

MEAN CURVATURE FLOW WITH POSITIVE RANDOM FORCING IN 2-D

WILLIAM M FELDMAN

ABSTRACT. We consider the forced mean curvature flow in 2-d, finite range of dependence and positive random forcing. We prove flatness and existence of effective speed for initially flat propagating fronts. This is the analogue, in random media, of a result of Caffarelli and Monneau [6]. The main new tools are a large scale Lipschitz estimate for the arrival time function, and a quantitative uniqueness result which does not use uniform local regularity.

1. INTRODUCTION

Consider the interface evolution equation

$$(1.1) \quad u_t = \operatorname{tr} \left[\left(I - \frac{Du \otimes Du}{|Du|^2} \right) D^2 u \right] + c(x)|Du| \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \times (0, \infty).$$

The forcing term $c > 0$ is a random field satisfying a finite range of dependence assumption. The PDE (1.1) is the level set form of the front propagation problem,

$$(1.2) \quad V_n = -\kappa + c(x)$$

where V_n is the outward normal velocity of an evolving (oriented) hypersurface $\Gamma_t = \partial S_t$ and κ is the mean curvature (positive for outward oriented boundaries of convex regions). We study the long time behavior of the interface Γ_t when S_0 is a half-space $\{x \cdot e \leq 0\}$. We will show that initially flat fronts stay approximately flat and propagate with an effective speed $\bar{c}(e)$.

$$(1.3) \quad \frac{1}{t} \Gamma_t \rightarrow \{x \cdot e = \bar{c}(e)\} \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty.$$

Under hyperbolic space-time rescaling one can see that the study of the long-time behavior of (1.1) is closely related to the asymptotic behavior as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ of the problem,

$$(1.4) \quad u_t^\varepsilon = \varepsilon \operatorname{tr} \left[\left(I - \frac{Du^\varepsilon \otimes Du^\varepsilon}{|Du^\varepsilon|^2} \right) D^2 u^\varepsilon \right] + c\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right)|Du^\varepsilon| \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \times (0, \infty)$$

with initial data $u(x, 0) = u_0(x)$. In this context one could hope to show that as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ the solutions u^ε converge to \bar{u} the solutions of the “homogenized problem”,

$$(1.5) \quad \bar{u}_t = \bar{c}\left(\frac{D\bar{u}}{|D\bar{u}|}\right)|D\bar{u}| \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \times (0, \infty) \quad \text{with } \bar{u}(x, 0) = u_0(x).$$

Here the asymptotic speeds $\bar{c}(e)$ appear again, now as the level set velocity for the homogenized problem.

This problem was considered in periodic media by Lions and Souganidis [20] who showed the existence of asymptotic front speeds in $d \geq 2$ under the following condition

$$(1.6) \quad \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} (c(x)^2 - (d-1)|Dc(x)|) > 0.$$

This condition, which we call the Lions-Souganidis condition, as in [1], is necessary and sufficient to obtain uniform Lipschitz estimates on the solutions of the approximate corrector problem associated with (1.1). However it was not clear whether the Lions-Souganidis condition was necessary for homogenization. Caffarelli and Monneau subsequently proved in [6] that, in $d = 2$, it is sufficient that $c > 0$, while, in $d \geq 3$, they constructed examples with positive velocity and linearly growing fingers, i.e. non-homogenization. The ideas of their paper will be discussed further below. Recently Armstrong and Cardaliaguet [1] have proven that homogenization holds for (1.1) in random media with a finite range of dependence property under the Lions-Souganidis condition. Again the main role of the Lions-Souganidis condition is to guarantee pointwise Lipschitz estimates of the arrival time function.

The contribution of this paper has two parts. The first is to point out that the geometric argument of Caffarelli and Monneau [6] in $d = 2$ showing flatness of interfaces in periodic media is in fact a result of regularity theory. In particular it is a large scale (deterministic) Lipschitz estimate for the arrival time function. The second is to explain that, as is typical in homogenization theory, a large scale regularity result is sufficient to obtain quantitative results. In particular we are able to adapt the method of Armstrong and Cardaliaguet [1] to use only large scale Lipschitz regularity.

In short, our paper extends Armstrong and Cardaliaguet [1] in random environments, in the same way that Caffarelli and Monneau [6] extended Lions and Souganidis [20] in periodic environments.

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose that $c : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$ is an \mathbb{R}^2 -stationary random field with finite range of dependence, almost surely bounded $c_{\min} \leq c(x) \leq c_{\max}$, and Lipschitz continuous $\|Dc\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)} < +\infty$. Then for every $e \in \mathbb{R}^2$ there is a deterministic asymptotic speed $\bar{c}(e)$ so that the arrival time at point x , $m(x)$, of the front started from $\{x \cdot e \leq 0\}$ satisfies,*

$$\mathbb{P}(|m(te) - \mathbb{E}[m(te)]| > \lambda t^{2/3}) \leq C e^{-C^{-1}\lambda^2} \quad \text{and} \quad |\mathbb{E}[m(te)] - \frac{1}{\bar{c}(e)}t| \leq C t^{2/3}.$$

Furthermore the effective velocity $\bar{c} : S^1 \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is continuous with logarithmic modulus of continuity.

Next we explain the connection of Theorem 1.1 with the homogenization (1.4) to (1.5) for general initial data. The general framework for quantitative homogenization of viscous Hamilton-Jacobi equations laid out in [1] appears not to apply due to the extremely weak only logarithmic continuity estimate on \bar{c} . Nonetheless we expect that the standard connection between metric problems and the approximate corrector problem, see Armstrong and Souganidis [3, Theorem 1] or [1, Proposition 2.4], still holds in non-quantitative form, and one should be able to obtain almost sure convergence of (1.4) to (1.5). We did not carry out the details here.

1.1. Literature. Here we give a slightly broader overview of the literature, including the results we have already mentioned. The first result of homogenization for the forced mean curvature in periodic environments was by Lions and Souganidis [20], under their strong coercivity condition guaranteeing Lipschitz estimates. Dirr, Karali and Yip [13] constructed pulsating wave solutions in all dimensions for $V_n = -\kappa + \delta c$ with smooth c (no positivity required) and δ small. Cardaliaguet, Lions and Souganidis [7] proved homogenization in dimension 2 with a weak and

non-perturbative positivity condition allowing signed c , Cesaroni and Novaga [8] further weakened this condition in dimension 2 and also constructed a maximal speed traveling wave in higher dimensional laminar media. Caffarelli and Monneau [6] constructed counter-examples to homogenization in $d \geq 3$ for some positive c , and proved homogenization in $d = 2$ for all $c > 0$. As mentioned before, our result is analogous to theirs, but in random media. In the direction of understanding the nature of non-homogenization, and potentially splitting non-flat traveling front solutions into traveling waves of multiple speeds, Kim and Gao [16] recently showed the existence of head and tail speeds that depend continuously on the normal direction and construct maximal and minimal speed traveling wave solutions in laminar media by a new proof.

Finally we discuss random media, where the only result for the forced mean curvature flow is by Armstrong and Cardaliaguet [1]. As described above, they prove homogenization under the strong Lions-Souganidis coercivity condition in all dimensions. We extend this result in $d = 2$ allowing only the weak Caffarelli-Monneau coercivity condition $c > 0$.

1.2. Physical motivation and related open problems. The forced mean curvature flow (1.7) is a model for interface motion in inhomogeneous media, e.g. contact lines of liquid droplets on a rough surface, fluid-fluid phase interface motion in a porous medium, or domain boundaries in random magnetic material [18]. We consider an (oriented) interface Γ_t pushed through the medium by a driving force F , moving by normal velocity

$$(1.7) \quad V_n = -\kappa + c(x) + F.$$

Pinning defects in the media c compete with surface tension κ and large scale forcing F (e.g. contact angle, pressure, applied magnetic field). When the forcing F is too weak interfaces are pinned, increasing the forcing there is a critical transition and interfaces de-pin and start moving.

There are many issues which are not clear, at least from a mathematical perspective, about this critical transition. Define the critical forcing for the transition from zero to positive speed (this may, or may not, be the same as de-pinning)

$$F_{*,s}(e, c) = \inf \left\{ F : \begin{array}{l} \text{the solution of (1.7) with initial data } \Gamma_0 = \partial\{x \cdot e \leq 0\} \text{ has} \\ c_*(F, c) = \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \inf \frac{1}{t} \Gamma_t \cdot e > 0 \end{array} \right\}.$$

When $F > F_{*,s}$ initially flat fronts separate from their initial data at positive speed. Now one can ask about the scale of the transversal fluctuations of the interfaces, either moving or pinned. Physicists have various conjectures on this topic especially at criticality, see for example [15, 18, 23]. The most basic question we can ask in this direction is that of homogenization. Does (1.3) hold whenever $F > F_{*,s}(e, c)$? Or, weaker, when $F > \sup_{e'} F_{*,s}(e', c)$? Or, even weaker, when $F > F_{*,s}(e, c)$ and c is rotation invariant in law? Do the answers depend on dimension?

A counter-example to homogenization under the first condition can be constructed in 2-d periodic and laminar medium in the spirit of [6, 7]. As explored by [6, 8, 16], informally speaking, non-homogenization at a given direction should imply pinning at a transversal direction (in 2-d). The example of [6] is a counter-example to the second question in $d \geq 3$. The second question in 2-d, and the third question in $d \geq 3$ are open.

Our result Theorem 1.1 is a step towards addressing this difficult, and more general, open issue. Our new result is in 2-d, we do not go all the way down to the pinning transition $\sup_{e'} F_{*,s}(e', c)$, instead we consider the (weakly) coercive case $c(x) + F > 0$. However, since we are able to deal with only large scale Lipschitz estimates (in fact larger than unit scale) for the arrival time, we expect the new ideas developed here to be useful in pushing the analysis down to $F_{*,s}$ where one would at best expect large scale Lipschitz estimates above, now, a random length scale. Still, there is a huge gap to bridge and we consider this to be a difficult and interesting open question.

1.3. Acknowledgments. Thanks Charlie Smart and Pierre Cardaliaguet for helpful conversations. Thanks to Takis Souganidis for helpful conversations and especially for pointing out the small scale Lipschitz estimate. Thanks to Inwon Kim for helpful comments on the manuscript.

1.4. Support. The author appreciates the support of the Friends of the Institute for Advanced Study and the NSF RTG grant DMS-1246999.

2. SET UP AND PRELIMINARY RESULTS

2.1. Viscosity Solutions. We use throughout the paper the notion of viscosity solutions for second order degenerate elliptic (and geometric) equations. See [6, 17, 21] for proof of comparison principle in this setting.

2.2. The random medium. We lay out the precise assumptions on the random medium. We require that there are $0 < c_{\min} \leq c_{\max} < +\infty$ and $L_0 < +\infty$ so that the following hold

$$(2.1) \quad 0 < c_{\min} \leq c(x) \leq c_{\max} \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ and } \|Dc\|_{\infty} \leq L_0.$$

For concreteness, our probability space Ω can be taken as the collection of all such coefficient fields

$$\Omega := \{c : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow (0, \infty) : (2.1) \text{ holds}\}.$$

We associate with Ω a family of (cylinder) σ -algebras $\mathcal{F}(U)$ for $U \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ a Borel set,

$$\mathcal{F}(U) := \sigma(c \mapsto c(x) : x \in U)$$

The largest of these σ -algebras is $\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ which, if we refer to it, will be just called \mathcal{F} . The underlying physical space \mathbb{R}^d naturally acts on Ω by translations, for each $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we define $T_y : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ by,

$$(T_y c)(\cdot) := c(\cdot + y).$$

One can check easily that this is indeed a group action.

Now we suppose that we are given a probability measure \mathbb{P} on the measurable space (Ω, \mathcal{F}) , which satisfies the following properties:

- Stationarity: for every $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and every $E \in \Omega$,

$$\mathbb{P}(E) = \mathbb{P}(T_y(E)).$$

- 1-dependence: for every two Borel sets U, V of \mathbb{R}^d with $\text{dist}(U, V) \geq 1$,

$$\mathcal{F}(U) \text{ and } \mathcal{F}(V) \text{ are } \mathbb{P}\text{-independent.}$$

The regularity estimates that we prove in Section 3 are uniform in Ω and therefore are not probabilistic in nature. The assumptions of stationarity and 1-dependence of the probability measure \mathbb{P} will come into play in the remainder of the paper Sections 4-5.

2.3. Notations. Constants which depend at most on c_{\min} , c_{\max} , d and L_0 will be called universal and will be written usually as C . The value of C may change from line to line.

3. PROPERTIES OF THE ARRIVAL TIME

In this section we introduce the arrival time problem, explain its relation with the front propagation problem (1.1), and prove some fundamental regularity properties. The main new result in this section is a large scale (larger than unit scale) Lipschitz estimate of the arrival time function. As explained in the introduction this result is the key to the remainder of the paper.

3.1. The arrival time problem. In this section we introduce the arrival time problem starting from a nonempty closed set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with smooth boundary satisfying the following $C^{1,1}$ regularity/smallness condition.

Assumption 3.1. S has interior tangent balls of radius $R_0 \geq 1$ and exterior tangent balls of radius 1 at every boundary point.

For now R_0 is a free parameter in the regularity condition, but we will soon fix $R_0 = \frac{C(d)}{c_{\min}} \vee 2$, chosen so that a ball of radius $R_0/8$ moving with velocity at most $c_{\min}/2$ in any direction is a subsolution of (1.1). We will keep that value for the remainder of the paper.

The arrival time is the maximal subsolution of,

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{cases} -\operatorname{tr} \left[\left(I - \frac{Dm \otimes Dm}{|Dm|^2} \right) D^2 m \right] + c(x)|Dm| = 1 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus S \\ m = 0 & \text{on } S. \end{cases}$$

When we wish to emphasize all the dependencies of m we write $m(x, S, c)$.

Note that this problem is typically referred to as the metric problem in the Hamilton-Jacobi literature [1, 4]. In the case of the mean curvature flow it is more natural to think of $m(x, S)$ as the first time that the evolving region started from S hits the point x . For this reason we call m the arrival time. To clarify this connection between the arrival time problem and the front propagation problem we make note of the following:

Lemma 3.2. *Let m solve the arrival time problem (3.1). Then*

$$u(x, t) = t - t \wedge m(x)$$

solves the level set equation for the forced mean curvature flow (1.1).

The zero level set of $u(x, t) = t - t \wedge m(x)$ can be interpreted as the locus of the front started from ∂S and evolving under (1.7).

The following theorem summarizes the results we will prove in this section.

Theorem 3.3. *Suppose that S satisfies Assumption 3.1. There exists a unique solution $m(x) = m(x, S)$ of (3.1) satisfying:*

(i) (Small scale Lipschitz) For $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus S$

$$|m(x) - m(y)| \leq \frac{2}{c_{\min}} e^{\|\nabla c\|_{\infty} m(x) \wedge m(y)} |x - y|.$$

(ii) (Regularity in time) Call $S_t = \{m(x) \leq t\}$ for any $s, t \geq 0$

$$d_H(S_t, S_s) \leq C(d) |t - s|^{1/2} + 2c_{\max} |t - s|.$$

(iii) (Regularity w.r.t. the data) For S and S' both satisfying Assumption 3.1

$$|m(x, S) - m(y, S')| \leq \frac{2}{c_{\min}} d_H(S, S').$$

Additionally the following property holds in $d = 2$:

(iv) (Large scale Lipschitz) There exist $\tau, L > 0$ depending on c_{\min} such that for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus S$

$$|m(x) - m(y)| \leq \tau + L|x - y|.$$

3.2. Local regularity. Let $S \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a compact set with smooth boundary and having interior tangent balls of radius $R_0 \geq 1$ and exterior tangent balls of radius 1 at every boundary point. Consider the evolution

$$(3.2) \quad u_t = \text{tr}[(I - \frac{Du \otimes Du}{|Du|^2}) D^2 u] + c(x) |Du| \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \times (0, \infty)$$

with

$$(3.3) \quad u(x, 0) = -d(x, S) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d$$

We will consider the existence, uniqueness and local regularity of the solutions of (3.2). We will also be interested in the regularity of the corresponding arrival time.

Proposition 3.4 (Existence and local regularity). *Let $S \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying Assumption 3.1 with $R_0 \geq \frac{2(d-1)}{c_{\min}} \vee 2$. There exists a unique solution u of (3.2) which is continuous with modulus*

$$|u(x, t) - u(y, t)| \leq \frac{2}{c_{\min}} e^{\|Dc\|_{\infty} t} |x - y| \quad \text{for all } x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus S, t \in [0, \infty),$$

and monotone increasing (strictly monotone in its negativity set)

$$u_t(x, t) \geq \frac{1}{2} c_{\min} \mathbf{1}_{\{u < 0\}} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, \infty).$$

This result is similar to Proposition 5.1 in [6], we need to deal with a more general class of initial data. The other new element here is the quantification of the local regularity of u which is guaranteed by the comparison principle. This idea goes back to [12, 22] for Hamilton-Jacobi equations and is surely known for mean curvature type equations although we do not have a reference. We give a slightly different proof based on a more geometric approach using inf-convolutions. Essentially the idea is to compare $u(x, t)$ with a translation $v(x, t) = u(x + \xi, t)$, but these do not solve the same equation since,

$$\begin{aligned} v_t &= \text{tr}[(I - \frac{Dv \otimes Dv}{|Dv|^2}) D^2 v] + c(x + \xi) |Dv| \\ &\geq \text{tr}[(I - \frac{Dv \otimes Dv}{|Dv|^2}) D^2 v] + (c(x) - \|Dc\|_{\infty} |\xi|) |Dv|. \end{aligned}$$

In order to fix this we speed up the level sets of v by an inf-convolution over balls $B_{r(t)}$ of decreasing radius.

Lemma 3.5. *Suppose that u is a solution of (3.2) on $\mathbb{R}^d \times (0, T)$ and $r : (0, T) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is C^1 , then*

$$v(x, t) = \inf_{z \in B_{r(t)}(x)} u(z, t)$$

is a supersolution on $\mathbb{R}^d \times (0, T)$ of

$$v_t \geq \operatorname{tr}[(I - \frac{Dv \otimes Dv}{|Dv|^2})D^2v] + (\inf_{z \in B_{r(t)}} c(x+z) - r'(t))|Dv|.$$

We omit the proof of this lemma since it is standard and proceed with the proof of Proposition 3.4.

Proof of Proposition 3.4. 1. We start with an auxiliary problem

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{cases} \tilde{u}_t = \operatorname{tr}[(I - \frac{D\tilde{u} \otimes D\tilde{u}}{|D\tilde{u}|^2})D^2\tilde{u}] + c(x)|D\tilde{u}| & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus S \times (0, \infty) \\ \tilde{u}(x, 0) = u_0(x) := -d(x, S) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus S \\ \tilde{u}(x, t) = t \left[\operatorname{tr}[(I - \frac{Du_0 \otimes Du_0}{|Du_0|^2})D^2u_0] + c(x)|Du_0| \right] & \text{on } \partial S \times (0, \infty) \end{cases}$$

Define the barrier sub and supersolutions,

$$u^\pm(x, t) = u_0(x) + C_\pm t \quad \text{with } C_- = \frac{1}{2}c_{\min} \text{ and } C_+ = (d-1) + c_{\max}.$$

Let $x \in \partial\{u_0 \geq \lambda\}$ for any $\lambda \leq 0$, let y be the nearest point to x in ∂S . Then S has an interior ball $B_{R_0}(y') \subset S$ centered at some $|y' - y| = R_0$. Then $B_{R_0}(y' + (x - y))$ is an interior ball to $\{u_0 \geq \lambda\}$ at x . Thus (in the viscosity sense)

$$\operatorname{tr}[(I - \frac{Du_0 \otimes Du_0}{|Du_0|^2})D^2u_0](x) \geq -\frac{d-1}{R_0}$$

and so the following holds (in the viscosity sense)

$$-\frac{d-1}{R_0} + c_{\min} \leq \operatorname{tr}[(I - \frac{Du_0 \otimes Du_0}{|Du_0|^2})D^2u_0] + c(x)|Du_0| \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus S.$$

The left hand side is larger than $C_- = \frac{1}{2}c_{\min}$ for $R_0 \geq 2(d-1)/c_{\min}$. Also, by the unit exterior ball condition of Assumption 3.1,

$$\operatorname{tr}[(I - \frac{Du_0 \otimes Du_0}{|Du_0|^2})D^2u_0] + c(x)|Du_0| \leq (d-1) + c_{\max} = C_+ \quad \text{on } \partial S.$$

Thus u^\pm are respectively sub and supersolutions of (3.4) with ordering holding on ∂S as well by the same argument. Then by Perron's method there exists a solution \tilde{u} of (3.4) with,

$$u^- \leq \tilde{u} \leq u^+.$$

See for more details on the application of Perron's method for this equation [9, 10].

2. Now we prove the regularity in time. Let $h \geq 0$ we have

$$\tilde{u}(x, t+h) \geq \tilde{u}(x, t) + C_-h,$$

so by comparison principle the same holds for all $t \geq 0$. This gives

$$\frac{1}{2}c_{\min} \leq \tilde{u}_t.$$

Now since $\tilde{u} > 0$ on ∂S for all $t > 0$ we have actually that $u = \tilde{u} \wedge 0$ solves (3.2) on \mathbb{R}^d , and by comparison it is the unique solution. Therefore

$$u_t(x, t) \geq \frac{1}{2}c_{\min} \mathbf{1}_{\{u(x, t) < 0\}}$$

since u and \tilde{u} agree on $\{u(x, t) < 0\}$.

3. Finally we address the local regularity in x . That u is continuous is simply a consequence of uniqueness. Let $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $t_0 > 0$, we aim to estimate,

$$u(x, t_0) - u(x + \xi, t_0) \leq e^{\|Dc\|_\infty t_0} |\xi|.$$

To this purpose we consider the geometric inf-convolution

$$v(x, t) = e^{\|Dc\|_\infty t_0} |\xi| + \inf_{z \in B_{r(t)}} u(x + z, t) \quad \text{with} \quad r(t) = e^{-\|Dc\|_\infty (t-t_0)} |\xi|.$$

We will check that v is a supersolution of (3.2). First check the initial data, using the 1-Lipschitz condition of the distance function u_0 ,

$$v(x, 0) = e^{\|Dc\|_\infty t_0} |\xi| + \inf_{z \in B_{e^{\|Dc\|_\infty t_0} |\xi|}} u_0(x + z) \geq u_0(x).$$

By Lemma 3.5, with $r(t) = e^{-\|Dc\|_\infty (t-t_0)} |\xi|$, v is a supersolution of

$$\begin{aligned} v_t &\geq \text{tr}[(I - \frac{Dv \otimes Dv}{|Dv|^2}) D^2 v] + (r'(t) + \inf_{z \in B_{r(t)}} c(x + z)) |Dv| \\ &\geq \text{tr}[(I - \frac{Dv \otimes Dv}{|Dv|^2}) D^2 v] + (c(x) - \|Dc\|_\infty r(t) - r'(t)) |Dv| \\ &= \text{tr}[(I - \frac{Dv \otimes Dv}{|Dv|^2}) D^2 v] + c(x) |Dv| \end{aligned}$$

since $r'(t) = -\|Dc\|_\infty r(t)$.

By comparison principle the ordering between u and v persists and we have for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ at time t_0 ,

$$u(x, t_0) \leq v(x, t_0) = e^{\|Dc\|_\infty t_0} |\xi| + \inf_{z \in B_{|\xi|}} u(x + z, t_0) \leq e^{\|Dc\|_\infty t_0} |\xi| + u(x + \xi, t_0).$$

□

Now we return to derive the first three parts of Theorem 3.3. The local Lipschitz regularity of the arrival time, part (i) of Theorem 3.3, is a corollary of Proposition 3.4.

Proof of Theorem 3.3 parts (i)-(ii). Part (i). We just need to show that if $u(x, t) \geq 0$ then, for $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $m(y) \geq m(x)$,

$$u(y, t + h) \geq 0 \quad \text{for} \quad h \geq \frac{2}{c_{\min}} e^{\|Dc\|_\infty t} |x - y|.$$

For this we combine the Lipschitz regularity of u in space with the lower bound $u_t \geq \frac{1}{2} c_{\min} \mathbf{1}_{\{u < 0\}}$ from Proposition 3.4. We have, either $u(y, t + h) \geq 0$ and we are done, or

$$u(y, t + h) \geq u(y, t) + \frac{1}{2} c_{\min} h \geq u(x, t) + \frac{1}{2} c_{\min} h - e^{\|Dc\|_\infty t} |x - y|,$$

the sum of the last two terms being nonnegative for $h \geq \frac{2}{c_{\min}} e^{\|Dc\|_\infty t} |x - y|$ as claimed.

Part (iii). Noting that $m(x, S \cap S') \geq m(x, S), m(x, S') \geq m(x, S \cup S')$, we can assume without loss that $S \subset S'$. Then applying part (i) for $x \in S'$

$$m(x, S) \leq \inf_{y \in S} \frac{2}{c_{\min}} e^{\|Dc\|_\infty m(x, S) \wedge m(y, S)} |x - y| \leq \frac{2}{c_{\min}} d_H(S, S')$$

using that $m(y, S) = 0$ for $y \in S$. Then $m(x, S) - \frac{2}{c_{\min}} d_H(S, S')$ is a subsolution of (3.1) for S' and so $m(x, S') \geq m(x, S)$ since $m(x, S')$ is the maximal subsolution.

Part (ii). Assume without loss that $t \geq s \geq 0$, we can also take $s = 0$ at the cost that $C^{1,1}$ regularity Assumption 3.1 is lost. Let ρ_ε be a standard mollifier M to be chosen and define

$$w(x) = \frac{1}{M}[\rho_\varepsilon \star d(\cdot, S)](x) - \frac{C(d)\varepsilon}{M}.$$

Then $w(x) \leq 0$ on S , for $C(d)$ above sufficiently large, and

$$|\nabla w(x)| \leq \frac{1}{M}, \quad |D^2 w(x)| \leq \frac{C(d)}{M\varepsilon}, \quad \text{and} \quad |w(x) - \frac{1}{M}d(x, S)| \leq \frac{C(d)\varepsilon}{M}.$$

Choose $\varepsilon = t^{1/2}$. Now w is a subsolution of

$$-\text{tr}\left[\left(I - \frac{Dw \otimes Dw}{|Dw|^2}\right)D^2 w\right] + |\nabla w| \leq \frac{C(d)}{M\varepsilon} + \frac{c_{\max}}{M} \leq 1$$

when we choose $M = 2c_{\max} + 2C(d)t^{-1/2}$. Thus by comparison in $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus S$ we have $m(x) \geq w(x)$ and therefore

$$\{m(x) \leq t\} \subset \{w(x) \leq t\} \subset \{d(x, S) \leq C(d)t^{1/2} + 2c_{\max}t\}.$$

□

3.3. Large Scale Lipschitz Estimates for the Arrival Time in 2-d. Finally we return to the main new part of Theorem 3.3, the large (unit) scale Lipschitz estimate of the arrival time function. This is a reinterpretation of the flatness result of Caffarelli and Monneau [6] in periodic media. Let $S \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ satisfying the regularity conditions Assumption 3.1 and let $u(x, t)$ be the corresponding solution of (3.2).

Theorem 3.6. *Suppose that S satisfies Assumption 3.1. There exists $\tau, L > 0$ depending only on c_{\min} so that for every $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus S$,*

$$|m(x, S) - m(y, S)| \leq \tau + L|x - y|.$$

Precisely $\tau = C(d)c_{\min}^{-1} \min\{c_{\min}, 1\}^{-1}$ and $L = \tau/R_0 = C(d)c_{\min}^{-1}$.

What is actually proven in [6] Proposition 6.1 is (with only a very small modification) the following essential result.

Proposition 3.7. *Suppose that S satisfies Assumption 3.1. There is a waiting time $\tau = \frac{13R_0}{2c_{\min}}$ so that for any $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $m(x_0, S) \leq t$*

$$m(x, S) \leq t + \tau \quad \text{for all } x \in B_{R_0}(x_0).$$

From Proposition 3.7 it is simple to prove Theorem 3.6. Let $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus S$ and call $e = \frac{x-y}{|x-y|}$,

$$m(y, S) \leq m(y + R_0 e, S) + \tau \leq \dots \leq m(x, S) + \lceil \frac{|x-y|}{R_0} \rceil \tau \leq m(x, S) + \tau + \frac{\tau}{R_0}|x-y|,$$

which is exactly the estimate claimed by Theorem 3.6.

First we prove a lemma on the path-connectedness of the set S_t . This is almost the same as Proposition 5.7 of [6], but we need to consider more general initial data which are not just half-spaces.

Lemma 3.8. *Let $x \in S_t$ and let ω_0 be any path-connected component of $\text{int}(S_t)$ containing x in its closure. Let $0 < r < R_0$ then $\omega_0 \cap \partial B_r(x_0) \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. Suppose that $\omega_0 \subset B_r(x)$ for some $0 < r < R_0$. Then $\omega_0 \cap S_0 = \emptyset$ since every connected component of $\text{int}(S_0)$ contains a ball of radius R_0 by Assumption 3.1.

Call $t_* = \inf\{s \in [0, t] : S_s \cap \omega_0 \neq \emptyset\}$. First note that

$$\emptyset \neq S_{t_*} \cap \bar{\omega}_0 \subset \partial\omega_0 \cap \partial S_{t_*},$$

this is just a consequence of the definition of t_* and the continuity in time of S_s in Hausdorff distance by Theorem 3.3 part (ii). In particular $t_* < t$. Let $x_0 \in \partial S_{t_*} \cap \partial\omega_0$, then by Theorem 3.3 part (i) we have $x_0 \in \text{int}(S_s)$ for all $s > t_*$. This fact applied to S_t contradicts that ω_0 is a connected component of $\text{int}(S_t)$. \square

Proof of Proposition 3.7. This is basically Proposition 6.1 in [6], we just mention the differences. Let x_0 with $m(x, S) = t_0$. Work in $B_R(x_0)$ for any $R_0/2 \leq R < R_0$ so that Lemma 3.8 applies and provides a path γ contained in $S_t \cap B_R(x_0)$ connecting x_0 to $\partial B_R(x_0)$. By the choice of R_0 the self-propagating ball barrier

$$\varphi_z(x, t) = \mathbf{1}_{B_{R/4}(z(t))}(x) \quad \text{with for any path } z : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2 \text{ with } |\dot{z}(t)| \leq c_{\min}/2$$

is a subsolution of (3.2). Then follow the proof of Proposition 6.1 in [6] through Steps 1 and 2. The result is that $B_{R/4}(z_0) \subset S_{t_0+\tau'}$ where $z_0 \in \partial B_{R/2}(x_0)$ and $\tau' = 5R_0/c_{\min}$. Then use the subsolutions φ_z with

$$z(t) = z_0 + \frac{1}{2}c_{\min}(t - t_0 - \tau')\xi \quad \text{for each } \xi \in S^{d-1}$$

on the time interval $t \in [t_0 + \tau', t_0 + \tau' + \frac{3R_0}{2c_{\min}}]$ to conclude that $B_{R_0}(x_0) \subset S_{t+\frac{13R_0}{2c_{\min}}}$. \square

We also mention here a corollary of the large scale Lipschitz estimate, which is the large scale strict monotonicity in time of the evolution S_t .

Lemma 3.9. *For every $0 \leq s \leq t$,*

$$S_s + B_{\frac{1}{L}((t-s)-\tau)_+} \subseteq S_t.$$

Proof. Let $x \in S_s$, by the large scale Lipschitz estimates Theorem 3.6

$$m(y, S) \leq m(x, S) + \tau + L|y - x| \leq s + \tau + L|y - x| \leq t$$

as long as $|y - x| \leq \frac{1}{L}((t-s)-\tau)_+$. In other words,

$$\{m(\cdot, S) \leq s\} + B_{\frac{1}{L}((t-s)-\tau)_+} \subseteq \{m(\cdot, S) \leq t\},$$

which was the desired result. \square

4. ESTIMATE OF THE RANDOM FLUCTUATIONS

In this section we consider the random part of the error estimate, for a given unit direction e and corresponding half-space $H(e) = \{x \cdot e \leq 0\}$ we show that,

$$|m(x, H(e)) - \mathbb{E}[m(x, H(e))]| \lesssim (x \cdot e)^{1/2} \quad \text{with high probability.}$$

In other words, the random fluctuations of the arrival time are quantitatively of lower order than the size of the arrival time itself which is of order $(x \cdot e)$.

Proposition 4.1. *Suppose that $d = 2$ and S satisfies Assumption 3.1, then for all $d(x, S) \geq 1$*

$$\log \mathbb{P}(|m(x, S) - \mathbb{E}m(x, S)| > \lambda d(x, S)^{1/2}) \leq -\frac{c_{\min} \min\{1, c_{\min}^2\}}{C c_{\max}} \lambda^2 + C,$$

where C are numerical constants.

This idea of the proof is very similar to [1, 2] (specifically see [1, Proposition 3.1]). The proof only relies on large scale Lipschitz estimates not local regularity. For completeness we include the adapted proofs in Appendix A. There are some small adjustments needed in the arguments since our Lipschitz estimate does not follow directly from the arrival time PDE, but rather from the connection with a front propagation initial data problem in the whole space (in particular no boundary).

5. ESTIMATE OF THE DETERMINISTIC PART OF THE ERROR

In this section we consider the deterministic part of the error estimate, aiming to show, for $H(e) = \{x \cdot e \leq 0\}$,

$$(5.1) \quad \left| \mathbb{E}[m(x, H(e))] - \frac{1}{\bar{c}(e)}(x \cdot e) \right| \lesssim (1 + (x \cdot e)^{2/3}).$$

As in [1] the idea is to show that $\mathbb{E}[m(te, H(e))]$ is approximately linear in t by using the concentration estimate along with a quantitative (localized) uniqueness property of the arrival time.

Here the lack of local regularity is a more serious issue. On its face, the localized uniqueness property, originally proved in [1], really relies on local regularity of the solution. The only local regularity that we have is the Lipschitz estimate of Theorem 3.3 part (i) which grows exponentially in time. If we were to directly emulate the localization result of [1] then, in order to obtain ordering between a pair of solutions at time t , would require ordering of the solutions at time 0 on a region of size e^{Ct} . This exponential growth is, just barely, too large of a region to control using the fluctuations estimate Proposition 4.1. We provide a slight improvement on this exponential localization scale by taking advantage of the large scale Lipschitz estimate. Basically we regularize n times during the evolution, resulting in an additional error of size $\sim n$, but reducing the time interval on which we need to use local regularity so that the localization rate is only $ne^{Ct/n}$. This result can be applied with $n \sim t^\alpha$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ chosen judiciously.

5.1. Localized influence of the boundary data. Our first goal is to establish the localization property of the arrival time solutions.

Proposition 5.1. *Let m^1 and m^2 be solutions of the arrival time problem,*

$$-\operatorname{tr} \left[\left(I - \frac{Dm \otimes Dm}{|Dm|^2} \right) D^2 m \right] + c(x)|Dm| = 1 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus S^i$$

with $m^i = 0$ in S^i . Suppose that: m^i both satisfy the unit scale Lipschitz estimate Theorem 3.6 with constants $\tau, L \geq 1$, there is $R \geq 1$ such that the ordering holds

$$S^2 \subset S^1 \quad \text{on } B_R(0).$$

Then there exists $C_1(\|Dc\|_\infty, c_{\min}), C_2(c_{\min}) \geq 1$ such that, if $s \geq 1$, $n \leq s$, and $R \geq \bar{R}_n(s) = ne^{C_1(\tau + L\frac{s}{n})}$,

$$\{m^2(x) \leq s - C_2n\} \subset \{m^1(x) \leq s\} \quad \text{on } B_{R-\bar{R}_n(s)}(0).$$

Note that we only assume that m^i satisfy the conclusion of Theorem 3.6, not that the S^i satisfy Assumption 3.1. Of course we will apply this result when S^i arise as some sub-levels $S^i = \{m(x, S_0^i) \leq t\}$ of the arrival time starting from a regular set S_0^i so that Theorem 3.6 does apply.

This is a generalization of the localized uniqueness of planar fronts proved in [1, Proposition 4.2] under a Lipschitz bound. In fact we will derive the Proposition by iterating [1, Proposition 4.2], a variant of which we recall here.

Lemma 5.2. *Let m^1 and m^2 be solutions of the arrival time problem,*

$$-\text{tr} \left[\left(I - \frac{Dm \otimes Dm}{|Dm|^2} \right) D^2 m \right] + c(x)|Dm| = 1 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus S^i$$

with $m^i = 0$ in S^i . Suppose that both S^i satisfy Assumption 3.1, there is $R \geq 1$ such that the ordering holds

$$S^2 \subset S^1 \quad \text{on } B_R(0).$$

Then there exists $C_1(\|Dc\|_\infty, c_{\min}) \geq 1$ such that, if $s \geq 1$ and $R \geq \bar{R}(s) = e^{C_1 s}$,

$$\{m(x, S^2) \leq s - 1\} \subset \{m(x, S^1) \leq s\} \quad \text{on } B_{R-\bar{R}(s)}(0).$$

The proof is similar to [1, Proposition 4.2] so we postpone it to Appendix B.

For m and S as in the Proposition 5.1, each sublevel set $S_t = \{m(x) \leq t\}$ can be replaced by a regular set \tilde{S} satisfying Assumption 3.1 up to a constant size error in the arrival time. This is a key consequence of the large scale Lipschitz estimate.

Lemma 5.3. *Suppose that $m(x, S)$ satisfies the conclusion of Theorem 3.6. Then there exists \tilde{S} with $S \subset \tilde{S}$ and $d_H(\tilde{S}, S) \leq R_0 + 2$ and*

$$m(x, \tilde{S}) \leq m(x, S) \leq m(x, \tilde{S}) + 3\tau.$$

Proof. Take

$$(5.2) \quad S' = \bigcup_{z \in B_{R_0+1}} (S + z) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{S} = \bigcap_{z \in B_1} (S' + z).$$

Then $S \subset \tilde{S}$ and $d_H(\tilde{S}, S) \leq 2R_0$ and \tilde{S} satisfies Assumption 3.1. Then by the assumed Lipschitz estimate

$$(5.3) \quad m(x, \tilde{S}) \leq m(x, S) \leq m(x, \tilde{S}) + \tau + 2LR_0.$$

Note that the second inequality follows from the Lipschitz estimate on $\partial\tilde{S}$ and then by comparison in $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \tilde{S}$. Also note that we must apply Theorem 3.6 here and not Theorem 3.3 part (iii) since S does not satisfy Assumption 3.1. Finally recall that $L = \tau/R_0$ to conclude with the claimed constant. \square

Proof of Proposition 5.1. We prove by inductively applying Lemma 5.2. Suppose that the bound holds for any $0 \leq s' \leq \frac{ks}{n}$

$$(5.4) \quad \{m(x, S^2) \leq s' - (1 + 3\tau)k\} \subset \{m(x, S^1) \leq s'\} \quad \text{in } B_{R-k\bar{R}(\frac{s}{n})}(0)$$

for some $0 \leq k \leq n-1$ where \bar{R} is from Lemma 5.2 and τ is from Theorem 3.6. Note that the ordering does hold in the case $k = 0$ by the assumption of the Proposition.

Now we wish to apply Lemma 5.2. Call

$$\Sigma^1 = \{m(x, S^1) \leq \frac{ks}{n}\} \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma^2 = \{m(x, S^2) \leq \frac{ks}{n} - (1 + 3\tau)k\}.$$

By the inductive assumption

$$(5.5) \quad \Sigma^2 \subset \Sigma^1 \quad \text{in} \quad B_{R-k\bar{R}(\frac{s}{n})}(0).$$

Now regularize replacing Σ^j by $\tilde{\Sigma}^j$ as in (5.2) at the cost of the error, from Lemma 5.3,

$$(5.6) \quad m(x, \tilde{\Sigma}^j) \leq m(x, \Sigma^j) \leq m(x, \tilde{\Sigma}^j) + 3\tau.$$

Also (5.5) still holds for the $\tilde{\Sigma}^j$ since the operation $\Sigma \mapsto \tilde{\Sigma}$ preserves containment. The $\tilde{\Sigma}^j$ now satisfy Assumption 3.1. Now for each $x_0 \in \cap B_{R-(k+1)\bar{R}(\frac{s}{n})}(0)$ apply Lemma 5.2 in $B_{R-k\bar{R}(\frac{s}{n})-|x_0|}(x_0)$ to find

$$\{m(x, \tilde{\Sigma}^2) \leq s' - 1\} \subset \{m(x, \tilde{\Sigma}^1) \leq s'\} \quad \text{in} \quad B_{R-(k+1)\bar{R}(\frac{s}{n})}(0) \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \leq s' \leq \frac{s}{n}.$$

Now recalling the bounds from (5.6), the following containments hold in $B_{R-(k+1)\bar{R}(\frac{s}{n})}(0)$

$$\begin{aligned} \{m(x, S^2) \leq \frac{ks}{n} + s' - (1 + 3\tau)(k + 1)\} &= \{m(x, \Sigma^2) \leq s' - 1 - 3\tau\} \\ &\subset \{m(x, \tilde{\Sigma}^2) \leq s' - 1 - 3\tau\} \\ &\subset \{m(x, \tilde{\Sigma}^1) \leq s' - 3\tau\} \\ &\subset \{m(x, \Sigma^1) \leq s'\} \\ &= \{m(x, S^1) \leq \frac{ks}{n} + s'\}. \end{aligned}$$

for any $3\tau \leq s' \leq \frac{s}{n}$. The case $0 \leq s' \leq 3\tau$ already follows from (5.4). Thus (5.4) holds for $k + 1$ and we conclude by induction. \square

5.2. Approximate linearity and the convergence of expectations. In this section we are finally able to address the convergence of the expectations $\mathbb{E}[m(te, H(e))]$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Since here we will just consider half-space initial data with a fixed e we will simply refer to $m(x) = m(x, H(e))$.

First we use the concentration estimate of Proposition 4.1 in combination with the large scale Lipschitz estimate and a union bound to estimate the probability that $|m(x) - \mathbb{E}m(x)|$ is too large anywhere on a very large region of $x \cdot e = t$. To quantify this we define,

$$M_R(t) := \sup_{x \in B_{Rt} \cap \{x \cdot e \leq t\}} |m(x) - \mathbb{E}[m(x)]|.$$

Note that by stationarity $\mathbb{E}[m(x)]$ is constant on $x \cdot e = t$.

Lemma 5.4. *There exists $C(c_{\min}, c_{\max}) \geq 1$ so that for every $R, t \geq 2$,*

$$\mathbb{E}[M_R(t)] \leq Ct^{1/2} \log^{1/2}(Rt).$$

Next we use Lemma 5.4 and Proposition 5.1.

Lemma 5.5. *There exists $C(c_{\min}, c_{\max}, \|\nabla c\|_{\infty}) \geq 1$ such that for every $t, s \geq 1$,*

$$|\mathbb{E}m(te) + \mathbb{E}m(se) - \mathbb{E}m((t + s)e)| \leq Ct^{2/3}$$

With the approximate linearity it is relatively standard to show the convergence of $\frac{1}{t}\mathbb{E}[m(te)]$.

Lemma 5.6. *For each $e \in S^{d-1}$ there exists $\bar{c}(e)$ such that*

$$\left| \frac{1}{t}\mathbb{E}[m(te)] - \frac{1}{\bar{c}(e)} \right| \leq Ct^{-1/3}.$$

We will skip the proof of Lemma 5.6 since it is almost the same as [1, lemma 4.6].

Now we return to prove Lemma 5.4 and Lemma 5.5.

Proof of Lemma 5.5. Assume that $s \leq t$. Call

$$n = (\tau + Ls)^{2/3} \quad \text{and} \quad R = 2 + t^{-1}(\tau + Ls)^{2/3}e^{C_1(\tau + Ls)^{1/3}}$$

with C_1 from Proposition 5.1 and τ, L from Theorem 3.6. Apply Proposition 5.1 with

$$S^1 = \{x \cdot e \leq t\} \quad \text{and} \quad S^2 = \{m(x) \leq \mathbb{E}[m(te)] - M_R(t)\}$$

in the domain $B_{Rt}(0)$ with the parameters R and n chosen above. By the definition of $M_R(t)$ we have

$$S^2 \subset S^1 \quad \text{on} \quad B_{Rt}(0).$$

Then

$$(5.7) \quad \{m(x, S^2) \leq \tau + Ls - Cn\} \subset \{m(x, S^1) \leq \tau + Ls\} \quad \text{in} \quad B_{Rt - \bar{R}_n(\tau + Ls)}(0)$$

where

$$\bar{R}_n(\tau + Ls) = ne^{C_1(\tau + Ls)/n} = (\tau + Ls)^{2/3}e^{C_1(\tau + Ls)^{1/3}}.$$

Now

$$Rt - \bar{R}_n(\tau + Ls) \geq t + s + (R - 2)t - \bar{R}_n(\tau + Ls) \geq t + s$$

by the definitions of R and n and by Theorem 3.6

$$m((t + s)e, S^1) \leq \tau + Ls$$

so the containment (5.7) holds at the point $x = (t + s)e$. The resulting inequality at $(t + s)e$ is

$$m((t + s)e, S^1) \leq m((t + s)e, S^2) + Cn = m((t + s)e) - \mathbb{E}[m(te)] + M_R(t) + Cn.$$

Taking expectations, applying Lemma 5.4, and using stationarity

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[m((t + s)e)] &\geq \mathbb{E}[m((t + s)e, S^1)] + \mathbb{E}[m(te)] - \mathbb{E}[M_R(t)] - Cn \\ &= \mathbb{E}[m(se)] + \mathbb{E}[m(te)] - \mathbb{E}[M_R(t)] - Cn \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}[m(se)] + \mathbb{E}[m(te)] - Ct^{1/2} \log^{1/2}(Rt) - Cn \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}[m(se)] + \mathbb{E}[m(te)] - Ct^{1/2}(t^{1/3} + \log t)^{1/2} - Ct^{2/3} \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}[m(se)] + \mathbb{E}[m(te)] - Ct^{2/3}, \end{aligned}$$

we have used stationarity to derive the second line and that $s \leq t$ in the fourth line. A similar comparison argument gives the upper bound. \square

5.3. Regularity of the asymptotic speed with respect to the normal direction. In this final section we address the regularity of $\bar{c}(e)$ with respect to varying normal direction e . This regularity plays an important role in studying the homogenization problem (1.5) with general (non-front like) initial data.

The proof follows [1, Lemma 4.7], however we need to replace Lipschitz regularity with large scale Lipschitz regularity. Note that, although the very weak localization estimate, Proposition 5.1, still allows for quantitative sublinearity with a Hölder exponent, the effect on the continuity of \bar{c} is more severe. We get only a logarithmic modulus of continuity for \bar{c} .

Lemma 5.7. *There is $C(c_{\min}, c_{\max}, \|\nabla c\|_{\infty})$ such that for $e_1, e_2 \in S^1$*

$$|\bar{c}(e_1) - \bar{c}(e_2)| \leq C |\log |e_1 - e_2||^{-1}.$$

Proof. We use that $H(e_1)$ and $H(e_2)$ are close in Hausdorff distance in B_R , distance $CR|e_1 - e_2|$, for any $R \geq 0$.

Let $R \geq C \geq 1$ to be chosen. There exist smooth compact convex sets K_R^i with Assumption 3.1, diameter bounded by CR , $K_R^i \subset H(e_i)$,

$$K_R^i \cap B_R = H(e_i) \cap B_R,$$

K_R^1 is the image of K_R^2 under the rotation sending e_1 to e_2 , and

$$d_H(K_R^1, K_R^2) \leq CR|e_1 - e_2|.$$

Then by Theorem 3.3 part (iii)

$$|m(x, K_R^1) - m(x, K_R^2)| \leq CR|e_1 - e_2|.$$

Now we fix $s = C_1^{-3} |\log |e_1 - e_2||^3$, $n = \lfloor s^{2/3} \rfloor$, and $R = ne^{C_1 s/n}$ with C_1 from Proposition 5.1. Apply Proposition 5.1 to see

$$m(se, H(e_i)) \leq m(se, K_R^i) \leq m(se, H(e_i)) + Cn.$$

Combining all of the above estimates

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{\bar{c}(e_1)} - \frac{1}{\bar{c}(e_2)} \right| &\leq Cs^{-1/3} + \frac{1}{s} |\mathbb{E}[m(se, \mathcal{H}_{e_1}^-)] - \mathbb{E}[m(se, \mathcal{H}_{e_2}^-)]| \\ &\leq Cs^{-1/3} + C \frac{n}{s} + \frac{1}{s} |m(x, K_R^1) - m(x, K_R^2)| \\ &\leq Cs^{-1/3} + C \frac{n}{s} + C \frac{1}{s} R |e_1 - e_2| \\ &= C[s^{-1/3} + \frac{n}{s} + \frac{n}{s} e^{C_1 s/n} |e_1 - e_2|] \\ &= C |\log |e_1 - e_2||^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\bar{c}(e) \geq \min c > 0$ we can also obtain the same continuity estimate for $\bar{c}(e)$. \square

APPENDIX A. RANDOM FLUCTUATIONS

In this section we prove the fluctuations bound Proposition 4.1 following [1, 2] which is based on an idea from first passage percolation by Kesten [19]. Essentially the idea is to construct a filtration $\{\mathcal{G}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ of the probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}) so that $\mathbb{E}[m(x, S) | \mathcal{G}_t]$ has bounded increments in t almost surely allowing us to use Azuma's inequality. In the discrete i.i.d. setting the σ -algebra \mathcal{G}_t would just be the smallest σ -algebra making $t \mapsto S_t = \{m(x, S) \leq t\}$ measurable, because of the

continuum setting and the finite range of dependence the definition will be a bit more complicated.

A.1. Localization in sub-level sets. One of the key observations behind the above idea is the “localization in sub-level sets” property of m , which is just another way of saying that, for a monotonically advancing front, the evolution S_t at time t only depends on the values of c in S_t .

Lemma A.1. *Fix coefficients $c_1, c_2 \in \Omega$. Suppose that $t \geq 0$ and*

$$c_1 \equiv c_2 \text{ in } \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus S : m(x, S, c_1) \leq t\}.$$

Then it holds that,

$$m(x, S, c_1) = m(x, S, c_2) \text{ in } \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus S : m(x, S, c_1) \leq t\}.$$

Proof. The proof is by a comparison principle. We call $m_j(\cdot) = m(\cdot, S, c_j)$ and F_j the corresponding PDE operators for $j = 1, 2$. We check, using that the equation is geometric and the assumption of the Lemma, that we have,

$$w(x) := m(x, S, c_1) \wedge t \text{ solves } F_2(D^2w, Dw, x) \leq 1 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus S.$$

Then by comparison principle for the metric problem Lemma 5.2 $m(x, S, c_1) \wedge t \leq m(x, S, c_2)$. Thus if $m(x, S, c_2) \leq t$ then so is $m(x, S, c_1)$ and so we can apply the same argument with

$$w(x) := m(x, S, c_2) \wedge t \text{ solves } F_1(D^2w, Dw, x) \leq 1 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus S.$$

to obtain the other inequality $m(x, S, c_2) \wedge t \leq m(x, S, c_1)$. \square

A.2. Martingale construction. Since $\{m(x, S) \leq t\}$ is a function on \mathbb{R}_+ taking values in the space of compact subsets of \mathbb{R}^2 we will need to work in the space,

$$\mathcal{K} = \text{the set of } K \text{ compact in } \mathbb{R}^2 \text{ with } S \subseteq K.$$

The space \mathcal{K} comes with the natural Hausdorff metric d_H defined as,

$$d_H(K, K') = \inf\{r > 0 : K \subseteq K' + B_r \text{ and } K' \subseteq K + B_r\}.$$

We remark that $\{m(x, S) \leq t\}$ will be a continuous map $\mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ under this metric with continuity and monotonicity estimates for $t \geq s \geq 0$,

(A.1)

$$\{m(x, S) \leq s\} + (\frac{1}{L}(t-s) - \tau)_+ B_1 \subseteq \{m(x, S) \leq t\} \subseteq \{m(x, S) \leq s\} + (1+C(t-s))B_1$$

see Lemma 3.9.

In order to make sense of events like $\{\{m(x, S) \leq t\} = K\}$, in analogy to the discrete case where $\{m(x, S) \leq t\}$ can only take finitely values, we introduce a discretization of the space \mathcal{K} . Since the metric space (\mathcal{K}, d_H) is locally compact there is a pairwise disjoint partition $(\Gamma_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ of \mathcal{K} into Borel sets of \mathcal{K} satisfying that $\text{diam}_H(\Gamma_i) \leq 1$ for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$. We represent each Γ_i by a set K_i which is the closure of $\cup_{K \in \Gamma_i} K + B_{R_0}$, we also define

$$\tilde{K}_i = K_i + B_2.$$

Note that by the 1-dependence we have that the σ -algebras \mathcal{F}_{K_i} and $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \tilde{K}_i}$ are independent. Now we can view the events,

$$E_i(t) = \{\{m(x, S) \leq t\} \in \Gamma_i\}$$

as being sufficiently fine approximations of the (possibly zero measure) events $\{\{m(x, S) \leq t\} = K\}$. For each $t > 0$ the $E_i(t)$ are a disjoint partition of Ω ,

$$\bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} E_i(t) = \Omega \text{ and the } E_i(t) \text{ are pairwise disjoint.}$$

This is a straightforward consequence of Γ_i being a partition of \mathcal{K} . The key use of the localization in sub-level sets Lemma A.1 is to show,

Lemma A.2. *For every $0 < s \leq t$ and $i \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$E_i(t) \in \mathcal{F}_{K_i}.$$

In particular $E_i(t)$ is independent of every set of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \tilde{K}_i}$.

Proof. This is a consequence of Lemma A.1 and the 1-dependence of the random field c . We define $m^{K_i}(x, S)$, a metric problem solution with localized dependence on the coefficients, as the solution of,

$$(A.2) \quad \begin{cases} -\operatorname{tr} \left[\left(I - \frac{Dm^{K_i} \otimes Dm^{K_i}}{|Dm^{K_i}|^2} \right) D^2 m^{K_i} \right] + c^{K_i}(x) |Dm^{K_i}| = 1 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus S \\ m^{K_i} = 0 & \text{on } S. \end{cases}$$

With c^{K_i} a $C\|\nabla c\|_\infty$ Lipschitz function on \mathbb{R}^d with $c^{K_i}(x) = c(x)$ for $x \in \cup_{K \in \Gamma_i} K$ and $c^{K_i}(x) = c_{\min}$ in the complement of K_i . Precisely we define c^{K_i} to be the minimal $C\|\nabla c\|_\infty$ -Lipschitz extension of $c(x)|_{\cup_{K \in \Gamma_i} K}$ to \mathbb{R}^d which is also $\geq c_{\min}$. For C sufficiently large dimensional constant this exists and equals to c_{\min} on the complement of K_i as claimed.

Then immediately $m^{K_i} \in \mathcal{F}_{K_i}$ and thus the event $F_i(t) := \{\{m^{K_i}(x, S) \leq t\} \in \Gamma_i\}$ is \mathcal{F}_{K_i} measurable as well. On the event $E_i(t)$ we have $\{m(x, S) \leq t\} \subseteq K_i$ and so by Lemma A.1 it holds that,

$$m(x, S) = m^{K_i}(x, S) \text{ for } x \in \{m(x, S) \leq t\} \text{ and thus } F_i(t) \text{ occurs as well.}$$

A similar argument shows that $F_i(t) \subseteq E_i(t)$ and so $F_i(t) = E_i(t)$ and the result is proven. \square

This allows us to define the discretization of $t \mapsto S_t = \{m(x, S) \leq t\}$,

$$(A.3) \quad \bar{S}_t := \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} K_i \mathbf{1}_{E_i(t)}.$$

From the setup that $\operatorname{diam}_h(\Gamma_i) \leq 1$ and the definition of K_i we have the discretization error estimate,

$$(A.4) \quad S_t \subseteq \bar{S}_t \subseteq S_t + B_{1+R_0}.$$

For the discretized process we have the continuity estimate which follows from Theorem 3.3 part (ii),

$$(A.5) \quad d_H(\bar{S}_t, \bar{S}_s) \leq M|t - s| + 2R_0 + 3.$$

Now we define the minimal filtration which makes \bar{S}_t adapted, \mathcal{G}_0 is the trivial σ -algebra and,

$$\mathcal{G}_t := \sigma \left(E_i(s) \cap F: 0 \leq s \leq t, i \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } F \in \mathcal{F}(K_i) \right).$$

Now, as usual for martingale based concentration bounds, for a fixed $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ we decompose $m(x, S) - \mathbb{E}[m(x, S)]$ by a sum of martingale differences. Consider the \mathcal{G}_t -adapted martingale,

$$(A.6) \quad X_t := \mathbb{E}[m(x, S)|\mathcal{G}_t] - \mathbb{E}[m(x, S)].$$

Since \mathcal{G}_0 is trivial we have $X_0 = 0$, while for t sufficiently large, $t \geq \tau + Ld(x, S)$ we are guaranteed that $m(x, S) \leq t$ and so we expect that $m(x, S)$ is almost (because of the discretization) \mathcal{G}_t measurable. We make this rigorous with the following,

Lemma A.3. *For every $0 < s \leq t$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$,*

$$|m(x, S) - \mathbb{E}[m(x, S)|\mathcal{G}_t]| \mathbf{1}_{x \in \bar{S}_s} \leq 8\tau$$

and in particular when $t \geq \tau + Ld(x, S)$,

$$|m(x, S) - \mathbb{E}[m(x, S)|\mathcal{G}_t]| \leq 8\tau.$$

The proof of Lemma A.3 will follow at the end of the section. Now to apply Azuma's inequality we aim to show the bounded differences estimate for $0 < s \leq t$,

$$(A.7) \quad |X_t - X_s| \leq C_1|t - s| + C_2.$$

With Lemma A.3 in mind we make the decomposition,

$$X_t = \mathbb{E}[m(x, S)|\mathcal{G}_t] \mathbf{1}_{x \in \bar{S}_s} + \mathbb{E}[m(x, S) \mathbf{1}_{x \notin \bar{S}_s} | \mathcal{G}_t] - \mathbb{E}[m(x, S)]$$

$$X_s = \mathbb{E}[m(x, S)|\mathcal{G}_s] \mathbf{1}_{x \in \bar{S}_s} + \mathbb{E}[m(x, S) \mathbf{1}_{x \notin \bar{S}_s} | \mathcal{G}_s] - \mathbb{E}[m(x, S)]$$

and see that the first terms are the same modulo constants via Lemma A.3 so we can estimate,

$$|X_t - X_s| \leq |\mathbb{E}[m(x, S) \mathbf{1}_{x \notin \bar{S}_s} | \mathcal{G}_t] - \mathbb{E}[m(x, S) \mathbf{1}_{x \notin \bar{S}_s} | \mathcal{G}_s]| + 16\tau$$

Since we are now on the event $x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \bar{S}_s$ we can use the semi-group type property can replace $m(x, S)$ by $m(x, \bar{S}_s) + s$ up to a constant error coming from the discretization,

Lemma A.4. *For every $t > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus S_t$,*

$$|m(x, S) - (t + m(x, \bar{S}_t))| \leq 4\tau$$

The proof of Lemma A.4 is relatively simple and is omitted, the argument is by comparison principle in $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \bar{S}_t$ and uses Theorem 3.3 part (iii) along with the fact (which follows immediately from the definitions) that $\bar{S}_t \subset \{m(x, S) \leq t\} + B_{1+R_0}$.

Lemma A.4 allows us to rewrite,

$$|X_t - X_s| \leq |\mathbb{E}[m(x, \bar{S}_s) \mathbf{1}_{x \notin \bar{S}_s} | \mathcal{G}_t] - \mathbb{E}[m(x, \bar{S}_s) \mathbf{1}_{x \notin \bar{S}_s} | \mathcal{G}_s]| + 20\tau$$

We can also pull out $\mathbf{1}_{x \notin \bar{S}_s}$ from both the expectations at this stage since it is \mathcal{G}_s measurable and then bound it by 1. Then using the continuity estimate (A.5) to bound $d_H(\bar{S}_t, \bar{S}_s)$ and the continuity of $m(x, \cdot)$ with respect to d_H from (A.5),

$$|X_t - X_s| \leq |\mathbb{E}[m(x, \bar{S}_t) | \mathcal{G}_t] - \mathbb{E}[m(x, \bar{S}_s) | \mathcal{G}_s]| + M|t - s| + 24\tau$$

Now finally we are able to use that \bar{S}_t is \mathcal{G}_t measurable (respectively \bar{S}_s is a \mathcal{G}_s measurable) to evaluate the conditional expectations,

Lemma A.5. *For every $t > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$,*

$$|\mathbb{E}[m(x, \bar{S}_t) | \mathcal{G}_t] - \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}[m(x, K_i) \mathbf{1}_{E_i(t)}]| \leq \tau + 2L.$$

The proof of Lemma A.5 can be found below. Applying Lemma A.5 twice we obtain,

$$|X_t - X_s| \leq \sum_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}} |\mathbb{E}[m(x, K_i)] - \mathbb{E}[m(x, K_j)]| \mathbf{1}_{E_i(t) \cap E_j(s)} + M|t - s| + 28\tau.$$

Again using the continuity of $m(x, \cdot)$ with respect to d_H and then the continuity estimate of \bar{S} from (A.5),

$$\begin{aligned} |X_t - X_s| &\leq \sum_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}} (\tau + Ld_H(K_i, K_j)) \mathbf{1}_{E_i(t) \cap E_j(s)} + M|t - s| + 28\tau \\ &= \tau + Ld_H(\bar{S}_t, \bar{S}_s) + M|t - s| + 28\tau \\ &\leq (1 + L)M|t - s| + 34\tau. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the bounded increments estimate (A.7).

Now we are finally able to apply Azuma's inequality. Fix $T = (\tau + Ld(x, S)) \vee 1$ so that by Lemma A.3

$$(A.8) \quad |X_T - (m(x, S) - \mathbb{E}m(x, S))| \leq 8\tau.$$

Then we divide the interval $[0, T]$ up into $N = T/T_0$ increments of length T_0 . Then Azuma's inequality yields for every $\lambda > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(|X_T| > \lambda) \leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{\lambda^2}{2N(2LMT_0 + 34\tau)^2} \right).$$

Evidently it is best, up to constants, to choose $T_0 = R_0/M$ which results in the estimate,

$$\mathbb{P}(|X_T| > \lambda) \leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{R_0 \lambda^2}{CM\tau^2 T} \right).$$

As per (A.8) we can replace X_T by the fluctuation $m(x, S) - \mathbb{E}m(x, S)$,

$$\mathbb{P}(|m(x, S) - \mathbb{E}m(x, S)| > \lambda) \leq C \exp \left(-\frac{c_{\min} \min\{1, c_{\min}^2\} \lambda^2}{Cc_{\max} d(x, S)} \right).$$

This is the fluctuation estimate claimed in Proposition 4.1.

We complete the proof of Proposition 4.1 with proofs of Lemma A.3 and Lemma A.5.

Proof of Lemma A.3. The second part follows from the first and Lemma 3.9 since for $t \geq \tau + Ld(x, S)$ it holds that $x \in S_t$ almost surely. We again make use of the localization $m^{K_i}(x, S)$, defined above in (A.2) which is $\mathcal{F}(K_i)$ measurable. Note that by the definition m^{K_i} satisfies the same estimates as m (e.g. Theorem 3.6). As in the proof of Lemma A.2,

$$m(x, S) = m^{K_i}(x, S) \quad \text{on the event } E_i(s) \text{ and } x \in \cap_{K \in \Gamma_i} K.$$

Then by the Lipschitz continuity we have,

$$|m(x, S) - m^{K_i}(x, S)| \mathbf{1}_{E_i(s)} \leq 2(\tau + LR_0) \quad \text{for all } x \in K_i \subset \cap_{K \in \Gamma_i} K + B_{1+R_0}.$$

Thus we can replace $m(x, S) \mathbf{1}_{x \in \bar{S}_s} = \sum_{i: x \in K_i} m(x, S) \mathbf{1}_{E_i(s)}$ with $\sum_{i: x \in K_i} m^{K_i}(x, S) \mathbf{1}_{E_i(s)}$ at the cost of a constant error,

$$(A.9) \quad |m(x, S) \mathbf{1}_{x \in \bar{S}_s} - \sum_{i: x \in K_i} m^{K_i}(x, S) \mathbf{1}_{E_i(s)}| \leq 2(\tau + LR_0) = C_0.$$

Making this substitution and using that $m^{K_i}(x, S)\mathbf{1}_{E_i(s)}$ is \mathcal{G}_s (and hence \mathcal{G}_t) measurable we get,

$$\begin{aligned} |m(x, S) - \mathbb{E}[m(x, S)|\mathcal{G}_t]|\mathbf{1}_{x \in \bar{S}_s} &\leq C_0 + \left| \sum_{i: x \in K_i} m^{K_i}(x, S)\mathbf{1}_{E_i(s)} - \mathbb{E}[m(x, S)\mathbf{1}_{x \in \bar{S}_s}|\mathcal{G}_t] \right| \\ &= C_0 + |\mathbb{E}[\sum_{i: x \in K_i} m^{K_i}(x, S)\mathbf{1}_{E_i(s)} - m(x, S)\mathbf{1}_{x \in \bar{S}_s}|\mathcal{G}_t]| \\ &\leq 2C_0 \end{aligned}$$

where in the last line we have again used (A.9). \square

Proof of Lemma A.5. Here is where the 1-dependence of the random field is really put to use. We first claim that for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t > 0$,

$$(A.10) \quad \mathbb{E}[m(x, \tilde{K}_i)\mathbf{1}_{E_i(t)}|\mathcal{G}_t] = \mathbb{E}[m(x, \tilde{K}_i)]\mathbf{1}_{E_i(t)}.$$

To prove this we need to show the following independence, for every $A \in \mathcal{G}_t$,

$$\mathbb{E}[m(x, \tilde{K}_i)\mathbf{1}_{E_i(t) \cap A}] = \mathbb{E}[m(x, \tilde{K}_i)]\mathbb{P}(E \cap A).$$

Note that $m(x, \tilde{K}_i) \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \tilde{K}_i)$, we wish to show that for $A \in \mathcal{G}_t$ we have $A \cap E_i(t) \in \mathcal{F}(K_i)$ then we will be done because of the 1-dependence. Since events of the form $A = F \cap E_j(s)$ for $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $F \in \mathcal{F}(K_j)$ and $0 < s \leq t$ generate \mathcal{G}_t we can just argue for such events. In that case $A \cap E_i(t) = F \cap E_j(s) \cap E_i(t)$. If $\mathbb{P}(E_j(s) \cap E_i(t)) = 0$ then we are done, otherwise we can show by the monotonicity, that (almost) $K_j \subseteq K_i$. More precisely, if $E_j(s) \cap E_i(t)$ has positive probability then on that event,

$$K_j \subseteq \{m(x, S) \leq s\} + B_{1+R_0} \subseteq \{m(x, S) \leq t\} + B_{1+R_0} \subseteq K_i + B_1.$$

Of course taken together this is a deterministic containment and so we obtain that $A \cap E_i(t) \in \mathcal{F}(K_i + B_1)$ and hence it is independent of $\mathcal{F}(\tilde{K}_i) = \mathcal{F}(K_i + B_2)$. This completes the proof of (A.10).

Now we can make use of the independence (A.10) to compute,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[m(x, \bar{S}_t)|\mathcal{G}_t] &= \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}[m(x, K_i)\mathbf{1}_{E_i(t)}|\mathcal{G}_t] \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}[m(x, \tilde{K}_i)\mathbf{1}_{E_i(t)}|\mathcal{G}_t] + \tau + 2L \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}[m(x, \tilde{K}_i)|\mathcal{G}_t]\mathbf{1}_{E_i(t)} + \tau + 2L \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}[m(x, K_i)|\mathcal{G}_t]\mathbf{1}_{E_i(t)} + \tau + 2L. \end{aligned}$$

The other direction is similar. \square

APPENDIX B. LOCALIZED UNIQUENESS

The proof of Lemma 5.2 somewhat technically involved so we give a brief outline and explanation of the ideas, emphasizing the places where our proof needs to differ from that of [1].

At a high level the proof of finite speed of propagation is basically a quantified proof of uniqueness. Intuitively speaking the idea of the proof is to make a bending in the interface S_t^1 to \tilde{S}_t^1 so that \tilde{S}_t^1 almost solves the same forced mean curvature

flow and the two sets are close near the origin, but the complement of B_R is always contained in \tilde{S}_t^1 for positive times. Again speaking intuitively \tilde{S}_t^1 is basically an interpolation between S_t^1 and a shrinking ball supersolution. The way of making this bending is basically by looking at an evolution like $S_{t+\varphi(t,x)}$ where φ is very slowly varying so that the solution property is only slightly perturbed. This kind of perturbation is much more straightforward to analyze at the level of the metric problem where it is simply additive.

The main new issues which arise in our case are the following (1) the Lipschitz estimate holds for $m(x) \wedge s$ not $m(x)$ itself, (2) the Lipschitz estimate grows exponentially in s affecting the choice of all the parameters, (3) we need to work always with $m(x, S)$ and not with solutions of the metric problem with general boundary data on a half space. The final issue is probably the most interesting difference. Our results Theorem 3.3 parts (i) and (iv) rely on connection of the metric problem with the interface evolution, this connection is a bit more difficult to exploit in the case of nontrivial boundary data on ∂S since this amounts to a boundary data problem for (1.1) which is of course more difficult to analyze than a problem in the whole space. This is the reason that Lemma 5.2 is phrased somewhat differently than [1, Proposition 4.2], in the end we believe this phrasing also makes the connection with the underlying interface evolution more clear.

Proof of Lemma 5.2. 1. We claim it suffices to prove that, under all the assumptions of the Lemma, weaker conclusion holds

$$(B.1) \quad \mathbf{1}_{\{m(x, S^2) \leq s-1\}}(0) \leq \mathbf{1}_{\{m(x, S^1) \leq s\}}(0).$$

First we prove that this weaker result suffices to prove the full Lemma. Let $x_0 \in B_{R-\bar{R}(s)}(0)$. Note that by assumption $R - |x_0| \geq R(s)$ and so the weaker conclusion (B.1) holds and

$$\mathbf{1}_{\{m(x, S^2) \leq s-1\}}(x_0) \leq \mathbf{1}_{\{m(x, S^1) \leq s\}}(x_0).$$

Since $x_0 \in B_{R-\bar{R}(s)}(0)$ was arbitrary we conclude

$$\{m(x, S^2) \leq s-1\} \subset \{m(x, S^1) \leq s\} \quad \text{on } B_{R-\bar{R}(s)}(0).$$

2. Now we prove the weaker conclusion of the Lemma (B.1). Define,

$$w^i(x, t) = \min\{m(x, S^i), t\},$$

which are solutions of the forced mean curvature flow equation,

$$w_t^i - \operatorname{tr}\left[\left(I - \frac{Dw^i \otimes Dw^i}{|Dw^i|^2}\right) D^2 w^i\right] + c(x)|Dw^i| = 1 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus S^i \times (0, \infty).$$

We introduce a slight perturbation of w^1 which have the effect of localizing the maximum of $w^1(x) - w^2(y)$ near to the origin while only making a small change to the gradient and Hessian of w^1 . Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ to be chosen in the course of the proof (depending on s) and take $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ to be smooth convex and non-decreasing satisfying,

$$g(t) = \varepsilon t + \frac{1}{3} \quad \text{for } t \in [0, \infty) \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} g'(t) \leq \varepsilon, \quad \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} g''(t) \leq \varepsilon.$$

Now based on g we define our localizing perturbation,

$$\psi(x, t) := g((1 + |x|^2)^{1/2} - (s - t)).$$

Let $\delta > 0$ and $2 > \eta > 1$ to be chosen later depending on ε (and hence on s) and consider the doubled variable function $\Psi : \bar{S}^1 \times \bar{S}^2 \times [0, s] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by,

$$\Psi(x, y, t) = w^1(x, t) - \eta w^2(y, t) - \frac{|x - y|^4}{4\delta} - \psi(x, t).$$

The function Ψ attains its maximum on $\bar{S}^1 \times \bar{S}^2 \times [0, s]$ since w^1 is bounded, w^2 is non-negative and $\psi(x, t) \rightarrow +\infty$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly over $t \in [0, s]$. Call the point (x_0, y_0, t_0) where the maximum of Ψ is attained.

One can immediately obtain an upper bound on $|x_0 - y_0| \lesssim \delta^{1/4}$ using the fact that w^1 is bounded from above but this is not sufficient for the comparison argument. Some quantitative continuity estimate is necessary (since the desired result is quantitative) to obtain a better bound of $|x_0 - y_0|$ and this is why we need the local Lipschitz estimate of Theorem 3.3 part (i). From the maximizing property we know,

$$\Psi(x_0, y_0, t_0) \geq \Psi(y_0, y_0, t_0)$$

and since w^1 is Lipschitz continuous in x on $[0, s]$ with constant $\exp(\|Dc\|_\infty s)$,

$$\frac{|x_0 - y_0|^4}{4\delta} \leq w^1(x_0, t_0) - w^1(y_0, t_0) + \psi(y_0, t_0) - \psi(x_0, t_0) \leq (C\varepsilon + e^{\|Dc\|_\infty s})|x_0 - y_0|,$$

or rearranging,

$$(B.2) \quad |x_0 - y_0| \leq Ce^{\|Dc\|_\infty s/3} \delta^{1/3}.$$

This estimate will play an important role later in dealing with the x -dependence of the coefficients.

We claim that, under a good choice of η , the maximum of Ψ has to be obtained on the parabolic boundary,

$$\text{either } t_0 = 0 \text{ or one of } x_0 \in \partial S^1 \text{ or } y_0 \in \partial S^2.$$

Suppose otherwise, that is we assume $t_0 > 0$ and $(x_0, y_0) \in S^1 \times S^2$ and so Ψ has an interior local maximum at (x_0, y_0, t_0) .

Now we are able to apply the standard viscosity solution comparison principle results, see [11] Theorem 8.3, to obtain that there are 2×2 symmetric matrices X and Y and $b_1, b_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ with,

$$\begin{cases} (X, \xi_0 + D\psi(x_0, t_0), b_1) \in \mathcal{P}_{x,t}^{2,+} w^1(x_0, t_0) \\ (Y, \eta^{-1}\xi_0, \eta^{-1}b_2) \in \mathcal{P}_{x,t}^{2,-} w^2(y_0, t_0) \end{cases},$$

with $b_1 - b_2 = \partial_t \psi(x_0, t)$ both non-negative, $\xi_0 := \delta^{-1}|x_0 - y_0|^2(x_0 - y_0)$ and the matrices X, Y satisfy for every $\gamma > 0$,

$$(B.3) \quad -(\frac{1}{\gamma} + |A|)I_{4 \times 4} \leq \begin{pmatrix} X + D^2\psi(x_0, t_0) & 0 \\ 0 & -\eta Y \end{pmatrix} \leq A + \gamma A^2.$$

where

$$A = \frac{1}{\delta} \begin{pmatrix} B & -B \\ -B & B \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{with } B = |x_0 - y_0|^2 I_{2 \times 2} + (x_0 - y_0) \otimes (x_0 - y_0).$$

For $x_0 \neq y_0$, which we will show below is the case, we take $\gamma = |A|^{-1}$ to get,

$$(B.4) \quad -\frac{C}{\delta} |x_0 - y_0|^2 I_{4 \times 4} \leq \begin{pmatrix} X + D^2\psi(x_0, t_0) & 0 \\ 0 & -\eta Y \end{pmatrix} \leq \frac{C}{\delta} |x_0 - y_0|^2 \begin{pmatrix} I_{2 \times 2} & -I_{2 \times 2} \\ -I_{2 \times 2} & I_{2 \times 2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

where the second inequality can be seen by writing out the definition of the matrix inequality and using the bound $B \leq 3|x_0 - y_0|^2 I_{2 \times 2}$. One obtains immediately from (B.4) by testing the left inequality by (v, v) on the left and $(v, v)^t$ on the right that,

$$(X - \eta Y) \leq -D^2\psi(x_0, t_0) \leq 0,$$

using convexity of ψ in x for the second inequality.

Now we show that $x_0 \neq y_0$ in fact with a lower bound on their distance, guaranteeing thereby a lower bound on $|\xi_0|$ so that we can avoid the singularity of the equation at $\xi_0 = 0$. For this we use the supersolution property of w^2 ,

$$(B.5) \quad \eta^{-1}b_2 - \text{tr}^*((I - \frac{\xi_0 \otimes \xi_0}{|\xi_0|^2})Y) + c(y_0)|\xi_0| \geq 1.$$

By multiplying the condition at the maximum (B.4) on the left and right by vectors $(0, v)$ and $(0, v)^t$ respectively we have

$$-Y \leq C(\eta\delta)^{-1}|x_0 - y_0|^2 \leq C\delta^{-1}|x_0 - y_0|^2,$$

if $|\xi_0| = 0$ then use (B.3) instead with any value of γ to get $-Y \leq 0$. Now plugging this back into the supersolution condition,

$$\eta^{-1}b_2 + C\delta^{-1}|x_0 - y_0|^2 + c(y_0)|\xi_0| \geq 1.$$

Using that $b_1 \leq 1$ and $b_2 = b_1 - \partial_t\psi(x_0, t_0) \leq 1$ this inequality becomes,

$$C\delta^{-1/3}|\xi_0|^{2/3} + c_{\max}|\xi_0| \geq 1 - \eta^{-1} \geq \frac{1}{2}(\eta - 1).$$

From here we see that $|\xi_0| \geq \frac{1}{C}\delta^{1/2}(\eta - 1)^{3/2}$. Given this lower bound we impose the requirement that

$$(B.6) \quad \varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{C}\delta^{1/2}(\eta - 1)^{3/2}$$

so that, with $\xi_1 = \xi_0 + D\psi(x_0, t_0)$, $|\xi_1| \geq \frac{1}{2}|\xi_0|$.

Now we use the lower bound of ξ_0 to deal with the perturbation term in the gradient of w^1 . From the sub-solution property of w^1 ,

$$b_1 - \text{tr} \left[(I - \frac{\xi_1 \otimes \xi_1}{|\xi_1|^2})(X + D^2\psi(x_0, t_0)) \right] + c(x_0)|\xi_1| \leq 1.$$

Now using this equation as well as the lower bound on ξ_1 and ξ_0 and the upper bounds of $D^2\psi$ and $D\psi$,

$$(B.7) \quad \begin{aligned} b_1 - \text{tr} \left[(I - \frac{\xi_0 \otimes \xi_0}{|\xi_0|^2})X \right] + c(x_0)|\xi_0| &\leq 1 + C|\xi_0|^{-1}|D\psi(x_0, t_0)||X| + |D^2\psi(x_0, t_0)| + c_{\max}|D\psi(x_0, t_0)| \\ &\leq 1 + Ce^{2\|Dc\|_{\infty}s/3}(\eta - 1)^{-3/2}\delta^{-5/6}\varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (B.4) again to obtain that,

$$|X| \leq \frac{C}{\delta}|x_0 - y_0|^2 + C\varepsilon \leq Ce^{2\|Dc\|_{\infty}s/3}\delta^{-1/3}.$$

Now finally we compare the viscosity solution conditions for w^1 and w^2 to get a contradiction. Subtracting (B.5) from (B.7) and using that $X - \eta Y \leq 0$,

$$b_1 - b_2 + (c(x_0) - c(y_0))|\xi_0| \leq 1 - \eta + Ce^{2\|Dc\|_{\infty}s/3}(\eta - 1)^{-3/2}\delta^{-5/6}\varepsilon,$$

which can be rearranging, using $|c(x_0) - c(y_0)| |\xi_0| \leq \|Dc\|_\infty \delta^{-1} |x_0 - y_0|^4$ and $b_1 - b_2 = \partial_t \psi$, to become

$$\eta - 1 \leq C e^{2\|Dc\|_\infty s/3} \left[(\eta - 1)^{-3/2} \delta^{-5/6} \varepsilon + \delta^{1/3} \right] \leq C (\eta - 1)^{-3/2} e^{2\|Dc\|_\infty s/3} \left[\delta^{-5/6} \varepsilon + \delta^{1/3} \right]$$

to make the two terms on the right of the same size we choose $\delta := \varepsilon^{6/7} (\eta - 1)^{-9/7}$ so that,

$$(\eta - 1)^{10/7} \leq C e^{2\|Dc\|_\infty s/3} \varepsilon^{2/7}$$

which will result in a contradiction if η is chosen as,

$$\eta := 1 + C e^{7\|Dc\|_\infty s/15} \varepsilon^{1/5}.$$

We remark that this choice is indeed consistent with the requirement (B.6) on ε since given our choices (B.6) becomes $\varepsilon \leq C e^{Cs} \varepsilon^{33/70}$ which is certainly satisfied when $\varepsilon < 1$ and that under this choice $\delta(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Now we have justified, given the choices of δ, η as above, that the maximum of $\Psi(x, y, t)$ over $\bar{S}^1 \times \bar{S}^2 \times [0, s]$ is achieved on the parabolic boundary. There are still several cases that we need to consider, (i) that $t_0 = 0$, (ii) that $x_0 \in \partial S^1$, (iii) that $y_0 \in \partial S^2$. We will show that in all three cases (at worst),

$$(B.8) \quad \max \Psi \leq \frac{1}{3}.$$

If $t_0 = 0$, both $w^i(x, 0) = 0$, so

$$\max \Psi = w^1(x_0, 0) - \eta w^2(y_0, 0) - \frac{|x_0 - y_0|^4}{4\delta} - \psi(x_0, 0) \leq 0.$$

Next we argue when $x_0 \in \partial S^1$, the other case when $y_0 \in \partial S^2$ is similar. First let us suppose that $x_0 \in B_R$, in that case we use the boundary condition $w^1(x_0, t_0) = 0 \leq w^2(x_0, t_0)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \max \Psi &= w^1(x_0, t_0) - \eta w^2(y_0, t_0) - \frac{|x_0 - y_0|^4}{4\delta} - \psi(x_0, t_0) \\ &\leq w^2(x_0, t_0) - w^2(y_0, t_0) \\ &\leq \frac{2}{c_{\min}} e^{\|Dc\|_\infty s} |x_0 - y_0| \leq C e^{4\|Dc\|_\infty s/3} \delta^{1/3} \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the local Lipschitz estimate Theorem 3.3 part (i) for the second inequality. For ε (and hence δ) small enough, in this case $\varepsilon \leq e^{-Cs}$ for a large enough C will suffice and ε will be chosen as such below, we obtain,

$$\max \Psi \leq \frac{1}{3}.$$

Note that here we could have used the large scale Lipschitz estimate instead, but we will need to choose ε and δ exponentially small in s anyway in the second paragraph below.

If, on the other hand, $x_0 \in \partial S^1 \setminus B_R$ or $y_0 \in \partial S^2 \setminus B_R$ then,

$$\max \Psi \leq s - \eta w^2(y_0, t) - \psi(x_0, t_0) \leq s - g(R - s) \leq s - \varepsilon(R - s) \leq 0$$

as long as

$$(B.9) \quad R \geq s \left(1 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right).$$

This completes the proof of (B.8).

Now from (B.8) we derive the result. By the assumed bounds,

$$w^1(0, s) \leq \eta w^2(0, s) + \frac{1}{3} + \psi(0, s) \leq w^2(0, s) + (\eta - 1)s + \frac{2}{3} \leq w^2(0, s) + 1$$

as long as we choose ε so that,

$$(\eta - 1)s = Ce^{7\|Dc\|_\infty s/15} \varepsilon^{1/5} s \leq \frac{1}{3}$$

i.e.

$$\varepsilon = e^{-Cs} \quad \text{with constant } C = C(\|Dc\|_\infty, c_{\min}).$$

Now we can satisfy (B.9) by the constraint $R \geq e^{Cs}$ and obtain

$$\min\{m^1(0), s\} \leq \min\{m^2(0), s\} + 1.$$

Now if $m(0, S^2) < s - 1$ then $\min\{m(0, S^1), s\} < s - 1 + 1 = s$ and hence $m(0, S^1) < s$. Thus we obtain (B.1). □

REFERENCES

- [1] Scott Armstrong and Pierre Cardaliaguet, *Stochastic homogenization of quasilinear Hamilton-Jacobi equations and geometric motions*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **20** (2018), no. 4, 797–864. MR3779686
- [2] Scott N. Armstrong, Pierre Cardaliaguet, and Panagiotis E. Souganidis, *Error estimates and convergence rates for the stochastic homogenization of Hamilton-Jacobi equations*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **27** (2014), no. 2, 479–540. MR3164987
- [3] Scott N. Armstrong and Panagiotis E. Souganidis, *Stochastic Homogenization of Level-Set Convex Hamilton-Jacobi Equations*, International Mathematics Research Notices **2013** (201206), no. 15, 3420–3449, available at <http://oup.prod.sis.lan/imrn/article-pdf/2013/15/3420/19041628/rns155.pdf>.
- [4] ———, *Stochastic homogenization of level-set convex Hamilton-Jacobi equations*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN **15** (2013), 3420–3449. MR3089731
- [5] T. Bodineau and A. Teixeira, *Interface motion in random media*, Comm. Math. Phys. **334** (2015), no. 2, 843–865. MR3306605
- [6] L. A. Caffarelli and R. Monneau, *Counter-example in three dimension and homogenization of geometric motions in two dimension*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **212** (2014), no. 2, 503–574. MR3176351
- [7] P. Cardaliaguet, P.-L. Lions, and P. E. Souganidis, *A discussion about the homogenization of moving interfaces*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **91** (2009), no. 4, 339–363. MR2518002
- [8] Annalisa Cesaroni and Matteo Novaga, *Long-time behavior of the mean curvature flow with periodic forcing*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **38** (2013), no. 5, 780–801. MR3046293
- [9] Yun Gang Chen, Yoshikazu Giga, and Shun'ichi Goto, *Uniqueness and existence of viscosity solutions of generalized mean curvature flow equations*, J. Differential Geom. **33** (1991), no. 3, 749–786. MR1100211
- [10] Michael G. Crandall, Hitoshi Ishii, and Pierre-Louis Lions, *User's guide to viscosity solutions of second order partial differential equations*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.) **27** (1992), no. 1, 1–67. MR1118699
- [11] ———, *User's guide to viscosity solutions of second order partial differential equations*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.) **27** (1992), no. 1, 1–67. MR1118699
- [12] Michael G. Crandall and Pierre-Louis Lions, *On existence and uniqueness of solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations*, Nonlinear Anal. **10** (1986), no. 4, 353–370. MR836671
- [13] N. Dirr, G. Karali, and N. K. Yip, *Pulsating wave for mean curvature flow in inhomogeneous medium*, European J. Appl. Math. **19** (2008), no. 6, 661–699. MR2463225
- [14] N. Dirr and N. K. Yip, *Pinning and de-pinning phenomena in front propagation in heterogeneous media*, Interfaces Free Bound. **8** (2006), no. 1, 79–109. MR2231253
- [15] Deniz Erta? and Mehran Kardar, *Critical dynamics of contact line depinning*, Physical Review E **49** (1994Apr), no. 4, R2532?R2535.
- [16] Hongwei Gao and Inwon Kim, *Head and tail speeds of mean curvature flow with forcing*, Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis (2019Jul).

- [17] Y. Giga, S. Goto, H. Ishii, and M.-H. Sato, *Comparison principle and convexity preserving properties for singular degenerate parabolic equations on unbounded domains*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **40** (1991), no. 2, 443–470. MR1119185
- [18] Mehran Kardar, *Nonequilibrium dynamics of interfaces and lines*, Physics Reports **301** (1998Jul), no. 1-3, 85–112.
- [19] Harry Kesten, *On the speed of convergence in first-passage percolation*, Ann. Appl. Probab. **3** (1993), no. 2, 296–338. MR1221154
- [20] Pierre-Louis Lions and Panagiotis E. Souganidis, *Homogenization of degenerate second-order PDE in periodic and almost periodic environments and applications*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **22** (2005), no. 5, 667–677. MR2171996
- [21] Moto-Hiko Sato, *Comparison principle for singular degenerate elliptic equations on unbounded domains*, Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A Math. Sci. **66** (1990), no. 8, 252–256. MR1077608
- [22] Panagiotis E. Souganidis, *Existence of viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations*, J. Differential Equations **56** (1985), no. 3, 345–390. MR780496
- [23] Semjon Stepanow, Thomas Nattermann, Lei-Han Tang, and Heiko Leschhorn, *Dynamics of interface depinning in a disordered medium*, Soft order in physical systems, 1994, pp. 155–158.

INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY, 1 EINSTEIN DR, PRINCETON, NJ 08540

E-mail address: `wfeldman@math.ias.edu`