

The Allen-Cahn equation on the complete Riemannian manifolds of finite volume

Akashdeep Dey *

Abstract

The semi-linear, elliptic PDE $AC_\varepsilon(u) := -\varepsilon^2 \Delta u + W'(u) = 0$ is called the Allen-Cahn equation. In this article we will prove the existence of finite energy solution to the Allen-Cahn equation on certain complete, non-compact manifolds. More precisely, suppose M^{n+1} (with $n+1 \geq 3$) is a complete Riemannian manifold of finite volume. Then there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, depending on the ambient Riemannian metric, such that for all $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$, there exists $u_\varepsilon : M \rightarrow (-1, 1)$ satisfying $AC_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) = 0$ with the energy $E_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) < \infty$ and the Morse index $\text{Ind}(u_\varepsilon) \leq 1$. Moreover, $0 < \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} E_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) \leq \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} E_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) < \infty$. Our result is motivated by the theorem of Chambers-Liokumovich [CL20] and Song [Son19], which says that M contains a complete minimal hypersurface Σ with $0 < \mathcal{H}^n(\Sigma) < \infty$. This theorem can be recovered from our result.

1 Introduction

Minimal hypersurfaces are the critical points of the area functional. By the combined works of Almgren [Alm65], Pitts [Pit81] and Schoen-Simon [SS81], every closed Riemannian manifold (M^{n+1}, g) , $n+1 \geq 3$, contains a closed minimal hypersurface, which is smooth and embedded outside a singular set of Hausdorff dimension $\leq n-7$.

Recently, Almgren-Pitts min-max theory has been further extended and it has been discovered that minimal hypersurfaces exist in abundance. By the works of Marques-Neves [MN17] and Song [Son18], every closed Riemannian manifold (M^{n+1}, g) , $3 \leq n+1 \leq 7$, contains infinitely many closed, minimal hypersurfaces. This was conjectured by Yau [Yau82]. In [IMN18], Irie, Marques and Neves proved that for a generic metric g on M , the union of all closed, minimal hypersurfaces is dense in (M, g) . This theorem was later quantified by Marques, Neves and Song in [MNS19] where they proved that for a generic metric there exists an equidistributed sequence of closed, minimal hypersurfaces in (M, g) . Recently, Song and Zhou [SZ20] proved the generic scarring phenomena for minimal hypersurfaces, which can be interpreted as the opposite of the equidistribution phenomena. In [Zho20], Zhou proved that for a generic (bumpy) metric, the min-max minimal hypersurfaces have multiplicity one, which was conjectured by Marques and Neves. Using this theorem, Marques and Neves

*Email: adey@math.princeton.edu, dey.akash01@gmail.com

[MN16, MN18] proved that for a generic (bumpy) metric g , there exists a sequence of closed, two sided minimal hypersurfaces $\{\Sigma_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ in (M, g) such that $\text{Ind}(\Sigma_k) = k$ and $\mathcal{H}^n(\Sigma_k) \sim k^{\frac{1}{n+1}}$. In higher dimensions, Li [Li19] proved the existence of infinitely many closed minimal hypersurfaces (with optimal regularity) for a generic set of metrics. While the arguments in [IMN18], [MNS19] and [Li19] depend on the Weyl law for the volume spectrum, which was conjectured by Gromov [Gro03] and proved by Liokumovich, Marques and Neves [LMN18], the arguments in [Son18] and [SZ20] use the cylindrical Weyl law, which was proved by Song [Son18].

In the above mentioned theorems, the ambient manifolds are assumed to be closed. If M is a complete non-compact manifold, Gromov [Gro14] proved that either M contains a complete minimal hypersurface with finite area or every compact domain of M admits a (possibly singular) strictly mean convex foliation. In [Mon16], Montezuma proved that a complete Riemannian manifold with a bounded, strictly mean concave domain contains a complete minimal hypersurface with finite area. The existence of minimal surfaces in hyperbolic 3-manifolds has been proved by Collin-Hauswirth-Mazet-Rosenberg [CHMR17], Huang-Wang [HW17] and Coskunuzer [Cos18]. In [CK18], Chodosh and Ketover proved the existence of minimal planes in asymptotically flat 3-manifolds. In [CL20], Chambers and Liokumovich proved that every complete Riemannian manifold with finite volume contains a complete minimal hypersurface with finite area. In [Son19], Song proved Yau's conjecture on certain complete non-compact manifolds. Moreover, he also proved the local version of the above mentioned theorem of Gromov [Gro14], using which he gave alternative proofs of the above mentioned theorems of Montezuma [Mon16] and Chambers-Liokumovich [CL20].

In [Gua18], Guaraco introduced a new approach for the min-max construction of minimal hypersurfaces, which was further developed by Gaspar and Guaraco in [GG18]. This approach is based on the study of the limiting behaviour of solutions to the Allen-Cahn equation. The Allen-Cahn equation (with parameter $\varepsilon > 0$) is the following semi-linear, elliptic PDE

$$AC_\varepsilon(u) := -\varepsilon^2 \Delta u + W'(u) = 0 \tag{1.1}$$

where $W : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is a double well potential e.g. $W(t) = \frac{1}{4}(1 - t^2)^2$. The solutions of this equation are precisely the critical points of the energy functional

$$E_\varepsilon(u) = \int_M \varepsilon \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{2} + \frac{W(u)}{\varepsilon}.$$

Informally speaking, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, the level sets of the solutions to (1.1) (with uniformly bounded energy) accumulate around a generalized minimal hypersurface (called a *limit-interface*). In particular, Modica [Mod87] and Sternberg [Ste88] proved that as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, the energy minimizing solutions to (1.1) converge to a area minimizing hypersurface. For general solutions to (1.1), Hutchinson and Tonegawa [HT00] proved that the limit-interface is a stationary, integral varifold. Moreover, if the solutions are stable, by the works of Tonegawa [Ton05], Wickramasekera

[Wic14] and Tonegawa-Wickramasekera [TW12], the limit-interface is a stable minimal hypersurface with optimal regularity. In [Gua18], Guaraco proved that the limit-interface has optimal regularity if the solutions have uniformly bounded Morse index. Furthermore, by a mountain-pass argument, he proved the existence of critical points of E_ε (on a closed Riemannian manifold) with uniformly bounded energy and Morse index. In this way he obtained a new proof of the previously mentioned theorem of Almgren-Pitts-Schoen-Simon. In the case of surfaces (i.e. when the ambient dimension = 2), Mantoulidis [Man17] proved the regularity of the geodesic limit-interface for the solutions with uniformly bounded Morse index.

The index upper bound of the limit-interface was proved by Hiesmayr [Hie18] assuming the limit-interface is two-sided and by Gaspar [Gas20] in the general case. In [GG19], Gaspar and Guaraco proved the Weyl law for the phase transition spectrum and gave alternative proofs of the density [IMN18] and the equidistribution [MNS19] theorems. In [CM20], Chodosh and Mantoulidis proved the multiplicity one conjecture in the Allen-Cahn setting in dimension 3 and the upper semi-continuity of the Morse index when the limit-interface has multiplicity one. As a consequence, they proved that for a generic (bumpy) metric g on a closed manifold M^3 , there exists a sequence of closed, two-sided minimal surfaces $\{\Sigma_p\}_{p=1}^\infty$ in (M^3, g) such that $\text{Ind}(\Sigma_p) = p$ and $\text{area}(\Sigma_p) \sim p^{1/3}$. In higher dimensions, the multiplicity one conjecture for the one parameter Allen-Cahn min-max has been proved by Bellettini [Bel20a, Bel20b]. In [GMN19] Guaraco, Marques and Neves proved that a strictly stable limit-interface must have multiplicity one.

In [BW20], Bellettini and Wickramasekera proved the existence of closed prescribed mean curvature (PMC) hypersurfaces in arbitrary closed Riemannian manifolds using the min-max solutions of the inhomogeneous Allen-Cahn equations. To prove the regularity of the Allen-Cahn PMC hypersurfaces, they used their earlier works [BW18, BW19] on the regularity and compactness theory of stable PMC hypersurfaces. Previously, Zhou and Zhu [ZZ19, ZZ20] developed a min-max theory for the construction of closed PMC hypersurfaces which is parallel to the Almgren-Pitts min-max theory. The estimates for the index and nullity of the Allen-Cahn PMC hypersurfaces have been proved by Mantoulidis [Man20].

The asymptotic behaviour of the critical points of the Ginzburg–Landau functional (which approximates the codimension-2 area functional) has been studied by Stern [Ste16, Ste17], Cheng [Che17] and Pigati-Stern [PS19]. In particular, in [PS19] Pigati and Stern proved the existence of a codimension-2 stationary, integral varifold in an arbitrary closed Riemannian manifold. This theorem was previously proved by Almgren [Alm65] using more complicated geometric measure theory approach.

If Σ is a non-degenerate, separating, closed minimal hypersurface in a closed Riemannian manifold, Pacard and Ritoré [PR03] constructed solutions of the Allen-Cahn equation, for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, whose level sets converge to Σ . The uniqueness of these solutions has been proved by Guaraco, Marques and Neves [GMN19]. The construction of Pacard and

Ritoré has been extended by Caju and Gaspar [CG19] in the case when all the Jacobi fields of Σ are induced by the ambient isometries. Assuming a positivity condition on the Ricci curvature of the ambient manifold, del Pino-Kowalczyk-Wei-Yang [dKWY10] constructed solutions of the Allen-Cahn equation whose energies concentrate on a non-degenerate, closed minimal hypersurface with multiplicity > 1 .

In this article we will show the existence of finite energy min-max solution to the Allen-Cahn equation (for ε sufficiently small) on complete Riemannian manifolds of finite volume. More precisely, we will prove the following theorem, which is motivated by the previously mentioned theorem of Chambers-Liokumovich [CL20] and Song [Son19].

Theorem 1.1. *Let M^{n+1} be a complete, Riemannian manifold, $n+1 \geq 3$, such that $\text{Vol}(M)$ is finite. Then there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, depending on the ambient Riemannian metric, such that for all $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$, there exists $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon : M \rightarrow (-1, 1)$ satisfying $AC_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon) = 0$, $\text{Ind}(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon) \leq 1$ and $E_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon) < \infty$. Moreover, there exists a good set $U \subset M$ (see Section 2.4) such that*

$$0 < \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} E_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon, U) \leq \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} E_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon) < \infty. \quad (1.2)$$

We will prove Theorem 1.1 by adapting the argument of Chambers-Liokumovich [CL20] in the Allen-Cahn setting. From Theorem 1.1, one can recover the above mentioned theorem of Chambers-Liokumovich [CL20] and Song [Son19].

Theorem 1.2. [CL20, Son19] *Let M^{n+1} be a complete, Riemannian manifold, $n+1 \geq 3$, such that $\text{Vol}(M)$ is finite. Then there exists a complete minimal hypersurface $\Sigma \subset M$ such that $0 < \mathcal{H}^n(\Sigma) < \infty$ and Σ has optimal regularity, i.e. Σ is smooth and embedded outside a singular set of Hausdorff dimension $\leq n-7$.*

As in [CL20] and [Son19], Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 continue to hold if the assumption $\text{Vol}(M) < \infty$ is replaced by the weaker assumption that there exists a sequence $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$, where each $U_i \subset M$ is a bounded open set with smooth boundary, such that $U_i \subset U_{i+1}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{H}^n(\partial U_i) = 0$.

Acknowledgements. I am very grateful to my advisor Prof. Fernando Codá Marques for many helpful discussions and for his support and guidance. The author is partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1811840.

2 Notation and Preliminaries

2.1 Notation

Here we summarize the notation which will be frequently used later.

- \mathcal{H}^k : the Hausdorff measure of dimension k .
- $B(p, r)$: the geodesic ball centered at p with radius r .
- $d(-, S)$: distance from a set S .
- $H^1(N)$: the Sobolev space $\{u \in L^2(N) : \text{the distributional derivative } \nabla u \in L^2(N, TN)\}$.
- $e_\varepsilon(u) = \varepsilon \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{2} + \frac{W(u)}{\varepsilon}$.
- $E_\varepsilon(u) = \int_N e_\varepsilon(u)$, where N is the ambient manifold.
- $E_\varepsilon(u, S) = \int_S e_\varepsilon(u)$, where S is a measurable set.
- $AC_\varepsilon(u) = -\varepsilon^2 \Delta u + W'(u)$.
- 2σ = the energy of the 1-D solution to the Allen-Cahn equation (see (2.1), (4.3)).
- For two measurable functions u and v , we say that $u \leq v$ (resp. $u \geq v$) if $u(x) \leq v(x)$ (resp. $u(x) \geq v(x)$) for a.e. x .

2.2 The Allen-Cahn equation and convergence of the phase interfaces

In this subsection we will briefly discuss about the Allen-Cahn equation and its connection with the minimal hypersurfaces. Suppose Ω^{n+1} is the interior of a compact Riemannian manifold. Let $W : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be a smooth, symmetric, double well potential. More precisely, W has the following properties. W is bounded; $W(-t) = W(t)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$; W has exactly three critical points $0, \pm 1$; $W(\pm 1) = 0$ and $W''(\pm 1) > 0$ i.e. ± 1 are non-degenerate minima; 0 is a local maximum. For $u \in H^1(\Omega)$, the ε -Allen-Cahn energy of u is given by

$$E_\varepsilon(u) = \int_\Omega \varepsilon \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{2} + \frac{W(u)}{\varepsilon}.$$

As mentioned earlier,

$$AC_\varepsilon(u) := -\varepsilon^2 \Delta u + W'(u) = 0$$

if and only if u is a critical point of E_ε .

Let $F : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and the energy constant σ be defined as follows.

$$F(t) = \int_0^t \sqrt{W(s)/2} \, ds; \quad \sigma = \int_{-1}^1 \sqrt{W(s)/2} \, ds \quad \text{so that} \quad F(\pm 1) = \pm \frac{\sigma}{2}. \quad (2.1)$$

For an n -rectifiable set $S \subset \Omega$, let $|S|$ denote the n -varifold defined by S . Given $u \in C^1(\Omega)$, we set $\tilde{u} = F \circ u$. The n -varifold associated to u is defined by

$$V[u](A) = \frac{1}{\sigma} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\{\tilde{u} = s\}|(A) \, ds,$$

for every Borel set $A \subset G_n\Omega$ (where $G_n\Omega$ denotes the Grassmannian bundle of unoriented n -dimensional hyperplanes on Ω).

Building on the works of Hutchinson-Tonegawa [HT00], Tonegawa [Ton05] and Tonegawa-Wickramasekera [TW12], Guaraco [Gua18] has proved the following theorem.

Theorem 2.1 ([HT00, Ton05, TW12, Gua18]). *Suppose Ω^{n+1} , $n+1 \geq 3$, is the interior of a compact Riemannian manifold. Let $\{u_i : \Omega \rightarrow (-1, 1)\}_{i=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of smooth functions such that*

- (i) $AC_{\epsilon_i}(u_i) = 0$ with $\epsilon_i \rightarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$;
- (ii)

$$\sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} E_{\epsilon_i}(u_i) < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Ind}(u_i) < \infty.$$

Then there exists a stationary, integral varifold V in Ω such that possibly after passing to a subsequence, $V[u_i] \rightarrow V$ in the sense of varifolds. Moreover, $\text{spt}(V)$ is a minimal hypersurface with optimal regularity in Ω . Furthermore, if $\|V\|$ denotes the Radon measure associated to V , then

$$\frac{1}{2\sigma} \left(\epsilon_i \frac{|\nabla u_i|^2}{2} + \frac{W(u_i)}{\epsilon_i} \right) d\text{Vol}_\Omega \rightarrow \|V\|,$$

in the sense of Radon measures.

The proof of the regularity of the limit-interface depends on the regularity theory of stable, minimal hypersurfaces, developed by Wickramasekera [Wic14]. In the ambient dimension $n+1 = 3$, the regularity of the limit-interface can also be obtained from the curvature estimates of Chodosh and Mantoulidis [CM20].

We also state here the theorem proved by Smith [Smi16] about the generic finiteness of the number of solutions to the Allen-Cahn equation on a closed manifold. This theorem will be used to prove the Morse index upper bound in Theorem 1.1.

Let N^{n+1} , $n+1 \geq 3$, be a closed manifold and \mathcal{M} be the space of all smooth Riemannian metrics on N , endowed with the C^∞ topology. For $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{M}$, we define

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\varepsilon, \gamma} = \{u \in C^\infty(N) : -\varepsilon^2 \Delta_\gamma u + W'(u) = 0\}.$$

Theorem 2.2. [Smi16, Theorem 1.1 (2)] *There exists a generic set $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}} \subset \mathcal{M}$ such that if $\gamma \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ and $\varepsilon^{-1} \notin \text{Spec}(-\Delta_\gamma)$ (here we are using the convention that $\text{Spec}(-\Delta_\gamma) \subset [0, \infty)$), then $\mathcal{Z}_{\varepsilon, \gamma}$ is finite.*

2.3 Min-max theorem on the Hilbert space

Let \mathcal{H} be a separable Hilbert space and $\mathcal{E} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a C^2 functional. Suppose B_0, B_1 are closed subsets of \mathcal{H} . We define

$$\mathcal{F} = \{\zeta : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{H} : \zeta \text{ is continuous, } \zeta(0) \in B_0, \zeta(1) \in B_1\} \quad (2.2)$$

and

$$c = \inf_{\zeta \in \mathcal{F}} \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \mathcal{E}(\zeta(t)).$$

A sequence $\{\zeta_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{F}$ is called a *minimizing sequence* if

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \mathcal{E}(\zeta_i(t)) = c.$$

For a minimizing sequence $\{\zeta_i\} \subset \mathcal{F}$, let $\mathcal{K}(\{\zeta_i\})$ denote the set of all $v \in \mathcal{H}$ for which there exist sequences $\{i_j\} \subset \{i\}$ and $\{t_j\} \subset [0, 1]$ such that

$$v = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \zeta_{i_j}(t_j).$$

Definition 2.3. Given a minimizing sequence $\{\zeta_i\}$ in \mathcal{F} , we say that \mathcal{E} satisfies the *Palais-Smale condition* along $\{\zeta_i\}$ if every sequence $\{v_i\}$, satisfying the conditions

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}'(v_i) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} d(v_i, \zeta_i([0, 1])) = 0,$$

has a convergent subsequence.

Definition 2.4. [Gho91, Section 3, page 53] Let

$$K_c = \{v \in \mathcal{H} : \mathcal{E}'(v) = 0, \mathcal{E}(v) = c\}.$$

A compact subset \mathcal{C} of K_c is called an *isolated critical set* for \mathcal{E} in K_c if there exists an open set $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{H}$ such that $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{U}$ and

$$K_c \cap \mathcal{U} = \mathcal{C}.$$

The following min-max theorem, which was proved by Ghoussoub [Gho91] in a much more general setting, will be used to prove Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 2.5. [Gho91] (a) Let $L \subset \mathcal{H}$ be a closed set such that the following conditions are satisfied:

$$(a1) \quad L \cap (B_0 \cup B_1) = \emptyset;$$

$$(a2) \quad \text{for all } \zeta \in \mathcal{F}, L \cap \zeta([0, 1]) \neq \emptyset;$$

(a3) $\inf_{v \in L} \mathcal{E}(v) \geq c$.

Suppose \mathcal{E} satisfies the Palais-Smale condition along a minimizing sequence $\{\zeta_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$. Then

$$K_c \cap L \cap \mathcal{K}(\{\zeta_i\}) \neq \emptyset.$$

(b) In addition to the assumptions stated in part (a), let us also assume that:

(b1) $K_c \cap L$ is an isolated critical set for \mathcal{E} in K_c ;

(b2) \mathcal{E}'' is Fredholm on K_c .

Then there exists

$$v \in K_c \cap L \cap \mathcal{K}(\{\zeta_i\}) \text{ such that } m(v) \leq 1,$$

where $m(v)$ is the Morse index of the critical point v , i.e. $m(v)$ is equal to the index of the bilinear form $\mathcal{E}''|_v$.

Remark 2.6. In the definition of \mathcal{F} in (2.2) and in Theorem 2.5, we have assumed that B_0 and B_1 are closed subsets of \mathcal{H} . This is slightly different from the hypothesis made in [Gho91, Theorem (1.bis) and Theorem (4)], where B_0 and B_1 are assumed to be singleton sets. However this does not affect the proof of Theorem 2.5 in [Gho91] for the following reason (see [Gho91, Remark (3) in page 32 and Remark (11) in page 60]). If $\zeta \in \mathcal{F}$ (as defined in (2.2)) and $\zeta' : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is another map satisfying $\zeta'(0) = \zeta(0)$ and $\zeta'(1) = \zeta(1)$, then $\zeta' \in \mathcal{F}$ as well.

2.4 The notion of the good set

In this subsection we will recall the definition of the *good set* from [CL20, Section 2.2]. Let N be a complete Riemannian manifold and $\Omega \subset N$ be a bounded open set with smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$. $\mathbf{I}_{n+1}(\Omega; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ denotes the space of $(n+1)$ -dimensional mod 2 flat chains in Ω ; $\mathcal{Z}_{n,\text{rel}}(\Omega, \partial\Omega; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ denotes the space of n -dimensional mod 2 relative flat cycles in Ω and $\partial : \mathbf{I}_{n+1}(\Omega; \mathbb{Z}_2) \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_{n,\text{rel}}(\Omega, \partial\Omega; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is the boundary map. Both the spaces $\mathbf{I}_{n+1}(\Omega; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ and $\mathcal{Z}_{n,\text{rel}}(\Omega, \partial\Omega; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ are assumed to be equipped with the flat topology. (We refer to [LMN18, Section 2] and [LZ16, Section 3] for more details about these spaces.) Let \mathcal{S} be the set of all continuous maps $\Gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbf{I}_{n+1}(\Omega; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ such that $\Gamma(0) = \emptyset$ and $\Gamma(1) = \Omega$. The *(relative) width of Ω* , denoted by $\mathbb{W}(\Omega)$, is defined as follows [Gro88, Gut09, LMN18, CL20, LZ16].

$$\mathbb{W}(\Omega) = \inf_{\Gamma \in \mathcal{S}} \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \mathbf{M}(\partial\Gamma(t)). \quad (2.3)$$

Ω is called a *good set* if

$$\mathbb{W}(\Omega) > 4\mathcal{H}^n(\partial\Omega). \quad (2.4)$$

3 Nested families in the Sobolev space $H^1(N)$

The notion of the nested family of open sets played an important role in the proof of the main theorem of Chambers-Liokumovich in [CL20]. In this section, we will deal with the notion of the nested family in the function space $H^1(N)$. Throughout this section, N will be assumed to be a closed Riemannian manifold (of dimension $n + 1$) and $\varepsilon > 0$. We begin with the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $u, v \in H^1(N)$ such that $v \geq u$ and $|u|, |v| \leq 1$. Suppose*

$$\mathcal{S} = \{w \in H^1(N) : v \geq w \geq u\}.$$

Then there exists $w^ \in \mathcal{S}$ such that*

$$E_\varepsilon(w^*) = \inf \{E_\varepsilon(w) : w \in \mathcal{S}\}.$$

Proof. Let

$$\alpha = \inf \{E_\varepsilon(w) : w \in \mathcal{S}\}$$

and $\{w_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{S}$ be such that

$$\int_N \varepsilon \frac{|\nabla w_i|^2}{2} + \frac{W(w_i)}{\varepsilon} \leq \alpha + \frac{1}{i}. \quad (3.1)$$

Since $|u|, |v| \leq 1$,

$$|w_i| \leq 1 \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (3.2)$$

(3.1) and (3.2) imply that $\{w_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ is a bounded sequence in $H^1(N)$. Therefore, by Rellich's compactness theorem, there exist $w^* \in H^1(N)$ and a subsequence $\{w_{i_k}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ such that

$$w_{i_k} \rightarrow w^* \text{ strongly in } L^2(N) \text{ and pointwise a.e.} \quad (3.3)$$

and

$$\nabla w_{i_k} \rightarrow \nabla w^* \text{ weakly in } L^2(N). \quad (3.4)$$

(3.3) implies that $w^* \in \mathcal{S}$. (3.3), (3.4) and (3.1) together imply that $E_\varepsilon(w^*) \leq \alpha$ and hence $E_\varepsilon(w^*) = \alpha$ (as $w^* \in \mathcal{S}$). \square

Definition 3.2. A continuous map $u : [a, b] \rightarrow H^1(N)$ is called *nested* if $u(t) \geq u(s)$ whenever $t \leq s$.

3.1 Truncation and concatenation of the nested maps

The following Lemmas 3.3 and 3.4 are the Allen-Cahn counterparts of [CL20, Lemma 5.1] and [CL20, Proposition 6.3], respectively.

Lemma 3.3. (a) Let $u : [0, 1] \rightarrow H^1(N)$ be nested. Suppose $v \in H^1(N)$ has the following properties:

- $v \geq u(1)$;
- for any $v' \in H^1(N)$ with $v \geq v' \geq u(1)$, we have $E_\varepsilon(v) \leq E_\varepsilon(v')$.

Then there exists $\tilde{u} : [0, 1] \rightarrow H^1(N)$ such that

- (i) \tilde{u} is nested;
- (ii) $\tilde{u}(0) \geq u(0)$ and $\tilde{u}(1) = v$; moreover if $u(0) \geq v$, one can choose $\tilde{u}(0) = u(0)$;
- (iii) $E_\varepsilon(\tilde{u}(t)) \leq E_\varepsilon(u(t))$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$;
- (iv) if $\|v\|_{L^\infty(N)} \leq 1$ and $\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \|u(t)\|_{L^\infty(N)} \leq 1$, then $\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \|\tilde{u}(t)\|_{L^\infty(N)} \leq 1$ as well.

(b) Let $u : [0, 1] \rightarrow H^1(N)$ be nested. Suppose $v \in H^1(N)$ has the following properties:

- $u(0) \geq v$;
- for any $v' \in H^1(N)$ with $u(0) \geq v' \geq v$, we have $E_\varepsilon(v) \leq E_\varepsilon(v')$.

Then there exists $\tilde{u} : [0, 1] \rightarrow H^1(N)$ such that

- (i) \tilde{u} is nested;
- (ii) $\tilde{u}(0) = v$ and $\tilde{u}(1) \leq u(1)$; moreover if $u(1) \leq v$, one can choose $\tilde{u}(1) = u(1)$;
- (iii) $E_\varepsilon(\tilde{u}(t)) \leq E_\varepsilon(u(t))$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$;
- (iv) if $\|v\|_{L^\infty(N)} \leq 1$ and $\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \|u(t)\|_{L^\infty(N)} \leq 1$, then $\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \|\tilde{u}(t)\|_{L^\infty(N)} \leq 1$ as well.

Proof. To prove part (a), we define

$$\tilde{u}(t) = \max\{u(t), v\}.$$

Items (i) and (ii) follow from the assumptions that u is nested and $v \geq u(1)$, respectively. Item (iv) follows from the definition of \tilde{u} . To prove (iii), we consider

$$u'(t) = \min\{u(t), v\}.$$

Then $v \geq u'(t) \geq u(1)$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$. By our hypothesis,

$$E_\varepsilon(v) \leq E_\varepsilon(u'(t)) = E_\varepsilon(u(t), \{u(t) < v\}) + E_\varepsilon(v, \{u(t) \geq v\}).$$

Hence

$$E_\varepsilon(v, \{u(t) < v\}) \leq E_\varepsilon(u(t), \{u(t) < v\}). \quad (3.5)$$

Therefore, using (3.5),

$$E_\varepsilon(\tilde{u}(t)) = E_\varepsilon(u(t), \{u(t) \geq v\}) + E_\varepsilon(v, \{u(t) < v\}) \leq E_\varepsilon(u(t)).$$

Part (b) can also be proved in a similar way by defining

$$\tilde{u}(t) = \min\{u(t), v\}$$

and using the fact that

$$u(0) \geq \max\{u(t), v\} \geq v.$$

□

Lemma 3.4. *Let $u_1, u_2 : [0, 1] \rightarrow H^1(N)$ be such that*

- u_1, u_2 are nested;
- $\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \|u_i(t)\|_{L^\infty(N)} \leq 1$ for $i = 1, 2$;
- $u_2(0) \geq u_1(1)$;
- $\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} E_\varepsilon(u_i(t)) \leq A$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Then there exists $\tilde{u} : [0, 1] \rightarrow H^1(N)$ such that

- (i) \tilde{u} is nested;
- (ii) $\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \|\tilde{u}(t)\|_{L^\infty(N)} \leq 1$;
- (iii) $\tilde{u}(0) \geq u_1(0)$ and $\tilde{u}(1) \leq u_2(1)$;
- (iv) $\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} E_\varepsilon(\tilde{u}(t)) \leq A$.

Proof. Let

$$\mathcal{S} = \{v \in H^1(N) : u_2(0) \geq v \geq u_1(1)\}.$$

By Lemma 3.1, there exists $v^* \in \mathcal{S}$ such that

$$E_\varepsilon(v^*) = \inf\{E_\varepsilon(v) : v \in \mathcal{S}\}.$$

We note that $v^* \geq v' \geq u_1(1)$ implies that $v' \in \mathcal{S}$ and hence $E_\varepsilon(v^*) \leq E_\varepsilon(v')$. Therefore, by Lemma 3.3, part (a), there exists a nested map $\tilde{u}_1 : [0, 1] \rightarrow H^1(N)$ such that

$$\tilde{u}_1(0) \geq u_1(0), \quad \tilde{u}_1(1) = v^*, \quad \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \|\tilde{u}_1(t)\|_{L^\infty(N)} \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} E_\varepsilon(\tilde{u}_1(t)) \leq A.$$

Similarly, $u_2(0) \geq v' \geq v^*$ implies that $v' \in \mathcal{S}$ and hence $E_\varepsilon(v^*) \leq E_\varepsilon(v')$. Therefore, by Lemma 3.3, part (b), there exists a nested map $\tilde{u}_2 : [0, 1] \rightarrow H^1(N)$ such that

$$\tilde{u}_2(0) = v^*, \quad \tilde{u}_2(1) \leq u_2(1), \quad \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \|\tilde{u}_2(t)\|_{L^\infty(N)} \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} E_\varepsilon(\tilde{u}_2(t)) \leq A.$$

Finally, we define $\tilde{u} : [0, 1] \rightarrow H^1(N)$ by

$$\tilde{u}(t) = \begin{cases} \tilde{u}_1(2t) & \text{if } t \in [0, 1/2]; \\ \tilde{u}_2(2t - 1) & \text{if } t \in [1/2, 1]. \end{cases}$$

□

3.2 Approximation by nested maps

In [CL20, Proposition 6.1], Chambers and Liokumovich proved that if $\{\Omega_t\}_{t \in [0, 1]}$ is a family of open sets and $\kappa > 0$, there exists a nested family of open sets $\{\tilde{\Omega}_t\}_{t \in [0, 1]}$ such that $\tilde{\Omega}_0 \subset \Omega_0$, $\tilde{\Omega}_1 \supset \Omega_1$ and

$$\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \mathcal{H}^n(\partial \tilde{\Omega}_t) \leq \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \mathcal{H}^n(\partial \Omega_t) + \kappa.$$

The following Proposition 3.5 is the Allen-Cahn analogue of this theorem.

Proposition 3.5. *Let $\phi : [0, 1] \rightarrow H^1(N)$ be a continuous map such that $|\phi(t)| \leq 1$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$ and $\kappa > 0$. Then there exists a nested map $\psi : [0, 1] \rightarrow H^1(N)$ such that $\psi(0) \geq \phi(0)$, $\psi(1) \leq \phi(1)$, $|\psi(t)| \leq 1$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$ and*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} E_\varepsilon(\psi(t)) \leq \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} E_\varepsilon(\phi(t)) + \kappa.$$

Before we prove Proposition 3.5, we need to prove few lemmas.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $w : [0, 1] \rightarrow H^1(N)$ be a continuous map. Then, for all $\delta > 0$, there exists $r > 0$ such that*

$$E_\varepsilon(w(t), B(p, r)) \leq \delta,$$

for all $t \in [0, 1]$ and $p \in N$.

Proof. We assume by contradiction that there exist $\delta > 0$ and sequences $\{t_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subset [0, 1]$ and $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subset N$ such that

$$E_\varepsilon(w(t_i), B(p_i, i^{-1})) > \delta. \tag{3.6}$$

Without loss of generality, we can assume that $t_i \rightarrow t_0$ and $p_i \rightarrow p_0$. Then, for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, if i is sufficiently large, $B(p_i, i^{-1}) \subset B(p_0, m^{-1})$. Therefore, by (3.6), for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$E_\varepsilon(w(t_0), B(p_0, m^{-1})) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} E_\varepsilon(w(t_i), B(p_0, m^{-1})) \geq \delta.$$

This contradicts the fact that

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} E_\varepsilon(w(t_0), B(p_0, m^{-1})) = 0.$$

□

Lemma 3.7. *Let $u_0, u_1 \in L^\infty(N)$ with $u_0 \geq u_1$ and $|u_0|, |u_1| \leq 1$. Suppose $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [-1, 1]$ is a piecewise C^1 function so that $h' \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ and $e_\varepsilon(h)$ is compactly supported inside the compact interval $[-a, a]$. For $p \in N$ and $r > 0$, let $b^r : N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined by $b^r(x) = h(d_p(x) - r)$, where $d_p(x) = d(x, p)$. Then, for all $0 < s_1 < s_2$ and $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\int_{s_1}^{s_2} E_\varepsilon(b^r, \{u_0 > b^r > u_1\}) \, dr \leq \int_{B(p, s_2+a)} \int_{\{u_0(x) > h > u_1(x)\}} e_\varepsilon(h)(t) \, dt \, d\mathcal{H}^{n+1}(x).$$

Proof. $d_p : N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Lipschitz continuous function with $|\nabla d_p| = 1$, \mathcal{H}^{n+1} -a.e. As a consequence,

$$\mathcal{H}^{n+1}(\{d_p = s\}) = 0 \quad \forall s \geq 0, \quad (3.7)$$

since otherwise $\nabla d_p = 0$ on a set of positive \mathcal{H}^{n+1} -measure. For all $r > 0$, b^r is Lipschitz continuous; by [GT01, Theorem 7.8] and (3.7),

$$\nabla b^r(x) = h'(d_p(x) - r) \nabla d_p(x) \quad \text{for } \mathcal{H}^{n+1}\text{-a.e. } x \in N.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{s_1}^{s_2} E_\varepsilon(b^r, \{u_0 > b^r > u_1\}) \, dr \\ &= \int_{s_1}^{s_2} \int_{\{u_0 > b^r > u_1\}} \left[\frac{\varepsilon}{2} h'(d_p(x) - r)^2 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} W(h(d_p(x) - r)) \right] \, d\mathcal{H}^{n+1}(x) \, dr \\ &= \int_{s_1}^{s_2} \int_{-a}^a \left[\frac{\varepsilon}{2} h'(t)^2 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} W(h(t)) \right] \mathcal{H}^n(\{d_p - r = t\} \cap \{u_0 > b^r > u_1\}) \, dt \, dr. \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

In the last step we have used the co-area formula. It follows from the definition of b^r that for fixed r and t ,

$$\{d_p - r = t\} \cap \{u_0 > b^r > u_1\} = \{d_p = r + t\} \cap \{u_0 > h(t) > u_1\}.$$

Hence, by Fubini's theorem and the co-area formula, (3.8) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{s_1}^{s_2} E_\varepsilon(b^r, \{u_0 > b^r > u_1\}) \, dr \\
 &= \int_{s_1}^{s_2} \int_{-a}^a \left[\frac{\varepsilon}{2} h'(t)^2 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} W(h(t)) \right] \mathcal{H}^n(\{d_p = r + t\} \cap \{u_0 > h(t) > u_1\}) \, dt \, dr \\
 &\leq \int_{-a}^a e_\varepsilon(h)(t) \mathcal{H}^{n+1}(B(p, s_2 + a) \cap \{u_0 > h(t) > u_1\}) \, dt \\
 &= \int_{-a}^a e_\varepsilon(h)(t) \int_{B(p, s_2 + a)} \chi_{\{u_0 > h(t) > u_1\}}(x) \, d\mathcal{H}^{n+1}(x) \, dt \\
 &= \int_{B(p, s_2 + a)} \int_{\{u_0(x) > h > u_1(x)\}} e_\varepsilon(h)(t) \, dt \, d\mathcal{H}^{n+1}(x).
 \end{aligned}$$

□

For $\rho > 0$, let $h^\rho : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [-1, 1]$ be defined by

$$h^\rho(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{t}{\rho} & \text{if } |t| \leq \rho; \\ 1 & \text{if } t \geq \rho; \\ -1 & \text{if } t \leq -\rho. \end{cases} \quad (3.9)$$

Setting $h = h^\rho$ in Lemma 3.7 and using the notation $b^{\rho, r}(x) = h^\rho(d_p(x) - r)$, one obtains

$$\int_{s_1}^{s_2} E_\varepsilon(b^{\rho, r}, \{u_0 > b^{\rho, r} > u_1\}) \, dr \leq C(\varepsilon, \rho) \|u_0 - u_1\|_{L^1(N)}, \quad (3.10)$$

where u_0, u_1 are as in Lemma 3.7 and

$$C(\varepsilon, \rho) = \frac{\varepsilon}{2\rho^2} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \|W\|_{L^\infty([-1, 1])}. \quad (3.11)$$

Lemma 3.8. *Let $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$. Suppose $u_0, u_1 \in H^1(N) \cap L^\infty(N)$ such that $u_0 \geq u_1$; $|u_0|, |u_1| \leq 1$ and*

$$\int_N |e_\varepsilon(u_0) - e_\varepsilon(u_1)| \leq \delta. \quad (3.12)$$

We fix a nested map $w : [0, 1] \rightarrow H^1(N)$ such that $w(0) \equiv 1$, $w(1) \equiv -1$ and $|w(t)| \leq 1$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$. Let $R > 0$ be such that for all $p \in N$,

$$E_\varepsilon(u_0, B(p, 4R)) \leq \delta, \quad E_\varepsilon(u_1, B(p, 4R)) \leq \delta \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} E_\varepsilon(w(t), B(p, 4R)) \leq \delta. \quad (3.13)$$

Suppose N can be covered by I balls of radius R . Then, using the notation of (3.11),

$$\|u_0 - u_1\|_{L^1(N)} \leq \frac{\delta R}{C(\varepsilon, R)I} \quad (3.14)$$

implies that there exists a nested map $u : [0, 1] \rightarrow H^1(N)$ such that $u(0) = u_0$, $u(1) = u_1$, $|u(t)| \leq 1$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$ and

$$\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} E_\varepsilon(u(t)) \leq \min\{E_\varepsilon(u_0), E_\varepsilon(u_1)\} + 9\delta.$$

Proof. Let

$$N = \bigcup_{i=1}^I B(p_i, R). \quad (3.15)$$

For $r > 0$ and $i = 1, 2, \dots, I$, let $b_i^r : N \rightarrow [-1, 1]$ be defined by (using the notation as in (3.9))

$$b_i^r(x) = h^R(d_{p_i}(x) - r).$$

We inductively define a sequence $\{v_i\}_{i=0}^I$ with

$$v_0 \geq v_1 \geq \dots \geq v_I$$

as follows. Set $v_0 = u_0$. Let us assume that v_k has been defined for $1 \leq k \leq i-1$ and

$$u_0 = v_0 \geq v_1 \geq \dots \geq v_{i-1} \geq u_1,$$

which implies that

$$\|v_{i-1} - u_1\|_{L^1(N)} \leq \|u_0 - u_1\|_{L^1(N)}. \quad (3.16)$$

Therefore, using (3.10), (3.16) and (3.14),

$$\int_{2R}^{3R} E_\varepsilon(b_i^r, \{v_{i-1} > b_i^r > u_1\}) \, dr \leq \frac{\delta R}{I}.$$

So there exists $r_i \in (2R, 3R)$ such that

$$E_\varepsilon(b_i^{r_i}, \{v_{i-1} > b_i^{r_i} > u_1\}) \leq \frac{\delta}{I}. \quad (3.17)$$

We define

$$v_i = \min\{v_{i-1}, \max\{u_1, b_i^{r_i}\}\} = \begin{cases} v_{i-1} & \text{on } \{b_i^{r_i} \geq v_{i-1}\}; \\ b_i^{r_i} & \text{on } \{v_{i-1} > b_i^{r_i} > u_1\}; \\ u_1 & \text{on } \{u_1 \geq b_i^{r_i}\}. \end{cases} \quad (3.18)$$

Then $v_{i-1} \geq v_i \geq u_1$.

Using the definition of v_i in (3.18), one can prove by induction that for each $1 \leq i \leq I$, there exist pairwise disjoint, \mathcal{H}^{n+1} -measurable sets $G_i^0, G_i^1, \{G_{k,i}\}_{k=1}^i$ with

$$N = G_i^0 \cup G_i^1 \cup \left(\bigcup_{k=1}^i G_{k,i} \right) \quad (3.19)$$

such that the following conditions are satisfied.

(i)

$$v_i = \begin{cases} u_0 & \text{on } G_i^0; \\ u_1 & \text{on } G_i^1; \\ b_k^{r_k} & \text{on } G_{k,i}, \ 1 \leq k \leq i. \end{cases} \quad (3.20)$$

(ii)

$$G_{i,i} = \{v_{i-1} > b_i^{r_i} > u_1\}. \quad (3.21)$$

 (iii) For $1 < i \leq I$ and $1 \leq k \leq i-1$,

$$G_{i-1}^0 \supset G_i^0; \quad G_{i-1}^1 \subset G_i^1; \quad G_{k,i-1} \supset G_{k,i}. \quad (3.22)$$

(iv)

$$\bigcup_{k=1}^i B(p_k, R) \subset G_i^1 \quad (3.23)$$

 (For this item one needs to use the fact that $b_k^{r_k} \equiv -1$ on $B(p_k, R)$.)

 (3.23) implies that (by (3.15)) $v_I = u_1$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} E_\varepsilon(v_i) &= E_\varepsilon(u_0, G_i^0) + E_\varepsilon(u_1, G_i^1) + \sum_{k=1}^i E_\varepsilon(b_k^{r_k}, G_{k,i}) \text{ (by (3.19), (3.20))} \\ &\leq \min\{E_\varepsilon(u_0, N), E_\varepsilon(u_1, N)\} + \int_N |e_\varepsilon(u_0) - e_\varepsilon(u_1)| + \sum_{k=1}^i E_\varepsilon(b_k^{r_k}, G_{k,k}) \text{ (by (3.22))} \\ &\leq \min\{E_\varepsilon(u_0), E_\varepsilon(u_1)\} + 2\delta \text{ (by (3.12), (3.21), (3.17))}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.24)$$

 Similarly, using (3.19) and (3.20), for any $p \in N$,

$$\begin{aligned} &E_\varepsilon(v_i, B(p, 4R)) \\ &= E_\varepsilon(u_0, G_i^0 \cap B(p, 4R)) + E_\varepsilon(u_1, G_i^1 \cap B(p, 4R)) + \sum_{k=1}^i E_\varepsilon(b_k^{r_k}, G_{k,i} \cap B(p, 4R)) \\ &\leq 3\delta \text{ (by (3.13), (3.22), (3.21), (3.17))}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.25)$$

 For each $1 \leq i \leq I$, we define $\beta_i : [0, 1] \rightarrow H^1(N)$ by

$$\beta_i(t) = \min\{v_{i-1}, \max\{v_i, w(t)\}\} = \begin{cases} v_{i-1} & \text{on } \{w(t) \geq v_{i-1}\}; \\ w(t) & \text{on } \{v_{i-1} > w(t) > v_i\}; \\ v_i & \text{on } \{v_i \geq w(t)\}. \end{cases}$$

Here $w : [0, 1] \rightarrow H^1(N)$ is as stated in the Lemma 3.8. Since w is nested, β_i is also nested. It follows from (3.18) that $|v_k| \leq 1$ for all $0 \leq k \leq I$. Hence $|\beta_i(t)| \leq 1$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$.

Moreover, $w(0) \equiv 1$ (resp. $w(1) \equiv -1$) implies that $\beta_i(0) = v_{i-1}$ (resp. $\beta_i(1) = v_i$). Using the fact that $b_i^{r_i} \equiv 1$ on $N \setminus B(p_i, 4R)$, it also follows from (3.18) that $v_{i-1} = v_i$ on $N \setminus B(p_i, 4R)$; hence for all $t \in [0, 1]$,

$$\beta_i(t) = v_{i-1} = v_i \text{ on } N \setminus B(p_i, 4R).$$

Therefore, for all $t \in [0, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} E_\varepsilon(\beta_i(t)) &\leq E_\varepsilon(v_i, N) + E_\varepsilon(v_{i-1}, B(p_i, 4R)) + E_\varepsilon(v_i, B(p_i, 4R)) + E_\varepsilon(w(t), B(p_i, 4R)) \\ &\leq \min\{E_\varepsilon(u_0), E_\varepsilon(u_1)\} + 9\delta \text{ (by (3.24), (3.25), (3.13)).} \end{aligned}$$

Finally we obtain the required map $u : [0, 1] \rightarrow H^1(N)$ by concatenating all the maps β_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, I$. \square

Proof of Proposition 3.5. We fix a nested map $w_0 : [0, 1] \rightarrow H^1(N)$ such that $w_0(0) \equiv 1$, $w_0(1) \equiv -1$ and $|w_0(t)| \leq 1$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$. (For instance, one can define $w_0(t)$ to be equal to the constant function $1 - 2t$.) Let $\delta_0 = \kappa/9$ and

$$A_0 = \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} E_\varepsilon(\phi(t)).$$

By Lemma 3.6, there exists $R_0 > 0$ such that for all $p \in N$ and $t \in [0, 1]$,

$$E_\varepsilon(\phi(t), B(p, 4R_0)) \leq \frac{\delta_0}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad E_\varepsilon(w_0(t), B(p, 4R_0)) \leq \delta_0. \quad (3.26)$$

Suppose N can be covered by I_0 balls of radius R_0 . One can choose $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $|t_1 - t_2| \leq 1/m$ implies

$$\int_N |e_\varepsilon(\phi(t_1)) - e_\varepsilon(\phi(t_2))| \leq \frac{\delta_0}{2} \quad (3.27)$$

and

$$\|\phi(t_1) - \phi(t_2)\|_{L^1(N)} \leq \frac{\delta_0 R_0}{C(\varepsilon, R_0) I_0}. \quad (3.28)$$

We define the sequence $\{\hat{\phi}_i\}_{i=0}^{2m}$ by setting $\hat{\phi}_{2k} = \phi(k/m)$ and

$$\hat{\phi}_{2k+1} = \min\{\hat{\phi}_{2k}, \hat{\phi}_{2k+2}\} = \begin{cases} \hat{\phi}_{2k} & \text{on } \{\hat{\phi}_{2k} \leq \hat{\phi}_{2k+2}\}; \\ \hat{\phi}_{2k+2} & \text{on } \{\hat{\phi}_{2k} > \hat{\phi}_{2k+2}\}. \end{cases}$$

Hence, (3.27) implies that for $0 \leq k \leq m-1$,

$$\int_N |e_\varepsilon(\hat{\phi}_{2k}) - e_\varepsilon(\hat{\phi}_{2k+1})| = \int_{\{\hat{\phi}_{2k} > \hat{\phi}_{2k+2}\}} |e_\varepsilon(\hat{\phi}_{2k}) - e_\varepsilon(\hat{\phi}_{2k+2})| \leq \frac{\delta_0}{2}. \quad (3.29)$$

Similarly, (3.28) implies that for $0 \leq k \leq m-1$,

$$\|\hat{\phi}_{2k} - \hat{\phi}_{2k+1}\|_{L^1(N)} \leq \frac{\delta_0 R_0}{C(\varepsilon, R_0) I_0}.$$

By (3.26) and (3.29), for all $0 \leq i \leq 2m$ and $p \in N$,

$$E_\varepsilon(\hat{\phi}_i, B(p, 4R_0)) \leq \delta_0.$$

By Lemma 3.8, for $0 \leq i \leq m-1$, there exists a nested map $\gamma_i : [0, 1] \rightarrow H^1(N)$ such that $\gamma_i(0) = \hat{\phi}_{2i}$, $\gamma_i(1) = \hat{\phi}_{2i+1}$, $|\gamma_i(t)| \leq 1$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$ and

$$\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} E_\varepsilon(\gamma_i(t)) \leq E_\varepsilon(\hat{\phi}_{2i}) + \kappa \leq A_0 + \kappa.$$

Therefore,

$$\gamma_i(1) = \hat{\phi}_{2i+1} \leq \hat{\phi}_{2i+2} = \gamma_{i+1}(0).$$

One obtains the map ψ in Proposition 3.5 from the maps $\{\gamma_i\}_{i=0}^{m-1}$ by repeatedly applying Lemma 3.4. More precisely, setting $u_1 = \gamma_0$ and $u_2 = \gamma_1$ in Lemma 3.4, we get a nested map $\bar{\gamma}_1 : [0, 1] \rightarrow H^1(N)$ such that

$$\bar{\gamma}_1(0) \geq \hat{\phi}_0, \quad \bar{\gamma}_1(1) \leq \hat{\phi}_3, \quad \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \|\bar{\gamma}_1(t)\|_{L^\infty(N)} \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} E_\varepsilon(\bar{\gamma}_1(t)) \leq A_0 + \kappa.$$

Let us assume that there exists a nested map $\bar{\gamma}_i : [0, 1] \rightarrow H^1(N)$, $1 \leq i < m-1$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\gamma}_i(0) &\geq \hat{\phi}_0, \quad \bar{\gamma}_i(1) \leq \hat{\phi}_{2i+1} \leq \hat{\phi}_{2i+2} = \gamma_{i+1}(0), \\ \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \|\bar{\gamma}_i(t)\|_{L^\infty(N)} &\leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} E_\varepsilon(\bar{\gamma}_i(t)) \leq A_0 + \kappa. \end{aligned}$$

Then choosing $u_1 = \bar{\gamma}_i$ and $u_2 = \gamma_{i+1}$ in Lemma 3.4, one gets a nested map $\bar{\gamma}_{i+1} : [0, 1] \rightarrow H^1(N)$ such that

$$\bar{\gamma}_{i+1}(0) \geq \hat{\phi}_0, \quad \bar{\gamma}_{i+1}(1) \leq \hat{\phi}_{2i+3}, \quad \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \|\bar{\gamma}_{i+1}(t)\|_{L^\infty(N)} \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} E_\varepsilon(\bar{\gamma}_{i+1}(t)) \leq A_0 + \kappa.$$

The map ψ in Proposition 3.5 is obtained by setting $\psi = \bar{\gamma}_{m-1}$. □

4 A deformation lemma

The following Lemma 4.1 is motivated by [CL20, Lemma 7.1 (3)]. To prove this lemma, we adapt the argument of Chambers and Liokumovich [CL20, Proof of Lemma 7.1] in the Allen-Cahn setting.

Lemma 4.1. *Let N be a closed Riemannian manifold and $\Omega \subset N$ be an open set with smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$. Suppose $f : N \rightarrow [1/3, \infty)$ is a Morse function so that in the interval $[1/3, 2/3]$, f has no critical value which is a non-global local maxima or minima;*

$$\min_N f = 1/3; \quad \max_N f > 1; \quad \Omega \subset\subset f^{-1}([1/3, 2/3]).$$

We set

$$\tilde{\Omega} = f^{-1}([1/3, 1]).$$

Then, for all $\eta > 0$, there exist $\varepsilon_1, \tilde{\eta} > 0$, depending on $\eta, \Omega, \tilde{\Omega}, f|_{\tilde{\Omega}}$, such that the following two conditions are satisfied.

- (i) If $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_1$ and $u_0 \in H^1(N)$ satisfies $|u_0| \leq 1, \|1 - u_0\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq \tilde{\eta}$, then there exists $u : [0, 1] \rightarrow H^1(N)$ such that $u(0) = u_0, u(1)|_{\Omega} \equiv 1$ and

$$\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} E_{\varepsilon}(u(t)) \leq E_{\varepsilon}(u_0) + 2\sigma \mathcal{H}^n(\partial\Omega) + \eta.$$

- (ii) If $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_1$ and $u_0 \in H^1(N)$ satisfies $|u_0| \leq 1, \|1 + u_0\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq \tilde{\eta}$, then there exists $u : [0, 1] \rightarrow H^1(N)$ such that $u(0) = u_0, u(1)|_{\Omega} \equiv -1$ and

$$\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} E_{\varepsilon}(u(t)) \leq E_{\varepsilon}(u_0) + 2\sigma \mathcal{H}^n(\partial\Omega) + \eta.$$

Proof. Let $q : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the unique solution of the following ODE.

$$\varphi'(t) = \sqrt{2W(\varphi(t))}; \quad \varphi(0) = 0. \quad (4.1)$$

For all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $-1 < q(t) < 1$ and

$$\text{as } t \rightarrow \pm\infty, (q(t) \mp 1) \text{ converges to zero exponentially fast.} \quad (4.2)$$

$q_{\varepsilon}(t) = q(t/\varepsilon)$ is a solution of the one dimensional Allen-Cahn equation

$$\varepsilon^2 \varphi''(t) = W'(\varphi(t))$$

with finite total energy:

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left[\frac{\varepsilon}{2} (q'_{\varepsilon}(t))^2 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} W(q_{\varepsilon}(t)) \right] dt = 2\sigma. \quad (4.3)$$

For $\varepsilon > 0$, we define Lipschitz continuous function

$$\hat{q}_{\varepsilon}(t) = \begin{cases} q_{\varepsilon}(t) & \text{if } |t| \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon}; \\ q_{\varepsilon}(\sqrt{\varepsilon}) + \left(\frac{t}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} - 1\right) (1 - q_{\varepsilon}(\sqrt{\varepsilon})) & \text{if } \sqrt{\varepsilon} \leq t \leq 2\sqrt{\varepsilon}; \\ 1 & \text{if } t \geq 2\sqrt{\varepsilon}; \\ q_{\varepsilon}(-\sqrt{\varepsilon}) + \left(\frac{t}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} + 1\right) (1 + q_{\varepsilon}(-\sqrt{\varepsilon})) & \text{if } -2\sqrt{\varepsilon} \leq t \leq -\sqrt{\varepsilon}; \\ -1 & \text{if } t \leq -2\sqrt{\varepsilon}. \end{cases} \quad (4.4)$$

For $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x \in N$, we set

$$d_1^t(x) = d_{\partial\Omega}(x) - t, \quad \text{where} \quad d_{\partial\Omega}(x) = \begin{cases} -d(x, \partial\Omega) & \text{if } x \in \Omega; \\ d(x, \partial\Omega) & \text{if } x \notin \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (4.5)$$

For $t \in [1/3, 1]$ and $x \in N$, we set

$$d_2^t(x) = \begin{cases} -d(x, f^{-1}(t)) & \text{if } f(x) \leq t; \\ d(x, f^{-1}(t)) & \text{if } f(x) \geq t. \end{cases}$$

Following [Gua18, Section 7 and Section 9], we define the continuous maps $w_{1,\varepsilon} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow H^1(N)$ and $w_{2,\varepsilon} : [0, 1] \rightarrow H^1(N)$ by

$$w_{1,\varepsilon}(t) = \hat{q}_\varepsilon \circ d_1^t; \quad (4.6)$$

$$w_{2,\varepsilon}(t) = \begin{cases} \hat{q}_\varepsilon \circ d_2^t & \text{if } \frac{1}{3} \leq t \leq \frac{2}{3}; \\ 1 - 3t(1 - w_{2,\varepsilon}(1/3)) & \text{if } 0 \leq t \leq \frac{1}{3}; \\ -1 + 3(1 - t)(1 + w_{2,\varepsilon}(2/3)) & \text{if } \frac{2}{3} \leq t \leq 1. \end{cases} \quad (4.7)$$

Since in the interval $[1/3, 2/3]$, f has no critical value which is a non-global local maxima or minima, $t \mapsto f^{-1}(t)$ is continuous on $[1/3, 2/3]$ in the Hausdorff topology. This implies that $w_{2,\varepsilon}$ is continuous (see [Gua18, Proposition 9.2]).

Let us fix $\eta > 0$. From the argument in [Gua18, Section 9], it follows that there exist ε' , $t_0 > 0$, depending on η , $\partial\Omega$ and $\tilde{\Omega}$, such that if $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon'$ and $|t| \leq 2t_0$ then

$$E_\varepsilon(w_{1,\varepsilon}(t)) \leq 2\sigma\mathcal{H}^n(\partial\Omega) + \frac{\eta}{2}. \quad (4.8)$$

By the “no concentration of mass” property ([MN17, Lemma 5.2]), there exists $0 < R < t_0/5$, depending on η , Ω , $\tilde{\Omega}$ and $f|_{\tilde{\Omega}}$, such that

$$\mathcal{H}^n(f^{-1}(t) \cap B(p, 5R)) \leq \frac{1}{2\sigma} \frac{\eta}{3},$$

for all $t \in [1/3, 2/3]$ and $B(p, 5R) \subset \Omega$. Moreover, $w_{2,\varepsilon}(1/3) > 0$ on N and $w_{2,\varepsilon}(2/3) < 0$ on Ω . As a consequence, by the results in [Gua18, Section 9], there exists $0 < \varepsilon'' \leq R^2/4$, depending on Ω , $\tilde{\Omega}$ and $f|_{\tilde{\Omega}}$ such that

$$E_\varepsilon(w_{2,\varepsilon}(t), B(p, 4R)) \leq \frac{\eta}{2}, \quad (4.9)$$

for all $t \in [0, 1]$ and $B(p, 5R) \subset \Omega$. We define $\varepsilon_1 = \min\{\varepsilon', \varepsilon''\}$. By our definitions of R and ε'' ,

$$2\sqrt{\varepsilon_1} \leq R < \frac{t_0}{5}. \quad (4.10)$$

Let us fix $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_1]$. Using the notation of (4.5), let

$$\Omega_r = \{x \in N : d_{\partial\Omega}(x) \leq r\}. \quad (4.11)$$

For $r > 0$ and for a fixed $p \in \Omega_{-t_0}$, we define $\omega_\varepsilon^r : N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\omega_\varepsilon^r(x) = \hat{q}_\varepsilon(r - d_p(x)),$$

where $d_p(x) = d(x, p)$.

By (4.10), $B(p, 3R + 2\sqrt{\varepsilon_1}) \subset \Omega$. Therefore, it follows from Lemma 3.7 that for $u \in L^\infty(N)$ with $|u| \leq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{2R}^{3R} E_\varepsilon(\omega_\varepsilon^r, \{1 > \omega_\varepsilon^r > u\}) dr \\
 & \leq \int_\Omega \int_{\{1 > \hat{q}_\varepsilon > u(x)\}} e_\varepsilon(\hat{q}_\varepsilon)(t) dt d\mathcal{H}^{n+1}(x) \quad (\text{since } \hat{q}_\varepsilon \text{ is an odd function}) \\
 & = \int_\Omega \int_{u(x)}^1 \left[\frac{\varepsilon}{2} \hat{q}'_\varepsilon(\hat{q}_\varepsilon^{-1}(s)) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \frac{W(s)}{\hat{q}'_\varepsilon(\hat{q}_\varepsilon^{-1}(s))} \right] ds d\mathcal{H}^{n+1}(x). \tag{4.12}
 \end{aligned}$$

In (4.12), \hat{q}_ε is thought of as a bijective map from $[-2\sqrt{\varepsilon}, 2\sqrt{\varepsilon}]$ to $[-1, 1]$. We claim that there exists $C_0 = C_0(W, \varepsilon_1) > 0$ such that the $L^\infty([-1, 1])$ norm of the integrand in (4.12) is bounded by C_0 . (In particular, C_0 does not depend on ε .) Indeed, the integrand is a non-negative, even function. If $0 \leq t < \sqrt{\varepsilon}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \hat{q}'_\varepsilon(t) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \frac{W(\hat{q}_\varepsilon(t))}{\hat{q}'_\varepsilon(t)} \\
 & = \frac{1}{2} q'(t/\varepsilon) + \frac{W(q(t/\varepsilon))}{q'(t/\varepsilon)} \\
 & = \sqrt{2W(q(t/\varepsilon))} \quad (\text{by (4.1)}) \\
 & \leq \sqrt{2} \|W\|_{L^\infty([-1, 1])}. \tag{4.13}
 \end{aligned}$$

If $\sqrt{\varepsilon} < t < 2\sqrt{\varepsilon}$, using the fact that

$$\sup_{t \in [-1, 1]} \frac{W(t)}{(1-t)^2} = C_1 < \infty,$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \hat{q}'_\varepsilon(t) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \frac{W(\hat{q}_\varepsilon(t))}{\hat{q}'_\varepsilon(t)} \\
 & \leq \frac{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}{2} \left(1 - q(\varepsilon^{-1/2})\right) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \frac{W(q(\varepsilon^{-1/2}))}{(1 - q(\varepsilon^{-1/2}))} \\
 & \leq \left(\frac{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}{2} + \frac{C_1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}\right) \left(1 - q(\varepsilon^{-1/2})\right). \tag{4.14}
 \end{aligned}$$

By (4.2), the expression in (4.14) is bounded by some constant $C_2 = C_2(\varepsilon_1, C_1)$. Thus our claim follows from (4.13) and (4.14). (4.12), together with the claim, implies that

$$\int_{2R}^{3R} E_\varepsilon(\omega_\varepsilon^r, \{1 > \omega_\varepsilon^r > u\}) dr \leq C_0 \|1 - u\|_{L^1(\Omega)}. \tag{4.15}$$

We choose a covering

$$\Omega_{-t_0} = \bigcup_{i=1}^I B(p_i, R); \quad (4.16)$$

each $p_i \in \Omega_{-t_0}$ so that (by (4.10)) $B(p_i, 5R) \subset \Omega$. To prove part (i) of Lemma 4.1, we set

$$\tilde{\eta} = \frac{\eta R}{2C_0 I}, \quad (4.17)$$

where C_0 is as in the above claim. Let u_0 be as in the statement of Lemma 4.1, part (i). We inductively define a sequence $\{v_i\}_{i=0}^I$,

$$-1 \leq v_0 \leq v_1 \leq \dots \leq v_I \leq 1,$$

as follows. Set $v_0 = u_0$. Suppose v_k has been defined for $0 \leq k \leq i-1$ so that

$$u_0 = v_0 \leq v_1 \leq \dots \leq v_{i-1} \leq 1;$$

hence

$$\|1 - v_{i-1}\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq \|1 - u_0\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq \tilde{\eta}. \quad (4.18)$$

Let $\omega_{i,\varepsilon}^r(x) = \hat{q}_\varepsilon(r - d_{p_i}(x))$. By (4.15), (4.18) and (4.17), there exists $r_i \in (2R, 3R)$ such that

$$E_\varepsilon \left(\omega_{i,\varepsilon}^{r_i}, \{v_{i-1} < \omega_{i,\varepsilon}^{r_i} < 1\} \right) \leq \frac{\eta}{2I}. \quad (4.19)$$

We define

$$v_i = \max\{v_{i-1}, \omega_{i,\varepsilon}^{r_i}\} = \begin{cases} v_{i-1} & \text{on } \{v_{i-1} \geq \omega_{i,\varepsilon}^{r_i}\}; \\ \omega_{i,\varepsilon}^{r_i} & \text{on } \{v_{i-1} < \omega_{i,\varepsilon}^{r_i}\}. \end{cases} \quad (4.20)$$

It follows from (4.20) that $v_{i-1} \leq v_i \leq 1$. Moreover, since $\omega_{i,\varepsilon}^{r_i} \equiv -1$ on $N \setminus B(p_i, 4R)$,

$$v_i = v_{i-1} \text{ on } N \setminus B(p_i, 4R). \quad (4.21)$$

Thus we have obtained the sequence $\{v_i\}_{i=0}^I$ with $v_0 = u_0$ and we set $v_I = \bar{u}$. As $\omega_{i,\varepsilon}^{r_i} \equiv 1$ on $B(p_i, R)$, using (4.20) and (4.16), one can prove by induction that

$$\bar{u}|_{\Omega_{-t_0}} \equiv 1. \quad (4.22)$$

By (4.20) and (4.19),

$$E_\varepsilon(v_i, \{v_i \neq v_{i-1}\}) = E_\varepsilon \left(\omega_{i,\varepsilon}^{r_i}, \{v_{i-1} < \omega_{i,\varepsilon}^{r_i} < 1\} \right) \leq \frac{\eta}{2I}. \quad (4.23)$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} E_\varepsilon(v_i) &= E_\varepsilon(v_{i-1}) + E_\varepsilon(v_i, \{v_i \neq v_{i-1}\}) \leq E_\varepsilon(v_{i-1}) + \frac{\eta}{2I} \\ \implies E_\varepsilon(v_i) &\leq E_\varepsilon(u_0) + \frac{\eta i}{2I} \quad \forall 0 \leq i \leq I. \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

For $1 \leq i \leq I$, let $\beta_i : [0, 1] \rightarrow H^1(N)$ be defined by

$$\beta_i(t) = \max\{v_{i-1}, \min\{v_i, -w_{2,\varepsilon}(t)\}\} = \begin{cases} v_{i-1} & \text{on } \{-w_{2,\varepsilon}(t) \leq v_{i-1}\}; \\ -w_{2,\varepsilon}(t) & \text{on } \{v_{i-1} < -w_{2,\varepsilon}(t) < v_i\}; \\ v_i & \text{on } \{v_i \leq -w_{2,\varepsilon}(t)\}. \end{cases} \quad (4.25)$$

Since $w_{2,\varepsilon}(0) \equiv 1$ and $w_{2,\varepsilon}(1) \equiv -1$, $\beta_i(0) = v_{i-1}$ and $\beta_i(1) = v_i$. Moreover, by (4.21),

$$\beta_i(t) = v_{i-1} = v_i \text{ on } N \setminus B(p_i, 4R).$$

Therefore, using (4.25), (4.24), (4.23) and (4.9), one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} E_\varepsilon(\beta_i(t)) &\leq E_\varepsilon(v_{i-1}) + E_\varepsilon(v_i, \{v_i \neq v_{i-1}\}) + E_\varepsilon(-w_{2,\varepsilon}(t), B(p_i, 4R)) \\ &\leq E_\varepsilon(u_0) + \frac{\eta(i-1)}{2I} + \frac{\eta}{2I} + \frac{\eta}{2} \\ &\leq E_\varepsilon(u_0) + \eta. \end{aligned}$$

Concatenating all the β_i 's we get a map $\beta' : [0, 1] \rightarrow H^1(N)$ such that $\beta'(0) = u_0$, $\beta'(1) = \bar{u} = v_I$ and

$$\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} E_\varepsilon(\beta'(t)) \leq E_\varepsilon(u_0) + \eta.$$

Let $\beta'' : [-2t_0, t_0] \rightarrow H^1(N)$ be defined by

$$\beta''(t) = \max\{\bar{u}, -w_{1,\varepsilon}(t)\}.$$

Then $\beta''(-2t_0) = \bar{u}$ as $\bar{u} \equiv 1$ on Ω_{-t_0} ((4.22)) and $w_{1,\varepsilon}(-2t_0) \equiv 1$ on $N \setminus \Omega_{-t_0}$ (by (4.10)). Moreover, $\beta''(t_0)|_\Omega \equiv 1$ as by (4.10), $w_{1,\varepsilon}(t_0)|_\Omega \equiv -1$. Using (4.8) and (4.24), we conclude that for all $t \in [-2t_0, t_0]$,

$$E_\varepsilon(\beta''(t)) \leq E_\varepsilon(\bar{u}) + E_\varepsilon(-w_{1,\varepsilon}(t)) \leq E_\varepsilon(u_0) + 2\sigma\mathcal{H}^n(\partial\Omega) + \eta.$$

Finally, the map u in Lemma 4.1 part (i) is obtained by concatenating β' and β'' . This finishes the proof of part (i) of Lemma 4.1; part (ii) of the lemma can be deduced from part (i) by replacing u_0 by $-u_0$. \square

The next lemma is motivated by the properties of the isoperimetric profile of a compact Riemannian manifold (see [CL20, Lemma 7.1 (2)]).

Lemma 4.2. *Let Ω be a compact Riemannian manifold (not necessarily closed). For all $\eta_1 > 0$, there exist $\varepsilon_2, \eta_2 > 0$, depending on Ω and η_1 , such that the following holds. If $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_2$ and $u \in H^1(\Omega)$ satisfies $\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq 1$ and $\min\{\|1 - u\|_{L^1(\Omega)}, \|1 + u\|_{L^1(\Omega)}\} > \eta_1$, then $E_\varepsilon(u, \Omega) > \eta_2$.*

Proof. We assume by contradiction that there exist sequences $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subset H^1(\Omega)$ with $|u_i| \leq 1$ for all i and $\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subset (0, \infty)$ with $\alpha_i \rightarrow 0$ such that

$$\min\{\|1 - u_i\|_{L^1(\Omega)}, \|1 + u_i\|_{L^1(\Omega)}\} > \eta_1 \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (4.26)$$

and

$$E_{\alpha_i}(u_i, \Omega) \rightarrow 0. \quad (4.27)$$

Let $F : [-1, 1] \rightarrow [-\sigma/2, \sigma/2]$ be as defined in (2.1) and $v_i = F \circ u_i$. As argued in [HT00, Section 2.1], for all i , $|v_i| \leq \sigma/2$ and

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_i| \leq \frac{1}{2} E_{\alpha_i}(u_i, \Omega). \quad (4.28)$$

Therefore, there exists a subsequence $\{v_{i_k}\} \subset \{v_i\}$ and $v_\infty \in BV(\Omega)$ such that

$$v_{i_k} \rightarrow v_\infty \text{ in } L^1(\Omega) \text{ and pointwise a.e.}$$

and (using (4.27) and (4.28))

$$\int_{\Omega} |Dv_\infty| \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_{i_k}| = 0.$$

Thus v_∞ is a constant function. Denoting $u_\infty = F^{-1}(v_\infty)$, by the dominated convergence theorem,

$$u_{i_k} \rightarrow u_\infty \text{ pointwise a.e. and in } L^1(\Omega).$$

Moreover, by (4.27),

$$\int_{\Omega} W(u_\infty) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} W(u_{i_k}) = 0.$$

Since u_∞ is a constant function, either $u_\infty \equiv 1$ or $u_\infty \equiv -1$. However, this contradicts the assumption (4.26). \square

5 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Let N be a closed Riemannian manifold and $\Omega \subset N$ be an open set with smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$. For $\varepsilon > 0$, the ε -Allen-Cahn width of Ω , which we denote by $\lambda_\varepsilon(\Omega)$, is defined as follows [Gua18]. Let \mathcal{A} be the set of all continuous maps $\zeta : [0, 1] \rightarrow H^1(\Omega)$ such that $\zeta(0) \equiv 1$ and $\zeta(1) \equiv -1$. Then

$$\lambda_\varepsilon(\Omega) = \inf_{\zeta \in \mathcal{A}} \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} E_\varepsilon(\zeta(t), \Omega).$$

It follows from [Gua18, Section 8] that

$$\mathbb{W}(\Omega) \leq \frac{1}{2\sigma} \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \lambda_\varepsilon(\Omega), \quad (5.1)$$

where $\mathbb{W}(\Omega)$ is as defined in (2.3). Motivated by [CL20, Section 2.2], we also make the following definition.

Definition 5.1. Let \mathcal{B} be the set of all continuous maps $\zeta : [0, 1] \rightarrow H^1(N)$ such that $\zeta(0)|_\Omega \equiv 1$ and $\zeta(1)|_\Omega \equiv -1$. For $\varepsilon > 0$, we define

$$\tilde{\lambda}_\varepsilon(\Omega) = \inf_{\zeta \in \mathcal{B}} \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} E_\varepsilon(\zeta(t), N). \quad (5.2)$$

Given $\tilde{\zeta} \in \mathcal{B}$ one can define $\zeta \in \mathcal{A}$ by $\zeta(t) = \tilde{\zeta}(t)|_\Omega$; hence, for all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\lambda_\varepsilon(\Omega) \leq \tilde{\lambda}_\varepsilon(\Omega). \quad (5.3)$$

The following Proposition 5.2 is the Allen-Cahn analogue of [CL20, Proposition 2.1].

Proposition 5.2. *Let N be a closed Riemannian manifold and $\Omega \subset N$ be a good set (as defined in Section 2.4). Suppose $f : N \rightarrow [1/3, \infty)$ is a Morse function so that in the interval $[1/3, 2/3]$, f has no critical value which is a non-global local maxima or minima;*

$$\min_N f = 1/3; \quad \max_N f > 1; \quad \Omega \subset \subset f^{-1}([1/3, 2/3]); \quad 1 \text{ is a regular value of } f.$$

We set

$$\tilde{\Omega} = f^{-1}([1/3, 1]).$$

Then there exist $\varepsilon^*, \eta^* > 0$, depending on Ω , $\tilde{\Omega}$ and $f|_{\tilde{\Omega}}$, such that for all $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon^*$ the following condition is satisfied. For every $\zeta \in \mathcal{B}$, there exists $t^0 \in [0, 1]$ such that

$$E_\varepsilon(\zeta(t^0)) \geq \tilde{\lambda}_\varepsilon(\Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad E_\varepsilon(\zeta(t^0), \Omega) \geq \eta^*.$$

Remark 5.3. The constants ε^* and η^* in the above Proposition 5.2 depend on the ambient Riemannian metric restricted to $\tilde{\Omega}$. (By our hypothesis, $\partial\tilde{\Omega}$ is smooth.) Let us fix a Riemannian metric g_0 on $\tilde{\Omega}$. If g' is an arbitrary Riemannian metric on N , from the proofs of Proposition 5.2, Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2, it follows that there exists $\varrho > 0$, depending on g_0 and $g'|_{\tilde{\Omega}}$, such that the following holds. One can choose ε^* and η^* in Proposition 5.2 in such a way that the proposition holds for all Riemannian metrics g'' on N satisfying

$$\|g'|_{\tilde{\Omega}} - g''|_{\tilde{\Omega}}\|_{C^2(\tilde{\Omega}, g_0)} < \varrho.$$

Proof of Proposition 5.2. The proof will be presented in four parts.

Part 1. Let

$$\tau = \frac{\sigma}{2} \mathcal{H}^n(\partial\Omega). \quad (5.4)$$

We set $\eta = \tau$ in Lemma 4.1 and choose $\varepsilon_1^* > 0$ and

$$0 < \tau_1 < \mathcal{H}^{n+1}(\Omega) \quad (5.5)$$

so that Lemma 4.1 holds for $\eta = \tau$, $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_1^*$ and $\tilde{\eta} = 3\tau_1$. Next, we set $\eta_1 = \tau_1$ in Lemma 4.2 and choose $\varepsilon_2^* > 0$ and

$$0 < \tau_2 \leq \frac{\sigma}{12} \mathcal{H}^n(\partial\Omega) \quad (5.6)$$

so that Lemma 4.2 holds for $\eta_1 = \tau_1$, $\varepsilon_2 = \varepsilon_2^*$ and $\eta_2 = \tau_2$. Let us define $\eta^* = \tau_2$. We also define ε^* to be a positive real number so that the following conditions are satisfied.

- $\varepsilon^* \leq \min\{\varepsilon_1^*, \varepsilon_2^*\}$.

- Let

$$w_\varepsilon = w_{1,\varepsilon}(-2\sqrt{\varepsilon}), \quad (5.7)$$

where $w_{1,\varepsilon}$ is as defined in (4.6). Then, for all $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon^*$,

$$E_\varepsilon(w_\varepsilon) \leq 2\sigma \mathcal{H}^n(\partial\Omega) + \tau_2. \quad (5.8)$$

(For this item one needs to use (4.8).)

- For all $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon^*$, using the notation of (4.11),

$$\mathcal{H}^{n+1}\left(\Omega \setminus \Omega_{-4\sqrt{\varepsilon}}\right) \leq \frac{\tau_1}{2}. \quad (5.9)$$

- For all $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon^*$,

$$\frac{1}{2\sigma} \lambda_\varepsilon(\Omega) > \frac{7}{2} \mathcal{H}^n(\partial\Omega). \quad (5.10)$$

(For this item one needs (5.1) and the hypothesis (2.4) that Ω is a good set.)

We will show that Proposition 5.2 holds for the above choices of ε^* and η^* . Let us assume by contradiction that there exist $\alpha \in (0, \varepsilon^*]$ and $h \in \mathcal{B}$ such that

$$\text{for } t \in [0, 1], \text{ if } E_\alpha(h(t)) \geq \tilde{\lambda}_\alpha(\Omega) \text{ then } E_\alpha(h(t), \Omega) < \eta^* = \tau_2. \quad (5.11)$$

Without loss of generality, we can assume that

$$|h(t)| \leq 1 \quad \forall t \in [0, 1]. \quad (5.12)$$

Indeed, if

$$\hat{h}(t) = \min\{1, \max\{-1, h(t)\}\},$$

then for all $t \in [0, 1]$, $|\hat{h}(t)| \leq 1$ and $e_\varepsilon(\hat{h}(t)) \leq e_\varepsilon(h(t))$. Therefore,

$$E_\alpha(\hat{h}(t)) \geq \tilde{\lambda}_\alpha(\Omega) \implies E_\alpha(h(t)) \geq \tilde{\lambda}_\alpha(\Omega) \implies \eta^* > E_\alpha(h(t), \Omega) \geq E_\alpha(\hat{h}(t), \Omega).$$

To prove Proposition 5.2, we will show that the existence of such $h \in \mathcal{B}$ and $\alpha \in (0, \varepsilon^*]$ imply there exists $\gamma \in \mathcal{B}$ satisfying $\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} E_\alpha(\gamma(t)) < \tilde{\lambda}_\alpha(\Omega)$.

Part 2. Let h and α be as defined above in (5.11) and (5.12).

Lemma 5.4. *There exist $0 < a < b < 1$ such that the following conditions are satisfied.*

- $E_\alpha(h(a), \Omega) = \tau_2 = E_\alpha(h(b), \Omega)$.
- $\|1 - h(a)\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq \tau_1$ and $\|1 + h(b)\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq \tau_1$.
- $E_\alpha(h(t), \Omega) \geq \tau_2$ for all $t \in [a, b]$.

Proof. Let

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= \left\{ t \in [0, 1] : E_\alpha(h(t), \Omega) \leq \tau_2 \text{ and } \|1 - h(t)\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq \tau_1 \right\}; \\ S_2 &= \left\{ t \in [0, 1] : E_\alpha(h(t), \Omega) \leq \tau_2 \text{ and } \|1 + h(t)\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq \tau_1 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

By (5.5),

$$\nexists t \in [0, 1] \text{ such that } \max \left\{ \|1 - h(t)\|_{L^1(\Omega)}, \|1 + h(t)\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \right\} \leq \tau_1. \quad (5.13)$$

(5.13), together with the choices of τ_1 , τ_2 and Lemma 4.2, implies that

$$S_1 \cap S_2 = \emptyset; \quad S_1 \cup S_2 = \{t \in [0, 1] : E_\alpha(h(t), \Omega) \leq \tau_2\}. \quad (5.14)$$

S_1 and S_2 are closed subsets of $[0, 1]$. Since $h \in \mathcal{B}$, $0 \in S_1$ and $1 \in S_2$. Let

$$a = \max S_1, \quad b = \min (S_2 \cap [a, 1]).$$

(5.14) implies that $\|1 + h(a)\|_{L^1(\Omega)} > \tau_1$. Suppose $E_\alpha(h(a), \Omega) < \tau_2$. By continuity, there exists $a' > a$ such that

$$E_\alpha(h(a'), \Omega) < \tau_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|1 + h(a')\|_{L^1(\Omega)} > \tau_1,$$

which implies (by (5.14)) $a' \in S_1$. This contradicts the definition of a ; hence $E_\alpha(h(a), \Omega) = \tau_2$. A similar argument shows that $E_\alpha(h(b), \Omega) = \tau_2$ as well. Suppose there exists $t' \in (a, b)$ such that $E_\alpha(h(t'), \Omega) < \tau_2$. Then by (5.14), $t' \in S_1 \cup S_2$, which contradicts the definitions of a and b . This finishes the proof of the lemma. \square

Part 3. By (5.11) and Lemma 5.4, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{t \in [a, b]} E_\alpha(h(t)) \leq \tilde{\lambda}_\alpha(\Omega) - \delta.$$

By Proposition 3.5, there exists a nested map $\tilde{h} : [0, 1] \rightarrow H^1(N)$ such that $\tilde{h}(0) \geq h(a)$, $\tilde{h}(1) \leq h(b)$, $|\tilde{h}(t)| \leq 1$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$ and

$$\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} E_\alpha(\tilde{h}(t)) \leq \tilde{\lambda}_\alpha(\Omega) - \frac{\delta}{2}. \quad (5.15)$$

We recall from (5.7) that $w_\varepsilon = w_{1,\varepsilon}(-2\sqrt{\varepsilon})$; hence using the notation of (4.11),

$$w_\varepsilon \equiv \begin{cases} -1 & \text{on } \Omega_{-4\sqrt{\varepsilon}}; \\ 1 & \text{on } (N \setminus \Omega). \end{cases} \quad (5.16)$$

Lemma 5.5. *Let $T : H^1(N) \rightarrow H^1(N)$ be defined by*

$$T(u) = \min\{-w_\alpha, \max\{w_\alpha, u\}\}.$$

If $|u| \leq 1$, then denoting $\hat{u} = T(u)$, we have $|\hat{u}| \leq 1$;

$$E_\alpha(\hat{u}) \leq E_\alpha(w_\alpha) + E_\alpha(u, \{-w_\alpha \geq u \geq w_\alpha\}) \leq E_\alpha(w_\alpha) + E_\alpha(u, \Omega); \quad (5.17)$$

$$\|1 - \hat{u}\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq \|1 - u\|_{L^1(\Omega)} + 2\mathcal{H}^{n+1}(\Omega \setminus \Omega_{-4\sqrt{\alpha}}); \quad (5.18)$$

$$\|1 + \hat{u}\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq \|1 + u\|_{L^1(\Omega)} + 2\mathcal{H}^{n+1}(\Omega \setminus \Omega_{-4\sqrt{\alpha}}). \quad (5.19)$$

Proof.

$$\hat{u} = \begin{cases} u & \text{on } \{-w_\alpha \geq u \geq w_\alpha\}; \\ \pm w_\alpha & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (5.20)$$

Therefore, $|\hat{u}| \leq 1$. Moreover,

$$\{-w_\alpha \geq u \geq w_\alpha\} \subset \{w_\alpha \leq 0\} \subset \Omega \quad (\text{by (5.16)}). \quad (5.21)$$

Combining (5.20) and (5.21), one gets (5.17). It follows from (5.16) and (5.20) that

$$\hat{u} = u \text{ on } \Omega_{-4\sqrt{\alpha}}. \quad (5.22)$$

Moreover,

$$0 \leq 1 \pm w_\alpha \leq 2. \quad (5.23)$$

Equations (5.18) and (5.19) both follow from (5.20), (5.22) and (5.23). \square

Let us define

$$\ell = \min\{h(a), -h(b)\}; \quad (5.24)$$

so

$$-\ell = \max\{-h(a), h(b)\}.$$

Moreover,

$$0 \leq 1 - \ell \leq (1 - h(a)) + (1 + h(b)). \quad (5.25)$$

Lemma 5.6. *Let \tilde{h} be as in (5.15). There exists $t^* \in [0, 1]$ such that*

$$E_\alpha \left(\tilde{h}(t^*), \{w_\alpha \leq \tilde{h}(t^*) \leq -w_\alpha\}^c \cup \{-\ell \leq \tilde{h}(t^*) \leq \ell\}^c \right) \leq E_\alpha(w_\alpha) + 2\tau_2. \quad (5.26)$$

Here, for $S \subset N$, $S^c = (N \setminus S)$.

Proof. Let $h' : [0, 1] \rightarrow H^1(N)$ be defined by

$$h'(t) = \min\{\ell, \max\{-\ell, \tilde{h}(t)\}\} = \begin{cases} \tilde{h}(t) & \text{on } \{\ell \geq \tilde{h}(t) \geq -\ell\}; \\ \pm\ell & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (5.27)$$

Since

$$\ell \leq h(a) \leq \tilde{h}(0) \leq \max\{-\ell, \tilde{h}(0)\} \quad \text{and} \quad -\ell \geq h(b) \geq \tilde{h}(1),$$

we have

$$h'(0) = \ell \quad \text{and} \quad h'(1) = \min\{\ell, -\ell\}. \quad (5.28)$$

Let $h'' : [0, 1] \rightarrow H^1(N)$ be defined by $h''(t) = T(h'(t))$, where T is as in Lemma 5.5. By Lemma 5.5, (5.28), (5.8) and Lemma 5.4,

$$\begin{aligned} E_\alpha(h''(0)) &\leq E_\alpha(w_\alpha) + E_\alpha(\ell, \Omega) \leq 2\sigma\mathcal{H}^n(\partial\Omega) + 3\tau_2; \\ E_\alpha(h''(1)) &\leq E_\alpha(w_\alpha) + E_\alpha(\ell, \Omega) \leq 2\sigma\mathcal{H}^n(\partial\Omega) + 3\tau_2. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by Lemma 5.5, (5.25), Lemma 5.4 and (5.9),

$$\begin{aligned} \|1 - h''(0)\|_{L^1(\Omega)} &\leq \|1 - \ell\|_{L^1(\Omega)} + 2\mathcal{H}^{n+1}(\Omega \setminus \Omega_{-4\sqrt{\alpha}}) \leq 3\tau_1; \\ \|1 + h''(1)\|_{L^1(\Omega)} &\leq \|1 - \ell\|_{L^1(\Omega)} + 2\mathcal{H}^{n+1}(\Omega \setminus \Omega_{-4\sqrt{\alpha}}) \leq 3\tau_1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by our choices of τ_1 , τ_2 , τ and Lemma 4.1, there exists a continuous map $\beta_0 : [0, 1] \rightarrow H^1(N)$ such that $\beta_0(0) = h''(0)$, $\beta_0(1)|_\Omega \equiv 1$ and

$$\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} E_\alpha(\beta_0(t)) \leq 4\sigma\mathcal{H}^n(\partial\Omega) + 3\tau_2 + \tau \leq 5\sigma\mathcal{H}^n(\partial\Omega) \quad (\text{by (5.4) and (5.6)}). \quad (5.29)$$

Similarly, there exists a continuous map $\beta_1 : [0, 1] \rightarrow H^1(N)$ such that $\beta_1(0) = h''(1)$, $\beta_1(1)|_\Omega \equiv -1$ and

$$\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} E_\alpha(\beta_1(t)) \leq 4\sigma\mathcal{H}^n(\partial\Omega) + 3\tau_2 + \tau \leq 5\sigma\mathcal{H}^n(\partial\Omega). \quad (5.30)$$

Let us define $\beta : [0, 1] \rightarrow H^1(N)$ by

$$\beta(t) = \begin{cases} \beta_0(1 - 3t) & \text{if } 0 \leq t \leq 1/3; \\ h''(3t - 1) & \text{if } 1/3 \leq t \leq 2/3; \\ \beta_1(3t - 2) & \text{if } 2/3 \leq t \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

Since $\beta \in \mathcal{B}$, there exists $t^\bullet \in [0, 1]$ such that

$$E_\alpha(\beta(t^\bullet)) \geq \tilde{\lambda}_\alpha(\Omega) \geq \lambda_\alpha(\Omega) > 7\sigma\mathcal{H}^n(\partial\Omega) \text{ (using (5.2), (5.3) and (5.10)).}$$

Therefore, by (5.29) and (5.30), there exists $t^* \in [0, 1]$ such that

$$E_\alpha(h''(t^*)) \geq \tilde{\lambda}_\alpha(\Omega). \quad (5.31)$$

However, by Lemma 5.5, (5.27) and Lemma 5.4, for all $t \in [0, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} E_\alpha(h''(t)) &\leq E_\alpha(w_\alpha) + E_\alpha(h'(t), \{w_\alpha \leq h'(t) \leq -w_\alpha\}) \\ &\leq E_\alpha(w_\alpha) + E_\alpha(\tilde{h}(t), \{w_\alpha \leq \tilde{h}(t) \leq -w_\alpha\} \cap \{-\ell \leq \tilde{h}(t) \leq \ell\}) + E_\alpha(\ell, \Omega) \\ &\leq E_\alpha(w_\alpha) + E_\alpha(\tilde{h}(t), \{w_\alpha \leq \tilde{h}(t) \leq -w_\alpha\} \cap \{-\ell \leq \tilde{h}(t) \leq \ell\}) + 2\tau_2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.32)$$

Further, by (5.15),

$$E_\alpha(\tilde{h}(t^*)) < \tilde{\lambda}_\alpha(\Omega). \quad (5.33)$$

Combining (5.31), (5.32) and (5.33), one obtains (5.26). \square

Part 4. For $r \in \mathbb{R}$, let $r^+ = \max\{r, 0\}$; $r^- = \min\{r, 0\}$. The maps $\Phi, \Psi, \Theta : H^1(N) \times H^1(N) \times H^1(N) \rightarrow H^1(N)$ are defined as follows [Dey20, Equation (3.70)].

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(u_0, u_1, w) &= \min\{\max\{u_0, -w\}, \max\{u_1, w\}\}; \\ \Psi(u_0, u_1, w) &= \max\{\min\{u_0, w\}, \min\{u_1, -w\}\}; \\ \Theta(u_0, u_1, w) &= \Phi(u_0, u_1, w)^+ + \Psi(u_0, u_1, w)^-. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 5.7. Let $u_0, u_1, w \in H^1(N)$ such that $|u_0|, |u_1|, |w| \leq 1$; $\phi = \Phi(u_0, u_1, w)$, $\psi = \Psi(u_0, u_1, w)$, $\theta = \Theta(u_0, u_1, w)$.

- (i) If $w(x) = 1$, then $\theta(x) = u_0(x)$; if $w(x) = -1$, then $\theta(x) = u_1(x)$.
- (ii) If $u_0(x) = u_1(x)$, then $\theta(x) = u_0(x) = u_1(x)$.
- (iii) For all $x \in N$, either $\theta(x) = \phi(x)$ or $\theta(x) = \psi(x)$; hence $\theta(x) \in \{u_0(x), u_1(x), w(x), -w(x)\}$.
- (iv) For $\varepsilon > 0$ and $S \subset N$,

$$\begin{aligned} E_\varepsilon(\theta, S) &\leq E_\varepsilon(w, S) + E_\varepsilon(u_0, S \cap (\{u_0 > -w\} \cup \{u_0 < w\})) \\ &\quad + E_\varepsilon(u_1, S \cap (\{u_1 > w\} \cup \{u_1 < -w\})). \end{aligned}$$

- (v) If $v_0, v_1 \in H^1(N)$ such that $v_0 \geq u_0, u_1 \geq v_1$, then $v_0 \geq \theta \geq v_1$.

Proof. For the proofs of items (i) – (iii), we refer to [Dey20, Proof of Proposition 3.12]. (iv) follows from (iii) and the definitions of Φ and Ψ . To prove item (v), we note the following. If $r_1, r'_1, r_2, r'_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $r_1 \geq r_2$ and $r'_1 \geq r'_2$, then $\max\{r_1, r'_1\} \geq \max\{r_2, r'_2\}$ and $\min\{r_1, r'_1\} \geq \min\{r_2, r'_2\}$. In particular, if we set $r'_1 = r'_2 = s$, then $\max\{r_1, s\} \geq \max\{r_2, s\}$ and $\min\{r_1, s\} \geq \min\{r_2, s\}$. Hence $v_0 \geq u_0, u_1 \geq v_1$ implies

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(v_0, v_0, w) &\geq \Phi(u_0, u_1, w) \geq \Phi(v_1, v_1, w), \\ \Psi(v_0, v_0, w) &\geq \Psi(u_0, u_1, w) \geq \Psi(v_1, v_1, w).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, using item (ii), we obtain

$$v_0 \geq \Theta(u_0, u_1, w) \geq v_1.$$

□

Let t^* be as in Lemma 5.6 and ℓ be as defined in (5.24). We define

$$\begin{aligned}\ell_0 &= \max\{\tilde{h}(t^*), \ell\}; \quad \ell_1 = \min\{\tilde{h}(t^*), -\ell\}; \\ h_0^* &= \Theta(\tilde{h}(t^*), \ell_0, w_\alpha); \quad h_1^* = \Theta(\tilde{h}(t^*), \ell_1, w_\alpha).\end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that

$$\ell_0 = \begin{cases} \ell & \text{on } \{\tilde{h}(t^*) \leq \ell\} \\ \tilde{h}(t^*) & \text{on } \{\tilde{h}(t^*) > \ell\}, \end{cases}$$

and Lemma 5.7 (ii), (iv), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}E_\alpha(h_0^*) &= E_\alpha\left(\Theta(\tilde{h}(t^*), \ell, w_\alpha), \{\tilde{h}(t^*) \leq \ell\}\right) + E_\alpha\left(\tilde{h}(t^*), \{\tilde{h}(t^*) > \ell\}\right) \\ &\leq E_\alpha(w_\alpha) + E_\alpha(\ell, \{\ell > w_\alpha\} \cup \{\ell < -w_\alpha\}) \\ &\quad + E_\alpha\left(\tilde{h}(t^*), \{\tilde{h}(t^*) > \ell\} \cup \{\tilde{h}(t^*) > -w_\alpha\} \cup \{\tilde{h}(t^*) < w_\alpha\}\right) \\ &\leq 2E_\alpha(w_\alpha) + 4\tau_2.\end{aligned}\tag{5.34}$$

In the last step we have used Lemma 5.4, Lemma 5.6 and the fact that

$$\{\ell > w_\alpha\} \cup \{\ell < -w_\alpha\} \subset \{w_\alpha < 1\} \subset \Omega \text{ (by (5.16)).}$$

By a similar argument,

$$E_\alpha(h_1^*) \leq 2E_\alpha(w_\alpha) + 4\tau_2.\tag{5.35}$$

By Lemma 5.7 (i) and (5.16), $h_0^* = \ell_0$ on $\Omega_{-4\sqrt{\alpha}}$. Further, $1 \geq \ell_0 \geq \ell$ and by Lemma 5.7 (v), $|h_0^*| \leq 1$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\|1 - h_0^*\|_{L^1(\Omega)} &\leq \|1 - \ell_0\|_{L^1(\Omega_{-4\sqrt{\alpha}})} + 2\mathcal{H}^{n+1}\left(\Omega \setminus \Omega_{-4\sqrt{\alpha}}\right) \\ &\leq \|1 - \ell\|_{L^1(\Omega)} + \tau_1 \text{ (by (5.9))} \\ &\leq 3\tau_1 \text{ (by Lemma 5.4).}\end{aligned}\tag{5.36}$$

Similarly, one can show that

$$\|1 + h_1^*\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq 3\tau_1. \quad (5.37)$$

Using Lemma 5.7 (v) and the definitions of \tilde{h} and ℓ , we obtain

$$\tilde{h}(0) \geq h_0^* \geq \tilde{h}(t^*); \quad \tilde{h}(t^*) \geq h_1^* \geq \tilde{h}(1). \quad (5.38)$$

By Lemma 3.1, there exists $\tilde{h}(0) \geq h_0^\bullet \geq h_0^*$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} E_\alpha(h_0^\bullet) &= \inf\{E_\alpha(u) : \tilde{h}(0) \geq u \geq h_0^*\} \\ &\leq E_\alpha(h_0^*) \\ &\leq 2E_\alpha(w_\alpha) + 4\tau_2 \text{ (by (5.34))} \\ &\leq 4\sigma\mathcal{H}^n(\partial\Omega) + 6\tau_2 \text{ (by (5.8))}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.39)$$

Moreover, (5.36) and $1 \geq h_0^\bullet \geq h_0^*$ imply that

$$\|1 - h_0^\bullet\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq \|1 - h_0^*\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq 3\tau_1. \quad (5.40)$$

Similarly, by Lemma 3.1, there exists $h_1^* \geq h_1^\bullet \geq \tilde{h}(1)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} E_\alpha(h_1^\bullet) &= \inf\{E_\alpha(u) : h_1^* \geq u \geq \tilde{h}(1)\} \\ &\leq E_\alpha(h_1^*) \\ &\leq 2E_\alpha(w_\alpha) + 4\tau_2 \text{ (by (5.35))} \\ &\leq 4\sigma\mathcal{H}^n(\partial\Omega) + 6\tau_2 \text{ (by (5.8))}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.41)$$

Moreover, (5.37) and $h_1^* \geq h_1^\bullet \geq -1$ imply that

$$\|1 + h_1^\bullet\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq \|1 + h_1^*\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq 3\tau_1. \quad (5.42)$$

Setting $u = \tilde{h}$ and $v = h_1^\bullet$ in Lemma 3.3 (a), we conclude that there exists a nested map $\gamma_1 : [0, 1] \rightarrow H^1(N)$ such that $\gamma_1(0) = \tilde{h}(0)$, $\gamma_1(1) = h_1^\bullet$ ((5.38) implies that $\tilde{h}(0) \geq h_1^\bullet$) and

$$\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} E_\alpha(\gamma_1(t)) \leq \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} E_\alpha(\tilde{h}(t)) \leq \tilde{\lambda}_\alpha(\Omega) - \frac{\delta}{2} \text{ (by (5.15))}.$$

Next, setting $u = \gamma_1$ and $v = h_0^\bullet$ in Lemma 3.3 (b), we obtain another nested map $\gamma_2 : [0, 1] \rightarrow H^1(N)$ such that $\gamma_2(0) = h_0^\bullet$, $\gamma_2(1) = h_1^\bullet$ ((5.38) implies that $h_0^\bullet \geq h_1^\bullet$) and

$$\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} E_\alpha(\gamma_2(t)) \leq \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} E_\alpha(\gamma_1(t)) \leq \tilde{\lambda}_\alpha(\Omega) - \frac{\delta}{2}. \quad (5.43)$$

By the definitions of τ_1 , τ and Lemma 4.1, (5.39) and (5.40) imply that there exists $\tilde{\gamma}_0 : [0, 1] \rightarrow H^1(N)$ such that $\tilde{\gamma}_0(0) = h_0^\bullet$, $\tilde{\gamma}_0(1)|_\Omega \equiv 1$ and

$$\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} E_\alpha(\tilde{\gamma}_0(t)) \leq 6\sigma\mathcal{H}^n(\partial\Omega) + 6\tau_2 + \tau \leq 7\sigma\mathcal{H}^n(\partial\Omega) \text{ (by (5.4) and (5.6))}. \quad (5.44)$$

Similarly (5.41) and (5.42) imply that there exists $\tilde{\gamma}_1 : [0, 1] \rightarrow H^1(N)$ such that $\tilde{\gamma}_1(0) = h_1^\bullet$, $\tilde{\gamma}_1(1)|_\Omega \equiv -1$ and

$$\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} E_\alpha(\tilde{\gamma}_1(t)) \leq 6\sigma\mathcal{H}^n(\partial\Omega) + 6\tau_2 + \tau \leq 7\sigma\mathcal{H}^n(\partial\Omega) \text{ (by (5.4) and (5.6))}. \quad (5.45)$$

Let $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow H^1(N)$ be defined by

$$\gamma(t) = \begin{cases} \tilde{\gamma}_0(1 - 3t) & \text{if } 0 \leq t \leq 1/3; \\ \tilde{\gamma}_2(3t - 1) & \text{if } 1/3 \leq t \leq 2/3; \\ \tilde{\gamma}_1(3t - 2) & \text{if } 2/3 \leq t \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

Then $\gamma \in \mathcal{B}$; (5.43), (5.44), (5.45), (5.10) and (5.3) imply that

$$\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} E_\alpha(\gamma(t)) < \tilde{\lambda}_\alpha(\Omega),$$

which contradicts the definition of $\tilde{\lambda}_\alpha(\Omega)$ ((5.2)). This finishes the proof of Proposition 5.2. \square

Theorem 5.8. *Let (N^{n+1}, g) , $n + 1 \geq 3$, be a closed Riemannian manifold and $\Omega \subset N$ be a good set. Suppose ε^* and η^* are as in Proposition 5.2 and Remark 5.3 (where we set $g' = g$ in Remark 5.3). Then for all $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon^*$, there exists $\vartheta_\varepsilon : N \rightarrow (-1, 1)$ satisfying $AC_\varepsilon(\vartheta_\varepsilon) = 0$, $\text{Ind}(\vartheta_\varepsilon) \leq 1$, $E_\varepsilon(\vartheta_\varepsilon) = \tilde{\lambda}_\varepsilon(\Omega)$ and $E_\varepsilon(\vartheta_\varepsilon, \Omega) \geq \eta^*$.*

Proof. To prove this theorem, we apply Theorem 2.5 to the functional $E_\varepsilon : H^1(N) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon^*$. In Theorem 2.5, we set

$$B_0 = \{u \in H^1(N) : u|_\Omega \equiv 1\}; \quad B_1 = \{u \in H^1(N) : u|_\Omega \equiv -1\};$$

$\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{B}$ so that $c = \tilde{\lambda}_\varepsilon(\Omega)$ and

$$L = \{u \in H^1(N) : E_\varepsilon(u) \geq \tilde{\lambda}_\varepsilon(\Omega)\} \cap \{u \in H^1(N) : E_\varepsilon(u, \Omega) \geq \eta^*\}. \quad (5.46)$$

Since $u|_\Omega \equiv 1$ or $u|_\Omega \equiv -1$ imply that $E_\varepsilon(u, \Omega) = 0$, the condition (a1) of Theorem 2.5 is satisfied. By Proposition 5.2, the condition (a2) is also satisfied. It follows from (5.46) that (a3) is satisfied as well. Following [Gua18, Section 4], if $\{\tilde{h}_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ is an arbitrary minimizing sequence for E_ε in \mathcal{B} , we define $\{h_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{B}$ by

$$h_i(t) = \min\{1, \max\{-1, \tilde{h}_i(t)\}\}.$$

Then

$$-1 \leq h_i(t) \leq 1 \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{N}, t \in [0, 1] \quad (5.47)$$

and $E_\varepsilon(h_i) \leq E_\varepsilon(\tilde{h}_i)$. Hence $\{h_i\}$ is again a minimizing sequence. By [Gua18, Proposition 4.4], E_ε satisfies the Palais-Smale condition along $\{h_i\}$. Therefore, by Theorem 2.5, part (a), there exists $\vartheta_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{K}(\{h_i\})$ such that

$$AC_\varepsilon(\vartheta_\varepsilon) = 0, \quad E_\varepsilon(\vartheta_\varepsilon) = \tilde{\lambda}_\varepsilon(\Omega), \quad E_\varepsilon(\vartheta_\varepsilon, \Omega) \geq \eta^*.$$

Moreover, by (5.47), $|\vartheta_\varepsilon| \leq 1$; hence by the strong maximum principle $|\vartheta_\varepsilon| < 1$. In addition, if the ambient metric $g \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ (where $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ is as defined in Theorem 2.2) and $\varepsilon^{-1} \notin \text{Spec}(-\Delta_g)$, then $\mathcal{Z}_{\varepsilon, g}$ is finite. In that case, the condition (b1) of Theorem 2.5, part (b) is satisfied and one can ensure that ϑ_ε satisfies $\text{Ind}(\vartheta_\varepsilon) \leq 1$.

To get the Morse index upper bound for arbitrary metric g and $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon^*]$, we use an approximation argument. Since, by Theorem 2.2, $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ is a generic subset of \mathcal{M} , it is possible to choose $\{g_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ such that g_i converges to g smoothly. Let $\{\epsilon_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ be a sequence in $(0, \varepsilon^*]$ such that $\epsilon_i^{-1} \notin \text{Spec}(-\Delta_{g_i})$ and $\epsilon_i \rightarrow \varepsilon$. Since the width $\mathbb{W}(\Omega)$ depends continuously on the ambient metric [IMN18, Lemma 2.1], Ω is a good set with respect to g_i if i is sufficiently large. Therefore, by the above discussion, Theorem 2.2, Theorem 2.5, Proposition 5.2 and Remark 5.3 imply that for all i sufficiently large, there exists $\vartheta^i : N \rightarrow (-1, 1)$ such that

$$AC_{\epsilon_i, g_i}(\vartheta^i) = 0; \quad \text{Ind}_{g_i}(\vartheta^i) \leq 1; \quad E_{\epsilon_i, g_i}(\vartheta^i) = \tilde{\lambda}_{\epsilon_i, g_i}(\Omega); \quad E_{\epsilon_i, g_i}(\vartheta^i, \Omega) \geq \eta^*. \quad (5.48)$$

In this equation, the subscript g_i indicates that these quantities are computed with respect to the metric g_i . Since $|\vartheta^i| < 1$, by the elliptic regularity and the Arzela-Ascoli theorem, there exists $\vartheta^\infty : N \rightarrow [-1, 1]$ such that up to a subsequence ϑ^i converges to ϑ^∞ in $C^2(N)$. Using (5.48) and the fact that the min-max quantity $\tilde{\lambda}_\varepsilon(\Omega)$ depends continuously on the ambient metric [GG19, Lemma 5.4], we obtain

$$AC_{\varepsilon, g}(\vartheta^\infty) = 0; \quad \text{Ind}_g(\vartheta^\infty) \leq 1; \quad E_{\varepsilon, g}(\vartheta^\infty) = \tilde{\lambda}_{\varepsilon, g}(\Omega); \quad E_{\varepsilon, g}(\vartheta^\infty, \Omega) \geq \eta^*.$$

Furthermore, by the strong maximum principle, $|\vartheta^\infty| < 1$. This finishes the proof of Theorem 5.8. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.1. As proved in [CL20, Section 8.1], $\text{Vol}(M) < \infty$ implies that there exists a sequence $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$, where each $U_i \subset M$ is a bounded open set with smooth boundary, such that $U_i \subset U_{i+1}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{H}^n(\partial U_i) = 0$. As a consequence, there exists $i_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that U_{i_0} is a good set. For simplicity, let us denote U_{i_0} by U .

The following proposition was proved in [Mon16, Section 12.2].

Proposition 5.9. [Mon16, Section 12.2] *Let M' be a complete Riemannian manifold and $f' : M' \rightarrow [a_0, \infty)$ be a proper Morse function. Suppose a_1 is a regular value of f' and define*

$$\mathcal{R} = \{x \in M' : f'(x) \leq a_1\}.$$

Then there exists a closed Riemannian manifold N' and a Morse function $f'' : N' \rightarrow [a_0, \infty)$ such that N' contains an isometric copy of \mathcal{R} , f'' coincides with f' on \mathcal{R} and $f'' > a_1$ on $N' \setminus \mathcal{R}$.

Coming back to the proof of Theorem 1.1, we choose a proper Morse function $f_1 : M \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ with $\min_M f_1 = 0$. Let t_1 be a regular value of f_1 so that $U \subset\subset f_1^{-1}([0, t_1/2])$. Furthermore, by suitably modifying f_1 , we can assume that in the interval $[0, t_1/2]$, f_1 has no critical value which is a non-global local maxima or minima. Let

$$f_2 = \frac{1}{3} + \frac{2f_1}{3t_1}.$$

Then $f_2 : M \rightarrow [1/3, \infty)$, $U \subset\subset f_2^{-1}([1/3, 2/3])$ and we set $\tilde{U} = f_2^{-1}([1/3, 1])$.

We choose an increasing sequence $\{s_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ such that $s_1 \geq 1$, each s_i is a regular value of f_2 and $s_i \rightarrow \infty$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$. Let

$$Q_i = \{x \in M : f_2(x) < s_i\}, \quad \bar{Q}_i = \{x \in M : f_2(x) \leq s_i\}.$$

By Proposition 5.9, there exists a sequence $\{N_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ of closed Riemannian manifolds such that N_i contains an isometric copy of \bar{Q}_i . Moreover, for every i , there exists a Morse function $\tilde{f}_i : N_i \rightarrow [1/3, \infty)$ such that \tilde{f}_i coincides with f_2 on \bar{Q}_i and $\tilde{f}_i > s_i$ on $N_i \setminus \bar{Q}_i$. In particular, N_i contains isometric copies of U and \tilde{U} ; suppose \mathcal{U}_i denotes the isometric copy of U in N_i . Setting $N = N_i$ and $f = \tilde{f}_i$ in Proposition 5.2 and Remark 5.3 and using Theorem 5.8, we obtain $\varepsilon_0, \eta_0 > 0$, which depend only on U, \tilde{U} , the ambient metric on M restricted to \tilde{U} and $f_2|_{\tilde{U}}$ such that the following holds.¹ For all $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$, there exists $\vartheta_{\varepsilon,i} : N_i \rightarrow (-1, 1)$ satisfying

$$AC_\varepsilon(\vartheta_{\varepsilon,i}) = 0; \quad \text{Ind}(\vartheta_{\varepsilon,i}) \leq 1; \quad E_\varepsilon(\vartheta_{\varepsilon,i}) = \tilde{\lambda}_\varepsilon(\mathcal{U}_i); \quad E_\varepsilon(\vartheta_{\varepsilon,i}, \mathcal{U}_i) \geq \eta_0.$$

Let $b \in [1/3, \infty)$ such that

$$\{x \in M : d(x, U) \leq 2\sqrt{\varepsilon_0}\} \subset f_2^{-1}([1/3, b]).$$

One can modify f_2 on $f_2^{-1}([1/3, b])$ and define another proper Morse function $f_3 : M \rightarrow [1/3, \infty)$ so that

$$\{x \in M : d(x, U) \leq 2\sqrt{\varepsilon_0}\} \subset f_3^{-1}([1/3, b]) \tag{5.49}$$

and in the interval $[1/3, b]$, f_3 has no critical value which is a non-global local maxima or minima. For $1/3 \leq t \leq b$, let $d^t : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined by

$$d^t(x) = \begin{cases} -d(x, f_3^{-1}(t)) & \text{if } f_3(x) \leq t; \\ d(x, f_3^{-1}(t)) & \text{if } f_3(x) \geq t. \end{cases}$$

¹In particular, ε_0 and η_0 do not depend on i .

(5.49) and the fact that b is not a local maximum value of f_3 imply

$$U \subset \left\{ d^b \leq -2\sqrt{\varepsilon_0} \right\}. \quad (5.50)$$

We choose $i_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ so that

$$\left\{ d^b \leq 2\sqrt{\varepsilon_0} \right\} \subset Q_{i_1}. \quad (5.51)$$

For $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$, let $\zeta_\varepsilon : [0, b] \rightarrow H^1(Q_{i_1})$ be defined by

$$\zeta_\varepsilon(t) = \begin{cases} \hat{q}_\varepsilon \circ d^t & \text{if } \frac{1}{3} \leq t \leq b \\ 1 - 3t(1 - \zeta_\varepsilon(1/3)) & \text{if } 0 \leq t \leq \frac{1}{3}, \end{cases}$$

where \hat{q}_ε is as defined in (4.4). ζ_ε is continuous (see the discussion after equation (4.7)), $\zeta_\varepsilon(0) \equiv 1$ and (5.50) implies that $\zeta_\varepsilon(b)|_U \equiv -1$. Further, by [Gua18, Section 9],

$$\Lambda_\varepsilon := \sup_{0 \leq t \leq b} E_\varepsilon(\zeta_\varepsilon(t))$$

satisfies

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \Lambda_\varepsilon \leq 2\sigma \sup_{1/3 \leq t \leq b} \mathcal{H}^n(f_3^{-1}(t)). \quad (5.52)$$

For each $i \geq i_1$, N_i contains an isometric copy of Q_{i_1} . Hence (5.51) implies that ζ_ε canonically defines a continuous map $\zeta_{\varepsilon,i} : [0, b] \rightarrow H^1(N_i)$ ($\zeta_{\varepsilon,i}(t) \equiv 1$ on $N_i \setminus Q_{i_1}$ for all $t \in [0, b]$) so that $\zeta_\varepsilon(0) \equiv 1$ and $\zeta_\varepsilon(b)|_{\mathcal{U}_i} \equiv -1$. Thus

$$\tilde{\lambda}_\varepsilon(\mathcal{U}_i) \leq \Lambda_\varepsilon \quad \forall i \geq i_1. \quad (5.53)$$

Restricting $\vartheta_{\varepsilon,i}$ to the isometric copy of Q_i contained in N_i , one gets $\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,i} : Q_i \rightarrow (-1, 1)$ such that

$$AC_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,i}) = 0; \quad \text{Ind}(\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,i}) \leq 1; \quad E_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,i}, Q_i) \leq \tilde{\lambda}_\varepsilon(\mathcal{U}_i); \quad E_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,i}, U) \geq \eta_0. \quad (5.54)$$

For each fixed $j \in \mathbb{N}$, by the elliptic estimates, $\|\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,i}\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(Q_j)}$ is uniformly bounded for all $i > j$ (since $|\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,i}| < 1$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$). Using a diagonal argument and the Arzela-Ascoli theorem, we conclude that there exists $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon : M \rightarrow [-1, 1]$ such that a subsequence $\{\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,i_k}\}$ converges to \mathbf{u}_ε in $C_{\text{loc}}^2(M)$. Hence, using (5.54) and (5.53),

$$AC_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon) = 0; \quad \text{Ind}(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon) \leq 1; \quad E_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon) \leq \Lambda_\varepsilon; \quad E_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon, U) \geq \eta_0.$$

By the strong maximum principle, $|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon| < 1$. Further, as mentioned in (5.52), $\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \Lambda_\varepsilon < \infty$. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.2 using Theorem 1.1. Let

$$\Omega_1 \subset \cdots \subset \Omega_i \subset \Omega_{i+1} \subset \cdots$$

be an exhaustion of M by bounded open subsets with smooth boundaries and $U \subset\subset \Omega_1$. Using Theorem 2.1 and a diagonal argument, there exist a sequence $\{\epsilon_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ converging to 0 and a stationary, integral varifold V_k in Ω_k (for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$) such that the following conditions are satisfied.

- $$V \left[\mathbf{u}_{\epsilon_i} \Big|_{\Omega_k} \right] \rightarrow V_k \tag{5.55}$$

in the sense of varifolds.

- $\text{spt}(V_k)$ is a minimal hypersurface with optimal regularity in Ω_k .

- $$\|V_k\|(\text{Clos}(U)) \geq \frac{1}{2\sigma} \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} E_{\epsilon_i}(\mathbf{u}_{\epsilon_i}, U). \tag{5.56}$$

- $$\|V_k\|(\Omega_k) \leq \frac{1}{2\sigma} \limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} E_{\epsilon_i}(\mathbf{u}_{\epsilon_i}, \Omega_k) \leq \frac{1}{2\sigma} \limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} E_{\epsilon_i}(\mathbf{u}_{\epsilon_i}). \tag{5.57}$$

By (5.55), $V_i \llcorner \Omega_j = V_j$ if $i > j$. Therefore, there exists a stationary, integral varifold V in M such that $V \llcorner \Omega_i = V_i$ and $\text{spt}(V)$ is a minimal hypersurface with optimal regularity. Further, (1.2), (5.56) and (5.57) imply

$$0 < \|V\|(\text{Clos}(U)) \leq \|V\|(M) < \infty.$$

□

References

- [Alm65] F. Almgren, *The theory of varifolds*, Mimeographed notes, Princeton, 1965.
- [Bel20a] C. Bellettini, *Generic existence of multiplicity-1 minmax minimal hypersurfaces via Allen–Cahn*, arXiv:2010.15788 [math.DG] (2020).
- [Bel20b] ———, *Multiplicity-1 minmax minimal hypersurfaces in manifolds with positive Ricci curvature*, arXiv:2004.10112 [math.AP] (2020).
- [BW18] C. Bellettini and N. Wickramasekera, *Stable CMC integral varifolds of codimension 1: regularity and compactness*, arXiv:1802.00377 [math.DG] (2018).
- [BW19] ———, *Stable prescribed-mean-curvature integral varifolds of codimension 1: regularity and compactness*, arXiv:1902.09669 [math.DG] (2019).
- [BW20] ———, *The inhomogeneous Allen–Cahn equation and the existence of prescribed-mean-curvature hypersurfaces*, arXiv:2010.05847 [math.DG] (2020).
- [CG19] R. Caju and P. Gaspar, *Solutions of the Allen–Cahn equation on closed manifolds in the presence of symmetry*, arXiv:1906.05938 [math.DG] (2019).

- [Che17] D. R. Cheng, *Geometric variational problems: Regular and singular behavior*, Ph.D. Thesis, Stanford University, 2017.
- [CHMR17] P. Collin, L. Hauswirth, L. Mazet, and H. Rosenberg, *Minimal surfaces in finite volume non-compact hyperbolic 3-manifolds*, Trans. Amer. Math. **369**(6) (2017), 4293–4309.
- [CK18] O. Chodosh and D. Ketover, *Asymptotically flat three-manifolds contain minimal planes*, Adv. Math. **337** (2018), 171–192.
- [CL20] G. R. Chambers and Y. Liokumovich, *Existence of minimal hypersurfaces in complete manifolds of finite volume*, Invent. Math. **219** (2020), 179–217.
- [CM20] O. Chodosh and C. Mantoulidis, *Minimal surfaces and the Allen-Cahn equation on 3-manifolds: index, multiplicity, and curvature estimates*, Ann. of Math. **191** (2020), no. 1, 213–328.
- [Cos18] B. Coskunuzer, *Minimal surfaces in hyperbolic 3-manifolds*, arXiv:1806.10549 [math.DG] (2018).
- [Dey20] A. Dey, *A comparison of the Almgren-Pitts and the Allen-Cahn min-max theory*, arXiv:2004.05120 [math.DG] (2020).
- [dKWY10] M. del Pino, M. Kowalczyk, J. Wei, and J. Yang, *Interface foliation of a minimal hypersurface in higher dimensional Riemannian manifolds*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **20** (2010), no. 4, 918–957.
- [Gas20] P. Gaspar, *The second inner variation of energy and the Morse index of limit interfaces*, J. Geom. Anal. **30** (2020), 69–85.
- [GG18] P. Gaspar and M. A. M. Guaraco, *The Allen-Cahn equation on closed manifolds*, Calc. Var. Partial Differ. Equ. **57** (2018), 101.
- [GG19] ———, *The Weyl law for the phase transition spectrum and the density of minimal hypersurfaces*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **29** (2019), no. 2, 382–410.
- [Gho91] N. Ghoussoub, *Location, multiplicity and Morse indices of min-max critical points*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **417** (1991), 27–76.
- [GMN19] M. A. M. Guaraco, F. C. Marques, and A. Neves, *Multiplicity one and strictly stable allen-cahn minimal hypersurfaces*, arXiv:1912.08997 [math.DG] (2019).
- [Gro03] M. Gromov, *Isoperimetry of waists and concentration of maps*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **13** (2003), 178–215.
- [Gro14] ———, *Plateau-Stein manifolds*, Cent. Eur. J. Math. **12**(7) (2014), 923–951.
- [Gro88] ———, *Dimension, nonlinear spectra and width*, Geometric aspects of functional analysis, (1986/87), 1988, pp. 132–184. Lecture Notes in Math., Springer, Berlin.
- [GT01] D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger, *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of second order*, Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001. Reprint of the 1998 edition.
- [Gua18] M. A. M. Guaraco, *Min-max for phase transitions and the existence of embedded minimal hypersurfaces*, J. Differ. Geom. **108** (2018), 91–133.
- [Gut09] L. Guth, *Minimax problems related to cup powers and Steenrod squares*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **18** (2009), 1917–1987.
- [Hie18] F. Hiesmayr, *Spectrum and index of two-sided Allen-Cahn minimal hypersurfaces*, Communications in Partial Differential Equations **43** (2018), no. 11, 1541–1565.
- [HT00] J. E. Hutchinson and Y. Tonegawa, *Convergence of phase interfaces in the van der Waals-Cahn-Hilliard theory*, Calc. Var. Partial Differ. Equ. **10**(1) (2000), 49–84.
- [HW17] Z. Huang and B. Wang, *Closed minimal surfaces in cusped hyperbolic 3-manifolds*, Geom. Dedicata **189** (2017), 17–37.
- [IMN18] K. Irie, F. C. Marques, and A. Neves, *Density of minimal hypersurfaces for generic metrics*, Ann. of Math. **187** (2018), 963–972.

- [Li19] Y. Li, *Existence of infinitely many minimal hypersurfaces in higher-dimensional closed manifolds with generic metrics*, arXiv:1901.08440 [math.DG] (2019).
- [LMN18] Y. Liokumovich, F. C. Marques, and A. Neves, *Weyl law for the volume spectrum*, Ann. of Math. **187** (2018), 933–961.
- [LZ16] M. Li and X. Zhou, *Min-max theory for free boundary minimal hypersurfaces I - regularity theory*, arXiv:1611.02612 [math.DG] (2016).
- [Man17] C. Mantoulidis, *Allen-Cahn min-max on surfaces*, arXiv:1706.05946 [math.AP] (2017).
- [Man20] ———, *Variational aspects of phase transitions with prescribed mean curvature*, arXiv:2011.00358 [math.DG] (2020).
- [MN18] F. C. Marques and A. Neves, *Morse index of multiplicity one min-max minimal hypersurfaces*, arXiv:1803.04273 [math.DG] (2018).
- [MN17] ———, *Existence of infinitely many minimal hypersurfaces in positive Ricci curvature*, Invent. Math. **209** (2017), no. 2, 577–616.
- [MN16] ———, *Morse index and multiplicity of min-max minimal hypersurfaces*, Cambridge J. Math. **4** (2016), no. 4, 463–511.
- [MNS19] F. C. Marques, A. Neves, and A. Song, *Equidistribution of minimal hypersurfaces in generic metrics*, Invent. Math. **216** (2019), no. 2, 421–443.
- [Mod87] L. Modica, *The gradient theory of phase transitions and the minimal interface criterion*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **98** (1987), no. 2, 123–142.
- [Mon16] R. Montezuma., *Min-max minimal hypersurfaces in non-compact manifolds*, J. Differ. Geom. **103(3)** (2016), 475–519.
- [Pit81] J. Pitts, *Existence and regularity of minimal surfaces on Riemannian manifolds*, Mathematical Notes 27, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1981.
- [PR03] F. Pacard and M. Ritoré, *From constant mean curvature hypersurfaces to the gradient theory of phase transitions*, J. Differ. Geom. **64** (2003), 359–423.
- [PS19] A. Pigati and D. Stern, *Minimal submanifolds from the abelian Higgs model*, arXiv:1905.13726 [math.DG] (2019).
- [Smi16] G. Smith, *Bifurcation of solutions to the Allen-Cahn equation*, J. Lond. Math. Soc. **94** (2016), no. 3, 667–687.
- [Son18] A. Song, *Existence of infinitely many minimal hypersurfaces in closed manifolds*, arXiv:1806.08816 [math.DG] (2018).
- [Son19] ———, *A dichotomy for minimal hypersurfaces in manifolds thick at infinity*, arXiv: 1902.06767 (2019).
- [SS81] R. Schoen and L. Simon, *Regularity of stable minimal hypersurfaces*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **34** (1981), 741–797.
- [Ste16] D. Stern, *A natural min-max construction for Ginzburg-Landau functionals*, arXiv:1612.00544 [math.DG] (2016).
- [Ste17] ———, *Energy concentration for min-max solutions of the Ginzburg-Landau equations on manifolds with $b_1(M) \neq 0$* , arXiv:1704.00712 [math.DG] (2017).
- [Ste88] P. Sternberg, *The effect of a singular perturbation on nonconvex variational problems*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **101** (1988), no. 3, 209–260.
- [SZ20] A. Song and X. Zhou, *Generic scarring for minimal hypersurfaces along stable hypersurfaces*, arXiv:2006.03038 [math.DG] (2020).
- [Ton05] Y. Tonegawa, *On stable critical points for a singular perturbation problem*, Comm. Anal. Geom. **13(2)** (2005), 439–459.

- [TW12] Y. Tonegawa and N. Wickramasekera, *Stable phase interfaces in the van der Waals–Cahn–Hilliard theory*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **668** (2012), 191–210.
- [Wic14] N. Wickramasekera, *A general regularity theory for stable codimension 1 integral varifolds*, Ann. of Math. **179(3)** (2014), 843–1007.
- [Yau82] S.-T. Yau, *Seminar on Differential Geometry, Problem section*, Ann. of Math. Stud., 102, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, N.J., 1982.
- [Zho20] X. Zhou, *On the multiplicity one conjecture in min-max theory*, Ann. of Math. **192** (2020), no. 3, 767–820.
- [ZZ19] X. Zhou and J. Zhu, *Min-max theory for constant mean curvature hypersurfaces*, Invent. Math. **218** (2019), no. 2, 441–490.
- [ZZ20] ———, *Existence of hypersurfaces with prescribed mean curvature I – generic min-max*, Camb. J. Math. **8** (2020), no. 2, 311–362.