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Abstract

Given a bounded Lipschitz domain $\omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ and a lower semicontinuous function $W : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{+\infty\}$ that vanishes on a finite set and that is bounded from below by a positive constant at infinity, we show that every map $u : \mathbb{R} \times \omega \to \mathbb{R}^N$ with
$$
\int_{\mathbb{R} \times \omega} (|\nabla u|^2 + W(u)) \, dx_1 \, dx' < +\infty
$$
has a limit $u^\pm \in \{W = 0\}$ as $x_1 \to \pm \infty$. The convergence holds in $L^2(\omega)$ and almost everywhere in $\omega$. We also prove a similar result for more general potentials $W$ in the case where the considered maps $u$ are divergence-free in $\Omega$ with $\omega$ being the $(d-1)$-torus and $N = d$.
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1 Introduction

Let $N \geq 1$, $d \geq 2$ and $\Omega = \mathbb{R} \times \omega$ be an infinite cylinder in $\mathbb{R}^d$, where $\omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ is an open connected bounded set with Lipschitz boundary. For a lower semicontinuous potential $W : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{+\infty\}$, we consider the functional
\begin{equation}
E(u) = \int_{\Omega} \left( |\nabla u|^2 + W(u) \right) \, dx, \quad u \in H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N),
\end{equation}
where $| \cdot |$ is the Euclidean norm and
\begin{equation}
H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N) = \left\{ u \in H^1_{loc}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N) : \nabla u = (\partial_j u_i)_{1 \leq i \leq N, 1 \leq j \leq d} \in L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^{N \times d}) \right\}.
\end{equation}
A natural problem consists in studying optimal transition layers for the functional $E$ between two wells $u^\pm$ of $W$ (i.e., $W(u^\pm) = 0$). In particular, motivated by the De Giorgi conjecture, one aim
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is to analyse under which conditions on the potential $W$ and on the dimensions $d$ and $N$, every minimizer $u$ of $E$ connecting $u^\pm$ as $x_1 \to \pm \infty$ is one-dimensional, i.e., depending only on $x_1$. Obviously, such one-dimensional transition layers $u$ coincide with their $x'$-average $\overline{u}: \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^N$ defined as
\begin{equation}
\overline{u}(x_1) := \int_\omega u(x_1, x') \, dx', \quad x_1 \in \mathbb{R},
\end{equation}
where $x' = (x_2, \ldots, x_d)$ denotes the $d-1$ variables in $\omega$ and the $x'$-average symbol is denoted by $\bar{\int}_\omega = \frac{1}{|\omega|} \int_\omega$.  

### 1.1 Main results

The purpose of this note is to prove a necessary condition for finite energy configurations $u$ provided that $W$ satisfies the following two conditions:

(H1) $W$ has a finite number of wells, i.e., $\text{card}(\{z \in \mathbb{R}^N : W(z) = 0\}) < \infty$;

(H2) $\liminf_{|z| \to \infty} W(z) > 0$.

More precisely, we prove that under these assumptions, there exist two wells $u^\pm$ of $W$ such that $u(x_1, \cdot)$ converges to $u^\pm$ in $L^2$ and a.e. in $\omega$ as $x_1 \to \pm \infty$; in particular, the $x'$-average $\overline{u}$ (as a continuous map in $\mathbb{R}$) admits the limits $\overline{u}(\pm \infty) = u^\pm$ as $x_1 \to \pm \infty$. Here, $u(x_1, \cdot)$ stands for the trace of the Sobolev map $u \in H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$ on the section $\{x_1\} \times \omega$ for every $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}$.

**Theorem 1.** Let $\Omega = \mathbb{R} \times \omega$, where $\omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ is an open connected bounded set with Lipschitz boundary. If $W : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{+\infty\}$ is a lower semicontinuous potential satisfying (H1) and (H2), then every $u \in H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$ with $E(u) < \infty$ connects two wells $u^\pm \in \mathbb{R}^N$ of $W$ at $x_1 = \pm \infty$ (i.e., $W(u^\pm) = 0$) in the sense that
\begin{equation}
\lim_{x_1 \to \pm \infty} \|u(x_1, \cdot) - u^\pm\|_{L^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N)} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{x_1 \to \pm \infty} u(x_1, \cdot) = u^\pm \ \text{a.e. in } \omega. \tag{1.3}
\end{equation}

In particular,
\begin{equation}
\lim_{x_1 \to \pm \infty} \int_\omega u(x_1, x') \, dx' = u^\pm.
\end{equation}

**Remark 2.** i) As a consequence of the Poincaré-Wirtinger inequality\(^2\) for $u \in H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$ with $\bar{u}(\pm \infty) = u^\pm$, there exist two sequences $(R^+_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(R^-_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $(R^+_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \to \pm \infty$ and
\begin{equation}
\|u(R^+_n) - u^\pm\|_{H^1(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N)} \to 0 \quad \text{as } n \to \infty \tag{1.4}
\end{equation}
(see [24, Lemma 3.2]).

ii) Theorem 1 also holds true if $\omega$ is a closed (i.e., compact, connected without boundary) Riemannian manifold.

iii) Theorem 1 also applies for maps $u$ taking values into a closed set $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ (e.g., $\mathcal{N}$ could be a compact manifold embedded in $\mathbb{R}^N$). More precisely, if the potential $W : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{+\infty\}$ satisfies (H1), (H2) and $\mathcal{N} := \{z \in \mathbb{R}^N : W(z) < +\infty\}$ is a closed set such that $W|_{\mathcal{N}} : \mathcal{N} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is lower semicontinuous, then Theorem 1 handles the case where the nonlinear constraint $u \in \mathcal{N}$ is present.

\(^1 u^-$ and $u^+$ could be equal.

\(^2\)The assumption that $\omega$ is connected with Lipschitz boundary is needed for the Poincaré-Wirtinger inequality.
The result in Theorem 1 extends to slightly more general potentials $W$ in the following context of divergence-free maps. For that, let $d = N$ and $\Omega = \mathbb{R} \times \omega$ with $\omega = \mathbb{T}^{d-1}$ and $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ being the flat torus. We consider maps $u \in H^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$ periodic in $x' \in \omega$ and divergence-free, i.e.,

$$
\nabla \cdot u = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega.
$$

Then the $x'$-average $\bar{u} : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^d$ is continuous and its first component is constant, i.e., there is $a \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$
\bar{a}_1(x_1) = a \quad \text{for every} \quad x_1 \in \mathbb{R}
$$

(see [24] Lemma 3.1]). For such maps $u$, we consider potentials $W$ satisfying the following two conditions:

(H1)$_a$ $W(a, \cdot)$ has a finite number of wells, i.e., card($\{z' \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} : W(a, z') = 0\}$) < $\infty$;

(H2)$_a$ $\liminf_{z_1 \to a, |z'| \to \infty} W(z_1, z') > 0$.

In this context, we have proved in our previous paper [24] that the $x'$-average map $\bar{u}$ admits limits $u^\pm$ as $x_1 \to \pm \infty$, where $u^+_1 = a$ and they are two wells of $W(a, \cdot)$, see [24] Lemma 3.7. As in Theorem 1 we will prove that $u(x_1, \cdot)$ converges to $u^\pm$ in $L^2$ and a.e. in $\omega$ as $x_1 \to \pm \infty$.

**Theorem 3.** Let $\Omega = \mathbb{R} \times \omega$ with $\omega = \mathbb{T}^{d-1}$ the $(d-1)$-dimensional torus and $u \in H^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $E(u) < \infty$ and $\bar{u}_1 = a$ in $\mathbb{R}$ for some $a \in \mathbb{R}$. If $W : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{+\infty\}$ is a lower semicontinuous potential satisfying (H1)$_a$ and (H2)$_a$, then there exist two wells $u^\pm \in \mathbb{R}^d$ of $W$ such that (1.3) holds true and $u^+_1 = a$. In particular, $\bar{u}(\pm \infty) = u^\pm$.

Note that we don’t assume that $u$ is divergence-free in Theorem 3 only the assumption that $\bar{u}_1$ is constant.

### 1.2 Motivation

Our main result is motivated by the well-known De Giorgi conjecture that consists in investigating the one-dimensional symmetry of critical points of the functional $E$, i.e., solutions $u : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^N$ to the nonlinear elliptic system

$$
\begin{align*}
\Delta u &= \frac{1}{2} \nabla W(u) \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega, \\
\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} &= 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \partial \Omega = \mathbb{R} \times \partial \omega,
\end{align*}
$$

(1.5)

where $W$ is assumed to be locally Lipschitz in $[1.3]$ and $\nu$ is the unit outer normal vector field at $\partial \omega$. Theorem 1 states in particular that solutions $u$ of finite energy satisfy the boundary condition (1.3) for two wells $u^\pm$ of $W$. A natural question related to the De Giorgi conjecture arises in this context:

**Question:** Under which assumptions on the potential $W$ and the dimensions $d$ and $N$, is it true that every global minimizer $u$ of $E$ connecting two wells $u^\pm$ of $W$ is one-dimensional symmetric, i.e., $u = u(x_1)$?

**Link with the Gibbons and De Giorgi conjectures.** i) In the scalar case $N = 1$ ($d$ is arbitrary) and $W(u) = \frac{1}{4}(1 - u^2)^2$, the answer to the above question is positive provided that the limits (1.3) are replaced by uniform convergence (see [12, 17]); within these uniform boundary conditions, the problem is called the Gibbons conjecture. We mention that many articles have been written on
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Gibbons’ conjecture in the case of the entire space \( \Omega = \mathbb{R}^d \): more precisely, if a solution \( u : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R} \) of the PDE

\[
\Delta u = \frac{1}{2} \frac{dW}{du}(u) \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^d
\]

satisfies the convergence \( \lim_{x_1 \to \pm \infty} u(x_1, x') = \pm 1 \) uniformly in \( x' \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \) and \( |u| \leq 1 \) in \( \mathbb{R}^d \), then \( u \) is one-dimensional (see \([5, 6, 11, 18]\)).

Let us now speak about the long standing De Giorgi conjecture in the scalar case \( N = 1 \). It predicts that any bounded solution \( u \) of (1.6) that is monotone in the \( x_1 \) variable is one-dimensional in dimension \( d \leq 8 \), i.e., the level sets \( \{ u = \lambda \} \) of \( u \) are hyperplanes. The conjecture has been solved in dimension \( d = 2 \) by Ghoussoub-Gui \([21]\), using a Liouville-type theorem and monotonicity formulas. Using similar techniques, Ambrosio-Cabrè \([3]\) extended these results to dimension \( d = 3 \), while Ghoussoub-Gui \([22]\) showed that the conjecture is true for \( d = 4 \) and \( d = 5 \) under some antisymmetry condition on \( u \). The conjecture was finally proved by Savin \([31]\) in dimension \( d \leq 8 \) under the additional condition \( \lim_{x_1 \to \pm \infty} u(x_1, x') = \pm 1 \) pointwise in \( x' \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \), the proof being based on fine regularity results on the level sets of \( u \). Lately, Del Pino-Kowalczyk-Wei \([13]\) gave a counterexample to the De Giorgi conjecture in dimension \( d \geq 9 \), which satisfies the pointwise limit conditions \( \lim_{x_1 \to \pm \infty} u(x_1, x') = \pm 1 \) for a.e. \( x' \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \). It would be interesting to investigate whether these results transfer (or not) to the context of the strip \( \Omega = \mathbb{R} \times \omega \) as stated in Question.

Theorem \([1]\) proves that the pointwise convergence as \( x_1 \to \pm \infty \) is a necessary condition in the context of a strip \( \mathbb{R} \times \omega \) and for finite energy configurations.

ii) Less results are available for the vector-valued case \( N = 2 \). In the case \( \Omega = \mathbb{R}^d \), \( N = 2 \) and \( W(u_1, u_2) = \frac{1}{4} (u_1^2 - 1)^2 + \frac{1}{4} (u_2^2 - 1)^2 + \Lambda u_1^2 u_2^2 - \frac{\Lambda}{4} \) with \( \Lambda \geq 1 \) (so \( W \geq 0 \) and \( W \) has exactly four wells \( \{(0, \pm 1), (\pm 1, 0)\} \), thus, \((H1)\) and \((H2)\) are satisfied), the Gibbons and De Giorgi conjectures corresponding to the system (1.5) are discussed in \([19]\). Several other phase separation models (e.g., arising in a binary mixture of Bose-Einstein condensates) are studied in the vectorial case where \( W \) has a non-discrete set of zeros (see e.g., \([7, 8, 20]\)).

We recall that in the study of the De Giorgi conjecture for (1.6), i.e., \( N = 1 \), there is a link between monotonicity of solutions (e.g., the condition \( \partial_1 u > 0 \)), stability (i.e., the second variation of the corresponding energy at \( u \) is nonnegative), and local minimality of \( u \) (in the sense that the energy does not decrease under compactly supported perturbations of \( u \)). We refer to \([2, \text{Section 4}]\) for a fine study of these properties. In particular, it is shown that the monotonicity condition in the De Giorgi conjecture implies that \( u \) is a local minimizer of the energy (see \([2, \text{Theorem 4.4}]\)). Therefore, it is natural to study Question under the monotonicity condition in \( x_1 \) (instead of the global minimality condition on \( u \)).

\textbf{Link with micromagnetic models.} We have studied Question in the context of divergence-free maps \( u : \mathbb{R} \times \omega \to \mathbb{R}^N \) where \( d = N \) and \( \omega = \mathbb{T}^{d-1} \) is the \((d - 1)\)-dimensional torus, see \([24]\). By developing a theory of calibrations, we have succeeded to give sufficient conditions on the potential \( W \) in order that the answer to Question is positive, in particular in the case where \((H1)_a\) and \((H2)_a\) are satisfied, see \([24, \text{Theorem 2.11}]\). In that context, Question is related to some reduced model in micromagnetics in the regime where the so-called stray-field energy is strongly penalized favoring the divergence constraint \( \nabla \cdot u = 0 \) of the magnetization \( u \) (the unit-length constraint on \( u \) being relaxed in the system). In the theory of micromagnetics, a challenging question concerns the symmetry of domain walls. Indeed, much effort has been devoted lately to identifying on the one hand, the domain walls that have one-dimensional symmetry, such as the so-called symmetric Néel and symmetric Bloch walls (see e.g., \([14, 20, 23]\)), and on the other hand, the domain walls involving microstructures, such as the so-called cross-tie walls (see e.g., \([8, 30]\)), the zigzag walls

\footnote{Here, \( u \) needs not be a global minimizer of \( E \) within the boundary condition \( \partial_1 u \), nor monotone in \( x_1 \), i.e., \( \partial_1 u > 0 \). Obviously, this result applies also to global minimizers, as \( |u| \leq 1 \) in \( \mathbb{R}^d \) by the maximum principle.}
(see e.g., [25, 23]) or the asymmetric Néel / Bloch walls (see e.g., [16, 15]). Thus, answering to Question would give a general approach in identifying the anisotropy potentials \( W \) for which the domain walls are one-dimensional in the elliptic system \([13]\).

**Link with heteroclinic connections.** One dimensional \( \mathbb{R} \) solutions \( u = u(x_1) \) of the system \((1.5)\) are called heteroclinic connections. Given two wells \( u^\pm \) of a potential \( W \) satisfying \((H1)\) and \((H2)\), it is known that there exists a heteroclinic connection \( \gamma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^N \) obtained by minimizing \( \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\frac{d}{dx_1}\gamma|^2 + W(\gamma) \, dx_1 \) under the condition \( \gamma(\pm \infty) = u^\pm \) (see [27, 33, 34]). In the vectorial case \( N \geq 2 \), this connection may not be unique in the sense that there could exist two (minimizing) heteroclinic connections \( \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \) such that \( \gamma_i(\pm \infty) = u^\pm \) for \( i = 1, 2 \) but \( \gamma_1(\cdot) \) and \( \gamma_2(\cdot - \tau) \) are distinct for every \( \tau \in \mathbb{R} \). If this is the case, at least in dimension \( d = 2 \) and \( \Omega = \mathbb{R}^2 \), there also exists a solution \( u \) to \( \Delta u = \frac{1}{2} \nabla W(u) \) which realizes an interpolation between \( \gamma_1 \) and \( \gamma_2 \) in the following sense (see [32, 8, 23]):

\[
\begin{aligned}
&\begin{cases}
  u(x_1, x_2) \to u^\pm & \text{as } x_1 \to \pm \infty \text{ uniformly in } x_2, \\
  u(x_1, x_2) \to \gamma_1(x_1) & \text{as } x_2 \to -\infty \text{ uniformly in } x_1, \\
  u(x_1, x_2) \to \gamma_2(x_1) & \text{as } x_2 \to +\infty \text{ uniformly in } x_1.
\end{cases}
\end{aligned}
\]

Moreover, this solution is energy local minimizing, i.e., the energy cannot decrease by compactly supported perturbations of \( u \). Solutions to the system \( \Delta u = \frac{1}{2} \nabla W(u) \) naturally arise when looking at the local behavior of a transition layer near a point at the interface between two wells \( u^\pm \); solutions satisfying the preceding boundary conditions correspond to the case of an interface point where the 1D connection passes from \( \gamma_1 \) to \( \gamma_2 \). The existence of such stable entire solutions to the Allen-Cahn system makes a significant difference with the scalar case, i.e. \( N = 1 \), where only 1D solutions are present by the De Giorgi conjecture.

## 2 Pointwise convergence and convergence of the \( x' \)-average

In this section we prove that under the assumptions in Theorem [1] the \( x' \)-average \( \overline{u}(\pm \infty) = u^\pm \) as \( x_1 \to \pm \infty \) corresponding to two wells of \( W \). For that, we will follow the strategy that we developed in our previous paper (see [24, Section 3.1]). The idea consists in introducing an “averaged” potential \( \bar{V} \) in \( \mathbb{R}^N \) with \( \bar{W} \geq V \geq 0 \) and \( \{V = 0\} = \{W = 0\} \) (see Lemma [4]), and a new functional \( E_{\bar{V}} \) associated to the \( x' \)-average \( \overline{u} \) of a map \( u \) such that \( \overline{E}(u) \geq E_{\bar{V}}(\overline{u}) \). This can be seen as a dimension reduction technique since the new map \( \overline{u} \) has only one variable. We will prove that every transition layer \( \overline{u} \) connecting two wells \( u^\pm \) has the energy \( E_{\bar{V}}(\overline{u}) \) bounded from below by the geodesic pseudo-distance \( \text{geod}_{\bar{V}} \) between the wells \( u^\pm \) (see Lemma [6]). As the Euclidean distance in \( \mathbb{R}^N \) is absolutely continuous with respect to \( \text{geod}_{\bar{V}} \) (see Lemma [3]), we will conclude that \( \overline{u} \) admits limits at \( \pm \infty \) given by two wells of \( W \) (see Lemma [7]). Note that in Section 3 we will give a second proof of the claim \( \overline{u}(\pm \infty) = u^\pm \) without using the geodesic pseudo-distance \( \text{geod}_{\bar{V}} \).

We first introduce the energy functional \( E \) (defined in \((1.1)\)) restricted to appropriate subsets \( A \subset \Omega \) (e.g., \( A \) can be a subset of the form \( I \times \omega \) for an interval \( I \subset \mathbb{R} \), or a section \( \{x_1\} \times \omega \) ): for every map \( u \in H^1(A, \mathbb{R}^N) \), we set

\[
E(u, A) := \int_A |\nabla u|^2 + W(u) \, dx,
\]

so that for \( A = \Omega \), we have \( E(u) = E(u, A) \). For any interval \( I \subset \mathbb{R} \), the Jensen inequality yields

\[
E(u, I \times \omega) = \int_I \int_{\omega} \left( |\partial_1 u|^2 + |\nabla' u|^2 + W(u) \right) \, dx' \, dx_1 \geq |\omega| \int_I \left( \frac{d}{dx_1} \overline{u}(x_1) \right)^2 + e(u(x_1, \cdot)) \, dx_1,
\]

\footnote{If \( u = u(x_1) \), the Neumann condition \( \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 0 \) is automatically satisfied.}
where $\nabla' = (\partial_2, \ldots, \partial_d)$, $\bar{u}$ is the $x'$-average of $u$ given in (1.2) and the $x'$-average energy $e$ is defined by

$$e(v) := \int_\omega \left( |\nabla' v|^2 + W(v) \right) \, dx' \quad \text{for all } v \in H^1(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N).$$

Introducing the averaged potential $V : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{+\infty\}$ defined for all $z \in \mathbb{R}^N$ by

$$V(z) := \inf \left\{ e(v) : v \in H^1(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N), \int_\omega v \, dx' = z \right\} \geq 0,$$

we have

$$E(u, I \times \omega) \geq |\omega| \int_I \left( \frac{1}{d} |\nabla(x_1)|^2 + V(\bar{\pi}(x_1)) \right) \, dx_1. \quad (2.1)$$

This observation is the starting point in the proof of the following lemma:

**Lemma 4.** Let $W : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{+\infty\}$ be a lower semicontinuous function satisfying (H2). Then the averaged potential $V : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{+\infty\}$ defined in (2.1) satisfies the following:

1. $V$ is lower semicontinuous in $\mathbb{R}^N$,
2. for all $z \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $V(z) \leq W(z)$, the infimum in (2.1) is achieved and $V(z) = 0 \iff W(z) = 0$,
3. $V_\infty := \liminf_{|z| \to \infty} V(z) > 0$,
4. for every interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ and for every $u \in \dot{H}^1(I \times \omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$, one has

$$\frac{1}{|\omega|} E(u, I \times \omega) \geq E_V(\bar{\pi}, I), \quad E_V(\bar{\pi}, I) := \int_I \left( \frac{1}{d} |\nabla(x_1)|^2 + V(\bar{\pi}(x_1)) \right) \, dx_1.$$

The new energy $E_V(\bar{u}) := E_V(\bar{\pi}, \mathbb{R})$ associated to the $x'$-average $\bar{u}$ will play an important role for proving the existence of the two limits $\bar{u}(\pm \infty)$.

**Proof of Lemma 4.** The claim 4 follows from (2.2). We divide the rest of the proof in three steps.

**Step 1:** Proof of Claim 2. Clearly, for all $z \in \mathbb{R}^N$, one has $V(z) \leq e(z) = W(z)$. By the compact embedding $H^1(\omega) \hookrightarrow L^1(\omega)$, the lower semicontinuity of $W$, Fatou’s lemma and the lower semicontinuity of the $L^2$ norm in the weak $L^2$-topology (see [9]), we deduce that $e$ is lower semicontinuous in the weak $H^1(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$-topology. Then the direct method in the calculus of variations implies that the infimum is achieved in (2.1) (infimum that could be equal to $+\infty$ as $W$ can take the value $+\infty$).

If $W(z) = 0$, then $V(z) = 0$ (as $0 \leq V \leq W$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$). Conversely, if $V(z) = 0$ with $z \in \mathbb{R}^N$, then a minimizer $v \in H^1(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$ in (2.1) satisfies $V(z) = e(v) = 0$ so that $v \equiv z$ and $W(z) = 0$.

**Step 2:** $V$ is lower semicontinuous in $\mathbb{R}^N$. Let $(z_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence converging to $z$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$. We need to show that

$$V(z) \leq \liminf_{n \to \infty} V(z_n).$$

Without loss of generality, one can assume that $(V(z_n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a bounded sequence that converges to $\liminf_{n \to \infty} V(z_n)$. By Step 1, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $v_n \in H^1(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$ such that

$$\int_\omega v_n \, dx' = z_n \quad \text{and} \quad e(v_n) = V(z_n).$$

\textbf{In particular, if $W$ satisfies (H1), then $V$ satisfies (H1), too.}
Since \((z_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\) and \((e(v_n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\) are bounded, we deduce that \((v_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\) is bounded in \(H^1(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N)\) by the Poincaré-Wirtinger inequality. Thus, up to extraction, one can assume that \((v_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\) converges weakly in \(H^1\), strongly in \(L^1\) and a.e. in \(\omega\) to a limit \(v \in H^1(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N)\). In particular, \(\int_\omega v \, dx' = z\).

Since \(e\) is lower semicontinuous in weak \(H^1(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N)\)-topology (by Step 1), we conclude

\[
V(z) \leq e(v) \leq \liminf_{n \to \infty} e(v_n) = \liminf_{n \to \infty} V(z_n).
\]

**STEP 3: PROOF OF CLAIM 3.** Assume by contradiction that there exists a sequence \((z_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}^N\) such that \(|z_n| \to \infty\) and \(V(z_n) \to 0\) as \(n \to \infty\). Then, there exists a sequence of maps \((w_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\) in \(H^1(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N)\) satisfying

\[
\int_\omega w_n(x') \, dx' = 0 \quad \text{for each } n \in \mathbb{N} \quad \text{and} \quad e(z_n + w_n) \to 0.
\]

By the Poincaré-Wirtinger inequality, we have that \((w_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\) is bounded in \(H^1\). Thus, up to extraction, one can assume that it converges weakly in \(H^1\), strongly in \(L^1\) and a.e. to a map \(w \in H^1(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N)\). We claim that \(w\) is constant since

\[
\int_\omega |\nabla w|^2 \, dx' \leq \liminf_{n \to \infty} \int_\omega |\nabla w_n|^2 \, dx' \leq \liminf_{n \to \infty} e(z_n + w_n) = 0.
\]

We deduce \(w \equiv 0\) since \(\int_\omega w = \lim_{n \to \infty} \int_\omega w_n = 0\). Thus \(w_n \to 0\) a.e and \((H2)\) implies that for a.e. \(x' \in \omega\),

\[
\liminf_{n \to \infty} W(z_n + w_n(x')) \geq \liminf_{z \to \infty} W(z) > 0,
\]

which contradicts the fact that \(e(z_n + w_n) \to 0\). \(\square\)

For every lower semicontinuous function \(W: \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{+\infty\}\) satisfying \((H1)\) and \((H2)\), we introduce the geodesic pseudo-distance \(\text{geo}_{W}\) in \(\mathbb{R}^N\) endowed with the singular pseudo-metric \(4Wg_0\), \(g_0\) being the standard Euclidean metric in \(\mathbb{R}^N\); this geodesic pseudo-distance (that can take the value \(+\infty\)) is defined for every \(x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N\) by

\[
\text{geo}_W(x, y) := \inf \left\{ \int_{-1}^{1} 2\sqrt{W(\sigma(t))} |\dot{\sigma}(t)| \, dt : \sigma \in \text{Lip}_{\text{loc}}([-1, 1], \mathbb{R}^N), \sigma(-1) = x, \sigma(1) = y \right\},
\]

\[(2.3)\]

where \(\text{Lip}_{\text{loc}}([-1, 1], \mathbb{R}^N)\) is the set of continuous and piecewise locally Lipschitz curves\(^7\) on \([-1, 1]\):

\[
\text{Lip}_{\text{loc}}([-1, 1], \mathbb{R}^N) := \left\{ \sigma \in C^0([-1, 1], \mathbb{R}^N) : \text{there is a partition } -1 = t_1 < \cdots < t_{k+1} = 1, \right. \\
\left. \quad \text{with } \sigma \in \text{Lip}_{\text{loc}}((t_i, t_{i+1})) \text{ for every } 1 \leq i \leq k \right\}.
\]

By pseudo-distance, we mean that \(\text{geo}_W\) satisfies all the axioms of a distance; the only difference with respect to the standard definition is that a pseudo-distance can take the value \(+\infty\). We will prove that \(\text{geo}_W\) yields a lower bound for the energy \(E\) (see Lemma \([3]\)); this plays an important role in the proof of our claim \(\|\|u(\pm \infty)\| = u^\pm\).

We start by proving some elementary facts about the pseudo-metric structure induced by \(\text{geo}_W\) on \(\mathbb{R}^N\):

---

\(^7\)In general, we cannot hope that a minimizing sequence in \((2.3)\) is better than piecewise locally Lipschitz because \(W\) is not assumed locally bounded (\(\dot{\sigma}\) is the derivative of \(\sigma\)). However, in the case of a locally bounded \(W\), we could use a regularization procedure in order to restrict to Lipschitz curves \(\sigma\).
Lemma 5. Let $W : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{ \infty \}$ be a lower semicontinuous function satisfying (H1) and (H2). Then the function $\text{geod}_W : \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{ \infty \}$ defines a pseudo-distance over $\mathbb{R}^N$ and the Euclidean distance is absolutely continuous with respect to $\text{geod}_W$, i.e., for every $\delta > 0$, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for every $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N$ with $\text{geod}_W(x, y) < \varepsilon$, we have $|x - y| < \delta$.

Proof of Lemma 5. In proving that $\text{geod}_W : \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{ \infty \}$ defines a pseudo-distance over $\mathbb{R}^N$, the only non-trivial axiom to check is the non-degeneracy, i.e., $\text{geod}_W(x, y) > 0$ whenever $x \neq y$. In fact, we prove the stronger property that for every $\delta > 0$, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for every $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $|x - y| \geq \delta$ implies $\text{geod}_W(x, y) \geq \varepsilon$ which also yields the absolute continuity of the Euclidean distance with respect to $\text{geod}_W$. For that, we recall that the set $\{W = 0\}$ is finite (by (H1)); therefore, w.l.o.g. we can assume that $\delta > 0$ is small enough so that the open balls $B(p, \delta/2)$, for $p \in \{W = 0\}$, are disjoint. We consider the following disjoint union of balls

$$
\Sigma_\delta := \bigcup_{p \in \{W = 0\}} B(p, \frac{\delta}{4}),
$$

the distance between each ball being larger than $\delta/2$. We now take two points $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N$ with $|x - y| \geq \delta$. In order to obtain a lower bound on $\text{geod}_W(x, y)$, we take an arbitrary continuous and piecewise locally Lipschitz curve $\sigma : [-1, 1] \to \mathbb{R}^N$ such that $\sigma(-1) = x$ and $\sigma(1) = y$. As $|x - y| \geq \delta$ (so no ball in $\Sigma_\delta$ can contain both $x$ and $y$), by connectedness, the image $\sigma([-1, 1])$ cannot be contained in $\Sigma_\delta$. Thus, there exists $t_0 \in [-1, 1]$ with $\sigma(t_0) \notin \Sigma_\delta$. It implies that $B(\sigma(t_0), \delta/8) \cap \Sigma_{\delta/2} = \emptyset$. Moreover, since $|x - y| \geq \delta$, we have either $|\sigma(t_0) - x| \geq \delta/2$ or $|\sigma(t_0) - y| \geq \delta/2$; w.l.o.g., we may assume that $|\sigma(t_0) - y| \geq \delta/2$. Then the (continuous) curve $\sigma|_{[t_0, 1]}$ has to get out of the ball $B(\sigma(t_0), \delta/8)$; in particular, it has length larger than $\delta/8$ and

$$
\int_{-1}^{1} 2\sqrt{W(\sigma(t))} |\dot{\sigma}(t)| \, dt \geq \frac{\delta}{4} \inf_{z \in B(\sigma(t_0), \delta/8)} \sqrt{W(z)} \geq \frac{\delta}{4} \inf_{z \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Sigma_{\delta/2}} \sqrt{W(z)}.
$$

Since $W$ is lower semicontinuous and bounded from below at infinity (by (H2)), we deduce that $W$ is bounded from below by a constant $c_8 > 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Sigma_{\delta/2}$. Taking the infimum over curves $\sigma \in \text{Lip}_{\text{loc}}([-1, 1], \mathbb{R}^N)$ connecting $x$ to $y$, we deduce from the preceding lower bound that

$$
\text{geod}_W(x, y) \geq \frac{\delta \sqrt{c_8}}{4} > 0.
$$

This finishes the proof of the result. \hfill \Box

We now use a regularization argument to derive the following lower bound on the energy:

Lemma 6. Let $W : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{ \infty \}$ be a lower semicontinuous function. Then, for every interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ and every map $\sigma \in \dot{H}^1(I, \mathbb{R}^N)$ having limits $\sigma(\inf I)$ and $\sigma(\sup I)$ at the endpoints of $I$, we have

$$
E_W(\sigma, I) := \int_I \left( |\dot{\sigma}(t)|^2 + W(\sigma(t)) \right) \, dt \geq \text{geod}_W(\sigma(\inf I), \sigma(\sup I)).
$$

(2.4)

Proof of Lemma 6. W.l.o.g. we assume that $I$ is an open interval. Since $\dot{H}^1(I, \mathbb{R}^N) \subset W^{1,1}_{\text{loc}}(I, \mathbb{R}^N)$, we can define the arc-length $s : I \to J := s(I) \subset \mathbb{R}$ by

$$
s(t) := \int_{t_0}^t |\dot{\sigma}(x_1)| \, dx_1, \quad t \in I,
$$
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where \( t_0 \in \mathcal{I} \) is fixed. Thus \( s \) is a nondecreasing continuous function with \( \dot{s} = |\dot{\sigma}| \) a.e. in \( \mathcal{I} \). Then the arc-length reparametrization of \( \sigma \), i.e.
\[
\tilde{\sigma}(s(t)) := \sigma(t), \quad t \in \mathcal{I},
\]
is well-defined and provides a Lipschitz curve \( \tilde{\sigma} : \mathcal{I} \to \mathbb{R}^N \) with constant speed on the interval \( \mathcal{I} \), i.e. \( |\dot{\tilde{\sigma}}| = 1 \) a.e., and such that \( \tilde{\sigma}(\inf \mathcal{I}) = \sigma(\inf \mathcal{I}) \) and \( \tilde{\sigma}(\sup \mathcal{I}) = \sigma(\sup \mathcal{I}) \). W.l.o.g. we may assume that \( \sigma \) is not constant, so \( \mathcal{I} \) has a nonempty interior. Then we consider an arbitrary function \( \phi \in \text{Lip}_{\text{loc}}((-1, 1), \text{int} \mathcal{I}) \) which is nondecreasing and surjective onto the interior of the interval \( \mathcal{I} \) and we set
\[
\gamma(t) := \tilde{\phi}(\phi(t)), \quad t \in (-1, 1).
\]

So \( \gamma \) is a locally Lipschitz map that is continuous on \([-1, 1]\) as \( \tilde{\sigma} \) admits limits at \( \inf \mathcal{I} \) and \( \sup \mathcal{I} \); thus, \( \gamma \in \text{Lip}_{\text{loc}}([-1, 1], \mathbb{R}^N) \). The changes of variable \( s := \phi(t) \), resp. \( s := \gamma(t) \), yield
\[
\int_{-1}^{1} 2 \sqrt{W(\gamma(t))} |\dot{\gamma}(t)| \, dt = \int_{-1}^{1} 2 \sqrt{W(\gamma(s))} |\dot{\gamma}(s)| \, ds = \int_{-1}^{1} 2 \sqrt{W(\sigma(t))} |\dot{\gamma}(t)| \, dt.
\]

Combined with \( \gamma(-1) = \sigma(\inf \mathcal{I}) \) and \( \gamma(1) = \sigma(\sup \mathcal{I}) \), the definition of geod\( \text{W} \) and the Young inequality imply
\[
E_W(\sigma, \mathcal{I}) \geq \int_{-1}^{1} 2 \sqrt{W(\sigma(t))} |\dot{\gamma}(t)| \, dt = \int_{-1}^{1} 2 \sqrt{W(\gamma(t))} |\dot{\gamma}(t)| \, dt \geq \text{geod}_W(\sigma(\inf \mathcal{I}), \sigma(\sup \mathcal{I})).
\]

This completes the proof. \( \square \)

The convergence of the \( x' \)-average in Theorem 1 stating that \( \overline{u}(\pm \infty) = u^\pm \) is a consequence of the following lemma:

**Lemma 7.** Let \( W : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{+\infty\} \) be a lower semicontinuous function satisfying (H1) and (H2). Then for every map \( \sigma \in H^1(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^N) \) such that \( E_W(\sigma, \mathbb{R}) < +\infty \) with \( E_W \) defined at (2.4), there exist two wells \( u^-, u^+ \in \{W = 0\} \) such that \( \lim_{t \to \pm \infty} \sigma(t) = u^\pm \).

**Proof of Lemma 7.** We use the fact that the energy bound \( E_W(\sigma, \mathbb{R}) < +\infty \) yields a bound on the total variation of \( \sigma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^N \) where \( \mathbb{R}^N \) is endowed with the pseudo-metric geod\( \text{W} \). More precisely, for every sequence \( t_1 < \cdots < t_k \) in \( \mathbb{R} \), we have by Lemma 6
\[
\sum_{i=1}^{k} \text{geod}_W(\sigma(t_{i+1}), \sigma(t_i)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} E_W(\sigma, [t_i, t_{i+1}]) \leq E_W(\sigma, \mathbb{R}) < +\infty.
\]

In particular, for every \( \varepsilon > 0 \), there exists \( R > 0 \) such that for all \( t, s \in \mathbb{R} \) with \( t, s \geq R \) or \( t, s \leq -R \), one has geod\( \text{W}(\sigma(t), \sigma(s)) < \varepsilon \). Since by Lemma 5 smallness of geod\( \text{W}(x, y) \) implies smallness of \(|x - y|\), we deduce that \( \sigma \) has a limit \( u^\pm \in \mathbb{R}^N \) at \( \pm \infty \). Since \( W(\sigma(t)) \) is integrable in \( \mathbb{R} \), we have furthermore that \( W(u^\pm) = 0 \). \( \square \)

Now we can prove the convergence of the \( x' \)-average \( \bar{u} \) at \( \pm \infty \) as stated in Theorem 1

**Proof of the convergence in \( x' \)-average in Theorem 1.** By Lemma 4 we have \( E_V(\overline{\pi}, \mathbb{R}) < +\infty \) for the lower semicontinuous function \( V : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{+\infty\} \) satisfying (H1) and (H2). By Lemma 7 applied to \( E_V \), we deduce that there exists \( u^\pm \in \{V = 0\} = \{W = 0\} \) such that \( \lim_{t \to \pm \infty} \overline{\pi}(t) = u^\pm \). \( \square \)
In this section, we prove that $u_{3}$ Theorem 1. We prove that $u(x_1, \cdot)$ converges a.e. in $\omega$ to $u^\pm \in \{W = 0\}$ as $x_1 \to \pm \infty$, where $u^\pm$ are the limits $\bar{u}(\pm \infty)$ of the $x'$-average $\bar{u}$ proved above. For that, we have by Fubini’s theorem:

$$E(u) \geq \int_{\Omega} |\partial_1 u|^2 + W(u) \, dx \geq \int_{\omega} E_W(u(\cdot, x'), \mathbb{R}) \, dx'$$

with the usual notation

$$E_W(\sigma, \mathbb{R}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\sigma|^2 + W(\sigma) \, dx_1, \quad \sigma \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^N).$$

As $E(u) < \infty$, we deduce that $E_W(u(\cdot, x'), \mathbb{R}) < \infty$ for a.e. $x' \in \omega$. By Lemma 8, we deduce that for a.e. $x' \in \omega$, there exist two wells $u^\pm(x')$ of $W$ such that

$$\lim_{x_1 \to \pm \infty} u(x_1, x') = u^\pm(x'). \quad (2.5)$$

By (2.4), as $\bar{u}(\pm \infty) = u^\pm$, we know that $\|u(R^\pm_n, \cdot) - u^\pm\|_{L^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N)} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ for two sequences $R^\pm_n \to \pm \infty$. Up to a subsequence, we deduce that $u(R^\pm_n, \cdot) \to u^\pm$ a.e. in $\omega$ as $n \to \infty$. By (2.5), we conclude that $u^\pm(x') = u^\pm$ for a.e. $x' \in \omega$.

3. The $L^2$ convergence

In this section, we prove that $u(x_1, \cdot)$ converges in $L^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$ to $u^\pm$ as $x_1 \to \pm \infty$. The idea is to go beyond the averaging procedure in Section 2 and keep the full information given by the $x'$-average energy $e$ introduced at Section 2 over the set $\dot{H}^1(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$. More precisely, we extend $e$ to the space $L^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$ as follows

$$e(v) = \begin{cases} \int_{\omega} (|\nabla' v|^2 + W(v)) \, dx' & \text{if } v \in H^1(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N), \\ +\infty & \text{if } v \in L^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N) \setminus H^1(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N). \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

In particular, we have for every $u \in \dot{H}^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$,

$$E(u) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\|\partial_1 u(x_1, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N)}^2 + |\omega| e(u(x_1, \cdot))\right) \, dx_1. \quad (3.2)$$

In the sequel, we will also need the following properties of the energy $e$:

**Lemma 8.** If $W : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{+\infty\}$ is a lower semicontinuous function satisfying (H2), then

1. $e$ is lower semicontinuous in $L^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$,

2. the sets of zeros of $e$ and $W$ coincide; moreover $\Sigma := \{e = 0\} = \{W = 0\} \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is compact,

3. for every $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$k_\varepsilon := \inf \{e(v) : v \in L^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N) \text{ with } d_{L^2}(v, \Sigma) \geq \varepsilon\} > 0.$$
Proof. We divide the proof in several steps:

**Step 1. Lower semicontinuity of \( e \) in \( L^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N) \).** Indeed, let \( v_n \to v \) in \( L^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N) \). W.l.o.g., we may assume that \( (e(v_n))_n \) is bounded, in particular, \((v_n)_n \) is bounded in \( H^1(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N) \); thus, \((v_n)_n \) converges to \( v \) weakly in \( H^1(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N) \). By Step 1 in the proof of Lemma \( \text{[4]} \) we know that \( e \mid_{H^1(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N)} \) is lower semicontinuous w.r.t. the weak \( H^1 \) topology and the conclusion follows.

**Step 2. Zeros of \( e \).** The equality of the zero sets of \( e \) and \( W \) is straightforward thanks to the connectedness of \( \omega \). Thanks to the assumption \((\text{H2})\), the set of zeros \( \Sigma \) of \( W \) is bounded and by the lower semicontinuity and non-negativity of \( W \), the set of zeros \( \Sigma \) of \( W \) is closed; thus, \( \Sigma \) is compact in \( \mathbb{R}^N \).

**Step 3. We prove that \( k_\varepsilon > 0 \).** Assume by contradiction that \( k_\varepsilon = 0 \) for some \( \varepsilon > 0 \). Then there exists a minimizing sequence \( v_n \in L^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N) \) such that \( d_{L^2}(v_n, \Sigma) \geq \varepsilon \) for every \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( \lim_{n \to \infty} e(v_n) = 0 \). W.l.o.g., we may assume that \( v_n \in H^1(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N) \) for every \( n \) as \( \|v_n\|_{H^1} \to 0 \). Denoting \( \overline{v}_n \) the \((x')\)-average of \( v_n \), the Poincaré-Wirtinger inequality implies that the sequence \((w_n := v_n - \overline{v}_n)_n \) converges in \( H^1(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N) \) to 0. Up to extracting a subsequence, we may assume that \( w_n \to 0 \) for a.e. \( x' \in \omega \).

**Claim:** The sequence \((\overline{v}_n)_n \) is bounded in \( \mathbb{R}^N \).

Indeed, assume by contradiction that there exists a subsequence of \((\overline{v}_n)_n \) (still denoted by \((\overline{v}_n)_n \)) such that \( |\overline{v}_n| \to \infty \) as \( n \to \infty \). As \( W \) is l.s.c. and \( w_n \to 0 \) for a.e. \( x' \in \omega \), the assumption \((\text{H2})\) implies

\[
\liminf_{n \to \infty} W(v_n(x')) = \liminf_{n \to \infty} W(w_n(x') + \overline{v}_n) \geq \liminf_{|z| \to \infty} W(z) > 0 \quad \text{for a.e.} \quad x' \in \omega
\]

which by integration over \( x' \in \omega \) contradicts the assumption \( e(v_n) \to 0 \). This finishes the proof of the claim.

As a consequence of the claim, we deduce that \((v_n)_n \in \mathbb{N} \) is bounded in \( H^1(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N) \). In particular, \((v_n)_n \in \mathbb{N} \) has a subsequence that converges in \( L^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N) \) to a map \( v \in H^1(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N) \) and we deduce \( d_{L^2}(v, \Sigma) \geq \varepsilon \), in particular, \( v \) is not a zero of \( e \), i.e., \( e(v) > 0 \). As \( e \) is l.s.c. in \( L^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N) \), we have \( 0 = \lim_{n \to \infty} e(v_n) \geq e(v) \), which contradicts that \( e(v) > 0 \).

Now we prove the \( L^2 \)-convergence of \( u(x_1, \cdot) \) to \( u^\pm \) as \( x_1 \to \pm \infty \):

**Proof of the \( L^2 \)-convergence in Theorem \( \text{[1]} \).** Take \( u \in H^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N) \) such that \( E(u) < +\infty \) and set \( \sigma(t) := u(t, \cdot) \in H^1(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N) \) for a.e. \( t \in \mathbb{R} \). We prove that \( \sigma(t) \) converges in \( L^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N) \) to a limit that is a zero in \( \Sigma \) as \( t \to +\infty \) (the proof of the convergence as \( t \to -\infty \) is similar). Moreover, we will see that these limits are in fact the zeros \( u^\pm \) of \( W \) given by the \( x' \)-average \( \overline{u} \) and the a.e. convergence of \( u(x_1, \cdot) \) as \( x_1 \to \pm \infty \).

**Step 1: Continuity.** We prove that \( t \mapsto \sigma(t) \in L^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N) \) is continuous in \( \mathbb{R} \), and moreover, it is a \( \frac{1}{2} \)-Hölder map. Indeed, for a.e. \( t, s \in \mathbb{R} \), we have

\[
d_{L^2}(\sigma(t), \sigma(s))^2 = \int_\omega \left| \int_t^s \partial_{x_1} u(x_1, x') \, dx' \right|^2 \, dx_1 \leq |t - s||\partial_{x_1} u\|^2_{L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N)}.
\]

**Step 2: Convergence of a subsequence \( (\sigma(t_n))_n \) to some \( u^+ \in \Sigma \).** Since \( e(\sigma(\cdot)) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}) \) by \((\text{H2})\), there is a sequence \((t_n)_n \in \mathbb{N} \) such that \( \lim_{n \to \infty} e(\sigma(t_n)) = 0 \). Exactly like in Step 3 in the proof of Lemma \( \text{[3]} \) we deduce that \((\sigma(t_n))_n \in \mathbb{N} \) has a subsequence that converges strongly in \( L^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N) \) to some map \( \sigma_\infty \in L^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N) \) (the assumption \((\text{H2})\) is essential here). Since \( e \) is l.s.c. in \( L^2 \) and \( e \geq 0 \) in \( L^2 \), we deduce that \( e(\sigma_\infty) = 0 \) and so, there exists \( u^+ \in \Sigma \) such that \( \sigma_\infty \equiv u^+ \).
STEP 3: CONVERGENCE TO $u^+$ IN $L^2$ AS $t \to +\infty$. Assume by contradiction that $\sigma(t)$ does not converge in $L^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$ to $u^+$ as $t \to \infty$. Then there is a sequence $(s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \to +\infty$ such that $\varepsilon := \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} d_{L^2}(\sigma(s_n), u^+) > 0$. Now, by Step 1, the curve $t \in [s_n, +\infty) \mapsto \sigma(t) \in L^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$ is continuous. Moreover, $\sigma(s_n)$ doesn’t belong to the $L^2$-ball centered at $u^+$ with radius $\frac{3\varepsilon}{4}$. By Step 2, it has to enter (at some time $t > s_n$) in the $L^2$-ball centered at $u^+$ with radius $\frac{\varepsilon}{4}$. Therefore, the curve $\sigma|_{(s_n, +\infty)}$ has to cross the ring $R := B_{L^2}(u^+, \frac{3\varepsilon}{4}) \setminus B_{L^2}(u^+, \frac{\varepsilon}{4})$, so it has $L^2$-length larger than $\frac{\varepsilon}{4}$, i.e.,

$$\int_{\{t \in (s_n, +\infty) : \sigma(t) \in R\}} \left\| \partial_x u(t, \cdot) \right\|_{L^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N)} dt = \int_{\{t \in (s_n, +\infty) : \sigma(t) \in \mathbb{R}\}} \left\| \partial_x u(t, \cdot) \right\|_{L^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N)} dt \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$$

Moreover, by the third claim in Lemma 8, we know that $e(\sigma(t)) \geq \kappa_{\varepsilon/4}$ if $\sigma(t) \in R$ (up to lowering $\varepsilon$, we may assume that the other zeros of $\Sigma$ are placed at distance larger than $2\varepsilon$ from $u^+$, the assumption (H1) is essential here). We obtain

$$\int_{s_n}^{+\infty} \sqrt{e(u(t, \cdot))} \left\| \partial_x u(t, \cdot) \right\|_{L^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N)} dt \geq \int_{\{t \in (s_n, +\infty) : \sigma(t) \in \mathbb{R}\}} \sqrt{e(u(t, \cdot))} \left\| \partial_x u(t, \cdot) \right\|_{L^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N)} dt$$

$$\geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \sqrt{k_{\varepsilon/4}}.$$

This is a contradiction with the assumption $E(u) < +\infty$ implying by (3.2):

$$2|\omega|^2 \int_{s_n}^{+\infty} \sqrt{e(u(t, \cdot))} \left\| \partial_x u(t, \cdot) \right\|_{L^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N)} dt \leq \int_{s_n}^{+\infty} \left( |\omega| e(u(t, \cdot)) + \left\| \partial_x u(t, \cdot) \right\|_{L^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N)}^2 \right) dt \underset{n \to \infty}{\longrightarrow} 0.$$

STEP 4: THE $L^2$ LIMITS $u^\pm$ COINCIDE WITH THE AVERAGE LIMITS $\bar{u}(\pm\infty)$. This is clear as $L^2$ convergence implies convergence in average.

**Remark 9.**

i) The above proof does not use (so, it is independent of) the almost everywhere convergence of $u(x_1, \cdot)$ as $x_1 \to \pm\infty$ or the convergence of the $x'$-average $\bar{u}$. Therefore, thanks to this proof, one can obtain as a direct consequence the convergence of the $x'$-average $\bar{u}$ as well as the almost everywhere convergence of $u(x_1, \cdot)$ as $x_1 \to \pm\infty$.

ii) Also, the above proof applies to Lemma 7 leading to a second method that does not use the geodesic distance $\text{geod}_W$.

iii) Behind the above proof, the notion of geodesic distance over $L^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$ with the degenerate weight $\sqrt{\varepsilon}$ is hidden (see (3.3)). Therefore, one could repeat the arguments in the first proof of Theorem 4 based on this geodesic distance.

The above argument can also be used directly to obtain a second proof for the existence of limits of $\bar{u}$ at $\pm\infty$ without using the geodesic pseudo-distance $\text{geod}_W$ (as presented in the proof in Section 2). For completeness, we redo the proof in the sequel:

**Second proof of the convergence in $x'$-average in Theorem 4.** Let $u \in \dot{H}^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$ such that $E(u) < \infty$. We want to prove that the $x'$-average $\bar{u}$ admits a limit $u^+$ as $x_1 \to \infty$ and $W(u^+) = 0$ (the proof of the convergence as $x_1 \to -\infty$ is similar). Let $V$ and $E_V$ given by Lemma 4. Recall that $\Sigma := \{ V = 0 \} = \{ W = 0 \}$ and $E_V(\bar{u}) \leq \frac{1}{4} E(u) < \infty$.

---

As the $L^2$-convergence implies almost everywhere convergence of $u(x_1, \cdot)$ only up to a subsequence, one should repeat the argument in the proof of the a.e. convergence in Theorem 4 at page 19.
STEP 1. We prove that for every $\epsilon > 0$, 

$$\kappa_\epsilon := \inf \{ V(z) : z \in \mathbb{R}^N, d_{g_N}(z, \Sigma) \geq \epsilon \} > 0.$$ 

Assume by contradiction that there exists a sequence $(z_n)_n$ such that $V(z_n) \to 0$ and $d_{g_N}(z_n, \Sigma) \geq \epsilon$. By the third claim in Lemma 3, we deduce that $(z_n)_n$ is bounded, so that, up to a subsequence, $z_n \to z$ for some $z \in \mathbb{R}^N$ yielding $d_{g_N}(z, \Sigma) \geq \epsilon$ and $V(z) = 0$, i.e., $z \in \Sigma$ (since $V$ is l.s.c. and $V \geq 0$) which is a contradiction.

STEP 2. There exists a sequence $(\bar{u}(t_n))_n$ converging to a well $u^+ \in \Sigma$. Indeed, as $V(\bar{u}) \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$, there exists a sequence $t_n \to \infty$ with $V(\bar{u}(t_n)) \to 0$. By (H2), $(\bar{u}(t_n))_n$ is bounded, so that up to a subsequence, $\bar{u}(t_n) \to u^+$ as $n \to \infty$ for some point $u^+ \in \mathbb{R}^N$. As $V$ is l.s.c. and $V \geq 0$, we deduce that $V(u^+) = 0$, i.e., $u^+ \in \Sigma$.

STEP 3: Convergence of $\bar{u}$ to $u^+$ as $x_1 \to +\infty$. Assume by contradiction that $\bar{u}(x_1)$ does not converge to $u^+$ as $x_1 \to \infty$. Then there is a sequence $(s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \to +\infty$ such that

$$\epsilon := \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} d_{g_N}(\bar{u}(s_n), u^+) > 0.$$ 

As $\bar{u} : [s_n, +\infty) \to \mathbb{R}^N$ is continuous, by Step 2, it has to get out of the ball $B(\bar{u}(s_n), \epsilon/4)$ and it has to enter in the ball $B(u^+, \epsilon/4)$. Therefore, $\bar{u}$ has to cross the ring $\mathcal{R} := B(u^+, \epsilon/4) \setminus B(u^+, \epsilon/4) \subset \mathbb{R}^N$. Moreover, by Step 1, we know that $V(\bar{u}(x_1)) \geq \kappa_{\epsilon/4}$ if $\bar{u}(x_1) \in \mathcal{R}$ (where we assumed w.l.o.g. that $\epsilon > 0$ is small enough so that the other zeros of $\Sigma$ are placed at distance larger than $2\epsilon$ from $u^+$). We obtain

$$2 \int_{s_n}^{+\infty} \sqrt{V(\bar{u}(x_1))} \left| \frac{d}{dx_1} \pi(x_1) \right| dx_1 \leq \int_{s_n}^{+\infty} \left( \left| \frac{d}{dx_1} \pi(x_1) \right|^2 + V(\bar{u}(x_1)) \right) dx_1 \xrightarrow{n \to \infty} 0.$$ 

This is a contradiction with the assumption $E_V(\bar{u}) < +\infty$ implying

$$2 \int_{s_n}^{+\infty} \sqrt{V(\bar{u}(x_1))} \left| \frac{d}{dx_1} \pi(x_1) \right| dx_1 \leq \int_{s_n}^{+\infty} \left( \left| \frac{d}{dx_1} \pi(x_1) \right|^2 + V(\bar{u}(x_1)) \right) dx_1 \xrightarrow{n \to \infty} 0.$$ 

$\square$ 

4 Proof of Theorem 3

In this section, we consider $d = N$, $\Omega = \mathbb{R} \times \Omega$ with $\omega = \mathbb{T}^{d-1}$ and $u \in H^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$ periodic in $x' \in \omega$ with $\bar{u}_1 = a$ in $\mathbb{R}$ for some constant $a \in \mathbb{R}$ (recall that $\bar{u}$ is the $x'$-average of $u$). Note that $|\omega| = 1$. We set

$$L^2_a(\omega, \mathbb{R}^d) := \left\{ v = (v_1, \ldots, v_d) \in L^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}^d) : \int_\omega v_1 dx' = a \right\}$$

and $H^1_a(\omega, \mathbb{R}^d) := H^1 \cap L^2_a(\omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$. Note that for a.e. $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}$, $u(x_1, \cdot) \in H^1_a(\omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$. We define the following energy $e_a$ on the convex closed subset $L^2_a(\omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$ of $L^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$:

$$e_a(v) = \begin{cases} \int_\omega \left( |\nabla' v|^2 + W(v) \right) dx' & \text{if } v \in H^1_a(\omega, \mathbb{R}^d), \\ +\infty & \text{if } v \in L^2_a(\omega, \mathbb{R}^d) \setminus H^1(\omega, \mathbb{R}^d). \end{cases}$$

(4.1)

In particular, we have for every $u \in H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\bar{u}_1 = a$:

$$E(u) = \int_\mathbb{R} \left( \|\partial_1 u(x_1, \cdot)\|^2_{L^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}^d)} + e_a(u(x_1, \cdot)) \right) dx_1.$$ 

(4.2)
The aim is to adapt the proof of Theorem 1 given in Section 3 to Theorem 3. We start by transferring the properties of the energy $e$ in Lemma S to the energy $e_a$ defined in $L^2_a(\omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$. More precisely, if $W : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{+\infty\}$ is a lower semicontinuous function, then $e_a$ is lower semicontinuous in $L^2_a(\omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$ endowed with the strong $L^2$-norm and the sets of zeros of $e_a$ and $W(a, \cdot)$ coincide, i.e.,

$$
\Sigma^a := \{ v \in L^2_a(\omega, \mathbb{R}^d) : e_a(v) = 0 \} = \{ z = (a, z') \in \mathbb{R}^d : W(a, z') = 0 \}.
$$

If in addition $W$ satisfies (H2)$_a$, then $\Sigma^a$ is compact in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and for every $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$
k^a_\varepsilon := \inf \{ e_a(v) : v \in L^2_a(\omega, \mathbb{R}^d) \text{ with } d_{L^2}(v, \Sigma^a) \geq \varepsilon \} > 0
$$

(proof of these properties follows by the same arguments presented in the proof of Lemma S).

**Proof of Theorem 3.** Let $u \in H^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $E(u) < +\infty$ and $\bar{u}_1 = a$ in $\mathbb{R}$. We set $\sigma(t) := u(t, \cdot) \in H^1_2(\omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$ for a.e. $t \in \mathbb{R}$. We prove that $\sigma(t)$ converges in $L^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$ to a limit that is a zero in $\Sigma^a$ as $t \to +\infty$ (the proof of the convergence as $t \to -\infty$ is similar). As in Steps 1 and 2 in the proof of the $L^2$-convergence in Theorem 1, we have that $t \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto \sigma(t) \in L^2_a(\omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$ is a $1/4$-Hölder continuous map in $\mathbb{R}$ and there is a sequence $(t_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \to +\infty$ such that $\sigma(t_n) \to u^+_a$ in $L^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$ for a well $u^+_a \in \Sigma^a$ (the assumption (H2)$_a$ is essential here). In order to prove the convergence of $\sigma(t)$ to $u^+_a$ in $L^2$ as $t \to +\infty$, we argue by contradiction. If $\sigma(t)$ does not converge in $L^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$ to $u^+_a$ as $t \to +\infty$, then there is a sequence $(s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \to +\infty$ such that $\varepsilon := \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} d_{L^2}(\sigma(s_n), u^+_a) > 0$. We repeat the argument in Step 3 in the proof of the $L^2$-convergence in Theorem 1 by restricting ourselves to $L^2_a(\omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$ endowed by the strong $L^2$ topology. More precisely, the continuous curve $t \in [s_n, +\infty) \mapsto \sigma(t) \in L^2_a(\omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$ has to cross the ring $\mathcal{R}_a := (B_{L^2}(u^+_a, \frac{\varepsilon}{4}) \setminus B_{L^2}(u^+_a, \frac{\varepsilon}{8})) \cap L^2_a(\omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$, so it has $L^2$-length larger than $\frac{\varepsilon}{4}$, i.e.,

$$
\int_{\{t \in (s_n, +\infty) : \sigma(t) \in \mathcal{R}_a\}} \| \partial_x u(t, \cdot) \|_{L^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}^d)} \, dt = \int_{\{t \in (s_n, +\infty) : \sigma(t) \in \mathcal{R}_a\}} \| \phi \|_{L^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}^d)} \, dt \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.
$$

As $e(\sigma(t)) \geq k^a_\varepsilon/4$ if $\sigma(t) \in \mathcal{R}_a$ (up to lowering $\varepsilon$, we may assume that the other zeros of $\Sigma^a$ are placed at distance larger than $2\varepsilon$ from $u^+_a$, the assumption (H1)$_a$ is essential here), we obtain

$$
\int_{\{t \in (s_n, +\infty) : \sigma(t) \in \mathcal{R}_a\}} \sqrt{e_a(u(t, \cdot)) \| \partial_x u(t, \cdot) \|_{L^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}^d)}} \, dt \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \sqrt{k^a_\varepsilon/4}.
$$

This is a contradiction with (H2)$_a$:

$$
2 \int_{s_n}^{+\infty} \sqrt{e_a(u(t, \cdot)) \| \partial_x u(t, \cdot) \|_{L^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}^d)}} \, dt \leq \int_{s_n}^{+\infty} \left( e_a(u(t, \cdot)) + \| \partial_x u(t, \cdot) \|_{L^2}^2 \right) \, dt \longrightarrow 0.
$$

Clearly, the $L^2$ convergence implies also the convergence in average of $\sigma(t)$ over $\omega$ as $t \to +\infty$ as well as the a.e. convergence $\sigma(t) \to u^+_a$ in $\omega$ but only up to a subsequence. For the full almost everywhere convergence of $u(x_1, \cdot) \to u^+_a$, we proceed as follows. First, by the Poincaré-Wirtinger inequality on $\omega = \mathbb{T}^{d-1}$, we have for a.e. $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$
\int_\omega |\nabla' u_1(x_1, x')|^2 \, dx' \geq 4\pi^2 \int_\omega |u_1(x_1, x') - \bar{u}_1(x_1)|^2 \, dx' = 4\pi^2 \int_\omega |u_1(x_1, x') - a|^2 \, dx'.
$$

By Fubini’s theorem, we deduce that

$$
E(u) \geq \int_\Omega (|\partial_1 u|^2 + |\nabla' u_1|^2 + W(u)) \, dx \geq \int_{\mathbb{T}^{d-1}} E_{W_a}(u(\cdot, x'), \mathbb{R}) \, dx',
$$
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where \( W_a(z) := W(z) + 4\pi^2|z_1 - a|^2 \) and, as usual,

\[
E_{W_a}(\sigma, \mathbb{R}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (|\dot{\sigma}|^2 + W_a(\sigma)) \, dx_1, \quad \sigma \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^N).
\]

Hence, \( E_{W_a}(u(\cdot, x'), \mathbb{R}) < \infty \) for a.e. \( x' \in \omega \). Note that \( W_a \) is lower semicontinuous and satisfies assumptions (H1) (the set of zeros of \( W_a \) coincides with \( \Sigma_a \), which is finite by (H1)_a) and the coercivity condition (H2) (thanks to (H2)_a). Thus, Lemma 7 implies that for a.e. \( x' \in \omega \), there exist two wells \( u^\pm(x') \) of \( W_a \) such that

\[
\lim_{x_1 \to \pm \infty} u(x_1, x') = u^\pm(x').
\]

By (1.4), as \( \bar{u}(\pm \infty) = u^\pm \), we know that \( \| u(R_n^\pm, \cdot) - u^\pm \|_{L^2(\omega; \mathbb{R}^N)} \to 0 \) as \( n \to \infty \) for two sequences \( (R_n^\pm)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \to \pm \infty \). Up to a subsequence, we deduce that \( u(R_n^\pm, \cdot) \to u^\pm \) a.e. in \( \omega \) as \( n \to \infty \). By (4.3), we conclude that \( u^\pm(x') = u^\pm \) for a.e. \( x' \in \omega \).

\[\square\]
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