In particular, \tilde{u} is radially invariant.*

Proof. The proof is almost identical to that of [37, Theorem 3.6]. We omit the details. \square

Since \tilde{u} is radially invariant, it depends only on the polar angle, i.e. $\tilde{u} = \tilde{u}(\theta)$ for $\theta \in (0, \pi)$, in polar coordinates. Extend \tilde{u} to $\partial\mathbb{R}_+^2$:

$$\hat{u}(r, \theta) = \hat{u}(\theta) := \begin{cases} \tilde{u}(\theta), & 0 < \theta < \pi, \\ a_1, & \theta = 0, \\ a_2, & \theta = \pi. \end{cases}$$

Then $\hat{u}(\theta) \in \text{BV}([0, \pi]; \{a_1, \dots, a_N\})$. We end this section by the following proposition on the structure of \hat{u} , which provides a classification of minimal cones to (1.11).

Proposition 3.7. *The function \hat{u} has at most two discontinuity points, denoted by $0 \leq \alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2 \leq \pi$. Moreover, if $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$, then $\alpha_2 - \alpha_1 > \frac{2}{3}\pi$ when hypothesis (H'_3) holds and $\alpha_1 - \alpha_2 \geq \theta_3$ when hypothesis (H_3) holds, where θ_3 is determined by Young's law (3.37).*

Proof. Since $\hat{u} \in \text{BV}([0, \pi]; \{a_1, \dots, a_N\})$, its discontinuity set consists of finitely many points $0 \leq a_1 < a_2 < \dots < a_k \leq \pi$. If $k \geq 2$, then for every $1 \leq j \leq k-1$, there is i_j such that $\hat{u} \equiv a_{i_j}$ on (α_j, α_{j+1}) . Moreover, $\hat{u} \equiv a_1$ on $[0, \alpha_1]$ when $\alpha_1 > 0$ and $\hat{u} \equiv a_2$ on $(\alpha_k, \pi]$ when $\alpha_k < \pi$. We divide the proof into two cases, corresponding to (H'_3) and (H_3) respectively.

(1) $N = 3$. We claim that for any $1 \leq j \leq k-1$, the value a_{i_j} cannot be a_1 or a_2 . Otherwise, one would contradict the minimality, as in Case 1 in the proof of Lemma 3.3, by perturbing the junction point in the direction of $\frac{\alpha_j}{2}$. Consequently, we obtain $k \leq 2$ and if $k = 2$, then $\hat{u} \equiv a_3$ on (α_1, α_2) . It remains to show $\alpha_2 - \alpha_1 \geq \theta_3$ when $k = 2$. Recall that $\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3$ are given by Young's law (3.37). Assume by contradiction $\alpha_2 - \alpha_1 < \theta_3$, we claim that the a_1 - a_3 interface and the a_2 - a_3 interface can be pinched together to decrease the total energy. Let $\alpha_0 := \alpha_1 + \pi - \theta_1$, then we have $\alpha_1 < \alpha_0 < \alpha_2$ because $\theta_3 > \pi - \theta_1$. Consider perturbation of the junction in the direction α_0 , the stability condition implies

$$\sigma_{23} \cos(\alpha_2 - \alpha_1 - (\pi - \theta_1)) + \sigma_{13} \cos(\pi - \theta_1) \leq \sigma_{12}.$$

This, together with (3.37) and the monotonicity of the cosine function on $(0, \pi)$, gives

$$\begin{aligned} \sin \theta_3 &\geq \sin \theta_1 \cos(\alpha_2 - \alpha_1 - (\pi - \theta_1)) + \sin \theta_2 \cos(\pi - \theta_1) \\ &> \sin \theta_1 \cos(\theta_3 - (\pi - \theta_1)) + \sin \theta_2 \cos(\pi - \theta_1) = \sin \theta_3, \end{aligned}$$

yielding a contradiction.

(2) $N > 3$ and $\sigma_{ij} \equiv \sigma$. From similar arguments as in the $N = 3$ case, for any $1 \leq j \leq k-1$, we have $\alpha_{j+1} - \alpha_j \geq \frac{2\pi}{3}$. Therefore, $k \leq 2$ and $\alpha_2 - \alpha_1 \geq \frac{2\pi}{3}$ when $k = 2$.

The proof of Proposition 3.7 is completed. \square

4. UNIQUENESS OF THE BLOW-DOWN LIMIT

In this section we show that the blow-down limit \tilde{u} is independent of the choice of sequence $\{r_j\}$. We present the proof under Hypothesis (H'_3) , i.e. all σ_{ij} are equal. All the arguments work equally well for the case (H_3) .

Using Lemma 3.4, Proposition 2.5 and Proposition 3.7, we have

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{W}(r) = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{N}(r) = \frac{\sigma}{2} \text{ or } \sigma,$$

depending on the number of discontinuity angles for one of the extended blow-down limits $\hat{u} = \hat{u}(\theta)$. Henceforth, we assume that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{W}(r) = \sigma,$$

which is equivalent to requiring that any extended blow-down limit $\hat{u}(\theta)$ has exactly two discontinuity angles. The case $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{W}(r) = \frac{\sigma}{2}$ follows analogously, with a simpler computation.

Utilizing Proposition 2.5, Proposition 3.7 and Lemma 3.5, we have that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a $R(\varepsilon)$ such that for every $R > R(\varepsilon)$, the following estimates hold:

$$\begin{aligned} 2\sigma - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} &\leq \frac{1}{R} \int_{B_R^+} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\nabla u|^2 + W(u) \right) dz \leq 2\sigma + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \\ \sigma - \frac{\varepsilon}{4} &\leq \frac{1}{R} \int_{A_{R,2R}^+} W(u) dz \leq \sigma + \frac{\varepsilon}{4}, \\ \sigma - \frac{\varepsilon}{4} &\leq \frac{1}{R} \int_{A_{R,2R}^+} \frac{1}{2} |\nabla_T u|^2 dz \leq \sigma + \frac{\varepsilon}{4}, \\ \|u_R - \tilde{u}\|_{L^1(B_2^+)} &\leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

for some \tilde{u} , which depends on R , having the structure described in Proposition 3.7. In particular, there exists α_1, α_2 and a_i ($i \neq 1, 2$), all depending on R , such that $\alpha_2 - \alpha_1 \geq \frac{2\pi}{3}$ and

$$\tilde{u}(r, \theta) = \begin{cases} a_i, & \alpha_1 < \theta < \alpha_2, \\ a_1, & 0 < \theta < \alpha_1, \text{ if } \alpha_1 > 0, \\ a_2, & \alpha_2 < \theta < \pi, \text{ if } \alpha_2 < \pi. \end{cases}$$

It follows immediately that the third phase a_i remains the same for all R . Without loss of generality, assume $i = 3$. Now we fix ε as a small parameter to be determined later. By Fubini's theorem and mean value theorem, we can find $R_0 \in (R, 2R)$ for any $R > R(\varepsilon)$, such that

$$(4.42) \quad 2\sigma - \varepsilon \leq \int_{\partial B_{R_0} \cap \mathbb{R}_+^2} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\partial_T u|^2 + W(u) \right) d\mathcal{H}^1 \leq 2\sigma + \varepsilon.$$

$$(4.43) \quad \mathcal{H}^1(\partial B_{R_0} \cap \mathbb{R}_+^2 \cap \{|u(z) - a_3| < \varepsilon\}) > R_0.$$

Let $\delta = \delta(W) \ll 1$ be the same constant as in the proof of Proposition 3.2. Without loss of generality, we assume that ε is very small compared to δ and R_0 is sufficiently large such that

$$(4.44) \quad |u(R_0, 0) - a_1| \leq \frac{\delta}{3}, \quad |u(-R_0, 0) - a_2| \leq \frac{\delta}{3}.$$

For $1 \leq i \leq N$, define the set

$$T_i := \{z \in \partial B_{R_0} \cap \overline{\mathbb{R}_+^2} : |u(z) - a_i| \leq \frac{\delta}{2}\}.$$

By (4.44) and (4.43) we have

$$(R_0, 0) \in T_1, \quad (-R_0, 0) \in T_2, \quad \mathcal{H}^1(T_3) > R_0.$$

This further implies that there are at least two phase transitions (a_1-a_3, a_2-a_3) along $\partial B_{R_0} \cap \mathbb{R}_+^2$. One can derive that $T_i = \emptyset$ for all $i \notin \{1, 2, 3\}$ since otherwise the energy estimate (4.42) will be violated. We continue to define the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_3^1 &:= \min\{\theta : (R_0 \cos \theta, R_0 \sin \theta) \in T_3\}, \\ \theta_3^2 &:= \max\{\theta : (R_0 \cos \theta, R_0 \sin \theta) \in T_3\}, \\ \theta_1 &:= \max\{\theta < \theta_3^1, (R_0 \cos \theta, R_0 \sin \theta) \in T_1\}, \\ \theta_2 &:= \min\{\theta > \theta_3^2, (R_0 \cos \theta, R_0 \sin \theta) \in T_2\}, \\ \tilde{T}_1 &:= \{(R_0 \cos \theta, R_0 \sin \theta) : \theta \in [0, \theta_1]\}, \\ \tilde{T}_2 &:= \{(R_0 \cos \theta, R_0 \sin \theta) : \theta \in [\theta_2, \pi]\}, \\ \tilde{T}_3 &:= \{(R_0 \cos \theta, R_0 \sin \theta) : \theta \in [\theta_3^1, \theta_3^2]\}, \\ C_{13} &:= \text{the open arc connecting } \tilde{T}_1 \text{ and } \tilde{T}_3, \\ C_{32} &:= \text{the open arc connecting } \tilde{T}_3 \text{ and } \tilde{T}_2. \end{aligned}$$

From this definition, there will be an a_1-a_3 transition on C_{13} and an a_2-a_3 transition on C_{23} . Also for $z \in C_{13} \cup C_{23}$, it holds that $|u(z) - a_i| > \frac{\delta}{2}$ for all i . Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}^1(C_{13} \cup C_{23}) &\leq C(W). \\ \int_{C_{13} \cup C_{32}} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\partial_T u|^2 + W(u) \right) d\mathcal{H}^1 &\geq 2\sigma - C\delta^2. \end{aligned}$$

This energy lower bound yields the uniform closeness of $u(z)$ to a_i on \tilde{T}_i for $i = 1, 2, 3$ if we choose $\varepsilon \ll \delta^2$, since by (4.42) most of energy is concentrated on arcs C_{13} and C_{32} , rendering the variation of u on \tilde{T}_i to be small. More specifically, we have

$$|u(z) - a_i| \leq C\delta \ll 1 \quad \text{on } \tilde{T}_i,$$

for some constant $C = C(W)$.

Set

$$\theta_{13} := \frac{\theta_1 + \theta_3^1}{2}, \quad \theta_{32} := \frac{\theta_3^2 + \theta_2}{2}.$$

Then the ray $l_{\theta_{13}}(l_{\theta_{32}})$ passes through the center point of $C_{13}(C_{32})$, denoted by A_0, B_0 respectively. Also, we define $v_0 \in \text{BV}(B_{R_0}^+; \{a_1, \dots, a_N\})$ as a minimizer of the following problem

$$\min J_*(v, B_{R_0}^+), \quad \text{such that}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(Problem 4)} \quad v_0(R_0 \cos \theta, R_0 \sin \theta) &= \begin{cases} a_1, & 0 \leq \theta < \theta_{13}, \\ a_3, & \theta_{13} < \theta < \theta_{32}, \\ a_2, & \theta_{32} < \theta \leq \pi, \end{cases} \quad \text{in the sense of traces.} \end{aligned}$$

We now introduce the approximate location of the sharp interface, which is denoted by Γ_0 . If $\theta_{32} - \theta_{13} \geq \frac{2\pi}{3}$, set $\Gamma_0 = (l_{\theta_{31}} \cup l_{\theta_{32}}) \cap B_{R_0}^+$. Otherwise, let $\theta_3 := \frac{\theta_{13} + \theta_{32}}{2}$ and we can choose a point G_0 on $l_{\theta_3} \cap B_{R_0}^+$ that minimizes the total distance $|G_0 O| + |G_0 A_0| + |G_0 B_0|$. In the latter case, the

segments G_0O , G_0A_0 , G_0B_0 form angles of $\frac{2\pi}{3}$ pairwise, and we set $\Gamma_0 = G_0O \cup G_0A_0 \cup G_0B_0$. We then use the same competitor construction as in the proof of the upper bound in Proposition 3.2, i.e. constructing the phase transitions using the heteroclinic connections within a thin rectangular neighborhood of each branch of Γ_0 . The corresponding energy upper bound follows from an explicit computation, which is given by

$$(4.45) \quad J(u, B_{R_0}^+) \leq \sigma \mathcal{H}^1(\Gamma_0) + CR_0^{1-\alpha}.$$




FIGURE 4. Definition of Γ_0 .

We aim to derive the lower bound $J(u, B_{R_0}^+) \geq \sigma \mathcal{H}^1(\Gamma_0) - CR_0^{1-\alpha}$. This estimate can be deduced from (3.26), which is already proved in Proposition 3.2 via results on a minimal partition problem with vacuum regions. Here, however, we present a more direct proof based on a slicing argument, which exploits the simpler structure of the sharp interface. The idea originally comes from [5, Proposition 3.1]. The first step is to slightly modify the boundary data on ∂B_{R_0} . Define a function v on $\partial B_{R_0} \cap \mathbb{R}_+^2$:

$$v(R_0 \cos \theta, R_0 \sin \theta) = \begin{cases} a_1, & 0 \leq \theta \leq \theta_{13} - R_0^{-1}, \\ \text{smoothly connecting } a_1, a_3, & \theta_{13} - R_0^{-1} \leq \theta \leq \theta_{13} + R_0^{-1}, \\ a_3, & \theta_{13} + R_0^{-1} \leq \theta \leq \theta_{32} - R_0^{-1}, \\ \text{smoothly connecting } a_3, a_2, & \theta_{32} - R_0^{-1} \leq \theta \leq \theta_{32} + R_0^{-1}, \\ a_2, & \theta_{32} + R_0^{-1} \leq \theta \leq \pi. \end{cases}$$

Then we extend v inside $B_{R_0}^+$ by setting

$$v(z) = \begin{cases} \text{linear interpolation between } v|_{\partial B_{R_0}} \text{ and } u(\frac{R_0}{R_0-1} \cdot)|_{\partial B_{R_0-1}}, & z \in A_{R_0-1, R_0}^+, \\ u(\frac{R_0}{R_0-1} z), & z \in B_{R_0-1}^+. \end{cases}$$

One can show that the energy in the boundary layer A_{R_0-1, R_0}^+ is uniformly bounded by a constant $C(\delta, W)$. Thus we obtain

$$J(u, B_{R_0}^+) \geq J(v, B_{R_0-1}^+) \geq J(v, B_{R_0}^+) - C.$$

With this, the energy lower bound follows immediately from the following Lemma.

Lemma 4.1. $J(v, B_{R_0}^+) \geq \sigma \mathcal{H}^1(\Gamma_0) - CR_0^{\frac{2}{3}}$.

Proof. The proof utilizes a slicing argument from [5, Proposition 3.1]. Here we present the detailed argument for the case $\frac{2\pi}{3} \leq \theta_{32} - \theta_{13} < \pi$, i.e. Γ_0 consists of two segments. In this case, the lower bound becomes

$$(4.46) \quad J(v, B_{R_0}^+) \geq 2\sigma R_0 - CR_0^{\frac{2}{3}}.$$

The same argument applies for the case when $\theta_{32} - \theta_{13} < \frac{2\pi}{3}$, with slightly more involved computation.

We first rotate $B_{R_0}^+$ so that the a_2 - a_3 interface $l_{\theta_{32}}$ becomes vertical. Under this rotation, the domain $B_{R_0}^+$ is transformed into $B_{R_0} \cap \{(x, y) : y > \frac{x}{\tan \theta_{32}}\}$, which we denote by Ω_0 . In the new coordinates, we have

$$\Gamma_0 = \{(0, y) : 0 \leq y \leq R_0\} \cup \{(r \cos \alpha_0, r \sin \alpha_0) : 0 \leq r \leq R_0\}, \quad \alpha_0 := \theta_{13} + \frac{\pi}{2} - \theta_{32} \in (-\frac{\pi}{2}, -\frac{\pi}{6}].$$

The boundary condition of v becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \text{On the straight part: } v(r \sin \theta_{32}, r \cos \theta_{32}) &= u_0 \left(\frac{R_0}{R_0 - 1} r \right), \quad r \in (-R_0 + 1, R_0 - 1), \\ \text{On the semicircle: } v(R_0 \cos \theta, R_0 \sin \theta) &= \begin{cases} a_1, & \theta \in [\frac{\pi}{2} - \theta_{32}, \frac{\pi}{2} - \theta_{32} + \theta_{13} - R_0^{-1}), \\ a_3, & \theta \in (\frac{\pi}{2} - \theta_{32} + \theta_{13} + R_0^{-1}, \frac{\pi}{2} - R_0^{-1}), \\ a_2, & \theta \in (\frac{\pi}{2} + R_0^{-1}, \frac{3\pi}{2} - \theta_{32}]. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

On the $O(1)$ gaps on $\partial\Omega_0$ separating those arcs(segments) described above, v interpolates smoothly. See Figure 5 for the domain Ω and the boundary data. In the argument below, we ignore these small gaps and assume instead that v transitions sharply from one phase to another along $\partial\Omega_0$. This simplification does not affect the main estimate but considerably streamlines the presentation.




FIGURE 5. Red: a_1 , Green: a_2 , Blue: a_3

Set the horizontal line segments γ_y as

$$\gamma_y := \{(x, y) : x \in \mathbb{R}\} \cap \Omega_0, \quad y \in [R_0 \cos \theta_{32}, R_0].$$

Define functions $\lambda_1(y)$, $\lambda_2(y)$, $\lambda_3(y)$ by

$$\lambda_i(y) := \mathcal{H}^1(\gamma_y \cap \{|v(x, y) - a_i| \leq R_0^{-\frac{1}{6}}\}), \quad i \in \{1, 2, 3\}, \quad y \in [R_0 \cos \theta_{32}, R_0].$$

Set

$$y^* := \min\{y \in [0, R_0] : \lambda_2(y) + \lambda_3(y) \geq \mathcal{H}^1(\gamma_y) - R_0^{\frac{2}{3}}\}.$$

When $|y - R_0| \ll 1$, $\mathcal{H}^1(\gamma_y) < R_0^{\frac{2}{3}}$, thus the set on which we minimize to get y^* is not empty. We further define

$$\Omega_1 := \Omega_0 \cap \{y \geq y^*\}, \quad \Omega_2 := \Omega_0 \cap \{y < y^*\}.$$

On Ω_1 , when $y \in (R_0 \cos(\pi - \theta_{32}), R_0)$, γ_y intersects with $\partial\Omega_0$ at two points on the semicircle, where v takes the value of a_2 at one point and a_3 at the other. Thus if $y^* \geq R_0 \cos(\pi - \theta_{32})$, we have

$$J(v, \Omega_1) \geq \int_{y^*}^{R_0} dy \left(\int_{\gamma_y} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\partial_x v|^2 + W(v) \right) dx \right) \geq (R_0 - y^*)\sigma.$$

If $y^* \in [0, R_0 \cos(\pi - \theta_{32})]$, for $y \in (y^*, R_0 \cos(\pi - \theta_{32}))$, γ_y meets $\partial\Omega_2$ at a point on the straight part, where the value of v is close to a_2 , and a point on the semicircle, which is a a_3 point. Utilizing Lemma 2.1 and (1.8), We compute

$$\begin{aligned} (4.47) \quad J(v, \Omega_1) &\geq \int_{y^*}^{R_0} dy \left(\int_{\gamma_y} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\partial_x v|^2 + W(v) \right) dx \right) \\ &\geq \int_{y^*}^{R_0 \cos(\pi - \theta_{32})} dy \int_{\gamma_y} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\partial_x v|^2 + W(v) \right) dx + R_0(1 - \cos(\pi - \theta_{32}))\sigma \\ &\geq \int_{y^*}^{R_0 \cos(\pi - \theta_{32})} \left(\sigma - C \left| u_0 \left(\frac{R_0}{R_0 - 1} \frac{y}{\cos \theta_{32}} \right) - a_2 \right|^2 \right) dy + R_0(1 - \cos(\pi - \theta_{32}))\sigma \\ &\geq (R_0 - y^*)\sigma - C, \end{aligned}$$

for some constant C depending only on W and u_0 .

For the domain Ω_2 , we first show that there exists a constant $C(W)$ such that

$$(4.48) \quad \mathcal{H}^1(\{y \in (0, y^*) : \lambda_i(y) = 0, \forall i \neq 2, 3\}) \leq CR_0^{\frac{2}{3}}.$$

For any $y \in (0, y^*)$ satisfying $\lambda_i(y) = 0$ for any $i \neq 2, 3$, by definition of y^* we have

$$\mathcal{H}^1(\gamma_y \cap \{|v(z) - a_i| > R_0^{-\frac{1}{6}}, \forall i\}) > R_0^{\frac{2}{3}}.$$

This implies

$$\int_{\gamma_y} W(v) dx \geq CR_0^{\frac{1}{3}}.$$

Combining this with the rough upper bound (2.17) gives (4.48). We denote by

$$K := \{y \in (0, y^*) : \lambda_i(y) = 0, \forall i \neq 2, 3\}$$

For any $y \in (0, y^*) \setminus K$, γ_y intersects with $\partial\Omega_2$ at an a_2 point and an a_3 point, and passes through an a_i point for some $i \neq 2, 3$, which leads to two phase transitions along γ_y . For $y \in (R_0 \cos(\theta_{32} - \theta_{13}), 0)$, there is at least one a_1 - a_3 transition along γ_y . Let $\kappa \in [0, 1]$ be an arbitrary

parameter. We compute utilizing Lemma 2.1 and (1.8):

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega_2} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\partial_x v|^2 + \kappa^2 W(v) \right) dx dy \\
& \geq \left(\int_{(0,y^*) \setminus K} + \int_{R_0 \cos(\theta_{32} - \theta_{13})}^0 \right) \left(\int_{\gamma_y} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\partial_x v|^2 + \kappa^2 W(v) \right) dx \right) dy \\
& \geq \left(\int_{(0,y^*) \setminus K} + \int_{R_0 \cos(\theta_{32} - \theta_{13})}^0 \right) \left(\int_{\gamma_y} \left(\sqrt{2\kappa} |\partial_x v| \sqrt{W(v)} \right) dx \right) dy \\
& \geq \kappa \int_{(0,y^*) \setminus K} \left(2\sigma - CR_0^{-\frac{1}{3}} - C|u\left(\frac{R_0}{R_0 - 1 \cos \theta_{32}} \frac{y}{y}\right) - a_2|^2 \right) dy \\
& \quad + \kappa \int_{R_0 \cos(\theta_{32} - \theta_{13})}^0 \left(\sigma - C|u\left(\frac{R_0}{R_0 - 1 \cos \theta_{32}} \frac{y}{y}\right) - a_1|^2 \right) dy \\
& \geq (2y^* - R_0 \cos(\theta_{32} - \theta_{13}))\kappa\sigma - CR_0^{\frac{2}{3}},
\end{aligned}$$

In the vertical direction, set

$$P := \{x \in (0, R_0 \sin(\theta_{32} - \theta_{13})) : |v(x, y^*) - a_i| < R_0^{-\frac{1}{6}}, i = 2 \text{ or } 3\}.$$

For every $x \in P$, the vertical line $\{(x, y) : y \in \mathbb{R}\} \cap \Omega_2$ meets γ_{y^*} at an a_2 or a_3 point and meets $\partial\Omega_0$ at a_1 . We calculate similarly as the horizontal energy to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega_2} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\partial_y v|^2 + (1 - \kappa^2) W(v) \right) dy dx \\
& \geq \int_P \left(\int_{(x,y) \in \Omega_2} \sqrt{2(1 - \kappa^2)} |\partial_y v| \sqrt{W(v)} dy \right) dx \\
& \geq \sqrt{1 - \kappa^2} \sigma R_0 \sin(\theta_{32} - \theta_{13}) - CR_0^{\frac{2}{3}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the energy in both horizontal and vertical directions leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.49) \quad J(v, \Omega_2) & \geq \max_{k \in [0,1]} \left\{ (2y^* - R_0 \cos(\theta_{32} - \theta_{13}))\kappa\sigma + R_0 \sin(\theta_{32} - \theta_{13})\sqrt{1 - \kappa^2}\sigma \right\} - CR_0^{\frac{2}{3}} \\
& = \sigma \sqrt{R_0^2 \sin^2(\theta_{32} - \theta_{13}) + (2y^* - R_0 \cos(\theta_{32} - \theta_{13}))^2} - CR_0^{\frac{2}{3}} \\
& = \sigma \sqrt{R_0^2 - 4y^* R_0 \cos(\theta_{32} - \theta_{13}) + 4y^{*2}} - CR_0^{\frac{2}{3}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Add the energy estimate on Ω_1 (4.47) implies

$$(4.50) \quad J(v, \Omega_0) \geq \sigma \left(R_0 - y^* + \sqrt{R_0^2 - 4y^* R_0 \cos(\theta_{32} - \theta_{13}) + 4y^{*2}} \right) - CR_0^{\frac{2}{3}}.$$

Since $\frac{2\pi}{3} \leq \theta_{32} - \theta_{13} < \pi$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& R_0 - y^* + \sqrt{R_0^2 - 4y^* R_0 \cos(\theta_{32} - \theta_{13}) + 4y^{*2}} \\
& \geq R_0 - y^* + \sqrt{R_0^2 + 2y^* R_0 + 4y^{*2}} \geq 2R_0, \quad \text{for } y^* \geq 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where the minimum is attained when $y^* = 0$. This implies (4.46).

When $\theta_{32} - \theta_{13} < \frac{2\pi}{3}$, Γ_0 has a third branch, corresponding to the a_1 - a_2 interface. In such a case, we can rotate Ω_0 based on G_0 so that $G_0 B_0$ becomes the new y -axis. All computations proceed

similarly in this case, and the leading term $\sigma\mathcal{H}^1(\Gamma_0)$ in the lower bound, is obtained by considering a minimization problem with a slightly different function of y^* .

□

Remark 4.1. If we assume (H₃) instead of (H'₃), the proof above requires modifications to account for the unequal partition at the triple junction. For a detailed discussion, we refer interested readers to [5, Section 7].

So far, we have established that

$$|J(u, B_{R_0}^+) - \sigma\mathcal{H}^1(\Gamma_0)| \leq CR_0^{1-\alpha},$$

for some $\alpha > 0$. For $\gamma > 0$, we define the *diffuse interface*

$$\mathcal{I}_{\gamma, R} := \{z \in B_R^+ : |u(z) - a_i| > \gamma, \forall i = 1, \dots, N\},$$

which represents the region that separates coexisting phases $\{|u(z) - a_i| \leq \gamma\}$. From the way the energy lower bound is calculated, we have the following result on the closeness of the diffuse interface $\mathcal{I}_{\gamma, R}$ to the sharp interface Γ_0 .

Lemma 4.2. *There exists a constant $C = C(\gamma, W)$, such that for sufficiently small ε and the associated R_0 ,*

$$(4.51) \quad \mathcal{I}_{\gamma, R_0} \subset N_{CR_0^{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}}(\Gamma_0) := \{z \in B_{R_0}^+ : \text{dist}(z, \Gamma_0) \leq CR_0^{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}\}.$$

Moreover, there are constants $k, K > 0$ such that if $z \notin N_{CR_0^{1-\alpha/2}}(\Gamma_0 \cup \partial B_{R_0}^+)$, then

$$\min_i |u(z) - a_i| \leq Ke^{-k \text{dist}(z, \partial N_{CR_0^{1-\alpha/2}}(\Gamma_0 \cup \partial B_{R_0}^+))},$$

which implies that u converges exponentially fast to one of the energy wells a_i , outside the $O(R_0^{1-\alpha/2})$ neighborhood of $\Gamma_0 \cup \partial B_{R_0}^+$.

The proof is almost identical to the proof of [26, Proposition 6.1], with some minor modifications adapted to our half-disk domain. The idea originates from [5, Proposition 4.2], which is based on the following observation: when computing the energy on Ω_1 in the proof of Lemma 4.1, see (4.47), only the horizontal deformation term $|\partial_x v|^2$ is computed. If the diffuse interface $\mathcal{I}_{\gamma, R_0} \cap \Omega_1$ deviate largely from the sharp interface $\Gamma_0 \cap \Omega_1$, which is approximately the positive y -axis in Figure 5, this deviation produces additional energy through vertical deformation. Adding this contribution to the energy lower bound would then contradict the upper bound. We omit the detailed argument here and refer the readers to [26, Proposition 6.1].

Now we are ready to establish the uniqueness of blow-down limit \tilde{u} .

Proposition 4.3. *Let $u : \mathbb{R}_+^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ be a minimizing solution of (1.1) satisfying (1.5)–(1.9). Then the blow-down limit \tilde{u} in Proposition 2.5 is independent of the choice of sequence $\{r_j\}$. That is to say, there exists a blow-down limit \tilde{u} , with structure characterized by Proposition 3.7, such that*

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \|u_r - \tilde{u}\|_{L^1(K)} = 0,$$

for any compact $K \Subset \overline{\mathbb{R}_+^2}$.

Moreover, there are constants C and r_0 such that for any $r > r_0$,

$$(4.52) \quad \|u_r - \tilde{u}\|_{L^1(B_1^+)} \leq Cr^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}.$$

Proof. We present the proof assuming (H'_3) . We fix R_0 such that (4.42), (4.43), (4.44) and (4.45) hold. Rescale the approximated sharp interface $\Gamma_0 \in B_{R_0}^+$ to the unit half disk B_1^+ by defining

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_0 := \{z \in B_1^+ : R_0 z \in \Gamma_0\}.$$

From Lemma 4.2, it follows that $\tilde{\Gamma}_0$ splits B_1^+ into three subdomains $\Omega_1^0, \Omega_2^0, \Omega_3^0$ such that for any $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$

$$|u_{R_0}(z) - a_i| \leq \gamma, \quad \forall z \in \Omega_i^0 \text{ satisfying } \text{dist}(z, \partial\Omega_i^0) \leq CR_0^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}.$$

Let

$$U_0 := \sum_{i=1}^3 a_i \cdot \chi_{\Omega_i^0},$$

Lemma 4.2 further implies

$$\|u_{R_0} - U_0\|_{L^1(B_1^+)} \leq CR_0^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}.$$

Now we can select a sequence of radii $\{R_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ such that $R_j \in (2^j R_0, 2^{j+1} R_0)$ and the corresponding rescaled map u_{R_j} satisfies

$$\|u_{R_j} - U_j\|_{L^1(B_1^+)} \leq CR_j^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}},$$

for some $U_j := \sum_{i=1}^3 a_i \cdot \chi_{\Omega_i^j}$ with $\{\Omega_i^j\}_{i=1}^3$ being a three-partition of B_1^+ determined either by union of three rays forming $\frac{2\pi}{3}$ angles pairwise, or two rays meeting at the origin with an opening angle greater than or equal to $\frac{2\pi}{3}$. Let $\tilde{\Gamma}_j$ denote the interface associated with U_j . $u_{R_j}(z)$ is γ -close to one of phases a_1, a_2, a_3 if $\text{dist}(z, \tilde{\Gamma}_0) > CR_j^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}$.

For any $j \geq 0$, let $\theta_{13}^j, \theta_{32}^j \in [0, \pi]$ denote the directions of the a_1 - a_3 interface and the a_3 - a_2 interface of $\tilde{\Gamma}_j$, respectively. since u_{R_j} and $u_{R_{j+1}}$ are rescalings of the same function u at comparable scales ($\frac{1}{4} < \frac{R_j}{R_{j+1}} < 1$), we argue as in [26, Section 8] to obtain that

$$|\theta_{13}^j - \theta_{13}^{j+1}| \leq CR_j^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}, \quad |\theta_{32}^j - \theta_{32}^{j+1}| \leq CR_j^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}$$

which implies that $\{\theta_{13}^j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ ($\{\theta_{32}^j\}_{j=1}^\infty$) forms a Cauchy sequence and therefore this is $\tilde{\theta}_{13}$ ($\tilde{\theta}_{32}$) such that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \theta_{13}^j = \tilde{\theta}_{13}, \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \theta_{32}^j = \tilde{\theta}_{32}.$$

Moreover we have the following estimate of the convergence rate,

$$|\theta_{13}^j - \tilde{\theta}_{13}| \leq CR_j^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}, \quad |\theta_{32}^j - \tilde{\theta}_{32}| \leq CR_j^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}.$$

Combining the convergence of the a_1 - a_3 and a_3 - a_2 interfaces with the complete characterization of blow-down limits in Proposition 3.7, one can deduce via a straightforward geometric argument the existence of a unique blow-down limit \tilde{u} , whose discontinuity angles are $\tilde{\theta}_{13}$ and $\tilde{\theta}_{32}$, such that

$$\|U_j - \tilde{u}\|_{L^1(B_1^+)} \leq CR_j^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}.$$

The convergence rate (4.52) then follows immediately. \square

Corollary 4.4. *By Lemma 4.2, Proposition 4.3, and an elementary argument, cf. [25, Lemma 3.2], one can derive that the diffuse interface \mathcal{D}_γ defined in (1.14) is contained in a $C(\gamma, u, W)R^{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ neighborhood of the sharp interface $l_{\alpha_1} \cup l_{\alpha_2}$ within B_R^+ , for sufficiently large R . Furthermore, we have the following estimates for sufficiently large r :*

$$(4.53) \quad \begin{aligned} |u(r, \theta) - a_1| &\leq Ke^{-kr \cdot \min\{|\theta|, |\alpha_1 - Cr^{-\alpha/2} - \theta|\}}, \quad \theta \in (0, \alpha_1 - Cr^{-\alpha/2}), \\ |u(r, \theta) - a_3| &\leq Ke^{-kr \cdot \min\{|\theta - \alpha_1 - Cr^{-\alpha/2}|, |\alpha_2 - Cr^{-\alpha/2} - \theta|\}}, \quad \theta \in (\alpha_1 + Cr^{-\alpha/2}, \alpha_2 - Cr^{-\alpha/2}), \\ |u(r, \theta) - a_2| &\leq Ke^{-kr \cdot \min\{|\theta - \alpha_2 - Cr^{-\alpha/2}|, |\pi - \theta|\}}, \quad \theta \in (\alpha_2 + Cr^{-\alpha/2}, \pi). \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Theorem 1.3. The statement in Theorem 1.3 follows immediately from Proposition 2.5, Proposition 3.7 and Proposition 4.3. \square

5. ASYMPTOTIC BEHAVIORS NEAR THE SHARP INTERFACE

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.4, which establishes the asymptotic behavior of u near the interior sharp interface. Similarly as in Section 4, we present the proof under Hypothesis (H'_3) . The proof can be easily generalized to the (H_3) case.

Let u be a minimizing solution of 1.1 satisfying (1.5)–(1.9), with $\tilde{u}(r, \theta) = \tilde{u}(\theta)$ being the unique blow-down limit of u at infinity. In particular, we assume \tilde{u} has the following structure:

$$(5.54) \quad \tilde{u}(\theta) = \begin{cases} a_1, & \theta \in (0, \alpha_1) \\ a_3, & \theta \in (\alpha_1, \alpha_2), \\ a_2, & \theta \in (\alpha_2, \pi), \end{cases} \quad \text{for some } 0 < \alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \pi, \alpha_2 - \alpha_1 \geq \frac{2}{3}\pi.$$

For the extended map \hat{u} defined in (1.12), the two discontinuity angles are α_1 and α_2 , respectively. In the two-phase case where $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 \in (0, \pi)$, the proof becomes simpler. Indeed, our argument will focus on a sector containing only a single interface l_{α_i} , along which we will establish the refined profile.

By Corollary 4.4, there exist $K = K(u, W)$, $k = k(u, W)$ such that

$$(5.55) \quad \begin{aligned} |u(r, \frac{\alpha_1}{2}) - a_1| &\leq Ke^{-kr}, \\ |u(r, \frac{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2}{2}) - a_3| &\leq Ke^{-kr}, \\ |u(r, \frac{\alpha_2 + \pi}{2}) - a_2| &\leq Ke^{-kr}. \end{aligned}$$

The following lemma provides refined energy lower bound and upper bound on B_R^+ .

Lemma 5.1. *There is a constant $C = C(u, W)$ such that for every $R > 0$,*

$$(5.56) \quad 2\sigma R - C \leq J(u, B_R^+) \leq 2\sigma R + C.$$

Proof. First we apply the exponential decay result on the rays $l_{\frac{\alpha_1}{2}}$, $l_{\frac{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2}{2}}$ and $l_{\frac{\alpha_2 + \pi}{2}}$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &J(u, B_R^+) \\ &\geq \int_0^R \int_{\partial B_r} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\partial_T u|^2 + W(u) \right) d\mathcal{H}^1 dr \\ &\geq \int_0^R \left(2\sigma - C|u(r, \frac{\alpha_1}{2}) - a_1|^2 - C|u(r, \frac{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2}{2}) - a_3|^2 - C|u(r, \frac{\alpha_2 + \pi}{2}) - a_2|^2 \right) dr \\ &= 2\sigma R - C \int_0^R Ke^{-2kr} dr \geq 2\sigma R - C(u, W), \end{aligned}$$

which yields the lower bound.

For the upper bound, we construct an explicit energy competitor in a manner analogous to the construction in the proof of Proposition 3.2. The idea is to build one-dimensional heteroclinic connections in small neighborhoods of l_{α_1} and l_{α_2} , and then fill in the boundary layers by linear interpolation to match the prescribed boundary data. The resulting estimates are essentially the same as before, although in the present setting the construction is actually simpler due to the clearer structure of \hat{u} thanks to the established convergence results. The energy within interpolation layers can be controlled by a constant $C(u, W)$ and the upper bound follows,

$$J(u, B_R^+) \leq 2\sigma R + C(u, W).$$

We leave the detailed calculation in the Appendix A. \square

Remark 5.1. In the cases $\alpha_1 = 0$ or $\alpha_2 = \pi$, the lower bound remains valid, but our present construction does not allow the next-order term in the upper bound to be uniformly bounded. The best estimate available is $O(R^\alpha)$ for arbitrarily small $\alpha > 0$, which is not sufficient for the results that follow.

With Lemma 5.1, we are able to restrict the diffuse interface \mathcal{D}_γ within a $O(R^{\frac{1}{2}})$ neighborhood of the sharp interface.

Lemma 5.2. *For each $\gamma > 0$, there exists a constant $C = C(\gamma, u, W)$ such that the diffuse interface $\mathcal{D}_\gamma \cap B_R^+$ is contained within a $CR^{1/2}$ -neighborhood of the sharp interface $l_{\alpha_1} \cup l_{\alpha_2}$. In addition, the estimate in (4.53) can be refined by replacing α with 1.*

Proof. The proof closely follows that of [25, Lemma 3.5 and Remark 3.6]. We outline the main idea here. The first step is to reduce the proof of the lemma to establishing the following claim.

Claim. There exists a constant $C(\gamma, u, W)$ such that the following holds: for each sufficiently large R , on the annulus $A_{R,9R}^+ := \{|z| \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 : R < |z| < 9R\}$, there are two angles $\theta_{13}^R, \theta_{32}^R \in (0, \pi)$ such that

$$(5.57) \quad \mathcal{D}_\gamma \cap A_{R,9R}^+ \subset \{re^{i\theta} : \theta \in (\theta_{13}^R - CR^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \theta_{13}^R + CR^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \cup (\theta_{32}^R - CR^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \theta_{32}^R + CR^{-\frac{1}{2}})\}.$$

Once this claim is established, we may iterate (5.57) at scales $R, 3R, 9R, \dots$ and obtain that

$$|\theta_{13}^R - \alpha_1| \leq CR^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad |\theta_{32}^R - \alpha_2| \leq CR^{-\frac{1}{2}},$$

which together with (5.57) directly yields the first statement of the lemma, namely, the distance of $\mathcal{D}_\gamma \cap B_R^+$ to the sharp interface is bounded by $CR^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Then the exponential decay estimates (4.53) can be improved accordingly.

We now turn to the proof of the claim. For fixed γ , by Corollary 4.4 we can exclude the possibility that $\mathcal{D}_\gamma \cap A_{R,9R}^+$ intersects a small neighborhood of the real axis $\{y = 0\}$. It suffices to consider neighborhoods of $l_{\alpha_1} \cup l_{\alpha_2}$.

For any R large enough, by Corollary 4.4, Lemma 5.1 and the analogous argument as in the beginning of Section 4, there are $R_1 \in (\frac{1}{2}R, R)$, $R_2 \in (9R, 10R)$ and angles $\theta_{13}^1, \theta_{13}^2, \theta_{32}^1, \theta_{32}^2$, such

that the following hold.

$$\begin{aligned} |\theta_{13}^i - \alpha_1| &\leq CR^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}, \quad |\theta_{32}^i - \alpha_2| \leq CR^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}, \quad i = 1, 2. \\ |u(r, \theta) - a_1| &\leq \gamma, \quad \text{when } r = R_i, \theta \in (0, \theta_{13}^i - \frac{C}{R}), \quad i = 1, 2. \\ |u(r, \theta) - a_3| &\leq \gamma, \quad \text{when } r = R_i, \theta \in (\theta_{13}^i + \frac{C}{R}, \theta_{32}^i - \frac{C}{R}), \quad i = 1, 2. \\ |u(r, \theta) - a_2| &\leq \gamma, \quad \text{when } r = R_i, \theta \in (\theta_{32}^i + \frac{C}{R}, \pi), \quad i = 1, 2. \end{aligned}$$

where C depends only on γ , u , and W , not on R .

Now we prove that $|\theta_{13}^1 - \theta_{13}^2| \leq C_1 R^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. Otherwise, suppose without loss of generality that $\theta_{13}^1 - \theta_{13}^2 > C_1 R^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, for some constant $C_1 = C_1(\gamma, u, W)$ will be determined later. Then for each $\theta \in (\theta_{13}^2 + CR^{-1}, \theta_{13}^1 - CR^{-1})$, l_θ intersects with ∂B_{R_1} at an a_1 point and with ∂B_{R_2} at an a_3 point. Consequently,

$$\int_{\theta_{13}^2 + CR^{-1}}^{\theta_{13}^1 - CR^{-1}} \left(\int_{R_1}^{R_2} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\partial_r u|^2 + \tau^2 W(u) \right) dr \right) r d\theta \geq \frac{C_1}{2} \sigma R^{\frac{1}{2}} \tau,$$

for arbitrary $\tau \in (0, 1)$. Utilizing (5.55) we have the following energy estimate of the energy which only includes the tangential variation on A_{R_1, R_2}^+ :

$$\int_{A_{R_1, R_2}^+} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\partial_T u|^2 + (1 - \tau^2) W(u) \right) dz \geq \sqrt{1 - \tau^2} (2\sigma - Ce^{-kR}) (R_2 - R_1) \geq 2\sqrt{1 - \tau^2} \sigma (R_2 - R_1) - C.$$

Combining the radial variation and the tangential variation yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{A_{R_1, R_2}^+} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\nabla u|^2 + W(u) \right) dz \\ &\geq \max_{\tau \in (0, 1)} \left\{ \frac{C_1}{2} \sigma R^{\frac{1}{2}} \tau + 2\sqrt{1 - \tau^2} \sigma (R_2 - R_1) - C \right\} \\ &= \sigma \sqrt{\frac{C_1^2}{4} R + 4(R_2 - R_1)^2} - C. \end{aligned}$$

We can choose C_1 large enough to obtain

$$\int_{A_{R_1, R_2}^+} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\nabla u|^2 + W(u) \right) dz \geq 2\sigma (R_2 - R_1) + 4C_2,$$

where C_2 is the constant in (5.56). We arrive at a contradiction with (5.56). Therefore, it must hold that $|\theta_{13}^1 - \theta_{13}^2| \leq C_1 R^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. Similarly, $|\theta_{32}^1 - \theta_{32}^2| \leq C_1 R^{-\frac{1}{2}}$.

Set $\theta_{13}^R := \frac{\theta_{13}^1 + \theta_{13}^2}{2}$ and $\theta_{32}^R := \frac{\theta_{32}^1 + \theta_{32}^2}{2}$. It remains to show the existence of a constant C , such that for any $R \in [R_1, R_2]$,

$$(5.58) \quad \mathcal{D}_\gamma \cap \partial B_R \subset \{Re^{i\theta} : \theta \in (\theta_{13}^R - CR^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \theta_{13}^R + CR^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \cup (\theta_{32}^R - CR^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \theta_{32}^R + CR^{-\frac{1}{2}})\}.$$

$R = R_1, R_2$ satisfy the above relation automatically. Define the set of angles

$$\Theta_R := \{\theta : l_\theta \cap A_{R_1, R_2}^+ \cap D_{\gamma/2} \neq \emptyset\}.$$

By the same method of splitting the energy in the tangential and radial directions and comparing with the sharp energy upper bound, one can obtain the following result

$$|\Theta_R| \leq C_3(\gamma, u, W) R^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Hence, there are angles $\beta_1 \in (\theta_{13}^R - C_3 R^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \theta_{13}^R)$, $\beta_3^1 \in (\theta_{13}^R, \theta_{13}^R + C_3 R^{-\frac{1}{2}})$, $\beta_3^2 \in (\theta_{32}^R - C_3 R^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \theta_{32}^R)$ and $\beta_2 \in (\theta_{32}^R, \theta_{32}^R + C_3 R^{-\frac{1}{2}})$ such that for every $r \in (R_1, R_2)$,

$$\begin{aligned} |u(r, \beta_1) - a_1| &< \frac{\gamma}{2}, & |u(r, \beta_3^1) - a_3| &< \frac{\gamma}{2}, \\ |u(r, \beta_3^2) - a_3| &< \frac{\gamma}{2}, & |u(r, \beta_2) - a_2| &< \frac{\gamma}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

(5.57) follows immediately by applying the Variational Maximum Principle, i.e. Lemma 2.2, with $r = \frac{\gamma}{2}$ and the domain D being $\{re^\theta : r \in (R_1, R_2), \theta \in (0, \beta_1)\}$, $\{re^\theta : r \in (R_1, R_2), \theta \in (\beta_3^1, \beta_3^2)\}$ and $\{re^\theta : r \in (R_1, R_2), \theta \in (\beta_2, \pi)\}$, respectively. The proof is completed. \square

So far we have shown that the diffuse interface $\mathcal{D}_\gamma \cap \partial B_R$ is contained in an $O(R^{\frac{1}{2}})$ -neighborhood of the sharp interface. In order to prove Theorem 1.4, it remains to refine the distance to $O(1)$.

Given a sufficiently large R , we define the following quadrilateral Q_R .

$$\partial Q_R := L_1 \cup L_2 \cup L_3 \cup L_4,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} L_1 &:= \{(x, x \tan \frac{\alpha_1}{2}) : x \in [0, R]\}, \\ L_2 &:= \{(x, y) : x \cos \alpha_1 + y \sin \alpha_1 = R, x \in [\frac{\sin \alpha_2 - \sin \alpha_1}{\sin(\alpha_2 - \alpha_1)} R, R]\}, \\ L_3 &:= \{(x, y) : x \cos \alpha_2 + y \sin \alpha_2 = R, x \in [-R, \frac{\sin \alpha_2 - \sin \alpha_1}{\sin(\alpha_2 - \alpha_1)} R]\}, \\ L_4 &:= \{(x, -x \cot \frac{\alpha_2}{2}) : x \in [-R, 0]\}. \end{aligned}$$

Q_R is the quadrilateral enclosed by $l_{\frac{\alpha_1}{2}}$ (L_1), $l_{\frac{\alpha_2+\pi}{2}}$ (L_4), and the tangent lines to B_R at $(R \cos \alpha_1, R \sin \alpha_1)$ (L_2) and at $(R \cos \alpha_2, R \sin \alpha_2)$ (L_3). We now establish the same energy lower and upper bounds for $J(u, Q_R)$.

Lemma 5.3. *There exists a constant $C(u, W)$ such that for sufficiently large R ,*

$$(5.59) \quad 2\sigma R - C \leq J(u, Q_R) \leq 2\sigma R + C.$$

Proof. If we examine the proof of the lower bound in (5.56) closely, we can obtain the following stronger inequality

$$\int_0^R \int_{\frac{\alpha_1}{2}}^{\frac{\pi+\alpha_2}{2}} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\nabla u|^2 + W(u) \right) d\theta r dr \geq 2\sigma R - C.$$

This follows from the fact that the estimate only depends on the values of u along $l_{\frac{\alpha_1}{2}}$, $l_{\frac{\alpha_1+\alpha_2}{2}}$ and $l_{\frac{\alpha_2+\pi}{2}}$, which induces at least two phase transitions on each ∂B_r . This inequality immediately gives the lower bound

$$J(u, Q_R) \geq 2\sigma R - C, \quad \forall R.$$

For the upper bound, we first establish the following weaker form.

$$J(u, Q_R) \leq 2\sigma(R + R^{\frac{1}{2}}) + C, \quad \forall R.$$

By elementary geometry we have

$$\text{dist}(z, l_{\alpha_1} \cup l_{\alpha_2}) \geq CR^{\frac{3}{4}}, \quad \forall z \in Q_R \setminus B_{R+R^{1/2}}^+,$$

which, combined with Lemma 5.2, further implies

$$|u(z)| + |\nabla u(z)| \leq C e^{-CR^{\frac{3}{4}}}, \quad \forall z \in Q_R \setminus B_{R+R^{1/2}}^+.$$

Therefore, we can assert that the energy contribution from $Q_R \setminus B_{R+R^{1/2}}^+$ is negligible and

$$J(u, Q_R) \leq J(u, B_{R+R^{1/2}}^+) + C \leq 2\sigma(R + R^{\frac{1}{2}}) + C.$$

Consequently, for sufficiently large R , there exists $\tilde{R} \in (R, 2R)$ such that

$$\int_{\partial Q_{\tilde{R}}} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\partial_T u|^2 + W(u) \right) d\mathcal{H}^1 \leq 2\sigma + o(1),$$

which leads to the existence of two points $P_1 = (x_1, y_1) \in L_2$ and $P_2 = (x_2, y_2) \in L_3$ (where L_2, L_3 are defined with respect to \tilde{R}) such that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(P_1, l_{\alpha_1}) &\leq C\tilde{R}^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \text{dist}(P_2, l_{\alpha_2}) \leq C\tilde{R}^{\frac{1}{2}}; \\ |u(x, y) - a_1| &\leq C e^{-k(|x-x_1|-C)}, \quad \forall (x, y) \in L_2, \quad x_1 + C < x < \tilde{R}, \\ |u(x, y) - a_3| &\leq C e^{-k(|x-x_1|-C)}, \quad \forall (x, y) \in L_2, \quad \frac{\sin \alpha_2 - \sin \alpha_1}{\sin(\alpha_2 - \alpha_1)} \tilde{R} < x < x_1 - C, \\ |u(x, y) - a_2| &\leq C e^{-k(|x-x_2|-C)}, \quad \forall (x, y) \in L_3, \quad -\tilde{R} < x < x_2 - C, \\ |u(x, y) - a_3| &\leq C e^{-k(|x-x_2|-C)}, \quad \forall (x, y) \in L_3, \quad x_2 + C < x < \frac{\sin \alpha_2 - \sin \alpha_1}{\sin(\alpha_2 - \alpha_1)} \tilde{R}. \end{aligned}$$

Here $C = C(u, W)$, and its value may vary across these estimates. Moreover, on L_1 and L_4 (also defined with respect to \tilde{R}), $u(z)$ is close to a_2 and a_1 respectively. With this precise estimate of u along $\partial Q_{\tilde{R}}$, we can construct an explicit energy competitor in $Q_{\tilde{R}}$ in the same manner as in the proof of Lemma 5.1, see Appendix A. Here the sharp interface, around which we build the transition layers, is simply the union of the two line segments OP_1 and OP_2 , whose lengths are controlled by

$$|OP_i| \leq \sqrt{\tilde{R}^2 + C\tilde{R}} \leq \tilde{R} + C, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

The total energy of the competitor is given by $\sigma(|OP_1| + |OP_2|) = 2\sigma\tilde{R} + C$, up to additional contributions from the interpolation layers and the interiors of each phase, which can be controlled by a universal constant. Consequently, we obtain

$$J(u, Q_{\tilde{R}}) \leq 2\sigma\tilde{R} + C.$$

The same upper bound for general R follows immediately from $J(u, Q_{\tilde{R}} \setminus Q_R) \geq 2\sigma(\tilde{R} - R) - C$, due to the same reasoning of the lower bound. The proof is complete. \square

Set \mathbf{e} as the unit vector representing the direction of l_{α_1} , i.e.

$$\mathbf{e} := (\cos \alpha_1, \sin \alpha_1),$$

and $\mathbf{e}^\perp := (\sin \alpha_1, -\cos \alpha_1)$ as its orthogonal unit vector. We have the following estimate for the directional derivative $\partial_{\mathbf{e}} u$ on the infinite sector of the opening angle $\frac{\alpha_2}{2}$ between $l_{\frac{\alpha_1}{2}}$ and $l_{\frac{\alpha_1+\alpha_2}{2}}$.

Lemma 5.4. *There exists a constant $C = C(u, W)$ such that*

$$(5.60) \quad \int_0^\infty \int_{\frac{\alpha_1}{2}}^{\frac{\alpha_1+\alpha_2}{2}} |\partial_{\mathbf{e}} u|^2 r d\theta dr \leq C.$$

Proof. Set

$$Q_R^1 := Q_R \cap \{re^{i\theta} : \theta \in (\frac{\alpha_1}{2}, \frac{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2}{2})\}, \quad Q_R^2 := Q_R \setminus Q_R^1.$$

It suffices to show

$$\int_{Q_R^1} |\partial_{\mathbf{e}} u|^2 dz < C, \quad \forall R,$$

for some constant C independent of R . Indeed, for any R , we have by Lemma 5.3 that

$$J(u, Q_R) \leq 2\sigma R + C.$$

From (5.55) we derive that

$$\int_{Q_R^1} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\partial_{\mathbf{e}^\perp} u|^2 + W(u) \right) dz + J(u, Q_R^2) \geq 2\sigma R - C.$$

Together with the upper bound we obtain

$$\int_{Q_R^1} |\partial_{\mathbf{e}} u|^2 dz < C,$$

which completes the proof. \square

Remark 5.2. A similar argument leads to the following energy bounds on Q_R^i :

$$(5.61) \quad \sigma R - C \leq J(u, Q_R^i) \leq \sigma R + C, \quad \forall R, i = 1, 2.$$

We now use Lemma 5.4 to refine the $O(R^{\frac{1}{2}})$ -distance between the diffuse interface and l_{α_i} , as suggested by Lemma 5.2, to $O(1)$, thereby completing the proof of Theorem 1.4. The argument follows essentially [25, Section 3.3], which combines techniques from [40, 30]. Here we will emphasize the necessary adjustments required to accommodate the half-space setting.

We simply focus on the a_1 - a_3 interface l_{α_1} . To simplify the presentation, we rotate the coordinate system by an angle α_1 , defining

$$v(x, y) = u(x \cos \alpha_1 - y \sin \alpha_1, x \sin \alpha_1 + y \cos \alpha_1).$$

We focus on the behavior of $v(x, y)$ within the sector:

$$\mathcal{S} := \{(r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta) : \theta \in [-\frac{\alpha_1}{2}, \frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1}{2}]\}.$$

For any $x > 0$, we define the line segment

$$\Lambda_x := \{(x, y) : -x \tan \frac{\alpha_1}{2} \leq y \leq x \tan \frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1}{2}\},$$

which is the intersection of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ and the vertical line passing through $(x, 0)$. Now (5.60) becomes

$$(5.62) \quad \int_{\mathcal{S}} |\partial_x v|^2 dz \leq C.$$

And (5.55) becomes the following estimate on $\partial \mathcal{S}$,

$$(5.63) \quad |v(x, x \tan \frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1}{2}) - a_3| \leq K e^{-kx}, \quad |v(x, -x \tan \frac{\alpha_1}{2}) - a_1| \leq K e^{-kx}, \quad \forall x > 0.$$

This together with standard elliptic regularity argument implies

$$(5.64) \quad |\nabla v(x, x \tan \frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1}{2})| \leq K e^{-kx}, \quad |\nabla v(x, -x \tan \frac{\alpha_1}{2})| \leq K e^{-kx}, \quad \forall x > 0.$$

Lemma 5.2 yields that

$$(5.65) \quad (\mathcal{D}_\gamma \cap \mathcal{S}) \subset \{(x, y) : |y| \leq C \max\{1, x^{\frac{1}{2}}\}\},$$

where we still let \mathcal{D}_γ denote the diffuse interface defined for v in the new coordinate system for convenience. Lemma 5.2 also implies

$$(5.66) \quad \begin{aligned} |v(x, y) - a_3| &\leq K e^{-k(y-Cx^{1/2})}, \quad y > Cx^{\frac{1}{2}}, x > 0, \\ |v(x, y) - a_1| &\leq K e^{-k(|y|-Cx^{1/2})}, \quad y < -Cx^{\frac{1}{2}}, x > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Another useful energy estimate follows from Remark 5.2:

$$(5.67) \quad \sigma R - C \leq J(v, \mathcal{S} \cap \{x < R\}) \leq \sigma R + C, \quad \forall R > 0.$$

To complete the proof of Theorem 1.4, it suffices to show there exists a constant h_0 such that

$$(5.68) \quad \|v(x, \cdot) - U_{13}(\cdot - h_0)\|_{C_{loc}^{2,\beta}(\Lambda_x; \mathbb{R}^2)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow \infty.$$

We note that this convergence result directly implies

$$(\mathcal{D}_\gamma \cap \mathcal{S}) \subset \{|y| \leq C\},$$

which establishes (1.15) in the case $\alpha_i \in (0, \pi)$. The remainder of this section is devoted to the proof of (5.68). We first establish the following lemma, which is originally due to [40, Lemma 8.2] and has been adapted to our setting with minor modifications.

Lemma 5.5. *There exist constants $C(u, W)$ and $k(u, W)$ such that for any $x > 0$,*

$$(5.69) \quad \left| \int_{\Lambda_x} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\partial_y v|^2 - \frac{1}{2} |\partial_x v|^2 + W(v) \right) dy - \sigma \right| \leq C e^{-kx}.$$

$$(5.70) \quad \left| \int_{\Lambda_x} \partial_x v \partial_y v dy \right| \leq C e^{-kx}.$$

Proof. Set

$$G(x) := \int_{\Lambda_x} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\partial_y v|^2 - \frac{1}{2} |\partial_x v|^2 + W(v) \right) dy, \quad H(x) := \int_{\Lambda_x} \partial_x v \partial_y v dy.$$

Direct computation implies

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dx} G(x) &= \frac{d}{dx} \left[\int_{-x \tan \frac{\alpha_1}{2}}^{x \tan \frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1}{2}} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\partial_y v|^2 - \frac{1}{2} |\partial_x v|^2 + W(v) \right) dy \right] \\ &= \tan \frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\partial_y v(x, x \tan \frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1}{2})|^2 - \frac{1}{2} |\partial_x v(x, x \tan \frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1}{2})|^2 + W(v(x, x \tan \frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1}{2})) \right) \\ &\quad + \tan \frac{\alpha_1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\partial_y v(x, -x \tan \frac{\alpha_1}{2})|^2 - \frac{1}{2} |\partial_x v(x, -x \tan \frac{\alpha_1}{2})|^2 + W(v(x, -x \tan \frac{\alpha_1}{2})) \right) \\ &\quad + \int_{-x \tan \frac{\alpha_1}{2}}^{x \tan \frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1}{2}} (\partial_y v \partial_{xy}^2 v - \partial_x v \partial_{xx}^2 v + DW(v) \partial_x v) dy \end{aligned}$$

The first two terms can be bounded by Ce^{-kx} for some constants C, k depending only on u, W , thanks to (5.63) and (5.64). Since v solves (1.1), the third term becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{-x \tan \frac{\alpha_1}{2}}^{x \tan \frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1}{2}} (\partial_y v \partial_{xy}^2 v + \partial_x v \partial_{yy}^2 v) dy \\ &= \partial_x v(x, x \tan \frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1}{2}) \partial_y v(x, x \tan \frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1}{2}) - \partial_x v(x, -x \tan \frac{\alpha_1}{2}) \partial_y v(x, -x \tan \frac{\alpha_1}{2}), \end{aligned}$$

which can be bounded by Ce^{-kx} again by (5.64). Consequently, we obtain

$$\left| \frac{d}{dx} G(x) \right| \leq Ce^{-kx}, \quad \forall x > 0.$$

Therefore, there is a constant G_0 such that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} G(x) = G_0, \quad |G(x) - G_0| \leq Ce^{-kx}.$$

It suffices to prove $G_0 = \sigma$ to get (5.69). Indeed, we have

$$\left| \int_0^R G(x) dx - J(v, \mathcal{S} \cap \{x < R\}) \right| = \int_{\mathcal{S} \cap \{x < R\}} |\partial_x v|^2 dx \leq C,$$

which together with (5.67) leads to $|\int_0^R G(x) dx - \sigma R| \leq C$ for any $R > 0$, and hence $G_0 = \sigma$ follows immediately.

For $H(x)$, a similar calculation using (1.1), (5.63) and (5.64) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{d}{dx} H(x) \right| &= \left| \frac{d}{dx} \left[\int_{-x \tan \frac{\alpha_1}{2}}^{x \tan \frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1}{2}} (\partial_x v \partial_y v) dy \right] \right| \\ &= \left| \tan \frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1}{2} \left(\partial_x v(x, x \tan \frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1}{2}) \partial_y v(x, x \tan \frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1}{2}) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \tan \frac{\alpha_1}{2} \left(\partial_x v(x, -x \tan \frac{\alpha_1}{2}) \partial_y v(x, -x \tan \frac{\alpha_1}{2}) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{-x \tan \frac{\alpha_1}{2}}^{x \tan \frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1}{2}} (\partial_{xx}^2 v \partial_y v + \partial_x v \partial_{yy}^2 v) dy \right| \\ &\leq Ce^{-kx} + \left| \int_{-x \tan \frac{\alpha_1}{2}}^{x \tan \frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1}{2}} \frac{d}{dy} \left(-\frac{1}{2} |\partial_y v|^2 + W(v) + \frac{1}{2} |\partial_x v|^2 \right) dy \right| \\ &\leq Ce^{-kx}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, there is H_0 such that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} H(x) = H_0, \quad |H(x) - H_0| \leq Ce^{-kx}.$$

Since $\int_{\mathcal{S}} |\partial_x v|^2 dz \leq C$ and $\int_{\mathcal{S} \cap \{x < R\}} |\partial_y v|^2 dz \leq \sigma R$, it follows that there exists a sequence $x_i \rightarrow \infty$ such that $H(x_i) \rightarrow 0$. Hence $H_0 = 0$, and the proof is complete. \square

Next, we extend our definition of v from \mathcal{S} to the half plane $\{x > 0\}$ for convenience. The extended function, still denoted by $v(x, y)$, satisfies

$$v(x, y) = \begin{cases} v(x, y), & (x, y) \in \mathcal{S}, \\ a_3, & \text{dist}((x, y), \mathcal{S}) > 1, y > 0 \\ a_1, & \text{dist}((x, y), \mathcal{S}) > 1, y < 0 \\ \text{smooth interpolation between } a_3/a_1 \text{ and } v|_{\partial\mathcal{S}}, & 0 \leq \text{dist}((x, y), \mathcal{S}) \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

One can carefully choose the interpolation function to guarantee that

$$(5.71) \quad |v(x, y)| + |\nabla v(x, y)| + |\nabla^2 v(x, y)| \leq C e^{-kx}, \quad \forall (x, y) \text{ such that } 0 \leq \text{dist}((x, y), \mathcal{S}) \leq 1.$$

This further implies that

$$(5.72) \quad J(v, (\mathbb{R}^2 \cap \{x > 0\}) \setminus \mathcal{S}) \leq C.$$

Define the set of functions

$$\mathcal{U} := \{U_{13}(\cdot - h) : h \in \mathbb{R}\}, \quad \text{is the set of all translations of } U_{13}.$$

$$\mathcal{A} := \{w \in H_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^2) : w(-\infty) = a_1, w(+\infty) = a_3, \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\frac{1}{2} |w'|^2 + W(w) \right) dx < \infty\}.$$

For simplicity, we shall henceforth write U_{13} as U . We further define

$$d_0(w, \mathcal{U}) := \inf_{\tau \in \mathcal{U}} \|w - \tau\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R}^2)},$$

$$d_1(w, \mathcal{U}) := \inf_{\tau \in \mathcal{U}} \|w - \tau\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R}^2)}.$$

We invoke the following result from [40, Lemma 2.1, Lemma 4.5, Corollary 4.6] to show that for most of $x > 0$, $v|_{\Sigma_x}$, which belongs to \mathcal{A} , can be approximated by a translation of U .

Proposition 5.6. *There exist positive constants ε and Λ such that*

(1) *For $s = 0, 1$, if $d_s(w, \mathcal{U}) \leq \varepsilon$, then there is a unique $h_s(w)$ such that*

$$d_s(w, \mathcal{U}) = \|w - U(\cdot - h_s(w))\|_s,$$

where $\|\cdot\|_0 = \|\cdot\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R}^2)}$ and $\|\cdot\|_1 = \|\cdot\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R}^2)}$. Moreover, h_s is a function of class C^{3-s} of w for $s = 0, 1$.

(2) *If $d_1(w, \mathcal{U}) \leq \varepsilon$, then*

$$(5.73) \quad J_1(w) - \sigma \geq \Lambda \|w - U(\cdot - h_0(w))\|_{H^1}^2 \geq \Lambda d_1(w, \mathcal{U})^2.$$

(3) *If $d_1(w, \mathcal{U}) > \varepsilon$, then $J_1(w) > \sigma + \Lambda \varepsilon^2$.*

Define the “good” set

$$\mathcal{G} := \{x > 0 : d_1(v(x, \cdot), \mathcal{U}) \leq \varepsilon\}.$$

It follows from the energy bound (5.67) that

$$(5.74) \quad \mathcal{H}^1(\mathbb{R}_+ \setminus \mathcal{G}) \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^2} = C(u, W),$$

which means aside from the set of finite measure, most x belongs to \mathcal{G} .

From Proposition 5.6, there exists a function $h_0(x) \in C^2(\mathcal{G}, \mathbb{R})$ such that

$$d_0(v(x, \cdot), \mathcal{U}) = \|v(x, \cdot) - U(\cdot - h_0(x))\|_0, \quad x \in \mathcal{G}.$$

For simplicity we will omit the subscript and write $h_0(x)$ as $h(x)$. The following identities hold.

$$(5.75) \quad \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (v(x, y) - U(y - h(x))) \cdot U'(y - h(x)) dy = 0, \quad x \in \mathcal{G},$$

$$(5.76) \quad h'(x) = \frac{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \partial_x v(x, y) \cdot U'(y - h(x)) dy}{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} [|U'(y - h(x))|^2 + U''(y - h(x))(v(x, y) - U(y - h(x)))] dy}.$$

Identity (5.75) follows from the fact that $U(y - h(x))$ minimizes the L^2 distance to $v(x, \cdot)$. And (5.76) follows from differentiating (5.75) with respect to x .

Using (5.69), (5.70), (5.71) and (5.73), we have for $x \in \mathcal{G}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \partial_x v(x, y) \cdot U'(y - h(x)) dy \right| \\ &= \left| \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \partial_x v(x, y) \cdot (U'(y - h(x)) - \partial_y v(x, y)) dy \right| + \left| \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \partial_x v \partial_y v dy \right| \\ (5.77) \quad &\leq \|\partial_x v(x, \cdot)\|_0 \cdot \|v(x, \cdot) - U(\cdot - h(x))\|_1 + C e^{-kx} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|\partial_x u(x, \cdot)\|_0^2 + \frac{1}{2\Lambda} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{2} |\partial_y v(x, y)|^2 + W(v(x, y)) dy - \sigma \right) + C e^{-kx}, \\ &\leq \frac{1 + \Lambda}{2\Lambda} \|\partial_x u(x, \cdot)\|_0^2 + C e^{-kx}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we are in the position to invoke [25, Lemma 3.12 & 3.13] to obtain the following result.

Proposition 5.7. *As $x \rightarrow \infty$, the distance function $d_0(v(x, \cdot), \mathcal{U}) \rightarrow 0$. Moreover, there exists a constant h_0 such that $h(x) \rightarrow h_0$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$.*

Proof. The proof is presented in Appendix B. □

It follows from Proposition 5.6 and Proposition 5.7 that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \|v(x, \cdot) - U(\cdot - h_0)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} = 0.$$

Since for any compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}$, $v(x, \cdot) - U(\cdot - h_0)$ is uniformly bounded in $C^{2,\beta}(K)$ for any $\beta \in (0, 1)$ and sufficiently large x , the L^2 convergence above can be upgraded to $C_{loc}^{2,\beta}$ for any $\beta \in (0, 1)$. Thus, we have verified (5.68), which completes the proof of Theorem 1.4.

APPENDIX A. PROOF OF THE UPPER BOUND IN LEMMA 5.1.

Proof. We first prove that for any R sufficiently large, there exists $\bar{R} \in (R, 2R)$ such that

$$(A.78) \quad J(u, B_{\bar{R}}^+) \leq 2\sigma\bar{R} + C.$$

Let δ, ε be fixed small parameters. By the weaker energy bound (3.25), when R is sufficiently large, one can always find a $\bar{R} \in (R, 2R)$ such that

$$\int_{\partial B_{\bar{R}} \cap \mathbb{R}_+^2} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\nabla u|^2 + W(u) \right) d\mathcal{H}^1 < 2\sigma + \varepsilon.$$

When ε is taken suitably small, it implies that u should be δ -close to a_1, a_3, a_2 respectively on three arcs which connected by two $O(1)$ -size small arcs on $\partial B_{\bar{R}}$. And by Corollary 4.4, those two connecting arcs is $O(\bar{R}^{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}})$ -close to $l_{\alpha_1}, l_{\alpha_2}$, where α is the constant in (4.53). More precisely, we have

(1) There are angles $0 < \theta_1 < \theta_3^1 < \theta_3^2 < \theta_2 < \pi$ such that

$$|\theta_1 - \alpha_1| \leq C\bar{R}^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}, \quad |\theta_2 - \alpha_2| \leq C\bar{R}^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}},$$

$$|\theta_3^i - \theta_i| \leq C(\delta, u, W)\bar{R}^{-1}, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

(2) When $\theta \in (0, \theta_1)$, $|u(\bar{R}, \theta) - a_1| \leq \delta$; when $\theta \in (\theta_3^1, \theta_3^2)$, $|u(\bar{R}, \theta) - a_3| \leq \delta$; when $\theta \in (\theta_2, \pi)$, $|u(\bar{R}, \theta) - a_2| \leq \delta$.

Now we construct an energy competitor u_t on $B_{\bar{R}}^+$ such that $u_t = u$ on $\partial B_{\bar{R}}^+$. Consider the partition $B_{\bar{R}}^+ = \bigcup_{i=1}^5 \Omega_i$ for $\Omega_1 - \Omega_5$ defined in the same way as in (2.18) by simply replacing r by \bar{R} . We set $u_t|_{\partial\Omega_1}$ as

$$u(x, y) = \begin{cases} a_1, & y = 1, x \in [1, \sqrt{\bar{R}^2 - 2\bar{R}}], \text{ or } x + iy = (\bar{R} - 1)e^{i\theta} \text{ for } \theta \in [\arcsin \frac{1}{\bar{R}-1}, \theta_1], \\ a_3, & x + iy = (\bar{R} - 1)e^{i\theta} \text{ for } \theta \in [\theta_3^1, \theta_3^2], \\ a_2, & y = 1, x \in [-\sqrt{\bar{R}^2 - 2\bar{R}}, -1], \text{ or } x + iy = (\bar{R} - 1)e^{i\theta} \text{ for } \theta \in [\theta_2, \pi - \arcsin \frac{1}{\bar{R}-1}], \end{cases}$$

while on the small arcs $\{(\bar{R}, \theta) : \theta \in (\theta_1, \theta_3^1)\}$, $\{(\bar{R}, \theta) : \theta \in (\theta_3^2, \theta_2)\}$ and the flat segment $\{(x, 1) : x \in [-1, 1]\}$, take u_t to be the smooth functions that connect the corresponding phases.

On Ω_2 , let u_t vertically interpolate between $u_t|_{\{y=1\}}$ and u_0 :

$$u_t(x, y) = yu_t(x, 1) + (1 - y)u_0(x), \quad x \in [-\sqrt{\bar{R}^2 - 2\bar{R}}, \sqrt{\bar{R}^2 - 2\bar{R}}], y \in (0, 1).$$

It is easy to verify that ∇u_t and u_t are uniformly bounded in $\{(x, y) : x \in [-1, 1], y \in [0, 1]\}$, and therefore

$$J(u_t, \{x \in [-1, 1], y \in [0, 1]\}) \leq C.$$

On the positive leg $\Omega_2^+ := \{(x, y) : x \in [1, \sqrt{\bar{R}^2 - 2\bar{R}}], y \in [0, 1]\}$, by (1.6) and (1.8) we have

$$\int_{\Omega_2^+} |\partial_y u_t|^2 dx dy = \int_1^{\sqrt{\bar{R}^2 - 2\bar{R}}} |a_1 - u_0(x)|^2 dx \leq C.$$

$$\int_{\Omega_2^+} |\partial_x u_t|^2 dx dy \leq \int_1^{\sqrt{\bar{R}^2 - 2\bar{R}}} |\partial_x u_0|^2 dx \leq C$$

$$\int_{\Omega_2^+} |W(u_t)|^2 dx dy \leq \int_{\Omega_2^+} |u_t(x, y) - a_1|^2 dx dy \leq C.$$

Consequently,

$$J(u_t, \Omega_2^+) \leq C,$$

and similar estimate also holds for the negative half $\Omega_2^- := \{(x, y) : x \in [-\sqrt{\bar{R}^2 - 2\bar{R}}, -1], y \in [0, 1]\}$, which yields

$$J(u_t, \Omega_2^-) \leq C.$$

On Ω_3 , which is approximately the width-1 layer between $\partial B_{\bar{R}-1}$ and $\partial B_{\bar{R}}$, let u_t interpolate in the radial direction between $u_t|_{\partial B_{\bar{R}}}$ and $u|_{\partial B_{\bar{R}}}$. Through the same estimate for Ω_2 , one can conclude that

$$J(u_t, \Omega_3) \leq C(u, W).$$

We point out this estimate relies on the $O(1)$ -size of the phase transitional layer on $\partial B_{\bar{R}}$.

For the corner regions Ω_4 and Ω_5 , one can argue as in the proof of Lemma 2.4 to extend u_t in $\Omega_4 \cup \Omega_5$ and ensure that

$$J(u_t, \Omega_4 \cup \Omega_5) \leq C.$$

Finally, with the refined boundary data on $\partial\Omega_1$, we directly adopt the construction from [5, Appendix A] to build u_t using U_{13} and U_{32} around l_{α_1} and l_{α_2} , respectively, and ensure that it satisfies

$$J(u_t, \Omega_1) \leq 2\sigma\bar{R} + C.$$

Combining all the estimates in Ω_1 – Ω_5 yields (A.78). The same upper bound for R follows from (A.78) and the lower bound on the half annulus $A_{R, \bar{R}}^+$:

$$J(u, A_{R, \bar{R}}^+) \geq 2\sigma(\bar{R} - R) - C,$$

thanks to (5.55). □

APPENDIX B. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 5.7

We first prove $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} d(v(x, \cdot), \mathcal{U}) = 0$ by contradiction. Suppose there exist $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and a sequence $x_n \rightarrow \infty$ such that $d_0(v(x_n, \cdot), \mathcal{U}) \geq \varepsilon_0$ for every n . Without loss of generality, we may assume $\varepsilon_0 < \varepsilon$, where ε is the constant in Proposition 5.6.

When $d_0(v(x, \cdot), \mathcal{U}) > \frac{\varepsilon_0}{10}$, Proposition 5.6 implies that $J_1(v(x, \cdot)) > \sigma + \alpha(\frac{\varepsilon_0}{10})^2$, and therefore the measure of the set $\{x : d_0(v(x, \cdot), \mathcal{U}) > \frac{\varepsilon_0}{10}\}$ is bounded by a constant $\frac{C}{\alpha(\frac{\varepsilon_0}{10})^2}$ due to (5.67) and (5.72). For sufficiently large R , one may always find $x_R > R$ such that

$$d_0(v(x_R, \cdot), \mathcal{U}) \leq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{10}.$$

Set

$$\bar{x}_R := \inf\{x : x > x_R, d_0(v(x, \cdot), \mathcal{U}) = \varepsilon_0\},$$

where the existence of $\bar{x}_R > x_R$ is guaranteed by the fact that $x_n \rightarrow \infty$. For any $x \in (x_R, \bar{x}_R)$, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dx} |d_0(v(x, \cdot), \mathcal{U})|^2 \\ &= \frac{d}{dx} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |v(x, y) - U(y - h(x))|^2 dy \\ (B.79) \quad &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (\partial_x v(x, y) - U'(y - h(x))\partial_x h(x)) \cdot (v(x, y) - U(y - h(x))) dy \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \partial_x v(x, y) \cdot (v(x, y) - U(y - h(x))) dy \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} (\|\partial_x v(x, \cdot)\|_0^2 + |d_0(v(x, \cdot), \mathcal{U})|^2) \end{aligned}$$

where we have utilized (5.75). Moreover, using (5.69) and (5.73), if $x \in \mathcal{G}$,

$$d_0(v(x, \cdot), \mathcal{U})^2 \leq \frac{1}{\Lambda} \left(\|\partial_x v(x, \cdot)\|_0^2 + C e^{-kx} \right)$$

Next we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{99\varepsilon_0^2}{100} &\leq \int_{x_R}^{\bar{x}_R} \left(\frac{d}{dx} |d_0(v(x, \cdot), \mathcal{U})|^2 \right) dx \\
&\leq \int_{(x_R, \bar{x}_R) \cap \mathcal{G}} \left(\frac{\Lambda+1}{2\Lambda} \|\partial_x v(x, \cdot)\|_0^2 + Ce^{-kx} \right) dx \\
&\quad + \int_{(x_R, \bar{x}_R) \setminus \mathcal{G}} \frac{1}{2} (\|\partial_x v(x, \cdot)\|_0^2 + d_0(v(x, \cdot), \mathcal{U})^2) dx \\
&\leq C \int_{x_R}^{\bar{x}_R} \|\partial_x v\|_0^2 dx + \varepsilon_0^2 |(x_R, \bar{x}_R) \setminus \mathcal{G}| + Ce^{-kx_R}.
\end{aligned} \tag{B.80}$$

Since both $\int_{x>0} |\partial_x v|^2 dz$ and $|\mathbb{R}_+ \setminus \mathcal{G}|$ are bounded by a constant $C(u, W)$, the last line in (B.80) goes to 0 as $R \rightarrow \infty$, which yields a contradiction. Thus, we obtain $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} d(v(x, \cdot), \mathcal{U}) = 0$.

It follows from Proposition 5.6 that there exists $x_0 > 0$ such that $h(x)$ is a well-defined C^3 function on (x_0, ∞) and satisfies (5.75), (5.76) and $d_0(v(x, \cdot), \mathcal{U}) < \varepsilon$.

When $x > x_0$, the denominator in (5.76) can be estimated by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} [|U'(y - h(x))|^2 + U''(y - h(x))(v(x, y) - U(y - h(x)))] dy \\
\geq &\|U'\|_0^2 - \varepsilon \|U''\|_0 \\
\geq &\frac{1}{2} \|U'\|_0^2 \geq C,
\end{aligned} \tag{B.81}$$

where we use that $\|U''\|_0$ is a constant and ε is sufficiently small. Now we combine (5.76), (5.77) and (B.81) to obtain

$$|h'(x)| \leq \begin{cases} C (\|\partial_x v(x, \cdot)\|_0^2 + e^{-kx}), & x \in \mathcal{G}, \\ C (\|\partial_x v(x, \cdot)\|_0^2 + \|v(x, \cdot) - U(\cdot - h(x))\|_1^2 + e^{-kx}), & x \in (x_0, \infty) \setminus \mathcal{G}. \end{cases} \tag{B.82}$$

where $C = C(u, W)$.

We conclude the proof by the following calculation which implies the existence of $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} h(x)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{x_0}^{\infty} |h'(x)| dx \\
\leq &C \left(\int_{x_0}^{\infty} \|\partial_x v(x, \cdot)\|_0^2 dx + \int_{(x_0, \infty) \setminus \mathcal{G}} \|v(x, \cdot) - U(\cdot - h(x))\|_1^2 dx + e^{-kx_0} \right) \\
\leq &C \int_{\{x > x_0\}} |\partial_x v|^2 dz + C \int_{(x_0, \infty) \setminus \mathcal{G}} (\|\partial_y v(x, \cdot)\|_0^2 + \|U'\|_0^2 + \|v(x, \cdot) - U(\cdot - h(x))\|_0^2) dx + Ce^{-kx_0} \\
\leq &C \left(\int_{\{x > x_0\}} |\partial_x v|^2 dz + \int_{(x_0, \infty) \setminus \mathcal{G}} J_1(v(x, \cdot)) dx + (\|U'\|_0^2 + \varepsilon) |(x_0, \infty) \setminus \mathcal{G}| \right) + Ce^{-kx_0} \\
\leq &C \left(\int_{\{x > x_0\}} |\partial_x v|^2 dz + \int_{\{x \in \{(x_0, \infty) \setminus \mathcal{G}\}\}} |\partial_x v|^2 dz + (\sigma + \|U'\|_0^2 + \varepsilon) |(x_0, \infty) \setminus \mathcal{G}| \right) + Ce^{-kx_0} \\
\leq &C(u, W),
\end{aligned}$$

where we have utilized (B.82), (5.69), (5.74) and $\int_{\{x > 0\}} |\partial_x v|^2 dz \leq C$.

REFERENCES

- [1] ALIKAKOS, N. D., AND FUSCO, G. Density estimates for vector minimizers and applications. *Discrete & Continuous Dynamical Systems* 35, 12 (2015), 5631–5663.
- [2] ALIKAKOS, N. D., AND FUSCO, G. A maximum principle for systems with variational structure and an application to standing waves. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society* 17, 7 (2015), 1547–1567.
- [3] ALIKAKOS, N. D., AND FUSCO, G. Sharp lower bounds for vector Allen-Cahn energy and qualitative properties of minimizers under no symmetry hypotheses. *Bulletin of the Hellenic Mathematical Society* 67 (2023), 12–58.
- [4] ALIKAKOS, N. D., FUSCO, G., AND SMYRNELIS, P. *Elliptic systems of phase transition type*. Springer, 2018.
- [5] ALIKAKOS, N. D., AND GENG, Z. On the triple junction problem without symmetry hypotheses. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis* 248, 2 (2024), 24.
- [6] AMBROSIO, L., AND CABRÉ, X. Entire solutions of semilinear elliptic equations in \mathbb{R}^3 and a conjecture of De Giorgi. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society* 13, 4 (2000), 725–739.
- [7] BALDO, S. Minimal interface criterion for phase transitions in mixtures of Cahn-Hilliard fluids. *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré C, Analyse non linéaire* 7, 2 (1990), 67–90.
- [8] BETHUEL, F. Asymptotics for 2-dimensional vectorial allen-cahn systems. *Acta Mathematica* 234, 2 (2025), 189–314.
- [9] BRONSARD, L., GUI, C., AND SCHATZMAN, M. A three-layered minimizer in \mathbb{R}^2 for a variational problem with a symmetric three-well potential. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* 49, 7 (1996), 677–715.
- [10] CHAN, H., AND WEI, J. On De Giorgi's conjecture: recent progress and open problems. *Science China Mathematics* 61 (2018), 1925–1946.
- [11] DE GIORGI, E. Convergence problems for functionals and operators. In *Proc. Int. Meeting on Recent Methods in Nonlinear Analysis* (1979), Pitagora, Bologna, pp. 131–188.
- [12] DEL PINO, M., KOWALCZYK, M., AND WEI, J. On De Giorgi's conjecture in dimension $n \geq 9$. *Annals of Mathematics* (2011), 1485–1569.
- [13] DU, W., MOONEY, C., YANG, Y., AND ZHU, J. A half-space bernstein theorem for anisotropic minimal graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.07519* (2023).
- [14] DU, W., WANG, L., AND YANG, Y. Flat level sets of allen-cahn equation in half-space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.20335* (2024).
- [15] EDELEN, N., AND WANG, Z. A bernstein-type theorem for minimal graphs over convex domains. *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré C* 39, 3 (2022), 749–760.
- [16] FARINA, A., AND VALDINOICI, E. Flattening results for elliptic pdes in unbounded domains with applications to overdetermined problems. *Archive for rational mechanics and analysis* 195, 3 (2010), 1025–1058.
- [17] FARINA, A., AND VALDINOICI, E. 1D symmetry for solutions of semilinear and quasilinear elliptic equations. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 363, 2 (2011), 579–609.
- [18] FLORES, G., PADILLA, P., AND TONEGAWA, Y. Higher energy solutions in the theory of phase transitions: a variational approach. *Journal of Differential Equations* 169, 1 (2001), 190–207.
- [19] FLORIT-SIMON, E., AND SERRA, J. On stable solutions to the allen-cahn equation with bounded energy density in \mathbb{R}^4 . *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.02739* (2025).
- [20] FONSECA, I., AND TARTAR, L. The gradient theory of phase transitions for systems with two potential wells. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh Section A: Mathematics* 111, 1-2 (1989), 89–102.
- [21] FUSCO, G. Layered solutions to the vector Allen-Cahn equation in \mathbb{R}^2 . minimizers and heteroclinic connections. *Communications on Pure and Applied Analysis* 16, 5 (2017), 1807.
- [22] FUSCO, G. Minimizing under relaxed symmetry constraints: Triple and N-junctions. *Annali Scuola Normale Superiore - classe di Scienze* (2022).
- [23] FUSCO, G. Connectivity of the diffuse interface and fine structure of minimizers in the Allen-Cahn theory of phase transitions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.11575* (2024).
- [24] GAZOULIS, D. On the Γ -convergence of the Allen-Cahn functional with boundary conditions. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh Section A: Mathematics* (2024), 1–23.
- [25] GENG, Z. Rigidity results for a triple junction solution of the Allen-Cahn system. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis* 57, 5 (2025), 5570–5597.
- [26] GENG, Z. Uniqueness of the blow-down limit for a triple junction problem. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* 78, 2 (2025), 500–534.
- [27] GHOUSSOUB, N., AND GUI, C. On a conjecture of De Giorgi and some related problems. *Mathematische Annalen* 311, 3 (1998), 481–491.
- [28] GIUSTI, E., AND WILLIAMS, G. H. *Minimal surfaces and functions of bounded variation*, vol. 80. Springer, 1984.

- [29] GUARACO, M. A. Min–max for phase transitions and the existence of embedded minimal hypersurfaces. *Journal of Differential Geometry* 108, 1 (2018), 91–133.
- [30] GUI, C. Hamiltonian identities for elliptic partial differential equations. *Journal of Functional Analysis* 254, 4 (2008), 904–933.
- [31] GUI, C., AND SCHATZMAN, M. Symmetric quadruple phase transitions. *Indiana University Mathematics Journal* (2008), 781–836.
- [32] HAMEL, F., LIU, Y., SICBALDI, P., WANG, K., AND WEI, J. Half-space theorems for the allen–cahn equation and related problems. *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik (Crelles Journal)* 2021, 770 (2021), 113–133.
- [33] LIU, Y., WANG, K., AND WEI, J. Global minimizers of the Allen–Cahn equation in dimension $n \geq 8$. *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées* 108, 6 (2017), 818–840.
- [34] MONTEIL, A., AND SANTAMBROGIO, F. Metric methods for heteroclinic connections in infinite dimensional spaces. *Indiana University Mathematics Journal* 69, 4 (2020), 1445–1503.
- [35] NOVACK, M. Regularity for minimizers of a planar partitioning problem with cusps. *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations* 64, 2 (2025), 68.
- [36] PACARD, F., AND WEI, J. Stable solutions of the Allen–Cahn equation in dimension 8 and minimal cones. *Journal of Functional Analysis* 264, 5 (2013), 1131–1167.
- [37] SANDIER, E., AND STERNBERG, P. Allen–Cahn solutions with triple junction structure at infinity. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* 77, 11 (2024), 4163–4211.
- [38] SAVIN, O. Regularity of flat level sets in phase transitions. *Annals of Mathematics* (2009), 41–78.
- [39] SAVIN, O. Minimal surfaces and minimizers of the Ginzburg Landau energy. *Cont. Math. Mech. Analysis AMS* 526 (2010), 43–58.
- [40] SCHATZMAN, M. Asymmetric heteroclinic double layers. *ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations* 8 (2002), 965–1005.
- [41] SMYRNELIS, P. Connecting orbits in Hilbert spaces and applications to PDE. *Communications on Pure & Applied Analysis* 19, 5 (2020), 2797.
- [42] STERNBERG, P. The effect of a singular perturbation on nonconvex variational problems. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis* 101, 3 (1988), 209–260.
- [43] STERNBERG, P., AND ZEIMER, W. P. Local minimisers of a three-phase partition problem with triple junctions. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh Section A: Mathematics* 124, 6 (1994), 1059–1073.
- [44] TONEGAWA, Y., AND WICKRAMASEKERA, N. Stable phase interfaces in the van der waals-cahn-hilliard theory. *Journal für die Reine und Angewandte Mathematik* 2012, 668 (2012).
- [45] WANG, K. A new proof of Savin’s theorem on Allen–Cahn equations. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society* 19, 10 (2017), 2997–3051.
- [46] WANG, K., AND WEI, J. Finite Morse index implies finite ends. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* 72, 5 (2019), 1044–1119.
- [47] WANG, K., AND WEI, J. Second order estimate on transition layers. *Advances in Mathematics* 358 (2019), 106856.