SHARP-INTERFACE LIMIT OF A GINZBURG-LANDAU FUNCTIONAL WITH A RANDOM EXTERNAL FIELD.

NICOLAS DIRR AND ENZA ORLANDI

Abstract. We add a random bulk term, modeling the interaction with the impurities of the medium, to a standard functional in the gradient theory of phase transitions consisting of a gradient term with a double well potential. For the resulting functional we study the asymptotic properties of minimizers and minimal energy under a rescaling in space, i.e. on the macroscopic scale. By bounding the energy from below by a coarse-grained, discrete functional, we show that for a suitable strength of the random field the random energy functional has two types of random global minimizers, corresponding to two phases. Then we derive the macroscopic cost of low-energy "excited" states that correspond to a bubble of one phase surrounded by the opposite phase.

1. Introduction

Models where a stochastic contribution is added to the energy of the system naturally arise in condensed matter physics where the presence of the impurities causes the microscopic structure to vary from point to point. The starting point is a random functional which models the free energy of a two phases material on a so-called mesoscopic scale, i.e. a scale which is much larger than the atomistic scale so that the adequate description of the state of the material is by a *continuous* scalar order parameter $m: D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$. The free energy functional consists of three competing parts: An "interaction term" penalizing spatial changes in m, a double-well potential $W(m)$, i.e. a nonconvex function which has exactly two minimizers, for simplicity $+1$ and -1, modeling a two-phase material, and a term which couples m to a random field with mean zero, variance θ^2 and unit correlation length, i.e. a term which prefers at each point in space one of the two minimizers of $W(\cdot)$ and breaks the translational invariance, but is "neutral" in the mean. This random term models the interaction with "impurities" that are randomly distributed in the material. A standard choice with the aforementioned properties is

$$\hat{G}(m,\omega) := \int_D \left(|\nabla m(y)|^2 + W(m(y)) + \theta g(y,\omega)m(y)\right) \mathrm{dy}.$$

We are, however, interested in a so-called *macroscopic* scale, which is coarse than the mesoscopic scale. Therefore we rescale space with a small parameter ϵ. If $\Lambda = \epsilon D$ and $u(x) = m(\epsilon^{-1}x)$, we obtain $\hat{G}(m,\omega) = \epsilon^{1-d} G_\epsilon(u,\omega)$, where

$$G_\epsilon(u,\omega) := \int_\Lambda \left(\epsilon|\nabla u(x)|^2 + \frac{1}{\epsilon}W(m(x)) + \frac{\theta}{\epsilon} g_\epsilon(x,\omega)m(x)\right) \mathrm{dx}$$

where g_ϵ has now correlation length ϵ. First, we are interested in the asymptotic behavior of the minimizers, which, unlike in the case $\theta = 0$, will not be the constant functions $u(x) \equiv 1$ and $u(x) \equiv -1$, but functions varying in x and ω, and the minimal energy will be strictly negative. Second, we would like to know how functions which are not minimizers, but have energy of the same order as the minimizer, behave as $\epsilon \to 0$. This can be used to obtain information on the asymptotic of minimizers with a

Date: March 19, 2007.
1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35R60, 80M35, 82D30, 74Q05.
Key words and phrases. Γ convergence, Random functionals, Phase segregation in disordered materials.
N.D. supported by DFG-Forschergruppe 718.
E.O. supported by MURST/Cofin 05-06 PRIN 2004028108 and ROMA TRE University.

constraint, like requiring the spatial mean of u to equal a fixed value. The appropriate mathematical set-up for the second question is as follows. First we "renormalize," i.e. we subtract the energy of the minimizers (which exists by standard arguments) to obtain

$$F_\epsilon(u,\omega) = G_\epsilon(u,\omega) - \inf_{H^1(\Lambda)} G_\epsilon(\cdot,\omega),$$

and then we consider the Γ-limit of the functionals F_ϵ defined in $L^1(\Lambda)$ (with respect to the $L^1(\Lambda)$ convergence). A functional F_0 is the Γ-limit of the family $(F_\epsilon)_{\epsilon\to 0}$ with respect to the L^1-topology, if for all $u \in L^1(\Lambda)$

- for all $\{u_\epsilon\} \in L^1(\Lambda)$ with $u_\epsilon \to u$ in $L^1(\Lambda)$,
$$\liminf_\epsilon F_\epsilon(u_\epsilon) \geq F_0(u),$$
- and there exists a sequence $\{v_\epsilon\} \in L^1(\Lambda)$, $v_\epsilon \to u$ in L^1 (recovery sequence or Γ-realizing sequence) such that (1.1)
$$\limsup_\epsilon F_\epsilon(v_\epsilon) \leq F_0(u).$$

The Γ-limit, a notion invented by E. De Giorgi, means heuristically that $F_0(u)$ is the limit energy of the "lowest-energy approximations" to u. In the the case $\theta = 0$ the minimizers are obviously the constants ± 1 with minimum energy zero, and the second question, the Γ-limit, was answered by Modica and Mortola, see [14, 15], who found that

$$F_0(u) = \begin{cases} \int_\Lambda \tau\left(\frac{\nabla u}{|\nabla u|}\right)|\nabla u| & \text{if} \quad u \in BV(\Lambda),\ |u| = 1 \text{ a.e.} \\ \infty & \text{else} \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

$$\tau(n) = C_W = 2\int_{-1}^{1} \sqrt{W(s)}ds \quad \text{for all} \quad n \in S^{d-1}, \tag{1.3}$$

where $S^{d-1} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x| = 1\}$. If the "jump set" of u, i.e. the set separating the region where $u = +1$ from the region where $u = -1$, is sufficiently regular, then $\nabla u(|\nabla u|)^{-1} = n$, the outward unit normal to the set $\{u < 0\}$. For the generalization to BV-functions, i.e. functions such that the distributional derivative is a (vector-valued) Radon measure, see e.g. [9]. The weight $\tau(n) = \tau(-n)$ is the *surface tension* in the language of statistical mechanics. While it is constant for $\theta = 0$, it is nonconstant (anisotropic) for *g periodic* (see [6, 7]) or for the gradient term being replaced by a bilinear form with periodic coefficients, see [1].

Note that the investigation of the limit behavior of $F_\epsilon(u,\omega)$ requires simultaneously the homogenization of a random structure and the performing of a limit of "singular" nature. Moreover, due to the non-convexity of the double-well potential, the Euler-Lagrange equation does not have an unique solution.

The g-dependent bulk term, can, because of the scaling with ϵ^{-1}, force a sequence u_ϵ to "follow" the oscillations of g. This always happens in the form of bounded oscillations around the two wells of the double well potential. In such a situation there are still two distinct minimizers, also called "phases," adopting the language of statistical mechanics. But in principle the g-dependent term could be strong enough to enforce large oscillations, so that the minimizers will "change well." In the periodic case it is possible to check on a deterministic volume with a diameter of the order of the period whether the minimizer "changes well," i.e. creates a "bubble" of the other phase. The random case is quite different, because there is no deterministic subset of Λ such that the integral of the random field over this subset equals zero for almost all realizations of the random field - there are always *fluctuations* around the zero mean. A set A becomes the support of a bubble of the other phase if the cost of switching to the other well, which can be estimated by the Modica-Mortola result as proportional to the boundary of A, is smaller than the integral of the random field part over A. As the correlation length is ϵ, a set $A \subseteq \Lambda$ contains roughly $|A|\epsilon^{-d}$ independent random variables, where $|\cdot|$ denotes the $d-$ dimensional Lebesgue measure of a set. By the central limit theorem, fluctuations of order $\theta\sqrt{|A|}\epsilon^{d/2}$ are highly likely, but the probability of larger fluctuations vanishes exponentially fast. Therefore, using the isoperimetric inequality, the probability of A being the support of a bubble is exponentially small if

$$c_d|A|^{(d-1)/d} \gg |A|^{1/2}\epsilon^{(d-2)/2}\theta,$$

where c_d is the isoperimetric constant. In $d \geq 3$ this is asymptotically always the case for sets of diameter of order larger ϵ, or for sets of any size, provided $\theta \to 0$. When determining properties of the minimizers we are, however, not interested in whether a *single* given set A becomes the support of a bubble, but whether *there exist* "bubbles" of the other phase. In order to estimate the latter probability, we have to find a way to count subsets, which requires a *coarse-graining* on the scale of the correlation length.

We define a *phase-indicator* which is ± 1 if the average of u over a cube of side ϵ is close to ± 1, the minimizers of the "unperturbed" ($\theta = 0$) functional. (See 2.15.) Then we prove that the energy of a function is bounded from below by an energy that can be expressed as a function of the so-called contours of the coarse-grained "representative" of the function. The proof of this bound does not require probabilistic arguments. The basic idea behind contours is to make explicit the region in space where the order parameter u deviates from the minimizer, which is, of course, unknown. However, one may guess that for sufficiently weak disorder (θ small) the minimizers should look almost like the ones without random field. It is thus natural to build the contour model on the basis of the ideal minimizers and to let the contours themselves keep track of the deviations of the true minimizers from these ideal minimizers. Our use of contours for functions $u : \Lambda \to \mathbb{R}$, i.e. functions in continuum, has been strongly inspired by the series of papers done for Ising spin systems with Kac type interaction by Errico Presutti and his collaborators, see the book [18].

However, we do not impose any boundary conditions on the cube Λ, because we are interested in global minimizers. This kind of free boundary condition corresponds to Neumann boundary conditions for smooth solutions of the Euler-Lagrange equations. In the "discretized" setting after "coarse-graining", the free boundary conditions will make the definition of contours more complicated than in the standard setting, where usually some type of "Dirichlet" boundary conditions are used. In addition the energy in [18] contains convolution terms instead of gradients, so our approach is quite different as far as the more technical parts are concerned.

These contour reduction techniques will have further applications in the analysis of random functionals which are related to a deterministic reference functional with multiple ground states (phases). The contour reduction allows us to use probabilistic techniques developed in the 1980's for the (discrete) random-field Ising model: The central question heatedly discussed in the 1980's in the physics community was whether the Random Field Ising model would show spontaneous magnetization at low temperature and weak disorder in dimension 3, or not. This is closely related to the question whether there are at least two distinct minimizers, one predominantly + and one predominantly −. The problem was solved by Bricmont and Kupiainen, [5], who proved the existence of phase transition in $d \geq 3$ for small magnitude of the random field, and Aizenman and Wehr, [2], who proved that there is no phase transition in $d = 2$ for all temperatures.

We prove that in $d \geq 3$ and for a set of random realizations of overwhelming probability, see Theorem 2.1, there are two functions $u^+_\epsilon(\cdot,\omega)$ and $u^-_\epsilon(\cdot,\omega)$, close in L^∞ respectively to $+1$ and -1, on which the value of the functional is close to its minimum value, and one of them is the global minimizer. The energy of these minimizers diverges as $\epsilon \to 0$, but the minimal energy is close to a deterministic sequence c_ϵ up to an error which vanishes as $\epsilon \to 0$, see Theorem 2.2, i.e. the energy becomes deterministic in the limit by a law of large numbers. The Γ-convergence of the renormalized energy F_ϵ is the content of Theorem 2.3. We show Γ-convergence with respect to the $L^1(\Lambda)$-topology with probability 1. The realization ω of the random field is treated as parameter for $\mathbb{P}$ almost all such ω.

Both Theorem 2.1 and 2.3 hold only in the case $\theta = (\log(\epsilon^{-1}))^{-1} \to 0$, while the analytic result which is crucial in obtaining these estimates, the contour reduction Theorem 2.7 and Theorem 2.9, hold for θ small but strictly positive as $\epsilon \downarrow 0$. The assumption $\theta \to 0$ is important because by analogy with the aforementioned Ising models with random field we expect that for θ small but finite two (almost) minimizers exist, but they do not stay in a single well: The + minimizer, for example, will be predominantly near $+1$, but there will be many small (diameter $\sim \epsilon$) "bubbles" where it is close to -1. In the case of "weak" disorder treated here, i.e. $\theta \to 0$, we show that the surface tension $\tau = C_W$ (see (1.2)) as in the case $\theta = 0$.

This does not mean that the disorder is too weak to have any effect: First note that the minimizers are not constants but functions depending on space and on the realization of the random field. Their energy is not zero, hence the presence of the renormalization.

Second, in Appendix III, we present a (partly heuristic) computation that indicates that minimizers in $d = 3$ are not microscopically flat, i.e. even if the jump set of u is a plane, the recovery sequence u_ϵ has the property that for some $\delta > 0$ the set $S(u_\epsilon) = \{-1 + \delta < u < 1 - \delta\}$ fluctuates around the limit plane on any scale smaller than $\epsilon^{2/3}$. This is clearly not the case for $\theta = 0$, where the global minimizer has planar level sets, and in the periodic case recent results by Novaga and Valdinoci, see [16], indicate that $S(u_\epsilon)$ oscillates on the scale ϵ.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we state the main results, define the phase indicator and our notion of contours. In Section 3 we show that we can associate to each function a representative which gives rise to essentially the same coarse grained function, but has smaller energy and is uniformly bounded and uniformly Lipschitz. This allows to derive that such a function must be pointwise close to the minimizers if the coarse-grained function is. In Section 4 we estimate the cost of a contour, i.e. a deviation of the coarse-grained function from local equilibrium. In Section 5 we show the already mentioned lower bound on the energy in terms of a functional depending only on the contours of the coarse-graining. As consequence, we prove that a minimizer stays in one single well of the double-well potential. In Section 6, finally, we use the information obtained so far to show the Γ-convergence of the renormalized functionals. We collect, in the appendix, for convenience of the reader, standard results and computations about properties of the solution to the Euler-Lagrange equation of our random functional under the condition that the solution stays in one single well and probabilistic estimates used in this paper.

Acknowledgments. We would like to thank Stephan Luckhaus and Errico Presutti for helpful discussions. EO acknowledges the hospitality of the Max-Planck-Institute for Mathematics in the Sciences Leipzig, and ND acknowledges the hospitality of the University Roma Tre.

2. Notations and Results

2.1. **The functional.** The "macroscopic" space is given by $\Lambda := [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^d$, the $d-$ dimensional unit cube centered at the origin. The ratio between the macroscopic and the "mesoscopic" scale is given by the small parameter $\epsilon > 0$. Hence for any ϵ the mesoscopic space is defined as $\Lambda_\epsilon := [-\frac{1}{2\epsilon}, \frac{1}{2\epsilon}]^d$. We require ϵ to be in a countable set, e.g. $\epsilon = \frac{1}{n}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. This choice avoids irrelevant technical difficulties.[1] The disorder or random field is constructed with the help of a family $\{g(z,\omega)\}_{z\in\mathbb{Z}^d}$ of independent, identically distributed Bernoulli random variables. The law of this family of random variables will be denoted by $\mathbb{P}$, in particular

$$\mathbb{P}(\{g(z,\omega) = \pm 1\}) = \pm\frac{1}{2} \qquad z \in \mathbb{Z}^d. \tag{2.1}$$

Different choices of g could be handled by minor modifications provided g is still a random field with finite correlation length, invariant under (integer) translations and such that $g(z,\omega)$ has a symmetric distribution with compact support. The disorder or random field in the functional will be obtained by

[1] It will become soon clear that this assumption simplifies some definitions, see for example the definition of contours given next, avoiding to deal with boundary layer problems.

a rescaling of g such that the correlation length is order ϵ and the amplitude grows as $\epsilon \to 0$. To this end define for $x \in \Lambda$ a function $g_\epsilon(\cdot, \omega) \in L^\infty(\Lambda)$ by

$$g_\epsilon(x,\omega) := \sum_{z\in\mathbb{Z}^d} g(z,\omega) 1\!\!1_{\epsilon(z+[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}]^d)\cap\Lambda}(x), \tag{2.2}$$

where for any Borel-measurable set A

$$1\!\!1_A(x) := \begin{cases} 1, \text{if } x \in A \\ 0 \text{ if } x \notin A. \end{cases}$$

For $u \in H^1(\Lambda)$ and any open set $A \subseteq \Lambda$ consider the following random functional

$$G_\epsilon(A,u,\omega) := \int_A \left(\epsilon |\nabla u(x)|^2 + \frac{1}{\epsilon} W(u(x)) \right) \mathrm{d}x + \frac{1}{\epsilon}\alpha(\epsilon)\theta \int_A g_\epsilon(x,\omega) u(x) \mathrm{d}x \tag{2.3}$$

where $\theta > 0$ and $0 < \alpha(\epsilon) \ll 1$ is a function of ϵ to be specified later. If $A = \Lambda$, we simply write $G_\epsilon(u,\omega)$. The potential W is a so-called "double-well potential:"

Assumption (H1) $W \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$, $W \geq 0$, $W(s) = 0$ iff $s \in \{-1, 1\}$, $W(s) = W(-s)$ and $W(s)$ is strictly decreasing in $[0, 1]$. Moreover there exists δ_0 and $C_0 > 0$ so that

$$W(s) = \frac{1}{2C_0}(s-1)^2 \qquad \forall s \in (1-\delta_0, \infty). \tag{2.4}$$

These assumptions could be relaxed, but in order to keep the exposition reasonably short, we prefer to use stronger assumptions. The functional (2.3) can be extended to a lower semicontinuous functional $G_\epsilon :\ L^1(\Lambda) \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ by defining $G_\epsilon(v,\omega) = +\infty$ for any $v \notin H^1(\Lambda)$ and $\omega \in \Omega$. For $\epsilon > 0$ fixed and $\omega \in \Omega$ it follows in the same way as in the case without random perturbation that the functional $G_\epsilon(\cdot,\omega)$ is coercive and weakly lower semicontinuous in $H^1(\Lambda)$, so there exists at least one minimizer, see [8], which is here a random functions in $H^1(\Lambda)$, i.e. different realizations of ω will give different minimizers.

2.2. **Minimizers and Γ-limit.**

Our first main result is the existence of two minimizing random functions $u_\epsilon^\pm$ and their properties.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $d \geq 3$, $0 < \theta$, $\alpha(\epsilon) = \frac{1}{\ln\frac{1}{\epsilon}}$. There exists $\epsilon_0 > 0$ and $a \equiv a(\alpha(\epsilon_0)\theta, d) > 0$ so that for all $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, there exists a set $\Omega_\epsilon \subseteq \Omega$, $\mathbb{P}[\Omega_\epsilon] \geq 1 - e^{-a\left(\ln\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)^{1+\frac{49}{50}}}$, [2], so that for all $\omega \in \Omega_\epsilon$ the following holds: There exist two functions $u_\epsilon^\pm(\cdot,\omega) \in H^1(\Lambda)$ such that*

$$\inf_{H^1(\Lambda)} G_\epsilon(\cdot,\omega) = G_\epsilon(u_\epsilon^\tau,\omega), \text{ where } \tau = -\text{sign}\left(\int_\Lambda g_\epsilon\right) \tag{2.5}$$

$$|G_\epsilon(u_\epsilon^+,\omega) - G_\epsilon(u_\epsilon^-,\omega)| \leq \delta_\epsilon, \tag{2.6}$$

where δ_ϵ is a deterministic function with $\delta_\epsilon \to 0$ as $\epsilon \to 0$,

$$\|u_\epsilon^+(\cdot,\omega) - 1\|_\infty \leq C\theta\alpha(\epsilon); \qquad \|u_\epsilon^-(\cdot,\omega) + 1\|_\infty \leq C\theta\alpha(\epsilon) \quad \omega \in \Omega_\epsilon,$$

$$\mathbb{E}[u_\epsilon^\pm(r,\cdot)] = 1 \quad \forall r \in \Lambda$$

and (decay of correlations)

$$\left|\mathbb{E}[u_\epsilon^\pm(r,\cdot)u_\epsilon^\pm(r',\cdot)] - \mathbb{E}[u_\epsilon^\pm(r,\cdot)]\mathbb{E}[u_\epsilon^\pm(r',\cdot)]\right| \leq C(d)\theta^2\alpha^2(\epsilon)e^{-\frac{1}{2\epsilon\sqrt{2C_0}}|r-r'|}. \tag{2.7}$$

[2]The exponent $\frac{49}{50}$ is just a possible choice. The relevant issue is that for $\epsilon = \frac{1}{n}$, $\sum_n e^{f(n)}$ is finite, where here $f(n) = -a(\ln n)^{1+\frac{49}{50}}$.

In the unperturbed case $\theta = 0$ the minimum value is zero and there are two minimizers, the constant functions identical equal to 1 or to -1. When $\theta > 0$ the infimum over $H^1(\Lambda)$ can be negative or even diverge to $-\infty$ as $\epsilon \downarrow 0$. Hence we shall introduce an additive renormalization for the functional and denote for $u \in H^1(\Lambda)$

$$F_\epsilon(u,\omega) = G_\epsilon(u,\omega) - \inf_{H^1(\Lambda)} G_\epsilon(\cdot,\omega). \tag{2.8}$$

Denote

$$c_\epsilon = \mathbb{E}[\inf_{H^1(\Lambda)} G_\epsilon(\cdot,\cdot)]. \tag{2.9}$$

We have the following result.

Theorem 2.2. *For $d \geq 3$ and $\alpha(\epsilon) = (\ln(1/\epsilon))^{-1}$, $\theta > 0$,*

$$c_\epsilon = \mathbb{E}[G_\epsilon(u_\epsilon^+,\cdot)] = \mathbb{E}[G_\epsilon(u_\epsilon^-,\cdot)] \tag{2.10}$$

$$\mathbb{E}\left[c_\epsilon - \inf_{H^1(\Lambda)} G_\epsilon(\cdot,\cdot)\right]^2 \to 0, \quad 0 < \liminf \epsilon\alpha(\epsilon)^{-2}|c_\epsilon| \leq \limsup \epsilon\alpha(\epsilon)^{-2}|c_\epsilon| < \infty. \tag{2.11}$$

Next theorem states that the renormalized functionals have a Γ-limit.

Theorem 2.3. *For $d \geq 3$, $\epsilon = \frac{1}{n}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\alpha(\epsilon) = (\ln(1/\epsilon))^{-1}$ and $\theta > 0$, $F_\epsilon(\cdot,\omega) \to F_0(\cdot)$ in the sense of Γ-convergence (with respect to the L^1 topology) $\mathbb{P}$-almost surely, where F_0 is as in (1.2) and C_W is as in (1.3).*

Theorem 2.2 corresponds to the highest order term of a so-called "Γ-expansion" of our functional. Its proof is given in Section 5. Theorem 2.3 characterizes the next order term. Its proof is given in Section 6.

Remark 2.4 (Minimizers with Constraints)**.** *As a direct consequence we obtain that a sequence $u_\epsilon(\cdot,\omega)$ with*

$$G_\epsilon(u_\epsilon,\omega) = \min_{\{v\in H^1:\ \int_\Lambda v=m\}} G_\epsilon(v,\omega),$$

for $m \in (-1,1)$, converges a.e. to a deterministic function $u(\cdot)$ such that

$$F_0(u) = \min_{\{v\in BV:\ \int_\Lambda v=m,\ |v|=1\ a.e.\}} F_0(v), \qquad \mathbb{P} = 1.$$

2.3. **Contours and Contour reduction.** The proof of Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.3 is based on an extension of Peierls, [17], argument to the present context, using three steps: First, a reformulation of the problem in term of contours, then an estimate of their energy and finally an estimate of their number. As we are interested in global minimizers, we consider free boundary conditions, which corresponds to Neumann boundary conditions for smooth solutions of the Euler-Lagrange equations. This makes the definition of contours in the "discretized" setting more complicated. It is convenient to reformulate the problem in the *mesoscopic coordinates.* We consider $v \in H^1(\Lambda_\epsilon)$ and denote in mesoscopic coordinates

$$G_1(v,\omega) := \int_{\Lambda_\epsilon} \left(|\nabla v(x)|^2 + W(v(x))\right) \mathrm{dx} + \alpha(\epsilon)\theta \int_{\Lambda_\epsilon} \mathrm{g_1(x,\omega)v(x)dx}. \tag{2.12}$$

The relation between (2.3) and (2.12) is

$$G_\epsilon(\Lambda,u,\omega) = \epsilon^{d-1} G_1(\Lambda_\epsilon,v,\omega), \tag{2.13}$$

where $v(x) = u(\epsilon x)$ for $x \in \Lambda_\epsilon$.

2.3.1. **Coarse-graining.** We introduce notations for the partition of $\mathbb{R}^d$. We denote by $\mathcal{D}^{(0)} = \{C^{(0)}\}$ the partition of $\mathbb{R}^d$ into cubes of side 1, with one of them having center 0, and we denote by $C^{(0}(y)$ for $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ the block of the partition $\mathcal{D}^{(0)}$ which contains y. Two cubes of $\mathcal{D}^{(0)}$ are *connected* if their closures have non empty intersection. Given $m \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we denote for each cube $C^{(0)} \in \mathcal{D}^{(0)}$

$$m^{(0)}(y) \equiv \int_{C^{(0)}(y)} m(z)\mathrm{dz} \tag{2.14}$$

and by

$$\eta(m,y) \equiv \eta^\zeta(m,y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if} \quad m^{(0)}(y) > 1-\zeta \\ -1 & \text{if} \quad m^{(0)}(y) < -1+\zeta \\ 0 & \text{if} \quad -1+\zeta \le m^{(0)}(y) \le 1-\zeta, \end{cases} \tag{2.15}$$

the block variable with tolerance ζ, where $1 > \zeta > 0$. We omit to write the superscript in notation (2.15) when no confusion arises.

2.3.2. **Islands and Contours.**

• *Correct points.* The point y is $\zeta-$ correct, or, equivalently $C^{(0)}(y)$, the block of $\mathcal{D}^{(0)}$ containing y, is $\zeta-$ correct, if $\eta^\zeta(m,y) \neq 0$ and $\eta^\zeta(m,y) = \eta^\zeta(m,y')$ on the cubes of $\mathcal{D}^{(0)}$ which are connected to $C^{(0)}(y)$. The point y, or equivalently $C^{(0)}(y)$, is $\zeta-$ incorrect if it is not $\zeta-$ correct. When no confusion arises we drop the $\zeta-$ in the previous definition and we denote a point or a block only by correct or incorrect.

•*Islands and signs of Islands.* The maximal connected components of the correct set are called *islands.* We denote them by the capital letter I. In an island $\eta(m,y)$ is constantly equal either to 1 or to -1, accordingly we define the sign of the island sign(I) $= \pm 1$.

•*Boundaries.* The boundary $\partial^{\text{ext}} I$ of an island I is the set of cubes $C^{(0)}$ not in I but at distance 0 from I, $\partial^{\text{int}} I$ is the set of cubes $C^{(0)}$ in I and at distance 0 from $\partial^{\text{ext}} I$. The topological boundary is denoted ∂I. The definition of island ensures that $\partial^{\text{ext}} I$ is a kind of "safety zone" around I, in which $\eta(m,y)$ has still a definite sign, equal to the sign of the island.

•*Contours.* Each maximal connected component of the incorrect set is the support of a contour. The contour is the pair $\Gamma = (\text{sp}(\Gamma), \eta_\Gamma)$ where sp(Γ) is the spatial support of Γ, i.e. the maximal connected component of the incorrect set and η_Γ is the restriction to sp(Γ) of $\eta(m,\cdot)$. See also Figure 1.

•*Boundary of a contour.* The boundary $\partial^{\text{int}}(\text{sp}(\Gamma))$ of the contour Γ is the union of $\partial^{\text{ext}} I \cap \text{sp}(\Gamma)$ over the islands. The $\pm$ boundary, $\partial^{\pm}(\text{sp}(\Gamma))$, is the union of cubes in $\partial^{\text{ext}} I \cap (\text{sp}(\Gamma))$ over the $\pm$ islands I.

•*Contours in finite regions.* When $m \in H^1(\Lambda_\epsilon)$ the block variable, see (2.15) can be defined only for those $C^{(0)} \subset \Lambda_\epsilon$, since m has support in Λ_ϵ. The notion of correctness for a block $C^{(0)}$ needs the knowledge of the block variables of the cubes connected to $C^{(0)}$. We make the following convention:

• *Neumann Boundary on Λ_ϵ.* A cube $C^{(0)} \subset \Lambda_\epsilon$ is correct if $\eta^\zeta(m,y) \neq 0$ for $y \in C^{(0)}$ and $\eta^\zeta(m,y) = \eta^\zeta(m,y')$ on the cubes of $\mathcal{D}^{(0)} \subset \Lambda_\epsilon$ connected to $C^{(0)}(y)$. Contours are defined consequently and their support is contained in Λ_ϵ.

•*Dirichlet Boundary on $A \subset \Lambda_\epsilon$.* Let $A \subset \Lambda_\epsilon$ be a bounded, $\mathcal{D}^{(0)}-$ measurable region. We say that A has boundary conditions + (or -1) when $\eta(m,y) = +1$ (or $-$) for all $y \in A^c$, $d(y,A) \le 1$. We then use the convection that all the blocks in A^c are considered positive (negative) correct and define those inside A according to the previous rules. Contours are defined consequently and their support is contained in A.

• *Collection of contours and islands.* Given $m \in H^1(\Lambda_\epsilon)$, $\zeta > 0$ we associate $\mathcal{G}(m) \equiv \mathcal{G}(m,\zeta) = \{\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_k\}$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the collection of contours according to the previous construction. This defines also the collection of islands $\mathcal{I}(m) \equiv \mathcal{I}(m,\zeta) = \{I_1, \dots, I_n\}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. It is possible that there are no islands, $\mathcal{I}(m) = \emptyset$, for example when $\mathcal{G}(m) = \{\Gamma\}$ and sp$(\Gamma) = \Lambda_\epsilon$. Since islands and their signs are

FIGURE 1. Possible types of contours and Inner/Outer Complement.

determined by the knowledge of the contours, $\Gamma = (\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma), \eta_\Gamma)$, it is convenient to fix a way to associate to each contour Γ the corresponding islands, i.e. to define a mapping $\Gamma \in \mathcal{G}(m) \to I_\Gamma \subset \mathcal{I}(m)$. Note that each contour may have several islands, i.e. I_Γ is a set of islands. By abuse of notation we will denote islands, i.e. elements in I_Γ, by I_Γ as well, if no confusion arises.

• *Outer complement of a contour* Γ. For a contour Γ, consider all connected components of $\Lambda_\epsilon \setminus \mathrm{sp}(\Gamma)$, which are connected to the boundary $\partial\Lambda_\epsilon$. Denote them by $C_1, \dots, C_{K_\Gamma}$. We can associate a sign with each connected component by defining $\mathrm{sign}(C_j) := \eta(x)$ for some $x \in C_j$ with $\mathrm{dist}(x, \mathrm{sp}(\Gamma)) < 1/2$. We form the union over the positive and negative connected components, i.e.

$$A_\Gamma^+ := \bigcup_{\mathrm{sign}(C_j)=+1} C_j, \quad A_\Gamma^- := \bigcup_{\mathrm{sign}(C_j)=-1} C_j.$$

Note that due to the possible presence of *other* contours, this does not imply that η is constant on $A_\Gamma^\pm$. We denote by O_Γ, the outer complement of a contour Γ, the set

$$O_\Gamma := \begin{cases} A_\Gamma^+, & \text{if } |A_\Gamma^+| \ge |A_\Gamma^-|, \\ A_\Gamma^-, & \text{if } |A_\Gamma^+| < |A_\Gamma^-|. \end{cases}$$

• *Inner complement of a contour* Γ. The inner complement of a contour Γ is denoted by $\mathrm{int}(\Gamma) := \Lambda_\epsilon \setminus [\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma) \cup O_\Gamma]$.

• *The islands of a contour* Γ. The islands I_Γ, together with their sign, are defined as follows: For each connected component of the inner complement the island associated with this connected component is the union of all cubes in the considered connected component, connected to $\partial^\tau(\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma))$, $\tau = \pm 1$, so that $\eta(m, y) = \tau$ for all $y \in I_\Gamma$ and the sign of I_Γ is τ. Note that the number of islands associated to Γ is equal to the number of the connected components of the inner complement and their signs can be $+$ or $-$.

• *Virtual contour.* Further we denote

$$I_{\tilde\Gamma} := \Lambda_\epsilon \setminus \cup_{\Gamma \in \mathcal{G}(m)} \left(\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma) \cup I_\Gamma\right).$$

The coarse-grained phase indicator η is constant on $I_{\tilde\Gamma}$, see Lemma 5.1 and we define

$$\mathrm{sign}(m) := \eta^\zeta(m, \cdot)|_{I_{\tilde\Gamma}}. \tag{2.16}$$

This means that $I_{\tilde\Gamma}$ shares this important property with the islands associated with real contours, therefore it is justified to call it an island associated with a virtual contour $\tilde\Gamma$.

Remark 2.5. *Note that in a finite volume with Neumann or Dirichlet boundary conditions it is always possible to divide the complement of the support of a collection of contours* $\{\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_k\}$ *into connected regions* I_i *for* $i = 1, \dots, n$ *so that* η *is constant and not zero on* $\partial^{\mathrm{ext}} I_i$ *(the boundary of an island).*

The definitions (2.14) and (2.15) distinguish functions in $L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ according to their mean over unit cubes of the partition $\mathcal{D}^{(0)}$. We would like to have some control on their *pointwise* behavior on correct cubes. In the next theorem we show that, given $\zeta > 0$ and $m_0 \in H^1(\Lambda_\epsilon)$, we can associate a function which decreases the energy functional, has "almost" the same phase indicator η^ζ as the original function and for which positive (negative rep.) mean over correct cubes implies pointwise positivity (negativity). We will refer to such a function as the $\zeta-$ *representative* of m_0. We denote by $\mathcal{R}_\zeta(\Lambda_\epsilon) \subset H^1(\Lambda_\epsilon)$ the set of the $\zeta-$ representatives of functions in $H^1(\Lambda_\epsilon)$. We will drop the suffix ζ when no confusion arises.

Remark 2.6. *Theorem 2.7 and Theorem2.9 are stated for θ small and $\alpha(\epsilon) = 1$. In the case $\alpha(\epsilon) \to 0$ they hold for ϵ sufficiently small.*

Theorem 2.7. [Representation] *There exists $\theta_0 > 0$ and $0 < \zeta_0 < \delta_0/4$,* [3]*, such that $\mathbb{P}$-almost surely the following holds: For all $0 < \theta \le \theta_0$, $0 < \zeta \le \zeta_0$ and for all $m_0 \in H^1(\Lambda_\epsilon)$ we can associate $m_1 \in H^1(\Lambda_\epsilon)$, $m_1 \equiv m_1(\omega, m_0, \zeta)$ so that*

$$G_1(m_1, \omega) \le G_1(m_0, \omega). \tag{2.17}$$

Further let $\widehat{I} = \{x \in \Lambda_\epsilon; d(x, I) \le \frac{1}{4}\}$ for $I \in \mathcal{I}(m_1, \zeta)$, and let $C_1 = 2C_0\|g\|_\infty$. Then

1. *If $\Gamma \in \mathcal{G}(m_0, \zeta)$ then $\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma) \subset \mathrm{sp}(\Gamma')$ with $\Gamma' \in \mathcal{G}(m_1, \zeta)$.*
2. *m_1 is Lipschitz continuous on $\widehat{I}$ with Lipschitz constant $L_0 = L_0(d, C_1, \theta_0)$.*
3. *There exists $0 < \hat{\zeta} < \delta_0/2$, $\hat{\zeta} = \hat{\zeta}(d, \zeta, \theta_0)$, see (3.4), so that*

$$m_1(x) \in \begin{cases} [1-\hat{\zeta}, 1+C_1\theta], & x \in \widehat{I} \text{ and } \mathrm{sign}(I) = +1, \\ [-1-C_1\theta, -1+\hat{\zeta}] & x \in \widehat{I} \text{ and } \mathrm{sign}(I) = -1 \end{cases}.$$

4. *$m_1(x, \omega) = \mathrm{sign(I)} + \hat{\mathrm{v}}(\mathrm{x}, \omega, \widehat{\mathrm{I}})$ for $x \in \widehat{I}$, where $\hat{v}(\cdot, \omega, \widehat{I})$ is the solution of*

$$-\Delta v + \frac{1}{2C_0} v + \frac{1}{2}\alpha(\epsilon)\theta g_1(\cdot, \omega) = 0 \quad in \quad \widehat{I}, \quad v = m_1 - \mathrm{sign(I)} \ on\ \partial\widehat{\mathrm{I}}. \tag{2.18}$$

Remark 2.8. *The previous theorem holds for $0 < \zeta < \zeta_0$, but it becomes meaningless for θ fixed and ζ small: In such a situation $\eta^\zeta = 0$ on too many cubes, because the random field will create deviations from ± 1 which are typically larger than ζ. Theorem 2.9, stated below, holds only for an accuracy parameter $\zeta(\theta)$, not for a range reaching up to zero.*

For this "representative" m_1 we can bound the energy from below in terms of contours. First we need to define two functions $u^+_\epsilon(\cdot, \omega)$ and $u^-_\epsilon(\cdot, \omega)$ which for $\theta \ll 1$ are the minimizers under the point-wise constraints $u > 0$ and $u < 0$ respectively.

Definition 1. *Let $v^*_\epsilon(\cdot, \omega)$ be the solution of the following equation*

$$-\epsilon\Delta v(r) + \frac{1}{2C_0}\frac{v(r)}{\epsilon} + \frac{1}{2\epsilon}\alpha(\epsilon)\theta g_\epsilon(r, \omega) = 0 \text{ in } \Lambda, \quad \frac{\partial v}{\partial n} = 0 \ on \quad \partial\Lambda. \tag{2.19}$$

Let $u^\pm_\epsilon := \pm 1 + v^*_\epsilon$, and set for $x \in \Lambda_\epsilon$, $v^*(x, \omega) := v^*_\epsilon(\epsilon x, \omega)$, $u^\pm := \pm 1 + v^*$. Note that v^* depends on ϵ only through $\alpha(\epsilon)$.

The relevant properties of v^*_ϵ are summarized in Proposition 7.2.

Theorem 2.9. [Reduction] *Let ζ_0 and θ_0 be as in Theorem 2.7. There exists $\theta_1 > 0$ with $\theta_1 < \theta_0$ such that $\mathbb{P}$-almost surely the following holds: There exists $0 < \zeta := \zeta(\theta_0) < \zeta_0$ such that for all $0 < \theta < \theta_1$ there exists a deterministic constant $c(\theta)$ with $\liminf_{\theta \to 0} c(\theta) > 0$ such that*

$$G_1(m, \omega) - G_1(u^{\mathrm{sign}(m)}, \omega) \ge \sum_{\Gamma \in \mathcal{G}(m_1, \zeta)} \left(2\theta \int_{I^\pm_\Gamma} g_1(x, \omega)\mathrm{dx} + \mathrm{c}(\theta)\mathrm{N}_\Gamma \right),$$

where m_1 is a $\zeta-$ representative of m, see Theorem 2.7, $N_\Gamma = \left|\cup_{\Gamma \in \mathcal{G}(m_1, \zeta)} \mathrm{sp}(\Gamma)\right|$, and $I^\pm_\Gamma$ denotes those islands associated with Γ where $\eta^\zeta = \pm 1$.

[3]The upper bound $\zeta_0 < \delta_0/4$ is an immediate consequence of (3.5).

Remark 2.10. *Since we apply Theorem 2.7 and Theorem 2.9 to prove Theorems 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3, which hold only in $d \geq 3$, we prove Theorem 2.7 and Theorem 2.9 only for $d \geq 3$. The proof extends to $d \geq 1$ with minor modifications mainly due to the explicit representation of the solution of* (2.19) *in term of the associated Green function.*

We show Theorem 2.9 in Section 5.

3. Properties of low energy states

3.1. **Existence and properties of global minimizers.** In this section we prove properties of function with energy close to the minimal one. The statements hold either for $\alpha(\epsilon) = 1$ and θ sufficiently small, or for θ arbitrary, $\alpha(\epsilon) \to 0$ and ϵ sufficiently small. We first show that to determine the minimizers of the functional G_ϵ, it is sufficient to consider functions in $H^1(\Lambda)$ which satisfy a uniform L^∞-bound:

Lemma 3.1. *Assume (H1). We have with $\mathbb{P} = 1$ that for all $v \in H^1(\Lambda)$ and all $t > 1 + C_0\theta\alpha(\epsilon)\|g\|_\infty$,*

$$G_\epsilon(t \wedge v \vee (-t), \omega) - G_\epsilon(v, \omega) \geq \frac{1}{\epsilon} \int_{\Lambda_t} \left(C_0^{-1}(t-1) - \alpha(\epsilon)\theta\|g\|_\infty\right)(|v(y)| - t), \tag{3.1}$$

where C_0 is the constant in (2.4) *and $\Lambda_t = \{y \in \Lambda : |v(y)| > t\}$. In particular $G_\epsilon(t \wedge v \vee (-t), \omega) < G_\epsilon(v, \omega)$ unless $\Lambda_t = \emptyset$.*

Proof.

$$G_\epsilon(v, \omega) - G_\epsilon(t \wedge v \vee (-t), \omega) \geq \frac{1}{\epsilon} \int_{\Lambda_t} (W(v(y)) - W(t))\, dy$$
$$+ \frac{1}{\epsilon}\alpha(\epsilon)\theta \int_{\Lambda_t} dy g_\epsilon(y, \omega)[v(y) - \text{sign}(v(y))t],$$

and from (H1) and the L^∞-bound on g we derive (3.1). □

This L^∞ bound on the global minimizer implies Lipschitz-regularity. In order to see this, note that a global minimizer of $G_\epsilon(\cdot, \omega)$ in $H^1(\Lambda)$ is for all $\omega \in \Omega$ a weak solution of the Euler-Lagrange equation

$$\epsilon\Delta v = \frac{1}{2\epsilon}[W'(v) + \theta\alpha(\epsilon)g_\epsilon] \quad \text{in } \Lambda, \tag{3.2}$$

with homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions.

Proposition 3.2. *Let*

$$L_0 = C(d)[\sup_{\{s:s=v(r), r\in\Lambda\}} |W'(s)| + \theta\|g\|_\infty]. \tag{3.3}$$

With $\mathbb{P} = 1$ it holds that the solution v of the Euler-Lagrange equation 3.2 satisfies

$$|v(r, \omega) - v(r', \omega)| < \frac{L_0}{\epsilon}|r - r'|, \quad r, r' \in \Lambda.$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.1, a global minimizer v satisfies the bound $|v(r, \omega)| \leq 1 + C_0\theta\|g\|_\infty\alpha(\epsilon)$ for $r \in \Lambda$ and $\omega \in \Omega$. Since $|g_\epsilon(\cdot, \omega)| \leq 1$ for all $\omega \in \Omega$, any minimizer will be a bounded solution of Poisson's equation with a bounded right hand side.

By changing variables $y = \frac{r}{\epsilon}$ one writes (3.2) in Λ_ϵ. Denote $u(y, \omega) = v(\epsilon y, \omega)$. By the regularity theory for the Laplacian (see [12]) the solution u is Lipschitz in Λ_ϵ with a Lipschitz constant bounded by $L_0 = \sup_{\{s:s=u(x), x\in\Lambda_\epsilon\}} |W'(s)| + \theta\|g\|_\infty$ and independent of ϵ. Transforming back the solution in the old set of coordinates one immediately obtains the result. □

3.2. **Pointwise properties.** Once the Lipschitz-continuity is established, it is easy to derive pointwise properties from information about integral averages over cubes by standard estimates.

Proposition 3.3. *Let $\theta_0 > 0$ and $1 > \zeta_0 > 0$, $Q \in \mathcal{D}^{(0)}$ and let*

$$k(d) = \inf_{x\in[0,1]^d} \liminf_{r\to 0} r^{-d}|B_r(x)\cap[0,1]^d|.$$

Suppose that u is Lipschitz continuous in Q with Lipschitz constant L_0, and $\|u\|_\infty \le 1 + C_1\theta$, for $0 < \theta \le \theta_0$. Let

$$\hat\zeta(d, L_0, \zeta_0, \theta_0) := 2\left(\frac{\zeta_0 + C_1\theta_0}{k(d)}\right)^{\frac{1}{(d+1)}} (2L_0)^{\frac{d}{(d+1)}}. \tag{3.4}$$

Then for $0 < \zeta < \zeta_0$

$$u(x) \in \begin{cases} \big[1-\hat\zeta, 1 + C_1\theta\big], & \text{if } \eta^\zeta(u,x) = +1,\\ \big[-1 - C_1\theta, -1+\hat\zeta\big] & \text{if } \eta^\zeta(u,x) = -1.\end{cases}$$

Proof. Suppose $\eta^\zeta(u,x) = 1$ for $x \in Q$. Let $\hat\zeta$ be as in (3.4) and assume there exists a point $x_0 \in Q$ such that $u(x_0) < 1 - \widehat\zeta$. We will show that this assumption leads to a contradiction. Let $0 < r \ll 1$. Then since u has Lipschitz constant bounded by L_0

$$u(x) < 1 - \widehat\zeta + L_0 r \quad \text{for all } x \in B_r(x_0).$$

Moreover we have the bound $|u| \le 1 + C_1\theta$. Let $v_r := |B_r(x_0) \cap Q|$, then since $\zeta \le \zeta_0$

$$(1-\zeta_0) \le (1-\zeta) \le \int_Q u \le (1-\widehat\zeta + L_0 r)v_r + (1-v_r)(1+C_1\theta_0),$$

and consequently

$$v_r(\widehat\zeta - L_0 r + C_1\theta_0) \le \zeta_0 + C_1\theta_0.$$

Choose r so small that $L_0 r \le (1/2)\widehat\zeta$, and let $k(d)$ be such that $v_r \ge k(d)r^d$ for $r \ll 1$. Then we derive a contradiction if $\hat\zeta$ is as in (3.4). Therefore x_0 cannot exist and $u(x) > 1 - \widehat\zeta$ for all $x \in Q$. The case $\eta^\zeta = -1$ is proven similarly. □

Remark 3.4. *To exploit the properties of the double well potential near the points ± 1 it is essential to require $u(x) \ge 1 - \delta_0$ for $x \in Q$, where δ_0 is the quantity defined in (2.4). Keeping in mind that by Lemma 3.1 we may assume $\|u\|_\infty \le 1 + 2C_0\|g\|_\infty$, we require*

$$2\left(\frac{\zeta_0 + 2C_0\|g\|_\infty\theta_0}{k(d)}\right)^{\frac{1}{(d+1)}} (2L_0)^{\frac{d}{(d+1)}} \le \frac{\delta_0}{2}. \tag{3.5}$$

This forces a condition on ζ_0 and θ_0 (when $\alpha(\epsilon) = 1$).

3.3. **Minimizers with constraints.**

Definition 2. *Denote for $m \in H^1(\Lambda_\epsilon)$, $|m| \le 1 + C_1\theta_0$, $I \subset \Lambda_\epsilon$, a $\mathcal{D}^{(0)}$ measurable set, $\tau = \pm$*

$$X_{I,m} = \left\{\psi \in H^1(\Lambda_\epsilon, R) : \psi = m \quad \text{on} \quad (I \cup \partial^{\text{ext}} I)^c\right\}, \tag{3.6}$$

$$\mathcal{A}^\tau_{I,m} = \{\psi \in X_{I,m} : \eta(\psi, x) = \tau \quad \text{on} \quad I \cup \partial^{\text{ext}} I\}. \tag{3.7}$$

A generic function in $\mathcal{A}^\tau_{I,m}$, e.g. an element of a recovery sequence for the Γ-convergence result in Theorem 2.3, does not need satisfy the hypothesis of Proposition 3.3. However, it will turn out that we do not need to prove that the constraint given by the mean, see (2.15), implies a strictly pointwise constraint for a generic function in $\mathcal{A}^\tau_{I,m}$ but only for those functions minimizing the energy under the constraint to be in $\mathcal{A}^\tau_{I,m}$ (the integral constraint) and the pointwise constraint $|\psi| \le 1 + C_1\theta_0$. So we dedicate the next subsection to the proof that the minimizers of the functional (2.12), subject to the integral and the pointwise constraint just described, are, on correct cubes, Lipschitz continuous with a Lipschitz constant depending only on W, θ_0 and $\|g\|_\infty$.

Definition 3. *Given $m_0 \in H^1(\Lambda_\epsilon)$, $\|m_0\|_{L^\infty} \le 1 + C_1\theta$, $\theta > 0$, $1 > \zeta > 0$ we define $\mathcal{S}_\epsilon(m_0) \equiv \mathcal{S}^\zeta_\epsilon(m_0)$ as follows:*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S}_\epsilon(m_0) := &\big\{m \in H^1(\Lambda_\epsilon) : \ \|m\|_{L^\infty} \le 1 + C_1\theta\big\} \\ &\cap \left\{ m \in H^1(\Lambda_\epsilon) : \ \left\{ \begin{array}{lll} \int_{C^{(0)}(x)} m \ge 1-\zeta & if & \int_{C^{(0)}(x)} m_0 > 1-\zeta, \\ \left|\int_{C^{(0)}(x)} m\right| \le 1-\zeta & if & \left|\int_{Q^{(0)}(x)} m_0\right| \le 1-\zeta, \\ \int_{C^{(0)}(x)} m \le -1+\zeta & if & \int_{C^{(0)}(x)} m_0 < -1+\zeta. \end{array} \right. \right\} \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

Since weak convergence in H^1 implies strong convergence in L^2, the integral constraints are preserved under weak H^1 convergence. Moreover any strongly L^2-converging sequence has a subsequence which converges almost everywhere, so that also the L^∞ constraint is preserved under weak H^1-convergence. Hence for any fixed $\epsilon > 0$ the set $S_\epsilon(m_0)$ is weakly H^1-closed and $\min_{S_\epsilon(m_0)} G_1(u, \omega)$ exists with $\mathbb{P} = 1$. Note that $m_0 \in S_\epsilon(m_0)$, so

$$\min_{S_\epsilon(m_0)} G_1(u, \omega) \le G_1(m_0, \omega). \tag{3.9}$$

Choose any $m_1 \in \text{argmin}_{S_\epsilon(m_0)} G_1(u, \omega)$. We denote $m_1 \equiv m_1(\omega, m_0, \zeta)$ a *representative* of m_0. Define, as before, the block indicator $\eta^\zeta(m_1, x)$, $x \in \Lambda_\epsilon$, and the set of the associated contours $\mathcal{G}(m_1)$ and islands. Note that if $\eta^\zeta(m_0, x) = 0$ then $\eta^\zeta(m_1, x) = 0$ but it might happen that $\eta^\zeta(m_1, x) = 0$ even though $\eta^\zeta(m_0, x) \ne 0$. Next Lemma shows that on correct cubes the pointwise constraint is not active for the minimizer m_1, while the integral constraint is not active by definition, see (2.15). This is not obvious due to the simultaneous presence of both types of constraints: The one-sided integral constraint "pushes the minimizer up."

Lemma 3.5. *Let $m_1 \in \text{argmin}_{\mathcal{S}_\epsilon(m_0)} G_1(u, \omega)$, Q_0 a $\zeta-$ correct cube for m_1 and $U := \{x : \ \text{dist}(x, Q_0) < 1/2\}$. There exists for any $\xi \in C_0^\infty(U)$ a $\delta_\xi > 0$ such that*

$$m_1 + \delta\xi \in S_\epsilon(m_0) \ \textit{for all} \ \delta < \delta_\xi.$$

As a simple consequence we have that the minimizer with the constraints satisfies the Euler-Lagrange equation in a weak sense:

Corollary 3.6. *For m_1 and ξ as in Lemma 3.5 we have that*

$$-2\int \nabla m_1 \nabla \xi = \int \left[W'(m_1) + \theta\alpha(\epsilon) g_1\right] \xi.$$

Lemma 3.5 follows from Lemma 3.7 and 3.8 stated below in the case $\eta^\zeta(m_1, x) = 1$, $x \in Q_0$, and the obvious version of them when $\eta^\zeta(m_1, x) = -1$, $x \in Q_0$. We need the following definition.

Definition 4. *Let $Q \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be connected, $\mathcal{D}^{(0)}$-measurable, i.e. a union of translated unit cubes, and such that the topological interior $\text{int}(Q)$ is connected, $\beta > 0$ and $C > 0$. We denote by $\Psi^\pm_{Q,\beta}$ the unique element of*

$$\text{argmin}_{\{v \in H^1(Q): \ v \mp (1+C\theta) \in H^1_0(Q)\}} \int_Q (|\nabla u|^2 + \beta u), \tag{3.10}$$

i.e. the minimizer with boundary condition $\pm(1 + C\theta)$.

To shorten notation we specialized next lemmas to the case $\eta^\zeta(m_1, x) = 1$, $x \in Q_0$ and denote $\Psi^+_{Q,\beta} := \Psi_{Q,\beta}$.

Lemma 3.7. *Let $\Psi_{Q,\beta}$ be as in Def. 4. Then*

(1) $-2\Delta\Psi_{Q,\beta} + \beta = 0$ on $\text{int}(Q)$, $\Psi_{Q,\beta} = 1 + C\theta$ on ∂Q.
(2) $1 + C\theta - C(Q)\beta \le \Psi_{Q,\beta} < 1 + C\theta$ on $\text{int}(Q)$ where $C(Q)$ depends only on the diameter of Q.
(3) $\int_Q |\Psi_{Q,\beta} - (1 + C\theta)| \to 0$ as $\beta \to 0$.

Proof. The point (1) is obvious, (2) is an immediate consequence of the strong maximum principle applied to $\Psi_{Q,\beta}$ (upper bound) and the maximum principle applied to $\phi \equiv \Psi_{Q,\beta} - [\frac{\beta}{4d}|x-x_0|^2 + c_0]$, where x_0 is the center of the smallest ball containing Q and c_0 is the largest constant such that $\frac{\beta}{4d}|x-x_0|^2 + c_0 \leq 1 + C\theta$ on ∂Q. Namely ϕ is harmonic function in Q and on the boundary of Q it is bigger or equal of zero. So $\phi(x) \geq 1 + C\theta - [\frac{\beta}{4d}(\mathrm{diam}Q)^2 + c_0] \geq 0$ for $x \in Q$. We choose $c_0 = 1 + C\theta - \frac{\beta}{4d}(\mathrm{diam}Q)^2$. This implies the lower bound in (2), setting $C(Q) = \frac{(\mathrm{diam}Q)^2}{4d}$. Finally (3) follows from (2). □

Lemma 3.8. *Let Q be connected and $\mathcal{D}^{(0)}$-measurable. Let $\Psi_{Q,\beta}$ be as in Def. 4 with $C \geq 2C_0\|g\|_{L^\infty}$, where C_0 is the constant in (2.4). Let $u \in H^1(Q)$ so that $\|u\|_\infty \leq 1 + C\theta$. There exists $\theta_0 = \theta(W, \|g\|_\infty) > 0$ and for all $\theta \leq \theta_0$ $\beta_0 = \beta_0(\theta, W, \mathrm{diamQ})$, see (3.14), so that for $0 < \beta < \beta_0$ the function $\widehat{u}_\beta := u \wedge \Psi_{Q,\beta}$satisfies*

1. *$G_1(Q, \widehat{u}_\beta, \omega) \leq G_1(Q, u, \omega)$, with strict inequality if $\widehat{u}_\beta \neq u$, $\mathbb{P} = 1$.*
2. *$\widehat{u}_\beta < 1 + C\theta$ in $\mathrm{int}(\mathrm{Q})$, $\widehat{u}_\beta = u$ on ∂Q.*
3. *$\left|\int_{Q_i} \widehat{u}_\beta - \int_{Q_i} u\right| \to 0$ as $\beta \to 0$, for all $Q_i \subseteq Q$, $Q_i \in \mathcal{D}^{(0)}$.*

Proof. The point (2) follows from (2) of Lemma 3.7, the L^∞ bound on u and that, by construction, $\Psi_{Q,\beta}(\cdot) = 1 + C\theta$ on the boundary of Q. The point (3) follows from the point (3) of Lemma 3.7 and the bound $u(x) \leq 1 + C\theta$ a.e..

It remains to show (1). The main idea is to consider $\widetilde{\Psi} := \Psi_{Q,\beta} \vee u$ as a (compactly supported) perturbation of $\Psi := \Psi_{Q,\beta}$, thus obtaining bounds on $\int_{\{u(x)>\Psi(x)\}} |\nabla u|^2$. These bounds, in turn, are used to obtain (1), considering $\widehat{u}_\beta \equiv \Psi_{Q,\beta} \wedge u$ as a perturbation of u. As Ψ is a minimizer, see (3.10), we obtain

$$0 \leq \int_Q \left[(|\nabla\widetilde{\Psi}|^2 - |\nabla\Psi|^2) + \beta(\widetilde{\Psi} - \Psi)\right] = \int_{\{u>\Psi\}} \left[(|\nabla u|^2 - |\nabla\Psi|^2) + \beta(u - \Psi)\right],$$

and therefore

$$\int_{\{u>\Psi\}} (|\nabla u|^2 - |\nabla\Psi|^2) \geq -\beta \int_{\{u>\Psi\}} (u - \Psi). \tag{3.11}$$

Then, since by (2) of Lemma 3.7, $\Psi(\cdot) \in [1 + C\theta - C(Q)\beta, 1 + C\theta]$ and $u(\cdot) \in (1 + C\theta - C(Q)\beta, 1 + C\theta]$ for all $x \in \{u > \Psi\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &G_1(Q, u, \omega) - G_1(Q, \widehat{u}_\beta, \omega) \\ &= \int_{\{u>\Psi\}} \left[(|\nabla u|^2 - |\nabla\Psi|^2) + \left(\frac{W(u) - W(\Psi)}{u - \Psi} + \theta g_1(\cdot, \omega)\right)(u - \Psi)\right] \\ &\geq C(\beta, \theta) \int_{\{u>\Psi\}} (u - \Psi), \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

where

$$C(\beta, \theta) = \inf_{[1+C\theta-C(Q)\beta, 1+C\theta]} W'(s) - \theta\|g\|_{L^\infty} - \beta. \tag{3.13}$$

Take $\beta \leq \frac{\delta_0}{C(Q)}$ so that $1 - \delta_0 < 1 + C\theta - C(Q)\beta$. By (2.4) $\inf_{[1+C\theta-C(Q)\beta, 1+C\theta]} W'(s) = \frac{1}{C_0}[C\theta - C(Q)\beta]$, then, since by assumption $C \geq 2C_0\|g\|_{L^\infty}$, we obtain that

$$C(\beta, \theta) \geq \theta\|g\|_{L^\infty} - \frac{\beta}{C_0}[C_0 + C(Q)].$$

Take θ_0 and β_0 so that

$$\theta_0 \leq 2\frac{\delta}{\|g\|_\infty}, \quad \beta_0 = \frac{1}{2}\theta\frac{C_0\|g\|_{L^\infty}}{C_0 + C(Q)}, \tag{3.14}$$

then $C(\beta,\theta) > \frac{1}{2}\theta\|g\|_\infty$ for all $\beta < \beta_0$. [4] □

Remark 3.9. *For u as in Lemma 3.8 we can find $\beta \equiv \beta(u) < \beta_0$ such that $\int_{Q_i} \widehat{u}_\beta > 1-\zeta$ if $\int_{Q_i} u > 1-\zeta$ for all unit cubes Q_i contained in $Q = \cup_i Q_i$.*

As consequence we have that for such β, $\widehat{u}_\beta$ strictly satisfies the integral and the L^∞ constraints in Q, $G_1(Q,u,\omega) \geq G_1(Q,\hat{u}_\beta,\omega)$, with strict inequality unless $u = \hat{u}_\beta$ a.e..

Proof of Lemma 3.5. Let m_1 be a minimizer in the set $S_\epsilon(m_0)$, see (3.8) and (3.9). Let $\widehat{Q}$ be the union of Q_0 and the cubes Q_i, which are the connected neighbors of Q_0. By assumption Q_0 is $\zeta-$ correct and we assume that $\eta^\zeta(m_1,x) = 1$ for $x \in \widehat{Q}$. Similar argument holds when $\eta^\zeta(m_1,x) = -1$ for $x \in \widehat{Q}$. By Lemma 3.8 (and its version for the negative well) there exists a $\beta > 0$ such that $|m_1(x)| \leq \Psi_{\widehat{Q},\beta}(x)$ in $\widehat{Q}$. This implies, see point (2) of (3.8), that there exists a $c_0 \equiv c_0(\beta,d)$ such that $|m_1(x)| \leq c_0 < 1 + C\theta$ in the set $U \subset\subset \widehat{Q}$, see the statement of the Lemma. Since $\xi \in C_0^\infty(U)$, there exists δ_ξ so that for all $\delta \leq \delta_\xi$, $m_1 + \delta\xi$ does not violate the pointwise constrain, i.e $\|m_1 + \delta\xi\|_{L^\infty} < 1 + C\theta$. (Take $\delta \sup_x |\xi(x)| < 1 + C\theta - c_0$.) We may require in addition that $0 < \delta|\int_{Q_i}\xi| < \min_{Q_i \subseteq \widehat{Q}}(\int_{Q_i} m_1) - (1-\zeta)$, then $m_1 + \delta\xi \in S_\epsilon(m_0)$. □

After having established that the constraint minimizer m_1 satisfies the same Euler-Lagrange as the unconstraint minimizer, we obtain Lipschitz regularity on correct cubes.

Lemma 3.10. *With $\mathbb{P} = 1$ the following holds: Let $\theta_0 > 0$, there exists a constant $L_0 \equiv L_0(d, C_0, \theta_0, \|g\|_\infty)$ (C_0 as in (2.4),) such that for $0 < \theta < \theta_0$, $0 < \zeta < \frac{\delta_0}{4}$ the representatives $m_1 \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathcal{S}_\epsilon^\zeta(m_0)} G_1(\cdot,\omega)$ of any $m_0 \in H^1(\Lambda_\epsilon)$ satisfy on any correct cube Q_0 for $x, y \in U := \{x : \operatorname{dist}(x,Q_0) < 1/2\}$*

$$|m_1(x) - m_1(y)| \leq L_0|x-y|.$$

Remark 3.11. *Note that L_0 does not depend on ζ. This will enable us to apply Lemma 3.3 to ζ, θ that satisfy (3.5)*

Proof. Let $\widehat{Q}$ be the union of Q_0 and the cubes Q_i, which are the connected neighbors of Q_0, and let $V := \{x : \operatorname{dist}(x,Q_0) < 3/4\}$. Then there exists a cutoff function $\chi \in C_0^\infty(\widehat{Q})$ such that $\|\chi\|_{W^{2,\infty}} \leq K$ for some $K(d)$ independent of θ and ζ, $\chi(x) = 1$ for all $x \in U$, while $\chi(x) \equiv 0$ for $x \in \widehat{Q} \setminus V$, and $0 \leq \chi(x) \leq 1$ for $x \in \widehat{Q}$. Then by Cor.3.6 we obtain that (χm_1) is a weak solution of the linear PDE

$$\Delta v = f \quad \text{on } \widehat{Q}; \quad v = 0 \text{ on } \partial\widehat{Q}, \tag{3.15}$$

$$f = m_1\Delta\chi + \nabla\chi\nabla m_1 + \frac{1}{2}\left[W'(m_1) + \theta\alpha(\epsilon)g_1\right]\chi \tag{3.16}$$

As the proof proceeds by standard arguments (see e.g. [8]), we sketch it. First we show that there exists a constant depending only on W, d, K the bound on the $W^{2,\infty}$ norm of the cutoff function and θ_0 so that for all $\theta \leq \theta_0$,

$$\int_V |\nabla m_1|^2 \leq C(W, \|g\|_\infty, d, \theta_0). \tag{3.17}$$

Now we know that f in (3.16) can be written as $f = f_1 + f_2$, $\|f_1\|_{L^\infty(\widehat{Q})} + \|f_2\|_{L^2(\widehat{Q})} \leq C(W,d,\theta_0)$. By the regularity theory for weak solutions of (3.15), we obtain $v \in W^{2,2}$, hence $\nabla m_1 \in L^p(V')$ for a slightly smaller set V' and $p < 2d/(d-2)$. This improves the regularity of f_2 to $\|f_2\|_{L^p} < C'(W,d,\theta_0)$. This standard bootstrap procedure can be repeated until, after a number of steps depending only on the dimension, $\|f_2\|_{L^p} < C_p(W,\theta)$ for $p > d$. Then $v \in W^{2,p}$ by L^p-regularity theory for elliptic equations and by Sobolev embedding $v \in C^1$ with constants depending only on W, θ, $\|g\|_\infty$ and the dimension. □

[4] The choices done enforce $\beta \leq \frac{\delta_0}{C(Q)}$ since $C(Q) \geq 1$.

We are now able to prove Theorem 2.7.

Proof of Theorem 2.7 Let $\zeta \le \zeta_0$ and $\mathcal{S}_\epsilon^\zeta(m_0)$ the set defined in (3.8). The existence of a minimizer of $G_1(m,\omega)$ for $m \in \mathcal{S}_\epsilon(m_0)$ is a consequence of the fact that there exist a constant C and $C_\epsilon(\theta, \|g\|_\infty)$ so that

$$G_1(u,\omega) \ge \frac{1}{C}\left(\|\nabla u\|^2 + \|u\|^2\right) - C_\epsilon \qquad \mathbb{P} = 1.$$

G_1 is weakly lower semicontinuous on $H^1(\Lambda_\epsilon)$ and, as pointed out before Lemma 3.5, the set $\mathcal{S}_\epsilon(m_0)$ is weakly H^1- closed. Point (1) is obvious because of the definitions of $\mathcal{S}_\epsilon(m_0)$, the block variable, see (2.15), and the definition of contours. The Lipschitz property in point (2) is a consequence of Lemma 3.10 applied to each block in any island associated to m_1. Recall that, by definition, each island is the union of correct blocks. The positivity is a consequence of point (1) and Proposition 3.3. Further assume without loss of generality that signI = 1. Set $m_1 = 1 + \hat{v}$. The functional restricted to $\widehat{I}$ can be written as following:

$$G_1(\widehat{I}, 1+\hat{v}, \omega) = \int_{\widehat{I}} \left(|\nabla \hat{v}(y)|^2 + \frac{1}{2C_0}(\hat{v}(y))^2 \right) \mathrm{dy} + \alpha(\epsilon)\theta \int_{\widehat{\mathrm{I}}} \mathrm{dy g_1(y,\omega)(1+\hat{v}(y))}.$$

The equality holds since $m_1(x) \ge 1 - \hat{\zeta}$ for $x \in \widehat{I}$, see point (3), $\hat{\zeta} \le \delta_0$ by assumptions, see remark 3.4, and the assumption on the double well potential, see (2.4). Further we proved that the constraints on m_1 are not active in $\widehat{I}$. Thus $\hat{v}$ solves the Euler-Lagrange equation (2.18). As a simple consequence of the convexity of the potential $W(s)$ when $s \ge \delta_0$, see (H1), this solution is unique. □

4. Deviations from equilibrium

In this section we estimate the cost associated with the support of a contour. We will need several lemmas for estimating the cost of a single cube which is not correct, and then conclude by a covering argument. Let Q be a cube of sidelength ℓ. Given $m \in H^1(Q)$ and $t > 0$ define

Definition 5.

$$m_Q^t(x) = \begin{cases} |m(x)| \vee t & \text{if } \ |\{m>0\}| \ge \frac{1}{2}|Q| \\ -(|m(x)| \vee t) & \text{if } \ |\{m>0\}| < \frac{1}{2}|Q|. \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

Lemma 4.1. *Set δ_0 be the quantity defined in* (2.4). *There exists* $\max\{\frac{1}{2}, 1-\delta_0\} < t_0 < 1$ *so that*

$$G_1(Q,m,\omega) - G_1(Q, m_Q^t, \omega) \ge \left(D_1 - \frac{8\alpha(\epsilon)\theta\ell}{t_0 C_2} \right) \int_{-\frac{t}{2}}^{\frac{t}{2}} P(\{m<s\}, Q)\, ds \tag{4.2}$$

where Q is a cube of sidelength ℓ, C_2 is a positive constant associate to the unitary cube, $t_0 < t < 1 - 2C_0\alpha(\epsilon)\theta\|g\|_\infty$ and $D_1 = \inf_{|s|\le\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{2(W(s)-W(t_0))}$.

The proof goes as in Proposition 3.6 of [6]. We will apply Lemma 4.1 together with the following isoperimetric inequality, see Section 5/6 of [9],

$$P(\{m<s\}, Q) \ge \left(\min(|Q \cap \{m(x) \le s\}|, |Q \cap \{m(x) > s\}|)\right)^{\frac{d-1}{d}}. \tag{4.3}$$

Next we show the following lemma:

Lemma 4.2. *Let $0 < \zeta < \frac{1}{4}$. There exist increasing and near 0 strictly increasing continuous functions $\tilde{\sigma}(\zeta) > 0$, $\tilde{\theta}(\zeta) > 0$ with $\tilde{\sigma}(0) = \tilde{\theta}(0) = 0$ which depend only on the double-well potential, the L^∞-norm of g, the sidelength of the cube and the dimension, such that for $0 < \theta < \tilde{\theta}(\zeta)$ on any cube Q with*

$$-1 + \zeta < \frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q m < 1 - \zeta, \quad \|m\|_{L^\infty(Q)} < 1 + 2\theta C_0$$

it holds that

$$G_1(Q,m,\omega) - G_1(Q,u^{\pm},\omega) \geq \tilde{\sigma}(\zeta)|Q|. \tag{4.4}$$

Proof. Assume w.l.o.g. that

$$\max(|Q \cap \{m(x) > 0\}|, |Q \cap \{m(x) \leq 0\}|) = |Q \cap \{m(x) \geq 0\}|. \tag{4.5}$$

Let $\delta > 0$, $\rho > 0$, so that $0 < \delta < \rho < \zeta$. Denote by

$$A = \{x \in Q : -1 + \zeta - \rho < m(x) < 1 - \zeta + \rho\}. \tag{4.6}$$

We distinguish two cases.

$$\text{Case 1}: \qquad |Q \cap A| > \delta |Q|. \tag{4.7}$$

$$\text{Case 2}: \qquad |Q \cap A| \leq \delta |Q|. \tag{4.8}$$

Case 1: Recall that $u^{\pm} = \pm 1 + v^*$ and, similarly to Proposition 3.2, one estimates $\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q |\nabla v^*|^2 \leq C\theta^2$ where $C = C(W, d, \|g\|_\infty)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} G_1(Q,m,\omega) - G_1(Q,u^{\pm},\omega) &\geq -\int_Q |\nabla v^*|^2 \\ + \int_Q W(m) - \int_Q W(u^{\pm}) + \theta \int_Q g_1[m \mp 1)] - \theta \int_Q g_1 v^* \\ \geq -C\theta|Q| + |Q| \frac{\delta}{2C_0}(\zeta - \rho)^2, \end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

since the assumption on the double-well potential (H1)

$$W(u^{\pm}) \leq \theta^2 \|g\|_\infty^2 C_0^2; \quad \frac{1}{|Q|}\int_{Q \cap A} W(m) \geq \frac{\delta}{2C_0}(\zeta-\rho)^2.$$

Then

$$G_1(Q,m,\omega) - G_1(Q,u^{\pm},\omega) \geq \left(\frac{\delta}{2C_0}(\zeta-\rho)^2 - C\theta\right)|Q|. \tag{4.10}$$

Case 2: Assume (4.8). We apply Lemma 4.1 to the cube Q. Recall that, see (4.5), $|Q \cap \{m(x) > 0\}| \geq 1/2|Q|$. So from Lemma 4.1, adding and subtracting we have for $\{\frac{1}{2}, 1-\delta_0\} < t < 1 - \zeta$:

$$\begin{aligned} G_1(Q,m,\omega) - G_1(Q,u^{\pm},\omega) \geq & [G_1(Q,m_Q^t,\omega) - G_1(Q,u^{\pm},\omega)] \\ + \left(D_1 - \frac{8\ell\theta}{t_0 C_2}\right) & \int_{-\frac{t}{2}}^{\frac{t}{2}} P(\{m < s\}, Q)\, ds. \end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

Taking in account the assumption (H1) for the potential, we estimate the first term in a straightforward manner, obtaining

$$[G_1(Q,m_Q^t,\omega) - G_1(Q,u^{\pm},\omega)] \geq -C\theta|Q|,$$

where $C = C(W, d, \|g\|_\infty)$. For the second term, by the isoperimetric inequality (4.3), it is enough to show that there exists a subinterval $[a,b] \subseteq [-t/2, t/2]$, with $|b-a|$ bounded below and a $\sigma_3 := \sigma_3(\rho, \zeta, \delta)$ so that

$$(\min(|Q \cap \{m(x) \leq s\}|, |Q \cap \{m(x) > s\}|))^{\frac{d-1}{d}} \geq \sigma_3^{\frac{d-1}{d}} |Q| \text{ for } s \in [a,b]. \tag{4.12}$$

The existence of $\sigma_3 > 0$ and of an subinterval with $|b-a| \geq \frac{t}{2} \geq \frac{1}{4}$ will be shown in Lemma 4.3. Take

$$\tilde{\sigma} = \min\left\{\sigma_3^{\frac{d-1}{d}}\left(D_1 - \frac{8\ell\theta}{t_0 C_2}\right)\frac{1}{4} - C\theta, \left(\frac{\delta}{2C_0}(\zeta-\rho)^2 - C\theta\right)\right\}. \tag{4.13}$$

Fix $t_0 := \frac{1+\max\{1/2, 1-\delta_0\}}{2}$, $0 < \zeta < 1/4$ such that $1 - t_0 < 1 - \zeta$, $\delta = \frac{1}{4}\zeta$ and $\rho = \frac{1}{2}\zeta$. Then take $\tilde{\theta}(\zeta)$ so that $\tilde{\sigma} := \tilde{\sigma}(\zeta)$ of (4.13) is strictly positive. ☐

Lemma 4.3. *Assume* $|m(x)| < 1 + C_1\theta$, $0 < \delta < \rho < \zeta < 1/4$, $\{\frac{1}{2}, 1-\delta_0\} < t < 1-\zeta$. *There exists* $\sigma_3 = \sigma_3(\rho,\zeta,\delta) > 0$, *given in* (4.19), *which is uniform in* $\theta < 1$ *such that for any* Q, *so that* $\eta^\zeta(m,x) = 0$ $x \in Q$, *satisfying* (4.8), (4.6), *on* Q *there exists* $[a,b]$ *with* $|b-a| > t/2$ *such that*

$$\min(|Q \cap \{m(x) > s\}|, |Q \cap \{m(x) < s\}|) \geq \sigma_3 |Q| \text{ for } a < s < b. \tag{4.14}$$

Proof. We show the lemma in the case (4.5), the remaining case is shown similarly. By assumption $\{\frac{1}{2}, 1-\delta_0\} < t_0 < t < 1-\zeta$ and $s \in [0, t/2]$. We distinguish two cases:

- (a) $|Q \cap \{m(x) > s\}| \leq |Q \cap \{m(x) < s\}|$,
- (b) $|Q \cap \{m(x) < s\}| \leq |Q \cap \{m(x) > s\}|$.

We start discussing the case (a). As $s < \frac{t}{2} < 1-\zeta$, we have

$$|\{0 < m(x) < s\}| \leq |\{0 < m(x) < 1-\zeta+\rho\}|, \tag{4.15}$$

for any $\rho > 0$ and by (4.8)

$$|Q \cap \{0 < m(x) < s\}| < \delta |Q|. \tag{4.16}$$

We have

$$|Q \cap \{m(x) > s\}| = |Q| - |Q \cap \{m(x) \leq 0\}| - |Q \cap \{0 < m(x) < s\}|.$$

As $|Q \cap \{m(x) \leq 0\}| \leq 1/2|Q|$ by assumption (4.5) and (4.16),we obtain

$$|Q \cap \{m(x) > s\}| \geq (\frac{1}{2} - \delta)|Q|. \tag{4.17}$$

Take $\delta < \frac{1}{2}$ so that (4.17) is strictly positive. In the (b) case we estimate with the help of the a-priori bound $|m| \leq 1 + C_1\theta$ and $0 < s < 1-\zeta$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_Q m \quad &\geq \quad \int_{Q\cap\{m(x)<s\}} m + \int_{Q\cap\{s<m(x)<1-\zeta+\rho\}} m + \int_{|Q\cap\{m(x)>1-\zeta+\rho\}} u \\
&\geq \quad (-1-C_1\theta)|Q \cap \{m(x) < s\}| + (1-\zeta+\rho)(|Q_0 \cap \{m(x) > 1-\zeta+\rho\}|) \\
&\geq \quad -(1+C_1\theta)|Q \cap \{m(x) < s\}| \\
&\quad\quad + (1-\zeta+\rho)\left[|Q| - |Q \cap \{m(x) < s\}| - |Q \cap \{-1+\zeta-\rho < m(x) < 1-\zeta+\rho\}|\right]
\end{aligned}$$

By $\eta^\zeta = 0$ on Q and inequality (4.8) we obtain

$$|Q|(1-\zeta) \geq -(2-\zeta+\rho+C_1\theta)|Q \cap \{m(x) < s\}| + (1-\zeta+\rho)(1-\delta)|Q|,$$

which implies for $\delta < \rho < \zeta < 1/4$

$$\frac{|Q \cap \{m(x) < s\}|}{|Q|} \geq \frac{\rho - \delta(1-\zeta+\rho)}{2-\zeta+\rho+C_1\theta} \geq \frac{\rho-\delta}{3+C_1} > 0. \tag{4.18}$$

Denote

$$\sigma_3 = \min\{(\frac{1}{2} - \delta), \frac{\rho-\delta}{3+C_1}\} \tag{4.19}$$

$[a,b) \equiv [0, \frac{t}{2})$ and we obtain (4.14). □

Lemma 4.4. *Set* $0 < \zeta < \zeta_0 < 1/2$. *Let* $C^\pm$ *be two cubes of sidelength* 1 *and let* $z' \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ *be such that* $C^- \cup C^+ \subseteq Q$ *for* $Q := z' + 2[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^d$. *Suppose that*

$$\int_{C_+} m > (1-\zeta), \ \int_{C_-} m < (-1+\zeta), \ \|m\|_{L^\infty(Q)} \leq 1 + C_1\theta.$$

There exists $\theta_0 > 0$ independent of ζ *and a constant* $\sigma_2 := \sigma_2(\zeta_0, \theta_0, d) > 0$ *given in* (4.23) *so that for all* $\theta \leq \theta_0$

$$G_1(Q, m, \omega) - G_1(Q, u^\pm, \omega) \geq \sigma_2 |Q| \qquad \mathbb{P} = 1.$$

Proof. Let

$$G_1(Q,m,\omega)-G_1(Q,u^{\pm},\omega)=[G_1(Q,m,\omega)-G_1(Q,m^t,\omega)]+G_1(Q,m^t,\omega)-G_1(Q,u^{\pm},\omega).$$

We estimate the second addend as in Lemma 4.2, $G_1(Q,m^t,\omega)-G_1(Q,u^{\pm},\omega)\geq -C\theta|Q|$, where $C=C(W,d,\|g\|_\infty)>0$. For the first addend we apply Lemma 4.1 and the isoperimetric inequality, see (4.3). Note that here Q is not an unitary cube but the union of 2 unitary cubes, so Lemma 4.1 holds with $\ell=2$. Next we show that for any $s\in[-t/2,t/2]$

$$\min|Q\cap\{m>s\}|,|Q\cap\{m<s\}|>\frac{1-\zeta_0}{2\ell^d(1+C_1\theta)}|Q|. \tag{4.20}$$

We obtain with the L^∞ bound on m.

$$(1-\zeta)\leq\int_{C_+}m\leq(1+C_1\theta)|C_+\cap\{m>s\}|,\qquad \text{for}\quad -t/2<s<0 \tag{4.21}$$

and

$$(1-\zeta)\leq\int_{C_+}m\leq s|C_+\cap\{m\leq s\}|+(1+C_1\theta)|C_+\cap\{m>s\}|,\qquad\text{for}\quad 0<s<\frac{t}{2}. \tag{4.22}$$

Since $t<1-\zeta_0$, we have for (4.22)

$$(1-\zeta)\leq\frac{t}{2}|C_+\cap\{m\leq\frac{t}{2}\}|+(1+C_1\theta)|C_+\cap\{m>s\}|\leq\frac{(1-\zeta_0)}{2}+(1+C_1\theta)|C_+\cap\{m>s\}|.$$

Then both (4.21) and (4.22) imply

$$|C_+\cap\{m>s\}|\geq\frac{(1-\zeta_0)}{2(1+C_1\theta)}.$$

A similar estimate can be obtained for $|C_-\cap\{m<s\}|$. Hence, we obtain (4.20) when $-\frac{t}{2}<s<\frac{t}{2}$. Set

$$\sigma_2=t_0\left(D_1-\frac{2\ell\theta_0}{t_0C_2}\right)\left(\frac{1-\zeta_0}{2\ell^d(1+C_1\theta_0)}\right)^{\frac{d-1}{d}}-C\theta_0. \tag{4.23}$$

Since $\zeta_0\leq\frac{1}{2}$ we can take θ_0 independent on ζ_0 and small enough so that $\sigma_2>0$. □

Given $m\in H^1(\mathbb{R}^d,\mathbb{R})$, $\zeta>0$ and a $\mathcal{D}^{(0)}$ measurable region J define

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{B}_0^{(\zeta,J)}(m)&\equiv\{x\in J:\eta^\zeta(m,x)=0\},\\ \mathcal{B}_\pm^{(\zeta,J)}(m)&=\Big\{x\in J:\ \eta^\zeta(m,x)=\pm1\text{ and there is }x'\in J\text{ with}\\ &\qquad\eta^\zeta(m,x')\eta^\zeta(m,x)=-1,C^{(0)}(x')\text{ connected to }C^{(0)}(x)\Big\}.\end{aligned} \tag{4.24}$$

We will show the following result:

Theorem 4.5. *Assume the conditions of Lemma 4.2. Given $m\in H^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mathbb{R})$, $\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma)$ a bounded $\mathcal{D}^{(0)}$-measurable -connected subset of $\zeta-$ incorrect cubes there exists $\sigma_1(\zeta)>0$ so that for all $\theta\leq\tilde\theta(\zeta)$, $\tilde\theta$ as in Lemma 4.2,*

$$G_1(J,m,\omega)-G_1(J,u^{\pm},\omega)\geq\sigma_1\,|\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma)|\qquad\mathbb{P}=1. \tag{4.25}$$

Proof. If $Q+z_0$ is an incorrect cube, then it either is a zero cube, or it has a connected neighbor which is a zero cube, or it has a connected neighbor of opposite sign. In each of the cases it holds that the cube $3Q+z_0$ of sidelength 3 centered at the same center contains

- (a) a zero cube, or
- (b) a pair C_+, C_- of connected cubes with opposite sign such that C_+ or C_- is centered at z_0.

In case (a), by Lemma 4.2,

$$G_1(3Q+z_0,m)-G_1(3Q+z_0,u^{\pm})\geq 3^{-d}\tilde{\sigma}(\zeta)|3Q+z_0|$$

while in case (b), by Lemma 4.4,

$$G_1(3Q+z_0,m)-G_1(3Q+z_0,u^{\pm})\geq (3/2)^{-d}\sigma_2|3Q+z_0|$$

for θ sufficiently small. Hence we have shown the following: Let $z_0\in\mathbb{Z}^d$ the center of a cube which is incorrect for m with accuracy ζ. Then for $\theta<\theta_0(\zeta)$ there exists $\sigma_3(\zeta)$ such that

$$G_1(3Q+z_0,m)-G_1(3Q+z_0,u^{\pm})\geq \sigma_3(\zeta)|3Q+z_0|.$$

Therefore, if $\{z_1,\dots,z_N\}$ is a collection of lattice points such that

$$z_i+Q\subseteq \mathrm{sp}(\Gamma),\ (z_i+3Q)\cap(z_j+3Q)=\emptyset \text{ for } j\neq i,\ i,j=1,\dots,N \tag{4.26}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned}&G_1(\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma),m)-G_1(\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma),u^{\pm})\geq \sum_{i=1}^{N}\Big(G_1(z_i+3Q,m)-G_1(z_i+3Q,u^{\pm})\Big)\\ &+G_1(\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma)\setminus\cup_{i=1}^{N}(z_i+3Q),m)-G_1(\Gamma)\setminus\cup_{i=1}^{N}(z_i+3Q),u^{\pm})\\ &\geq \sigma_3(\zeta)N-\theta\|g\|_\infty|\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma)|.\end{aligned}$$

The claim of Theorem 4.5 follows by choosing θ sufficiently small, provided we can show that there exists a constant $C(d)$ depending only on the dimension such that for any contour Γ there exists a collection of lattice sites $\{z_1,\dots,z_{N(\Gamma)}\}$ satisfying (4.26) such that $N(\Gamma)\geq C(d)^{-1}|\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma)|$. We claim that $C(d)^{-1}\geq 6^{-d}$, which is sufficient but not optimal. This is done by induction on $|\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma)|\in\mathbb{N}$. For the induction proof we will not assume that $\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma)$ is connected, the claim holds for any $\mathcal{D}^{(0)}$-measurable set. The claim is obvious with $C(d)=5^{-d}$ for $0<|\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma)|\leq 5^d$. Assume that the claim is shown for $0<|\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma)|\leq n$, and suppose that $|\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma)|=n+1$. Choose a cube z_0+Q in Γ and consider the set $\widehat{\Gamma}:=\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma)\setminus(5Q+z_0)$. Clearly any cube of sidelength 3 centered at any cube in $\widehat{\Gamma}$ does not intersect z_0+3Q. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}N(\Gamma)&\geq 1+N(\widehat{\Gamma})\geq 1+C^{-1}(n-5^d)\\ &= C^{-1}(n+1)+1-C^{-1}(1+5^d)\geq (n+1)C^{-1},\end{aligned}$$

provided $1+5^d<C$. □

5. Contour Reduction and proof of Theorem 2.1, 2.2 and 2.9.

Take $\zeta\leq\zeta_0\wedge\frac{1}{4}$, where ζ_0 is chosen according to Theorem 2.7. Let $\mathcal{G}(m,\zeta)$ be the collection of contours associated to m. Next we show that the $\mathrm{sign}(m):=\eta^{\zeta}(m,\cdot)|_{I_{\tilde{\Gamma}}}$, defined in (2.16) is well defined.

Lemma 5.1. *The function $\eta(m,\cdot)$ is constant on*

$$I_{\tilde{\Gamma}}:=\Lambda_\epsilon\setminus\cup_{\Gamma\in\mathcal{G}(m)}(\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma)\cup I_\Gamma)\,.$$

Proof. By construction, $I_{\tilde{\Gamma}}\cap\mathrm{int}(\Gamma)=\emptyset$ for all $\Gamma\in\mathcal{G}(m)$, hence each cube in $I_{\tilde{\Gamma}}$ is connected to the boundary of Λ_ϵ. The function $\eta(m,\cdot)$ is constant over each connected component of $I_{\tilde{\Gamma}}$. Assume that there exist two connected components with different signs. As they are connected to the boundary of Λ_ϵ, there exist two cubes $Q^+\in I_{\tilde{\Gamma}}$ and $Q^-\in I_{\tilde{\Gamma}}$ of different sign, which touch the boundary. Hence there must be a contour $\Gamma_0\in\mathcal{G}(m)$ intersecting the boundary such that Q^+ and Q^- are in *different* connected components of O_{Γ_0}. According to our definition, either Q^+ or Q^- must be contained in I_{Γ_0}, which contradicts that both are contained in $I_{\tilde{\Gamma}}$. □

Next we estimated the difference between the energy of $m \in \mathcal{R}_\zeta(\Lambda_\epsilon)$ and the one of $u^\pm$ in each $\zeta-$ Island of m.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $u^\pm = \pm 1 + v^*$ where v^* solves (2.19) rescaled in Λ_ϵ. Let $m = sign(I) + \hat{v}$ for $x \in \hat{I}$, $I \subset\subset \hat{I}$, see Theorem 2.7, and let θ, ζ be as in Theorem 2.7. Then there exists $c = c(d, W, \|g\|_\infty)$ such that*

$$G_1(I, m, \omega) - G_1(I, u^{sign(I)}, \omega) \geq -c\sqrt{\theta}|\partial^{\text{ext}} I|. \tag{5.1}$$

Remark 5.3. *Note that for those islands that touch $\partial\Lambda_\epsilon$, in particular for $I_{\tilde{\Gamma}}$, the external boundary $\partial^{\text{ext}} I$ consists of cubes contained in the support of a contour and is therefore very different from the topological boundary.*

Proof. For the sake of simplifying the presentation we prove the case $I \neq I_{\tilde{\Gamma}}$. The case $I = I_{\tilde{\Gamma}}$ is proven similarly, replacing ∂I with $\partial^{\text{ext}} I$. To take advantage of the boundary influence decay, we separate a strip near the boundary from the rest of the island. For this purpose, let

$$I_\mu := \{x \in I : \ \text{dist}(x, \partial I) \leq \mu\},$$

and choose $\mu = \sqrt{2C_0} \log\left(\theta^{-1}\right)$. We split

$$\begin{aligned} G_1(I, m, \omega) - G_1\left(I, u^{\text{sign}I}, \omega\right) &= \left[G_1(I_\mu, m, \omega) - G_1\left(I_\mu, u^{\text{sign}I}, \omega\right)\right] \\ &\quad + \left[G_1(I \setminus I_\mu, m, \omega) - G_1\left(I \setminus I_\mu, u^{\text{sign}I}, \omega\right)\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

By the Lipschitz estimate in Lemma 3.2 and the L^∞-bound (7.14) we obtain that

$$G_1\left(I_\mu, u^{\text{sign}I}, \omega\right) \leq c\theta|I_\mu| \leq c\theta \log\left(\theta^{-1}\right)(|\partial I|),$$

where we denoted by $c := c(d, W, \|g\|_\infty)$ a constant which may change from one occurrence to the other. Moreover

$$G_1(I_\mu, m, \omega) \geq \int_{I_\mu} \theta g m \geq -2\|g\|_{L^\infty}\theta|I_\mu| \geq -2\|g\|_{L^\infty}\sqrt{2C_0}\theta \log\left(\theta^{-1}\right)(|\partial I|),$$

hence

$$\left[G_1(I_\mu, m, \omega) - G_1\left(I_\mu, u^{\text{sign}I}, \omega\right)\right] \geq -c\theta \log\left(\theta^{-1}\right)(|\partial I|).$$

The remaining term in (5.2) is estimated applying the estimate (7.22), which in mesoscopic coordinates becomes

$$|m(x) - u^{\text{sign}I}(x)| \leq C(d)e^{-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2C_0}}\text{dist}(x,\partial I)}\|m - u^{\text{sign}I}\|_{L^\infty(\partial I)} \leq C(d)\theta \tag{5.3}$$

for all $x \in I \setminus I_\mu$. Denote by χ_θ a $C^\infty(\Lambda_\epsilon, [0,1])$ cut-off function so that

$$\chi_\theta(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{when} \quad x \in I \setminus (I_{\mu+\sqrt{\theta}}), \\ 0 & \text{when} \quad x \in I_\mu \end{cases}$$

and $\|\nabla\chi_\theta\|_{L^\infty} \leq C(d)\theta^{-1/2}$. Suppose that $sign(I) = +1$. Let

$$h_\theta := \chi_\theta m + (1 - \chi_\theta)u^+.$$

Then $h_\theta|_{\partial(I \setminus I_\mu)} = u^+$, hence, recalling that u^+ is a minimizer in its well,

$$G_1(I \setminus I_\mu, h_\theta, \omega) - G_1(I \setminus I_\mu, u^+, \omega) \geq 0. \tag{5.4}$$

Moreover by Theorem 2.7 and Proposition 3.2 there exists $c \equiv c(d, W, \|g\|_\infty)$ so that $|\nabla u^+| + |\nabla m| \leq c$. Hence, recalling (5.3),

$$|\nabla h_\theta - \nabla m| \leq |\nabla\chi_\theta||m - u^+| + |\nabla m| + |\nabla u^+| \leq \sqrt{\theta} + c.$$

As $h_\theta = m$ on $I \setminus I_{\mu+\sqrt{\theta}}$, we can combine this, with (5.4) and the gradient bounds above obtaining

$$\begin{aligned} &G_1(I\setminus I_\mu, m,\omega) - G_1\left(I\setminus I_\mu, u^+,\omega\right) \geq G_1(I\setminus I_\mu, m,\omega) - G_1(I\setminus I_\mu, h_\theta,\omega) \\ &\geq -c\int_{I_{\sqrt{\theta}+\mu}\setminus I_\mu} (|\nabla h_\theta - \nabla m| + |m-h_\theta|) \geq -c\sqrt{\theta}|\partial I|. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Theorem 2.9 As the proof holds for all realizations of the random field provided $\|g(\cdot,\omega)\|_\infty \leq 1$, we will suppress the explicit dependence on ω. Thanks to Theorem 2.7 it is enough to show the theorem for a $\zeta-$representative of $m \in H^1(\Lambda_\epsilon)$, $\zeta \leq \zeta_0$, with ζ_0 as in Theorem 2.7. To simplify the presentation we take $\zeta = \zeta_0$. Further, to shorten notation, we denote the representative always by m, we assume $\alpha(\epsilon) = 1$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} &G_1(m) - G_1(u^{\mathrm{sign}(m)}) = G_1(I_{\tilde\Gamma}, m) - G_1(I_{\tilde\Gamma}, u^{\mathrm{sign}(m)}) \\ &+ \sum_{\Gamma\in\mathcal{G}(m)} \left\{\left[G_1(I_\Gamma, m) - G_1(I_\Gamma, u^{\mathrm{sign}(m)})\right] + \left[G_1(\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma), m) - G_1(\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma), u^{\mathrm{sign}(m)})\right]\right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

From now on, we assume w.l.o.g that the sign of $I_{\tilde\Gamma}$ is positive. We estimate each addend in the sum.

$$\begin{aligned} G_1(I_\Gamma, m) - G_1(I_\Gamma, u^+) &= \left[G_1(I_\Gamma, m) - G_1\left(I_\Gamma, u^{\mathrm{sign(I_\Gamma)}}\right)\right] \\ &+ \left[G_1(I_\Gamma, u^{\mathrm{sign(I_\Gamma)}}) - G_1(I_\Gamma, u^+)\right] \\ &\geq \left[G_1(I_\Gamma, u^{\mathrm{sign(I_\Gamma)}}) - G_\epsilon(I_\Gamma, u^+,\omega)\right] - c\sqrt{\theta}|\partial^{\mathrm{ext}} I_\Gamma| \\ &= 2\theta[\mathrm{sign(I_{\tilde\Gamma})} - \mathrm{sign(I_\Gamma)}]\int_{\mathrm{I_\Gamma}} \mathrm{g_1(x,\omega)dx} - \mathrm{c}\sqrt{\theta}|\partial^{\mathrm{ext}}\mathrm{I_\Gamma}|. \end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

The last equality is a consequence on the hypothesis (2.4), $|u^\pm - \pm 1| \leq \delta_0$ and Lemma 5.2. Note that the contributions of the random field on islands having the same sign as m cancel. The last term in (5.5) is estimated as

$$G_1(I_{\tilde\Gamma}, m) - G_1(I_{\tilde\Gamma}, u^+) \geq -c\sqrt{\theta}|\partial^{\mathrm{ext}} I_{\tilde\Gamma}|.$$

To estimate from below the energy of a contour we apply Theorem 4.5. Let $\theta_1 := \tilde\theta(\zeta_0)$ be as in Theorem 4.5, then for all $\theta \leq \theta_1$ we have

$$G_1(\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma), m) - G_1(\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma), u^+) \geq \sigma_1 N_\Gamma, \tag{5.7}$$

where

$$N_\Gamma = |\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma)| = \text{number of } \mathcal{D}^{(0)} \text{ measurable cubes in } \mathrm{sp}(\Gamma)$$

and $\sigma_1 = \sigma_1(\zeta_0)$ is the quantity defined in Theorem 4.5. The r.h.s. of (5.7) is the "gain term" and the energy of a contour Γ is at least the gain term. If there are more contours in Λ_ϵ, each one will contribute by its volume. Therefore from (5.5) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} G_1(m) - G_1(u^+) &\geq \sum_{\Gamma\in\Gamma(m)} \left(2\theta\int_{I_\Gamma^-} g_1(x)\mathrm{dx} + \sigma_1\mathrm{N_\Gamma} - \mathrm{c}\sqrt{\theta}|\partial^{\mathrm{ext}}\mathrm{I_\Gamma}|\right) - c\sqrt{\theta}|\partial^{\mathrm{ext}} I_{\tilde\Gamma}| \\ &\geq \sum_{\Gamma\in\Gamma(m)} \left(2\theta\int_{I_\Gamma^-} g_1(x)\mathrm{dx} + \frac{\sigma_1}{2}\mathrm{N_\Gamma}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

To prove the last inequality use that $N_\Gamma \geq |\partial^{\mathrm{ext}} I_\Gamma|$ and choose θ small enough. □

5.1. **Proof of Theorem 2.1.** Applying Lemma 3.1 we get immediately that the global minimizer u_ϵ fulfills $|u_\epsilon(r,\omega)| \le 1 + C_0\alpha(\epsilon)\theta$ for $r \in \Lambda$. Set $u_\epsilon^+ = 1 + v_\epsilon^*$ and $u_\epsilon^- = -1 + v_\epsilon^*$ where v_ϵ^* solves (2.19) in Λ. Choose $\epsilon_0 > 0$ so that $C_0\theta\alpha(\epsilon_0) \le \delta_0$, then for all $\epsilon \le \epsilon_0$, by the symmetry assumption on W, see (2.4), we obtain for $\omega \in \Omega$

$$G_\epsilon(u_\epsilon^+,\omega) - G_\epsilon(u_\epsilon^-,\omega) = \frac{2}{\epsilon}\alpha(\epsilon)\theta \int_\Lambda g_\epsilon(r,\omega)\mathrm{dr}. \tag{5.9}$$

L^∞ bound on v_ϵ^*, $C_0\theta\alpha(\epsilon) \le \delta_0$ and the symmetry assumption on W, see (2.4). By the Markov exponential inequality one has for any $t > 0$

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\omega :\ \frac{2}{\epsilon}\alpha(\epsilon)\theta \int_\Lambda g_\epsilon(r,\omega)\mathrm{dr}| \ge \mathrm{t}\right] \le 2e^{-\frac{t^2}{4\epsilon^{d-2}\theta^2\alpha^2(\epsilon)}}. \tag{5.10}$$

In dimension $d \ge 3$, for any choice $\alpha(\epsilon)$ ($\alpha(\epsilon) = 1$ suffices) we can take $t = t(\epsilon)$, $\lim_{\epsilon\to 0} t(\epsilon) = 0$ so that

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\omega : |G_\epsilon(u_\epsilon^+,\omega) - G_\epsilon(u_\epsilon^-,\omega)| \le t(\epsilon)\right] \ge 1 - 2e^{-\frac{t^2(\epsilon)}{4\epsilon^{d-2}\theta^2\alpha^2(\epsilon)}},$$

which concludes the proof of (2.6). To show

$$\inf_{H^1(\Lambda)} G_\epsilon(\cdot,\omega) = \min\{G_\epsilon(u_\epsilon^+,\omega), G_\epsilon(u_\epsilon^-,\omega)\}, \qquad \omega \in \Omega_\epsilon, \tag{5.11}$$

we first prove that any $\tilde u$ such that

$$G_\epsilon(\tilde u,\omega) = \inf_{H^1(\Lambda)} G_\epsilon(\cdot,\omega)$$

does not change sign, so it is in one well of the potential W. The assumption on W, see (H1) and the L^∞ bound on g imply that if ϵ is small enough

$$\inf_{u\in H^1(\Lambda):\ u>0 \text{ a.e.}} G_\epsilon(\cdot,\omega) = \inf_{u\in H^1(\Lambda):\ u>1-\delta_0 \text{ a.e.}} G_\epsilon(\cdot,\omega).$$

The functional G_ϵ is convex on $\{u \in H^1(\Lambda) :\ u > 1-\delta_0 \text{ a.e.}\}$, hence it has a unique minimizer over that set. It follows easily that the constraint is not active for ϵ sufficiently small, so the minimizer solves the linear Euler-Lagrange equation. Thanks to the symmetry assumptions on W, see (2.4), it is enough to solve the Euler-Lagrange equation in one well. In this way one obtains immediately that the two minimizers are indeed $u_\epsilon^* = \pm 1 + v_\epsilon^*$, being v_ϵ^* solution of (2.19). To prove (5.11) we apply Theorem 2.9, i.e. we use the notion of contours and Theorem 2.7. It is convenient to reformulate the problem in mesoscopic coordinates and therefore study the functional (2.12) in Λ_ϵ. The idea of the proof is to show that each contour costs more than the possible gain obtained from the random field, hence a minimizer cannot have contours. Note that I_Γ need not be connected. Denote by $(I_\Gamma)_1,\dots,(I_\Gamma)_{K_\Gamma}$ its connected components, and denote by $\partial^{ext}(I_\Gamma)_j$ the exterior boundary of $(I_\Gamma)_j$, see also 2.3.2. As all connected components of the islands as well their exterior boundaries are $\mathcal{D}^{(0)}$ measurable there exists a $\delta := \delta(d,\zeta) > 0$ such that

$$2\alpha(\epsilon)\theta\int_{I_\Gamma^-} g_1(x,\omega)\mathrm{dx} + \frac{\sigma_1}{2}\mathrm{N}_\Gamma \ge \sum_{\mathrm{j}=1}^{\mathrm{K}_\Gamma}\left[2\alpha(\epsilon)\theta\int_{(\mathrm{I}_\Gamma^-)_\mathrm{j}} \mathrm{g}_1(\mathrm{x},\omega)\mathrm{dx} + \delta|\partial^{\mathrm{ext}}(\mathrm{I}_\Gamma)_\mathrm{j} \cap \mathrm{sp}(\Gamma)|\right] + \frac{\sigma_1}{4}\mathrm{N}_\Gamma,$$

where all sets $(I_\Gamma^-)_j$ are connected. Note that they need not be simply connected, because there may be contours within contours. Recall that $\partial^{ext}(I_\Gamma) \subset \mathrm{sp}(\Gamma)$ then we obtain

$$G_1(m,\omega) - G_1(u^+,\omega) \ge \sum_{\Gamma\in\Gamma(m)} \sum_{j=1}^{K_\Gamma}\left[2\alpha(\epsilon)\theta\int_{(I_\Gamma^-)_j} g_1(x,\omega)\mathrm{dx} + \delta|\partial^{\mathrm{ext}}(\mathrm{I}_\Gamma)_\mathrm{j}|\right]. \tag{5.12}$$

The purely probabilistic Lemma 5.4 implies that with overwhelming probability for any choice of $m \in \mathcal{R}_\zeta(\Lambda_\epsilon)$ the r.h.s. of (5.12) is nonnegative. Let $\Omega_{\epsilon,\delta}$ be as in Lemma 5.4 with some $0 < \delta < 1$ to be determined later. If m is a function which has at most one block different from $\eta = 1$, by Theorem

4.5, there will be a $\delta > 0$, independent on ϵ, so that one obtains the estimate (5.14). For $\omega \in \Omega_{\epsilon,\delta}$, the minimizer $\tilde{u}$ must have all cubes $\zeta-$ close to the sign($\tilde{u}$) phase, i.e $\eta^\zeta(\tilde{u}, x) = \text{sign}(\tilde{u})$ for all $x \in \Lambda_\epsilon$, i.e all blocks are correct. The theorem holds for $\omega \in \Omega_{\epsilon,\delta}$ for any fixed choice of δ. We strengthen the result taking $\delta = \delta(\epsilon) \downarrow 0$ for $\epsilon \downarrow 0$ as in (5.15). We can apply Proposition 3.3 to show that $|\tilde{u}(x,\omega)| > 0$ for $x \in \Lambda_\epsilon$. From Appendix II (The minimizer in one single well) we have that the minimizer $\tilde{u}$ equals either u^+ or u^-, see Definition 1 in Section 2. The statement (2.5) is now an immediate consequence of the symmetry of W. Obviously

$$\mathbb{E}[u^\pm_\epsilon(r,\cdot)] = 1 \qquad \forall r \in \Lambda$$

and, see (7.18),

$$\begin{aligned} &\left|\mathbb{E}[u^\pm_\epsilon(r,\cdot)u^\pm_\epsilon(r',\cdot)] - \mathbb{E}[u^\pm_\epsilon(r,\cdot)]\mathbb{E}[u^\pm_\epsilon(r',\cdot)]\right| = |\mathbb{E}[v^*_\epsilon(r,\cdot)v^*_\epsilon(r',\cdot)]| \\ &\le C(d)\theta^2\alpha^2(\epsilon)e^{-\frac{1}{2\epsilon\sqrt{2C_0}}|r-r'|}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.13}$$

□

Lemma 5.4. *Let $d \ge 3$, $R \subset \Lambda_\epsilon$ a connected, $\mathcal{D}^{(0)}$ region, and let for $\delta > 0$*

$$\Omega_{\epsilon,\delta} := \left\{\omega \in \Omega: \ \exists R \subset \Lambda_\epsilon, \left|\int_R dy g_1(y,\omega)\right| < \frac{\delta}{\alpha(\epsilon)\theta}|\partial R|\right\}.$$

There exists $\epsilon_0 > 0$ and $a := a(\alpha(\epsilon_0)\theta, d)$ so that for $\epsilon \le \epsilon_0$

$$\mathbb{P}[\Omega \setminus \Omega_{\epsilon,\delta}] \le 2\frac{|\Lambda|}{\epsilon^d}e^{-\frac{\delta^2 a}{\theta^2\alpha^2(\epsilon)}}. \tag{5.14}$$

Further, setting

$$\delta(\epsilon) = \theta(\ln(1/\epsilon))^{-\frac{1}{100}} \qquad \text{and} \quad \Omega_\epsilon := \Omega_{\epsilon,\delta(\epsilon)} \tag{5.15}$$

we have

$$\mathbb{P}[\Omega \setminus \Omega_\epsilon] \le e^{-a\ln\frac{1}{\epsilon}\left(\ln(\frac{1}{\epsilon})\right)^{\frac{49}{50}}}. \tag{5.16}$$

Proof. In the following we consider only region R connected and $\mathcal{D}^{(0)}$ measurable, i.e unions of unit cubes. We have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left[\exists R \subset \Lambda_\epsilon, \left|\int_R dy g_1(y,\omega)\right| \ge \frac{\delta}{\alpha(\epsilon)\theta}|\partial R|\right] \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left[\exists x_0 \in \Lambda_\epsilon, \exists R \subset \Lambda_\epsilon : x_0 \in R, \left|\int_R dy g_1(y,\omega)\right| \ge \frac{\delta}{\alpha(\epsilon)\theta}|\partial R|\right] \\ &\le \frac{|\Lambda|}{\epsilon^d}\mathbb{P}\left[\exists R \subset \mathbb{R}^d : 0 \in R, \left|\int_R dy g_1(y,\omega)\right| \ge \frac{\delta}{\alpha(\epsilon)\theta}|\partial R|\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{5.17}$$

A naive upper bound of (5.17), ignoring the factor $\frac{|\Lambda|}{\epsilon^d}$, is given by

$$\sum_{\{R:0\in R\}} \mathbb{P}\left[\left|\int_R dy g_1(y,\omega)\right| \ge \frac{\delta}{\theta\alpha(\epsilon)}|\partial R|\right] \le \sum_{\{R:0\in R\}} e^{-\frac{\delta^2}{\theta^2\alpha^2(\epsilon)}\frac{1}{2d}|\partial R|^{\frac{(d-2)}{(d-1)}}}. \tag{5.18}$$

The last inequality is obtained by the independence of the random field and then applying the isoperimetric inequality[5] $|R| \le 2d|\partial R|^{\frac{d}{d-1}}$ then $\frac{|\partial R|^2}{|R|} \ge \frac{1}{2d}\frac{|\partial R|^2}{|\partial R|^{\frac{d}{d-1}}} = \frac{1}{2d}|\partial R|^{\frac{(d-2)}{(d-1)}}$. On the other hand there are $e^{C(d)n}$, see [13], regions R containing the origin, $\mathcal{D}(0)$ measurable, of given surface n. One immediately verifies that (5.18) diverges. So this analysis is inadequate. We need to take advantage of the fact that

[5]Note that a relative isoperimetric inequality bounds the ratio $|R|^{(d-1)/d}||S|^{-1} \le C(d)$ in the case where $R = I_\Gamma$ and $S = \partial^{ext}(\Gamma)$, and the island I_Γ associated with a contour is given by our definition. A proof of the relative isoperimetric inequality can be given adapting the arguments in [19], p.230.

many regions enclose essentially the same volume. In order to obtain (5.14), we apply then a method we learned from [11], see also [4], p. 115 ff., reported in the Proposition 7.1 of the appendix. [6]

Now take δ function of ϵ, so that $\delta(\epsilon) \to 0$ sufficiently slow, e.g. like (5.15). It is immediate to verify that there exists an ϵ_0 and a constant $a(\alpha(\epsilon_0)\theta, d)$ so that for $\epsilon \le \epsilon_0$ the right hand side of (5.14) is smaller than the right hand side of (5.16). □

In the proof of Theorem 2.1 we actually quantified the difference of the energy between a function and the minimizer. We state this for further use.

Theorem 5.5. *There exist $\delta > 0$, $\epsilon_0 > 0$, $a := a(\epsilon_0\theta, d) > 0$ and there exists for each $\epsilon < \epsilon_0$ a set $\Omega_\epsilon \subseteq \Omega$ with $\mathbb{P}(\Omega_\epsilon) \ge 1 - e^{-a \ln \frac{1}{\epsilon}\left(\ln(\frac{1}{\epsilon})\right)^{\frac{49}{50}}}$ such that for $\omega \in \Omega_\epsilon$*

$$G_1(m,\omega) - \min\left\{G_1(u^+,\omega), G_1(u^-,\omega)\right\} \ge \delta \sum_{\Gamma \in \mathcal{G}(m)} |\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma)|. \tag{5.20}$$

Moreover we get the immediate Corollary, see for notation (2.8):

Corollary 5.6. *Under the same hypothesis of Theorem 5.5, for $\omega \in \Omega_\epsilon$, we have*

$$F_\epsilon(m,\omega) \ge \epsilon^{d-1}\delta \sum_{\Gamma \in \mathcal{G}(m)} |\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma)|.$$

Next we prove Theorem (2.2).

Proof of Theorem (2.2) Since (2.5) of Theorem 2.1, the symmetry of the wells and the fact that v_ϵ^* is solution of (2.19) one immediately obtains that

$$\inf_{H^1(\Lambda)} G_\epsilon(\cdot,\omega) = \min\left\{G_\epsilon(u^+,\omega), G_\epsilon(u^-,\omega)\right\} = \min\left\{\pm\frac{\alpha(\epsilon)}{\epsilon}\theta\int_\Lambda g_\epsilon(r,\omega)\mathrm{d}r\right\} + \mathcal{F}_\epsilon(v_\epsilon^*,\omega),$$

where $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon$ is the functional defined in (7.12). Then

$$\mathbb{E}[G_\epsilon(u_\epsilon^\pm,\cdot)] = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(v_\epsilon^*,\cdot)]$$

and (2.10) follows immediately. Since (7.15) we have that

$$\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(v_\epsilon^*,\omega) = \frac{1}{2\epsilon}\alpha(\epsilon)\theta\int_\Lambda g_\epsilon(r,\omega)v_\epsilon^*(r,\omega)\mathrm{d}r = \frac{\alpha^2(\epsilon)}{4\epsilon^3}\theta^2\int_{\Lambda\times\Lambda}\mathrm{g}_\epsilon(\mathrm{r},\omega)\mathrm{G}_\epsilon(\mathrm{r},\mathrm{z})\mathrm{g}_\epsilon(\mathrm{z},\omega)\mathrm{dzdr}$$

where $G_\epsilon(r,z)$ in the integrand is the Green function solution of (7.16). Then, using the construction of g_ϵ with the help of i.i.d. random variables, see (2.1) and (2.2) and the bounds on the Green function in the appendix, see (7.19), we have that there exists $C(d) > 0$ such that in $d \ge 3$

$$|\mathbb{E}[G_\epsilon(u_\epsilon^\pm,\cdot)]| \le \frac{\alpha(\epsilon)^2}{4\epsilon}\theta^2 C(d)|\Lambda|, \qquad \mathbb{E}[G_\epsilon(u_\epsilon^\pm,\cdot) - c_\epsilon]^2 \le C(d)\alpha^2(\epsilon)\theta^2\epsilon^{d-2}|\Lambda|.$$

Moreover, using the exponential decay of the Green function we obtain that for any $\delta > 0$ there exists $\epsilon(\delta) > 0$ such that $G_\epsilon(x,y) > C(d)^{-1}$ for $\mathrm{dist}(x,\partial\Lambda) > \delta$, $\mathrm{dist}(y,\partial\Lambda) > \delta$, $\epsilon < \epsilon(\delta)$. Therefore we also obtain

$$\liminf_{\epsilon\downarrow 0}\frac{4\epsilon}{\alpha(\epsilon)^2}|\mathbb{E}[G_\epsilon(u_\epsilon^\pm,\cdot)]| > 0.$$

[6] In $d = 2$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\left|\int_R dy g_\epsilon(y,\omega)\right| \ge \epsilon\frac{\delta}{\theta\alpha(\epsilon)}|\partial R|\right] \le 2e^{-\frac{\delta^2}{\theta^2\alpha(\epsilon)^2}}. \tag{5.19}$$

Therefore in $d = 2$, when $\alpha(\epsilon) = 1$ the upper bound in (5.19) depends only on θ. By the Borel Cantelli Lemma one sees immediately that with probability one, the event $\left|\int_R dy g_\epsilon(y,\omega)\right| \ge \frac{\delta}{\theta}\epsilon|\partial R|$, for any $\delta > 0$ occurs for a number of regions in Λ going to ∞ as $\epsilon \downarrow 0$. In $d = 2$, when $\alpha(\epsilon) = (\ln\frac{1}{\epsilon})^{-1}$ for a fixed region, the upper bound in (5.19) is small for ϵ small. Nevertheless even in this case, see Proposition 7.1, the entropic factor spoils the estimate and we are not able to show the absence of contours.

□

6. Γ-CONVERGENCE WHEN $\alpha(\epsilon) = [\ln \frac{1}{\epsilon}]^{-1}$

We first show that passing to the representative leaves the L^1-limit of a sequence of bounded renormalized energy unchanged. Although the representative depends on the realization of the random field, we will suppress this dependence in the notation when no confusion arises. Likewise we will not denote explicitly the dependence on ω of the energy.

Definition 6. *For $m \in H^1(\Lambda)$ define $\widehat{m} : \Lambda_\epsilon \to \mathbb{R}$ by $\widehat{m}(y) := m(\epsilon y)$. Let m_1 be any $\zeta-$ representative of $\widehat{m}$ as in Theorem 2.7. Then*

$$m_{1,\epsilon}(x,\omega) := m_1(\epsilon^{-1}x,\omega), \qquad x \in \Lambda.$$

Theorem 6.1. *Let θ_1 and ζ be as in Theorem 2.9, and let $\theta < \theta_1$. With $\mathbb{P} = 1$ the following holds: Let $(m_\epsilon)_{\epsilon\to 0} \in H^1(\Lambda)$, and let the associated representatives $(m_\epsilon)_{1,\epsilon}$ be as in Definition 6. Then*

$$\text{if} \quad \limsup_{\epsilon\to 0} F_\epsilon(m_\epsilon,\omega) < C < \infty, \quad \text{then} \quad \int_\Lambda |m_\epsilon(x) - (m_\epsilon)_{1,\epsilon}(x,\omega)| \to 0.$$

Proof. Because of the quadratic growth of the potential and the L^∞-bound on the random field g it is easy to show that there exists a sequence $C_\epsilon \to 0$ such that for $M_\epsilon = 1 + C_\epsilon$

$$F_\epsilon((m_\epsilon \vee (-M_\epsilon)) \wedge M_\epsilon) \le F_\epsilon(m_\epsilon); \qquad \int_\Lambda |(m_\epsilon \vee (-M_\epsilon)) \wedge M_\epsilon - m_\epsilon| \mathrm{d}r \to 0.$$

Therefore we can assume that $\|m_\epsilon\|_\infty \le M$ by any constant $M > 1$ provided $\epsilon < \epsilon_0(M)$. To simplify notations we work on the rescaled cube Λ_ϵ and let, see Definition 6, Theorem 2.7,

$$m(x) := m_\epsilon(\epsilon x), \quad m_1(x) := (m_\epsilon)_{1,\epsilon}(\epsilon x), \quad x \in \Lambda_\epsilon.$$

Take a smooth cut-off function $r : \Lambda_\epsilon \to [0,1]$ such that $\|\nabla r\|_\infty < C$, $r(x) = 1$ for $x \in \bigcup_{\Gamma\in\mathcal{G}(m_1)} \mathrm{sp}(\Gamma)$, and $r(x) = 0$ for $x \in \partial^{\mathrm{int}} I_\Gamma$, and let

$$\tilde{m} := m(1 - r^2) + m_1 r^2.$$

This functions is equal to m_1 on the contours of m_1. We obtain immediately

$$F_1(\tilde{m}) = F_1(m) + \sum_{\Gamma\in\mathcal{G}(m_1)} \left[G_1\left(\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma)\cup\partial^{\mathrm{int}} I_\Gamma, \tilde{m}\right) - G_1\left(\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma)\cup\partial^{\mathrm{int}} I_\Gamma, m\right)\right].$$

Since $r \le 1$, m and m_1 are bounded in L^∞ and Theorem 4.5 we can estimate as follows

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{\Gamma\in\mathcal{G}(m_1)} \left[G_1\left(\left(\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma)\cup\partial^{\mathrm{int}} I_\Gamma\right), \tilde{m}\right) - G_1\left(\left(\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma)\cup\partial^{\mathrm{int}} I_\Gamma\right), m\right)\right] \\ &\le \sum_{\Gamma\in\mathcal{G}(m_1)} \left\{C|\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma)| + \int_{\partial^{\mathrm{int}} I_\Gamma} \left[|\nabla\tilde{m}|^2 - |\nabla m|^2\right]\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\nabla\tilde{m} = (1 - r^2)\nabla m + r\left[2\nabla r(m_1 - m) + r\nabla m_1\right].$$

From the bound on $|\nabla r|$ and the bound on the Lipschitz constant of m_1 we immediately get that there exists a constant C so that

$$|\nabla\tilde{m}|^2 \le (1 - r^2)^2|\nabla m|^2 + C + r|\nabla m|C.$$

Since $r \le 1$,

$$\left[|\nabla\tilde{m}|^2 - |\nabla m|^2\right] \le C + r^2[r^2 - 1]|\nabla m|^2 + r|\nabla m|[C - r|\nabla m|] \le \frac{C^2}{4} + C.$$

Then we can conclude for some constant C'

$$F_1(\tilde{m}) \leq F_1(m) + C' \sum_{\Gamma \in \mathcal{G}(m_1)} |\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma)|.$$

Since Theorem 5.5 we obtain that $\sum_{\Gamma\in\mathcal{G}(m_1)} |\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma)| \leq \epsilon^{1-d}C$, hence there exists C_1 such that

$$F_1(\tilde{m}) \leq \epsilon^{1-d} C_1.$$

Therefore $\tilde{m}$ satisfies a bound on the energy of the same order as m. As m and $\tilde{m}$ are different only on $\sum_{\Gamma\in\mathcal{G}(m_1)} \left(\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma) \cup \partial^{\mathrm{int}} I_\Gamma\right)$, the L^∞-bound on both functions and the bound on the volume of the contours implies immediately that $\|\tilde{m} - m\|_1 \to 0$ as $\epsilon \to 0$. The new function $\tilde{m}$ has an important property: On the topological boundary of an island it equals m_1 and is therefore pointwise in the well of W which corresponds to the sign of $\eta(m_1)$. This property will allow us to show that $\tilde{m}$ and m_1 are close in the islands. Note that $G_1(m_1) \geq \inf_{H^1(\Lambda_\epsilon)} G_1(\cdot)$, so we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
\epsilon^{1-d} C &\geq G_1(\tilde{m}) - G_1(m_1) = G_1(m_1 + (\tilde{m} - m_1)) - G_1(m_1) \\
&= \int_{\Lambda_\epsilon} [2\nabla(\tilde{m} - m_1)\nabla m_1 + (W'(m_1) + \alpha(\epsilon)\theta g)(\tilde{m} - m_1)] \\
&\quad + \int_{\Lambda_\epsilon} \left(|\nabla(\tilde{m} - m_1)|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\left(\int_0^1 W''(m_1 + s(\tilde{m} - m_1))ds\right)(\tilde{m} - m_1)^2 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

By Corollary 3.6 we get that the term in the second line equals zero since $\tilde{m} - m_1$ is an admissible test function. We have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\Lambda_\epsilon} \left(|\nabla(\tilde{m} - m_1)|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\left(\int_0^1 W''(m_1 + s(\tilde{m} - m_1))ds\right)(\tilde{m} - m_1)^2 \right) \\
&= \int_{\{x\in\Lambda_\epsilon, \eta(m_1,x)\neq 0\}} \left(|\nabla(\tilde{m} - m_1)|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\left(\int_0^1 W''(m_1 + s(\tilde{m} - m_1))ds\right)(\tilde{m} - m_1)^2 \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$

We obtain, using the convexity of the wells, and recalling the definition of $\tilde{m}$ that

$$\epsilon^{1-d} C \geq \int_{\Lambda_\epsilon} C(\tilde{m} - m_1)^2 - C''|\{x : \eta(m_1, x) \neq 0\} \cap \{\eta(m_1, x)\tilde{m}(x) < 1 - \delta_0\}|$$

where δ_0 is defined in (2.4). It remains to show that

$$|\{x : \eta(m_1, x) \neq 0\} \cap \{\eta(m_1, x)\tilde{m}(x) < 1 - \delta_0\}| \leq C\epsilon^{1-d}.$$

For $t = 1 - \delta_0$ and x in the Islands of m_1 we denote

$$\tilde{m}^t := \begin{cases} |\tilde{m}(x)| \vee t, & \text{if } \eta(m_1, x) = 1, \\ -(|\tilde{m}(x)| \vee t), & \text{if } \eta(m_1, x) = -1, \end{cases}$$

while for $\tilde{m}^t(x) := \tilde{m}(x)$ for $x \in \mathrm{sp}(\Gamma)$, $\Gamma \in \mathcal{G}(m_1)$. Note that $\tilde{m} = m_1$ on the topological boundary of any contour, and that the representative m_1 stays pointwise in the well associated with $\eta(m_1)$ on this topological boundary of the contour, see Thm. 2.7. Therefore the function $\tilde{m}^t$ is H^1, and

$$G_1(\tilde{m}) - G_1(\tilde{m}^t) \leq G_1(\tilde{m}) - \inf G_1(\cdot) < C\epsilon^{1-d}.$$

Since $\eta(m_1, x) = \eta(m, x)$ for x in the islands of m_1, applying Lemma 4.1 and then (4.3) we obtain

$$G_1(\tilde{m}) - G_1(\tilde{m}^t) \geq C \sum_{\{z: z+Q\in I_\Gamma, \Gamma\in\mathcal{G}(m_1)\}} |(z + Q) \cap \{\eta(z, m)m < -(1 - t)/2\}|^{\frac{d-1}{d}}.$$

As $(d - 1)/d < 1$, this implies

$$\left| \left(\bigcup_{\Gamma\in\mathcal{G}(m_1)} I_\Gamma \right) \cap \{\eta(m, z)m < -(1 - t)/2\} \right| \leq C\epsilon^{1-d}.$$

Note that we can easily bound $|\{-1+\delta_0<\tilde m<1-\delta_0\}|$, because on this set the double-well potential dominates the random field. So we finally obtain

$$|\{x:\eta(m_1,x)\neq 0\}\cap\{\eta(m_1,x)\tilde m(x)<1-\delta_0\}|\leq|\{-1+\delta_0<\tilde m<1-\delta_0\}|$$
$$+\left|\left(\bigcup_{\Gamma\in\mathcal{G}(m_1)}I_\Gamma\right)\cap\{\eta(m,z)m<-\frac{\delta_0}{2}\}\right|+\sum_{\Gamma\in\mathcal{G}(m_1)}|\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma)|\leq C\epsilon^{1-d},$$

and the claim is shown. □

6.1. **Identification of the Γ Limit.** The proof of the lower and later of the upper bound is given in macroscale, but still uses the notion of contours which was introduced in the mesoscale. To avoid confusion we keep on writing the contours always in mesoscale and rescale by ϵ the sp(Γ) when we deal with the support of the contour of the representative m_ϵ in macro scale. Hence $m(x):=m_\epsilon(\epsilon x)$ $x\in\Lambda_\epsilon$ denotes the representative in the mesoscopic scale, $\mathcal{G}(m):=\mathcal{G}(m,\zeta)$ the collection of contours associated to m when the chosen tolerance is ζ. We suppose $0\leq\theta<\theta_1$, with θ_1 as in Theorem 2.9, and we avoid to write the explicit dependence on ζ, where ζ is as in Theorem 2.9.

Lemma 6.2. *There exists a set $\widetilde\Omega\subseteq\Omega$ with $\mathbb{P}(\widetilde\Omega)=1$ such that on $\widetilde\Omega$ the following holds: For any $u\in BV(\Lambda,\{-1,1\})$ and for any m_ϵ with $\|m_\epsilon-u\|_{L^1}\to 0$ we have that*

$$\liminf_\epsilon F_\epsilon(m_\epsilon,\omega)\ \geq C_W\int_\Lambda|\nabla u|\qquad \textit{for } C_W \textit{ as in } (1.3). \tag{6.2}$$

Proof. First fix a $\delta>0$ independent of ω. Recall that $\epsilon=\epsilon(n)=\frac{1}{n}$ and let $\delta(\epsilon(n))$ and $\Omega_{\epsilon(n)}$ as in (5.15). We define $\widetilde\Omega$ by defining its complement:

$$A_n:=\Omega\setminus\Omega_{\epsilon(n)},\quad \Omega\setminus\widetilde\Omega=\{\omega:\ \omega\in A_n\text{ for infinitely many }n\in\mathbb{N}\}.$$

The first Borel-Cantelli Lemma and the probabilistic estimates in Theorem 2.1 and in Lemma 5.4 imply that $\mathbb{P}(\Omega\setminus\widetilde\Omega)=0$. By definition, for any $\omega\in\widetilde\Omega$ there exists $n(\omega)$ such that $\omega\in\Omega_{\epsilon(n)}$ for all $n\geq n(\omega)$. From now on we will always assume that $\omega\in\widetilde\Omega$ and $\epsilon(n)\leq\epsilon(n(\omega))$ without stating the dependence on ω explicitly. Moreover we will write ϵ for $\epsilon(n)$ in order to simplify notation. Note that it is sufficient to consider the case $\sup_\epsilon F_\epsilon(m_\epsilon,\omega)<\infty$. By Theorem 6.1 we can replace m_ϵ by a representative, see Definition 6, which we still denote by m_ϵ for simplicity. Hence we may assume that $\|m_\epsilon\|_{L^\infty}\leq 1+C_0\theta\alpha(\epsilon)$. By Theorem 2.1 $\inf_{H^1(\Lambda)}\{G_\epsilon(\cdot,\omega)\}=\min\{G_\epsilon(u_\epsilon^+,\omega),G_\epsilon(u_\epsilon^-,\omega)\}$ and without loss of generality we suppose that the $G_\epsilon(u_\epsilon^+,\omega)\leq G_\epsilon(u_\epsilon^-,\omega)$.

Recall that $u_\epsilon^\pm=\pm1+v_\epsilon^*$, and let $v_\epsilon:=m_\epsilon-\mathrm{sign}(m_\epsilon)$. Due to the exponential decay of the boundary influence and the fact that the representative solves a linear PDE in the islands, one can easily show the following, see Section 7.2 (7.22, 7.23). There exists $C>0$ and $K>0$ such that for $\Gamma\in\mathcal{G}(m,\zeta)$ in an island I_Γ

$$|u_\epsilon^\pm(r)-m_\epsilon(r)|=|v_\epsilon^*(r)-v_\epsilon(r)|<Ke^{-\epsilon^{-1}C\,\mathrm{dist}(r,\epsilon\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma))} \tag{6.3}$$
$$\left|\nabla(u_\epsilon^\pm(r)-m_\epsilon(r))\right|=\left|\nabla(v_\epsilon^*(r)-v_\epsilon(r))\right|<\epsilon^{-1}Ke^{-\epsilon^{-1}C\,\mathrm{dist}(r,\epsilon\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma))}. \tag{6.4}$$

We write $\sum_\Gamma$ for $\sum_{\Gamma\in\mathcal{G}(m)}$ and define $I_\Gamma^\alpha := \{y \in I_\Gamma :\ \mathrm{dist}(y, \partial I_\Gamma) > C^{-1}|\ln(\alpha(\epsilon))|\}$, where C is the constant in (6.3, 6.4). We estimate

$$\begin{aligned} G_\epsilon(m_\epsilon) - G_\epsilon(u_\epsilon^+) \ \geq\ & \sum_\Gamma \int_{\epsilon\,(\mathrm{supp}(\Gamma))} \Big(2\sqrt{W}|\nabla m_\epsilon| - 4\theta\alpha(\epsilon)\epsilon^{-1}\|g\|_\infty\Big) \\ & - \sum_\Gamma \int_{\epsilon\,(\mathrm{supp}(\Gamma))} \left(\epsilon|\nabla v_\epsilon^*|^2 + \epsilon^{-1}W(1+v_\epsilon^*)\right) \\ & + \frac{\alpha(\epsilon)}{\epsilon}\theta \sum_\Gamma \int_{\epsilon I_\Gamma} \Big\{ g_\epsilon[m_\epsilon - u_\epsilon^{\mathrm{sign}(I_\Gamma)}] - g_\epsilon(1-\mathrm{sign}(I_\Gamma))\Big\} \\ & + \sum_\Gamma \int_{\epsilon I_\Gamma} \left(\epsilon(|\nabla v_\epsilon|^2 - |\nabla v_\epsilon^*|^2) + \frac{1}{2C_0\epsilon}(v_\epsilon^2 - (v_\epsilon^*)^2)\right). \end{aligned}$$

For $\delta < \delta_0$ we get from Theorem 2.7 that $m_\epsilon > 1-\delta$ on I_Γ. Hence $\mathrm{Per}(\{m_\epsilon < s\}) = 0$ in I_Γ, and

$$\begin{aligned} G_\epsilon(m_\epsilon) - G_\epsilon(u_\epsilon^+) \ \geq\ & \int_{-1+\delta}^{1-\delta} 2\sqrt{W(s)}\mathrm{Per}(\{m_\epsilon < s\})ds \\ & - \sum_\Gamma c(\alpha(\epsilon)\theta)|\ln(\alpha(\epsilon))|\epsilon^{d-1}|\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma)| \\ & - \frac{\alpha(\epsilon)}{\epsilon}\theta \sum_\Gamma \int_{\epsilon I_\Gamma} \{g_\epsilon(1-\mathrm{sign}(I_\Gamma)) + \|g\|_\infty |v_\epsilon^* - v_\epsilon|\} \qquad (6.5) \\ & + \sum_\Gamma \int_{\epsilon I_\Gamma} \left(\epsilon(|\nabla v_\epsilon|^2 - |\nabla v_\epsilon^*|^2) + \frac{1}{2C_0\epsilon}\left(v_\epsilon^2 - (v_\epsilon^*)^2\right)\right). \qquad (6.6) \end{aligned}$$

First we are going to estimate the term in line (6.6). Denote by

$$M_\epsilon(u) := \epsilon|\nabla u|^2 + \epsilon^{-1}u^2.$$

Now we will make use of the splitting $I_\Gamma = I_\Gamma^\alpha \cup (I_\Gamma \setminus I_\Gamma^\alpha)$. On I_Γ^α

$$|M_\epsilon(v_\epsilon(x)) - M_\epsilon(v_\epsilon^*(x))| < C\epsilon^{-1}\alpha(\epsilon)e^{-\epsilon^{-1}C\mathrm{dist}(x,\epsilon\,\partial(I_\Gamma^\alpha))}, \quad \epsilon^{-1}x \text{ in } I_\Gamma^\alpha. \qquad (6.7)$$

Therefore a computation using the Co-Area formula yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\epsilon I_\Gamma^\alpha} |M_\epsilon(v_\epsilon) - M_\epsilon(v_\epsilon^*)| \ =\ & \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\int |M_\epsilon(v_\epsilon) - M_\epsilon(v_\epsilon^*)| \mathrm{d}\mathcal{H}^{d-1}|_{\epsilon I_\Gamma^\alpha \cap \{x:\ \mathrm{dist(x,\epsilon\partial I_\Gamma)=r}\}}\right) \mathrm{d}r \\ & \leq C\epsilon^{d-1}|\partial I_\Gamma^\alpha|\alpha(\epsilon) \leq C'\epsilon^{d-1}|\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma)|\alpha(\epsilon), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathrm{d}\mathcal{H}^{d-1}$ is the $(d-1)$ dimensional Hausdorff measure. Let R_ϵ be defined as the argument of the summation in (6.6). As $M_\epsilon(v_\epsilon) - M_\epsilon(v_\epsilon^*) \geq -M_\epsilon(v_\epsilon^*)$ and as $M_\epsilon(v_\epsilon^*)$ is of order $\epsilon^{-1}(\theta\alpha(\epsilon))^2$, we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned} R_\epsilon(I_\Gamma, m_\epsilon, v_\epsilon^*) \ \geq\ & \int_{\epsilon I_\Gamma^\alpha} (\dots) + \int_{\epsilon(I_\Gamma \setminus I_\Gamma^\alpha)} (\dots) \\ \geq\ & -C'\epsilon^{d-1}|\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma)|\alpha(\epsilon) - \|M_\epsilon(v_\epsilon^*)\|_{L^\infty}\epsilon^d|I_\Gamma \setminus I_\Gamma^\alpha| \\ \geq\ & -C\epsilon^{d-1}|\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma)|\Big[\alpha(\epsilon) + |\ln(\alpha(\epsilon))|(\theta\alpha(\epsilon))^2\Big]. \end{aligned}$$

The term in (**??**) is bounded on ϵI_Γ^α by the right hand side of (6.7), while it is of order $\epsilon^{-1}(\theta\alpha(\epsilon))$ on $\epsilon(I_\Gamma \setminus I_\Gamma^\alpha)$, so it can be estimated in a similar way.

In order to estimate the expression in (6.5), recall that $\omega \in \Omega_{\epsilon,\delta(\epsilon)}$, hence

$$\alpha(\epsilon)\epsilon^{-1}\theta \left| \int_{\epsilon I_\Gamma} g_\epsilon(1-\mathrm{sign}(I_\Gamma))\right| \leq \delta(\epsilon)\epsilon^{d-1}|\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma)|.$$

So far we have shown that for $\omega \in \widetilde{\Omega}$ and $\epsilon(n)$ sufficiently small

$$G_\epsilon(m_\epsilon) - G_\epsilon(u_\epsilon^+) \geq \int_{-1+\delta}^{1-\delta} 2\sqrt{W(s)}\mathrm{Per}(\{m_\epsilon < s\})ds \tag{6.8}$$

$$- \sum_\Gamma c'\big[\alpha(\epsilon)|\ln(\alpha(\epsilon))| + \delta(\epsilon)\big]\epsilon^{d-1}|\mathrm{sp}\Gamma|, \tag{6.9}$$

and as by Corollary 5.6 for all $\omega \in \Omega_{\epsilon(n)}$

$$\sum_{\Gamma\in\mathcal{G}(m)} \epsilon^{d-1}|\mathrm{sp}(\Gamma)| \leq CF_\epsilon(m_\epsilon) < C',$$

we have that the expression in (6.9) vanishes as $\epsilon(n) \to 0$ for $\omega \in \widetilde{\Omega}$.

So it remains to bound (6.8). As $m_\epsilon \to u$ in $L^1(\Lambda)$ there exists a subsequence, denoted by m_ϵ again, which converges almost everywhere to u, and for this subsequence we have $1_{\{m_\epsilon<s\}}(r) \to 1_{\{u<s\}}(r)$, in $L^1(\Lambda)$. Further it is easy to prove by applying Lemma 3.1 that $|u| = 1$ almost everywhere. Then by lower semicontinuity of the perimeter

$$\liminf_{\epsilon\to 0} \mathrm{Per}(\{m_\epsilon < s\}) \geq \mathrm{Per}(u < 0\}), \quad \text{for } -1 < s < 1,$$

and, by Fatou's lemma,

$$\liminf_\epsilon \int_{-1+\delta}^{1-\delta} \Big(2\sqrt{W(s)}\mathrm{Per}(\{m_\epsilon < s\})\Big)\,ds \geq \left(\int_{-1+\delta}^{1-\delta} 2\sqrt{W(s)}ds\right)\mathrm{Per}(\{u<0\})$$

$$\geq (C_W - 2C\delta)\int_\Lambda |\nabla u|.$$

As $\delta > 0$ was arbitrary and independent of ω, this proves the theorem. ☐

Lemma 6.3. *There exists a set $\widetilde{\Omega} \subseteq \Omega$ with $\mathbb{P}(\Omega\setminus\widetilde{\Omega}) = 0$ such that for any $\omega \in \widetilde{\Omega}$ the following holds: For any $u \in BV(\Lambda, \{-1, 1\})$ which has the property that $E := \{x : u(x) = -1\}$ has a smooth boundary, there exists $m_\epsilon(\cdot,\omega)$ with $\|m_\epsilon(\cdot,\omega) - u\|_{L^1} \to 0$ and*

$$\limsup F_\epsilon(m_\epsilon) \leq C_W\mathrm{Per}(E) \quad \textit{for } C_W \textit{ as in } (1.3).$$

Proof. We construct a sequence with the required properties. To this end, let $\bar{m} : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be the increasing solution of

$$\bar{m}'' = W'(\bar{m}), \quad \lim_{r\to\pm\infty} \bar{m}(r) = \pm 1.$$

It is well known, [10], that there exist $C,\ \lambda > 0$ such that

$$|(1 - |\bar{m}(r)|)| + \bar{m}'(r) \leq Ce^{-\lambda|r|}. \tag{6.10}$$

Define

$$d(x) := \begin{cases} -\mathrm{dist}(x, E), & \text{if } x \in \Lambda\setminus E,\\ \mathrm{dist}(x, \mathbb{R}^d\setminus E), & \text{if } x \in E,\end{cases} \qquad d_\epsilon(x) := \frac{d(x)}{\epsilon}$$

and

$$m_\epsilon(\cdot,\omega) := v_\epsilon^*(\cdot,\omega) + \bar{m}\,(d_\epsilon(\cdot)) \qquad \forall\omega \in \Omega,$$

where v_ϵ^* solves (2.19). Obviously $\|m_\epsilon(\cdot,\omega) - u\|_{L^1} \to 0$ for all $\omega \in \Omega$. To shorten notation we avoid to write in the following the dependence on ω of m_ϵ and v_ϵ^*. Note that $|\nabla d(x)| = 1$, therefore

$$|\nabla m_\epsilon(x)|^2 \leq \epsilon^{-2}[\bar{m}'(d_\epsilon(x))]^2 + 2\epsilon^{-1}|\nabla v_\epsilon^*(x)|\bar{m}'(d_\epsilon(x)) + |\nabla v_\epsilon^*(x)|^2,$$

and

$$G_\epsilon(m_\epsilon) - G_\epsilon(1+v_\epsilon^*) \le \int_\Lambda \epsilon^{-1}[\bar m'(d_\epsilon(x))^2 + W(\bar m(d_\epsilon(x))] \tag{6.11}$$

$$+2\int_\Lambda |\nabla v_\epsilon^*(x)|\bar m'(d_\epsilon(x)) \tag{6.12}$$

$$+\frac{1}{\epsilon}\int_\Lambda \left[W(\bar m(d_\epsilon(x)) + v_\epsilon^*(x)) - W(1+v_\epsilon^*(x)) - W(\bar m(d_\epsilon(x)))\right] \tag{6.13}$$

$$+\frac{\alpha}{\epsilon}\int_\Lambda (\bar m(d_\epsilon(x)) - 1) g_\epsilon(x) \tag{6.14}$$

$$+\int_\Lambda \left[\epsilon|\nabla v_\epsilon^*(x)|^2 + \frac{1}{\epsilon}W(1+v_\epsilon^*(x)) + \frac{\alpha}{\epsilon} g_\epsilon(x)(1+v_\epsilon^*(x))\right] - G_\epsilon(1+v_\epsilon^*).$$

Clearly the term in the last line vanishes, and it is well known, see [15], that the expression in (6.11) converges to $C_W \mathrm{Per}(E)$. Next, we show that the term in (6.12) vanishes. We obtain from Proposition 7.2 for ϵ sufficiently small $|\nabla v_\epsilon^*| \le C'\alpha(\epsilon)\epsilon^{-1}$. Hence by the co-area formula and (6.10) we estimate

$$\int_\Lambda 2|\nabla v_\epsilon^*|\bar m'(d_\epsilon) \le 2C'\frac{\alpha(\epsilon)}{\epsilon}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\{d(x)=r\})e^{-\lambda\frac{r}{\epsilon}}dr \le C''\mathrm{Per}(E)\alpha(\epsilon) \to 0.$$

Let $\mu_\epsilon := -\epsilon\ln(\alpha(\epsilon)) = \epsilon\ln\ln(1/\epsilon) > 0$, and

$$\Lambda_{\mu_\epsilon} := \{x : \ |d(x)| < \mu_\epsilon\}.$$

Split the expression in (6.13) in an integral over Λ_{μ_ϵ} and the rest. Set $L := \sup_{s\in[-2,2]}|W'(s)|$. On Λ_{μ_ϵ} we have

$$|W(\bar m + v_\epsilon) - W(\bar m)| \le L\|v_\epsilon^*\|_\infty, \ W(1+v_\epsilon^*) \le \frac{1}{2C_0}\|v_\epsilon^*\|_\infty^2.$$

This helps to estimate

$$\begin{aligned}\epsilon^{-1}\int_{\Lambda_{\mu_\epsilon}} (W(\bar m + v_\epsilon^*) - W(1+v_\epsilon^*) - W(\bar m)) &\le \frac{|\Lambda_{\mu_\epsilon}|}{\epsilon}C\left(L\alpha(\epsilon) + \frac{1}{2C_0}\right)\alpha(\epsilon)\\ &\le C'\alpha(\epsilon)\ln\left(\frac{1}{\alpha(\epsilon)}\right)\mathrm{Per}(E).\end{aligned}$$

To estimate the integral over $\Lambda \setminus \Lambda_{\mu_\epsilon}$, we use that for x so that $|d(x)| > \epsilon|\ln(\alpha)|$

$$|W(\bar m(d_\epsilon))| \le \frac{1}{2C_0}(\bar m(d_\epsilon) - 1)^2 \le \frac{C^2}{2C_0}e^{-2\lambda d(x)/\epsilon}$$

and then

$$|W(\bar m(d_\epsilon) + v_\epsilon^*) - W(1+v_\epsilon)| \le \left[\sup_{|s-1|\le C\alpha(\epsilon)} W'(s)\right] Ce^{-\lambda d(x)/\epsilon} \le C'\alpha(\epsilon)e^{-d(x)/\epsilon}.$$

Here the symmetry of the wells was used. The constants depend on the second fundamental form of E. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\epsilon^{-1}\int_{\Lambda\setminus\Lambda_{\mu_\epsilon}} ([W(\bar m + v_\epsilon^*) - W(1+v_\epsilon^*)] - W(\bar m))\\ &\le \epsilon^{-1}\int_{\Lambda\setminus\Lambda_{\mu_\epsilon}} \left(C'\alpha(\epsilon)e^{-d(x)/\epsilon} + \frac{C^2}{2C_0}e^{-2\lambda d(x)/\epsilon}\right).\end{aligned}$$

By the co-area formula and a change of variables $d/\epsilon = r$ this is bounded by

$$C\left(\mathrm{Per}(E)\right)\left[(\alpha(\epsilon)+1)\int_{|\ln(\alpha(\epsilon))|}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda r}dr\right] \le C'\left(\mathrm{Per}(E)\right)\alpha(\epsilon) \to 0.$$

The term in (6.14), which depends on the random field, can be bounded by

$$C'\mathrm{Per}(E)\alpha(\epsilon) + 2\frac{\alpha(\epsilon)}{\epsilon}\int_E g_\epsilon.$$

Note that there exists a constant $C(d)$ depending only on the dimension, such that the following holds: There exists for any E as above an $\epsilon_0(E)$ such that for any $\epsilon < \epsilon_0(E)$ there exists a set E_ϵ which is a union of cubes of sidelength ϵ with centers on $\epsilon\mathbb{Z}^d$ and

$$C(d)^{-1}\mathrm{Per}(E_\epsilon) \le \mathrm{Per}(E) \le C(d)\mathrm{Per}(E_\epsilon),\ |E_\epsilon \Delta E| \to 0 \text{ as } \epsilon \to 0.$$

This can be shown e.g. by approximating the smooth manifold ∂E by polygons and then by faces of cubes with centers on the lattice $\epsilon\mathbb{Z}^d$. Hence in arguing that the term in the fourth line vanishes we can use Lemma 5.4 with $\epsilon(n)$, $\delta(\epsilon(n))$ as in the proof of Lemma 6.2 to show that

$$\left|\frac{\alpha(\epsilon)}{\epsilon}\int_E g_\epsilon\right| \le C\delta(\epsilon)\mathrm{Per}(E).$$

Hence the Lemma is proven. □

Proof of Theorem 2.3: From Lemma 3.1 we get immediately that $F_\epsilon \to +\infty$ if $|u|$ is different from 1 on a set of positive Lebesgue measure. By general arguments ([15, Lemma 1]) it is sufficient to consider the upper bound in the case where E has a smooth boundary. Now the theorem follows from the Lemmas 6.3 and 6.2 together with Theorem 6.1.

7. Appendix

7.1. **Appendix I: Probabilistic Estimates.**

Let $\mathcal{R}$ be the set of connected union of cubes of size 1 containing the origin. We denote by R an element of $\mathcal{R}$ and by $|\partial R|$ the surface of R. We have

Proposition 7.1. *For $d \ge 3$, for any $S_0 > 0$ there exists $c' \equiv c'(S_0, d)$ so that for all $S > S_0$, we obtain*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\exists R \in \mathcal{R} : 0 \in R, \left|\sum_{z\in\mathbb{Z}^d:(z+[0,1]^d)\cap R\subset R} g(z,\omega)\right| \ge S|\partial R|\right] \le 2e^{-S^2c'}. \tag{7.1}$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}\left[\exists R \in \mathcal{R} : 0 \in R, \left|\sum_{z\in\mathbb{Z}^d:(z+[0,1]^d)\cap R\subset R} g(z,\omega)\right| \ge S|\partial R|\right]\\ &\le \sum_{n\ge 1}\mathbb{P}\left[\sup_{|\partial R|=n:0\in R,R\in\mathcal{R}}\left|\sum_{z\in\mathbb{Z}^d:(z+[0,1]^d)\cap R\subset R} g(z,\omega)\right| \ge S|\partial R|\right].\end{aligned} \tag{7.2}$$

To estimate each addend we define a sequence of sets $R_\ell \in \mathcal{D}^{(\ell)}$, $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, the partition of $\mathbb{R}^d$ in cubes of side 2^ℓ, with one of them having center 0. The R_ℓ, $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, are constructed by a "coarse grained" procedure from the original connected region $R_0 \equiv R$. We denote by $\mathcal{R}_\ell : R_0 \to R_\ell$ the map which associate to R_0 the set of cubes in $\mathcal{D}^{(\ell)}$ so that

$$|C^{(\ell)} \cap R_0| \ge \frac{1}{2}2^{d\ell},$$

R_ℓ is the union of such cubes. Note that R_ℓ is in general not connected. One can prove, see Proposition 1 of [11], that

$$|\partial R_\ell| \le C(d)|\partial R_0|, \tag{7.3}$$

and that the volume of the corridor between R_ℓ and $R_{\ell-1}$ when $R_\ell \neq \emptyset$, is estimated by

$$|R_\ell \Delta R_{\ell-1}| \le |\partial R_0| 2^\ell, \tag{7.4}$$

where for two sets A and B, $A\Delta B = (A \setminus B) \cup (B \setminus A)$. Denote

$$F(R_0,\omega) = \sum_{z\in\mathbb{Z}^d:(z+[0,1]^d)\cap R_0 \subset R_0} g(z,\omega).$$

Set $z = S|\partial R_0| = Sn$ and write, for any choice of $k(n) \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$F(R_0,\omega) = F(R_{k(n)},\omega) + [F(R_{k(n)-1},\omega) - F(R_{k(n)},\omega)] + ...[F(R_0,\omega) - F(R_1,\omega)].$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left[\sup_{|\partial R_0|=n:0\in R_0} F(R_0,\omega) > z\right] &\le \sum_{\ell=1}^{k(n)} \mathbb{P}\left[\sup_{|\partial R_0|=n:0\in R_0} \{F(R_{\ell-1},\omega) - F(R_\ell,\omega)\} > z_\ell\right] \\ &+ \mathbb{P}\left[\sup_{|\partial R_0|=n:0\in R_0} F(R_{k(n)},\omega) > z_{k(n)+1}\right] \end{aligned} \tag{7.5}$$

for any sequences z_ℓ with $\sum_{\ell=1}^{k+1} z_\ell \le z$. Since F is a sum of i.i.d.r.v. it is immediate to see that

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\{F(R_\ell,\omega) - F(R_{\ell-1},\omega)\} > z_\ell\right] \le e^{-\frac{z_\ell^2}{|R_\ell \Delta R_{\ell-1}|}}. \tag{7.6}$$

The (7.6) represents the probability that a particular coarse grained corridor has a large field. Therefore

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\sup_{|\partial R_0|=n:0\in R_0} \{F(R_\ell,\omega) - F(R_{\ell-1},\omega)\} > z_\ell\right] \le A_{\ell-1,n} A_{\ell,n} e^{-\frac{z_\ell^2}{\sup_{\{|\partial R_0|=n:0\in R_0\}} |R_\ell \Delta R_{\ell-1}|}} \tag{7.7}$$

where $A_{\ell,n}$ is the number of image points in R_ℓ that are reached when mapping any of the R_0 occurring in the sup, i.e. those so that $|\partial R_0| = n$ and containing the origin. In [11], Proposition 2, it has been shown that there exists a constant $C = C(d)$ so that

$$A_{\ell,n} \le e^{\left(\frac{C\ell n}{2^{(d-1)\ell}}\right)}. \tag{7.8}$$

Therefore we obtain from (7.7) and (7.4)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left[\sup_{|\partial R_0|=n:0\in R} F(R_0,\omega) > z\right] &\le \sum_{\ell=1}^{k(n)} A_{\ell-1,n} A_{\ell,n} e^{-\frac{z_\ell^2}{n2^\ell}} \\ &+ A_{k(n),n} e^{-\frac{z_{k+1}^2}{\sup_{\{|\partial R_0|=n:0\in R_0\}} |R_{k(n)}|}}. \end{aligned} \tag{7.9}$$

By isoperimetric inequality and (7.3) we have $\sup_{|\partial R_0|=n:0\in R_0} |R_{k(n)}| \le C(d) n^{\frac{d}{d-1}}$. By (7.8)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left[\sup_{|\partial R_0|=n:0\in R_0} F(R_0,\omega) > z\right] &\le \sum_{\ell=1}^{k(n)} e^{\left(\frac{2C\ell n}{2^{(d-1)(\ell-1)}}\right)} e^{-\frac{z_\ell^2}{n2^\ell}} \\ &+ e^{\left(\frac{Ck(n)n}{2^{(d-1)k(n)}}\right)} e^{-\frac{z_{k+1}^2}{n^{\frac{d}{d-1}}}}. \end{aligned} \tag{7.10}$$

Choose then $k(n)$, the number of times one repeats the coarse graining procedure, so that the final coarse-grained volume does not have an anomalous large total field, $R_{k(n)-1} \neq \emptyset$ and the sum in the right hand side of (7.10) is small. Take

$$2^{k(n)} = n^{\frac{1}{3}}, \qquad z_\ell = \frac{S}{2}\frac{n}{\ell^2},$$

and notice that $k(n) \simeq \log n$ and $\frac{S}{2}\sum_{\ell=1}^{k(n)+1}\frac{n}{\ell^2} \leq \frac{S}{n}[1-\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{k(n)+1}] \leq z$. We obtain, since $z_{k(n)+1} = \frac{S}{2}\frac{n}{(k(n)+1)^2} \simeq \frac{S}{2}\frac{n}{(\ln n+1)^2}$ and $\frac{k(n)n}{2^{(d-1)k(n)}} \simeq \frac{n\ln n}{n^{\frac{1}{3}(d-1)}}$, in $d \geq 3$, [7]

$$e^{\left(\frac{Ck(n)n}{2^{(d-1)k(n)}}\right)} e^{-\frac{z^2_{k+1}}{n^{\frac{d}{d-1}}}} = e^{\left(Cn^{\frac{1}{3}(4-d)}\ln n - S^2\frac{n^{\frac{d-2}{d-1}}}{(\ln n+1)^4}\right)} \overset{n\uparrow\infty}{\to} 0.$$

For the remaining term in (7.10), when $d \geq 3$, one can choose $S_0 \equiv S_0(d) > 0$ so that for $S \geq S_0$

$$\frac{C(\ell-1)n}{2^{(d-1)\ell}} - \frac{nS^2}{2^\ell\ell^4} = n\ell\frac{S^2}{2^\ell}\left(\frac{C}{S^2}\frac{(\ell-1)}{2^{(d-2)\ell}\ell} - \frac{1}{\ell^5}\right) < 0 \qquad \forall \ell \geq 1. \tag{7.11}$$

Then, it is possible to find $c = c(S_0, d)$ so that for all $S \geq S_0$

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^{k(n)} e^{-S^2\frac{\ell}{2^\ell}nc} \leq \sum_{\ell=1}^{k(n)} e^{-S^2\ell n^{\frac{2}{3}}c} \leq e^{-S^2 n^{\frac{2}{3}}c}.$$

Summarizing all the estimates one immediately gets (7.1). □

7.2. **Appendix II : Global and local minimizers in one single well.** Let

$$V(s) = \frac{1}{2C_0}s^2 \qquad \forall s \in \mathbb{R}$$

and consider for $u \in H^1(\Lambda)$ the functional

$$\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(u,\omega) \equiv \int_\Lambda \left(\epsilon|\nabla u(y)|^2 + \frac{1}{\epsilon}V(u(y))\right)\mathrm{dy} + \frac{1}{\epsilon}\alpha(\epsilon)\theta\int_\Lambda \mathrm{dy} g_\epsilon(\mathrm{y},\omega)\mathrm{u(y)}. \tag{7.12}$$

As in Lemma 3.1, one has for all $u \in H^1(\Lambda)$

$$\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(t\wedge u \vee(-t),\omega) < \mathcal{F}_\epsilon(u,\omega) \qquad \forall t > C_0\alpha(\epsilon)\theta, \qquad \mathbb{P} = 1. \tag{7.13}$$

The minimizer of $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(u,\omega)$ is obviously v^*_ϵ, the solution of the Euler- Lagrange equation (2.19). Next we report the properties of v^*_ϵ used all along the paper. The proofs use standard computations involving the Green's function for (7.16) below, therefore they are omitted. For the required properties of the Green's function, see e.g. Dautray- Lions, [3], vol 1, pag 635.

Proposition 7.2. *v^*_ϵ, the solution of the Euler- Lagrange equation (2.19), is Lipschitz continuous in Λ with Lipschitz constant bounded by $\epsilon^{-1}L_0 = \epsilon^{-1}C(\|g\|_\infty)\alpha(\epsilon)\theta$ and*

$$|v^*_\epsilon(r,\omega)| \leq C_0\alpha(\epsilon)\theta\|g\|_\infty \qquad r \in \Lambda, \quad \mathbb{P} = 1. \tag{7.14}$$

It can be represented as

$$v^*_\epsilon(r,\omega) = \frac{\alpha(\epsilon)}{2\epsilon^2}\theta\int_\Lambda G_\epsilon(r,r')g_\epsilon(r',\omega)\mathrm{dr'} \qquad \mathrm{r} \in \Lambda, \tag{7.15}$$

[7]In $d = 2$ the choice done of $k(n)$ makes the last term in the sum (7.10) diverging. Namely we have

$$e^{\left(Cn^{\frac{2}{3}}\ln n - \frac{S^2}{(\ln n+1)^4}\right)} \to \infty \quad \text{when} \quad n \to \infty.$$

Further in $d = 2$ the remaining term in (7.10), independently of the choice of $k(n)$ is always diverging.

where $G_\epsilon(\cdot,\cdot)$ is the Green function solution of the following problem:

$$\begin{aligned} & -\Delta_r G_\epsilon(r,r') + \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}\frac{1}{2C_0} G_\epsilon(r,r') = \delta(r-r') \qquad r,r' \in \Lambda \\ & \frac{\partial G_\epsilon}{\partial n}(r,r') = 0 \quad r' \in \Lambda, \quad a.e. \quad for\ r \quad \partial\Lambda. \end{aligned} \tag{7.16}$$

v_ϵ^* is a Gaussian process with mean

$$\mathbb{E}[v_\epsilon^*(r,\cdot)] = 0 \qquad r \in \Lambda \tag{7.17}$$

and covariance for $d \geq 3$

$$\mathbb{E}[v_\epsilon^*(r,\cdot) v_\epsilon^*(r',\cdot)] \leq C(d)\theta^2\alpha^2(\epsilon) e^{-\frac{1}{2\epsilon\sqrt{2C_0}}|r-r'|}. \tag{7.18}$$

Proposition 7.3. *In $d \geq 3$ one can bound*

$$0 < G_\epsilon(r) \leq C(d)\frac{1}{4\pi|r|^{d-2}} e^{-k|r|}, \qquad k = \frac{1}{\epsilon}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2C_0}}. \tag{7.19}$$

Next we consider local minimizer in one single well with Dirichlet Boundary conditions. Let $D \subset \Lambda$ and consider the following boundary value problem

$$-\epsilon\Delta u(r) + \frac{1}{\epsilon}\frac{1}{2C_0} u(r) + \frac{1}{2\epsilon}\alpha(\epsilon)\theta g_\epsilon(r,\omega) = 0 \quad \text{in } D, \quad u = v_0 \qquad \text{on} \quad \partial D, \tag{7.20}$$

where $v_0 \in H^1(\Lambda)$. We have the following boundary influence decay for the solution of (7.20).

Proposition 7.4. *For $d \geq 3$, there exists a positive constant $C(d)$ so that for $\mathbb{P} = 1$ the following holds: Let v be the solution of* (7.20) *we have*

$$|v(r,\omega)| \leq C(d) \sup_{y\in\partial D} |v_0(y)| e^{-\frac{1}{\epsilon 4\sqrt{2C_0}} d(r,\partial D)} + C_0\alpha(\epsilon)\|g\|_\infty \theta \quad r \in D. \tag{7.21}$$

For solutions of (7.20) *with different boundary conditions we obtain*

$$|v_1(r,\omega) - v_2(r,\omega)| \leq C(d) \sup_{y\in\partial D} |v_1(y) - v_2(y)| e^{-\frac{d(r,\partial D)}{4\epsilon\sqrt{2C_0}}}, x \in D, \tag{7.22}$$

$$|\nabla(v_1(r,\omega) - v_2(r,\omega))| \leq \frac{\widehat{C}(d)}{\epsilon} \sup_{y\in\partial D} |v_1(y) - v_2(y)| e^{-\frac{d(r,\partial D)}{4\epsilon\sqrt{2C_0}}}, \tag{7.23}$$

$$\text{for } r \in D \text{ and } d(r,\partial D) > \epsilon.$$

7.3. **Appendix III.** In this section we show for a simplified functional that sequences that approximate a function with a flat jump set are not microscopically flat. First we give some definitions. From now on $d = 3$, $x = (x_1,x_2,x_3)$, $\Lambda = (-1/2,1/2)^3$. As a simplification we replace the part of the functional G_ϵ which consists of the gradient part and the double well potential directly by its sharp-interface limit and and we restrict to functions which are BV with values in $\{+1,-1\}$

$$\hat{G}_\epsilon(u,\omega) = \begin{cases} \int_\Lambda \left(|\nabla u| + \frac{\alpha(\epsilon)}{\epsilon} g_\epsilon u \right) & \text{if} \quad u \in BV(\Lambda,\{-1,1\}) \\ +\infty & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

Recall that the Heaviside function $H(x) : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is defined as $H(x) = 1$ for $x > 0$, $H(0) = 0$, and $H(x) = -1$ for $x < 0$. We will show that perturbations of the "planar" function $U(x) := H(x_3)$ decrease the energy. More precisely we consider "graph-like" perturbations, i.e. functions $V : \Lambda \to \{-1,1\}$ for which there exist functions $\varphi : (-1/2,1/2)^2 \to (-1,1)$ so that $\{V = -1\} = \{x : \ x_3 \leq \varphi(x_1,x_2)\}$ and $\mathrm{osc}(\varphi) := \sup_{(-1/2,1/2)^2}\varphi - \inf_{(-1/2,1/2)^2}\varphi \gg \epsilon$.

This indicates that the minimizer under boundary conditions that enforce a "planar" jump are not planar on small scales. We make another assumption which is not automatic because the g_ϵ here is constant on deterministic cubes:

H2 There is a $\delta > 0$ so that for any measurable set A

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\int_A g_\epsilon > \epsilon^{3/2}\sqrt{|A|}\right) \geq \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\int_A g_\epsilon\right| > \epsilon^{3/2}\sqrt{|A|}\right) \geq \delta > 0$$

and the random variables $\int_A g_\epsilon$, $\int_{A'} g_\epsilon$ are independent and identically distributed for $\mathrm{dist}(A,\ A') > \epsilon$.

Theorem 7.5. *Let $U(x) := H(x_3)$, $0 < \beta < 1$, $\epsilon = \frac{1}{n}$ and assume* **H2**. *There exists a function $\varphi_\epsilon(\cdot, \omega) : [-1,1]^2 \to [0, h_\epsilon)$, $h_\epsilon = \alpha(\epsilon)\epsilon^{(2\beta+1)/3}$ such that $\mathbb{P}$-almost surely for any $i \in \mathbb{Z}^2$*

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to 0} h_\epsilon^{-1}\left(\sup_{\epsilon^\beta(i+[-1,1]^2)\subset[-1,1]^2}(\varphi_\epsilon(\cdot,\omega)) - \inf_{\epsilon^\beta(i+[-1,1]^2)\subset[-1,1]^2}(\varphi_\epsilon(\cdot,\omega))\right) > 0.$$

Further, denote by $V_\epsilon(\cdot,\omega) : \Lambda \to \{-1, 1\}$ the function so that $\{V = -1\} = \{x : \ x_3 \leq \varphi(x_1, x_2, \omega)\}$, then there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\hat{G}(U) - \hat{G}(V_\epsilon(\omega)) > C\epsilon^{2/3(1-\beta)}\alpha(\epsilon)^2\right] \to 1.$$

Proof. Let $r_\epsilon = \epsilon^\beta$, and divide the square $(-1/2, 1/2)^2$ in cubes $Q_r(x_i)$ of sidelength $2r_\epsilon$ centered at $x_i = \epsilon^\beta i \in (-1/2, 1/2)^2$, for $i \in \mathbb{Z}^2$.

We denote by $P_\epsilon \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$ the pyramid with center at the origin, base $(-r_\epsilon, r_\epsilon)^2 \times \{x_3 = 0\}$ and height h_ϵ. The excess area (surface of the pyramid minus area of the base) is $r\sqrt{r^2 + h^2} - r^2$. We translate the basis of the pyramid on the plane $(-1/2, 1/2)^2$ and denote it by $P_\epsilon + (x_i, 0)$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ so that $x_i = i\epsilon^\beta \in (-1/2, 1/2)^2$. Next we define a random variable which indicates whether a perturbation is convenient or not.

$$\eta_i(x,\omega) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if} \quad \alpha(\epsilon)\epsilon^{-1}\int\limits_{P_\epsilon+(x_i,0)} g_\epsilon > 2r_\epsilon^2(\sqrt{1+(h_\epsilon/r_\epsilon)^2} - 1),\ x \in Q_r(x_i), \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

Now let $\varphi_{r_\epsilon}(x_1, x_2) : \ Q_{r_\epsilon}(0) \to [0, h_\epsilon]$ be such that $\varphi_{r_\epsilon}(x_1, x_2)$ is the graph of P_ϵ and denote

$$\varphi_{r_\epsilon}(x,\omega) = \sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}^2 : x_i\in(-1/2,1/2)^2} \eta_i(x,\omega)\varphi_{r_\epsilon}(x - x_i).$$

The theorem follows immediately from a Borel-Cantelli argument if we are able to show that $1 > \mathbb{P}(\eta(0) = 1) > 0$. The upper bound follows from the symmetry of the random field, which yields $\mathbb{P}(\eta(0) = 1) \leq 1/2$. The lower bound is a consequence of (**H2**): The volume of the pyramid is $1/3 r_\epsilon^2 h_\epsilon^2$, i.e. (**H2**) implies

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\alpha(\epsilon)\epsilon^{-1}\int_{P_\epsilon} g_\epsilon > \epsilon^{1/2}\alpha(\epsilon)(1/3)r_\epsilon\sqrt{h_\epsilon}\right) > \delta,$$

and for ϵ sufficiently small

$$\frac{\epsilon^{1/2}\alpha(\epsilon)\sqrt{(1/3)}r_\epsilon\sqrt{h_\epsilon}}{2r_\epsilon^2(\sqrt{1+(h_\epsilon/r_\epsilon)^2} - 1)} \geq \frac{\epsilon^{1/2}\alpha(\epsilon)\epsilon^\beta}{\epsilon^{\beta+1/2}\alpha(\epsilon)^{3/2}} = \frac{1}{\alpha(\epsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}}} > 1.$$

□

Remark 7.6. *The error in the upper bound, Lemma 6.3, is of order $\alpha(\epsilon) \gg \epsilon^{2/3}$, therefore the error when replacing G_ϵ by the functional $\hat{G}_\epsilon$ defined in this appendix is larger than the effect described here. Hence this is not a proof that minimizing sequences of F_ϵ with plane-like constraints are not flat. However, a careful analysis of the next order for the functional G_ϵ would be beyond the scope of this paper.*

References

[1] N. Ansini, A. Braides, V. Chiadò Piat, *Gradient theory of phase transitions in composite media*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A, **133** no. 2 (2003), pp. 265–296.

[2] M. Aizenman and J. Wehr, *Rounding effects on quenched randomness on first-order phase transitions*, Comm. Math. Phys., **130** (1990), pp. 489–528.

[3] R. Dautray, J. L. Lions *Mathematical Analysis and Numerical Methods for Science and Technology*, vol. 1, Springer- Verlag, 1990.

[4] A. Bovier, *Statistical Mechanics of Disordered Systems. A Mathematical Perspective,* Cambridge University Press, 2006.

[5] J. Bricmont and A. Kupiainen, *Phase transition in the three-dimensional random field Ising model, Com. Math. Phys.,* **116** *(1988), pp. 539–572.*

[6] N. Dirr, M. Lucia, M. Novaga $\Gamma-$ convergence of the Allen-Cahn energy with an oscillating forcing term*, Interfaces and Free Boundaries,* **8** *(2006), pp. 47–78.*

[7] N. Dirr, M. Lucia, M. Novaga Gradient theory of phase transitions with a strong external field*, Preprint, (2007).*

[8] L. C. Evans , Partial Differential Equations*, volume 19, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, AMS, 1998.*

[9] L. C. Evans, R.L. Gariepy Measures Theory and fine properties of functions*, Studies in Advanced Mathematics, CRC Press, Boca Raton, 1992.*

[10] P. Fife and J.B. McLeod, The approach of solutions of nonlinear diffusion equations to travelling front solutions*, Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal.,* **65** *(1977), pp. 335–361.*

[11] D. Fisher, J. Fröhlich and T.Spencer The Ising model in a random magnetic field *, J. Statist. Phys.,* **34** *Nos. 5/6 (1984), pp. 863–870.*

[12] D. Gilbarg, N.S. Trudinger, Elliptic partial Differential Equations of Second order *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, 2nd ed., Berlin 1983.*

[13] R. Griffiths Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena*, Vol 1, C. Domb and M. Green, eds, Academic Press, London, 1972.*

[14] L. Modica, S. Mortola, Un esempio di Γ^{-}-convergenza*, Bollettino U.M.I.,* **14-B** *(1977), pp. 285–299.*

[15] L. Modica, The gradient theory of phase transitions and the minimal interface criterion*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.,* **98** *(1987), pp. 123–142.*

[16] M. Novaga, E. Valdinoci, The geometry of mesoscopic phase transition interfaces*, Preprint (2006)*

[17] R. Peierls Ising's model of ferromagnetism*, Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* **32** *(1936), pp. 477-481.*

[18] E. Presutti Scaling limits in Statistical Mechanics and microstructures in continuum Mechanics. *to appear.*

[19] W. P. Ziemer. Weakly Differentiable Functions *Springer 1989.*

Nicolas Dirr, Max-Planck-Institute for Mathematics in the Sciences, Inselstr. 22, 04103 Leipzig, Germany.
E-mail address: ndirr@mis.mpg.de

Enza Orlandi, Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Roma Tre, L.go S.Murialdo 1, 00156 Roma, Italy.
E-mail address: orlandi@mat.uniroma3.it